United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 148 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 9, 2002 No. 132—Part II

House of Representatives

□ 1945

FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 114, AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ RESOLUTION OF 2002—Continued

Therefore, firm in my beliefs, buoyed by the input from my constituents, and strong in my faith in the principles and ideals of America, I will vote for the Spratt-Moran substitute resolution.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker this is the most important vote I will have cast in my 20 years in Congress. I was here to cast my vote to go to war against Iraq in 1991. That was a definable conflict involving an aggressor who had to be stopped by the international community. America provided the leadership both to develop the coalition effort and provided the military power needed to win the war decisively.

Now we face a far greater threat: the threat of a government dedicated to methodical, committed development, production, and stockpiling of chemical and biological weapons, and ultimately to the development of a small transportable nuclear weapon. This threat is spearheaded by Iraq, but not posed by Iraq alone. I firmly believe that if we fail to develop an international response to turn back this new threat of far more mobile and potent weapons, the cost will be extraordinary in the sacrifice of innocent lives and the crippling effect on the world's economy and on the stability of governments throughout the world.

We cannot allow nations, as a matter of their public policy, to develop chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons that can be delivered in lethal amounts all around the world. Whether it be delivery through terrorist organizations such as al Qaeda or hard-to-detect drones with sprayer nozzles, there are now the means to deliver these weapons of mass destruction into the very hearts of our cities and towns. The attack of September 11 was only the most vivid and terrible demonstration of the power of hate to deliver death and destruction of incredible dimensions by stealth means.

Make no mistake, for 4 years, ever since the arms inspectors left Iraq when they were prevented from doing their job, Iraq has been increasing its research, development, and production of chemical and biological weapons despite their international agreements not to do so. I believe the evidence on this matter is clear and convincing and that there is sufficient evidence of an accelerated effort to develop nuclear weapons to make action the only realistic course.

We and the international community must act, not only to stop Iraq, but to demonstrate to other nations that are starting down the same path as Iraq that are developing chemical and biological arsenals that the international community will not tolerate such a development because it poses such an extraordinary threat to all nations' economies, governments, and the very fabric of human communities.

I will vote ''yes'' on this resolution, and commend the President, Secretary Powell, and Secretary Rumsfeld for working to unify the international community in the face of this new and unprecedented threat. I firmly believe, as the President has said, that war is neither imminent nor unavoidable. But I believe that the passage of this resolution will make an effective peaceful multilateral response more likely because it represents the depth of our commitment to the goal of Iraqi disarmament and the elimination of the threat of chemical and biological weapons in tandem with the power of terrorist organizations and the stealthy delivery systems so clearly under development in Iraq.

Failure to act as we have for 4 years is no longer an option. We must prevent the accumulation of chemical and biological weapons and the development of increasingly stealthy means of delivery before these weapons are used against us and others.

I thank the Speaker for this opportunity to be heard on this historic occasion.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), my friend and colleague who serves on the Committee on Ways and Means and is a leader in the Massachusetts delegation.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor of the House to carry out one of the most important responsibilities that an elected Member of this institution has, to vote on a resolution authorizing the use of military force. It is a profound responsibility and one that I take most seriously.

Even Mr. Lincoln, as a Member of this House, wrestled with the issue of war-making powers when in 1848, in a letter to his law partner, William Herndon, voiced concern that Congress should not give unlimited powers to the executive. I share Mr. Lincoln's views on this important subject.

Everyone in this Chamber agrees that Saddam Hussein is a threat to his own people, his neighbors, and the entire civilized world. He is a tyrant intent on developing weapons of mass destruction and the means to deliver them. His many atrocities have been catalogued in this House and the Senate during this important debate, and his dictatorial regime is held in contempt around the globe. That is why

Printed on recycled paper.

any attempt to disarm or to replace him, and I support both, should be done with the support of our friends and allies in the international community.

Unilateralism and the doctrine of preemption are dangerous precedents that the United States may be setting. Such action is contrary to our country's core values and principles. Efforts to neutralize Iraq's chemical, biological, and nuclear threat should be done with the support of an international coalition and in accordance with international law. In my opinion and the opinion of many allies around the world, there are many compelling alternatives to acting alone and the immediate use of force as the first option. Here is one.

It is my belief that we need a new unambiguous resolution from the United Nations Security Council calling for the immediate and unfettered weapons inspectors to be allowed into Iraq. This new resolution should be unconditional, have clear time tables, and must exclude the unreasonable 1998 language that restricts inspectors from visiting Saddam Hussein's presidential palaces. Nothing should be off limits. It will hold Iraq permanently accountable to the international community. Saddam Hussein will have only two stark choices. He can accept robust inspections and begin to disarm or pay serious consequences, and I urge the United Nations to act immediately.

In preparation for this debate, Mr. Speaker, I have had an opportunity to talk and listen to many people about the merits of this resolution. I went to my constituents in Massachusetts, colleagues in Washington, and officials of administrations past and present. And each time I came away with more questions than answers. Important and timely questions about the wider implications of a unilateral war with Iraq should be answered.

The administration must tell the American people in clear and concise terms what impact a unilateral strike against Iraq would have on the already tenuous situation in the Middle East. In 1990 Saddam Hussein launched 39 SCUD missiles into the heart of Israel. Does anyone doubt that he would do it again? Twelve years ago the State of Israel showed restraint in the face of such attacks; but as we debate this resolution this evening, the Israeli Government has indicated it will defend itself against any Iraqi initiative.

What does this mean for the security of the region? Any attempt to restore the peace process between the Israelis and the Palestinians would be lost in the short term. What about Iran, Syria, and Libya, who are all engaged in active programs to develop weapons of mass destruction and the means to deliver them? How do we respond to a unilateral, preemptive American strike against Iraq?

We should not minimize the far-reaching implications of a first strike and a new doctrine of preemption. Indeed, it may have unintended consequences in other parts of the world, in conflicts between India and Pakistan, China and Taiwan, Russia and Georgia. On the verge of this historic vote, these questions need to be answered before we reach a decision to send our young Americans into harm's way.

Mr. Speaker, if we suddenly turn our attention to a unilateral war with Iraq, what are the implications for the ongoing war on terrorism? Since the attacks of September 11, we have waged a war on terrorism with the support of friends and allies around the globe. I have supported President Bush and commended his leadership time and again for his war on terrorism. But will the United States continue to receive the same level of support and cooperation from countries that do not support a unilateral preemptive strike on Iraq?

Ironically, there is one aspect of this debate where there are definitive answers, and I ask this tonight: How much is this war going to cost the American people? The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that the incremental cost of deploying a force to the Persian Gulf would be between $9 billion and $13 billion. Prosecuting a war would cost between $6 billion and $9 billion a month. After hostilities end, and we do not know how long they are going to last, the cost to return our troops home would range between $5 billion and $7 billion. If, as President Bush insisted, we intend to rebuild Iraq, the costs to the American taxpayer will rise exponentially.

In the Gulf War with the support of an international coalition, the costs of the war was shared by our friends and allies. This will not be the case with unilateral action. The burden conceivably will rise to $200 billion, and it will not be ours alone if we do this with the support of the Security Council.

Mr. Speaker, I have not been persuaded that unilateralism and the doctrine of preemption is the best course of action against Iraq. From my perspective, a preferable course of action is to enlist the support of the international community and demand a strict review by U.N. inspectors. We should take the diplomatic and political route before bringing this Nation to war, and I plan to vote against this resolution.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN), a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this is the most important vote that I ever will cast in this House. Deciding when to send our troops into harm's way is never easy and must not be made without serious consideration.

My father was a career Air Force sergeant and B–52 tail gunner, and I remember worrying every time he left for a flight that he would not return. So I have some idea of what is going through the hearts and the minds of the families of our troops. And growing up on military bases, I personally knew the people willing to put their lives on the line to protect our great Nation. I see my late father in all of them, and I remain committed to making sure if we have to send our troops into battle that they will have all the support and resources they need.

Threat from international terrorism is real. The threat from weapons of mass destruction is real. That is why it was so important to stress that we have moved away from unilateral action. My colleagues and I stood strong on our principles and got the administration to agree to the changes in the Iraq resolution. We felt that these changes were necessary to protect our Nation and the world from Saddam Hussein and ensure that military force would be used as a last resort.

On Monday President Bush told the Nation and the world that approving this resolution does not mean that military action is imminent or unavoidable. He has asked Congress to authorize the use of America's military, if it proves necessary. The American people are taking him at his word. We in Congress are taking him at his word. I hope that military action will not be necessary, but I am prepared to support our troops if all other efforts fail.

This resolution does not indicate abandonment but rather, I believe, an extension of the fight against terrorists. We will continue to improve homeland security and to find terrorist organizations wherever they may hide. This resolution retains the constitutional power of Congress in defense and foreign affairs. It does not justify unilateral military action by any country anywhere.

□ 2000

It is limited to Iraq, a nation that has made promises and then deliberately refused to live up to them.

This resolution retains the constitutional power in defense and foreign affairs. This is not the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution. We will be kept informed and can, if necessary, restrain any abuse of power.

It also seeks to compel the entire international community to back efforts to compel Iraq to comply with the world's will as expressed in various U.N. resolutions. International support is vital. It will show the world that this is not a dispute between the United States and Iraq. It is not a dispute between American and Arab. It is not a dispute between cultures. If conflict occurs, the blame rests solely with Saddam Hussein, who first invaded Kuwait and then refused to accept the consequences of his actions.

We have the best-trained and best-equipped Armed Forces in the world. I have no doubt that they will do whatever is asked of them and that they will succeed.

But war is not cheap, in blood or treasure. Sacrifices will be made by our troops and their families. But the rest of us will have to shoulder our fair share of the burden. We will have to pay for this action, just as my parents paid for World War II and my grandparents paid for World War I, because we must not pass the cost of this war on to our children and our grandchildren. Our country needs to be prepared for the cost of the war, in both human life and limited government resources.

I have promised our troops that they will not go wanting. I now promise the rest of America that I will not forget your needs. Each of us knows what needs those are, because we hear about them from people every day.

We must provide for our common defense abroad or else we will never be secure at home. But we will not lose sight of our priorities at home. We will prevail. We will execute our constitutional duty to provide for the common defense, and we will provide for the general welfare at home.

I, therefore, will support the resolution on final passage.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), a voice for justice that we have heard for many, many years, a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, 3 weeks before election seems to be an odd time to be authorizing war. It is especially odd when President Bush himself said at the United Nations that Iraq represents a ''grave and gathering threat,'' not an imminent threat. For a month, this debate has frozen off the front pages Social Security, prescription drugs, rising unemployment, growing deficits, robbery of pension accounts, corporate abuses and the inaction of this Congress itself.

The generals have not weighed in either. Retired General Norman Schwartzkopf, who headed the Persian Gulf War campaign, called on President Bush ''not to go it alone.'' Retired General Wesley Clark, who headed up the Balkans campaign, called on President Bush ''not to go it alone.'' Former National Security Adviser Brent Scowcroft said an attack on Iraq without addressing the problems of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict ''could turn the whole region into a cauldron, and thus destroy the war on terrorism.''

Last weekend, Israel's Chief of Military Intelligence, speaking on television, disputed contentions that Iraq is 18 months away from nuclear capability. He concluded Iraq's time frame was more like 4 years, and he said Iran's nuclear threat was as great as Iraq's.

Yes, Congress, on behalf of the American people must decide whether the United States incursion now into Iraq will make our country more secure and whether it will make that region more stable. On both counts, my conclusion is no.

It will not make America safer, because unilateral military action without broad international support will isolate America further. It will thrust us into the position of becoming a common enemy in a volatile region where anti-western terrorism grows with each passing year.

It will not make the region more stable either. The Bush approach will yield more terrorism and instability, not less.

We should insist on rigorous inspections in concert with our allies and enforce all U.N. resolutions relating to the Middle East.

Indeed, if the politics of the oil regimes and lethal force had been successful over the past 25 years, America's citizens would not be the victims of escalating terrorist violence at home and abroad.

Since 1975, more American diplomats and military personnel have been killed or taken hostage as a result of Middle Eastern tumult than in the first 187 years of our Nation's history, and it worsens with each decade. After 9/11, 13,025 additional names of civilians here at home were added to that growing list.

Look more deeply at the roots of the rising levels of hatred and terrorism toward our people. Even if Iraq were able to serve as an instrument of global terrorism, the causes of that terrorism will not disappear with the demise of Saddam Hussein. The enemy has many fresh faces. They spring daily from the growing resentment of western influence over an Islamic world that is awakening to its own political destiny. America must not wed itself to the past but to the rising aspirations of subjugated people; and we must do it in concert with our friends, both inside the Arab world and outside it.

What propels the violence? A deep and powerful undercurrent moving people to violence in that region. It is the unresolved Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

The other major destabilizing force is America's utter and dangerous dependence on imported oil, whose purchases undergird repressive regimes. We must address both.

Think about it. Modern terrorism dawned in our homeland in June, 1968, with the assassination of Robert F. Kennedy. The unresolved Israeli-Palestinian conflict lay at the basis of that tragic loss. His disgruntled assassin, a Jordanian Arab, revealed in his diary that loss of his homeland in East Jerusalem lay at the root of his discontent. Sirhan Sirhan is one such face.

The intifada now proceeding in the West Bank and Gaza proves the lingering tragedy of the Holy Land resists peaceful resolution until today, and its irresolution instructs the street and produces sacred rage.

Now, let us look at oil, the one word the President left out of his address in Cincinnati. As the 1970s proceeded, America's economic security became to be shaped more and more by events abroad. Thrust into two deep recessions due to the Arab oil embargoes as petroleum prices shot through the roof, our economy faltered. And the current recession, too, has been triggered by rising oil prices.

Meanwhile, America, rather than becoming energy independent at home, sinks deeper into foreign oil dependence, from the undemocratic regimes of Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and Iraq, to also include the state-owned monopolies of Nigeria and Venezuela and Mexico. While our military enforces the no-fly zones over Iraq, we import 8 percent of our oil from her. America has become more and more hostage to the oil regimes, with our future intertwined with the politics that Islamic fundamentalism breeds in the Muslim world.

Al Qaeda, led by Osama bin Laden, a Saudi national, is but the latest face of international terrorism. Al Qaeda's goal is expulsion of western influence in the Gulf and the creation of a religious, unified Islamic caliphate.

Mohammed Atta grew up in the undemocratic oil regimes of Saudi Arabia where 17 of the 19 hijackers originated.

By contrast, the goal of Saddam Hussein and his Baath Party has been control of the vast oil deposits in Iraq and access to waterborne shipping in the Persian Gulf. Hussein has been a fairly predictable foe. In the 1990s, he conventionally invaded Kuwait; and the raw truth is he never got what he expected, which was access through Kuwait to the Gulf.

When Iraq invaded Kuwait in 1990, the dispute not only involved Iraq's belief that Kuwait was part of its historic territory, but essentially the struggle involved who within OPEC would control that oil. Is defending oil reserves worthy of one more American life?

Before launching another war, Congress must vote to place our priorities where they belong, security here at home and a valued partner in the global community of nations.

Please vote for the Spratt-Skelton resolution and no on the Hastert-Gephardt resolution.

Three weeks before election seems an odd time to be authorizing war.

It is especially odd when President Bush himself said at the United Nations that Iraq represents a ''grave and gathering threat,'' not an ''imminent threat.'' For a month, this debate has frozen off the front pages Social Security, prescription drugs, rising unemployment, growing deficits, robbery of pension accounts, corporate abuses and the inaction of this Congress.

The generals have not weighed in either. Retired General Norman Schwartzkopf, who headed the Persian Gulf War campaign, called on President Bush ''not to go it alone.'' Retired General Wesley Clark, who headed up the Balkans campaign, called on President Bush ''not to go it alone.'' Former National Security Advisor Brent Scowcroft said an attack on Iraq without addressing the problems of the Israeli-

Palestinian conflict ''could turn the whole region into a cauldron and thus destroy the war on terrorism.''

In Cincinnati, President Bush said Iraq is seeking nuclear capability. He did not say Iraq had such a capability. And never has Saddam Hussein risked his regime's annihilation, which would be a certainty if he exhibits any adventurism.

The Philadelphia Inquirer reported yesterday (Tuesday) that a Central Intelligence Agency report, which was released last Friday, concluded that it could take Iraq until the last half of this decade to produce a nuclear weapon, unless it could acquire bomb grade uranium or plutonium on the black market.

Intelligence sources confirm chemical capabilities have been substantially reduced as a result of inspectors and Iraq's armed forces are 40% of their strength prior to the Gulf War.

The President claimed Iraq had acquired smooth aluminum tubes for its secret nuclear weapons program. But analysts at the Energy and State Departments concluded that the Iraqis probably wanted the tubes to make conventional artillery pieces. On chemical and biological weapons, all the evidence indicates the inspection regime of the 1980s worked and that civilized nations are effective in dismantling rogue states' arsenals when they join in common cause.

Last weekend, Israel's chief of military intelligence, speaking on television, disputed contentions that Iraq is 18 months away from nuclear capability. He concluded Iraq's time frame was more like four years, and he said Iran's nuclear threat was as great as Iraq's. I daresay Israel's chief of military intelligence is not the type of person who would engage in self-delusion.

Yet, Congress, on behalf of the American people, must decide: whether U.S. military incursion now into Iraq will make our country more secure, whether it will make that region more stable.

On both counts, my conclusion is ''No.''

It won't make America safer because unilaterial military action, without broad international support, will isolate America further. It will thrust us into the position of becoming a ''common enemy'' in a volatile region where anti-Western terrorism grows with each passing year.

It won't make the region more stable, either. The Bush approach will yield more terrorism and instability, not less. We should insist on rigorous inspections in concert with our allies and enforce all U.N. resolutions relating to the Middle East. Indeed, if the politics of the oil regimes and lethal force had been successful over the past 25 years, America's citizens would not be the victims of escalating terrorist violence at home and abroad. Since 1975, more American diplomats and military personnel have been killed or taken hostage abroad as a result of Middle Eastern tumult than in the first 187 years of our nation's history. And it worsens with each decade. After 9/11, 3025 additional names of civilians here at home were added to that growing list.

Look more deeply at the roots of the rising levels of hatred and terrorism toward our people. Even if Iraq were able to serve as an instrument of global terrorism, the causes of that terrorism would not disappear with the demise of Saddam Hussein. Terrorists are being molded every day.

Look at the enemy. It is not conventional. It is not faceless. The enemy has many fresh faces. They spring daily from the growing resentment of Western influence over an Islamic world that is awakening to its own political destiny. America must not wed itself to the past but to the rising aspirations of subjugated people, and we must do so in concert with our friends both inside the Arab world and outside it.

What propels the violence?

A deep and powerful undercurrent moving people to violence in that region is the unresolved Palestinian-Israeli conflict. The other major destabilizing force is America's utter and dangerous dependence on imported oil whose purchases undergird repressive regimes. We must address both.

Think about it. Modern terrorism dawned in our homeland in June 1968. with the assassination of Robert F. Kennedy. The unresolved Israel-Palestinian conflict lay at the basis of that tragic loss. His disgruntled assassin, a Jordanian Arab, revealed in this diary that loss of his homeland in East Jerusalem lay at the root of his discontent. Sirhan Sirhan is one such face.

The intifada now proceeding in the West Bank and Gaza proves the lingering tragedy of the Holy Land resists peaceful resolution event until today and its irresolution instructs the street and produces sacred rage.

Now, let's look at oil . . . the one word the President left out of his address in Cincinnati. As the 1970's proceeded, America's economic security came to be shaped by events abroad. Thrust into two deep recessions due to Arab oil embargoes as petroleum prices shot through the roof, our economy faltered. The current recession too has been triggered by rising oil prices.

In 1980, Jimmy Carter lost his bid for reelection because economic conditions at home so deteriorated. Carter had dubbed Arab oil price manipulation as the ''moral equivalent of war.'' He had launched a major effort to restore America's energy independence.

Ronald Reagan and George Bush were elected in a campaign that highlighted the ''misery index,'' the combination of unemployment and interest rates exploding over 20 percent.

By the 1980's, OPEC's cartel had realized that it lost revenue when America caught economic pneumonia. So OPEC learned something it practices to this very day: how to dance a clever pirouette of price manipulation rather than outright price gouging.

Meanwhile, America, rather than becoming energy independent at home, sinks deeper into foreign oil dependence—from the undemocratic regimes of Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and Iraq to also include the state-owned monopolies of Nigeria and Venezuela and Mexico. While our military enforces the no-fly zone over Iraq, we import 8% of our oil from her.

America has become more and more an economic hostage to the oil regimes, with our future intertwined with the politics that Islamic fundamentalism breeds in the Muslim world.

America's ill-fraught alliances with unpopular Middle East regimes was vividly revealed in 1979 when Iran, though not an oil state, fell despite the fact the U.S. and our CIA had supported its Shah and his secret police, purportedly to assure regional stability. It produced exactly the opposite—a revolution.

Recall 1983, in the thick of Lebanon's civil war, when suicide bombers attacked the U.S. Marine compound in Beirut, killing 241 Americans. They were caught in the crossfire of that civil war. From that point forward, U.S. casualties escalated every year, as more and more U.S. citizens were killed abroad and at home. If you travel to Lebanon today, our U.S. embassy is built like a bunker, underground. This is happening to U.S. facilities around the world.

Here is our nation's capital—barricades, concrete barriers, truck-bomb checks have become commonplace. A citizen can no longer drive down Pennsylvania Avenue in front of the White House. It is blocked off. We now have red, orange, yellow warning lights across the land. It is harder for our people to access their institutions of government. Block by block, our freedom is being circumscribed. In 1993, at the World Trade Center, six people died and one thousand were injured here at home in a bombing masterminded by a Pakistani trained in Afghanistan. In 1996, a truck bomb killed 19 Americans in Saudi Arabia at Khobar Towers, a residence for American military personnel. Last week a Green Beret was killed in Manila by a terrorist bomb, and yesterday in Kuwait two U.S. military personnel were fired upon—one died. Dozens of such tragedies now happen each year, and the body count mounts.

Al Qaeda, led by Osama bin Laden, a Saudi national, is but the latest face of international terrorism. Al Qaeda's goal is expulsion of Western influence in the Gulf and the creation of a religious, unified Islamic caliphate. But Al Qaeda and Osama are not Iraqi.

Mohammed Atta grew up in the undemocratic oil regimes of Saudi Arabia where 17 of 19 hijackers originated. They believed in the religious fundamentalism of the Wahhabi sect, but not its economic imperative that holds power through billions earned from vast oil reserves. Despite oil wealth, the king has become less and less able to control the disgruntled in that society, who resent the secular nature of the religious kingdom.

By contrast, the goal of Saddam Hussein and his Baath Party has been control of the vast oil deposits in Iraq and access to waterborne shipping in the Persian Gulf. Hussein has been a fairly predictable foe. In 1990, he conventionally invaded Kuwait. The raw truth is he received his early encouragement and support from the first Reagan-Bush Administration, in the early 1980s. That administration engaged Saddam Hussein and provided him with resources, and credits to depose Iran's Ayatollah Khomeini, who had just deposed the CIA-supported Shah in 1979. Through his U.S. contacts, Hussein assumed Iraq's quid pro quo would be access to the Persian Gulf on Bubiyan Island. Kuwait, however, never agreed.

When Iraq invaded Kuwait in 1990, the dispute not only involved Iraq's belief that Kuwait was part of its historic territory. Iraq also surmised that Kuwait was asking too low a price for oil sold to the West. Yes, America went to war to defend Kuwait's border. But essentially the struggle involved who within OPEC would control that oil. Subsequent to the Persian Gulf War, America began stationing more and more troops in Saudi Arabia, ostensibly to guard the oil flow out of the Persian Gulf. Is defending oil reserves worthy of one more life?

Of course, these forces also conveniently offered some threat to unwelcome enemies of the Saudi regime, at home and abroad. Anti-

western resentment in the region continues to rise. In 2000, our destroyer USS *Cole* was suicide bombed in Yemen harbor guarding the oil flows. Thirteen U.S. service members were killed and 39 wounded.

Over the last quarter century, it is interesting to reflect upon the intimate connection between the George Bush family, oil, and the shaping of foreign policy towards the Middle East. During the 1950s and 1960s, George Herbert Walker Bush, an oilman from Midland, Texas sought international exploration and investments as Texas oil wells were depleted prior to seeking office. In the 1960s and early 1970s, George Herbert Walker Bush served in the U.S. House, Senate, U.S. Ambassador to China, and was appointed head of the CIA in 1976 and served until March 1977.

Simultaneous with George Herbert Walker Bush's service in the CIA, Syria sent troops to Lebanon to stem the civil war, the Iranian Revolution gained steam, and Egyptian President Anwar Sadat traveled to Jerusalem and became the first Arab leader to recognize Israel.

George Herbert Walker Bush served as Vice President from 1981 to 1989 and as President from 1989 until 1993. During this period, the U.S. was drawn more directly into a central role in Middle East security.

In 1990, with the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq, President George Herbert Walker Bush fashioned a U.S.-led coalition of nations to push Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait. More than 400,000 U.S. troops were involved in that war. One hundred forty Americans died in that war, thousands have sustained war injuries and tens of thousands of Iraqis died.

With each succeeding decade, wars involving terrorism and America escalated. Now George Bush's son is serving as President and a second war resolution is being contemplated. It is fair to say that the Bush view of the Middle East literally has dominated U.S. policy for 75 percent of the past two decades.

9/11 was but the latest chapter in the expanding violence.

It is also important to inquire as to what private oil interests in the Middle East are held, or were held, by key officials in the current Bush Administration and how that might influence their views of U.S. ''vital interests.''

In the past, according to the Arabian Peninsula and Gulf Studies Project (supported by the Kuwait Foundation for the Advancement of Sciences). George W. Bush sat on the board of Harken Oil of Grand Prairie, Texas, as a private citizen, and held major oil company involvement in Bahrain both professionally and personally.

Halliburton, the firm that hired Vice-President DICK CHENEY as its CEO subsequent to the Persian Gulf War, had previously operated in Iraq. During the early 1980's, Vice-President CHANEY served as U.S. Secretary of Defense and Donald Rumsfeld as one of his Assistant Secretaries of Defense.

Newspaper reports now indicate that during that same period, biological and chemical germ samples were transferred to Iraq from the government of the United States through the Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) to several Iraqi sites that U.N. weapons inspectors determined were part of Saddam Hussein's biological weapons program. Indeed, the U.S. government provided agricultural credits to Iraq to finance these transactions and the purchase of large amounts of fertilizer and chemicals to be used in Iraq's protracted war with Iran.

Congressional records and CDC documents for that period show Iraq ordered the samples, and claimed them for legitimate medical research. The CDC and a biological sample company called the American Type Culture Collection sent strains of several germs. The transfers were made in the 1980's.

Included among these strains: anthrax, the bacteria that make botulinum toxin, and the germs that cause gas gangrene. Iraq also got samples of other deadly pathogens, including the West Nile virus. Senator ROBERT BYRD has questioned Secretary Rumsfeld, as President Reagan's envoy to the Middle East at that time, inquiring about how contacts were made with Iraq to transfer chemical and biological agents from the U.S. to Iraq as its launched its attacks on Iran.

Before launching another war, this one unilaterally, Congress must vote to place U.S. priorities where they belong—security here at home and a valued partner in the global community of nations.

Three policy prescriptions deserve greater weight.

First, inspection now, rigorous and full, in legion with the world community.

Second, America must restore energy independence here at home. If we could land a man on the moon in 10 years, surely we can gather ourselves to master this scientific imperative. No longer should oil become a proxy for America's foreign policy. Our economic relations should not reward dictatorships.

Third, the U.S. must regain momentum to find a solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. President Bush should dispatch former U.S. Senators George Mitchell and Warren Rudman to the Middle East as ambassadors without portfolio to exercise their considerable talents.

In closing, let me re-emphasize:

What is the ''imminent threat'' to the United States that justifies going to war now?

Where is the hard evidence of the new threat?

With unilateral action, how will the United States avoid being viewed in the Islamic world as a ''common enemy?''

What specific threat justifies abandoning 50 years of strategic policy in favor of a unilateral policy of pre-emption?

Who would succeed Saddam Hussein in power in Iraq? How would a partitioned Iraq be a stabilizing force?

Does the United States want to engage in nation building in Afghanistan and Iraq simultaneously?

Who will pay for this nation building?

When will the United States wean itself from its dangerous dependence on foreign oil, which takes money from our people and distorts our foreign policy?

Why should the U.S. military be asked to serve as an occupying force in Afghanistan and Iraq?

What makes Iraq's threat to the United States so much more serious today that it was four months ago or even two years ago?

In closing, let not America be perceived as the ''bully on the block'' in the most oil-rich region of the world, where not one democratic state exists. Vote for security. Vote for stability. Vote for energy independence. Vote for resolving the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Vote for Spratt-Skelton. Vote ''no'' on the Hastert-Gephardt resolution.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the kind gentleman for his leadership on human rights and on safety throughout the world.

You have to ask yourself at a serious time like this, was not 9/11 enough? Was not 9/11 enough to spur America's resolve to defend our own country?

I support this resolution because the first responsibility of our government is to defend American citizens. The government of Iraq, like our terrorist nations, presents a grave threat to the safety, to the security, to the well-being of every American that hears this debate tonight.

We are in the early stages of what is likely to be a very long war against terrorism. In his September 20th, 2001, address to a Joint Session of Congress here in this Chamber, President Bush vowed that America would not rest until we had rooted out terrorism around the world. He said the countries harboring terrorists would be treated as terrorist nations themselves; that the coming war would be a long one, to be measured in years, rather than months.

The Afghanistan campaign is the first step in putting that pledge into action, and much remains to be done. Does anyone seriously believe that terrorism began and ended in Afghanistan?

Disarming Iraq and its support for state-sponsored terrorism is the next logical step to secure peace for our families and for this world. As we were reminded again this afternoon with the released audiotape of bin Laden's second in command predicting yet more terrorist attacks on America, the question is not if America will be attacked again here at home, but when and by whom.

Instead of crashing airplanes into our downtown office buildings or into our Pentagon, the terrorists of the future will turn to dangerous chemical and biological weapons, attempts to poison our air and water, disrupt our energy supply, our economy, our electronic commerce, destroy the jobs we rely upon each day.

Yes, they will direct these weapons of terrible destruction toward America, because standing as the world's lone superpower means standing as the world's biggest target. Our homeland,

our communities, our schools, our neighborhoods and millions of American lives are at risk as we speak tonight.

It is clear to me we are going to fight this war on terrorism in one of two ways: either overseas at its source, or here at home when it lands in our neighborhoods. I choose overseas at its source.

America's security at home depends upon largely our strength in the world. Terrorism expands according to our willingness to tolerate it. For too long the world has turned a blind eye to terrorism, afraid to confront it; and terrorism has flourished because the actions of our world leaders never matched their harsh words.

Well, that is all over now. That all changed September 11. That all changed with President Bush.

For the sake of our homeland, we must mean what we say. For the sake of our children, we must follow through on our vow to end terrorism. If the United Nations efforts should fail, if Saddam Hussein chooses to continue to arm himself and harbor terrorists, then America must act. Words alone are not enough. And when we send U.S. troops overseas, it must be to win and to return home as planned.

Our first President said there is nothing so likely to produce peace as to be well-prepared to meet an enemy. We know the enemy, we know the difficulty, we know the duty, and we know the strength of America's military men and women.

The resolution before the House tonight is not a question of the President's persuasiveness. It is a question of Congress' resolve to whip this terrible war on terrorism.

We know where the President stands. The question is, where does Congress stand, and do we stand with him? I do, and I am proud to do so. Make it clear, our resolve is not for war today; it is for peace tomorrow.

□ 2015

Our resolve is not for security for America alone, but for security for the world, a world free of fear from horror, from the incredible weapons of mass destruction, from all of that terrorism spawns.

All I seek and all Americans seek is a simple request: when our families leave our homes each morning, that they return home safely each night. Was not 9–11 enough for America to act to protect our citizens? It is.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I gladly yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN), a distinguished member of the House Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, on September 11, 2001, America's view of the world changed. On that day, many Americans learned, for the first time, that there were people in the world who hated America so much that they would cross the oceans to come here to kill thousands of American men, women, and children, even if it meant they would die themselves.

In considering the resolution before us, I have weighed all of the pros and cons, all the risks of action and the risks of inaction, with September 11 very much in my mind. I believe that any close question on matters of national security must now be resolved in favor of erring on the side of being proactive and not reactive in protecting our people and our homeland.

I have spent a tremendous amount of time and study over the past several months on what to do about Saddam Hussein. I have engaged in dialogue with many of my constituents, spoken with experts on every side of this issue, and read literally thousands of pages of analysis. I can delineate as well as any opponent of this resolution all of the possible and considerable risks associated with military action against Saddam Hussein. However, in the end, I conclude, beyond any reasonable doubt, that America must join forces with our allies, hopefully under the express authorization of the United Nations, but that we must take action to prevent Saddam Hussein from using his weapons of mass destruction against us.

Now, especially in the light and shadow of September 11, there is a new immediacy and power to Saddam Hussein's long-standing and often-stated threats against America.

For years, Saddam Hussein has been a well-known patron and financier of some of the world's most lethal anti-American terrorists and terrorist organizations. Now, al Qaeda has joined them. After being driven from Afghanistan, al Qaeda has now sought and received safe haven from Saddam Hussein. Saddam is now training al Qaeda in bomb-making and the manufacture and delivery of poisonous and deadly gases.

We know that for years al Qaeda has been trying to get their hands on chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons to use against America and Americans. The thought of Saddam Hussein now infecting willing al Qaeda ''martyrs'' with his smallpox virus and sending them into America's major cities, causing hundreds of thousands of Americans to die of smallpox, is truly terrifying. The thought of Saddam Hussein sending these same al Qaeda martyrs to America to spray chemical or biological poisons over America's reservoirs or in our most populated cities is a thought so horrifying, yet so real a possibility, that I cannot, in good conscience, especially after the surprise attack of September 11, permit this to happen.

I, therefore, endorse this resolution. I do so, however, with a heavy heart. I do so yet with no reasonable doubt that preventing Saddam Hussein from using his weapons of mass destruction against us is necessary now if we are to avoid another 9–11 or worse.

Mr. Speaker, I pray that military action is not necessary and that alone, passage of this resolution will result in Saddam Hussein's compliance with all existing U.N. resolutions to disarm and to permit unconditional inspections. But in the end, that is Saddam Hussein's choice.

Mr. Speaker, as we pass this resolution, let us pray for the safety of all Americans, including the brave men and women in our military, law enforcement, and all other branches of our government who are today protecting us here at home and in countries around the world and who will be called upon to do so tomorrow or in the days ahead. God bless them and God bless America.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD).

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, tonight we discuss giving the President the authority to use military force against Iraq. As the Congressman from the first district of Kentucky, I have the privilege of representing the fine men and women of Fort Campbell, Kentucky, home of the 101st Airborne, Air Assault Division, the 5th Special Forces Group, and the 160th Special Operations Aviation Regiment, better known as the Night Stalkers.

These soldiers were among the first to engage the Taliban in Afghanistan and, unfortunately, the first to suffer casualties.

If we go to war with Iraq, they will again be the tip of the spear thrusting at our enemies, and they will again, sadly, be among the first to suffer casualties. Hopefully, that will not occur.

When I vote later this week, I may be putting my friends and neighbors on the frontline of combat. It is not a decision that any of us takes lightly. Therefore, after much deliberation, I have reluctantly concluded that Saddam Hussein has proven himself to be a threat that we cannot ignore.

For 11 years Saddam Hussein has defied U.N. resolution after resolution, while continuing his drive to acquire weapons of mass destruction. For years, he hindered and toyed with U.N. weapons inspectors in defiance of the cease-fire that ended the Gulf War. He has consorted with terrorists who are willing and eager to target innocent civilians in their war of hatred against the civilized world. He controls biological and chemical weapons, and we know he is trying to develop nuclear capability as well.

We are the world's only remaining superpower; yet a small band of terrorists were able to cause unprecedented death and destruction here in America. We cannot wait for another attack to take more American lives before finally deciding to act.

Another dead American man, woman, or child, struck down in their home or workplace by terrorist violence, would be an indictment of this Congress's failure to act while we had the chance.

I firmly believe that granting the President the authority he needs to continue to combat the menace of Saddam's regime is the best way to preserve peace, and I firmly believe that granting the President the authority he needs to combat the menace of Saddam's regime is the best way to help the Iraqi people.

Our allies in the U.N., many of whom have explored reestablishing beneficial economic ties with Saddam Hussein's regime, are unlikely to take the necessary steps or approve our taking those steps to end Saddam's threat unless the U.S. leads the way.

Since the President's speech to the United Nations, we have witnessed the rest of the civilized world awakening from its slumber and stealing itself for this necessary confrontation with Saddam Hussein. By uniting behind our President, we can send the world an indication of our resolve. If we show our allies that we consider the threat worth risking the lives of our soldiers, I believe our allies will support us in our endeavor.

Mr. Speaker, my hometown newspaper recently noted that 60 million people died in World War II to teach the world that allowing tyranny to go unchecked was wrong. Let us not make that same mistake with Saddam Hussein.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), a person who is a senior member of the Committee on Armed Services and has worked for persons in uniform for many years.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution.

I believe that taking action against Iraq at this time will take vital resources away from an even more pressing and dangerous threat: the war on al Qaeda. And this action, including the occupation and stabilization of the nation after the invasion, could drain our military resources for over a decade.

I do believe that Saddam Hussein and his possession and development of weapons of mass destruction does pose a threat to our Nation. But we already have a policy that is containing the threat and positions us well if we have to move forcefully.

I think our greater responsibility is to assess threats to our national security and then decide how to deal with them. I believe we have an even greater challenge that we must not divert precious resources from the global war on terrorism.

The greatest danger facing our Nation comes from al Qaeda, the terrorist network that perpetrated the acts of September 11. And while a year has passed and we have prosecuted a successful war against al Qaeda in Afghanistan, the infrastructure of terror, however, remains in place. Our forces are still searching for bin Laden and his followers, and while these people remain at large, our Nation still focuses on the possibility of attacks from this group on an even larger scale than September 11.

I am deeply concerned that prosecuting a war on Iraq will divert precious resources from this war. A campaign against Saddam Hussein could tie up 200,000 military personnel. Diverting these forces and the assets that will be needed to support them will stretch our military perilously thin. To do this while we are conducting an intense worldwide anti-terror operations is unwise. I believe it puts the lives of American citizens at risk. It will keep us from exerting the full range of military options we need to neutralize terrorist cells and to interrupt planned terrorist operations. And it could continue to weigh down our military for a number of years.

It has been estimated that we will need up to 50,000 to remain behind for a period of years to help guarantee as much as can be possibly done for the civility of Iraq.

□ 2030

No one knows how long this will take or what type of resources we will need. Add to this the potential for conflict between ethnic and political rivals in Iraq, and we could be entering a quagmire that we may not be able to get out of. The administration has not clearly outlined our exit strategy, and this is another thing that bothers my constituents.

The war that the administration is entering into is a war on terror. Yet the case has not been made that links Iraq to support to al-Qaeda. The evidence to this point is sketchy, at best. In fact, the evidence really suggests that Iraq is a greatly weakened nation and that the threat posed by it has been deterred or reduced by the U.S. presence in the Gulf and the enforcement of the no-fly zones.

The strategy of containment has kept Iraq at bay. It has worked and continues to work. We can continue this policy as well as allow the U.N. weapons inspectors to go in to do their jobs. If all of this ends in the conclusion that Iraq is in violation of U.N. resolutions and is near a real nuclear weapons capability, we can reevaluate our options. Until then, we should continue with the present policy.

I think we have a great responsibility to our men and women who are going to fight this war and to the people who have, time and time again, come before this body and talked about how their sons or daughters and relatives have served in the Persian Gulf War and suffered from, let us say, Agent Orange disability. Because those that saw combat went over to the Persian Gulf healthy and came back ill. Many of them still suffer from the illnesses, the causes of which we still do not know.

Before we send these young men and women off to war and expose them not only to the hazards of conflict but to a lifetime of dealing with the physical and emotional costs of combat, we must do everything to achieve our goals without resorting to force.

In the case of Iraq, we can do this. If not, we face losing the war we must win, the fight against al Qaeda.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH), a distinguished member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, there is no more important thing that this Congress does, and, in fact, this country does, than protect our national security.

For many years, the most significant threat to us as a Nation was ballistic missiles from the former Soviet Union. That threat does not exist today; and, in fact, we are living in a new world.

I think what the President has acknowledged, and is trying to lead the American people and this Congress to an understanding of, is that the greatest threat to this country today is the threat of weapons of mass destruction by both terrorist states and terrorists.

That is the unthinkable, weapons of mass destruction against our homeland. What could that mean? It is the unthinkable. We do not want to think about it, but it is a potential reality. Had a nuclear weapon been on one of the planes that hit the World Trade Center, it would not have been 4,000 people who died. I think it is impossible for any of us to really feel or really understand what it means for 4,000 people to die in an instant. It literally would have meant at least 4 million people dying in an instant, and many more dying subsequent to that.

This is not an unthinkable possibility. The reality is we live in a world where to build a nuclear weapon takes about 7 pounds of enriched uranium, not much larger than a softball. In fact, it can be carried without detriment to a carrier of it. The technology to build the weapon, unfortunately, is not that sophisticated today.

One of the issues in terms of Iraq that is worth pointing out, in 1981, when the Israelis blew up the Iraqi military nuclear reactor, in 1981, they were 6 months away from having a nuclear weapon. That was over 20 years ago. If we think about a sense of how much the world and technology has changed in 20 years, personal computers did not exist 20 years ago when that nuclear reactor was blown up. Obviously, technology has gone a long way from that point; as well, the effort of the Iraqis to acquire those weapons since that period of time and in the approximately 4 years that there have been no weapons inspectors at all in Iraq.

When the weapons inspectors left 4 years ago, about 4 years ago, 4 years and a short period of time, in the public domain we have the information that the Iraqis had smallpox and anthrax at that time, and we know they have used it against their own citizens and other countries.

What does it mean? What is the issue? Iraq is not the only country in the world that has weapons of mass destruction. Why are we addressing this

issue? Why am I supporting the resolution of use of force against Iraq? I think there is a policy that the President has articulated that it is just not enough that they have the weapons, but, really, the intent to use them.

Clearly, Iraq does not have the ability to send ballistic missiles to the United States. We understand that. But they do have the ability today to attack us with biological and chemical weapons, today. We do not know how far off they are from nuclear weapons, but 20 years ago they were 6 months away. We know they are aggressively trying to seek those weapons today.

I think we need to acknowledge this is really a change in policy, but a change in policy for this country that is needed in terms of weapons of mass destruction in the 21st century. The downside of not stopping these weapons is, in fact, the unthinkable.

One of the things we do not talk about often is, once the sort of code of both equipment and delivery of these weapons is broken, why would a country, why would Iraq, have one nuclear weapon? Would they not have five, 10, or for that matter, 15, to be able to use in terrorist ways?

We talk about the fact they have the ability today to build a weapon. The only restriction potentially is their lack of material, of enriched uranium, 7 pounds of enriched uranium. Effectively, we have no way of stopping that from entering the United States today. We acknowledge that, effectively, we cannot.

We have thousands of pounds of cocaine, and our war on drugs, as effective as it is, it literally lets in thousands of pounds of cocaine a year into the United States.

I urge my colleagues, I urge the country to support this effort. We have a country that literally wants to kill us. They do not want to kill the French. They do not want to kill the Swedish. The action is directed at us.

This is an issue, as I started this evening, of national security, national defense, national survival for the United States of America. I urge the adoption of the resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me say to all the Members on this side who will be coming up, because of the large number of Members who would like to speak, we are asking if their remarks can be contained in the 5 minutes, because from this point on we will be unable to yield extra time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA), who is a new Member, but his mark has been made in agriculture and science.

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

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I come before this Chamber with a heavy heart, because I know that I am making one of the most difficult decisions in my life.

Like my colleagues in Congress and every American, I have debated whether unilateral military action in Iraq is the best thing to do. I have carefully weighed and considered all options. I pray to God that I am making the right decision.

I have not been able to sleep. I think about the mothers and fathers I have met who have asked me, how long will this war last? How many lives will be lost? Could our children be drafted? How many of those children will come back with deformities, with cancer or mental illness?

I think about our many sons and daughters that will be affected by our decision. I wonder how many will not make it home to their parents.

I think about the many veterans that already have served our Nation but still have not received access to the benefits of our country that has promised them that.

I think about the innocent Iraqi children who will be caught in the crossfire.

I think about how this war could make us more suspicious of others based on the color of their skin.

I have talked to bishops, clergy, community leaders. All of my constituents have written and voiced their concern about the war. Is the price we will pay in lives worth the security we might gain by eliminating only one of countless threats? In our Nation's history, we have never fired the first shot, so why now?

One thing is clear: We must exhaust every alternative before we send our sons and daughters into harm's way. We all want to keep our families and our Nation safe from terrorists and weapons of mass destruction, but I also want to make sure that I can look into my children's eyes and tell them that we have done everything we can to avoid a war.

War should also be the last resort, not the first option. I do not believe the President has made the case clear to the American people that now is the best time, or that unilateral action is the best option.

That is why I will vote in favor of the Spratt substitute. The Spratt substitute supports the President's proposal for intrusive weapons inspections and still gives the President the power to use our military if Iraq refuses to comply.

Let me be clear: I support the President in his efforts to protect and defend this Nation, but we must do so with the support of the United Nations and the international community.

The Spratt amendment says that the President has to get congressional approval before he unilaterally invades Iraq. Does that not make sense? Should the President come to Congress before he leads this Nation into war? That is what our Constitution demands.

Like the rest of the Nation, I am concerned that Saddam Hussein could transfer weapons of mass destruction to terrorist organizations, but we must not act in haste and not without the support of the United Nations and the world community. That is why I reluctantly will vote against H.R. 114.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make one thing clear: Do not confuse my vote against the resolution as a vote against our troops. As a veteran, as a Congressman, as a patriotic American, I stand 100 percent for our troops. I remember how our brave men and women were treated when they returned home from Vietnam. They were treated with scorn and hate. We must not repeat our mistakes of the past. Regardless of what we think of the war, we must all support our soldiers, and we should protect their lives by winning support of our allies.

Acting alone will increase our economic burden and leave us with few resources to rebuild Iraq. It would raise the question about the legitimacy of our action in the eyes of the world. It would create more instability in the region and turn a mere threat into our worst nightmare.

Mr. Speaker, has the Bush administration answered all of our questions? What will happen if we go to war and Saddam Hussein uses chemical or biological weapons against our troops?

Our troops must have the equipment and resources they need to fight the war. Do we know what Saddam will throw at us? That is why we must provide them with all possible protection and treatment and benefits they need.

When our children come back to us sick with cancer, horribly disfigured, we must not turn our backs on them or their families.

What will happen with this regime? We must make sure that a new Iraq is democratic and respects human rights. A post-Saddam Iraq must be a beacon of hope to the Arab world and not a tool of American foreign policy.

What effect will this have on our war on terrorism? Would going to war with Iraq add fuel to the fire of the war on terrorism?

What effects would this have on our economy? The Bush administration tries to paint a rosy picture of the state of our economy, but we have gone from a record surplus to crippling deficits. My constituents are concerned about their savings, their jobs, prescription drugs, Social Security, the schools. How will this war affect them?

The President must not forget the economic problems of the American people. I am placing my trust, and our country is placing its trust, in this President to heed these concerns.

I know the President's resolution will likely pass this body with little effort. I oppose it because more of our men and women will die if we go to war. I pray to God that I have made the right decision.

□ 2045

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY), a member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, over the last few weeks my constituents in St. Louis have made their opinions clear to me regarding the President's positions regarding Iraq, and I hear great opposition to war against Iraq. I hear mothers, fathers, seniors, college students and veterans opposing any action in the region. Their voices are black, white, Asian and Hispanic. And while the reasons for their opposition vary, the one common question they all seem to have is this: How does this conflict serve America's best interest?

I, along with many Americans, believe that the state of our sagging domestic economy has to be considered our Nation's greatest concern at this time. In the past year and a half this country has experienced increasing unemployment, growing national debt, tumbling economic growth, and a floundering stock market which has lost all consumer confidence.

Despite all this, our domestic issues have been pushed aside as we debate a possible preemptive attack against Iraq. Important issues like education, Social Security, unemployment, and affordable health care have been almost completely ignored by this diversion. Another question my constituents frequently ask is this: How will this war affect our young men and women serving in the Armed Forces?

When one looks at the make-up of our Armed Forces, African Americans make up more than 25 percent of the U.S. Army and over 38 percent of our Marine Corps. And since African Americans comprise more than 50 percent of my district, my constituents are justifiably concerned that instead of making their lives more secure, this war will likely expose them to even greater dangers.

Mr. Speaker, if my constituents are any gauge of the American public's concern regarding possible military action against Iraq, then I hope all Americans will contact their elected officials here in Congress at 202–225–3121 and voice their opposition to this resolution.

Neither my constituents nor I have forgotten September 11. We are still asking questions about the magnitude of this country's loss, but debating unprovoked unilateral action against a country whose ties to terrorism are suspect at best is not providing any answers. I for one believe that our military's top priority should be fighting al Qaeda and finishing the war against terrorism that we started in Afghanistan. Those who support this resolution have not yet come close to proving to me that Iraq represents a big enough military threat to take our focus off of bin Laden.

In addition, the stability of the Middle East is in danger. Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Egypt would be subject to extreme internal pressure and unrest that would disrupt and threaten American interests in the region.

The concerns of my constituents echos voices heard more than 200 years ago. The men and women who founded our country imagined a Nation based on liberty and republican principals. One of these principals was that no country had the unilateral right to attack another without just cause. And President George Washington went so far as to suggest that America should keep its hands out of most foreign affairs. Washington stated, ''The great rule of conduct for us in regards to foreign nations is in extending our commercial relation to have as little political connection as possible.''

It appears that now, 200 years later, we have strayed quite far from our Founding Fathers' vision. And I cannot in good faith subject my constituents to this military conflict. I urge my fellow Members of Congress to also vote against this resolution.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), a member of the Committee on Government Reform.

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution, and I am opposed not because I do not believe that we need to protect our national security. I am not in opposition because Saddam Hussein does not need to be checkmated and stopped. And I am not opposed because I do not recognize the need for a strong military, and I am not in opposition because this resolution has been put forth by President Bush.

However, I am opposed because after all of the information I have seen and after all I have heard, neither am I or a majority of residents of my district, the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois, convinced that the war is our only and most immediate option. We are not convinced that every diplomatic action has been exhausted. Therefore, I am not convinced that this resolution would prevent us, the United States of America, from acting without agreement and involvement of the international community.

I oppose a unilateral first-strike action by the United States without a clearly demonstrated and imminent threat of attack against the United States. We are now asked to vote on a resolution which will likely culminate in a war with Iraq, a war which may involve the entire Mid East region.

As the American people are attempting to make sense of this complex situation, no one doubts the evil of the current Iraqi regime. No one doubts the eventuality that the United States would prevail in armed conflict with Iraq.

What then are the central issues which confront us? One, is there an immediate threat to the United States? In my judgment the answer is no. We have not received evidence of immediate danger. We have not received evidence that Iraq has the means to attack the United States, and we have not received evidence that the danger is greater today than it was last year or the year before.

Two, will the use of military force against Iraq reduce or prevent the spread or use of weapons of mass destruction? In my judgment, the answer is no. All evidence is that Iraq does not possess nuclear weapons today. The use of chemical or biological weapons or the passage of such weapons to terrorist groups would be nothing less than suicide for the current Iraqi leadership. However, as the CIA reports have indicated, faced with invasion and certain destruction, there would be nothing for the Iraqi regime to lose by using or transferring any such weapons they may still possess. Other states in the region which fear they could be attacked next could be moved to rash action.

Finally, three, have we exhausted all nonmilitary options to secure the elimination of all weapons of mass destruction in Iraq in accordance with United Nations resolutions? In my judgment, the answer is no. We have not exhausted the potential for a collective action with our allies. We have not yet exhausted the potential for inspections and for a strict embargo on technologies which could be used for weapons of mass destruction. The use of armed force should be a last resort to be used only when all other options have failed.

In my judgment that commitment to the peaceful solution of problems and conflict is an important part of what our democracy should stand for, and that does not necessitate or demand invasion or an attack on Iraq at this time.

I was at church on Sunday and the pastor reminded us of Paul as he talked about our problems with Saddam Hussein. He reminded us that as Paul instructed the Philippians on how to deal with conflict, at one point he wrote to the Philippians, ''Brethren, I count myself not to have apprehended, but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before. I press forth towards the mark for the prize of the high calling of Jesus Christ.''

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that as we press forward, I trust that we will press forward towards the mark of a high calling, that we will take the high road, that we will take the road that leads to peace and not to war, the road that lets us walk by faith and not alone by sight or might. Let us, Mr. Speaker, walk by the Golden Rule. Let us do unto others as we would have them do unto us. Let us walk the road that leads to life and not to death and destruction. Let us walk the road to peace.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution, which authorizes the President of the United States to use armed forces of the United States against Iraq, and I am opposed to H.J. Res. 114, not because I don't believe we need to protect our national security, I am

not in opposition because Saddam Hussein does not need to be checkmated and stopped, I am not opposed because I don't recognize the need for a strong military, and I am not in opposition because this resolution has been put forth by President Bush.

However, I am opposed because after all the information that I have seen and after all that I have heard, neither am I, or a majority of the residents of my district, the 7th Congressional District of Illinois, convinced that war is our only and most immediate option. We are not convinced that every diplomatic action has been exhausted. Therefore, I am not convinced that this resolution will prevent us, the United States of America from acting without agreement and involvement of the international community. I oppose a unilateral first strike action by the United States without a clearly demonstrated and imminent threat of attack against the United States.

We are now being asked to vote on a resolution which will likely culminate in war with Iraq—a war which may involve the entire Mideast region.

The American people are attempting to make sense of this complex situation. No one doubts the evil of the current Iraqi regime. No one doubts that eventually the United States would prevail in armed conflict with Iraq. What then are the central issues which confront.

(1) Is there an immediate threat to the United States?

In my judgment the answer is NO. We have not received evidence of immediate danger. We have not received evidence that Iraq has the means to attack the United States. We have not received evidence that the danger is greater today than it was last year or the year before.

(2) Will the use of military force against Iraq reduce or prevent the spread or use of Weapons of Mass Destruction?

In my judgment the answer is NO. All evidence is that Iraq does not possess nuclear weapons today. The use of chemical or biological weapons, or the passing of such weapons to terrorist groups would be nothing less than suicide for the current Iraqi leadership. As the CIA report has indicated we know that when backed up against the wall people sometimes lash out blindly and without careful thought.

(3) Have we exhausted all non-military options to secure the elimination of Weapons of Mass Destruction in Iraq in accordance with United Nations resolutions?

In my judgment, the answer is no. We have not exhausted the potential for collective action with our allies. We have not yet exhausted the potential for inspections and for a strict embargo on technologies which could be used for Weapons of Mass Destruction. The use of armed force should be a last resort, to be used only when all other options have failed. In my judgment, that commitment to the peaceful solution of problems and conflicts is an important part of what our Democracy should stand for, and that does not necessitate or demand invasion or an attack on Iraq at this time.

I was at church on Sunday and the pastor reminded us of Paul as he talked about our problems with Saddam Hussein. He reminded us that as Paul instructed the Philippians on how to deal with conflict—

Phillipians 3–13–14

Paul wrote to the Phillipians—

''Brethren, I count myself not to have apprehended, but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before.

I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Jesus Christ.''

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that as we press forward, I trust that we will press forward toward the mark of the high calling toward the high road, the road which leads to peace and not to war, the road that lets us walk by faith and not alone by sight or might. Let us, walk by the Golden Rule—let us do unto others as we would have them do unto us. Let us walk the road that leads to life and not to death and destruction. Let us walk the road that leads to peace. I urge a no vote on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote on this resolution.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND), a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Subcommittee on Energy and Health.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, all of us agree that Saddam Hussein is a bloodthirsty dictator and must be contained. But before we send young Americans into the deserts of Iraq, all diplomatic possibilities to avert war must be exhausted, and they have not been.

In times like these amid all of the swirling difference of opinion, what we need more than anything else is a good dose of common sense. Just today the Columbus Dispatch offered an editorial opinion which presents a commonsense approach to the challenge we face. I would like to share that editorial as a commonsense message from Ohio, the Heartland of America.

The editorial begins, ''In his speech on Monday, President Bush made an excellent case for renewed United Nations weapons inspections in Iraq. He did not, however, make a case for war. Though the President continues to paint Iraq as an imminent threat to peace, he offered no new evidence to back that assessment. Iraq appears to be neither more nor less a threat than it was in 1998 when the last U.N. weapons inspectors left the country; nor does it appear to be a bigger threat than Iran, Libya or North Korea, all of whom are developing long-range missiles and weapons of mass destruction and are hostile to the United States.

The speech was a hodgepodge of half-plausible justifications for war with the President hoping that if he strings together enough weak arguments, they will somehow add up to a strong one. For example, the President failed to demonstrate any significant link between Iraqi dictator Saddam Hussein and the al Qaeda terrorism network. The truth is it would be far easier to demonstrate links between Iran and al Qaeda or Saudi Arabia and al Qaeda. But President Bush is not proposing military action against those states whose support for terrorism and terrorist organizations is practically overt. In fact, less than a day after the President's speech, CIA Director George Tenet told Congress that Saddam apparently has a policy of not supporting terrorism against the United States.

The backhanded admission came as Tenet warned that Saddam might change his mind if he believes the United States is serious about attacking Iraq.

Next, the President cited the 11-year history of Iraqi attempts to deceive U.N. weapons inspectors as proof that inspectors have failed. But have they? For 11 years Saddam has not fielded a nuclear weapon, nor has he deployed any chemical or biological weapons. This suggests that in spite of Iraqi attempts to thwart inspectors, inspections have thwarted Saddam's ability to build the weapons he seeks.

The President also points out that removing Saddam from power would be a blessing to the people from Iraq who have endured his totalitarian boot on their necks for decades. This is true. Saddam idolizes Soviet dictator Josef Stalin and certainly will be skewered on an adjacent spit in hell. But if removing oppressive regimes justifies war, the United States is in for a long, long battle against half of the world that is ruled by bloodthirsty dictators.

The weaknesses of the President's arguments only heighten suspicions that the proposed attack on Iraq is intended to divert attention from the so-so progress of the genuine war on terrorism and the sputtering economy. Still, President Bush is correct to demand that the inspectors resume and that inspectors have unimpeded access to all Iraqi sites including the so-called presidential palaces. All diplomatic means now should be deployed to achieve that end.

□ 2100

As it stands, Iraq has agreed to readmitting the inspectors, and the United Nations is preparing to send them in.

Sure, the United States and the United Nations have been down this road with Saddam before. But, last time, neither Washington nor the world community chose to do anything significant about it. There is time to give peaceful processes one more try. If, as many expect, Saddam intends to block the new inspections, the United States and the United Nations will have all the justifications they need for stronger measures; and at that point the President would have little problem in enlisting the support of the American people and the aid of the international community.

This concludes the editorial. And, Mr. Speaker, I stand today in support of the Spratt amendment because I cannot support H.J. Res. 114. We may have to eventually use military force to disarm Saddam Hussein, but this resolution is too open, too far-reaching. It is wrong. It should be rejected.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE)

be granted an additional 60 minutes, and that he be permitted to control the time and yield to other Members of our body.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYES). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from American Samoa?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the second longest serving Democrat in the House and ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. CONYERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) for yielding me this time, and I am proud to be a part of this discussion tonight.

Passage of a resolution authorizing the President to commence war at a time and place of his choosing would set a dangerous precedent and risk unnecessary death. The proposal of this resolution has already been called a grand diversion of America's political focus as elections approach. Worse, it would create a grand diversion of our already depleted resources, those that are so desperately needed for the pressing problems at home.

The American people are not bloodthirsty. We never want to go to war unless we have been convinced that it is absolutely necessary. That is as true of Americans whether in Maine or West Virginia or Texas or Michigan, whether they are black, brown or white, young or old, rich or poor. The mail and phone calls I have received have been overwhelmingly opposed to a preemptive attack against Iraq.

Is war necessary now? We keep coming back to one stubborn irrefutable fact: There is no imminent threat to our national security. The President has not made the case. Senators and Congressmen have emerged from countless briefings with the same question: Where is the beef? There is no compelling evidence that Iraq's capability and intentions regarding weapons of mass destruction threaten the U.S. now, nor has any member of the Bush administration, the Congress, the intelligence community shown evidence linking the al Qaeda attacks last year on New York and the Pentagon with either Saddam Hussein or Iraqi terrorists. Indeed, if President Bush had such proof of Iraq's complicity, he would need no further authorization to retaliate. That is the law. He could do so under the resolution we passed only 3 days after al Qaeda's infamous attacks.

What is it we do now about Iraq? We know Saddam is a ruthless ruler who will try to maintain power at all costs and who seeks to expand his weapons of destruction. We have known that for some time. We do know that Iraq has some biological and chemical weapons, but none with a range to reach the United States.

Therefore, the President paints two scenarios:

The first is that Iraq would launch biological or chemical weapons against Israel, Arab allies, or our deployed forces. But during the Gulf War, Saddam did not do so. Why not? Because he knew he would be destroyed in retaliation, and we were not then threatening his destruction as President Bush is now doing. Thus, attacking Iraq will increase rather than decrease the likelihood of Saddam Hussein's launching whatever weapons he may have.

Now, under the administration's second scenario, Iraq would give weapons of destruction to al Qaeda, who might bring them to our shores. But that scenario, too, is not credible.

Perhaps the most significant intelligence assessment we have was revealed publicly only last night and has been raised repeatedly on the floor during this debate. The Central Intelligence Agency states that Iraq is unlikely to initiate chemical or biological attacks against the United States, and goes on to warn that ''Should Saddam conclude that a U.S.-led attack could no longer be deterred, he might decide the extreme step of assisting Islamist terrorists in conducting a weapons of mass destruction attack against the United States would be his last chance to exact vengeance by taking a number of victims with him.''

Passage of a resolution authorizing the President to commence war at a time and place of his choosing would set dangerous precedents and risk unnecessary death. The proposal of this resolution has already created a ''grand diversion'' of America's political focus as elections approach, and worse, it would create a ''grand diversion'' of our already depleted resources, so desperately needed for pressing problems at home.

The American people are not bloodthirsty. We never want to go to war, unless we have been convinced that it is absolutely necessary. That is as true of Americans whether in Maine, West Virginia, Texas or Michigan—whether they are black, brown or white; young or old, rich or poor. The mail and phone calls I receive have been overwhelmingly opposed to a pre-emptive attack against Iraq.

Is war necessary now? We keep coming back to one stubborn irrefutable fact: There is no imminent threat to our national security. The President has not made the case. Senators and Congressmen have emerged from countless briefing with the same question: ''Where's the beef?'' There is no compelling evidence that Iraq's capability and intentions regarding weapons of mass destruction threaten the U.S. now. Nor has any member of the Bush Administration, the Congress or the intelligence community shown evidence linking the Al Qaeda attacks last year on New York City, and the Pentagon with either Saddam Hussein or Iraqi terrorists. Indeed, if President Bush had such proof of Iraq's complicity, he would need no further authorization to retaliate. He could do so under the resolution we passed only three days after Al Qaeda's infamous attacks.

What is it that we do now about Iraq? We know Saddam is a ruthless ruler who will try to maintain power at all costs and who seeks to expand his weapons of destruction. We have known that for some time. We do know that Iraq has some biological and chemical weapons, but none with range to reach the U.S. Therefore, President Bush paints two scenarios:

The first is that Iraq would launch biological or chemical weapons against Israel, Arab allies or our deployed forces. But during the Gulf War, Saddam did not do so. Why not? Because he knew he would be destroyed in retaliation, and we were not then threatening his destruction, as President Bush is now doing. Thus, attacking Iraq will increase rather than decrease the likelihood of Saddam Hussein's launching whatever weapons he does have.

Under the Administration's second scenario, Iraq would give weapons of destruction to Al Qaeda, who might bring them to our shores. But that scenario, too, is not credible. Perhaps the most significant intelligence assessment we have is one revealed publicly only last night. The CIA states that Iraq is unlikely to initiate chemical or biological attack against the U.S., and goes on to warn that, and I quote:

> Should Saddam conclude that a U.S.-led attack could no longer be deterred, [Hussein might] decide that the extreme step of assisting Islamist terrorist in conducting a [weapons of mass destruction] attack against the United States would be his last chance to exact vengeance by taking a number of victims with him.

In other words, the CIA warns that an attack on Iraq could well provoke the very tragedy the President claims he is trying to forestall—Saddam's use of chemical or biological weapons.

President Bush and his supporters now cite some ''evidence of contacts between Al Qaeda representatives and Baghdad.'' So what? We have had high level contracts with North Korea, Afghanistan when the Taliban ruled it, and other ruthless despots. That did not mean we were allies. The intelligence community has confirmed that Al Qaeda and Saddam's secular Baathist regime are enemies. As a religious fanatic, Bin Laden has been waging underground war against the secular governments of Iraq, Egypt, Syria and the military rulers of other Arabic countries. Saddam would be very unlikely to give such dangerous weapons to a group of radical terrorists who might see fit to turn them against Iraq.

We are fairly certain that Iraq currently has no nuclear weapons. Even with the best luck in obtaining enriched uranium or plutonium, the official intelligence estimate is that Iraq will not have them for some time. If Iraq must produce its own fissile material, it would take three to five years, according to those estimates. In a futile effort to mirror the prudent approach of President Kennedy during the Cuban Missile Crisis, President Bush recently released satellite photographs of buildings, as evidence that Saddam has resumed a nuclear weapons development. This is hardly headline news. We knew that he had resumed them.

Another thing we know is that:

Iraq's vast oil reserves have been a major tool in the Administration's pressuring other countries to support our rush to war against their better judgment; and

Those oil reserves will be controlled and allocated by the U.S. if we install or bless a new regime in Baghdad.

These implications are explored in an excellent Washington Post article, which I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD immediately following remarks. Let me read just two paragraphs here:

A U.S.-led ouster of Iraqi President Saddam Hussein could open up a bonanza for American oil companies long banished from Iraq, scuttling oil deals between Baghdad and Russia, France and other countries, and reshuffling world petroleum markets, according to industry officials and leaders of the Iraqi opposition.

Although senior Bush administration officials say that they have not begun to focus on the issues involving oil and Iraq, American and foreign oil companies have already begun maneuvering for a stake in the country's huge proven reserves of 112 billion barrels of crude oil, the largest in the world outside Saudi Arabia.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a discernible and disconcerting rhythm to the Administration's arguments. Every time one of their claims has been rebutted, they have reverted to the mantra that, after September 11, 2001, the whole world has changed. Indeed it has. But they cannot wave that new international landscape like a magic wand in order to transform Iraq into an imminent threat to the United States when it is not.

Moreover, discussing whether Iraq presents such a threat only deals with half of the equation before us. What are all the costs of war? While Iraq poses no imminent threat to us, unleashing war against Iraq would pose many terrible threats to America.

It would dilute our fight against Al Qaeda terrorists. That is why families of the victims of "9/11" have angrily told me and some of you that they oppose a pre-emptive war precisely because it would undermine our war on terrorism. Administration assurances that war against Iraq would not dilute our war on terrorism are pleasing, but cannot change the facts. Space satellites, aircraft, ships and special forces simply cannot be in two places at the same time.

America's attacking Iraq alone would ignite a firestorm of anti-American fervor in the Middle East and Muslim world and breed thousands of new potential terrorists.

As we see in Afghanistan, there would be chaos and inter-ethnic conflict following Saddam's departure. A post-war agreement among them to cooperate peacefully in a new political structure would not be self-executing. Iraq would hardly become overnight a shining "model democracy" for the Middle East. We would need a U.S. peacekeeping force and nation-building efforts there for years. Our soldiers and aid workers could be targets for retribution and terrorism.

American has never been an aggressor nation. If we violate the U.N. Charter and unilaterally assault another country when it is not yet a matter of necessary self-defense, then we will set a dangerous precedent, paving the way for any other nation that chooses to do so, too, including those with nuclear weapons such as India and Pakistan and China.

We will trigger an arms-race of nations accelerating and expanding their efforts to develop weapons of destruction, so that they can deter "pre-emptive" hostile action by the U.S. Do we really want to open this Pandora's box?

Mr. Speaker, of all the consequences I fear, perhaps the most tragic is that war, plus the need to rebuild Iraq, would cost billions of dollars badly needed at home. For millions of Americans, the biggest threat to their security is the lack of decent wage jobs, health insurance or affordable housing for their families. Senior citizens having to choose between buying enough food and buying prescription drugs is an imminent threat. Unemployment reaching 6 million people is an imminent threat to America's well-being. Forty-one million American without health insurance is an imminent threat.

The huge cost of war and nation building, which will increase our deficit, along with the impact of the likely sharp rise in oil prices, will deal a double-barreled blow to our currently fragile economy.

What then should we do at this time? We should face the many clear and present dangers that threaten us here at home; we should seek peaceful resolution of our differences with Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD an article from the Washington Post from Sunday, September 15, 2002.

[From The Washington Post, Sept. 15, 2002]

IN IRAQI WAR SCENARIO, OIL IS KEY ISSUE

(By Dan Morgan and David B. Ottaway)

A U.S.-led ouster of Iraqi President Saddam Hussein could open a bonanza for American oil companies long banished from Iraq, scuttling oil deals between Baghdad and Russia, France and other countries, and reshuffling world petroleum markets, according to industry officials and leaders of the Iraqi opposition.

Although senior Bush administration officials say they have not begun to focus on the issues involving oil and Iraq, American and foreign oil companies have already begun maneuvering for a stake in the country's huge proven reserves of 112 billion barrels of crude oil, the largest in the world outside Saudi Arabia.

The importance of Iraq's oil has made it potentially one of the administration's biggest bargaining chips in negotiations to win backing from the U.N. Security Council and Western allies for President Bush's call for tough international action against Hussein. All five permanent members of the Security Council—the United States, Britain, France, Russia and China—have international oil companies with major stakes in a change of leadership in Baghdad.

"It's pretty straighforward," said former CIA director R. James Woolsey, who has been one of the leading advocates of forcing Hussein from power. "France and Russia have oil companies and interests in Iraq. They should be told that if they are of assistance in moving Iraq toward decent government, we'll do the best we can to ensure that the new government and American companies work closely with them.

But he added: "If they throw in their lot with Saddam, it will be difficult to the point of impossible to persuade the new Iraqi government to work with them."

Indeed, the mere prospect of a new Iraqi government has fanned concerns by non-American oil companies that they will be excluded by the United States, which almost certainly would be the dominant foreign power in Iraq in the aftermath of Hussein's fall. Representatives of many foreign oil concerns have been meeting with leaders of the Iraqi opposition to make their case for a future stake and to sound them out about their intentions.

Since the Persian Gulf War in 1991, companies from more than dozen nations, including France, Russia, China, India, Italy, Vietnam and Algeria, have either reached or sought to reach agreements in principle to develop Iraqi oil fields, refurbish existing facilities or explore undeveloped tracts. Most of the deals are on hold until the lifting of U.N. sanctions.

But Iraqi opposition officials made clear in interviews last week that they will not be bound by any of the deals.

"We will review all these agreements, definitely," said Faisal Qaragholi, a petroleum engineer who directs the London office of the Iraqi National Congress (INC), an umbrella organization of opposition groups that is backed by the United States. "Our oil policies should be decided by a government in Iraq elected by the people."

Ahmed Chalabi, the INC leader, went even further, saying he favored the creation of a U.S.-led consortium to develop Iraq's oil fields, which have deteriorated under more than a decade of sanctions. "American companies will have a big shot at Iraqi," Chalabi said.

The INC, however, said it has not taken a formal position on the structure of Iraq's oil industry in event of a change of leadership.

While the Bush administration's campaign against Hussein is presenting vast possibilities for multi-national oil giants, it poses major risks and uncertainties for the global oil market, according to industry analysts.

Access to Iraqi oil and profits will depend on the nature and intentions of a new government. Whether Iraq remains a member of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries, for example, or seeks an independent role, free of the OPEC cartel's quotas, will have an impact on oil prices and the flow of investments to competitors such as Russia, Venezuela and Angola.

While Russian oil companies such as Lukoil have a major financial interest in developing Iraqi fields, the low prices that could result from a flood of Iraqi oil into world markets could set back Russian government efforts to attract foreign investment in its untapped domestic fields. That is because low world oil prices could make costly ventures to unlock Siberia's oil treasures far less appealing.

Bush and Vice President Cheney have worked in the oil business and have longstanding ties to the industry. But despite the buzz about the future of Iraqi oil among oil companies, the administration, preoccupied with military planning and making the case about Hussein's potential threat, has yet to take up the issue in a substantive way, according to U.S. officials.

The Future of Iraq Group, a task force set up at the State Department, does not have oil on its list of issues, a department spokesman said last week. An official with the National Security Council declined to say whether oil had been discussed during consultations on Iraq that Bush has had over the past several weeks with Russian President Vladimir Putin and Western leaders.

On Friday, a State Department delegation concluded a three-day visit to Moscow in connection with Iraq. In early October, U.S. and Russian officials are to hold an energy summit in Houston, at which more than 100 Russian and American energy companies are expected.

Rep. Curt Weldon (R–Pa.) said Bush is keenly aware of Russia's economic interests in Iraq, stemming from a $7 billion to $8 billion debt that Iraq ran up with Moscow before the Gulf War. Weldon, who has cultivated close ties to Putin and Russian parliamentarians, said he believed the Russian

leader will support U.S. action in Iraq if he can get private assurances from Bush that Russia ''will be made whole'' financially.

Officials of the Iraqi National Congress said last week that the INC's Washington director, Entifadh K. Qanbar, met with Russian Embassy officials here last month and urged Moscow to begin a dialogue with opponents of Hussein's government.

But even with such groundwork, the chances of a tidy transition in the oil sector appear highly problematic. Rival ethnic groups in Iraq's north are already squabbling over the giant Kirkuk oil field, which Arabs, Kurds and minority Turkmen tribesmen are eyeing in the event of Hussein's fall.

Although the volumes have dwindled in recent months, the United States was importing nearly 1 million barrels of Iraqi oil a day at the start of the year. Even so, American oil companies have been banished from direct involvement in Iraq since the late 1980s, when relations soured between Washington and Baghdad.

Hussein in the 1990s turned to non-American companies to repair fields damaged in the Gulf War and Iraq's earlier war against Iran, and to tap undeveloped reserves, but U.S. government studies say the results have been disappointing.

While Russia's Lukoil negotiated a $4 billion deal in 1997 to develop the 15-billion-barrel West Qurna field in southern Iraq, Lukoil had not commenced work because of U.N. sanctions. Iraq has threatened to void the agreement unless work began immediately.

Last October, the Russian oil services company Slavneft reportedly signed a $52 million service contract to drill at the Tuba field, also in southern Iraq. A proposed $40 billion Iraqi-Russian economic agreement also reportedly includes opportunities for Russian companies to explore for oil in Iraq's western desert.

The French company Total Fina Elf has negotiated for rights to develop the huge Majnoon field, near the Iranian border, which may contain up to 30 billion barrels of oil. But in July 2001, Iraq announced it would no longer give French firms priority in the award of such contracts because of its decision to abide by the sanctions.

Officials of several major firms said they were taking care to avoiding playing any role in the debate in Washington over how to proceed on Iraq. ''There's no real upside for American oil companies to take a very aggressive stance at this stage. There'll be plenty of time in the future,'' said James Lucier, an oil analyst with Prudential Securities.

But with the end of sanctions that likely would come with Hussein's ouster, companies such as ExxonMobil and ChevronTexaco would almost assuredly play a role, industry officials said. ''There's not an oil company out there that wouldn't be interested in Iraq,'' one analyst said.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER), a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and a strong fighter for the environment.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution to grant unilateral authority to the President of the United States for a preemptive strike on Iraq. I cannot believe that the Members of this body are ceding our constitutional authority to this President. And they can give me all the fancy whereases and phrases, and put on the fig leafs, and write all the report language they want, but this is a blank check. This is a Gulf of Tonkin resolution. This is a violation not only of our Constitution but will lead to a violation of the United Nations Charter.

Wake up, my colleagues. Why would anyone vote to do that? That is not our constitutional responsibility. And when we vote on this resolution, will America be more safe? No, I think America will be less safe. We will dilute the war against terrorism. The destabilization of the area will lead to the increased probability of terrorists getting nuclear weapons, say, in Pakistan. The al Qaeda are probably cheering the passage of this resolution. Now is their chance to get more weapons.

We should not risk American lives. We should be working with the United Nations. We should get the inspectors in there. We should disarm Saddam Hussein. And if they cannot do their work, if the U.N. authorizes force, we will be a much stronger and efficient force working with the United Nations.

Imminent threat. There is an imminent threat. I will tell my colleagues what the imminent threat is, it is our failing economy and the rising unemployment. It is kids not getting a quality education. It is 401(k)s that are down to zero. It is corporate theft. It is the obscene cost of prescription drugs. That is the imminent threat to America, Mr. Speaker. That is what we ought to be working on here.

I have heard all my colleagues on the other side of this issue calling us appeasers, those who are going to vote against this resolution. We are wishful thinkers. We have our eyes closed. We sit on our hands. And, of course, that phrase, the risk of inaction is greater than the risk of action.

No one on this side, Mr. Speaker, is suggesting inaction. Making peace is hard work. Just ask Martin Luther King, Jr. Ask Ghandi. Ask Norman Mandela. They were not appeasers. They were not inactive. They were peacemakers. And they changed the history of this world.

So let us not hear talk of appeasement. Let us not hear talk that we favor inaction. We want action for peace in this world, and we want the United States to be part of that action.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, there is a whiff of Vietnam in the air. I had a constituent call me and say, ''You know, if you enjoyed Vietnam, you are really going to love Iraq.'' The mail is running 10 to 1 against this war. Protests have already begun around the Nation and around the world.

I say to the President, of course through the Speaker, that you came to office as a uniter, not a divider. Yet we are going round the road of division in this Nation. You can see it, you can smell it, you can hear it, and we are going to hear more.

Let us not go down this road, Mr. President. Rethink this policy. A country divided over war is not a country that is going to make any progress. Let us have a rethinking of this resolution. Let us not vote for a preemptive unilateral strike. Let us work through the United Nations. Let us become a peacemaking Nation. Let us vote ''no'' on this resolution.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, like my colleagues of both parties and in both Chambers and as the wife of a Vietnam veteran, the national debate on whether or not to go to war with Iraq and under what circumstances has weighed heavily on my mind and my heart. For, clearly, sending the young men and women of our Armed Forces into harm's way is one of the most serious and far-reaching decisions a Member of Congress will ever have to make.

Like all Americans, I take pride in the fact that we are a peaceful Nation but one that will defend itself if needed against real and imminent dangers. Like all Americans, I take very seriously our responsibilities as the world's global superpower and realize how our words and actions can have huge repercussions throughout the world.

For that reason, I attended meetings and studied the materials provided us. I have listened to the administration, my constituents, my colleagues on both sides of the issue, both sides of the aisle, and both sides of the Congress; and I remain deeply concerned about our march to war without a supportive coalition or a clear and moral justification.

Before making a final decision on my vote, I also asked myself, as a wife and mother, what would I want our Nation's leaders to do before sending my son, my daughter, any loved one to war? While I support our President's efforts to keep our Nation and our world safe, I firmly believe the President has not made the case for granting him far-reaching power to declare preemptive and unilateral war against Iraq.

There is no question that Saddam Hussein is a dangerous and unconscionable dictator with little regard for human life, and there is no question that he must be disarmed and removed from power. The facts presented thus far, however, do not support the premise that Saddam Hussein is an immediate danger to our country.

It is for that reason that I believe it is in the best interest of our Nation and our American troops to make every possible effort now to prevent war by exhausting diplomatic efforts, by giving the U.N. weapons inspectors the resources and opportunity to perform their work, and by establishing a U.N. Security Council multilateral coalition to use force, if necessary.

□ 2115

If that fails, the President can then bring his case to Congress on the need for a unilateral preemptive strike against Iraq. At this time, however, a blank check authorization for military force is not acceptable.

I cannot, therefore, in good conscience support the administration's request for a near carte blanche authority to wage war when the case to do so has not been justified.

I will, however, support the resolutions of my colleagues, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

The Lee resolution urges Congress to work with the United Nations using all peaceful means possible to resolve the issue of Iraqi weapons of mass destruction.

The Spratt resolution includes similar requirements with regards to the United Nations but also authorizes the use of force if the U.N. efforts fail. The Spratt resolution brings responsibility and accountability to our effort to protect our country from Saddam Hussein, and it makes the administration and the Congress partners in any military action against Iraq.

The Spratt proposal honors our Nation's fundamental system of checks and balances. It makes it possible for me to say to my constituents and our Nation's sons and daughters, including my stepson who proudly serves in the U.S. Army, I did everything in my power to keep you from harm's way.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and a constitutional expert.

(Mr. WATT of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Article I of the United States Constitution states that the Congress shall have power to declare war. Article II of the Constitution provides that the President shall be the Commander-in-Chief. Over the years, these provisions of the Constitution have been the subject of a virtually endless tug of war between the legislative branch and the executive branch, as well as the subject of virtually endless debate among constitutional scholars.

In general I believe, and many constitutional scholars agree, that these two provisions reserve to Congress the sole authority to declare war when there is time for Congress to make a deliberative determination to invade another country and allow the President, as Commander-in-Chief to engage the United States in war only in response to an attack upon the United States or its citizens or in the event of direct and imminent threat of such an attack.

I believe the resolution before us today crosses the line, delegating to the President the authority our Constitution gives solely to Congress. While we most certainly may delegate our authority, to do so would, in my opinion, be an abdication of our responsibility as Members of Congress.

If, as the President asserted in his speech to the American people, an imminent threat exists, it seems to me that this resolution is unnecessary. There is ample precedent for the President to act under those circumstances without a declaration of war or of authorization from Congress. No such imminent threat has been shown to exist.

Of course, Saddam Hussein is a thug and probably all the other things he has been called in the course of this debate. That, however, does not mean that Iraq poses any imminent threat that would justify the President proceeding to war without authorization from Congress.

Further, nothing the President said in his speech and nothing I have seen apart from his speech has led me to conclude that we should be delegating to the President the authority the Constitution gives to Congress, certainly not in the one-step manner in which the resolution we are considering would do. Nor do I believe that refusing to give that authority over to the President places the United States in any imminent danger.

If the President and the United States fail in their efforts to have Iraq comply with U.N. resolutions and if the President fails in his efforts to mobilize a coalition of nations in support of the United States, I believe that would be the appropriate time for the Congress to consider the advisability of declaring war.

This resolution, instead, requires us to make that decision today by delegating the decision to the President without the authority to bring it back to us. To do so now, in fact, would put us ahead of the President since he insisted in his speech that he had not yet decided whether war is necessary.

Unfortunately, despite the President's assurance, the contents of the President's speech left me with the sinking feeling that giving him a blank check to invade Iraq without seeking further authorization from Congress will virtually assure war. In my opinion, war should always be the last resort and in this case will almost certainly increase, not decrease, the risk of biological, chemical, or other terrorist retaliations. In fact, that is exactly what the CIA told Senator LEVIN in testimony in the Senate.

We are called upon, as Members of Congress and as citizens of the world, to ask ourselves today, where and when would it end? The risks are too great to proceed to war without a satisfactory answer to that question and without pursuing every conceivable peaceful option short of war.

For these reasons, I will vote against the resolution; and I encourage my colleagues to vote against it, too.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman who attended the same alma mater I attended in Cleveland Heights, Ohio, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I have to admit to a great deal of confusion tonight. A number of my colleagues are convinced that war is the only action; some believe it should never be an option; and most, I think, join with me and think that it should be an issue of last resort.

Like most of my colleagues, I have received volumes of mail from my constituents, and their opinions mirror the confusion which exists in this body tonight.

What troubles me is I have heard members of my party indicate in the press that the issue of war with Iraq has sucked the air out of Democratic message; and, sadly, I have heard Members on the other side of the aisle complain of the same thing.

The thought that this issue where we are talking about certain casualties, Iraqi, American, and those of our coalition partners, that those would be used for an advantage by either side in midterm elections is repugnant to me and the people I represent in Ohio.

When I have an 84-year-old Republican grandmother in Ashtabula, Ohio, grab my arm and say, Congressman, we have never attacked another sovereign country in our history without first being attacked, I am moved.

When I hear former Prime Minister Netanyahu tell our Committee on Government Reform that Israel has dealt with terrorists like Saddam Hussein since 1948, and if you do not get him, he will get you, I am moved as well.

At the end of it all, I will say that I have concluded if we were on the floor of this House on September 10, 2001, and we knew what we know today, every Member in this body, Republican and Democrat, would do whatever it took to protect the people of this Republic, and we should do that tonight.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), a member of the Committee on Appropriations and an environmentalist.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight on the issue of war with Iraq. I rise not only as a House Member from California, but as a father and about-to-be grandfather, and as a person who in his youth responded to a call for action by serving in the United States Peace Corps.

I have to ask myself in casting the votes before us, what is the best way to achieve peace in Iraq, not only for its own diverse ethnic people living in Iraq, but also for the people in the rest of the world?

The House leadership has adopted a closed rule on the debate so only three resolutions can be voted on. I think the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) has the preferred alternative because it speaks to the issue of putting all our efforts into working with the world community through the United Nations Security Council to get inspectors into Iraq. We should let that process run its course before determining that it will fail.

The Lee resolution calls upon the United States to ''work through the United Nations to seek to resolve the matter of insuring that Iraq is not developing weapons of mass destruction through mechanisms such as resumption of weapons inspectors, negotiation, inquiry, mediation, regional arrangements and other peaceful means.''

The President has done a good job in making the point that the U.N. Security Council must resolve the Iraq violation of U.N. resolutions. He should have stopped there, using all of the power of the President of the United States, the State Department, the Commerce Department, and the Department of Defense to help the U.N. inspectors into Iraq but not to threaten war. Why? Because, first, according to the U.N. Charter, only the U.N. Security Council has the power to enforce U.N. resolutions.

I find it ironic that the President who seems to be committed to holding Iraq accountable to the U.N. is requesting an authorization that circumvents the Security Council and runs counter to the authority of the U.N. Charter.

Second, the people's House should not give a blank check to declare war to the President of the United States. According to Article I Section 8 of the Constitution, Congress is given the power to declare war. The President is asking Congress to abrogate its constitutional responsibility. The President's resolution authorizes him to use force as he determines to be necessary. This is not the responsibility of the President. The President is the Commander-in-Chief. He shall execute as determined by Congress.

The Constitution clearly makes a separation of powers to stop the President from going on foreign adventures without the express consent of the American people.

Third, I think leaping into war before we get all of the facts could threaten world security, especially our own. Think about it. Striking preemptively without gathering sufficient intelligence will put U.S. troops in harm's way. We need U.N. inspectors in Iraq to gather information.

How will the U.S. military carry out surgical strikes of Iraq weapons depots and laboratories if it does not know where these facilities are? We need to know how many weapons Iraq has and what types of weapons. Striking before knowing creates an unintended consequence which could further threaten the world.

□ 2130

A preemptive strike will set an extremely damaging precedent to the future of international affairs. The U.S. will entirely lose its moral authority on preventing conflict. What will we say if Russia moves to attack Georgia, if China invades Taiwan, if India or Pakistan makes a decisive move into Kashmir? Lastly, a unilateral attack could alienate the U.S. from the rest of the world community including our traditional allies, our allies in the region, and our new allies in the war against terrorism. Far from strengthening the U.N., a unilateral strike before the U.N. acts will undermine the international body and lead the world to believe that the U.S. views the U.N. as a rubber stamp at best.

A unilateral attack makes it less likely that the rest of the international community will support the U.S. in postconflict reconstruction of Iraq. The U.S. will bear most of the costs if not all the costs of the war and postwar, and remember the Persian Gulf War cost approximately $70 billion. Our allies paid all but $7 billion, which the U.S. took responsibility for. This new war against Iraq is estimated to cost between 100 and $200 billion. If we go it alone, the U.S. will have to pay it all. What will happen to other priorities? What will happen to Social Security, to Medicare, to education? Will we have enough resources to spend on our domestic priorities?

Last, let us not forget that the power we have as Members of Congress is to cast these important votes from the consent of the people. My constituents have responded 5,000 to 24, approximately two to one.

If one has to vote, let us vote on the side of peace before we vote on the side of war.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. RIVERS), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce and a spokesperson for women.

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution before us. There is a saying in the practice of law that tough cases make bad law. I believe that that is also true in the creation of laws and history tells us that when we are frightened and angry we are also more likely to make bad law.

I believe we are poised today to approve some very bad law and tread on some very important principles as we do it. While I share the concerns raised by many of my colleagues regarding the lack of substance in the administration's arguments, I am most concerned about the damage this proposal would do to our Constitution. James Madison wrote: ''In no part of the Constitution is more wisdom to be found than in the clause which confides the question of war or peace to the legislature and not to the executive department . . . The trust and the temptation would be too great for any one man.''

The Founding Fathers were explicit that the awesome power to commit the United States people and resources to waging of war should lie not with a single individual but rather in the collective judgment of the Congress. It was the hope of the Founders that reserving this decision to Congress would in fact make it harder to move the country to war. I applaud that sentiment. Historians note that Congress exclusively possesses the constitutional power to initiate war, whether declared or undeclared, public or private, perfect or imperfect, de jure or defacto, with the only exception being the President's power to respond self-defensively to sudden direct attack upon the United States. There is no constitutionally recognized authorized use of force.

In the book ''War, Foreign Affairs and Constitutional Power,'' Abraham Sofaer points out that the Constitution says Congress shall declare war, and it seems unreasonable to contend that the President was given the power to make undeclared war. He concludes that nothing in the framing or ratification debates gives the President as Commander in Chief an undefined reservoir of power to use the military in situations unauthorized by Congress.

The U.S. Constitution requires the expressed declaration of war by Congress to execute any military operations in Iraq. Authorizing military action is our job, not the President's. We, not he, must determine when and if the fearsome power of our country should be turned to war. I understand the political and military risks associated with sending Americans into harm's way, but fear of public reaction does not justify the dereliction of Congress's constitutional duty. Similarly, the fact that many Presidents and Congresses over the years have engaged in the unconstitutional transfer of war powers does not make our obligation any less binding. Congress is not free to amend the Constitution through avoidance of its duties, and a President is not free to take constitutional power through adverse possession.

The Congressional Research Service points out that the power to commence even limited acts of war against another nation belongs exclusively to Congress. We may not shirk this responsibility. We may not abdicate it, and we may not pretend it does not exist. We must meet our constitutional obligation to decide if or when America will go to war, whether our sons and daughters should be put in harm's way, and whether the country's purse should be opened to pay a bill as high as $200 billion. This decision cannot be handed over to the President. If the Founding Fathers had wanted that, they would have explicitly provided so in the Constitution. They did not.

Should the United States go to war with Iraq? I do not believe the case has been made to do so. Can the Congress leave it to the President to decide whether or not we should attack Iraq? Any such transfer of congressional authority to the President is forbidden by the Constitution and would move us toward an upset of the delicate balance of powers between the Congress and the United States.

I urge my colleagues to exercise great care as we consider these questions. Tough cases can make for very bad law. Let us not let them make us trample very good laws that have existed since the dawn of the Republic. Vote ''no.''

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. SANDLIN), a senior member of the House Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, we are poised today on the brink of armed conflict, not knowing what the future may hold but confident in our position and in our resolve. We sincerely pray that war is not necessary. We realize that it may be. These closing hours and minutes of the 107th Congress may be our last chance for true and meaningful debate and deliberation. Can we as a reasonable people, supported by the international community, avoid the horrors of war, the stench of death, or rather does the protection of our country and the belief of the unalienable rights of all people, does common human decency require us to press forward in the face of certain American casualties?

Two questions face the American people: Is Iraq's threat imminent? Is an unprecedented first strike the proper course to take? On a positive note, the President has indicated that approval of the resolution does not mean war is imminent or unavoidable. Additionally the U.S. has indicated support for a three-pronged resolution: number one, Iraq must reveal and destroy all weapons of mass destruction under U.N. supervision; two, witnesses must be allowed to be interviewed outside of Iraq; and, thirdly, any site the U.N. wants to inspect must be open without delay, without preclearance, without restriction, without exception. These are reasonable and rational rules that are required to maintain international peace. Absent Iraqi compliance, it appears necessary to vest in the President the flexibility and authority to protect the American public and international community by military action if necessary.

But there is also a responsibility to exhaust all other options prior to risking the lives of young American sons and daughters. That is why we must use the most powerful military weapon that we have, diplomacy. That is why we must use all resources at our disposal to encourage the international community to pressure Hussein into compliance. But if all reasonable efforts fail, we must answer our duty to ensure the security of our country and those that we represent.

Certainly questions remain. It is particularly important to have a clear goal, a clear plan, and a clear exit strategy when American lives are at risk. Additionally, the President must address the issue of sacrifice. There is no short-term solution to the long-term problem, and there will be a cost to be paid in dollars and in American lives lost.

Presently, another cost is being assessed, the cost of waiting, the cost of allowing Saddam Hussein to build an international killing force, the cost of world instability. As the President has indicated, the riskiest of all options is to wait.

So let us exhaust all diplomatic efforts. Let us make every reasonable effort to avoid conflict. But at the end of the day we may be called on to make a tremendous sacrifice by using our might to preserve what is right. Our cause is clearly just. Our responsibility is clear. We will have to walk by faith and not by sight, trusting that in the end we will choose the right course.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

(Ms. SOLIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, there is no matter that comes before this Congress that is more serious than whether or not our Nation should enter into war. The implications of such a decision are so profound and will have worldwide impact. It could jeopardize U.S. relations with countries around the world. It would escalate the vulnerability of our Nation to a biological and chemical attack. And, of course, its most painful and lasting impact would be on the many American families who watch their sons and daughters go to war only to never see them again and maybe even return with lifetime illnesses.

This is not a decision that I take lightly. I recognize the gravity of it. And this is why I remain concerned about the timing of this resolution of the President's effort to send troops into Iraq. I do not doubt that Saddam Hussein is a menace to the United States and to the world and even to his own people. I echo concerns that we must ensure greater security for our people here at home and abroad. But I cannot support authorizing our President to send troops in harm's way without the support of our allies and concrete compelling evidence of imminent or nuclear threats that demand military action. We must eliminate weapons of mass destruction and the threat they pose to our Nation and others around the world. But unilateral military action against Iraq or any other foreign nation is not the most effective short-term strategy to accomplish this goal.

Over 90 percent of the calls that I received in my own district tell me that they are opposed to this war. They ask, What is the rush, Congresswoman? Why is it that we have to take action so immediate? They want to know why we cannot wait for the support of the U.N. and our allies. Some of these calls have come from my very own veterans in my district, many who have already made the ultimate sacrifices through their families, many of them who look like me and speak Spanish and are of Hispanic decent. They understand the extreme price of war and caution against using force without first gathering ally support and using diplomatic means to find peace. They also recognize the implications that a war would have on our community, and I represent a largely Hispanic community.

Our military is a volunteer force. Most often it is the people of low-income families that answer that call to duty to serve our Nation. The young men and women on the frontlines would disproportionately be Latino, African American, and people of color. These communities will lose so much if the U.S. attacks Iraq.

I am concerned about the price of the war. It has been estimated that the cost of this war against Iraq would be between 100 and $200 billion. How is the U.S. going to pay for this war? We are always told that we cannot afford a prescription drug benefit plan, that we cannot extend unemployment insurance to workers laid off after the wake of September 11. We need to think about these costs before we rush into a war, and we should exhaust tough, rigorous U.N. inspections before going into war. We should seek support from the U.N. Security Council. As the first President Bush's advisers of Operation Desert Storm have warned, by attacking Iraq we give Saddam Hussein both the excuse and the incentive to use the biological and chemical weapons that he already has.

I oppose this resolution and urge my colleagues to give serious consideration on this crucial matter.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), my good friend.

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

□ 2145

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, for 2 days Members have marched to the floor to offer their support for or opposition to this resolution, good Americans every one. Soon the hours of debate will come to an end. The House Chamber has echoed with the sentiments of almost every Member. Yet, many questions remain unanswered.

To be sure, there is one thing we all agree upon: Saddam Hussein is a tyrant, is a threat. He is the epitome of malevolence. Plato must have had visions of Hussein, a Hussein character, when he described evil in The Allegory of the Cave.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD The Allegory of the Cave from Plato's Republic.

The material referred to is as follows:

[From Plato's Republic]

THE ALLEGORY OF THE CAVE

And now, I said, let me show in a figure how far our nature is enlightened or unenlightened:, Behold! human beings living in an underground den, which has a mouth open towards the light and reaching all along the den; here they have been from their childhood, and have their legs and necks chained so that they cannot move, and can only see before them, being prevented by the chains from turning round their heads.

Above and behind them a fire is blazing at a distance, and between the fire and the prisoners there is a raised way; and you will see, if you look, a low wall built along the way, like the screen which marionette players have in front of them, over which they show the puppets.

I see, he said.

And do you see, I said, men passing along the wall carrying all sorts of vessels, and statutes and figures of animals made of wood and stone and various materials, which appear over the wall? Some of them are talking, other silent.

You have shown me a strange image, and they are strange prisoners.

Like ourselves, I replied; and they see only their own shadows, or the shadows of one another, which the fire throws on the opposite wall of the cave?

True, he said; how could they see anything but the shadows if they were never allowed to move their heads?

And of the objects which are being carried in like manner they would only see the shadows?

Yes, he said.

And if they were able to converse with one another, would they not suppose that they were naming what was actually before them? And suppose further that the prison had an echo which came from the other side, would they not be sure to fancy, when one of the passers-by spoke that the voice which they heard came from the passing shadow?

No question, he replied.

To them, I said, the truth would be literally nothing but the shadows of the images.

That is certain.

And now look again, and see what will naturally follow if the prisoners are released and disabused of their error. At first, when any of them is liberated and compelled suddenly to stand up and turn his neck round and walk and look towards the light, he will suffer sharp pains; the glare will distress him, and he will be unable to see the realities of which is his former state he had seen the shadows; and then conceive some one saying to him, that what he saw before was an illusion, but that now, when he is approaching nearer to being and his eye is turned towards more real existence, he has a clearer vision, what will be his reply?

And you may further imagine that his instructor is pointing and when to the objects as they pass and requiring him to name them, will he not be perplexed? Will he not fancy that the shadows which he formerly saw are truer than the objects which are now shown to him? Far truer. And if he is compelled to look straight at the light, will he not have a pain in his eyes which will make him turn away to take refuge in the objects of vision which he can see, and which he will conceive to be in reality clearer than the things which are now being shown to him?

True, he said.

And suppose once more, that he is reluctantly dragged up a steep and rugged ascent, and held fast until he is forced into the presence of the sun himself, is he not likely to be pained and irritated? When he approaches the light his eyes will be dazzled, and he will not be able to see anything at all of what are now called realities?

Not all in a moment, he said.

He will require to grow accustomed to the sight of the upper world. And first he will see the shadows best, next the reflections of men and other objects in the water, and then the objects themselves; then he will gaze upon the light of the moon and the stars and the spangled heaven; and he will see the sky and the stars by night better than the sun or the light of the sun by day?

Certainly.

Last of all he will be able to see the sun, and not mere reflections of him in the water, but he will see him in his own proper place, and not in another; and he will contemplate him as he is.

Certainly.

He will then proceed to argue that this is he who gives the season and the years, and is the guardian of all that is in the visible world, and in a certain way the cause of all things which he and his fellows have been accustomed to behold?

Clearly, he said, he would first see the sun and then reason about it.

And when he remembered his old habitation, and the wisdom of the den and his fellow-prisoners, do you not suppose that he would felicitate himself on the change, and pity them?

Certainly, he would.

And if they were in the habit of conferring honors among themselves on those who were quickest to observe the passing shadows and to remark which of them went before, and which followed after, and which were together; and who were therefore best able to draw conclusions as to the future, do you think that he would care for such honors and glories, or envy the possessors of them? Would he not say with Homer, Better to be the poor servant of a poor master, and to endure anything, rather than think as they do and live after their manner?

Yes, he said, I think that he would rather suffer anything than entertain these false notions and live in this miserable manner.

Imagine once more, I said, such a one coming suddenly out of the sun to be replaced in his old situation; would he not be certain to have his eyes full of darkness?

To be sure, he said.

And if there were a contest, and he had to compete in measuring the shadows with the prisoners who had never moved out of the den, while his sight was still weak, and before his eyes had become steady (and the time which would be needed to acquire this new habit of sight might be very considerable), would he not be ridiculous? Men would say of him that up he went and down he came without his eyes; and that it was better not even to think of ascending; and if any one tried to loose another and lead him up to the light, let them only catch the offender, and they would put him to death.

No question, he said.

This entire allegory, I said, you may now append, dear Glaucon, to the previous argument; the prison-house is the world of sight, the light of the fire is the sun, and you will not misapprehend me if you interpret the journey upwards to be the ascent of the soul into the intellectual world according to my poor belief, which, at your desire, I have expressed, whether rightly or wrongly God knows. But, whether true or false, my opinion is that in the world of knowledge the idea of good appears last of all, and is seen only with an effort; and, when seen, is also inferred to be the universal author of all things beautiful and right, parent of light and of the lord of light in this visible world, and the immediate source of reason and truth in the intellectual; and that this is the power upon which he who would act rationally either in public or private life must have his eye fixed.

I agree, he said, as far as I am able to understand you.

Moreover, I said, you must not wonder that those who attain to this beautific vision are unwilling to descend to human affairs; for their souls are ever hastening into the upper world where they desire to dwell; which desire of theirs is very natural, if our allegory may be trusted.

Yes, very natural.

And is there anything surprising in one who passes from divine contemplations to the evil state of man, when they returned to the den they would see much worse than those who had never left it himself in a ridiculous manner; if, while his eyes are blinking and before he has become accustomed to the surrounding darkness, he is compelled to fight in courts of law, or in other places, about the images or the shadows of images of justice, and is endeavoring to meet the conceptions of those who have never yet seen absolute justice?

Anything but surprising, he replied.

Any one who has common sense will remember that the bewilderments of the eyes are of two kinds, and arise from two causes, either from coming out of the light or from going into the light, which is true of the mind's eye, quite as much as of the bodily eye; and he who remembers this when he sees any one whose vision is perplexed and weak, will not be too ready to laugh; he will first ask whether that soul of man has come out of the brighter life, and is unable to see because unaccustomed to the dark, or having turned from darkness to the day is dazzled by excess of light. And he will count the one happy in his condition and state of being, and he will pity the other; or, if he has a mind to laugh at the soul which comes from below into the light, there will be more reason in this than in the laugh which greets him who returns from above out of the light into the den.

That, he said, is a very just distinction.

But then, if I am right, certain professors of education must be wrong when they say that they can put a knowledge into the soul which was not there before, like sight into blind eyes?

They undoubtedly say this, he replied.

Whereas, our argument shows that the power and capacity of learning exists in the soul already; and that just as the eye was unable to turn from darkness to light without the whole body, so too the instrument of knowledge can only by the movement of the whole soul be turned from the world of becoming into that of being, and learn by degrees to endure the sight of being, and of the brightest and best of being, or in other words, of the good.

Very true.

And must there not be some art which will effect conversion in the easiest and quickest manner; not implanting the faculty of sight, for that exists already, but has been turned in the wrong direction, and is looking away from the truth?

Yes, he said, such an art may be presumed.

And whereas the other so-called virtues of the soul seem to be akin to bodily qualities, for even when they are not originally innate they can be implanted later by habit and exercise, the virtue of wisdom more than anything else contains a divine element which always remains, and by this conversation is rendered useful and profitable; or, on the other hand, hurtful and useless. Did you never observe the narrow intelligence flashing from the keen eye of a clever rogue, how eager he is, how clearly his paltry soul sees the way to this end; he is the reverse of blind, but his keen eye-sight is forced into the service of evil, and he is mischievous in proportion to his cleverness?

Very true, he said.

But what if there had been a circumcision of such natures in the days of their youth; and they had been severed from those sensual pleasures, such as eating and drinking, which, like leaden weights, were attached to them at their birth, and which drag them down and turn the vision of their souls upon the things that are below, if, I say, they had been released from these impediments and turned in the opposite direction, the very same faculty in them would have seen the truth as keenly as they see what their eyes are turned to now.

Very likely.

Yes I said; and there is another thing which is likely, or Neither rather a necessary inference from what has preceded, that neither the uneducated and uninformed of the truth, nor yet those who never make an end of their education, will be able educated ministers of State; nor the former, because they have no single aim of duty which is the rule of all their actions, private as well as public; nor the latter, because they will not act at all except upon compulsion, fancying that they are already dwelling apart in the islands of the blest.

Very true, he replied.

Them, I said, the business of us who are the founders of the State will be to compel the best minds to attain that knowledge which we have already shown to be the greatest of all, they must continue to ascend until they arrive at the good; but when they have ascended and seen enough we must not allow them to do as they do now.

What do you mean?

I mean that they remain in the upper world: but this must not be allowed; they must be made to descend again among the prisoners in the den, and partake of their labors and honors, whether they are worth having or not.

But is not this unjust? he said; ought we to give them a worse life, when they might have a better?

You have again forgotten, my friend, I said, the intention of the legislator, who did not aim at making any one class in the State happy above the rest; the happiness was to be in the whole State, and he held the citizens together by persuasion and necessity, making them benefactors of the State, and therefore benefactors of one another; to this end he created them, not to please themselves, but to be his instruments in binding up the State.

True, he said, I had forgotten.

Observe, Glaucon, that there will be no injustice in compelling our philosophers to have a care and providence of others; we shall explain to them that in other States, men of their class are not obliged to share in the toils of politics: and this is reasonable, for they grow up at their own sweet will, and the government would rather not have them. Being self-taught, they cannot be expected to show any gratitude for a culture which they have never received. But we have brought you into the world to be rulers of the hive, kings of yourselves and of the other citizens, and have educated you far better and more perfectly than they have been educated, and you are better able to share in the double duty. That is why each of you, when his turn comes, must go down to the general underground abode, and get the habit of seeing in the dark. When you have acquired the habit, you will see ten thousand times better than the inhabitants of the den, and you will know what the several images are, and what they represent, because you have seen the beautiful and just and good in their truth. And thus our State, which is also yours will be a reality, and not a dream only, and will be administered in a spirit unlike that of other States, in which men fight with one another about shadows only and are distracted in the struggle for power, which in their eyes is a great good. Whereas the truth is that the State in which the rulers are most reluctant to govern is always the best and most quietly governed, and the State in which they are most eager, the worst.

Quite true, he replied.

And will our pupils, when they hear this, refuse to take their turn at the toils of State, when they are allowed to spend the greater part of their time with one another in the heavenly light?

Impossible, he answered; for they are just men, and the commands which we impose upon them are just; there can be no doubt that every one of them will take office as a stern necessity, and not after the fashion of our present rulers of State.

Yes, my friend, I said; and there lies the point. You must contrive for your future rulers another and a better life than that of a ruler, and then you may have a well-ordered State; for only in the State which offers this, will they rule who are truly rich, not in silver and gold, but in virtue and wisdom, which are the true blessings of life. Whereas if they go to the administration of public affairs, poor and hungering after their own private advantage, thinking that hence they are to snatch the chief good, order there can never be; for they will be fighting about office, and the civil and domestic broils which thus arise will be the ruin of the rulers themselves and of the whole State.

Most true, he replied.

And the only life which looks down upon the life of political ambition is that of true philosophy. Do you know of any other?

Indeed, I do not, he said.

And those who govern ought not to be lovers of the task? For, if they are, there will be rival lovers, and they will fight.

No question.

Who then are those whom we shall compel to be guardians? Surely they will be the men who are wisest about affairs of the state.

ENDNOTES

If you understand this first distinction, the much more difficult division of the intelligible world will make more sense. Think over this carefully: the visible world, that is, the world you see, has two kinds of visible objects in it. The first kind are shadows and reflections, that is, objects you see but aren't really there but derive from the second type of visible objects, that is, those that you see and are really there. The relation of the visible world to the intelligible world is identical to the relation of the world of reflections to the world of visible things that are real.

The lower region of the intelligible world corresponds to the upper region in the same way the lower region of the visible world corresponds to the upper region. Think of it this way: the lower region deals only with objects of thought (that are, in part, derived from visible objects), which is why it is part of the intelligible world. There have to be certain first principles (such as the existence of numbers or other mathematical postulates) that are just simply taken without question: these are hypotheses. These first principles, however, derive from other first principles; the higher region of the intelligible world encompasses these first principles.

So you can see that the lower region derives from the higher region in that the thinking in the lower region derives from the first principles that make up the higher region, just as the mirror reflects a solid object. When one begins to think about first principles (such as, how can you prove that numbers exist at all?) and derives more first principles from them until you reach the one master, first principle upon which all thought is based, you are operating in this higher sphere in intellection. Plato's line is also a hierarchy: the things at the top (first principles) have more truth and more existence; the things at the bottom (the reflections) have almost no truth and barely exist at all.

He wrote: ''Did you never observe the narrow intelligence flashing from the keen eye of a clever rogue? How eager he is. How clearly his paltry soul sees the way to his end. He is the reverse of blind, but his keen eyesight is forced into the service of evil, and he is mischievous in proportion to his cleverness.''

What a perfect description of Saddam Hussein in that allegory for all of us, distinguishing from falsehoods and reality of the cave, the shadows against the wall, the light behind us, like a puppeteer.

The record of this murderous regime has been outlined forcefully in this body and by our Commander-in-Chief. Saddam has used weapons of mass destruction against his own people, he waged war with Iran, he invaded Kuwait, and he even murdered his own people in the northern part of Iraq.

Two cities stand out in the northern part of Iraq in 1988, Halabja and Goktapa. We all, each and every one of us, need to read the stories from both of those towns of innocent people who were massacred, massacred.

The helicopters came over the day before in May, Mr. Speaker, taking pictures of the villages. People did not know what they were doing. Then, 2 days later, the same helicopters showed up and they dropped out of the sky mustard gases, lethal, lethal gases which left animals and plants and human beings dead. They did not need sophisticated state-of-the-art technology to deliver these gases.

Nothing like it was seen since the Holocaust, nothing came close. We need to think about this and who perpetuated these deaths.

For the last 11 years, he has defied the will of the entire planet, as expressed in the resolutions which we have heard over and over the last 2 days. Indeed, I know of no thinking person who argues against the profound necessity of eliminating Saddam's weapons technology.

But while we can all agree on the menace he poses and unite in the desire to live in a world where he is not a factor, there are still critically important lingering questions, questions about the process, about the timing and, ultimately, the unilateral nature of preemptive war that we seem to be accepting for the first time in the history of this great country.

Is the relative sudden frenzy to eliminate Saddam clouding the strategic vision of those who are most vociferous in the support of his ouster? My inquiry stems not from any kind of partisan agenda but out of a genuine confusion as to why key issues have not fully been discussed and debated.

We spend millions of dollars every day for 10 years protecting the no-fly zones in the north and south. The American people have a right to know what these actions will cost us. They have every right to know.

If we endorse this historic shift in our strategy that abandons our reliance on deterrence and arms control as the pillars of national security, will we open a Pandora's box of preemptive action throughout the world? What is our response when it comes?

If this is our Nation's new policy, then what is to prevent India from attacking Pakistan, or Russia from attacking the state of Georgia? If they do, what will we say? After war, then what? What happens on day three, as Thomas Friedman wrote?

After the intervention, how will the situation likely evolve? We have yet to hear any discussion on this. Surely in this great deliberative body we should give pause to this critical issue. Surely the administration must address this most comprehensively.

Let us remember, this is not a game of chess. These are our sons, these are our daughters who will execute this mission, many of whom may not return. Full debate is essential. Anything less is an abdication of the oath we all took together.

We also need to make absolutely certain that whatever is done in Iraq does not negatively impact the broader war that we authorized 12 months ago, the war on terrorism.

That said, a great many people predict that the Congress will pass the resolution, the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 114, with an overwhelming majority. I do not dispute this, nor do I declare my opposition, but Congress must ensure that, through this process, no matter the duration, we are involved as explicitly as possible under article 1, Section 8. We must ensure that we constantly ask the appropriate questions and demand the pertinent answers.

I do believe that it is imperative that the United States speaks with one voice to Saddam Hussein. There can be no ambiguity in our resolve to protect and defend this greatest of all democracies and the families that make it great.

We all love America, not some more than others. When we leave this week, we must remember this: None of us love America more than anyone else in this room.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SIMMONS).

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am a Vietnam veteran. I served 18 months in uniform in that country. As someone who has seen the ugly face of war, I do not embrace it as a policy choice, nor is it my first choice, but as a choice we sometimes have to make.

I believe that preparation for war and a demonstration of national will to engage in war can be a way to avoid war, and I also believe that diplomacy without the threat of military action can be a hollow exercise in extreme cases. Right now, we are faced with an extreme case.

There is no doubt that Saddam Hussein is a menace. Our intelligence tells the story of brutality, savagery, patterns of aggression, deception, and defiance. It shows the danger that Saddam Hussein poses to our country, to his region, and to the world. His ouster could bring peace and stability, and it could also inflame further violence and instability. How we do what we do in this case is as important as what we do.

In dealing with the issue, I have asked myself a question: Does Iraq's intent and capability to use weapons of mass destruction pose a clear and present danger to the United States, to our allies, or to Israel? And based on a reading and hearing of information available to me, I believe that the danger to the United States is clear. Whether or not it is present is less certain.

For the continental United States, the danger may be 6 months away or it may be 6 years away, depending on a number of variables. For Israel, for some of our troops abroad, for our NATO ally Turkey, the danger is certainly clear and present.

Given this assessment, diplomacy and multilateral action are still reasonable options to use against Hussein, and they should be encouraged. That is why I intend to vote for the Spratt amendment, which maintains substantial focus on diplomacy and multilateral action.

My decision to support this amendment is not an easy one, but the stakes in this situation are very high. Over the past year, the intelligence community and committees of this Congress have tried to connect the dots on the vicious attack that took place on September 11, and the challenge for us today is to connect the dots once again but before another and potentially more lethal attack.

There are risks and consequences if we act; there are risks and consequences if we do not act. I lost friends in the Vietnam War, and I am reminded of that every time I go down to the Wall. But I lost neighbors on September 11, and I am reminded of that every time I see the World Trade Center.

On balance, I feel the greatest risk is through inaction, which is why, if the Spratt amendment fails on the floor tomorrow, I intend to vote for the bipartisan resolution.

A vote for the bipartisan resolution is not a vote for war, it is a vote for will. It is a statement of national unity that says to Saddam Hussein, you are a menace and a bully to your own people and to your neighbors. You must disarm. You have exhausted our patience. We will join the United Nations and the world community and work with them against you in this cause, but, at the 11th hour, we will be prepared to act.

We cannot wait for the smoking gun. A gun smokes only after it has been fired, and that may be too late for another American city, our troops abroad, a NATO ally, or Israel. When it comes to weapons of mass destruction, we must connect the dots before the next attack, not after it has occurred.

□ 2200

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS), a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution. There is no question that Saddam Hussein is a villain and a menace to his own people and to the rest of the world. He is a terrible dictator who has used chemical weapons in his own country and on other nations. He has likely biological weapons and is certainly seeking nuclear weapons. He has invaded his neighbors and defied the international community. He has worked to destabilize the Middle East in support of terrorism. We can all agree he is a threat to international peace and security. His own people and the rest of the world would be better off if he were not in power.

Mr. Speaker, it appears that the United States is going to use military force to reduce or eliminate this threat. It seems likely that the brave men and women of our Armed Forces will be sent to the region to disarm his regime and possibly remove Hussein from power. If that happens, I will support our country men as they do their duty and obey the orders of the Commander in Chief. But tomorrow, I will vote against the resolution authorizing the use of force now.

This is a hard decision. It is one of the most important votes that I cast. It is a vote of conscience for me, as I trust it is for all Members. And my conscience leads me to vote ''no.'' After careful consideration, I have determined that the resolution before us does not advance our national security. The bottom line is that it authorizes the President to launch a unilateral preemptive attack if he so chooses. Our national security is not served by such an attack.

Mr. Speaker, I do not oppose the use of force in all circumstances. I voted to support military operations in Kosovo, and I stood on this floor and supported the President in the operations in Afghanistan. But I think an authorization to use force against Iraq before we have explored all of our options is premature and potentially dangerous.

First of all, international support, especially from the U.N., is critical. It allows us to share the risks and costs of our operations. It lends our efforts legitimacy. Recently, the United Nations has regained its focus on Iraq. It is on the verge of restarting inspections and international support for a stricter inspection regime is growing. The return of the inspectors should be our top priority. They can determine the extent of the threat Iraq represents, and their findings can help us build international support to check the Iraqi regime.

I will be supporting an alternative that continues those efforts. This alternative will only authorize force as a part of U.N. efforts to disarm Iraq. A unilateral preemptive attack on Iraq without U.N. support may undermine

the multilateral war against global terror. It could drive a wedge between us and those allies whose support we need.

In addition, with or without international support, we will have to be committed to rebuilding Iraq or we may be left with a state that is just as dangerous as the current one or worse we could be dealing with a chaotic civil war where we are not sure who has what kind of weapons. Unfortunately, the administration has shown little interest in addressing this important issue. This is consistent with its lack of attention to post-Taliban Afghanistan. Both are troubling.

And a preemptive, unilateral strike on Iraq may lead to uprisings in the Middle East. Friendly regimes could be threatened by extremists who will openly support terrorism. And key moderate Islamic nations, like Egypt, Jordan, and the nuclear-armed Pakistan, could be destabilized.

A U.S. attack would certainly further inflame the cycle of violence between Israel and the Palestinians. And I cannot imagine the consequences if Iraq were to attack Israel and Israel were to respond as Prime Minister Sharon has declared it would.

An attack on Iraq could lead to the use of the very weapons we want to destroy. In an attempt to survive, Saddam Hussein may use all the weapons at his disposal against our servicemen and women.

Finally, a preemptive attack on Iraq turns 50 years of national security policy on its head. We have struggled for 5 decades to help build a world in which nations do not attack one another without specific provocation. In the face of an imminent threat to the U.S., with an obvious provocation, a preemptive attack might be justified. But I have not seen convincing evidence that Saddam Hussein is an immediate threat.

There is still time to try to resolve the situation using other tools of statecraft, such as diplomacy. The United States would win a war against Iraq. But that does not necessarily mean it is a war that should be waged at this time. At some point it may be necessary to use force. We may have to place our men and women in our Armed Forces in harm's way, but that should be the last resort, only after we have explored all other means and after other measures have failed.

For now I do not think the case has been made that force is the only option left to us. It is premature to launch a unilateral preemptive attack, and it would be premature for us to authorize one. I oppose this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have chosen to remain silent and our side has held their debate because we want to allow full time for those opposed to have their word; but sometimes as you listen to a series of words you begin to see a pattern. And I think the American people, Mr. Speaker, need to also hear maybe some of the realities that are not being mentioned.

This is not the beginning of a new war. In fact, President Herbert Bush, President Clinton, and now President George W. Bush have all, in fact, had to make strikes in Iraq to contain this evil dictator. In fact, President Clinton has made probably the largest strikes since the Gulf War during his administration. And at that time I do not believe that we heard in this body something about new preemptive acts of war. In fact, what we understood was we had a dictator who continued to use his remaining force and the ill-gotten revenues that he is getting from his clandestine selling of oil from outside the food program to, in fact, intimidate his neighbors and rebuild his weapons of mass destruction.

So as much as I certainly want to yield as much time to my colleagues who oppose this, I think the American people, Mr. Speaker, must understand that this is by no means a new war. The President is not asking for a new war. In fact, what he is asking for is a recognition that after 11-plus years of a war which has not ended because this dictator has not met his responsibilities, responsibilities he agreed with the United Nations to keep, that in fact the President has said, our President now has said, I must in fact have the tools to be able to go further to get the compliance. And I would hope that all of us in this body would very much understand the historic context in which I say the war has never ended.

We are only asking to continue a direction that President Herbert Bush started, President Clinton continued, and now President George W. Bush has on his desk; and we hold him responsible for our safety.

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ), a member of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, today we are debating whether and under what considerations we will consider sending our young men and women into battle. That is an awesome responsibility, and I have given it much thought. I rise to offer my support of the Spratt substitute. It is a balanced, very careful approach to a serious problem.

I stand before you as a father, as a husband, as an American, and as an elected representative of the people who live in the 20th Congressional District of Texas. Since the terrible attacks of September 11, we, as a Nation, have felt a new vulnerability; and we set out on a war against terrorism to safeguard our future.

During this past year, I have listened to my constituents' concerns, sharing their fears and consoling those shaken by disruptions and the issue of security in our Nation. I offered my full support to the fight against terrorism, and I will continue to do so. We must not lose sense of the purpose, but we also must not lose our perspective. In recent months as the administration has begun to call for a war against Iraq, I have spoken with parents, brothers and sisters; and I have read heartfelt letters of young and old, and I have met with American men and women in uniform who proudly serve this Nation.

As I visited churches and restaurants, shops and homes throughout the San Antonio, South Texas region, I have heard patriotic voices, yet voices filled with concern about the war we are today asked to authorize. As the administration has tried to make its case for the unilateral war against Iraq, I have had many questions. I am troubled because many of these questions remain unanswered, even as we debate whether or how to put American troops in harm's way.

We have also heard mixed messages when we heard the Secretary call for a cut of 23,000 in the Army while at the same time we have heard our generals indicate that we need 40,000 in the Army, 20,000 in the Air Force and 8,000 Marines. Those mixed messages have not been helpful. But we also do not get the answers to our questions, questions such as, Who will pay for this war? We should have a tax bill on this House floor to pay for this war. What are our mission goals and our exit strategy?

The other reality is that there has been no dialogue and no real thrust in that with terrorism, also, it is a fight of ideology and ideas. One thing we are clear about is we know that Saddam Hussein and the government he controls brutally, Iraq, are without question a danger not only to the United States but also to the world community. We know that Saddam Hussein has gone to great lengths to seek, develop, and then conceal weapons of mass destruction. I believe I join my colleagues here today in stating that we must end Saddam Hussein's quest for these terrible weapons.

The issue before us is how we do so. It is crucial that we as representatives of the people translate the concerns about the execution of war against Iraq into a concrete plan to ensure the congressional representatives have a role in the decision to send our troops into harm's way.

The administration seeks a blank check from the Congress to authorize the use of force broadly. But the administration's proposal does not encourage multilateral cooperation and also does not anticipate further congressional input. The approach offered by the Spratt substitute offers a better option. We are today the world's greatest superpower; our military might and economic power reach around the globe. Our democracy is an example to which other nations aspire. We are a diverse Nation united by our love of liberty, our thirst for freedom, and our belief in justice and the rule of law.

That status as a world superpower brings with it great responsibilities. Yes, we have the power to go it alone, but I feel very strongly that the power to do exactly that would be the wrong thing to do. In the case of Iraq, I believe going it alone under the circumstances we now face is not the best approach. First, by working with the United Nations, we will act not only on our own behalf, but on behalf of the world community.

Let me ask that you support the substitute, the Spratt substitute, because it is also the best military option, because that would allow us an opportunity to seek out those biological and chemical weapons before our soldiers go in. And if they have to go in, at least we will identify those areas where they might be able to be hiding, and there is no doubt that that would be the best way to go at it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, our decision to authorize the President to commit American men and women to overseas military action is the most difficult decision a Member of Congress will ever face.

Since September 11, 2001, when more than 100 of my constituents were killed in the terror attacks on our country, I have felt a new urgency to address the dangers to our national security that exist both here in the United States and abroad. Our government must act to secure our boarders and airways, protect nuclear power plants, safeguard our food and water supplies and more.

□ 2215

We must face up to the very real possibility of a biological, chemical or even nuclear attack upon our country and take whatever action is necessary to prevent it.

I have spent a great deal of time, as have my colleagues, in recent weeks in classified briefings, with military and intelligence experts; and I have also paid close attention to the very real concerns of my constituents and even my family. We are living in a world far more dangerous today than we have ever known, and I have concluded that we must not wait for another terrorist attack before giving the President the authority to take the necessary action to protect our children and our grandchildren.

Throughout world history, inaction against tyrants has proven to be an ineffective strategy for averting catastrophe. We have every reason to believe that Saddam Hussein is continuing to build up his arsenal of weapons of mass destruction. He continues to defy the civilized world and United Nations Security Council resolutions ordering him to disarm. He has shown through brutality toward his own people his willingness to use these terrible weapons against innocent people.

Therefore, I have concluded that Saddam Hussein poses a serious danger to United States national security. We must stand up to this threat first by pursuing to the fullest all possible diplomatic means and then, only if we must, by the use of force.

As a strong believer in the United Nations, I have a long record of support for a robust United States role in the United Nations, and I believe that strong United States leadership in the United Nations is critical to achieve peace in the world.

But the United Nations must act. The crisis before us provides an important opportunity for the U.N. Security Council to show that there are consequences to ignoring the will of the international community. Failure to enforce the relevant resolutions will hurt the U.N.'s effectiveness as an organization, diminishing a potent force for stability around the world. And if all else fails, if we must pursue military action, I hope and I pray that the mission is successful and short and that it will pave the way to a better day for Iraq and the region and result in greater security for Americans here at home.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, as I take the floor this evening I am humbled by the task at hand and the paths that have led us to this point.

When I arrived in Congress last year, I never imagined that we would witness cruel attacks on our own soil, that we would lead a war against terrorism across the globe or that we would contemplate returning to Iraq to address the ongoing threat of Saddam Hussein, all in less than 2 years. Yet, we did not choose these circumstances. Instead, they found us; and it is our responsibility to act in a careful and appropriate manner to protect the United States, its people, its allies and our ideals.

Authorizing the use of military force is one of the most important decisions Congress can make; and as a member of the House Committee on Armed Services, I do not take it lightly.

Last month, I held a listening tour in Rhode Island to understand my constituents' concerns about military action in Iraq. I spent many hours being briefed in the Committee on Armed Services and in the White House by senior administration officials and other experts. From these conversations, I have grown increasingly alarmed by the widening body of evidence that Saddam Hussein poses a grave and expanding threat to the security of the United States.

His development of biological and chemical weapons, as well as his pursuit of nuclear capabilities, flaunts United Nations resolutions and threatens the stability of the region. His oppression of the Iraqi people, including his use of chemical weapons against civilians, strikes at the very core of our belief in protecting human rights. He has also made it clear that he will take action to harm us and our allies, even firing on aircraft and enforcing the Iraqi's no-fly zone 2,500 times since 1991.

While it may be difficult to imagine what horrors this tyrant is planning over 6,000 miles away, I am convinced that the threat is very real.

The question, therefore, becomes how best to deal with this danger. I have heard overwhelming concerns from constituents that the United States could endanger the international coalition against terror if we act against Iraq, if we act particularly unilaterally. Equally important, I share the concern that we will damage our moral authority as the world's sole remaining superpower if we do not proceed responsibly.

For this reason, we must engage the global community in our efforts to neutralize the threat of Saddam Hussein. Cooperation with the United Nations and our allies is critical, and I hope that we are collectively able to develop a strong mandate for the disarmament of Iraq.

In his speech Monday night, President Bush pledged to engage the U.N. Security Council in drafting a new resolution; and I fully expect him to pursue this strategy, not only to establish broader support and deeper confidence for our mission but also to protect the integrity of the United States. If new weapons inspections do not achieve total disarmament, we must not rule out using military action to force compliance with U.N. resolutions, eradicate Iraq's destructive capabilities and protect the American people.

Again, such action must be taken in conjunction with other Nations. President Bush stated that we would act with our allies at our side, and we must hold him to his promise. We cannot ignore that unilateral action against Iraq could have dangerous ramifications on the region and America's own efforts in the war on terrorism. Furthermore, the international coalition would also be essential in promoting a new government in Iraq, an effort that should be undertaken as seriously as the Marshall Plan.

Tomorrow, I will vote for the Spratt amendment, which would require cooperation with the United Nations to the greatest extent possible. In contemplating a preemptive attack against another nation, it is our responsibility to work with our friends and allies and rally them to our cause. If the Spratt amendment is unsuccessful, I cannot support the underlying resolution until we first go to the U.N. Security Council and attempt to get a vote authorizing the use of force. Though that vote may ultimately fail,

the United States has been instrumental in shaping the guidelines and agreements that have fostered peace and cooperation throughout the world, and we must demonstrate our continued commitment to these goals.

The threat posed by Saddam Hussein is too great for us to remain inactive. We cannot sit idly by while the pieces of another September 11 fall into place. We cannot risk a single American life waiting for the promises from a madman.

We now have the opportunity to improve the safety of our citizens and the stability of the Middle East. However, there is a right way and a wrong way of approaching this complicated issue. Just as a prosecutor must lay out the facts to establish guilt, we must make our case before the world community.

I urge support for the Spratt amendment.

As I take the floor this afternoon, I am humbled by the task at hand and the path that has led us to this point. When I arrived in Congress last year, I never imagined that we would witness cruel attacks on our soil, that we would lead a war against terrorism across the globe, or that we would contemplate returning to Iraq to address the ongoing threat of Saddam Hussein—all in less than two years. Yet we did not choose these circumstances; instead, they found us, and it is our responsibility to act in a careful and appropriate manner to protect the United States, its people, its allies, and its ideals.

Authorizing the use of military force is one of the most important decisions Congress can make, and, as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I do not take it lightly. Last month, I held a listening tour in Rhode Island to understand my constituents' concerns about military action in Iraq. I have spent many hours being briefed in the Armed Services Committee and at the White House by Administration officials and other experts. From these conversations, I have grown increasingly alarmed by the widening body of evidence that Saddam Hussein poses a grave and expanding threat to the security of the United States. His development of biological and chemical weapons, as well as his pursuit of nuclear capabilities, flaunts United Nations resolutions and threatens the stability of the region. His oppression of the Iraqi people, including his use of chemical weapons against civilians, strikes at the very core of our belief in protecting human rights. He has also made it clear that he will take action to harm us and our allies, firing on aircraft enforcing the Iraqi no-fly zones 2,500 times since 1991. And while it may be difficult for some to imagine what horrors this tyrant is planning over 6,000 miles away, I am convinced that the threat is real.

The question therefore becomes how best to deal with this danger. I have heard overwhelming concern from my constituents that the United States could endanger the international coalition against terror if we act unilaterally against Iraq. Equally important, I share their concern that we will damage our moral authority as the world's sole remaining superpower if we do not proceed responsibly. For this reason, we must engage the global community in our efforts to neutralize the threat of Saddam Hussein. Cooperation with the United Nations and our allies is critical, and I hope that we are collectively able to develop a strong mandate for the disarmament of Iraq. In his speech on Monday night, President Bush pledged to engage the U.N. Security Council in drafting a new resolution, and I fully expect him to pursue this strategy, not only to establish broader support and deeper confidence for our mission, but also to protect the integrity of the United States.

If new weapons inspections do not achieve total disarmament, we must not rule out using military action to force compliance with U.N. resolutions, eradicate Iraq's destructive capabilities, and protect the American people. Again, such action must be taken in conjunction with other nations. President Bush stated we would act "with allies at our side," and we must hold him to his promise. We cannot ignore that unilateral action against Iraq could have dangerous ramifications on the region and America's own efforts in the war on terrorism. Furthermore, an international coalition would also be essential in promoting a new government in Iraq—an effort that should be undertaken as seriously as the Marshall Plan. Tomorrow, I will vote for the Spratt amendment, which would require cooperation with the United Nations to the greatest extent possible. When contemplating a preemptive attack against another nation, it is our responsibility to work with our friends and allies and rally them to our cause.

If the Spratt amendment is unsuccessful, I cannot support the underlying resolution until we first go to the U.N. Security Council and attempt to get a vote authorizing the use of force. Though that vote may ultimately fail, the United States has been instrumental in shaping the guidelines and agreements that have fostered peace and cooperation throughout the world, and we must demonstrate our continued commitment to these goals.

The threat posed by Saddam Hussein is too great for us to remain inactive. We cannot sit idly by while the pieces of another September 11 fall into place. We cannot risk a single American life waiting for promises from a madman. We now have the opportunity to improve the safety of our citizens and the stability of the Middle East. However, there is a right way and a wrong way of approaching this complicated issue. Just as a prosecutor must lay out facts to establish guilt, we must make our case before the world community. This is the only approach to guarantee that our efforts to disarm Iraq will have the full force of international support and not undermine our greater war against terrorism.

I appreciate the opportunity to share in this debate and urge my colleagues to vote for the Spratt amendment.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I must once again reiterate, although it seems rude and people do want to extend and it is difficult to end before my colleagues complete their statements, I must insist that we take no more than 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS), a leading member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that this resolution ignores the political realities that are present in a tinderbox like the Middle East. It is naive to think that unilateral American action in the Middle East will achieve lasting security, but it is downright foolish to ignore the United Nations' potential as a partner in eliminating Saddam's chokehold on world security.

This resolution merely pays lip service to any meaningful coalition building or endorsement of U.N. findings without establishing an international coalition. We leave the fate of the Iraqi people to uncertainty and without the hope of meaningful nation building or distribution of aid. America cannot achieve this alone or on its own.

The world is watching us to see how a superpower acts which has defeated its dragons and is now confronted by malignant dictators of developing powers. Make no mistake about it, Saddam Hussein is a dictator who resorts to the most heinous of atrocities to silence his opponents.

As the world's sole superpower, we must be careful that our allies do not grow resentful of us. We need to make certain that they are included in any sort of action that we as a Nation might decide to take. That has not happened, and I must vote no on the resolution.

Let me close by saying I am concerned as anyone in this Chamber about national and international security. I served in the United States Army, but I am not convinced that we should put our young people in harm's way. We should not do that; and, therefore, I will vote no on this resolution and hope that many of my colleagues would join us. This is the wrong way to go.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), a member of the Committee on Resources.

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

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution.

Like many of my colleagues, I have struggled with the question of whether to give the President the broad authority to take our Nation into a full-scale war with Iraq. I have also struggled with the question of how to support the President's objectives and also keep faith with my oath to uphold the Constitution.

I continue to have grave reservations about acting unilaterally, acting without evidence of an imminent threat and acting without considering the consequences for the war on terrorism or without a commitment to rebuilding a post-war Iraq. In my opinion, the resolution we are considering today would give the President authority to act without adequately addressing these crucial questions.

Congress has a solemn responsibility to join with the President in determining whether any path to war will be short or long, who will be on that path

with us and ultimately what kind of war we intend to wage. This resolution does not allow Congress to answer these important questions. Instead, the resolution gives that power to one man, the President, and represents a dangerous erosion of congressional power and responsibility. That is why it should be defeated unless it is amended.

Absent new evidence that Saddam Hussein poses an imminent threat to our national security, I believe we should only go to war against Iraq as a part of a broad international coalition authorized by the United Nations. This is important not only to secure the peace and manage the costly and difficult nation building that must follow but also to avoid compromising our efforts to combat global terrorism, particularly in the Islamic world.

□ 2230

As a last resort, it may be necessary for American military forces to act without the support of the United Nations Security Council. But before we do so, I believe the President should come to Congress for a separate authorization. That is what the amendment I offered to the Committee on Rules called for.

My amendment was based on a resolution I introduced, House Joint Resolution 118, which would ensure that Congress, not the President, makes this awesome decision. Regrettably, my amendment was not made in order; so I am glad that tomorrow I will have the opportunity to vote for the Spratt amendment, which I believe is more consistent with the Constitution than the underlying resolution we are being asked to support.

Congress needs to know whether the United Nations is with us or on the sidelines before we launch a military invasion of Iraq on our own. Not having this information beforehand, with all of the implications it poses for our global war on terrorism, and the consequences for our security in this region, is simply irresponsible, in my view.

Do not misunderstand. I have no illusions about the duplicity of Saddam Hussein or the depths of his cruelty. Saddam Hussein is a dangerous tyrant and a threat to peace, and I fully support the goal of disarming him. I do not believe in a policy of appeasement towards Saddam Hussein. But I believe that ridding the world of Saddam Hussein is only part of the job we face. We have to remove Saddam Hussein's threat in the context of broader security goals, including crippling al Qaeda and sustaining and building the important global relationships we need for the war against terrorism and for solving other critical global problems.

My father, Morris Udall, who was serving in Congress in 1964, came to regret his support for the Gulf of Tonkin resolution when it became clear that it was being used as a substitute for the constitutional responsibility of Congress to declare war. I fear that this Congress, a generation later, is poised to make a similar mistake. To avoid that, we need to reject this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution.

Like many of our colleagues, I have struggled with the question of whether to give the president the broad authority to take our nation into a full-scale war against Iraq. I have also struggled with the question of how to support the president's objectives and also keep faith with my oath to uphold the Constitution. I continue to have grave reservations about acting unilaterally, acting without evidence of an imminent threat, and acting without considering the consequences for the war on terrorism or without a commitment to rebuilding a post-war Iraq. In my opinion, the resolution we are considering today would give the president authority to act without adequately addressing these crucial questions.

Congress has a solemn responsibility to join with the president in determining whether any path to war will be short or long, who will be on that path with us, and ultimately what kind of war we intend to wage. This resolution doesn't allow Congress to answer these important questions. Instead, the resolution gives that power to one man, the president, and represents a dangerous erosion of congressional power and responsibility. That is why it should be defeated unless it is amended.

Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the president told us that voting for this resolution would not mean that war was imminent or unavoidable. Many of my colleagues draw comfort from the vies that this resolution is not necessarily a call to arms. With respect, I find no such comfort. This resolution very clearly gives the president authority to take us to war.

I introduced a resolution, H.J. Res. 118, which would ensure that Congress makes this awesome decision. I also submitted to the Rules Committee an amendment based on my resolution. Regrettably, my amendment was not made in order. So I am glad that I will have the opportunity to vote for the Spratt amendment, which I believe is more consistent with the Constitution than the underlying resolution we are being asked to support.

Absent new evidence that Saddam Hussein poses an imminent threat to our national security, I believe we should only go to war against Iraq as part of a broad international coalition authorized by the United Nations. This is important not only to secure the peace and manage the costly and difficult nation-building that must follow, but also to avoid compromising our efforts to combat global terrorism, particularly in the Islamic world. As a last resort, it may be necessary for American military forces to act without the support of the United Nations Security Council, but before we do so, I believe the president should come to Congress to ask for a separate authorization.

Congress needs to know whether the United Nations is with us or on the sidelines before we launch a military invasion of Iraq on our own. Not having this information beforehand, with all of the implications it poses for our global war on terror and the consequences for our security in the region, is simply irresponsible in my view.

Don't misunderstand, I have no illusions about the duplicity of Saddam Hussein or about the depths of his cruelty. Saddam Huessin is a dangerous tyrant and a threat to peace, and I fully support the goal of disarming him. I do not believe in a policy of international amnesia toward Saddam Hussein. That's why I can't support the Lee amendment, which I believe does not adequately respond to the urgency of ending Saddam Hussein's decade of defiance and eliminating Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. The Lee amendment seems to rule out military action as a last resort, and I don't believe we can or should do that.

But I believe that ridding the world of Saddam Hussein is only part of the job we face. We have to remove Saddam Hussein's threat to the context of broader security goals, including crippling Al Qaeda and sustaining and building important global relationships we need for the war against terrorism and for solving other critical global problems.

My father was serving in Congress in 1964 when it passed the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, which led to the eventual deployment of 500,000 American soldiers in Vietnam and the deaths of 55,000 American servicemen and women. My father came to regret his support for that resolution when it became clear that it was being used as a substitute for the Constitutional responsibility of Congress to declare war. I fear that this Congress, a generation later, is posed to make a similar mistake.

To avoid that, we need to reject this resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are demonstrating to our Nation and to the world what American democracy is all about, where the duly elected representatives of this body have been given an opportunity to share with each colleague their best judgment on whether the Congress supports the President's request to place the men and women of our armed services in harm's way.

I have no doubt that our President has spent countless hours, perhaps even sleepless hours, and probably even thought a thousand times over as to whether or not this was the best course of action that our country should take at this time and for him to make such an important decision that will determine whether our soldiers, sailors and airmen are going to be sent into harm's way.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad our President does not have the constitutional authority to declare war against enemy nations. I am also glad that our President does not have the authority under the provisions of our Constitution to establish our Nation's armies and navies. That is the exclusive authority that has been given specifically to the Congress of the United States. Mr. Speaker, I respect our President; but I do not worship him, nor is he a king or an emperor. He is our President and is subject to the will of the American people.

My reason for supporting this resolution is that our President is properly authorized under the terms of this proposed resolution to seek out all diplomatic options, to make sure that there is substantive participation from our allies and from other nations in the

world to confront the serious danger that is now before us and the world with the regime currently governed by the dictator Saddam Hussein.

Another critical factor in this whole debate, Mr. Speaker, is that we have not questioned the loyalty and patriotism of each of us or the integrity of each of us, of any Member of this body, especially under the climate we are now under to make a firm decision whether our Nation should commit her military forces against her enemies. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that sometime tomorrow, if as a result of a final vote by this body that vote is not overwhelming in support of the President's proposed resolution, that common sense would dictate that our President would seriously have to reconsider his position on this matter, go back to the drawing board and try again. I would rather deal with some bruised egoes in the White House and in the Congress than to end up fighting another war like Vietnam.

Again, in good faith and as a consequence of the deliberative efforts of the leadership of both sides of the aisle in this body, a proposed resolution has been offered for our consideration. But, Mr. Speaker, I make reference to my friend, the Chinese General Sun Tzu, who some 2,500 years ago made some very astute observations concerning the art of warfare, and I hope our Vice President and our leaders in the Department of Defense will take heed to General Tzu's advice.

General Tzu said, ''If you know the enemy and know yourself, you need not fear the result of 100 battles. If you know yourself but not the enemy, for every victory gained, you will also suffer a defeat. But if you do not know your enemy nor yourself, you will absolutely lose in every battle.''

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and ask that he be permitted to control the rest of that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from American Samoa?

There was no objection.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I would ask for the time remaining now on the two sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) has 2 hours and 21 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) now has 24½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SAWYER).

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

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I have with me a carefully prepared floor statement. It lays out my opposition to the Hastert-Gephardt-Bush resolution, although it is a meaningful improvement over the original proposal, and my support for the Spratt alternative. I commend it to my colleagues, and will place that statement in the RECORD for reference.

In truth, it covers ground already well covered, more eloquently and with deepest conviction, by both supporters and opponents many times in this important and serious debate. Instead, because these votes may well be my last of real import as a Member of Congress, I would like to share with colleagues a very specific thought. It is simple. We all remember the warning common from childhood: ''Don't start something you cannot finish.''

I do not mean to suggest that what we are doing here today is something we cannot finish. But my father said it a little bit differently, more as a matter of advice than childish threat. ''Don't start anything you don't know how to finish.'' It is good advice about many things. And even though I will not be here to help at the finish of what we begin here today, it is good advice here nonetheless.

Now, I am not talking about war plans. I am confident that they will be well and professionally crafted; and, clearly, we should not share them with our adversaries. But I am talking about peace plans. We seem to have more trouble with them. And we need to make them very clear to adversaries and allies alike. It is a powerful tool.

For the second time in a year, we are talking about making war in order to rebuild a nation and its culture. The echo which that recalls from 40 years ago is a concern.

''Don't start anything you don't know how to finish,'' my father said.

It reminds me of 1991. And the events of the last year in Afghanistan are even more troubling, as rebuilding there hardly proceeds at all. And the message that sends to the oppressed people of Iraq and others whom we would make our friends throughout the Middle East, that message is a real problem.

''Don't start anything you don't know how to finish,'' my father said.

Because this will not be over when the bombs stop falling and the ground combat is over and the wounded are cared for and the dead are put to rest. It will not begin to be over until we have carried out a coherent and clearly stated plan for postwar Iraq. It is the single most important message we can send to the people of the region as they debate and choose a better future for themselves.

Middle East analyst Stephen Cohen has remarked, ''We in the West cannot have that debate for them, but we can help create the conditions for it to happen. America's role is to show the way to incremental change, something that is not, presto, instant democracy, or fantasies that enlightened despotism will serve our interests. We cannot just go on looking at the Arab world as a giant gas station, indifferent to what happens inside. Because gas is now leaking and all around people are throwing matches.''

''Don't start anything you don't know how to finish,'' my father said.

It is an important lesson. It is one that we might have thought the President's own father might have said to him. Or maybe not. And that is why I say it today.

Mr. Speaker, I believe Congress would achieve near unanimity if we were voting only on the overall purpose of this resolution, which is to eliminate Saddam Hussein's control over weapons of mass destruction. On that issue we are as unified as we are in the war against terrorism that we launched with the President a year ago. I, and many others, believe that the current Iraqi regime poses a long-term threat to the community of nations through its ongoing defiance of United Nations resolutions prohibiting Iraq from developing weapons of mass destruction. But I will not support the resolution before us because it provides the President with an open-ended authority that is far too broad for the task before us.

The President is asking for authorization of force even before he determines that force is necessary and before we have exhausted our other options short of force. Instead, Congress should pass a resolution that calls on the President to obtain the support of the United Nations and our allies and authorizes him to use force if it is so sanctioned by the United Nations. This approach is embodied in the Spratt substitute amendment to be offered tomorrow, which I will support. If the United Nations fails to take sufficient action, then we can pass another resolution of force at that time. But action by the United Nations Security Council offers the best chance to reintroduce meaningful inspections into Iraq. This would be the best way to resolve the threat from Iraq peacefully and without reducing our focus on eliminating al Qaeda, which remains the foremost immediate threat to America.

Given Saddam Hussein's record of obstruction over the past eleven years, the United Nations should authorize force against Iraq if Iraq interferes with the unconditional inspection and dismantling of its weapons of mass destruction. However, I cannot support a resolution that authorizes unilateral military force in the present circumstances.

I am concerned that if the U.S. were to act alone it would damage our wide international support in the war against terrorism and al Qaeda. This war depends on the cooperation of other governments to arrest terrorist suspects, monitor terrorist financial transactions, and share intelligence. We should not risk the goodwill of the international community by acting unilaterally while multilateral options still exist.

I am also concerned that if the U.S. were to act against Iraq without the support of the United Nations Security Council, it would set a dangerous precedent for other countries who might be tempted to use military intervention against the wishes of the international community in order to end long-simmering disputes. It is important that our policy toward Iraq be guided by our long-standing commitment to the principle of collective security, which the United States helped place in the Charter of the United Nations.

Let me close by saying that I believe that Congress and the Administration should make

it crystal clear before any military action is taken that the U.S. will be committed to helping Iraq rebuild after a war. The U.S. cannot expect to make a quick exit from Iraq after a war. We would have to be committed to a substantial expenditure of time and money to revitalize Iraq, and we will need the support of our allies to succeed. Doing otherwise would risk leaving behind a dangerously unstable country in the Middle East that could be an even greater source of danger in the region than the current regime.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio for his thoughtful comments. I may not agree with all of them, but the contribution that he has made in this body will be sorely missed with his departure. And I know that I share with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle in knowing that this body will be poorer for not having the kind of insight and the kind of caring that we have just heard.

I know this debate has gone on long, but some things are worth going on a little longer, and I once again would like to express my appreciation for his thoughtful comments.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to also compliment the gentleman from Ohio, who has served this House so outstandingly; and we will certainly truly miss him.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), one of the brightest persons in the House, who serves on the Committee on Financial Services and who has patiently waited.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding me this time, and thank him as well for having undertaken this thankless, but very important, job and has done it well.

When I listened to the President's speech the other night, I found myself in agreement with much of it, but then I find myself in disagreement with his conclusion. I think the President made a pretty good case for a multilateral approach to making sure that Saddam Hussein is disarmed, but that is not what he is asking us to do.

The President is asking us to authorize a unilateral invasion of Iraq to overthrow Saddam Hussein because he is an immoral and evil ruler. I wish he were the only immoral and evil ruler in the world. Our job would be simpler.

But I do not see a rationale for a unilateral American invasion to overthrow Saddam Hussein that does not apply to a number of other governments, some of whom we are allied with. In fact, there will be a choice tomorrow for a very well-thought-out proposal that would empower the President with the full support of Congress to undertake a serious effort to get a multilateral approach, using force if necessary, to impose disarmament on Saddam Hussein. It is the resolution that will be offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

And the President said, let us have unity, let us have a large majority here. He could get, I believe, more than 90 percent, if he were willing to throw his support behind a resolution that said let us use force in a multilateral context not to overthrow this government, because we cannot be in the position of, I think, invading every government that fails to meet our moral standards, as much as I believe those moral standards to be correct ones. He, instead, will choose a more divisive path.

Why? One reason is that we are told the policy of deterrence will not work with Saddam Hussein. We are told that deterrence, which has worked with the Soviet Union and with the People's Republic of China and with North Korea and with Iran and with other nations, uniquely will not work with Iraq because of the nature of Saddam Hussein. The problem with the argument that deterrence will not work, that is the policy that says the way to keep him from using chemical and biological and, ultimately, nuclear weapons, if he gets them, and we should try to stop him from getting them, but the way to keep him from doing it is to threaten him with overwhelming retaliation.

□ 2245

The President says it does not work. But American intelligence says it does.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the Washington Post article from last Monday from which I want to read.

''Although Iraq's chemical artillery shells and warheads were deployed during the war of 1991, they were not used. U.S. officials now believe this was because the United States had repeatedly cautioned Iraq before the fighting started that use of such weapons would draw an immediate and possibly overwhelming response that would topple Hussein from power.

''One reason the Pentagon has adopted a plan to dissuade Iraqi officers from ordering the use of chemical and biological weapons is that, unlike in 1991, this deterrent has been rendered moot by the administration's decision to make removing Hussein the goal of any military action.''

This is the conclusion of American military intelligence, not rebutted by the administration. It was recently reinforced by a letter released by the CIA, and the CIA said he is not likely to use the weapons because he is being deterred effectively by the threat of our force.

In a colloquy with a Senator from Michigan he was asked the question, What about his use of weapons of mass destruction? If we initiate an attack and he was an extremist or otherwise, what is the likelihood in response to our attack he would use chemical or biological weapons?

Senior intelligence witness: ''Pretty high, in my view.''

In other words, deterrence according to American intelligence analysis in 1991 and American intelligence analysis today works. So there is no need for this unilateral invasion.

Yes, I think it is useful for the international community to put maximum pressure on Saddam Hussein to disarm. I believe that the resolution offered by the gentleman from South Carolina is an authorization to do that.

I disagree with the President about this policy of a unilateral American invasion with us paying all of the costs and having all of the responsibility for the subsequent administration with Iraq. I disagree with it; but if one agrees with it, it is the height of irresponsibility to pretend that we can pay for it in the current situation without serious social harm.

This administration put through a major tax cut 2 years ago with the consent of Congress, over my objection and many others. Since that time, we have committed to spend on a war on Afghanistan, which I supported; reconstruction of Afghanistan, our moral obligation; significant increases to compensate the victims, both municipal and individual, of the mass murders of September 11; significant ongoing increases in expenditure of homeland security. Now add to that a war in Iraq and the subsequent responsibility to run Iraq and leave that tax cut in place. Members should understand the consequences: a deterioration in our environmental cleanup; a lack of transportation spending; indeed, a reduction of real spending for virtually every other domestic program.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that deterrence still works means that is unnecessary.

The previously referred to material is as follows:

[From The Washington Post, Sept. 30, 2002]

U.S. EFFORT AIMED AT IRAQI OFFICERS

(By Walter Pincus)

The Pentagon is preparing a campaign aimed at deterring Iraqi officers from firing chemical or biological weapons during a U.S. invasion because intelligence officials believe President Saddam Hussein has given field commanders conditional authority to use the weapons in the event of an attack, according to defense and intelligence officials.

The effort would include massive leafleting of Iraqi military positions—a tactic used by U.S. forces during the Gulf War in 1991—but also might employ covert techniques that would enable the U.S. message to reach Iraqi commanders, the officials said.

Final authority to use weapons of mass destruction has resided with Hussein. But the Iraqi president's knowledge that the United States would seek to take down Iraqi command centers and communications systems at the outset of any military strike means he has likely already given authority for firing chemical and biological weapons to his most loyal commanders in the field, the officials said. They said Hussein issued similar orders before the Gulf War.

As a result, the sources said, the Pentagon plans to appeal directly to these officers not to use the weapons. One of the biggest challenges before military planners is determining which Iraqi military units can be encouraged to defect in the event of a U.S. invasion and how to communicate with them, defense officials have said.

A British intelligence report released Tuesday by Prime Minister Tony Blair said Iraqi could deploy nerve gas and anthrax weapons on 45 minutes' notice. It also said Hussein may have already delegated authority to order use of such weapons to his youngest son, Qusai, who leads the Republican Guard—elite units that control deployed weapons for mass destruction.

The Pentagon's campaign was signaled recent by Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld. Testifying before the House Armed Services Committee, Rumsfeld said, ''Wise Iraqis will not obey orders to use WMD [weapons of mass destruction].... The United States will make clear at the outset that those who are not guilty of atrocities can play a role in the new Iraq. But if WMD is used, all bets are off.''

Rumsfeld added that if the order to use chemical or biological weapons were made by Hussein, ''that does not necessarily mean his orders would be carried out. He might not have anything to lose, but those beneath him in the chain of command most certainly would have a great deal to lose.''

A Pentagon official said Rumsfeld's comments ''are at least the start of telling them were are serious.''

After the Gulf War, coalition force interrogators learned that Hussein had decided ahead of time to give commanders the go-ahead to use chemical weapons if Baghdad's communications were interrupted.

One administration source said the Iraqi president issued specific orders to use the weapons if ''the allies were winning the ground war and they had crossed a line due west of the city of Al-Amarah,'' which is 200 miles south of Baghdad. Iraqi unit commanders were also told they should employ the weapons against Iranian forces if they crossed the border during the war and moved into Iraq's Maysan Province, where Al-Amarah is located.

Although Iraq's chemical artillery shells and warheads were deployed during the war, they were not used. U.S. officials now believe this was because the United States had repeatedly cautioned Iraq before the fighting started that use of such weapons would draw a immediate and possibly overwhelming response that would topple Hussein from power.

One reason the Pentagon has adopted a plan to dissuade Iraqi officers from ordering the use of chemical or biological weapons is that, unlike in 1991, this deterrent has been rendered moot by the administration's decision to make removing Hussein the goal of any military action.

Whether a plan to deter Iraqi commanders from employing the weapons will work is a matter of disagreement among military experts. the Republican Guard units that control the weapons are run by Hussein's most loyal officers.

They will face a short-term or a long-term problem'' one former senior intelligence official said. ''We may come after them when the fighting is over. But there may be a Saddam loyalist with a gun who is threatening to kill him right away if he doesn't follow orders.''

Judith Yaphe, an Iraq specialist at the National Defense University, said that in 1991, according to documents found after the war, Hussein had tried to persuade his commanders to use the weapons because they would be killed anyway. Also, Hussein had placed loyalists with the commanders to enforce his wishes. ''The question is, are they still there?'' she said.

Richard Russell, a CIA area analyst who specialized in Iraq and is now at the National Defense University, said the effort to deter individual commanders ''makes sense as an attempt.'' But he noted that Iraqi operational security was very good in the Gulf War and ''you have to assume it is much better now.''

After Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in 1990, U.S. officials talked openly of American forces making preparations for waging combat in a chemical environment. Then-Secretary of State James A. Baker III told Iraqi Foreign Minister Tariq Aziz that Hussein's government would be endangered if such weapons were used. Then-Defense Secretary Richard B. Cheney hinted that if such an attack took place against Israel, that country might respond with nuclear weapons.

In the war's aftermath, U.S. intelligence officials learned that Iraq had been deterred from using chemical weapons by the threat of massive retaliation. Iraqi artillery units armed with chemical shells were segregated from the rest of the forces and chemical munitions were never moved to Kuwait and never moved toward the front as coalition forces approached, and in some cases breached, the Iraq-Kuwait border.

C.I.A. LETTER TO SENATE ON BAGHDAD'S INTENTIONS

Following is the text of a letter dated Oct. 7 to Senator Bob Graham, Democrat of Florida and chairman of the Intelligence Committee, by George J. Tenet, director of central intelligence, about decisions to declassify material related to the debate about Iraq:

In response to your letter of 4 October 2002, we have made unclassified material available to further the Senate's forthcoming open debate on a Joint Resolution concerning Iraq.

As always, our declassification efforts seek a balance between your need for unfettered debate and our need to protect sources and methods. We have also been mindful of a shared interest in not providing to Saddam a blueprint of our intelligence capabilities and shortcomings, or with sight into our expectation of how he will and will not act. The salience of such concerns is only heightened by the possibility of hostilities between the U.S. and Iraq.

These are some of the reasons why we did not include our classified judgments on Saddam's decision-making regarding the use of weapons of mass destruction (W.M.D.) in our recent unclassified paper on Iraq's Weapons of Mass Destruction. Viewing your request with those concerns in mind, however, we can declassify the following from the paragraphs you requested:

Baghdad for now appears to be drawing a line short of conducting terrorist attacks with conventional or C.B.W. [chemical and biological weapons] against the United States.

Should Saddam conclude that a U.S.-led attack could no longer be deterred, he probably would become much less constrained in adopting terrorist actions. Such terrorism might involve conventional means, as with Iraq's unsuccessful attempt at a terrorist offensive in 1991, or C.B.W.

Saddam might decide that the extreme step of assisting Islamist terrorists in conducting a W.M.D. attack against the United States would be his last chance to exact vengeance by taking a large number of victims with him.

Regarding the 2 October closed hearing, we can declassify the following dialogue:

Senator Levin [Carl Levin, Democrat of Michigan]: ... If (Saddam) didn't feel threatened, did not feel threatened, is it likely that he would initiate an attack using a weapon of mass destruction?

Senior Intelligence Witness: ... My judgment would be that the probability of him initiating an attack—let me put a time frame on it—in the foreseeable future, given the conditions we understand now, the likelihood I think would be low.

Senator Levin: Now if he did initiate an attack you've ... indicated he would probably attempt clandestine attacks against us ... But what about his use of weapons of mass destruction? If we initiate an attack and he thought he was in extremis or otherwise, what's the likelihood in response to our attack that he would use chemical or biological weapons?

Senior Intelligence Witness: Pretty high, in my view.

In the above dialogue, the witness's qualifications—''in the foreseeable future, given the conditions we understand now''—were intended to underscore that the likelihood of Saddam using W.M.D. for blackmail, deterrence, or otherwise grows as his arsenal builds. Moreover, if Saddam used W.M.D., it would disprove his repeated denials that he has such weapons.

Regarding Senator Bayh's [Evan Bayh, Democrat of Indian] question of Iraqi links to al-Qa'ida. Senators could draw from the following points for unclassified discussions:

Our understanding of the relationship between Iraq and al-Qa'ida is evolving and is based on sources of varying reliability. Some of the information we have received comes from detainees, including some of high rank.

We have solid reporting of senior level contacts between Iraq and al-Qa'ida going back a decade.

Credible information indicates that Iraq and al-Qa'ida have discussed safe heaven and reciprocal nonaggression.

Since Operation Enduring Freedom, we have solid evidence of the presence in Iraq of al-Qa'ida members, including some that have been in Baghdad.

We have credible reporting that al-Qa'ida leaders sought contacts in Iraq who could help them acquire W.M.D. capabilities. The reporting also stated that Iraq has provided training to al-Qa'ida members in the areas of poisons and gases and making conventional bombs.

Iraq's increasing support to extremist Palestinians coupled with growing indications of a relationship with al-Qa'ida, suggest that Baghdad's links to terrorists will increase, even absent U.S. military action.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to keep fairness in this body, I believe there are more speakers on the other side of the aisle, and I would like to inquire how much longer they would need in order to find a way to equalize time?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, we would need a minimum of at least one full hour. That would be the least amount of time. It is very difficult to predict. We will not let anyone speak over 5 minutes. However, we feel an obligation to every Member who was promised the opportunity to speak. We want to live up to our obligations, but we will try to move it along as quickly as possible.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, certainly the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) had every intention in making sure that every Member got an opportunity to speak.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield 44 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr.

PAYNE) and that he may control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ISSA. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my deep appreciation to the gentleman from California, and to the majority, for this very generous action. It is not always the norm, and I just want to express my appreciation.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and hope it will always be the norm on the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH).

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

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, as a representative of the thousands in my district who are opposed to an ill-conceived war, I rise in opposition to this resolution on the use of force against Iraq.

Thousands of my constituents have spoken. Families of military personnel who reside in my district have spoken. They have all emphatically and resoundingly delivered an answer to the question of going to war with Iraq; and the answer is, no, no, and no. No against the war in Iraq. No against sending their sons and daughters to war for yet-unknown reasons. And no to the ignoring of the economic problems that still are plaguing our Nation.

The war that my constituents want us to wage is a war on poverty, a war on layoffs, a war on inadequate health care, a war on a lack of affordable housing and a war for economic opportunity and fairness.

Over the last several months, the President has been earnest in his efforts to inform the American public of what the risks are of not going to war and what they may be. But, to date, he has not convinced the people in my district why their sons and their daughters should be placed in harm's way.

If we are going to engage in an honest debate, we owe it to the American public to ask the right questions. Questions like: What will the number of military and civilian casualties be? Questions like: How long will the conflict in Iraq be expected to last? And simple questions like: Does Saddam Hussein pose a clear and present threat to the United States?

Simply citing all the atrocities committed by Saddam Hussein, and there are many atrocities that have been ignored for a decade, and calling Saddam Hussein a bad name is simply not enough.

Mr. Speaker, during this incredible moment in American history, we should all be reminded of a quote by President James Madison, ''The advancement and infusion of knowledge is the only guardian of liberty.''

If we are sincere about bringing democracy to the people of Iraq, we should lead by example in every step of the way. We should lead by presenting the American public and the American people with clear, balanced and realistic information on the consequences of a war on Iraq.

Let us not insult our own citizens by ignoring the fact that all nations in the Middle East region and many of our long-standing allies around the world oppose this war. They see military action in Iraq as a glorified oil and land grab. Let us not ignore the fact that a strike against Iraq will not only have the effect of inflaming existing resentment of U.S. foreign policy and possibly provoking renewed terrorist attacks on Americans both here and abroad.

And despite the President's proclamation that America is a friend of the Iraqi people, we cannot insult the American people by ignoring the fact that U.S.-led sanctions have created a hotbed of disease and extreme poverty in Iraq, and war will only plunge the Iraqi people deeper into death and despair.

For those who are saber rattling, war mongering and unconcerned with America's place in the global community, let us not ignore the consequences that the American people will have to pay.

To this issue, some argue that a war with Iraq is worth the blood of young Americans. But as a Representative who may have to face mothers and fathers and brothers and sisters of fallen constituents, I will not disrespect and dishonor them with tough talk, tough talk that refuses to answer obvious questions, tough talk that only provides the American people with answers that do not answer, with explanations that do not explain, and conclusions that do not conclude.

While I am confident that we will win an armed conflict with Iraq, there must be a forthright discussion with the public about the impact of a war on the American people and the world in which we live.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS), a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, with a deep appreciation for the gravity of our collective decision, I rise to oppose this resolution, not because I disagree with the goal of disarming Saddam Hussein, with force if necessary, but because I believe that this resolution is dangerously broad and counterproductive to America's greater goal of winning the war on terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, over the course of the history of our country and the Congress, relatively few issues have risen to the significance of a declaration of war. Like many of my colleagues, I have personally anguished over this decision because I am convinced that Saddam Hussein is a threat. It is clear that he has designs to amass weapons of mass destruction with the intent to exert control over the Middle East, if not a larger region. The core of our decision lies in the best way to address this threat.

I have tried to understand all perspectives. I have attended classified and public hearings, examined evidence, studied pages of material, and sought the counsel of many. I have listened intently to those who have fought wars and those who have prevented them. I have also listened attentively to the citizens of San Diego.

Mr. Speaker, looking back on the lessons of history, it is clear no one can predict the future. Those faced with difficult decisions must make the best judgment based on the information at hand. To be sure, in the words of Secretary Rumsfeld, ''We do not know what we do not know.'' However, that is precisely the reason that I continue to have reservations about unilateral force.

Unilateral preemptive force may indeed win the battle for Iraq but cause us to lose the war by isolating America from its many allies, turning nations against us and reinforcing the cause of those who wish us harm.

In addition to these considerations, we must consider our young men and women in uniform. Before sending them into harm's way, we must fully explore every other avenue to achieve our goals without risking their lives. I do not believe we have done that.

I applaud the efforts of many to bring Congress to a place where there is more agreement than disagreement. While we may disagree on the manner, we agree that something must be done, and we agree that Saddam Hussein is a menace, and we agree that the United States must exercise its leadership.

To be a true leader, we must convince others to follow. Hubert Humphrey once said, ''Leadership in today's world requires far more than a large stock of gunboats and a hard fist at the conference table.'' That is precisely why we must continue to seek options to unilateral force, to work with the United Nations and the world community, and to use force only when all other options are exhausted. If we do not, how can we expect others to do likewise?

In addition, we must be clear in our goal. Again, citing the Secretary of Defense, our goal is disarmament. To achieve this, we must insist on tough new rigorous U.N. inspections. If those inspections are thwarted, we may use force, first, if sanctioned by the U.N. Security Council, and then alone if necessary.

Based on these principles, I will support the Spratt substitute because it embodies the best way to address the threat posed by Saddam. It holds the U.N. accountable, and it retains Congress' prerogative to truly be the voice of the American people.

□ 2300

Mr. Speaker, I question the notion that we must speak with one voice because it is the collection of voices that grants us our strength. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I will vote ''no'' because House Joint Resolution 114 is a premature de facto declaration of war that fails to recognize the fundamental tenet that leadership involves leading, not merely acting alone. But make no mistake. A ''no'' vote on the resolution does not restrict the President's power to act should an imminent threat arise. He already has that authority.

To conclude, let me say to the servicemen and women, especially those living in San Diego who will be called upon to enforce this policy, my admiration and respect for you is as strong as ever and it will never waiver. Just as you always do your duty to America regardless of how you personally feel about a particular mission, so will I do my duty to give you the support you need to complete your mission and get home safely. Along with my fellow Members of the House Committee on Armed Services, I will fight vigorously to get you every tool you need to do the job right.

To my colleagues on the committee and in Congress, I hope you will take my opposition to this resolution in the spirit in which it is offered, that of doing what I feel must be done to fight and win the war on terrorism and empower diplomacy. We may disagree over the strategy of addressing the threats posed by Iraq at this time, but we are united in the greater goal to free America and the world from the threat of terrorism.

To our enemies in Iraq and elsewhere, a warning: do not confuse democracy and debate with disunity or disarray. Our voices constitute our strength, and the United States of America is united in its resolve.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), a member of the Committee on Government Reform and the Committee on Financial Services, a true leader in this government.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from New Jersey for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think any Member of this body disagrees that Saddam Hussein is a tyrant, a murderer, and a man who has started two wars. He is clearly someone who cannot be trusted or believed. The question, Mr. Speaker, is not whether we like Saddam Hussein or not. The question is whether he represents an imminent threat to the American people and whether a unilateral invasion of Iraq will do more harm than good.

Mr. Speaker, the front page of The Washington Post today reported that all relevant U.S. intelligence agencies now say despite what we have heard from the White House that ''Saddam Hussein is unlikely to initiate a chemical or biological attack against the United States.'' Even more importantly, our intelligence agencies say that should Saddam conclude that a U.S.-led attack could no longer be deterred, he might at that point launch a chemical or biological counterattack. In other words, there is more danger of an attack on the United States if we launch a precipitous invasion.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know why the President feels, despite what our intelligence agencies are saying, that it is so important to pass a resolution of this magnitude this week and why it is necessary to go forward without the support of the United Nations and our major allies including those who are fighting side by side with us in the war on terrorism.

But I do feel that as a part of this process, the President is ignoring some of the most pressing economic issues affecting the well-being of ordinary Americans. There has been virtually no public discussion about the stock market's loss of trillions of dollars over the last few years and that millions of Americans have seen the retirement benefits for which they have worked their entire lives disappear. When are we going to address that issue? This country today has a $340 billion trade deficit, and we have lost 10 percent of our manufacturing jobs in the last 4 years, 2 million decent-paying jobs. The average American worker today is working longer hours for lower wages than 25 years ago. When are we going to address that issue?

Mr. Speaker, poverty in this country is increasing and median family income is declining. Throughout this country family farmers are being driven off of the land; and veterans, the people who put their lives on the line to defend us, are unable to get the health care and other benefits they were promised because of government underfunding. When are we going to tackle these issues and many other important issues that are of such deep concern to Americans?

Mr. Speaker, in the brief time I have, let me give five reasons why I am opposed to giving the President a blank check to launch a unilateral invasion and occupation of Iraq and why I will vote against this resolution. One, I have not heard any estimates of how many young American men and women might die in such a war or how many tens of thousands of women and children in Iraq might also be killed. As a caring Nation, we should do everything we can to prevent the horrible suffering that a war will cause. War must be the last recourse in international relations, not the first. Second, I am deeply concerned about the precedent that a unilateral invasion of Iraq could establish in terms of international law and the role of the United Nations. If President Bush believes that the U.S. can go to war at any time against any nation, what moral or legal objection could our government raise if another country chose to do the same thing?

Third, the United States is now involved in a very difficult war against international terrorism as we learned tragically on September 11. We are opposed by Osama bin Laden and religious fanatics who are prepared to engage in a kind of warfare that we have never experienced before. I agree with Brent Scowcroft, Republican former National Security Advisor for President George Bush, Sr., who stated, ''An attack on Iraq at this time would seriously jeopardize, if not destroy, the global counterterrorist campaign we have undertaken.''

Fourth, at a time when this country has a $6 trillion national debt and a growing deficit, we should be clear that a war and a long-term American occupation of Iraq could be extremely expensive.

Fifth, I am concerned about the problems of so-called unintended consequences. Who will govern Iraq when Saddam Hussein is removed and what role will the U.S. play in ensuing a civil war that could develop in that country? Will moderate governments in the region who have large Islamic fundamentalist populations be overthrown and replaced by extremists? Will the bloody conflict between Israel and the Palestinian Authority be exacerbated? And these are just a few of the questions that remain unanswered.

If a unilateral American invasion of Iraq is not the best approach, what should we do? In my view, the U.S. must work with the United Nations to make certain within clearly defined timelines that the U.N. inspectors are allowed to do their jobs. These inspectors should undertake an unfettered search for Iraqi weapons of mass destruction and destroy them when found, pursuant to past U.N. resolutions. If Iraq resists inspection and elimination of stockpiled weapons, we should stand ready to assist the U.N. in forcing compliance.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. MCCRERY).

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

Mr. MCCRERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 114.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 114, which would authorize the use of military force against Iraq.

The diplomatic and military situation in Iraq without question remains one of the most difficult security issues facing the United States and the international community. It has only been further complicated by the terrorist attacks on our country last year. Recently, the President's national security adviser said Saddam Hussein has sheltered al-Qaeda terrorists in Baghdad and helped train some in the development of chemical weapons. Also of concern is the revelation that there may have been a meeting between a senior Iraqi intelligence official and Mohammed Atta, the leader of the September 11th attacks.

The administration has stated on numerous occasions that the war on terrorism will continue to be fought against all countries that support or harbor terrorists. It appears that list must include Iraq.

Our national security depends on preventing other countries from developing weapons of mass destruction. Iraq has pursued an agenda to develop weapons of mass destruction including chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons for many years. Saddam Hussein has already demonstrated an unconscionable willingness to use chemical weapons on his own people, attacking ethnic Kurds in Northern Iraq. He also used them against Iranian troops during the Iran-Iraq War. Iraq's arsenal includes several delivery systems, including long-range missiles capable of carrying dangerous payloads to our allies in the Middle East and Europe, including U.S. military bases in Bahrain and Turkey.

The United Nations Security Council required Iraq to scrap all weapons of mass destruction and long-range missiles and to allow for weapons verification inspections. For the past four years, Iraq has prevented representatives of the United Nations from inspecting Iraq's weapon facilities. It is clear that the Iraqi government has undermined the authority of the United Nations by rebuilding many of its chemical, biological, and nuclear weapon manufacturing plants.

Iraq has a history of invading its neighbors and using any and all weapons at its disposal against its enemies. A nuclear weapon in the hands of Hussein's brutal regime would give him an unacceptable upper hand to expand control over the world's petroleum reserves and quite possibly give him the leverage he needs to expand the borders of tyranny.

Mr. Speaker, it is not an unlikely possibility that Iraq, as a state-sponsor of terrorism, would transfer weapons of mass destruction to terrorists intent on using them against the United States. September 11th showed us that America is not immune to terror attacks, and Iraq's ties to international terrorist groups are unquestioned.

I support the President's campaign against any state, including Iraq, which is found to support terrorism or seeks to develop weapons of mass destruction with the intent of attacking America or its allies. We cannot wait for a transparent threat to materialize. The longer we wait, the more we risk another unthinkable attack upon our soil. Simply put, the United States cannot ignore the threat that Iraq poses to our way of life and that of our allies.

Saddam Hussein must be held accountable for years of noncompliance with United Nations resolutions. Failure to enforce the resolutions weakens the authority of the United Nations itself and sends a message to the foes of peace that future disobedience will be objected to solely through empty threats and resolutions without teeth.

I am hopeful that diplomatic efforts may yet succeed, and believe the United States must try to work with our allies and the international community towards a peaceful solution to our present situation. Every Member of Congress weighs this decision carefully, knowing the votes we cast may place the men and women of our armed forces in harm's way. Yet if it becomes necessary, we must be certain we do not embark upon a Sicilian Expedition. Any use of force should include clear goals. If we are to enter into conflict in Iraq, we must plainly establish our objectives and follow through on a commitment to purge terror and rebuild Iraq into a strong and stable nation.

Our first priority of any use of force should be to eliminate the ability of the Hussein regime to manufacture, distribute, or employ weapons of mass destruction. Hussein's goal has always been to obtain a weapon of such destructive force, that no other nation would be willing to resist his will. It would be fundamentally irresponsible to allow Iraq to obtain a weapon that could be used to deter allied forces from enforcing the internationally recognized authority of the United Nations. Saddam's arsenal of aggression and terror must be completely destroyed in order to encourage stability and prevent the proliferation of those weapons to other parts of the region. This action must be our first goal.

The second goal, is the removal of Saddam Hussein from power. Iraq has traditionally been a nation of commerce and prosperity, but Hussein hoards the resources of his country, starving her citizens into submission. His power is sustained by a 25,000-strong Republican Guard who, in return for maintaining Saddam's rule, are rewarded with Iraq's riches at the expense of her people. Hussein is not only guilty of some of the most heinous crimes against humanity, but he rules Iraq like a gangster by modeling his authority on the oppressive tyranny of Joseph Stalin and frequently and personally executes any who oppose his rule or stand in his way. We cannot continue to allow Hussein to cow the Iraqi people into living under an umbrella of terror. Hussein's sinister methodology of terror, assassination, and execution against all who oppose him must end. We must support a regime change.

Our third objective should include a plan to root out all elements of terror within Iraq and bring accountability to the war on terror within the borders of Iraq. Hussein's government has proven uncooperative and refuses to help in the identification and apprehension of those in terror networks. The Hussein regime is unable to control areas within Northern Iraq giving terrorist organizations like al-Qaeda free rein to operate within Iraq's borders. This stands in stark contrast to the other nations in the region who are working with the United States to eradicate terrorist networks.

Finally, the United States and the International Community must create a plan to rebuild Iraq and to restore a government that represents the interests of Iraqis and is dedicated to reconstructing an economy decimated by tyranny. New leadership will give the people of Iraq an opportunity to become a responsible member of the international community.

Mr. Speaker, President Bush has requested the Congress pass a resolution authorizing the use of military force to enforce the United Nations' Security Council Resolutions which Iraq continues to defy. We must defend the national security interests of the United States. We must eliminate the threat posed by Iraqi terror and we must work to restore international peace and security to Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of House Joint Resolution 114.

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON), a real spokesperson for justice in this country and a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution. On September 11, 2001, our Nation changed. We were traumatized when al Qaeda terrorists attacked our Nation, killed nearly 3,000 Americans, wounded many others physically, emotionally, and spiritually; destroyed families and buildings and disrupted our economy. The President, the Congress, and the American people responded quickly, appropriately and with courage. All Americans support the war on terrorism, and they want homeland security.

However, terrorism not only changed our psyche; it changed our politics. Our politics shifted from hope to fear, and fear now clouds our thinking. September 11 and Iraq are two distinct issues. Nevertheless, President Bush is trying to take our legitimate fear following 9–11 and illegitimately link it to Iraq. The White House and some in this body have sought to link al Qaeda and September 11 to Iraq. That alleged link underscores the President's position that the Iraqi threat is imminent. However, congressional Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence members have said President Bush has presented no factual evidence proving that link. Even the President separates 9–11 from an imminent Iraqi threat, and here is the proof. President Bush sees 9–11 and Iraq as separate because just 2 weeks ago on September 24, he lowered the domestic risk of terrorist attacks from orange to yellow. He lowered it. If the Iraqi threat were imminent, would not the risk of terrorist attacks have at least remained the same, at orange, or even elevated and raised to red, a severe risk of terrorist attacks? But the President lowered it from orange to yellow.

Yes, Iraq's threat is real; and in light of 9–11, it is normal for Americans to be afraid, but the Iraqi threat is not imminent. We should not let it affect our politics over the next 3 weeks. We should not vote on the basis of fear of an imminent threat from Saddam Hussein. We must vote our hopes and not our fears. So far this debate has been about military sticks, whether, when or under what circumstances to use them. But why not try carrots too? Most Americans do not know that the United States would not lift economic sanctions on Iraq even if Saddam agreed to and fully implemented all U.N. resolutions.

In 1997 Secretary Albright said the U.S. would only lift sanctions when Saddam Hussein was gone, not when Iraq lived up to U.N. resolutions. President Clinton stated sanctions will be there until the end of time or as long as Hussein lasts. But economic sanctions are only hurting the people, making life miserable for the average Iraqi, causing an estimated 500,000 deaths, mainly women and children. The economic sanctions are not hurting Saddam Hussein. If they were, he would not be the threat that the President says he is. Insisting on a regime change before lifting economic sanctions goes beyond the legal mandate of U.N. policy and is not authorized by any U.N.

resolution. We need to lure Iraqi compliance with a meaningful economic inducement, not merely threaten them with military force. Why does the United States not offer to lift economic sanctions in an orderly and progressive way in exchange for unfettered and comprehensive inspections? Without the carrot of lifting economic sanctions in exchange for removing weapons of mass destruction, the Iraqi government has no incentive to cooperate. Offering to lift economic sanctions in exchange for unfettered inspections will gain the support within Iraq and among our allies.

Before there is any authorization for the use of armed force against Iraq, we must make sure that all peaceful means containing and eliminating Iraq's weapons of mass destruction have been exhausted, including offering positive incentives, and the U.S. should lead this initiative. This positive incentive to get Saddam Hussein to comply has not and is not currently in play. But until we make this overture and change the policy of only lifting economic sanctions after a regime change, we will not have exhausted all peaceful alternatives to force.

We are a Nation united by our Constitution and committed to the rule of law. That commitment is now challenged by an outlaw. We must bring this outlaw to justice but not become outlaws ourselves. And while our attention is focused on a military threat overseas, we are drowning at home economically. I believe we can creatively insist on a peaceful resolution to eliminate Saddam's weapons of mass destruction without an invasion and the actual use of force. Our military might is unquestioned. Our wisdom, our compassion, our commitment to a nonviolent means of resolving conflict is not. By that and that alone will move us toward a genuine peace, justice and security for all.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution. I take the threat of nuclear weapons in the hands of a hostile and aggressive Iraq very seriously. On September 11 when my district was attacked, I thanked God the terrorists did not have nuclear weapons. We all want to protect this Nation. The question before us today is not whether to protect America, but how best to do so.

Saddam Hussein unquestionably poses a real danger. He has consistently shown a virulent hostility to the United States and to Israel, a willingness to invade other countries without provocation, a willingness to use chemical and biological weapons against civilian populations, a relentless drive to obtain weapons of mass destruction including nuclear weapons and the means to deliver them, and a reckless aggressiveness.

□ 2315

The conclusion is inescapable that the acquisition of nuclear weapons by Iraq would pose an intolerable threat to the United States and to world peace. That threat must be met, if at all possible, through the United Nations and in accordance with international law, but war must be the last resort, not the first option.

The resolution before us is not a compromise. It is in all important respects still very much the original draft: a blank check, like the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. We must not grant the President a blank check.

Make no mistake, this resolution grants the President the power to go to war entirely at his discretion. While the resolution pays lip service to the need for international cooperation, it does not require the President to seek it. While the resolution mentions a desire to work through the United Nations, it does not require the President to exhaust our options at the U.N. before starting a war.

The resolution requires the President to inform Congress that efforts in the U.N. and the international community have failed, but he need not do so until after he starts a war. We must grant the President the power to take prudent action to meet the threat from Iraq but only action that does not itself threaten international peace and security.

The United States should seek a U.N. resolution providing for the immediate return to Iraq of beefed-up arms inspection teams and demanding that they be afforded unfettered and unconditional access to all sites they deem necessary to accomplish their task of locating and destroying all chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons and their production facilities.

The U.N. resolution should authorize the use of military force to the extent necessary to overcome any Iraqi attempts to interfere with the inspection teams, and Congress should authorize the President to use such military force only to enable the inspection teams to do their jobs.

We might this way be able to eliminate the threat of Iraq's chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons without military conflict. But if military conflict occurred, we would be better off as part of a multilateral effort enforcing a Security Council inspection and disarmament order, with the onus on Saddam Hussein for starting the conflict, than we would as the Lone Ranger invading Iraq on our own, with most of the world looking on in disapproval.

Let me remind my colleagues: Before they were ejected from Iraq, U.N. inspectors destroyed more weapons and more weapons facilities than did the coalition forces during the Gulf War. This proven, successful course of action should be fully utilized before we risk regional conflagration.

I believe the Security Council would adopt a resolution embodying such a specific limited approach, and that, working through the U.N. and with other nations, the U.S. could participate in successfully implementing it.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the President insists that, in addition to disarming Saddam, we must overthrow his regime. Demanding regime change is extremely dangerous. It is one thing to tell Saddam he must disarm. It is quite another to demand the end of his regime.

Faced with such a threat, which in practical terms means his death, there would be nothing to deter Saddam Hussein from deciding, like Samson in the Philistine temple, that he might as well pull the world down with him. Why should he not go down in history as an Arab hero by attacking Israel with chemical or biological weapons of perhaps devastating lethality? Israel might then feel compelled to retaliate, and no one could calculate the course of escalation from there.

But Members do not need to take my evaluation of this threat. Just yesterday, the director of the CIA, George Tenet, told the other body that ''Baghdad, for now, appears to be drawing a line short of conducting terrorist attacks with conventional or chemical or biological weapons.'' But, he continued, if Saddam concluded the survival of his regime was threatened, ''he probably would become much less constrained in adopting terrorist action.''

Mr. Speaker, we must constrain the administration from pursuing this perilous course. The substitute resolution offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) grants the President the authority to use military force as part of a multilateral effort to divest Saddam of his weapons of mass destruction.

That is as far as we should go. We must draw this line, Mr. Speaker, not because we are unconcerned with our country's security, but precisely because we care so very, very much for it.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 5010, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2003

Mr. LEWIS of California, submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 5010) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H.R. 107–732)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5010) ''making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes'', having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

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

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

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, for military functions administered by the Department of Defense, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Army on active duty (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $26,855,017,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Navy on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere), midshipmen, and aviation cadets; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $21,927,628,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Marine Corps on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere); and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $8,501,087,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Air Force on active duty (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $21,981,277,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army Reserve on active duty under sections 10211, 10302, and 3038 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $3,374,355,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Navy Reserve on active duty under section 10211 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $1,907,552,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Marine Corps Reserve on active duty under section 10211 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and for members of the Marine Corps platoon leaders class, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $553,983,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Air Force Reserve on active duty under sections 10211, 10305, and 8038 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and for members of the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $1,236,904,000.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army National Guard while on duty under section 10211, 10302, or 12402 of title 10 or section 708 of title 32, United States Code, or while serving on duty under section 12301(d) of title 10 or section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $5,114,588,000.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Air National Guard on duty under section 10211, 10305, or 12402 of title 10 or section 708 of title 32, United States Code, or while serving on duty under section 12301(d) of title 10 or section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $2,125,161,000.

TITLE II

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Army, as authorized by law; and not to exceed $10,818,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Army, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes, $23,992,082,000: Provided, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, not less than $355,000,000 shall be made available only for conventional ammunition care and maintenance: Provided further, That of the funds made available under this heading, $2,500,000 shall be available for Fort Baker, in accordance with the terms and conditions as provided under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', in Public Law 107–117.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Navy and the Marine Corps, as authorized by law; and not to exceed $4,415,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Navy, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes, $29,331,526,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Marine Corps, as authorized by law, $3,585,759,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Air Force, as authorized by law; and not to exceed $7,902,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Air Force, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes, $27,339,533,000: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, that of the funds available under this heading, $750,000 shall only be available to the Secretary of the Air Force for a grant to Florida Memorial College for the purpose of funding minority aviation training: Provided further, That of the amount provided under this heading, $2,000,000 may be obligated for the deployment of Air Force active and Reserve aircrews that perform combat search and rescue operations to operate and evaluate the United Kingdom's Royal Air Force EH–101 helicopter, to receive training using that helicopter, and to exchange operational techniques and procedures regarding that helicopter.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as authorized by law, $14,773,506,000, of which not to exceed $25,000,000 may be available for the CINC initiative fund account; and of which not to exceed $34,500,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of Defense, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds provided in this Act for Civil Military programs under this heading, $750,000 shall be available for a grant for Outdoor Odyssey, Roaring Run, Pennsylvania, to support the Youth Development and Leadership program and Department of Defense STARBASE program: Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to plan or implement the consolidation of a budget or appropriations liaison office of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the office of the Secretary of a military department, or the service headquarters of one of the Armed Forces into a legislative affairs or legislative liaison office: Provided further, That $4,675,000, to remain available until expended, is available only for expenses relating to certain classified activities,

and may be transferred as necessary by the Secretary to operation and maintenance appropriations or research, development, test and evaluation appropriations, to be merged with and to be available for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: Provided further, That any ceiling on the investment item unit cost of items that may be purchased with operation and maintenance funds shall not apply to the funds described in the preceding proviso: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided elsewhere in this Act.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Army Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, $1,970,180,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Navy Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, $1,236,809,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Marine Corps Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, $187,532,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Air Force Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, $2,163,104,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For expenses of training, organizing, and administering the Army National Guard, including medical and hospital treatment and related expenses in non-Federal hospitals; maintenance, operation, and repairs to structures and facilities; hire of passenger motor vehicles; personnel services in the National Guard Bureau; travel expenses (other than mileage), as authorized by law for Army personnel on active duty, for Army National Guard division, regimental, and battalion commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard Bureau regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau; supplying and equipping the Army National Guard as authorized by law; and expenses of repair, modification, maintenance, and issue of supplies and equipment (including aircraft), $4,261,707,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For operation and maintenance of the Air National Guard, including medical and hospital treatment and related expenses in non-Federal hospitals; maintenance, operation, repair, and other necessary expenses of facilities for the training and administration of the Air National Guard, including repair of facilities, maintenance, operation, and modification of aircraft; transportation of things, hire of passenger motor vehicles; supplies, materials, and equipment, as authorized by law for the Air National Guard; and expenses incident to the maintenance and use of supplies, materials, and equipment, including such as may be furnished from stocks under the control of agencies of the Department of Defense; travel expenses (other than mileage) on the same basis as authorized by law for Air National Guard personnel on active Federal duty, for Air National Guard commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard Bureau regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau, $4,117,585,000.

OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses directly relating to Overseas Contingency Operations by United States military forces, $5,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer these funds only to military personnel accounts; operation and maintenance accounts within this title; the Defense Health Program appropriation; procurement accounts; research, development, test and evaluation accounts; and to working capital funds: Provided further, That the funds transferred shall be merged with and shall be available for the same purposes and for the same time period, as the appropriation to which transferred: Provided further, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided in this paragraph is in addition to any other transfer authority contained elsewhere in this Act.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES

For salaries and expenses necessary for the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, $9,614,000, of which not to exceed $2,500 can be used for official representation purposes.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Army, $395,900,000, to remain available until transferred: Provided, That the Secretary of the Army shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Army, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Army, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: Provided further, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Navy, $256,948,000, to remain available until transferred: Provided, That the Secretary of the Navy shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Navy, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Navy, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: Provided further, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Air Force, $389,773,000, to remain available until transferred: Provided, That the Secretary of the Air Force shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Air Force, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Air Force, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: Provided further, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of Defense, $23,498,000, to remain available until transferred: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of Defense, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of Defense, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: Provided further, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, FORMERLY USED DEFENSE SITES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Army, $246,102,000, to remain available until transferred: Provided, That the Secretary of the Army shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris at sites formerly used by the Department of Defense, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Army, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: Provided further, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation.

OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AID

For expenses relating to the Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid programs of the Department of Defense (consisting of the programs provided under sections 401, 402, 404, 2547, and 2551 of title 10, United States Code), $58,400,000, to remain available until September 30, 2004.

FORMER SOVIET UNION THREAT REDUCTION

For assistance to the republics of the former Soviet Union, including assistance provided by contract or by grants, for facilitating the elimination and the safe and secure transportation and storage of nuclear, chemical and other weapons; for establishing programs to prevent the proliferation of weapons, weapons components, and weapon-related technology and expertise; for programs relating to the training and support of defense and military personnel for demilitarization and protection of weapons, weapons components and weapons technology

and expertise, and for defense and military contacts, $416,700,000, to remain available until September 30, 2005: Provided, That of the amounts provided under this heading, $10,000,000 shall be available only to support the dismantling and disposal of nuclear submarines and submarine reactor components in the Russian Far East.

SUPPORT FOR INTERNATIONAL SPORTING COMPETITIONS, DEFENSE

For logistical and security support for international sporting competitions (including pay and non-travel related allowances only for members of the Reserve Components of the Armed Forces of the United States called or ordered to active duty in connection with providing such support), $19,000,000, to remain available until expended.

TITLE III

PROCUREMENT

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of aircraft, equipment, including ordnance, ground handling equipment, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $2,285,574,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2005: Provided, That of the funds made available under this heading, $39,100,000 shall be available only to support a restructured CH–47F helicopter upgrade program for the full fleet to facilitate increases in the planned production rate to an economically optimal rate by fiscal year 2005: Provided further, That funds in the immediately preceding proviso shall not be made available until the Secretary of the Army has certified to the congressional defense committees that the Army intends to budget for the upgrade of the entire CH–47 fleet required for the Objective Force at economically optimal production rates in order to complete this program within ten years after it is initiated.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of missiles, equipment, including ordnance, ground handling equipment, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $1,096,548,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2005.

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of weapons and tracked combat vehicles, equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $2,266,508,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2005.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of ammunition, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including ammunition facilities authorized by section 2854 of title 10, United States Code, and the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $1,253,099,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2005.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of vehicles, including tactical, support, and non-tracked combat vehicles; the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and the purchase of 6 vehicles required for physical security of personnel, notwithstanding price limitations applicable to passenger vehicles but not to exceed $180,000 per vehicle; communications and electronic equipment; other support equipment; spare parts, ordnance, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $5,874,674,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2005.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of aircraft, equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $8,812,855,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2005.

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of missiles, torpedoes, other weapons, and related support equipment including spare parts, and accessories therefor; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $1,868,517,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2005.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of ammunition, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including ammunition facilities authorized by section 2854 of title 10, United States Code, and the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $1,165,730,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2005.

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

For expenses necessary for the construction, acquisition, or conversion of vessels as authorized by law, including armor and armament thereof, plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools and installation thereof in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; procurement of critical, long leadtime components and designs for vessels to be constructed or converted in the future; and expansion of public and private plants, including land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title, as follows:

Carrier Replacement Program, $90,000,000;

Carrier Replacement Program (AP), $403,703,000;

NSSN, $1,499,152,000;

NSSN (AP), $645,209,000;

SSGN, $404,305,000;

SSGN (AP), $421,000,000;

CVN Refuelings (AP), $221,781,000;

Submarine Refuelings, $435,792,000;

Submarine Refuelings (AP), $64,000,000;

DDG–51 Destroyer, $2,321,502,000;

LPD–17, $596,492,000;

LHD–8, $243,000,000;

LCAC Landing Craft Air Cushion, $89,638,000;

Mine Hunter SWATH, $7,000,000;

Prior year shipbuilding costs, $1,279,899,000;

Service Craft, $9,756,000; and

For outfitting, post delivery, conversions, and first destination transportation, $300,608,000;

In all: $9,032,837,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2007: Provided, That additional obligations may be incurred after September 30, 2007, for engineering services, tests, evaluations, and other such budgeted work that must be performed in the final stage of ship construction: Provided further, That none of the funds provided under this heading for the construction or conversion of any naval vessel to be constructed in shipyards in the United States shall be expended in foreign facilities for the construction of major components of such vessel: Provided further, That none of the funds provided under this heading shall be used for the construction of any naval vessel in foreign shipyards.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For procurement, production, and modernization of support equipment and materials not otherwise provided for, Navy ordnance (except ordnance for new aircraft, new ships, and ships authorized for conversion); the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, and the purchase of 3 vehicles required for physical security of personnel, notwithstanding price limitations applicable to passenger vehicles but not to exceed $240,000 per unit for one unit and not to exceed $125,000 per unit for the remaining two units; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $4,612,910,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2005.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

For expenses necessary for the procurement, manufacture, and modification of missiles, armament, military equipment, spare parts, and

accessories therefor; plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installation thereof in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; vehicles for the Marine Corps, including the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and expansion of public and private plants, including land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title, $1,388,583,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2005.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, lease, and modification of aircraft and equipment, including armor and armament, specialized ground handling equipment, and training devices, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment; expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes including rents and transportation of things, $13,137,255,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2005: Provided, That amounts provided under this heading shall be used for the advance procurement of 15 C–17 aircraft.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, and modification of missiles, spacecraft, rockets, and related equipment, including spare parts and accessories therefor, ground handling equipment, and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes including rents and transportation of things, $3,174,739,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2005.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of ammunition, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including ammunition facilities authorized by section 2854 of title 10, United States Code, and the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $1,288,164,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2005.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For procurement and modification of equipment (including ground guidance and electronic control equipment, and ground electronic and communication equipment), and supplies, materials, and spare parts therefor, not otherwise provided for; the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, and the purchase of 2 vehicles required for physical security of personnel, notwithstanding price limitations applicable to passenger vehicles but not to exceed $232,000 per vehicle; lease of passenger motor vehicles; and expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon, prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $10,672,712,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2005.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) necessary for procurement, production, and modification of equipment, supplies, materials, and spare parts therefor, not otherwise provided for; the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; the purchase of 4 vehicles required for physical security of personnel, notwithstanding price limitations applicable to passenger vehicles but not to exceed $250,000 per vehicle; expansion of public and private plants, equipment, and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $3,444,455,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2005.

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT

For procurement of aircraft, missiles, tracked combat vehicles, ammunition, other weapons, and other procurement for the reserve components of the Armed Forces, $100,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2005: Provided, That the Chiefs of the Reserve and National Guard components shall, not later than 30 days after the enactment of this Act, individually submit to the congressional defense committees the modernization priority assessment for their respective Reserve or National Guard component.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES

For activities by the Department of Defense pursuant to sections 108, 301, 302, and 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2078, 2091, 2092, and 2093), $73,057,000, to remain available until expended, of which, $5,000,000 may be used for a Processable Rigid-Rod Polymeric Material Supplier Initiative under title III of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2091 et seq.) to develop affordable production methods and a domestic supplier for military and commercial processable rigid-rod polymeric materials.

TITLE IV

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $7,669,656,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2004.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $13,946,085,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2004: Provided, That funds appropriated in this paragraph which are available for the V–22 may be used to meet unique operational requirements of the Special Operations Forces.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $18,822,569,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2004.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation; advanced research projects as may be designated and determined by the Secretary of Defense, pursuant to law; maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $17,924,642,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2004.

OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the independent activities of the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation, in the direction and supervision of operational test and evaluation, including initial operational test and evaluation which is conducted prior to, and in support of, production decisions; joint operational testing and evaluation; and administrative expenses in connection therewith, $245,554,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2004.

TITLE V

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

For the Defense Working Capital Funds, $1,784,956,000: Provided, That during fiscal year 2003, funds in the Defense Working Capital Funds may be used for the purchase of not to exceed 315 passenger carrying motor vehicles for replacement only for the Defense Security Service, and the purchase of not to exceed 7 vehicles for replacement only for the Defense Logistics Agency.

NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND

For National Defense Sealift Fund programs, projects, and activities, and for expenses of the National Defense Reserve Fleet, as established by section 11 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (50 U.S.C. App. 1744), and for the necessary expenses to maintain and preserve a U.S.-flag merchant fleet to serve the national security needs of the United States, $942,629,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That none of the funds provided in this paragraph shall be used to award a new contract that provides for the acquisition of any of the following major components unless such components are manufactured in the United States: auxiliary equipment, including pumps, for all shipboard services; propulsion system components (that is; engines, reduction gears, and propellers); shipboard cranes; and spreaders for shipboard cranes: Provided further, That the exercise of an option in a contract awarded through the obligation of previously appropriated funds shall not be considered to be the award of a new contract: Provided further, That the Secretary of the military department responsible for such procurement may waive the restrictions in the first proviso on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes: Provided further, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, $8,500,000 of the funds available under this heading shall be available in addition to other amounts otherwise available, only to finance the cost of constructing additional sealift capacity.

TITLE VI

OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, for medical and health care programs of the Department of Defense, as authorized by law,

$14,843,542,000, of which $14,100,386,000 shall be for Operation and maintenance, of which not to exceed 2 percent shall remain available until September 30, 2004; of which $284,242,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2005, shall be for Procurement; of which $458,914,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2004, shall be for Research, development, test and evaluation, and of which not less than $7,000,000 shall be available for HIV prevention educational activities undertaken in connection with U.S. military training, exercises, and humanitarian assistance activities conducted primarily in African nations.

CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, ARMY

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the destruction of the United States stockpile of lethal chemical agents and munitions in accordance with the provisions of section 1412 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (50 U.S.C. 1521), and for the destruction of other chemical warfare materials that are not in the chemical weapon stockpile, $1,490,199,000, of which $974,238,000 shall be for Operation and maintenance to remain available until September 30, 2004, $213,278,000 shall be for Procurement to remain available until September 30, 2005, and $302,683,000 shall be for Research, development, test and evaluation to remain available until September 30, 2004.

DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For drug interdiction and counter-drug activities of the Department of Defense, for transfer to appropriations available to the Department of Defense for military personnel of the reserve components serving under the provisions of title 10 and title 32, United States Code; for Operation and maintenance; for Procurement; and for Research, development, test and evaluation, $881,907,000: Provided, That the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for obligation for the same time period and for the same purpose as the appropriation to which transferred: Provided further, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority contained elsewhere in this Act.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For expenses and activities of the Office of the Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $157,165,000, of which $155,165,000 shall be for Operation and maintenance, of which not to exceed $700,000 is available for emergencies and extraordinary expenses to be expended on the approval or authority of the Inspector General, and payments may be made on the Inspector General's certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes; and of which $2,000,000 to remain available until September 30, 2005, shall be for Procurement.

TITLE VII

RELATED AGENCIES

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM FUND

For payment to the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System Fund, to maintain the proper funding level for continuing the operation of the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, $222,500,000.

INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Intelligence Community Management Account, $163,479,000, of which $24,252,000 for the Advanced Research and Development Committee shall remain available until September 30, 2004: Provided, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, $34,100,000 shall be transferred to the Department of Justice for the National Drug Intelligence Center to support the Department of Defense's counter-drug intelligence responsibilities, and of the said amount, $1,500,000 for Procurement shall remain available until September 30, 2005 and $1,000,000 for Research, development, test and evaluation shall remain available until September 30, 2004: Provided further, That the National Drug Intelligence Center shall maintain the personnel and technical resources to provide timely support to law enforcement authorities and the intelligence community by conducting document and computer exploitation of materials collected in Federal, State, and local law enforcement activity associated with counter-drug, counter-terrorism, and national security investigations and operations.

PAYMENT TO KAHO'OLAWE ISLAND CONVEYANCE, REMEDIATION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FUND

For payment to Kaho'olawe Island Conveyance, Remediation, and Environmental Restoration Fund, as authorized by law, $75,000,000, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL SECURITY EDUCATION TRUST FUND

For the purposes of title VIII of Public Law 102–183, $8,000,000, to be derived from the National Security Education Trust Fund, to remain available until expended.

TITLE VIII

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 8001. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not authorized by the Congress.

SEC. 8002. During the current fiscal year, provisions of law prohibiting the payment of compensation to, or employment of, any person not a citizen of the United States shall not apply to personnel of the Department of Defense: Provided, That salary increases granted to direct and indirect hire foreign national employees of the Department of Defense funded by this Act shall not be at a rate in excess of the percentage increase authorized by law for civilian employees of the Department of Defense whose pay is computed under the provisions of section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, or at a rate in excess of the percentage increase provided by the appropriate host nation to its own employees, whichever is higher: Provided further, That this section shall not apply to Department of Defense foreign service national employees serving at United States diplomatic missions whose pay is set by the Department of State under the Foreign Service Act of 1980: Provided further, That the limitations of this provision shall not apply to foreign national employees of the Department of Defense in the Republic of Turkey.

SEC. 8003. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 8004. No more than 20 percent of the appropriations in this Act which are limited for obligation during the current fiscal year shall be obligated during the last 2 months of the fiscal year: Provided, That this section shall not apply to obligations for support of active duty training of reserve components or summer camp training of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8005. Upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, he may, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, transfer not to exceed $2,000,000,000 of working capital funds of the Department of Defense or funds made available in this Act to the Department of Defense for military functions (except military construction) between such appropriations or funds or any subdivision thereof, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: Provided, That such authority to transfer may not be used unless for higher priority items, based on unforeseen military requirements, than those for which originally appropriated and in no case where the item for which funds are requested has been denied by the Congress: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the Congress promptly of all transfers made pursuant to this authority or any other authority in this Act: Provided further, That no part of the funds in this Act shall be available to prepare or present a request to the Committees on Appropriations for reprogramming of funds, unless for higher priority items, based on unforeseen military requirements, than those for which originally appropriated and in no case where the item for which reprogramming is requested has been denied by the Congress: Provided further, That a request for multiple reprogrammings of funds using authority provided in this section must be made prior to May 31, 2003: Provided further, That section 8005 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2002 (Public Law 107–117) is amended by striking ''$2,000,000,000'', and inserting ''$2,500,000,000''.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8006. During the current fiscal year, cash balances in working capital funds of the Department of Defense established pursuant to section 2208 of title 10, United States Code, may be maintained in only such amounts as are necessary at any time for cash disbursements to be made from such funds: Provided, That transfers may be made between such funds: Provided further, That transfers may be made between working capital funds and the ''Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Defense'' appropriation and the ''Operation and Maintenance'' appropriation accounts in such amounts as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, except that such transfers may not be made unless the Secretary of Defense has notified the Congress of the proposed transfer. Except in amounts equal to the amounts appropriated to working capital funds in this Act, no obligations may be made against a working capital fund to procure or increase the value of war reserve material inventory, unless the Secretary of Defense has notified the Congress prior to any such obligation.

SEC. 8007. Funds appropriated by this Act may not be used to initiate a special access program without prior notification 30 calendar days in session in advance to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 8008. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available to initiate: (1) a multiyear contract that employs economic order quantity procurement in excess of $20,000,000 in any 1 year of the contract or that includes an unfunded contingent liability in excess of $20,000,000; or (2) a contract for advance procurement leading to a multiyear contract that employs economic order quantity procurement in excess of $20,000,000 in any 1 year, unless the congressional defense committees have been notified at least 30 days in advance of the proposed contract award: Provided, That no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available to initiate a multiyear contract for which the economic order quantity advance procurement is not funded at least to the limits of the Government's liability: Provided further, That no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available to initiate multiyear procurement contracts for any systems or component thereof if the value of the multiyear contract would exceed $500,000,000 unless specifically provided in this Act: Provided further, That no multiyear procurement contract can be terminated without 10-day prior notification to the congressional defense committees: Provided

further, That the execution of multiyear authority shall require the use of a present value analysis to determine lowest cost compared to an annual procurement.

Funds appropriated in title III of this Act may be used for multiyear procurement contracts as follows:

C–130 aircraft;

FMTV; and

F/A–18E and F engine.

SEC. 8009. Within the funds appropriated for the operation and maintenance of the Armed Forces, funds are hereby appropriated pursuant to section 401 of title 10, United States Code, for humanitarian and civic assistance costs under chapter 20 of title 10, United States Code. Such funds may also be obligated for humanitarian and civic assistance costs incidental to authorized operations and pursuant to authority granted in section 401 of chapter 20 of title 10, United States Code, and these obligations shall be reported to the Congress as of September 30 of each year: Provided, That funds available for operation and maintenance shall be available for providing humanitarian and similar assistance by using Civic Action Teams in the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands and freely associated states of Micronesia, pursuant to the Compact of Free Association as authorized by Public Law 99–239: Provided further, That upon a determination by the Secretary of the Army that such action is beneficial for graduate medical education programs conducted at Army medical facilities located in Hawaii, the Secretary of the Army may authorize the provision of medical services at such facilities and transportation to such facilities, on a nonreimbursable basis, for civilian patients from American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, Palau, and Guam.

SEC. 8010. (a) During fiscal year 2003, the civilian personnel of the Department of Defense may not be managed on the basis of any end-strength, and the management of such personnel during that fiscal year shall not be subject to any constraint or limitation (known as an end-strength) on the number of such personnel who may be employed on the last day of such fiscal year.

(b) The fiscal year 2004 budget request for the Department of Defense as well as all justification material and other documentation supporting the fiscal year 2004 Department of Defense budget request shall be prepared and submitted to the Congress as if subsections (a) and (b) of this provision were effective with regard to fiscal year 2004.

(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to military (civilian) technicians.

SEC. 8011. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds made available by this Act shall be used by the Department of Defense to exceed, outside the 50 United States, its territories, and the District of Columbia, 125,000 civilian workyears: Provided, That workyears shall be applied as defined in the Federal Personnel Manual: Provided further, That workyears expended in dependent student hiring programs for disadvantaged youths shall not be included in this workyear limitation.

SEC. 8012. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used in any way, directly or indirectly, to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before the Congress.

SEC. 8013. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available for the basic pay and allowances of any member of the Army participating as a full-time student and receiving benefits paid by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from the Department of Defense Education Benefits Fund when time spent as a full-time student is credited toward completion of a service commitment: Provided, That this subsection shall not apply to those members who have reenlisted with this option prior to October 1, 1987: Provided further, That this subsection applies only to active components of the Army.

SEC. 8014. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to convert to contractor performance an activity or function of the Department of Defense that, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, is performed by more than 10 Department of Defense civilian employees until a most efficient and cost-effective organization analysis is completed on such activity or function and certification of the analysis is made to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: Provided, That this section and subsections (a), (b), and (c) of 10 U.S.C. 2461 shall not apply to a commercial or industrial type function of the Department of Defense that: (1) is included on the procurement list established pursuant to section 2 of the Act of June 25, 1938 (41 U.S.C. 47), popularly referred to as the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act; (2) is planned to be converted to performance by a qualified nonprofit agency for the blind or by a qualified nonprofit agency for other severely handicapped individuals in accordance with that Act; or (3) is planned to be converted to performance by a qualified firm under 51 percent ownership by an Indian tribe, as defined in section 450b(e) of title 25, United States Code, or a Native Hawaiian organization, as defined in section 637(a)(15) of title 15, United States Code.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8015. Funds appropriated in title III of this Act for the Department of Defense Pilot Mentor-Protege Program may be transferred to any other appropriation contained in this Act solely for the purpose of implementing a Mentor-Protege Program developmental assistance agreement pursuant to section 831 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101–510; 10 U.S.C. 2301 note), as amended, under the authority of this provision or any other transfer authority contained in this Act.

SEC. 8016. None of the funds in this Act may be available for the purchase by the Department of Defense (and its departments and agencies) of welded shipboard anchor and mooring chain 4 inches in diameter and under unless the anchor and mooring chain are manufactured in the United States from components which are substantially manufactured in the United States: Provided, That for the purpose of this section manufactured will include cutting, heat treating, quality control, testing of chain and welding (including the forging and shot blasting process): Provided further, That for the purpose of this section substantially all of the components of anchor and mooring chain shall be considered to be produced or manufactured in the United States if the aggregate cost of the components produced or manufactured in the United States exceeds the aggregate cost of the components produced or manufactured outside the United States: Provided further, That when adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis, the Secretary of the service responsible for the procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes.

SEC. 8017. None of the funds appropriated by this Act available for the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services (CHAMPUS) or TRICARE shall be available for the reimbursement of any health care provider for inpatient mental health service for care received when a patient is referred to a provider of inpatient mental health care or residential treatment care by a medical or health care professional having an economic interest in the facility to which the patient is referred: Provided, That this limitation does not apply in the case of inpatient mental health services provided under the program for persons with disabilities under subsection (d) of section 1079 of title 10, United States Code, provided as partial hospital care, or provided pursuant to a waiver authorized by the Secretary of Defense because of medical or psychological circumstances of the patient that are confirmed by a health professional who is not a Federal employee after a review, pursuant to rules prescribed by the Secretary, which takes into account the appropriate level of care for the patient, the intensity of services required by the patient, and the availability of that care.

SEC. 8018. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during the current fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense may, by executive agreement, establish with host nation governments in NATO member states a separate account into which such residual value amounts negotiated in the return of United States military installations in NATO member states may be deposited, in the currency of the host nation, in lieu of direct monetary transfers to the United States Treasury: Provided, That such credits may be utilized only for the construction of facilities to support United States military forces in that host nation, or such real property maintenance and base operating costs that are currently executed through monetary transfers to such host nations: Provided further, That the Department of Defense's budget submission for fiscal year 2004 shall identify such sums anticipated in residual value settlements, and identify such construction, real property maintenance or base operating costs that shall be funded by the host nation through such credits: Provided further, That all military construction projects to be executed from such accounts must be previously approved in a prior Act of Congress: Provided further, That each such executive agreement with a NATO member host nation shall be reported to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate 30 days prior to the conclusion and endorsement of any such agreement established under this provision.

SEC. 8019. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense may be used to demilitarize or dispose of M–1 Carbines, M–1 Garand rifles, M–14 rifles, .22 caliber rifles, .30 caliber rifles, or M–1911 pistols.

SEC. 8020. No more than $500,000 of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used during a single fiscal year for any single relocation of an organization, unit, activity or function of the Department of Defense into or within the National Capital Region: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the congressional defense committees that such a relocation is required in the best interest of the Government.

SEC. 8021. In addition to the funds provided elsewhere in this Act, $8,000,000 is appropriated only for incentive payments authorized by Section 504 of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1544): Provided, That a prime contractor or a subcontractor at any tier that makes a subcontract award to any subcontractor or supplier as defined in 25 U.S.C. 1544 or a small business owned and controlled by an individual defined under 25 U.S.C. 4221(9) shall be considered a contractor for the purposes of being allowed additional compensation under section 504 of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1544) whenever the prime contract or subcontract amount is over $500,000 and involves the expenditure of funds appropriated by an Act making Appropriations for the Department of Defense with respect to any fiscal year: Provided further, That notwithstanding 41 U.S.C. §430, this section shall be applicable to any Department of Defense acquisition of supplies or services, including any contract and any subcontract at any tier for acquisition of commercial items produced or manufactured, in whole or in part by any subcontractor or supplier defined in 25 U.S.C. §1544 or a small business

owned and controlled by an individual defined under 25 U.S.C. 4221(9).

SEC. 8022. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to perform any cost study pursuant to the provisions of OMB Circular A–76 if the study being performed exceeds a period of 24 months after initiation of such study with respect to a single function activity or 48 months after initiation of such study for a multi-function activity.

SEC. 8023. Funds appropriated by this Act for the American Forces Information Service shall not be used for any national or international political or psychological activities.

SEC. 8024. Notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, the Secretary of Defense may adjust wage rates for civilian employees hired for certain health care occupations as authorized for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs by section 7455 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 8025. (a) Of the funds for the procurement of supplies or services appropriated by this Act, qualified nonprofit agencies for the blind or other severely handicapped shall be afforded the maximum practicable opportunity to participate as subcontractors and suppliers in the performance of contracts let by the Department of Defense.

(b) During the current fiscal year, a business concern which has negotiated with a military service or defense agency a subcontracting plan for the participation by small business concerns pursuant to section 8(d) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(d)) shall be given credit toward meeting that subcontracting goal for any purchases made from qualified nonprofit agencies for the blind or other severely handicapped.

(c) For the purpose of this section, the phrase ''qualified nonprofit agency for the blind or other severely handicapped'' means a nonprofit agency for the blind or other severely handicapped that has been approved by the Committee for the Purchase from the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped under the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (41 U.S.C. 46–48).

SEC. 8026. During the current fiscal year, net receipts pursuant to collections from third party payers pursuant to section 1095 of title 10, United States Code, shall be made available to the local facility of the uniformed services responsible for the collections and shall be over and above the facility's direct budget amount.

SEC. 8027. During the current fiscal year, the Department of Defense is authorized to incur obligations of not to exceed $350,000,000 for purposes specified in section 2350j(c) of title 10, United States Code, in anticipation of receipt of contributions, only from the Government of Kuwait, under that section: Provided, That upon receipt, such contributions from the Government of Kuwait shall be credited to the appropriations or fund which incurred such obligations.

SEC. 8028. Of the funds made available in this Act, not less than $21,188,000 shall be available for the Civil Air Patrol Corporation, of which $19,688,000 shall be available for Civil Air Patrol Corporation operation and maintenance to support readiness activities which includes $1,500,000 for the Civil Air Patrol counterdrug program: Provided, That funds identified for ''Civil Air Patrol'' under this section are intended for and shall be for the exclusive use of the Civil Air Patrol Corporation and not for the Air Force or any unit thereof.

SEC. 8029. (a) None of the funds appropriated in this Act are available to establish a new Department of Defense (department) federally funded research and development center (FFRDC), either as a new entity, or as a separate entity administrated by an organization managing another FFRDC, or as a nonprofit membership corporation consisting of a consortium of other FFRDCs and other non-profit entities.

(b) No member of a Board of Directors, Trustees, Overseers, Advisory Group, Special Issues Panel, Visiting Committee, or any similar entity of a defense FFRDC, and no paid consultant to any defense FFRDC, except when acting in a technical advisory capacity, may be compensated for his or her services as a member of such entity, or as a paid consultant by more than one FFRDC in a fiscal year: Provided, That a member of any such entity referred to previously in this subsection shall be allowed travel expenses and per diem as authorized under the Federal Joint Travel Regulations, when engaged in the performance of membership duties.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds available to the department from any source during fiscal year 2003 may be used by a defense FFRDC, through a fee or other payment mechanism, for construction of new buildings, for payment of cost sharing for projects funded by Government grants, for absorption of contract overruns, or for certain charitable contributions, not to include employee participation in community service and/or development.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds available to the department during fiscal year 2003, not more than 6,321 staff years of technical effort (staff years) may be funded for defense FFRDCs: Provided, That of the specific amount referred to previously in this subsection, not more than 1,050 staff years may be funded for the defense studies and analysis FFRDCs.

(e) The Secretary of Defense shall, with the submission of the department's fiscal year 2004 budget request, submit a report presenting the specific amounts of staff years of technical effort to be allocated for each defense FFRDC during that fiscal year.

(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act for FFRDCs is hereby reduced by $74,200,000.

SEC. 8030. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used to procure carbon, alloy or armor steel plate for use in any Government-owned facility or property under the control of the Department of Defense which were not melted and rolled in the United States or Canada: Provided, That these procurement restrictions shall apply to any and all Federal Supply Class 9515, American Society of Testing and Materials (ASTM) or American Iron and Steel Institute (AISI) specifications of carbon, alloy or armor steel plate: Provided further, That the Secretary of the military department responsible for the procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes: Provided further, That these restrictions shall not apply to contracts which are in being as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 8031. For the purposes of this Act, the term ''congressional defense committees'' means the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 8032. During the current fiscal year, the Department of Defense may acquire the modification, depot maintenance and repair of aircraft, vehicles and vessels as well as the production of components and other Defense-related articles, through competition between Department of Defense depot maintenance activities and private firms: Provided, That the Senior Acquisition Executive of the military department or defense agency concerned, with power of delegation, shall certify that successful bids include comparable estimates of all direct and indirect costs for both public and private bids: Provided further, That Office of Management and Budget Circular A–76 shall not apply to competitions conducted under this section.

SEC. 8033. (a)(1) If the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the United States Trade Representative, determines that a foreign country which is party to an agreement described in paragraph (2) has violated the terms of the agreement by discriminating against certain types of products produced in the United States that are covered by the agreement, the Secretary of Defense shall rescind the Secretary's blanket waiver of the Buy American Act with respect to such types of products produced in that foreign country.

(2) An agreement referred to in paragraph (1) is any reciprocal defense procurement memorandum of understanding, between the United States and a foreign country pursuant to which the Secretary of Defense has prospectively waived the Buy American Act for certain products in that country.

(b) The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Congress a report on the amount of Department of Defense purchases from foreign entities in fiscal year 2003. Such report shall separately indicate the dollar value of items for which the Buy American Act was waived pursuant to any agreement described in subsection (a)(2), the Trade Agreement Act of 1979 (19 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.), or any international agreement to which the United States is a party.

(c) For purposes of this section, the term ''Buy American Act'' means title III of the Act entitled ''An Act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes'', approved March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a et seq.).

SEC. 8034. Appropriations contained in this Act that remain available at the end of the current fiscal year as a result of energy cost savings realized by the Department of Defense shall remain available for obligation for the next fiscal year to the extent, and for the purposes, provided in section 2865 of title 10, United States Code.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8035. Amounts deposited during the current fiscal year to the special account established under 40 U.S.C. 485(h)(2) and to the special account established under 10 U.S.C. 2667(d)(1) are appropriated and shall be available until transferred by the Secretary of Defense to current applicable appropriations or funds of the Department of Defense under the terms and conditions specified by 40 U.S.C. 485(h)(2)(A) and (B) and 10 U.S.C. 2667(d)(1)(B), to be merged with and to be available for the same time period and the same purposes as the appropriation to which transferred.

SEC. 8036. The President shall include with each budget for a fiscal year submitted to the Congress under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, materials that shall identify clearly and separately the amounts requested in the budget for appropriation for that fiscal year for salaries and expenses related to administrative activities of the Department of Defense, the military departments, and the defense agencies.

SEC. 8037. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds available for ''Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense'' may be obligated for the Young Marines program.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8038. During the current fiscal year, amounts contained in the Department of Defense Overseas Military Facility Investment Recovery Account established by section 2921(c)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act of 1991 (Public Law 101–510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) shall be available until expended for the payments specified by section 2921(c)(2) of that Act.

SEC. 8039. (a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Air Force may convey at no cost to the Air Force, without consideration, to Indian tribes

located in the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Minnesota relocatable military housing units located at Grand Forks Air Force Base and Minot Air Force Base that are excess to the needs of the Air Force.

(b) PROCESSING OF REQUESTS.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall convey, at no cost to the Air Force, military housing units under subsection (a) in accordance with the request for such units that are submitted to the Secretary by the Operation Walking Shield Program on behalf of Indian tribes located in the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Minnesota.

(c) RESOLUTION OF HOUSING UNIT CONFLICTS.—The Operation Walking Shield program shall resolve any conflicts among requests of Indian tribes for housing units under subsection (a) before submitting requests to the Secretary of the Air Force under subsection (b).

(d) INDIAN TRIBE DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''Indian tribe'' means any recognized Indian tribe included on the current list published by the Secretary of the Interior under section 104 of the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–454; 108 Stat. 4792; 25 U.S.C. 479a–1).

SEC. 8040. During the current fiscal year, appropriations which are available to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance may be used to purchase items having an investment item unit cost of not more than $100,000.

SEC. 8041. (a) During the current fiscal year, none of the appropriations or funds available to the Department of Defense Working Capital Funds shall be used for the purchase of an investment item for the purpose of acquiring a new inventory item for sale or anticipated sale during the current fiscal year or a subsequent fiscal year to customers of the Department of Defense Working Capital Funds if such an item would not have been chargeable to the Department of Defense Business Operations Fund during fiscal year 1994 and if the purchase of such an investment item would be chargeable during the current fiscal year to appropriations made to the Department of Defense for procurement.

(b) The fiscal year 2004 budget request for the Department of Defense as well as all justification material and other documentation supporting the fiscal year 2004 Department of Defense budget shall be prepared and submitted to the Congress on the basis that any equipment which was classified as an end item and funded in a procurement appropriation contained in this Act shall be budgeted for in a proposed fiscal year 2004 procurement appropriation and not in the supply management business area or any other area or category of the Department of Defense Working Capital Funds.

SEC. 8042. None of the funds appropriated by this Act for programs of the Central Intelligence Agency shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, except for funds appropriated for the Reserve for Contingencies, which shall remain available until September 30, 2004: Provided, That funds appropriated, transferred, or otherwise credited to the Central Intelligence Agency Central Services Working Capital Fund during this or any prior or subsequent fiscal year shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That any funds appropriated or transferred to the Central Intelligence Agency for agent operations and for covert action programs authorized by the President under section 503 of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, shall remain available until September 30, 2004.

SEC. 8043. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available in this Act for the Defense Intelligence Agency may be used for the design, development, and deployment of General Defense Intelligence Program intelligence communications and intelligence information systems for the Services, the Unified and Specified Commands, and the component commands.

SEC. 8044. Of the funds appropriated to the Department of Defense under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', not less than $10,000,000 shall be made available only for the mitigation of environmental impacts, including training and technical assistance to tribes, related administrative support, the gathering of information, documenting of environmental damage, and developing a system for prioritization of mitigation and cost to complete estimates for mitigation, on Indian lands resulting from Department of Defense activities.

SEC. 8045. Of the funds made available in this Act, not less than $68,900,000 shall be available to maintain an attrition reserve force of 18 B–52 aircraft, of which $3,700,000 shall be available from ''Military Personnel, Air Force'', $40,000,000 shall be available from ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', and $25,200,000 shall be available from ''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force'': Provided, That the Secretary of the Air Force shall maintain a total force of 94 B–52 aircraft, including 18 attrition reserve aircraft, during fiscal year 2003: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense shall include in the Air Force budget request for fiscal year 2004 amounts sufficient to maintain a B–52 force totaling 94 aircraft.

SEC. 8046. (a) None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be expended by an entity of the Department of Defense unless the entity, in expending the funds, complies with the Buy American Act. For purposes of this subsection, the term ''Buy American Act'' means title III of the Act entitled ''An Act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes'', approved March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a et seq.).

(b) If the Secretary of Defense determines that a person has been convicted of intentionally affixing a label bearing a ''Made in America'' inscription to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in America, the Secretary shall determine, in accordance with section 2410f of title 10, United States Code, whether the person should be debarred from contracting with the Department of Defense.

(c) In the case of any equipment or products purchased with appropriations provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that any entity of the Department of Defense, in expending the appropriation, purchase only American-made equipment and products, provided that American-made equipment and products are cost-competitive, quality-competitive, and available in a timely fashion.

SEC. 8047. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available for a contract for studies, analysis, or consulting services entered into without competition on the basis of an unsolicited proposal unless the head of the activity responsible for the procurement determines—

(1) as a result of thorough technical evaluation, only one source is found fully qualified to perform the proposed work;

(2) the purpose of the contract is to explore an unsolicited proposal which offers significant scientific or technological promise, represents the product of original thinking, and was submitted in confidence by one source; or

(3) the purpose of the contract is to take advantage of unique and significant industrial accomplishment by a specific concern, or to insure that a new product or idea of a specific concern is given financial support:

Provided, That this limitation shall not apply to contracts in an amount of less than $25,000, contracts related to improvements of equipment that is in development or production, or contracts as to which a civilian official of the Department of Defense, who has been confirmed by the Senate, determines that the award of such contract is in the interest of the national defense.

SEC. 8048. (a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), none of the funds made available by this Act may be used—

(1) to establish a field operating agency; or

(2) to pay the basic pay of a member of the Armed Forces or civilian employee of the department who is transferred or reassigned from a headquarters activity if the member or employee's place of duty remains at the location of that headquarters.

(b) The Secretary of Defense or Secretary of a military department may waive the limitations in subsection (a), on a case-by-case basis, if the Secretary determines, and certifies to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate that the granting of the waiver will reduce the personnel requirements or the financial requirements of the department.

(c) This section does not apply to field operating agencies funded within the National Foreign Intelligence Program.

SEC. 8049. Notwithstanding section 303 of Public Law 96–487 or any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to lease real and personal property at Naval Air Facility, Adak, Alaska, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2667(f), for commercial, industrial or other purposes: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Navy may remove hazardous materials from facilities, buildings, and structures at Adak, Alaska, and may demolish or otherwise dispose of such facilities, buildings, and structures.

(RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 8050. Of the funds appropriated in Department of Defense Appropriations Acts, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following accounts and programs in the specified amounts:

''Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army, 2001/2003'', $9,500,000;

''Procurement of Ammunition, Army, 2001/2003'', $4,000,000;

''Other Procurement, Army, 2001/2003'', $8,000,000;

''Other Procurement, Navy, 2001/2003'', $5,000,000;

''Missile Procurement, Air Force, 2001/2003'', $93,600,000;

''Missile Procurement, Army, 2002/2004'', $37,650,000;

''Procurement of Ammunition, Army, 2002/2004'', $19,000,000;

''Other Procurement, Army, 2002/2004'', $21,200,000;

''Missile Procurement, Air Force, 2002/2004'', $114,600,000;

''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy, 2002/2003'', $1,700,000;

''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force, 2002/2003'', $69,000,000; and

''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide, 2002/2003'', $19,500,000.

SEC. 8051. None of the funds available in this Act may be used to reduce the authorized positions for military (civilian) technicians of the Army National Guard, the Air National Guard, Army Reserve and Air Force Reserve for the purpose of applying any administratively imposed civilian personnel ceiling, freeze, or reduction on military (civilian) technicians, unless such reductions are a direct result of a reduction in military force structure.

SEC. 8052. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be obligated or expended for assistance to the Democratic People's Republic of North Korea unless specifically appropriated for that purpose.

SEC. 8053. During the current fiscal year, funds appropriated in this Act are available to compensate members of the National Guard for duty performed pursuant to a plan submitted by a Governor of a State and approved by the Secretary of Defense under section 112 of title 32, United States Code: Provided, That during the performance of such duty, the members of the National Guard shall be under State command and control: Provided further, That such duty shall be treated as full-time National Guard duty for purposes of sections 12602(a)(2) and (b)(2) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 8054. Funds appropriated in this Act for operation and maintenance of the Military Departments, Combatant Commands and Defense

Agencies shall be available for reimbursement of pay, allowances and other expenses which would otherwise be incurred against appropriations for the National Guard and Reserve when members of the National Guard and Reserve provide intelligence or counterintelligence support to Combatant Commands, Defense Agencies and Joint Intelligence Activities, including the activities and programs included within the National Foreign Intelligence Program (NFIP), the Joint Military Intelligence Program (JMIP), and the Tactical Intelligence and Related Activities (TIARA) aggregate: Provided, That nothing in this section authorizes deviation from established Reserve and National Guard personnel and training procedures.

SEC. 8055. During the current fiscal year, none of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to reduce the civilian medical and medical support personnel assigned to military treatment facilities below the September 30, 2002 level: Provided, That the Service Surgeons General may waive this section by certifying to the congressional defense committees that the beneficiary population is declining in some catchment areas and civilian strength reductions may be consistent with responsible resource stewardship and capitation-based budgeting.

SEC. 8056. (a) LIMITATION ON PENTAGON RENOVATION COSTS.—Not later than the date each year on which the President submits to Congress the budget under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a certification that the total cost for the planning, design, construction, and installation of equipment for the renovation of wedges 2 through 5 of the Pentagon Reservation, cumulatively, will not exceed four times the total cost for the planning, design, construction, and installation of equipment for the renovation of wedge 1.

(b) ANNUAL ADJUSTMENT.—For purposes of applying the limitation in subsection (a), the Secretary shall adjust the cost for the renovation of wedge 1 by any increase or decrease in costs attributable to economic inflation, based on the most recent economic assumptions issued by the Office of Management and Budget for use in preparation of the budget of the United States under section 1104 of title 31, United States Code.

(c) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN COSTS.—For purposes of calculating the limitation in subsection (a), the total cost for wedges 2 through 5 shall not include—

(1) any repair or reconstruction cost incurred as a result of the terrorist attack on the Pentagon that occurred on September 11, 2001;

(2) any increase in costs for wedges 2 through 5 attributable to compliance with new requirements of Federal, State, or local laws; and

(3) any increase in costs attributable to additional security requirements that the Secretary of Defense considers essential to provide a safe and secure working environment.

(d) CERTIFICATION COST REPORTS.—As part of the annual certification under subsection (a), the Secretary shall report the projected cost (as of the time of the certification) for—

(1) the renovation of each wedge, including the amount adjusted or otherwise excluded for such wedge under the authority of paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (c) for the period covered by the certification; and

(2) the repair and reconstruction of wedges 1 and 2 in response to the terrorist attack on the Pentagon that occurred on September 11, 2001.

(e) DURATION OF CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—The requirement to make an annual certification under subsection (a) shall apply until the Secretary certifies to Congress that the renovation of the Pentagon Reservation is completed.

SEC. 8057. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, that not more than 35 percent of funds provided in this Act for environmental remediation may be obligated under indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity contracts with a total contract value of $130,000,000 or higher.

SEC. 8058. (a) None of the funds available to the Department of Defense for any fiscal year for drug interdiction or counter-drug activities may be transferred to any other department or agency of the United States except as specifically provided in an appropriations law.

(b) None of the funds available to the Central Intelligence Agency for any fiscal year for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities may be transferred to any other department or agency of the United States except as specifically provided in an appropriations law.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8059. Appropriations available in this Act under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'' for increasing energy and water efficiency in Federal buildings may, during their period of availability, be transferred to other appropriations or funds of the Department of Defense for projects related to increasing energy and water efficiency, to be merged with and to be available for the same general purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred.

SEC. 8060. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used for the procurement of ball and roller bearings other than those produced by a domestic source and of domestic origin: Provided, That the Secretary of the military department responsible for such procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes: Provided further, That this restriction shall not apply to the purchase of ''commercial items'', as defined by section 4(12) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act, except that the restriction shall apply to ball or roller bearings purchased as end items.

SEC. 8061. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds available to the Department of Defense shall be made available to provide transportation of medical supplies and equipment, on a nonreimbursable basis, to American Samoa, and funds available to the Department of Defense shall be made available to provide transportation of medical supplies and equipment, on a nonreimbursable basis, to the Indian Health Service when it is in conjunction with a civil-military project.

SEC. 8062. None of the funds in this Act may be used to purchase any supercomputer which is not manufactured in the United States, unless the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes that is not available from United States manufacturers.

SEC. 8063. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Naval shipyards of the United States shall be eligible to participate in any manufacturing extension program financed by funds appropriated in this or any other Act.

SEC. 8064. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each contract awarded by the Department of Defense during the current fiscal year for construction or service performed in whole or in part in a State (as defined in section 381(d) of title 10, United States Code) which is not contiguous with another State and has an unemployment rate in excess of the national average rate of unemployment as determined by the Secretary of Labor, shall include a provision requiring the contractor to employ, for the purpose of performing that portion of the contract in such State that is not contiguous with another State, individuals who are residents of such State and who, in the case of any craft or trade, possess or would be able to acquire promptly the necessary skills: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense may waive the requirements of this section, on a case-by-case basis, in the interest of national security.

SEC. 8065. (a) None of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be used to pay the salary of any officer or employee of the Department of Defense who approves or implements the transfer of administrative responsibilities or budgetary resources of any program, project, or activity financed by this Act to the jurisdiction of another Federal agency not financed by this Act without the express authorization of Congress: Provided, That this limitation shall not apply to transfers of funds expressly provided for in Defense Appropriations Acts, or provisions of Acts providing supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense.

(b) None of the funds in this or any other Act may be used to dismantle national memorials commemorating United States participation in World War I.

SEC. 8066. (a) LIMITATION ON TRANSFER OF DEFENSE ARTICLES AND SERVICES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds available to the Department of Defense for the current fiscal year may be obligated or expended to transfer to another nation or an international organization any defense articles or services (other than intelligence services) for use in the activities described in subsection (b) unless the congressional defense committees, the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate are notified 15 days in advance of such transfer.

(b) COVERED ACTIVITIES.—This section applies to—

(1) any international peacekeeping or peace-enforcement operation under the authority of chapter VI or chapter VII of the United Nations Charter under the authority of a United Nations Security Council resolution; and

(2) any other international peacekeeping, peace-enforcement, or humanitarian assistance operation.

(c) REQUIRED NOTICE.—A notice under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A description of the equipment, supplies, or services to be transferred.

(2) A statement of the value of the equipment, supplies, or services to be transferred.

(3) In the case of a proposed transfer of equipment or supplies—

(A) a statement of whether the inventory requirements of all elements of the Armed Forces (including the reserve components) for the type of equipment or supplies to be transferred have been met; and

(B) a statement of whether the items proposed to be transferred will have to be replaced and, if so, how the President proposes to provide funds for such replacement.

SEC. 8067. To the extent authorized by subchapter VI of chapter 148 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may issue loan guarantees in support of United States defense exports not otherwise provided for: Provided, That the total contingent liability of the United States for guarantees issued under the authority of this section may not exceed $15,000,000,000: Provided further, That the exposure fees charged and collected by the Secretary for each guarantee shall be paid by the country involved and shall not be financed as part of a loan guaranteed by the United States: Provided further, That the Secretary shall provide quarterly reports to the Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, and Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, and International Relations in the House of Representatives on the implementation of this program: Provided further, That amounts charged for administrative fees and deposited to the special account provided for under section 2540c(d) of title 10, shall be available for paying the costs of administrative expenses of the Department of Defense that are attributable to the loan guarantee program under subchapter VI of chapter 148 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 8068. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense under this Act shall be obligated or expended to pay a contractor under a contract with the Department of Defense for costs of any amount paid by the contractor to an employee when—

(1) such costs are for a bonus or otherwise in excess of the normal salary paid by the contractor to the employee; and

(2) such bonus is part of restructuring costs associated with a business combination.

SEC. 8069. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to transport or provide for the transportation of chemical munitions or agents to the Johnston Atoll for the purpose of storing or demilitarizing such munitions or agents.

(b) The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to any obsolete World War II chemical munition or agent of the United States found in the World War II Pacific Theater of Operations.

(c) The President may suspend the application of subsection (a) during a period of war in which the United States is a party.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8070. During the current fiscal year, no more than $30,000,000 of appropriations made in this Act under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'' may be transferred to appropriations available for the pay of military personnel, to be merged with, and to be available for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred, to be used in support of such personnel in connection with support and services for eligible organizations and activities outside the Department of Defense pursuant to section 2012 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 8071. During the current fiscal year, in the case of an appropriation account of the Department of Defense for which the period of availability for obligation has expired or which has closed under the provisions of section 1552 of title 31, United States Code, and which has a negative unliquidated or unexpended balance, an obligation or an adjustment of an obligation may be charged to any current appropriation account for the same purpose as the expired or closed account if—

(1) the obligation would have been properly chargeable (except as to amount) to the expired or closed account before the end of the period of availability or closing of that account;

(2) the obligation is not otherwise properly chargeable to any current appropriation account of the Department of Defense; and

(3) in the case of an expired account, the obligation is not chargeable to a current appropriation of the Department of Defense under the provisions of section 1405(b)(8) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991, Public Law 101–510, as amended (31 U.S.C. 1551 note): Provided, That in the case of an expired account, if subsequent review or investigation discloses that there was not in fact a negative unliquidated or unexpended balance in the account, any charge to a current account under the authority of this section shall be reversed and recorded against the expired account: Provided further, That the total amount charged to a current appropriation under this section may not exceed an amount equal to 1 percent of the total appropriation for that account.

SEC. 8072. Funds appropriated in title II of this Act and for the Defense Health Program in title VI of this Act for supervision and administration costs for facilities maintenance and repair, minor construction, or design projects may be obligated at the time the reimbursable order is accepted by the performing activity: Provided, That for the purpose of this section, supervision and administration costs includes all in-house Government cost.

SEC. 8073. During the current fiscal year and hereafter, the Secretary of Defense may waive reimbursement of the cost of conferences, seminars, courses of instruction, or similar educational activities of the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies for military officers and civilian officials of foreign nations if the Secretary determines that attendance by such personnel, without reimbursement, is in the national security interest of the United States: Provided, That costs for which reimbursement is waived pursuant to this section shall be paid from appropriations available for the Asia-Pacific Center.

SEC. 8074. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau may permit the use of equipment of the National Guard Distance Learning Project by any person or entity on a space-available, reimbursable basis. The Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall establish the amount of reimbursement for such use on a case-by-case basis.

(b) Amounts collected under subsection (a) shall be credited to funds available for the National Guard Distance Learning Project and be available to defray the costs associated with the use of equipment of the project under that subsection. Such funds shall be available for such purposes without fiscal year limitation.

SEC. 8075. Using funds available by this Act or any other Act, the Secretary of the Air Force, pursuant to a determination under section 2690 of title 10, United States Code, may implement cost-effective agreements for required heating facility modernization in the Kaiserslautern Military Community in the Federal Republic of Germany: Provided, That in the City of Kaiserslautern such agreements will include the use of United States anthracite as the base load energy for municipal district heat to the United States Defense installations: Provided further, That at Landstuhl Army Regional Medical Center and Ramstein Air Base, furnished heat may be obtained from private, regional or municipal services, if provisions are included for the consideration of United States coal as an energy source.

SEC. 8076. None of the funds appropriated in title IV of this Act may be used to procure end-items for delivery to military forces for operational training, operational use or inventory requirements: Provided, That this restriction does not apply to end-items used in development, prototyping, and test activities preceding and leading to acceptance for operational use: Provided further, That this restriction does not apply to programs funded within the National Foreign Intelligence Program: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that it is in the national security interest to do so.

SEC. 8077. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to approve or license the sale of the F–22 advanced tactical fighter to any foreign government.

SEC. 8078. (a) The Secretary of Defense may, on a case-by-case basis, waive with respect to a foreign country each limitation on the procurement of defense items from foreign sources provided in law if the Secretary determines that the application of the limitation with respect to that country would invalidate cooperative programs entered into between the Department of Defense and the foreign country, or would invalidate reciprocal trade agreements for the procurement of defense items entered into under section 2531 of title 10, United States Code, and the country does not discriminate against the same or similar defense items produced in the United States for that country.

(b) Subsection (a) applies with respect to—

(1) contracts and subcontracts entered into on or after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) options for the procurement of items that are exercised after such date under contracts that are entered into before such date if the option prices are adjusted for any reason other than the application of a waiver granted under subsection (a).

(c) Subsection (a) does not apply to a limitation regarding construction of public vessels, ball and roller bearings, food, and clothing or textile materials as defined by section 11 (chapters 50–65) of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule and products classified under headings 4010, 4202, 4203, 6401 through 6406, 6505, 7019, 7218 through 7229, 7304.41 through 7304.49, 7306.40, 7502 through 7508, 8105, 8108, 8109, 8211, 8215, and 9404.

SEC. 8079. Funds made available to the Civil Air Patrol in this Act under the heading ''Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense'' may be used for the Civil Air Patrol Corporation's counterdrug program, including its demand reduction program involving youth programs, as well as operational and training drug reconnaissance missions for Federal, State, and local government agencies; and for equipment needed for mission support or performance: Provided, That the Department of the Air Force should waive reimbursement from the Federal, State, and local government agencies for the use of these funds.

SEC. 8080. (a) PROHIBITION.—None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to support any training program involving a unit of the security forces of a foreign country if the Secretary of Defense has received credible information from the Department of State that the unit has committed a gross violation of human rights, unless all necessary corrective steps have been taken.

(b) MONITORING.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall ensure that prior to a decision to conduct any training program referred to in subsection (a), full consideration is given to all credible information available to the Department of State relating to human rights violations by foreign security forces.

(c) WAIVER.—The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, may waive the prohibition in subsection (a) if he determines that such waiver is required by extraordinary circumstances.

(d) REPORT.—Not more than 15 days after the exercise of any waiver under subsection (c), the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees describing the extraordinary circumstances, the purpose and duration of the training program, the United States forces and the foreign security forces involved in the training program, and the information relating to human rights violations that necessitates the waiver.

SEC. 8081. The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, may carry out a program to distribute surplus dental equipment of the Department of Defense, at no cost to the Department of Defense, to Indian Health Service facilities and to federally-qualified health centers (within the meaning of section 1905(l)(2)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(l)(2)(B))).

SEC. 8082. The total amount appropriated in this Act is hereby reduced by $338,000,000 to reflect savings from favorable foreign currency fluctuations, to be derived as follows:

''Military Personnel, Army'', $80,000,000;

''Military Personnel, Navy'', $6,500,000;

''Military Personnel, Marine Corps'', $11,000,000;

''Military Personnel, Air Force'', $29,000,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $102,000,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', $21,500,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps'', $2,000,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', $46,000,000; and

''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', $40,000,000.

SEC. 8083. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act to the Department of the Navy shall be used to develop, lease or procure the T–AKE class of ships unless the main

propulsion diesel engines and propulsors are manufactured in the United States by a domestically operated entity: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes or there exists a significant cost or quality difference.

SEC. 8084. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or other Department of Defense Appropriations Acts may be obligated or expended for the purpose of performing repairs or maintenance to military family housing units of the Department of Defense, including areas in such military family housing units that may be used for the purpose of conducting official Department of Defense business.

SEC. 8085. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'' for any advanced concept technology demonstration project may only be obligated 30 days after a report, including a description of the project and its estimated annual and total cost, has been provided in writing to the congressional defense committees: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying to the congressional defense committees that it is in the national interest to do so.

SEC. 8086. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of establishing all Department of Defense policies governing the provision of care provided by and financed under the military health care system's case management program under 10 U.S.C. 1079(a)(17), the term ''custodial care'' shall be defined as care designed essentially to assist an individual in meeting the activities of daily living and which does not require the supervision of trained medical, nursing, paramedical or other specially trained individuals: Provided, That the case management program shall provide that members and retired members of the military services, and their dependents and survivors, have access to all medically necessary health care through the health care delivery system of the military services regardless of the health care status of the person seeking the health care: Provided further, That the case management program shall be the primary obligor for payment of medically necessary services and shall not be considered as secondarily liable to title XIX of the Social Security Act, other welfare programs or charity based care.

SEC. 8087. During the current fiscal year, refunds attributable to the use of the Government travel card, refunds attributable to the use of the Government Purchase Card and refunds attributable to official Government travel arranged by Government Contracted Travel Management Centers may be credited to operation and maintenance accounts of the Department of Defense which are current when the refunds are received.

SEC. 8088. (a) REGISTERING FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS WITH DOD CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER.—None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used for a mission critical or mission essential financial management information technology system (including a system funded by the defense working capital fund) that is not registered with the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense. A system shall be considered to be registered with that officer upon the furnishing to that officer of notice of the system, together with such information concerning the system as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe. A financial management information technology system shall be considered a mission critical or mission essential information technology system as defined by the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller).

(b) CERTIFICATIONS AS TO COMPLIANCE WITH FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT MODERNIZATION PLAN.—

(1) During the current fiscal year, a financial management major automated information system may not receive Milestone A approval, Milestone B approval, or full rate production, or their equivalent, within the Department of Defense until the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) certifies, with respect to that milestone, that the system is being developed and managed in accordance with the Department's Financial Management Modernization Plan. The Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) may require additional certifications, as appropriate, with respect to any such system.

(2) The Chief Information Officer shall provide the congressional defense committees timely notification of certifications under paragraph (1).

(c) CERTIFICATIONS AS TO COMPLIANCE WITH CLINGER-COHEN ACT.—(1) During the current fiscal year, a major automated information system may not receive Milestone A approval, Milestone B approval, or full rate production approval, or their equivalent, within the Department of Defense until the Chief Information Officer certifies, with respect to that milestone, that the system is being developed in accordance with the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 (40 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.). The Chief Information Officer may require additional certifications, as appropriate, with respect to any such system.

(2) The Chief Information Officer shall provide the congressional defense committees timely notification of certifications under paragraph (1). Each such notification shall include, at a minimum, the funding baseline and milestone schedule for each system covered by such a certification and confirmation that the following steps have been taken with respect to the system:

(A) Business process reengineering.

(B) An analysis of alternatives.

(C) An economic analysis that includes a calculation of the return on investment.

(D) Performance measures.

(E) An information assurance strategy consistent with the Department's Global Information Grid.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) The term ''Chief Information Officer'' means the senior official of the Department of Defense designated by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to section 3506 of title 44, United States Code.

(2) The term ''information technology system'' has the meaning given the term ''information technology'' in section 5002 of the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 (40 U.S.C. 1401).

(3) The term ''major automated information system'' has the meaning given that term in Department of Defense Directive 5000.1.

SEC. 8089. During the current fiscal year, none of the funds available to the Department of Defense may be used to provide support to another department or agency of the United States if such department or agency is more than 90 days in arrears in making payment to the Department of Defense for goods or services previously provided to such department or agency on a reimbursable basis: Provided, That this restriction shall not apply if the department is authorized by law to provide support to such department or agency on a nonreimbursable basis, and is providing the requested support pursuant to such authority: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that it is in the national security interest to do so.

SEC. 8090. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used to transfer to any nongovernmental entity ammunition held by the Department of Defense that has a center-fire cartridge and a United States military nomenclature designation of ''armor penetrator'', ''armor piercing (AP)'', ''armor piercing incendiary (API)'', or ''armor-piercing incendiary-tracer (API–T)'', except to an entity performing demilitarization services for the Department of Defense under a contract that requires the entity to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Department of Defense that armor piercing projectiles are either: (1) rendered incapable of reuse by the demilitarization process; or (2) used to manufacture ammunition pursuant to a contract with the Department of Defense or the manufacture of ammunition for export pursuant to a License for Permanent Export of Unclassified Military Articles issued by the Department of State.

SEC. 8091. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, or his designee, may waive payment of all or part of the consideration that otherwise would be required under 10 U.S.C. 2667, in the case of a lease of personal property for a period not in excess of 1 year to any organization specified in 32 U.S.C. 508(d), or any other youth, social, or fraternal non-profit organization as may be approved by the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, or his designee, on a case-by-case basis.

SEC. 8092. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used for the support of any nonappropriated funds activity of the Department of Defense that procures malt beverages and wine with nonappropriated funds for resale (including such alcoholic beverages sold by the drink) on a military installation located in the United States unless such malt beverages and wine are procured within that State, or in the case of the District of Columbia, within the District of Columbia, in which the military installation is located: Provided, That in a case in which the military installation is located in more than one State, purchases may be made in any State in which the installation is located: Provided further, That such local procurement requirements for malt beverages and wine shall apply to all alcoholic beverages only for military installations in States which are not contiguous with another State: Provided further, That alcoholic beverages other than wine and malt beverages, in contiguous States and the District of Columbia shall be procured from the most competitive source, price and other factors considered.

SEC. 8093. During the current fiscal year and hereafter, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, the Center of Excellence for Disaster Management and Humanitarian Assistance may also pay, or authorize payment for, the expenses of providing or facilitating education and training for appropriate military and civilian personnel of foreign countries in disaster management, peace operations, and humanitarian assistance.

SEC. 8094. (a) The Department of Defense is authorized to enter into agreements with the Department of Veterans Affairs and federally-funded health agencies providing services to Native Hawaiians for the purpose of establishing a partnership similar to the Alaska Federal Health Care Partnership, in order to maximize Federal resources in the provision of health care services by federally-funded health agencies, applying telemedicine technologies. For the purpose of this partnership, Native Hawaiians shall have the same status as other Native Americans who are eligible for the health care services provided by the Indian Health Service.

(b) The Department of Defense is authorized to develop a consultation policy, consistent with Executive Order No. 13084 (issued May 14, 1998), with Native Hawaiians for the purpose of assuring maximum Native Hawaiian participation in the direction and administration of governmental services so as to render those services more responsive to the needs of the Native Hawaiian community.

(c) For purposes of this section, the term ''Native Hawaiian'' means any individual who is a

descendant of the aboriginal people who, prior to 1778, occupied and exercised sovereignty in the area that now comprises the State of Hawaii.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8095. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'', $136,000,000 shall be made available for the Arrow missile defense program: Provided, That of this amount, $66,000,000 shall be available for the purpose of continuing the Arrow System Improvement Program (ASIP), and $70,000,000 shall be available for the purpose of producing Arrow missile components in the United States and Arrow missile components and missiles in Israel to meet Israel's defense requirements, consistent with each nation's laws, regulations and procedures: Provided further, That funds made available under this provision for production of missiles and missile components may be transferred to appropriations available for the procurement of weapons and equipment, to be merged with and to be available for the same time period and the same purposes as the appropriation to which transferred: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided under this provision is in addition to any other transfer authority contained in this Act.

SEC. 8096. Funds available to the Department of Defense for the Global Positioning System during the current fiscal year may be used to fund civil requirements associated with the satellite and ground control segments of such system's modernization program.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8097. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the heading, ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', $68,000,000 shall remain available until expended: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to transfer such funds to other activities of the Federal Government.

SEC. 8098. Section 8106 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1997 (titles I through VIII of the matter under subsection 101(b) of Public Law 104–208; 110 Stat. 3009–111; 10 U.S.C. 113 note) shall continue in effect to apply to disbursements that are made by the Department of Defense in fiscal year 2003.

SEC. 8099. In addition to amounts provided in this Act, $1,700,000 is hereby appropriated for ''Defense Health Program'', to remain available for obligation until expended: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, these funds shall be available only for a grant to the Fisher House Foundation, Inc., only for the construction and furnishing of additional Fisher Houses to meet the needs of military family members when confronted with the illness or hospitalization of an eligible military beneficiary.

SEC. 8100. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act is hereby reduced by $850,000,000, to reflect savings to be achieved from business process reforms, management efficiencies, and procurement of administrative and management support, to be distributed as follows:

''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $26,000,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', $60,300,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps'', $8,400,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', $91,200,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', $199,000,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve'', $5,900,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve'', $900,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve'', $1,000,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard'', $4,300,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard'', $2,600,000;

''Aircraft Procurement, Army'', $3,700,000;

''Missile Procurement, Army'', $1,100,000;

''Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army'', $3,100,000;

''Other Procurement, Army'', $17,700,000;

''Aircraft Procurement, Navy'', $22,800,000;

''Weapons Procurement, Navy'', $4,800,000;

''Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps'', $1,000,000;

''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'', $15,700,000;

''Other Procurement, Navy'', $7,200,000;

''Procurement, Marine Corps'', $2,600,000;

''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force'', $9,700,000;

''Missile Procurement, Air Force'', $6,200,000;

''Other Procurement, Air Force'', $6,200,000;

''Procurement, Defense-Wide'', $1,200,000;

''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army'', $23,500,000;

''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy'', $55,700,000;

''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force'', $66,200,000;

''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'', $154,000,000;

''Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense'', $5,000,000;

''National Defense Sealift Fund'', $1,000,000;

''Defense Health Program'', $12,000,000;

''Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army'', $20,000,000; and

''Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense'', $10,000,000:

Provided, That these reductions shall be applied proportionally to each budget activity, activity group and subactivity group and each program, project, and activity within each appropriation account: Provided further, That none of the funds provided in this Act may be used for consulting and advisory services for legislative affairs and legislative liaison functions.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8101. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'', $1,279,899,000 shall be available until September 30, 2003, to fund prior year shipbuilding cost increases: Provided, That upon enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy shall transfer such funds to the following appropriations in the amounts specified: Provided further, That the amounts transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes as the appropriations to which transferred:

To:

Under the heading, ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 1996/03'':

LPD–17 Amphibious Transport Dock Ship Program, $300,681,000;

Under the heading, ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 1998/03'':

DDG–51 Destroyer Program, $76,100,000;

New SSN, $190,882,000;

Under the heading, ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 1999/03'':

DDG–51 Destroyer Program, $93,736,000;

LPD–17 Amphibious Transport Dock Ship Program, $82,000,000;

New SSN, $135,800,000;

Under the heading, ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 2000/03'':

DDG–51 Destroyer Program, $51,724,000;

LPD–17 Amphibious Transport Dock Ship Program, $187,000,000;

Under the heading, ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 2001/03'':

DDG–51 Destroyer Program, $63,976,000; and

Under the heading, ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 2002/03'':

DDG–51 Destroyer Program, $98,000,000.

SEC. 8102. The Secretary of the Navy may settle, or compromise, and pay any and all admiralty claims under 10 U.S.C. 7622 arising out of the collision involving the U.S.S. GREENEVILLE and the EHIME MARU, in any amount and without regard to the monetary limitations in subsections (a) and (b) of that section: Provided, That such payments shall be made from funds available to the Department of the Navy for operation and maintenance.

SEC. 8103. The total amount appropriated in title II of this Act is hereby reduced by $97,000,000, to reflect savings attributable to improved supervision in determining appropriate purchases to be made using the Government purchase card, to be derived as follows:

''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $24,000,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', $29,000,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps'', $3,000,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', $27,000,000; and

''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', $14,000,000.

SEC. 8104. Funds provided for the current fiscal year or hereafter for Operation and maintenance for the Armed Forces may be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purchase of ultralightweight camouflage net systems as unit spares.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8105. During the current fiscal year and for fiscal years 2004 and 2005, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Defense may transfer not more than $20,000,000 of unobligated balances remaining in a Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army appropriation account during the last fiscal year before the account closes under section 1552 of title 31 United States Code, to a current Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army appropriation account to be used only for the continuation of the Venture Capital Fund demonstration, as originally approved in Section 8150 of Public Law 107–117, to pursue high payoff technology and innovations in science and technology: Provided, That any such transfer shall be made not later than July 31 of each year: Provided further, That funds so transferred shall be merged with and shall be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriation to which transferred: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided in this section is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: Provided further, That no funds for programs, projects, or activities designated as special congressional interest items in DD Form 1414 shall be eligible for transfer under the authority of this section: Provided further, That any unobligated balances transferred under this authority may be restored to the original appropriation if required to cover unexpected upward adjustments: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army shall provide an annual report to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees no later than 15 days prior to the annual transfer of funds under authority of this section describing the sources and amounts of funds proposed to be transfered, summarizing the projects funded under this demonstration program (including the name and location of project sponsors) to date, a description of the major program accomplishments to date, and an overall assessment of the benefits of this demonstration program compared to the goals expressed in the legislative history accompanying Section 8150 of Public Law 107–117.

SEC. 8106. Notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, the Secretary of Defense may exercise the provisions of 38 U.S.C. 7403(g) for occupations listed in 38 U.S.C. 7403(a)(2) as well as the following:

Pharmacists, Audiologists, and Dental Hygienists.

(A) The requirements of 38 U.S.C. 7403(g)(1)(A) shall apply.

(B) The limitations of 38 U.S.C. 7403(g)(1)(B) shall not apply.

SEC. 8107. Funds appropriated by this Act, or made available by the transfer of funds in this

Act, for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414) during fiscal year 2003 until the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 2003.

SEC. 8108. In addition to funds made available elsewhere in this Act $7,750,000 is hereby appropriated and shall remain available until expended to provide assistance, by grant or otherwise (such as, but not limited to, the provision of funds for repairs, maintenance, construction, and/or for the purchase of information technology, text books, teaching resources), to public schools that have unusually high concentrations of special needs military dependents enrolled: Provided, That in selecting school systems to receive such assistance, special consideration shall be given to school systems in States that are considered overseas assignments, and all schools within these school systems shall be eligible for assistance: Provided further, That up to $2,000,000 shall be available for the Department of Defense to establish a non-profit trust fund to assist in the public-private funding of public school repair and maintenance projects, or provide directly to non-profit organizations who in return will use these monies to provide assistance in the form of repair, maintenance, or renovation to public school systems that have high concentrations of special needs military dependents and are located in States that are considered overseas assignments, and of which 2 percent shall be available to support the administration and execution of the funds: Provided further, That to the extent a federal agency provides this assistance, by contract, grant, or otherwise, it may accept and expend non-federal funds in combination with these federal funds to provide assistance for the authorized purpose, if the non-federal entity requests such assistance and the non-federal funds are provided on a reimbursable basis: Provided further, That $2,750,000 shall be available for a grant to the Central Kitsap School District, Washington.

SEC. 8109. Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act is hereby reduced by $400,000,000, to reduce cost growth in information technology development, to be distributed as follows:

''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', $19,500,000;

''Other Procurement, Army'', $53,200,000;

''Other Procurement, Navy'', $20,600,000;

''Procurement, Marine Corps'', $3,400,000;

''Other Procurement, Air Force'', $12,000,000;

''Procurement, Defense-Wide'', $3,500,000;

''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army'', $17,700,000;

''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy'', $25,600,000;

''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force'', $27,200,000;

''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'', $36,600,000;

''Defense Working Capital Funds'', $148,600,000; and

''Defense Health Program'', $32,100,000:

Provided, That these reductions shall be applied proportionally to each budget activity, activity group and subactivity group and each program, project, and activity within each appropriation account.

SEC. 8110. Notwithstanding section 1116(c) of title 10, United States Code, payments into the Department of Defense Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Care Fund for fiscal year 2003 under section 1116(a) of such title shall be made from funds available in this Act for the pay of military personnel.

SEC. 8111. None of the funds in this Act may be used to initiate a new start program without prior notification to the Office of Secretary of Defense and the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 8112. The amount appropriated in title II of this Act is hereby reduced by $120,000,000, to reflect Working Capital Fund cash balance and rate stabilization adjustments, to be derived as follows:

''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', $120,000,000.

SEC. 8113. Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act is hereby reduced by $48,000,000, to reduce excess funded carryover, to be derived as follows:

''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $48,000,000.

SEC. 8114. Of the amounts appropriated in title II of the Act, not less than $1,000,000,000 is available for operations of the Department of Defense to prosecute the war on terrorism.

SEC. 8115. (a) In addition to the amounts provided elsewhere in this Act, the amount of $3,400,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard''. Such amount shall be made available to the Secretary of the Army only to make a grant in the amount of $3,400,000 to the entity specified in subsection (b) to facilitate access by veterans to opportunities for skilled employment in the construction industry.

(b) The entity referred to in subsection (a) is the Center for Military Recruitment, Assessment and Veterans Employment, a nonprofit labor-management co-operation committee provided for by section 302(c)(9) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U.S.C. 186(c)(9)), for the purposes set forth in section 6(b) of the Labor Management Cooperation Act of 1978 (29 U.S.C. 175a note).

SEC. 8116. (a) During the current fiscal year, funds available to the Secretary of a military department for Operation and Maintenance may be used for the purposes stated in subsection (b) to support chaplain-led programs to assist members of the Armed Forces and their immediate family members in building and maintaining a strong family structure.

(b) The purposes referred to in subsection (a) are costs of transportation, food, lodging, supplies, fees, and training materials for members of the Armed Forces and their family members while participating in such programs, including participation at retreats and conferences.

SEC. 8117. Section 8159 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2002 (division A of Public Law 107–117; 115 Stat. 2284), is revised as follows:

(1) in subsection (c) by inserting at the end of paragraph (1) the following new sentence: ''Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 3324 of Title 31, United States Code, payment for the acquisition of leasehold interests under this section may be made for each annual term up to one year in advance.''

(2) by adding the following paragraph (g):

''(g) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any payments required for a lease entered into under this Section, or any payments made pursuant to subsection (c)(3) above, may be made from appropriations available for operation and maintenance or for lease or procurement of aircraft at the time that the lease takes effect; appropriations available for operation and maintenance or for lease or procurement of aircraft at the time that the payment is due; or funds appropriated for those payments.''.

SEC. 8118. (a) LIMITATION ON ADDITIONAL NMCI CONTRACT WORK STATIONS.—Notwithstanding section 814 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (as enacted into law by Public Law 106–398; 114 Stat. 1654A–215) or any other provision of law, the total number of work stations provided under the Navy-Marine Corps Intranet contract (as defined in subsection (i) of such section 814) may not exceed 160,000 work stations until the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics and the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense certify to the congressional defense committees that all of the conditions specified in subsection (b) have been satisfied.

(b) CONDITIONS.—The conditions referred to in subsection (a) are the following:

(1) The Commander of the Navy Operational Test and Evaluation Force conducts an operational assessment of the work stations that have been fully transitioned to the Navy-Marine Corps Intranet, as defined in the Test and Evaluation Strategy Plan for the Navy-Marine Corps Intranet approved on September 4, 2002.

(2) The results of the assessment are submitted to the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics and the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense, and they determine that the results of the assessment are acceptable.

SEC. 8119. None of the funds in this Act, excluding funds provided for advance procurement of fiscal year 2004 aircraft, may be obligated for acquisition of more than 16 F–22 aircraft until the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics has provided to the congressional defense committees:

(a) A formal risk assessment which identifies and characterizes the potential cost, technical, schedule or other significant risks resulting from increasing the F–22 procurement quantities prior to the conclusion of Dedicated Initial Operational Test and Evaluation (DIOT&E) of the aircraft: Provided, That such risk assessment shall evaluate, based on the best available current information: (1) the range of potential additional program costs (compared to the program costs assumed in the President's fiscal year 2003 budget) that could result from retrofit modifications to F–22 production aircraft that are placed under contract or delivered to the government prior to the conclusion of DIOT&E; and (2) a cost-benefit analysis comparing, in terms of unit cost and total program cost, the cost advantages of increasing aircraft production at this time to the potential cost of retrofitting production aircraft once DIOT&E has been completed; and

(b) Certification that increasing the F–22 production quantity for fiscal year 2003 beyond 16 airplanes involves lower risk and lower total program cost than staying at that quantity, or he submits a revised production plan, funding plan and test schedule.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8120. Section 305(a) of the Emergency Supplemental Act, 2002 (division B of Public Law 107–117; 115 Stat. 2300), is amended by adding at the end the following new sentences: ''From amounts transferred to the Pentagon Reservation Maintenance Revolving Fund pursuant to the preceding sentence, not to exceed $305,000,000 may be transferred to the Defense Emergency Response Fund, but only in amounts necessary to reimburse that fund (and the category of that fund designated as 'Pentagon Repair/Upgrade') for expenses charged to that fund (and that category) between September 11, 2001, and February 19, 2002, for reconstruction costs of the Pentagon Reservation. Funds transferred to the Defense Emergency Response Fund pursuant to this section shall be available only for reconstruction, recovery, force protection, or security enhancements for the Pentagon Reservation.''.

SEC. 8121. FINANCING AND FIELDING OF KEY ARMY CAPABILITIES. The Department of Defense and the Department of the Army shall make future budgetary and programming plans to fully finance the Non-Line of Sight (NLOS) Objective Force cannon and resupply vehicle program in order to field this system in the 2008 timeframe. As an interim capability to enhance Army lethality, survivability, and mobility for light and medium forces before complete fielding of the Objective Force, the Army shall ensure that budgetary and programmatic plans will provide for no fewer than six Stryker Brigade Combat Teams to be fielded between 2003 and 2008.

SEC. 8122. (a) MANAGEMENT OF CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION ACTIVITIES AT BLUEGRASS ARMY DEPOT, KENTUCKY.—If a technology other than the baseline incineration program is selected for

the destruction of lethal chemical munitions pursuant to section 142 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261; 50 U.S.C. 1521 note), the program manager for the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment shall be responsible for management of the construction, operation, and closure, and any contracting relating thereto, of chemical demilitarization activities at Bluegrass Army Depot, Kentucky, including management of the pilot-scale facility phase of the alternative technology.

(b) MANAGEMENT OF CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION ACTIVITIES AT PUEBLO DEPOT, COLORADO.—The program manager for the Assembled Chemical Weapons Assessment shall be responsible for management of the construction, operation, and closure, and any contracting relating thereto, of chemical demilitarization activities at Pueblo Army Depot, Colorado, including management of the pilot-scale facility phase of the alternative technology selected for the destruction of lethal chemical munitions.

SEC. 8123. Of the total amount appropriated pursuant to this Act for any selected component of the Department of Defense that the Director of the Office of Management and Budget determines shall require audited financial statements under subsection (c) of section 3515 of title 31, United States Code, not more than 99 percent may be expended until the Inspector General of the Department of Defense certifies to the Congress of the United States that the head of the affected agency has made a formal decision as to whether to audit vouchers of the agency pursuant to section 3521(b) of title 31, United States Code: Provided, That such certification shall include a written assessment of the agency head's decision by the Inspector General.

SEC. 8124. Of the funds made available under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', $8,000,000 shall be available to realign railroad track on Elmendorf Air Force Base and Fort Richardson.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8125. Upon enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy shall make the following transfers of funds: Provided, That the amounts transferred shall be available for the same purpose as the appropriations to which transferred, and for the same time period as the appropriation from which transferred: Provided further, That the amounts shall be transferred between the following appropriations in the amount specified:

From:

Under the heading, ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 1994/2003'':

DDG–51 Destroyer program, $7,900,000;

LHD–1 Amphibious Assault Ship program, $6,500,000;

Oceanographic Ship program, $3,416,000;

Craft, outfitting, post delivery, first destination transportation, $1,800,000;

Mine warfare command and control ship, $604,000;

To:

Under the heading, ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 1999/2003'':

LPD–17 Amphibious Transport Dock Ship program, $20,220,000.

SEC. 8126. Of the amounts appropriated in Public Law 107–206 under the heading ''Defense Emergency Response Fund'', an amount up to the fair market value of the leasehold interest in adjacent properties necessary for the force protection requirements of Tooele Army Depot, Utah, may be made available to resolve any property disputes associated with Tooele Army Depot, Utah, and to acquire such leasehold interest as required: Provided, That none of these funds may be used to acquire fee title to the properties.

SEC. 8127. Up to $3,000,000 of the funds appropriated under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'' in this Act for the Pacific Missile Range Facility may be made available to contract for the repair, maintenance, and operation of adjacent off-base water, drainage, and flood control systems critical to base operations.

SEC. 8128. Of the total amount appropriated by this Act under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', $3,000,000 may be available for payments under section 363 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (as enacted into law by Public Law 106–398; 114 Stat. 1654A–77).

SEC. 8129. In addition to the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act, $8,100,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003, is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense shall make grants in the amount of $2,800,000 to the American Red Cross for Armed Forces Emergency Services; $2,800,000 to the United Service Organizations, Incorporated; and $2,500,000 to the Intrepid Sea-Air-Space Foundation.

SEC. 8130. None of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund'' may be transferred or obligated for Department of Defense expenses not directly related to the conduct of overseas contingencies: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report no later than 30 days after the end of each fiscal quarter to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives that details any transfer of funds from the ''Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund'': Provided further, That the report shall explain any transfer for the maintenance of real property, pay of civilian personnel, base operations support, and weapon, vehicle or equipment maintenance.

SEC. 8131. For purposes of section 1553(b) of title 31, United States Code, any subdivision of appropriations made in this Act under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'' shall be considered to be for the same purpose as any subdivision under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'' appropriations in any prior year, and the 1 percent limitation shall apply to the total amount of the appropriation.

SEC. 8132. The budget of the President for fiscal year 2004 submitted to the Congress pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, and each annual budget request thereafter, shall include separate budget justification documents for costs of United States Armed Forces' participation in contingency operations for the Military Personnel accounts, the Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund, the Operation and Maintenance accounts, and the Procurement accounts: Provided, That these budget justification documents shall include a description of the funding requested for each anticipated contingency operation, for each military service, to include active duty and Guard and Reserve components, and for each appropriation account: Provided further, That these documents shall include estimated costs for each element of expense or object class, a reconciliation of increases and decreases for ongoing contingency operations, and programmatic data including, but not limited to troop strength for each active duty and Guard and Reserve component, and estimates of the major weapons systems deployed in support of each contingency: Provided further, That these documents shall include budget exhibits OP–5 and OP–32, as defined in the Department of Defense Financial Management Regulation, for the Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund for fiscal years 2002 and 2003.

SEC. 8133. Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act is hereby reduced by $59,260,000, to reduce cost growth in travel, to be distributed as follows:

''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $14,000,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', $9,000,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps'', $10,000,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', $15,000,000; and

''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', $11,260,000.

SEC. 8134. None of the funds in this Act may be used for research, development, test, evaluation, procurement or deployment of nuclear armed interceptors of a missile defense system.

(INCLUDING RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 8135. (a) The total amount appropriated or otherwise made available in titles II, III, and IV of this Act is hereby reduced by $1,374,000,000 to reflect revised economic assumptions: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense shall allocate this reduction proportionately to each budget activity, activity group, subactivity group, and each program, project, and activity within each applicable appropriation account: Provided further, That appropriations made available in this Act for the pay and benefits of military personnel are exempt from reductions under this provision.

(b) Of the funds provided in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2002, (division A of Public Law 107–117), $300,000,000 are rescinded from amounts made available under titles III and IV of that Act: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense shall allocate this rescission proportionately by program, project, and activity.

SEC. 8136. During the current fiscal year, section 2533a(f) of Title 10, United States Code, shall not apply to any fish, shellfish, or seafood product. This section is applicable to contracts and subcontracts for the procurement of commercial items notwithstanding section 34 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 430).

SEC. 8137. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to convert the 939th Combat Search and Rescue Wing of the Air Force Reserve until the Secretary of the Air Force certifies to the Congress the following: (a) that a functionally comparable search and rescue capability is available in the 939th Search and Rescue Wing's area of responsibility; (b) that any new aircraft assigned to the unit will comply with local environmental and noise standards; and (c) that the Air Force has developed a plan for the transition of personnel and manpower billets currently assigned to this unit.

SEC. 8138. NAVY DRY-DOCK AFDL–47 (a) REQUIREMENT FOR SALE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Navy shall sell the Navy Dry-dock AFDL–47, located in Charleston, South Carolina, to Detyens Shipyards, Inc., the current lessee of the dry-dock from the Navy.

(b) CONSIDERATION.—As consideration for the sale of the dry-dock under subsection (a), the Secretary shall receive an amount equal to the fair market value of the dry-dock at the time of the sale, as determined by the Secretary, taking into account amounts paid by, or due and owing from, the lessee.

SEC. 8139. From funds made available in this Act for the Office of Economic Adjustment under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', $100,000 shall be available for the elimination of asbestos at former Battery 204, Odiorne Point, New Hampshire.

SEC. 8140. The Secretary of Defense may, using amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act, make a grant to the National D-Day Museum in the amount of $3,000,000.

SEC. 8141. (a) PRELIMINARY STUDY AND ANALYSIS REQUIRED.—The Secretary of the Army shall carry out a preliminary engineering study and environmental analysis regarding the establishment of a connector road between United States Route 1 and Telegraph Road in the vicinity of Fort Belvoir, Virginia.

(b) FUNDING.—Of the amount appropriated by title II under the heading ''OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY'', up to $5,000,000 may be available for the preliminary study and analysis required by subsection (a).

SEC. 8142. Of the amount appropriated by title V under the heading ''NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND'', up to $10,000,000 may be available for implementing the recommendations resulting from the Navy's Non-Self Deployable Watercraft (NDSW) Study and the Joint Chiefs of Staff Focused Logistics Study, which are to determine the requirements of the Navy for providing lift support for mine warfare ships and other vessels.

SEC. 8143. (a) Congress finds that—

(1) the Medal of Honor is the highest award for valor in action against an enemy force which can be bestowed upon an individual serving in the Armed Forces of the United States;

(2) the Medal of Honor was established by Congress during the Civil War to recognize soldiers who had distinguished themselves by gallantry in action;

(3) the Medal of Honor was conceived by Senator James Grimes of the State of Iowa in 1861; and

(4) the Medal of Honor is the Nation's highest military honor, awarded for acts of personal bravery or self-sacrifice above and beyond the call of duty.

(b)(1) Chapter 9 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 903. Designation of Medal of Honor Flag

''(a) DESIGNATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall design and designate a flag as the Medal of Honor Flag. In selecting the design for the flag, the Secretary shall consider designs submitted by the general public.

''(b) PRESENTATION.—The Medal of Honor Flag shall be presented as specified in sections 3755, 6257, and 8755 of title 10 and section 505 of title 14.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''903. Designation of Medal of Honor Flag.''.

(c)(1)(A) Chapter 357 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 3755. Medal of honor: presentation of Medal of Honor Flag

''The President shall provide for the presentation of the Medal of Honor Flag designated under section 903 of title 36 to each person to whom a medal of honor is awarded under section 3741 of this title after the date of the enactment of this section. Presentation of the flag shall be made at the same time as the presentation of the medal under section 3741 or 3752(a) of this title.''.

(B) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''3755. Medal of honor: presentation of Medal of Honor Flag.''.

(2)(A) Chapter 567 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 6257. Medal of honor: presentation of Medal of Honor Flag

''The President shall provide for the presentation of the Medal of Honor Flag designated under section 903 of title 36 to each person to whom a medal of honor is awarded under section 6241 of this title after the date of the enactment of this section. Presentation of the flag shall be made at the same time as the presentation of the medal under section 6241 or 6250 of this title.''.

(B) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''6257. Medal of honor: presentation of Medal of Honor Flag.''.

(3)(A) Chapter 857 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 8755. Medal of honor: presentation of Medal of Honor Flag

''The President shall provide for the presentation of the Medal of Honor Flag designated under section 903 of title 36 to each person to whom a medal of honor is awarded under section 8741 of this title after the date of the enactment of this section. Presentation of the flag shall be made at the same time as the presentation of the medal under section 8741 or 8752(a) of this title.''.

(B) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''8755. Medal of honor: presentation of Medal of Honor Flag.''.

(4)(A) Chapter 13 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 504 the following new section:

''§ 505. Medal of honor: presentation of Medal of Honor Flag

''The President shall provide for the presentation of the Medal of Honor Flag designated under section 903 of title 36 to each person to whom a medal of honor is awarded under section 491 of this title after the date of the enactment of this section. Presentation of the flag shall be made at the same time as the presentation of the medal under section 491 or 498 of this title.''.

(B) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 504 the following new item:

''505. Medal of honor: presentation of Medal of Honor Flag.''.

(d) The President shall provide for the presentation of the Medal of Honor Flag designated under section 903 of title 36, United States Code, as added by subsection (b), to each person awarded the Medal of Honor before the date of enactment of this Act who is living as of that date. Such presentation shall be made as expeditiously as possible after the date of the designation of the Medal of Honor Flag by the Secretary of Defense under such section.

SEC. 8144. (a) The conditions described in section 1305 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65; 22 U.S.C. 5952 note) shall not apply to the obligation and expenditure of funds for fiscal years 2000, 2001, 2002 and 2003 for the planning, design, or construction of a chemical weapons destruction facility in Russia if the President submits to Congress a written certification that includes—

(1) a statement as to why waiving the conditions is important to the national security interests of the United States;

(2) a full and complete justification for exercising this waiver; and

(3) a plan to promote a full and accurate disclosure by Russia regarding the size, content, status, and location of its chemical weapons stockpile.

(b) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority under paragraph (a) shall expire on September 30, 2003.

SEC. 8145. Effecitve as of August 2, 2002, the 2002 Supplemental Appropriations Act for Further Recovery From and Response To Terrorist Attacks on United States (Public Law 107–206) is amended—

(1) in section 305(a) (116 Stat. 840), by striking ''fiscal year 2002'' and inserting ''fiscal years 2002 and 2003''; and

(2) in section 309 (116 Stat. 841), by striking ''of'' after ''instead''.

SEC. 8146. The Secretary of Defense may modify the grant made to the State of Maine pursuant to section 310 of the 2002 Supplemental Appropriations Act for Further Recovery From and Response To Terrorist Attacks on the United States (Public Law 107–206) such that the modified grant is for purposes of supporting community adjustment activities relating to the closure of the Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor, Maine (the naval base on Schoodic Point, within Acadia National Park), and the reuse of such Activity, including reuse as a research and education center the activities of which may be consistent with the purposes of Acadia National Park, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior. The grant may be so modified not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 8147. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used for leasing of transport/VIP aircraft under any contract entered into under any procurement procedures other than pursuant to the Competition and Contracting Act.

SEC. 8148. (a) Funds appropriated by title II under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'' may be used by the Military Community and Family Policy Office of the Department of Defense for the operation of multidisciplinary, impartial domestic violence fatality review teams of the Department of Defense that operate on a confidential basis.

(b) Of the total amount appropriated by title II under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', $5,000,000 may be used for an advocate of victims of domestic violence to provide confidential assistance to victims of domestic violence at military installations.

(c) Not later than June 30, 2003, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Congress a report on the implementation of the recommendations included in the reports submitted to the Secretary by the Defense Task Force on Domestic Violence.

SEC. 8149. (a) LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF GOVERNMENT CHARGE CARD ACCOUNTS DURING FISCAL YEAR 2003.—The total number of accounts for government purchase charge cards and government travel charge cards for Department of Defense personnel during fiscal year 2003 may not exceed 1,500,000 accounts.

(b) REQUIREMENT FOR CREDITWORTHINESS FOR ISSUANCE OF GOVERNMENT CHARGE CARD.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall evaluate the creditworthiness of an individual before issuing the individual a government purchase charge card or government travel charge card.

(2) An individual may not be issued a government purchase charge card or government travel charge card if the individual is found not credit worthy as a result of the evaluation under paragraph (1).

(c) DISCIPLINARY ACTION FOR MISUSE OF GOVERNMENT CHARGE CARD.—(1) The Secretary shall establish guidelines and procedures for disciplinary actions to be taken against Department personnel for improper, fraudulent, or abusive use of government purchase charge cards and government travel charge cards.

(2) The guidelines and procedures under this subsection shall include appropriate disciplinary actions for use of charge cards for purposes, and at establishments, that are inconsistent with the official business of the Department or with applicable standards of conduct.

(3) The disciplinary actions under this subsection may include—

(A) the review of the security clearance of the individual involved; and

(B) the modification or revocation of such security clearance in light of the review.

(4) The guidelines and procedures under this subsection shall apply uniformly among the Armed Forces and among the elements of the Department.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than June 30, 2003, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the implementation of the requirements and limitations in this section, including the guidelines and procedures established under subsection (c).

SEC. 8150. Notwithstanding any provision of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101–510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) or any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Navy shall transfer

administrative jurisdiction of the portion of the former Charleston Naval Base, South Carolina, comprising a law enforcement training facility of the Department of Justice, together with any improvements thereon, to the head of the department of the Federal Government having jurisdiction of the Border Patrol as of the date of the transfer under this section.

TITLE IX—COMMERCIAL REUSABLE IN-SPACE TRANSPORTATION

SEC. 901. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Commercial Reusable In-Space Transportation Act of 2002''.

SEC. 902. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) It is in the national interest to encourage the production of cost-effective, in-space transportation systems, which would be built and operated by the private sector on a commercial basis.

(2) The use of reusable in-space transportation systems will enhance performance levels of in-space operations, enhance efficient and safe disposal of satellites at the end of their useful lives, and increase the capability and reliability of existing ground-to-space launch vehicles.

(3) Commercial reusable in-space transportation systems will enhance the economic well-being and national security of the United States by reducing space operations costs for commercial and national space programs and by adding new space capabilities to space operations.

(4) Commercial reusable in-space transportation systems will provide new cost-effective space capabilities (including orbital transfers from low altitude orbits to high altitude orbits and return, the correction of erroneous satellite orbits, and the recovery, refurbishment, and refueling of satellites) and the provision of upper stage functions to increase ground-to-orbit launch vehicle payloads to geostationary and other high energy orbits.

(5) Commercial reusable in-space transportation systems can enhance and enable the space exploration of the United States by providing lower cost trajectory injection from earth orbit, transit trajectory control, and planet arrival deceleration to support potential National Aeronautics and Space Administration missions to Mars, Pluto, and other planets.

(6) Satellites stranded in erroneous earth orbit due to deficiencies in their launch represent substantial economic loss to the United States and present substantial concerns for the current backlog of national space assets.

(7) Commercial reusable in-space transportation systems can provide new options for alternative planning approaches and risk management to enhance the mission assurance of national space assets.

(8) Commercial reusable in-space transportation systems developed by the private sector can provide in-space transportation services to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Department of Defense, the National Reconnaissance Office, and other agencies without the need for the United States to bear the cost of production of such systems.

(9) The availability of loan guarantees, with the cost of credit risk to the United States paid by the private-sector, is an effective means by which the United States can help qualifying private-sector companies secure otherwise unattainable private financing for the production of commercial reusable in-space transportation systems, while at the same time minimizing Government commitment and involvement in the development of such systems.

SEC. 903. LOAN GUARANTEES FOR PRODUCTION OF COMMERCIAL REUSABLE IN-SPACE TRANSPORTATION.

(a) AUTHORITY TO MAKE LOAN GUARANTEES.—The Secretary may guarantee loans made to eligible United States commercial providers for purposes of producing commercial reusable in-space transportation services or systems.

(b) ELIGIBLE UNITED STATES COMMERCIAL PROVIDERS.—The Secretary shall prescribe requirements for the eligibility of United States commercial providers for loan guarantees under this section. Such requirements shall ensure that eligible providers are financially capable of undertaking a loan guaranteed under this section.

(c) LIMITATION ON LOANS GUARANTEED.—The Secretary may not guarantee a loan for a United States commercial provider under this section unless the Secretary determines that credit would not otherwise be reasonably available at the time of the guarantee for the commercial reusable in-space transportation service or system to be produced utilizing the proceeds of the loan.

(d) CREDIT SUBSIDY.—

(1) COLLECTION REQUIRED.—The Secretary shall collect from each United States commercial provider receiving a loan guarantee under this section an amount equal to the amount, as determined by the Secretary, to cover the cost, as defined in section 502(5) of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, of the loan guarantee.

(2) PERIODIC DISBURSEMENTS.—In the case of a loan guarantee in which proceeds of the loan are disbursed over time, the Secretary shall collect the amount required under this subsection on a pro rata basis, as determined by the Secretary, at the time of each disbursement.

(e) OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—

(1) PROHIBITION ON SUBORDINATION.—A loan guaranteed under this section may not be subordinated to another debt contracted by the United States commercial provider concerned, or to any other claims against such provider.

(2) RESTRICTION ON INCOME.—A loan guaranteed under this section may not—

(A) provide income which is excluded from gross income for purposes of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; or

(B) provide significant collateral or security, as determined by the Secretary, for other obligations the income from which is so excluded.

(3) TREATMENT OF GUARANTEE.—The guarantee of a loan under this section shall be conclusive evidence of the following:

(A) That the guarantee has been properly obtained.

(B) That the loan qualifies for the guarantee.

(C) That, but for fraud or material misrepresentation by the holder of the loan, the guarantee is valid, legal, and enforceable.

(4) OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may establish any other terms and conditions for a guarantee of a loan under this section, as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the financial interests of the United States.

(f) ENFORCEMENT OF RIGHTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General may take any action the Attorney General considers appropriate to enforce any right accruing to the United States under a loan guarantee under this section.

(2) FORBEARANCE.—The Attorney General may, with the approval of the parties concerned, forebear from enforcing any right of the United States under a loan guaranteed under this section for the benefit of a United States commercial provider if such forbearance will not result in any cost, as defined in section 502(5) of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, to the United States.

(3) UTILIZATION OF PROPERTY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law and subject to the terms of a loan guaranteed under this section, upon the default of a United States commercial provider under the loan, the Secretary may, at the election of the Secretary—

(A) assume control of the physical asset financed by the loan; and

(B) complete, recondition, reconstruct, renovate, repair, maintain, operate, or sell the physical asset.

(g) CREDIT INSTRUMENTS.—

(1) AUTHORITY TO ISSUE INSTRUMENTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate, issue credit instruments to United States commercial providers of in-space transportation services or system, with the aggregate cost (as determined under the provisions of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661 et seq.)) of such instruments not to exceed $1,500,000,000, but only to the extent that new budget authority to cover such costs is provided in subsequent appropriations Acts or authority is otherwise provided in subsequent appropriations Acts.

(2) CREDIT SUBSIDY.—The Secretary shall provide a credit subsidy for any credit instrument issued under this subsection in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990.

(3) CONSTRUCTION.—The eligibility of a United States commercial provider of in-space transportation services or systems for a credit instrument under this subsection is in addition to any eligibility of such provider for a loan guarantee under other provisions of this section.

SEC. 904. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Defense.

(2) COMMERCIAL PROVIDER.—The term ''commercial provider'' means any person or entity providing commercial reusable in-orbit space transportation services or systems, primary control of which is held by persons other than the Federal Government, a State or local government, or a foreign government.

(3) IN-SPACE TRANSPORTATION SERVICES.—The term ''in-space transportation services'' means operations and activities involved in the direct transportation or attempted transportation of a payload or object from one orbit to another by means of an in-space transportation vehicle.

(4) IN-SPACE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM.—The term ''in-space transportation system'' means the space and ground elements, including in-space transportation vehicles and support space systems, and ground administration and control facilities and associated equipment, necessary for the provision of in-space transportation services.

(5) IN-SPACE TRANSPORTATION VEHICLE.—The term ''in-space transportation vehicle'' means a vehicle designed—

(A) to be based and operated in space;

(B) to transport various payloads or objects from one orbit to another orbit; and

(C) to be reusable and refueled in space.

(6) UNITED STATES COMMERCIAL PROVIDER.—The term ''United States commercial provider'' means any commercial provider organized under the laws of the United States that is more than 50 percent owned by United States nationals.

This Act may be cited as the ''Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2003''.

And the Senate agree to the same.

JERRY LEWIS,
BILL YOUNG,
JOE SKEEN,
DAVE L. HOBSON,
HENRY BONILLA,
GEORGE R. NETHERCUTT, Jr.,
RANDY ''DUKE'' CUNNINGHAM,
RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN,
TODD TIAHRT,
JOHN P. MURTHA,
NORMAN D. DICKS,
MARTIN OLAV SABO,
PETER J. VISCLOSKY,
JAMES P. MORAN,
DAVE R. OBEY
(Except for sec. 8149 relating to corporate expatriates),

Managers on the Part of the House.

DANIEL K. INOUYE,

ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
PATRICK J. LEAHY,
TOM HARKIN,
BYRON L. DORGAN,
RICHARD J. DURBIN,
HARRY REID,
DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
HERB KOHL,
TED STEVENS,
THAD COCHRAN,
ARLEN SPECTER,
PETE V. DOMENICI,
CHRISTOPHER S. BOND,
MITCH MCCONNELL,
RICHARD C. SHELBY,
JUDD GREGG,
KAY BAILEY HUTCHINSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5010), making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The conference agreement on the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2003, incorporates some of the provisions of both the House and Senate versions of the bill. The language and allocations set forth in House Report 107–532 and Senate Report 107–213 should be complied with unless specifically addressed in the accompanying bill and statement of the managers to the contrary.

Senate Amendment: The Senate deleted the entire House bill after the enacting clause and inserted the Senate bill. The conference agreement includes a revised bill.

DEFINITION OF PROGRAM, PROJECT, AND ACTIVITY

The conferees agree that for the purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99–177) as amended by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Reaffirmation Act of 1987 (Public Law 100–119) and by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–508), the term program, project, and activity for appropriations contained in this Act shall be defined as the most specific level of budget items identified in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2003, the accompanying House and Senate Committee reports, the conference report and accompanying joint explanatory statement of the managers of the Committee of Conference, the related classified annexes and reports, and the P–1 and R–1 budget justification documents as subsequently modified by Congressional action. The following exception to the above definition shall apply: for the Military Personnel and the Operation and Maintenance accounts, the term ''program, project, and activity'' is defined as the appropriations accounts contained in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act.

At the time the President submits his budget for fiscal year 2004, the conferees direct the Department of Defense to transmit to the congressional defense committees budget justification documents to be known as the ''M–1'' and ''O–1'' which shall identify, at the budget activity, activity group, and subactivity group level, the amounts requested by the President to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for military personnel and operation and maintenance in any budget request, or amended budget request, for fiscal year 2004.

SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS

Items for which additional funds have been provided as shown in the project level adjustment tables or items identified in paragraphs using the phrase ''only for'' or ''only to'' in this Statement, are congressional interest items for the purpose of the Base for Reprogramming (DD 1414). Each of these items must be carried on the DD Form 1414 at the stated amount, or a revised amount if changed during the conference or if otherwise specifically addressed in the conference report. These items remain special interest items whether or not they are repeated in a subsequent conference report or Statement.

CLASSIFIED ANNEX

Adjustments to classified programs are addressed in the classified annex accompanying this report.

TITLE I – MILITARY PERSONNEL

The conferees agree to the following amounts for the Military Personnel accounts:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
16250 RECAPITULATION				
16300 MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY	27,079,392	26,832,217	26,939,792	26,855,017
16350 MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY	22,074,901	21,874,395	21,975,201	21,927,628
16400 MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS	8,558,887	8,504,172	8,507,187	8,501,087
16450 MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE	22,142,585	21,957,757	22,036,405	21,981,277
16500 RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY	3,398,555	3,373,455	3,402,055	3,374,355
16550 RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY	1,927,152	1,897,352	1,918,352	1,907,552
16600 RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS	557,883	553,983	554,383	553,983
16650 RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE	1,243,904	1,236,904	1,237,504	1,236,904
16700 NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY	5,128,988	5,070,188	5,128,588	5,114,588
16750 NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE	2,135,611	2,124,411	2,126,061	2,125,161
16800 GRAND TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL	94,247,858	93,424,834	93,825,528	93,577,552

FORCE STRUCTURE CHANGES

The conferees recommend a total of $110,100,000 in the military personnel, operation and maintenance, and procurement accounts for force structure that was not included in the budget request, as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Milpers	O&M	Proc.	Total
Air Force B–52 aircraft	2,600	28,000	17,700	48,300
Army Reserve Full-Time Support	11,400	4,000	.....	15,400
Army National Guard Full-Time Support	35,100	11,300	.....	46,400

ACTIVE END STRENGTH

[Fiscal Year 2003]

	Budget	Conference	Conference vs. budget
Army	480,000	480,000	.....
Navy	375,700	375,700	.....
Marine Corps	175,000	175,000	.....
Air Force	359,000	359,000	.....
Total, Active Personnel	1,389,700	1,389,700	.....

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
50 MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY				
100 ACTIVITY 1: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICER 150 BASIC PAY	4,138,217	4,138,217	4,138,217	4,138,217
200 RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	1,133,871	1,133,871	1,133,871	1,133,871
250 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM ACCRUAL	270,390	270,390	270,390	270,390
350 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	832,483	832,483	832,483	832,483
400 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	156,455	156,455	156,455	156,455
450 INCENTIVE PAYS	76,694	76,694	76,694	76,694
500 SPECIAL PAYS	218,677	218,677	218,677	218,677
550 ALLOWANCES	65,397	65,397	65,397	65,397
600 SEPARATION PAY	111,690	111,690	85,690	85,690
650 SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	313,641	313,641	313,641	313,641
700 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	7,317,515	7,317,515	7,291,515	7,291,515
750 ACTIVITY 2: PAY AND ALLOW OF ENLISTED PERS 800 BASIC PAY	9,277,977	9,278,940	9,278,940	9,278,940
825 RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	2,542,166	2,542,430	2,542,430	2,542,430
850 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM ACCRUAL	1,943,850	1,943,850	1,943,850	1,943,850
1000 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	1,474,070	1,474,070	1,474,070	1,474,070
1050 INCENTIVE PAYS	67,866	67,866	67,866	67,866
1100 SPECIAL PAYS	547,812	497,812	531,312	510,812
1150 ALLOWANCES	409,382	409,382	409,382	409,382
1200 SEPARATION PAY	321,423	318,523	318,423	318,423
1250 SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	701,953	702,026	702,026	702,026
1300 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	17,286,499	17,234,899	17,268,299	17,247,799
1350 ACTIVITY 3: PAY AND ALLOW OF CADETS 1400 ACADEMY CADETS	47,352	47,352	47,352	47,352

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
1500 ACTIVITY 4: SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERS				
1550 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	833,180	833,180	833,180	833,180
1600 SUBSISTENCE-IN-KIND	614,538	614,538	614,538	614,538
1625 FAMILY SUBSISTENCE SUPPLEMENTAL ALLOWANCE	5,198	5,198	5,198	5,198
1650 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	1,452,916	1,452,916	1,452,916	1,452,916
1700 ACTIVITY 5: PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION				
1750 ACCESSION TRAVEL	188,434	188,434	188,434	188,434
1800 TRAINING TRAVEL	46,250	46,250	46,250	46,250
1850 OPERATIONAL TRAVEL	179,001	179,001	179,001	179,001
1900 ROTATIONAL TRAVEL	525,754	525,754	525,754	525,754
1950 SEPARATION TRAVEL	152,926	152,926	152,926	152,926
2000 TRAVEL OF ORGANIZED UNITS	1,822	1,822	1,822	1,822
2050 NON-TEMPORARY STORAGE	28,105	28,105	28,105	28,105
2100 TEMPORARY LODGING EXPENSE	20,672	20,672	20,672	20,672
2200 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 5	1,142,964	1,142,964	1,142,964	1,142,964
2250 ACTIVITY 6: OTHER MILITARY PERS COSTS				
2300 APPREHENSION OF MILITARY DESERTERS	611	611	611	611
2350 INTEREST ON UNIFORMED SERVICES SAVINGS	202	202	202	202
2400 DEATH GRATUITIES	3,360	3,360	3,360	3,360
2450 UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS	83,314	77,939	83,314	77,939
2500 SURVIVOR BENEFITS	7,204	7,204	7,204	7,204
2550 EDUCATION BENEFITS	19,163	19,163	19,163	19,163
2575 ADOPTION EXPENSES	252	252	252	252
2600 SPECIAL COMPENSATION FOR SEVERELY DISABLED RETIREES	20,200	---	20,200	20,200
2625 TRANSPORTATION SUBSIDY	2,092	2,092	2,092	2,092
2675 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 6	136,398	110,823	136,398	131,023
2690 LESS REIMBURSABLES	-294,352	-294,352	-294,352	-294,352
2760 UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENT	-9,900	-9,900	-9,900	-9,900
2770 LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS NOT ADOPTED	---	-9,300	---	---
2780 DHP ACCRUAL REESTIMATE	---	-110,700	-101,800	-110,700
2790 UNOBLIGATED BALANCES	---	-50,000	---	-50,000
2800 ADOPTED LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS	---	---	6,400	6,400
2845 TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY	27,079,392	26,832,217	26,939,792	26,855,017

ADJUSTMENTS TO BUDGET ACTIVITIES

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

Budget Activity 1: Pay and Allowances of Officers:	
600 Separation Pay/$30,000 Lump Sum Bonus	−26,000
Budget Activity 2: Pay and Allowances of Enlisted Personnel:	
800 Basic Pay/CT–FP DERF Transfer—CINC Protective Services Detail	963
825 Retired Pay Accrual/CT–FP DERF Transfer—CINC Protective Services Detail	264
1100 Special Pays/Enlistment Bonuses	−24,000
1100 Special Pays/Selective Reenlistment Bonus	−13,000
1200 Separation Pays/$30,000 Lump Sum Bonus	−3,000
1250 Social Security Tax/CT–FP DERF Transfer—CINC Protective Services Detail	73
Budget Activity 6: Other Military Personnel Costs:	
2450 Unemployment Benefits	−5,375
Other Adjustments:	
2780 DHP Accrual Reestimate	−110,700
2790 Unobligated Balances	−50,000
2800 Adopted Legislative Proposals	6,400

SELECTIVE REENLISTMENT BONUS PROGRAM

The conferees direct the Army to transfer $13,000,000 from Selective Reenlistment Bonus initial payments to anniversary payments to cover the anticipated shortfall in anniversary payments during fiscal year 2003.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

	(In thousands of dollars)			
	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
2850 MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY				
2900 ACTIVITY 1: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICER				
2950 BASIC PAY	2,887,210	2,887,210	2,887,210	2,887,210
3000 RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	791,096	791,096	791,096	791,096
3100 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM ACCRUAL	248,010	248,010	248,010	248,010
3150 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	730,451	730,451	730,451	730,451
3200 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	109,467	109,467	109,467	109,467
3250 INCENTIVE PAYS	177,881	177,881	177,881	177,881
3300 SPECIAL PAYS	257,016	257,016	257,016	257,016
3350 ALLOWANCES	55,443	55,443	55,443	55,443
3400 SEPARATION PAY	59,069	54,569	40,069	40,069
3450 SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	219,838	219,838	219,838	219,838
3500 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	5,535,481	5,530,981	5,516,481	5,516,481
3550 ACTIVITY 2: PAY AND ALLOW OF ENLISTED PERS				
3600 BASIC PAY	7,434,536	7,434,536	7,434,536	7,434,536
3650 RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	2,037,050	2,037,050	2,037,050	2,037,050
3700 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM ACCRUAL	1,460,429	1,460,429	1,460,429	1,460,429
3800 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	2,075,003	2,075,003	2,075,003	2,075,003
3850 INCENTIVE PAYS	100,889	100,889	100,889	100,889
3900 SPECIAL PAYS	911,110	888,110	906,110	897,110
3950 ALLOWANCES	386,850	386,850	386,850	386,850
4000 SEPARATION PAY	213,869	196,469	213,869	213,869
4050 SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	563,249	563,249	563,249	563,249
4100 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	15,182,985	15,142,585	15,177,985	15,168,985
4150 ACTIVITY 3: PAY AND ALLOW OF MIDSHIPMEN				
4200 MIDSHIPMEN	47,294	47,294	47,294	47,294
4300 ACTIVITY 4: SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERS				
4350 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	573,757	573,757	573,757	573,757

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
4400 SUBSISTENCE-IN-KIND	344,595	344,595	344,595	344,595
4425 FAMILY SUBSISTENCE SUPPLEMENTAL ALLOWANCE	2,640	2,640	2,640	2,640
4450 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	920,992	920,992	920,992	920,992
4500 ACTIVITY 5: PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION 4550 ACCESSION TRAVEL	64,511	64,511	64,511	64,511
4600 TRAINING TRAVEL	58,287	58,287	58,287	58,287
4650 OPERATIONAL TRAVEL	180,140	180,140	180,140	180,140
4700 ROTATIONAL TRAVEL	268,923	268,923	268,923	268,923
4750 SEPARATION TRAVEL	105,254	105,254	105,254	105,254
4800 TRAVEL OF ORGANIZED UNITS	19,375	19,375	19,375	19,375
4850 NON-TEMPORARY STORAGE	11,390	11,390	11,390	11,390
4900 TEMPORARY LODGING EXPENSE	13,888	13,888	13,888	13,888
4950 OTHER	7,247	7,247	7,247	7,247
5000 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 5	729,015	729,015	729,015	729,015
5050 ACTIVITY 6: OTHER MILITARY PERSONNEL COSTS 5100 APPREHENSION OF MILITARY DESERTERS	825	825	825	825
5150 INTEREST ON UNIFORMED SERVICES SAVINGS	209	209	209	209
5200 DEATH GRATUITIES	1,470	1,470	1,470	1,470
5250 UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS	50,858	44,085	50,858	44,085
5300 SURVIVOR BENEFITS	2,748	2,748	2,748	2,748
5350 EDUCATION BENEFITS	6,746	6,746	6,746	6,746
5400 ADOPTION EXPENSES	236	236	236	236
5420 SPECIAL COMPENSATION FOR SEVERELY DISABLED RETIREES	10,433	---	10,433	10,433
5440 TRANSPORTATION SUBSIDY	4,391	4,391	4,391	4,391
5500 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 6	77,916	60,710	77,916	71,143
5510 LESS REIMBURSABLES	-399,282	-399,282	-399,282	-399,282
5580 UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENT	-19,500	-19,500	-19,500	-19,500
5590 LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS NOT ADOPTED	---	-3,000	---	---
5600 DHP ACCRUAL REESTIMATE	---	-85,400	-78,600	-85,400
5610 UNOBLIGATED BALANCES	---	-50,000	---	-25,000
5620 ADOPTED LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS	---	---	2,900	2,900
5645 TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY	22,074,901	21,874,395	21,975,201	21,927,628

Adjustments to Budget Activities

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

Budget Activity 1: Pay and Allowances of Officers:	
3400 Separation Pay/$30,000 Lump Sum Bonus	-19,000
Budget Activity 2: Pay and Allowances of Enlisted Personnel:	
3900 Special Pays/Selective Reenlistment Bonus	-14,000
Budget Activity 6: Other Military Personnel Costs:	
5250 Unemployment Benefits	-6,773
Other Adjustments:	
5600 DHP Accrual Reestimate	-85,400
5610 Unobligated Balances	-25,000
5620 Adopted Legislative Proposals	2,900

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
5650 MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS				
5700 ACTIVITY 1: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICER 5750 BASIC PAY	953,611	953,611	953,611	953,611
5800 RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	261,005	261,005	261,005	261,005
5850 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM ACCRUAL	83,310	83,310	83,310	83,310
5950 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	193,249	193,249	193,249	193,249
6000 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	37,231	37,231	37,231	37,231
6050 INCENTIVE PAYS	46,651	46,651	46,651	46,651
6100 SPECIAL PAYS	2,451	2,451	2,451	2,451
6150 ALLOWANCES	19,727	19,727	19,727	19,727
6200 SEPARATION PAY	16,126	15,226	11,126	11,126
6250 SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	73,350	73,350	73,350	73,350
6300 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	1,686,711	1,685,811	1,681,711	1,681,711
6350 ACTIVITY 2: PAY AND ALLOW OF ENLISTED PERS 6400 BASIC PAY	3,297,782	3,298,382	3,298,382	3,298,382
6450 RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	900,416	900,416	900,416	900,416
6500 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM ACCRUAL	718,487	718,487	718,487	718,487
6600 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	606,017	606,017	606,017	606,017
6650 INCENTIVE PAYS	8,356	8,356	8,356	8,356
6700 SPECIAL PAYS	118,988	118,988	118,988	118,988
6750 ALLOWANCES	163,489	163,489	163,489	163,489
6800 SEPARATION PAY	62,002	59,802	51,002	51,002
6850 SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	251,375	251,375	251,375	251,375
6900 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	6,126,912	6,125,312	6,116,512	6,116,512
6950 ACTIVITY 4: SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL 7000 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	269,393	269,393	269,393	269,393

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
7050 SUBSISTENCE-IN-KIND	189,268	189,268	189,268	189,268
7075 FAMILY SUBSISTENCE SUPPLEMENTAL ALLOWANCE	750	750	750	750
7100 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	459,411	459,411	459,411	459,411
7150 ACTIVITY 5: PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION				
7200 ACCESSION TRAVEL	39,258	39,258	39,258	39,258
7250 TRAINING TRAVEL	7,431	7,431	7,431	7,431
7300 OPERATIONAL TRAVEL	68,889	68,889	68,889	68,889
7350 ROTATIONAL TRAVEL	99,944	99,944	99,944	99,944
7400 SEPARATION TRAVEL	43,492	43,492	43,492	43,492
7450 TRAVEL OF ORGANIZED UNITS	3,124	3,124	3,124	3,124
7500 NON-TEMPORARY STORAGE	5,006	5,006	5,006	5,006
7550 TEMPORARY LODGING EXPENSE	10,985	10,985	10,985	10,985
7600 OTHER	2,191	2,191	2,191	2,191
7650 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 5	280,320	280,320	280,320	280,320
7700 ACTIVITY 6: OTHER MILITARY PERSONNEL COSTS				
7750 APPREHENSION OF MILITARY DESERTERS	1,437	1,437	1,437	1,437
7800 INTEREST ON UNIFORMED SERVICES SAVINGS	16	16	16	16
7850 DEATH GRATUITIES	708	708	708	708
7900 UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS	28,753	19,738	28,753	25,753
7950 SURVIVOR BENEFITS	1,511	1,511	1,511	1,511
8000 EDUCATION BENEFITS	1,725	1,725	1,725	1,725
8020 ADOPTION EXPENSES	80	80	80	80
8040 SPECIAL COMPENSATION FOR SEVERELY DISABLED RETIREES	2,900	---	2,900	2,900
8060 TRANSPORTATION SUBSIDY	1,297	1,297	1,297	1,297
8150 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 6	38,427	26,512	38,427	35,427
8160 LESS REIMBURSABLES	-32,294	-32,294	-32,294	-32,294
8240 UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENT	-600	-600	-600	-600
8250 LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS NOT ADOPTED	---	-300	---	---
8260 DHP ACCRUAL REESTIMATE	---	-40,000	-36,900	-40,000
8265 ADOPTED LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS	---	---	600	600
8295 TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS	8,558,887	8,504,172	8,507,187	8,501,087

Adjustments to Budget Activities

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

Budget Activity 1: Pay and Allowances of Officers:	
6200 Separation Pay/$30,000 Lump Sum Bonus.....	-5,000
Budget Activity 2: Pay and Allowances of Enlisted Personnel:	
6400 Basic Pay/CT-FP DERF Transfer--CINC Security Force Personnel.....	600
6800 Separation Pay/$30,000 Lump Sum Bonus.....	-11,000
Budget Activity 6: Other Military Personnel Costs:	
7900 Unemployment Benefits	-3,000
Other Adjustments:	
8260 DHP Accrual Reestimate	-40,000
8265 Adopted Legislative Proposals.....	600

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

	(In thousands of dollars)			
	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
8300 MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE				
8350 ACTIVITY 1: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICER				
8400 BASIC PAY	3,872,634	3,872,634	3,872,634	3,872,634
8450 RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	1,061,102	1,061,102	1,061,102	1,061,102
8500 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM ACCRUAL	326,881	326,881	326,881	326,881
8600 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	778,898	778,898	778,898	778,898
8650 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	145,032	145,032	145,032	145,032
8700 INCENTIVE PAYS	284,327	284,327	284,327	284,327
8750 SPECIAL PAYS	261,119	203,536	261,119	222,436
8800 ALLOWANCES	58,222	58,222	58,222	58,222
8850 SEPARATION PAY	122,004	121,204	90,004	90,004
8900 SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	294,071	294,071	294,071	294,071
8950 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	7,204,290	7,145,907	7,172,290	7,133,607
9000 ACTIVITY 2: PAY AND ALLOW OF ENLISTED PERS				
9050 BASIC PAY	7,105,972	7,105,972	7,105,972	7,105,972
9100 RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	1,947,036	1,947,036	1,947,036	1,947,036
9200 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM ACCRUAL	1,328,732	1,328,732	1,328,732	1,328,732
9250 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	1,542,052	1,542,052	1,542,052	1,542,052
9300 INCENTIVE PAYS	33,250	33,250	33,250	33,250
9350 SPECIAL PAYS	444,437	442,539	439,437	437,539
9400 ALLOWANCES	359,219	359,219	359,219	359,219
9450 SEPARATION PAY	135,166	135,166	134,166	134,166
9500 SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	543,607	543,607	543,607	543,607
9550 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	13,439,471	13,437,573	13,433,471	13,431,573
9600 ACTIVITY 3: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF CADETS				
9650 ACADEMY CADETS	49,821	49,821	49,821	49,821

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
9750 ACTIVITY 4: SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERS				
9800 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	722,407	722,407	722,407	722,407
9850 SUBSISTENCE-IN-KIND	124,086	124,086	124,086	124,086
9875 FAMILY SUBSISTENCE SUPPLEMENTAL ALLOWANCE	1,177	1,177	1,177	1,177
9900 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	847,670	847,670	847,670	847,670
9950 ACTIVITY 5: PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION				
10000 ACCESSION TRAVEL	95,779	95,779	95,779	95,779
10050 TRAINING TRAVEL	65,087	65,087	65,087	65,087
10100 OPERATIONAL TRAVEL	166,545	166,545	166,545	166,545
10150 ROTATIONAL TRAVEL	466,133	466,133	466,133	466,133
10200 SEPARATION TRAVEL	120,933	120,933	120,933	120,933
10250 TRAVEL OF ORGANIZED UNITS	6,614	6,614	6,614	6,614
10300 NON-TEMPORARY STORAGE	25,446	25,446	25,446	25,446
10350 TEMPORARY LODGING EXPENSE	42,226	42,226	42,226	42,226
10450 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 5	988,763	988,763	988,763	988,763
10500 ACTIVITY 6: OTHER MILITARY PERS COSTS				
10550 APPREHENSION OF MILITARY DESERTERS	100	100	100	100
10600 INTEREST ON UNIFORMED SERVICES SAVINGS	595	595	595	595
10650 DEATH GRATUITIES	1,506	1,506	1,506	1,506
10700 UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS	26,456	19,709	26,456	19,709
10750 SURVIVOR BENEFITS	3,290	3,290	3,290	3,290
10800 EDUCATION BENEFITS	3,690	3,690	3,690	3,690
10820 ADOPTION EXPENSES	800	800	800	800
10840 SPECIAL COMPENSATION FOR SEVERELY DISABLED RETIREES	20,400	---	20,400	20,400
10860 TRANSPORTATION SUBSIDY	14,290	14,290	14,290	14,290
10950 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 6	71,127	43,980	71,127	64,380
10960 LESS REIMBURSABLES	-443,957	-443,957	-443,957	-443,957
10980 B-52 FORCE STRUCTURE	---	---	3,700	2,600
11060 UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENT	-14,600	-14,600	-14,600	-14,600
11070 LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS NOT ADOPTED	---	-14,600	---	---
11080 DHP ACCRUAL REESTIMATE	---	-82,800	-76,100	-82,800
11090 ADOPTED LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS	---	---	4,220	4,220
11140 TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE	22,142,585	21,957,757	22,036,405	21,981,277

ADJUSTMENTS TO BUDGET ACTIVITIES

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

Budget Activity 1: Pay and Allowances of Officers:	
8750 Special Pays/High Deployment Per Diem Allowances	−383
8750 Special Pays/Critical Skills Accession Bonus	−18,300
8750 Special Pays/Critical Skills Retention Bonus	−20,000
8850 Separation Pay/$30,000 Lump Sum Bonus	−32,000
Budget Activity 2: Pay and Allowances of Enlisted Personnel:	
9350 Special Pays/High Deployment Per Diem Allowances	−1,898
9350 Special Pays/Selective Reenlistment Bonus	−5,000
9450 Separation Pay/$30,000 Lump Sum Bonus	−1,000
Budget Activity 6: Other Military Personnel Costs:	
10700 Unemployment Benefits	−6,747
Other Adjustments:	
10980 B–52 Force Structure	2,600
11080 DHP Accrual Reestimate	−82,800
11090 Adopted Legislative Proposals	4,220

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES

The conferees agree to provide $14,312,543,000 in Reserve personnel appropriations, $13,936,917,000 in Reserve operation and maintenance appropriations, and $100,000,000 in the National Guard and Reserve Equipment appropriation. These funds support a Selected Reserve end strength of 864,558 as shown below.

Selected Reserve End Strength

[Fiscal Year 2003]

	Budget	Conference	Conference vs. budget
Selected Reserve:			
Army Reserve	205,000	205,000	
Navy Reserve	87,800	87,800	

Selected Reserve End Strength—Continued

[Fiscal Year 2003]

	Budget	Conference	Conference vs. budget
Marine Corps Reserve	39,558	39,558	
Air Force Reserve	75,600	75,600	
Army National Guard	350,000	350,000	
Air National Guard	106,600	106,600	
Total	864,558	864,558	864,558
AGR/TARS:			
Army Reserve	13,588	13,888	+300
Navy Reserve	14,572	14,572	
Marine Corps Reserve	2,261	2,261	
Air Force Reserve	1,498	1,498	
Army National Guard	23,768	24,662	+894
Air National Guard	11,697	11,727	+30
Total	67,384	68,608	+1,224
Technicians:			
Army Reserve	7,344	7,594	+250
Air Force Reserve	9,911	9,911	
Army National Guard	25,215	25,702	+487
Air National Guard	22,845	22,845	
Total	65,315	66,052	+737

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
11150 RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY				
11200 ACTIVITY 1: UNIT AND INDIVIDUAL TRAINING				
11250 PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS & DRILLS 24/48)	1,209,865	1,164,865	1,164,865	1,164,865
11300 PAY GROUP B TRAINING (BACKFILL FOR ACT DUTY)	39,372	39,372	39,372	39,372
11350 PAY GROUP F TRAINING (RECRUITS)	169,922	169,922	169,922	169,922
11400 PAY GROUP P TRAINING (PIPELINE RECRUITS)	10,117	10,117	10,117	10,117
11420 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM ACCRUAL	339,788	339,788	339,788	339,788
11500 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	1,769,064	1,724,064	1,724,064	1,724,064
11600 MOBILIZATION TRAINING	18,142	18,142	18,142	18,142
11650 SCHOOL TRAINING	100,610	100,610	108,110	108,110
11700 SPECIAL TRAINING	120,540	128,040	120,540	120,540
11750 ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT	1,134,589	1,155,589	1,193,089	1,155,589
11800 EDUCATION BENEFITS	51,378	51,378	51,378	51,378
11850 ROTC - SENIOR, JUNIOR	99,243	99,243	99,243	99,243
11900 HEALTH PROFESSION SCHOLARSHIP	29,556	29,556	29,556	29,556
11925 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM ACCRUAL	62,614	62,614	62,614	62,614
11950 OTHER PROGRAMS	13,819	13,819	13,819	13,819
11960 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	1,630,491	1,658,991	1,696,491	1,658,991
11970 UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENT	-1,000	-1,000	-1,000	-1,000
11980 ADDITIONAL FULL-TIME SUPPORT	---	11,500	---	11,400
11990 DHP ACCRUAL REESTIMATE	---	-20,100	-18,500	-20,100
12000 ADOPTED LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS	---	---	1,000	1,000
12090 TOTAL RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY	3,398,555	3,373,455	3,402,055	3,374,355

Adjustments to Budget Activities

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

Budget Activity 1: Unit and Individual Training:	
11250 Pay Group A Training/Realignment to BA 2.....	-7,500
11250 Pay Group A Training/Annual Training Participation Rates	-37,500
Budget Activity 2: Other Training and Support:	
11650 School Training/Realignment from BA 1.....	7,500
11750 Administration and Support/CT-FP DERF Transfer--Threat Force Protection Condition Bravo.....	21,000
Other Adjustments:	
11980 Additional Full-Time Support.....	11,400
11990 DHP Accrual Reestimate	-20,100
12000 Adopted Legislative Proposals.....	1,000

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
12100 RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY				
12150 ACTIVITY 1: UNIT AND INDIVIDUAL TRAINING				
12200 PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS & DRILLS 24/48)	704,404	704,404	704,404	704,404
12225 PAY GROUP B TRAINING (BACKFILL FOR ACT DUTY)	3,854	3,854	3,854	3,854
12250 PAY GROUP F TRAINING (RECRUITS)	3,238	3,238	3,238	3,238
12275 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM ACCRUAL	128,212	128,212	128,212	128,212
12350 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	839,708	839,708	839,708	839,708
12400 ACTIVITY 2: OTHER TRAINING AND SUPPORT				
12450 MOBILIZATION TRAINING	6,343	6,343	6,343	6,343
12500 SCHOOL TRAINING	16,099	16,099	16,099	16,099
12550 SPECIAL TRAINING	53,151	53,151	53,151	53,151
12600 ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT	877,719	877,719	877,719	877,719
12650 EDUCATION BENEFITS	1,103	1,103	1,103	1,103
12700 ROTC - SENIOR, JUNIOR	38,242	38,242	38,242	38,242
12750 HEALTH PROFESSION SCHOLARSHIP	28,988	28,988	28,988	28,988
12775 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM ACCRUAL	65,899	65,899	65,899	65,899
12820 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	1,087,544	1,087,544	1,087,544	1,087,544
12840 UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENT	-100	-100	-100	-100
12850 LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS NOT ADOPTED	---	-100	---	---
12860 DHP ACCRUAL REESTIMATE	---	-9,700	-8,900	-9,700
12870 UNOBLIGATED BALANCES	---	-20,000	---	-10,000
12880 ADOPTED LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS	---	---	100	100
12940 TOTAL, RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY	1,927,152	1,897,352	1,918,352	1,907,552

Adjustments to Budget Activities

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

Other Adjustments:		
12860	DHP Accrual Reestimate	-9,700
12870	Unobligated Balances	-10,000
12880	Adopted Legislative Proposals	100

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
12950 RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS				
13000 ACTIVITY 1: UNIT AND INDIVIDUAL TRAINING				
13050 PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS & DRILLS 24/48)	172,881	172,881	172,881	172,881
13100 PAY GROUP B TRAINING (BACKFILL FOR ACT DUTY)	16,969	16,969	16,969	16,969
13150 PAY GROUP F TRAINING (RECRUITS)	72,473	72,473	72,473	72,473
13200 PAY GROUP P TRAINING (PIPELINE RECRUITS)	177	177	177	177
13225 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM ACCRUAL	66,340	66,340	66,340	66,340
13300 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	328,840	328,840	328,840	328,840
13350 ACTIVITY 2: OTHER TRAINING AND SUPPORT				
13400 MOBILIZATION TRAINING	2,304	2,304	2,304	2,304
13450 SCHOOL TRAINING	10,710	10,710	10,710	10,710
13500 SPECIAL TRAINING	29,874	29,874	29,874	29,874
13550 ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT	141,474	141,474	141,474	141,474
13600 EDUCATION BENEFITS	16,198	16,198	16,198	16,198
13650 ROTC - SENIOR, JUNIOR	5,282	5,282	5,282	5,282
13675 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM ACCRUAL	10,801	10,801	10,801	10,801
13700 OTHER PROGRAMS	12,400	12,400	12,400	12,400
13710 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	229,043	229,043	229,043	229,043
13740 DHP ACCRUAL REESTIMATE	---	-3,900	-3,500	-3,900
13840 TOTAL, RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS	557,883	553,983	554,383	553,983

Adjustments to Budget Activities

Adjustment to the budget activities is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

Other Adjustments:	
13740 DHP Accrual Reestimate	-3,900

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

	(In thousands of dollars)			
	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
13850 RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE				
13900 ACTIVITY 1: UNIT AND INDIVIDUAL TRAINING 13950 PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS & DRILLS 24/48)	520,875	520,875	520,875	520,875
14000 PAY GROUP B TRAINING (BACKFILL FOR ACT DUTY)	105,332	105,332	105,332	105,332
14050 PAY GROUP F TRAINING (RECRUITS)	24,933	24,933	24,933	24,933
14075 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM ACCRUAL	132,127	132,127	132,127	132,127
14100 OTHER	95	95	95	95
14150 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	783,362	783,362	783,362	783,362
14200 ACTIVITY 2: OTHER TRAINING AND SUPPORT 14250 MOBILIZATION TRAINING	3,058	3,058	3,058	3,058
14300 SCHOOL TRAINING	71,351	71,351	71,351	71,351
14350 SPECIAL TRAINING	148,351	148,351	148,351	148,351
14400 ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT	143,948	143,948	143,948	143,948
14450 EDUCATION BENEFITS	7,700	7,700	7,700	7,700
14500 ROTC - SENIOR, JUNIOR	53,315	53,315	53,315	53,315
14525 HEALTH PROFESSION SCHOLARSHIP	26,189	26,189	26,189	26,189
14550 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM ACCRUAL	6,630	6,630	6,630	6,630
14600 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	460,542	460,542	460,542	460,542
14610 DHP ACCRUAL REESTIMATE	---	-7,000	-6,400	-7,000
14690 TOTAL, RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE	1,243,904	1,236,904	1,237,504	1,236,904

Adjustments to Budget Activities

Adjustment to the budget activities is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

Other Adjustments:	
14610 DHP Accrual Reestimate	-7,000

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

	(In thousands of dollars)			
	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
14700 NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY				
14750 ACTIVITY 1: UNIT AND INDIVIDUAL TRAINING				
14800 PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS & DRILLS 24/48)	1,811,587	1,783,587	1,811,587	1,793,587
14850 PAY GROUP F TRAINING (RECRUITS)	246,397	246,397	246,397	246,397
14900 PAY GROUP P TRAINING (PIPELINE RECRUITS)	24,894	24,894	24,894	24,894
14925 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM ACCRUAL	577,660	577,660	577,660	577,660
15000 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	2,660,538	2,632,538	2,660,538	2,642,538
15050 ACTIVITY 2: OTHER TRAINING AND SUPPORT				
15100 SCHOOL TRAINING	229,609	229,609	229,609	229,609
15150 SPECIAL TRAINING	141,503	141,503	141,503	141,503
15200 ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT	1,926,099	1,926,099	1,954,499	1,926,099
15250 EDUCATION BENEFITS	66,158	66,158	66,158	66,158
15275 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM ACCRUAL	107,181	107,181	107,181	107,181
15350 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	2,470,550	2,470,550	2,498,950	2,470,550
15370 EMERGENCY SPILL RESPONSE PROGRAM	---	---	600	600
15380 UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENT	-2,100	-2,100	-2,100	-2,100
15390 ADDITIONAL FULL-TIME SUPPORT	---	28,400	---	35,100
15400 DHP ACCRUAL REESTIMATE	---	-34,200	-31,500	-34,200
15410 UNOBLIGATED BALANCES	---	-25,000	---	---
15420 ADOPTED LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS	---	---	2,100	2,100
15445 TOTAL, NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY	5,128,988	5,070,188	5,128,588	5,114,588

ADJUSTMENTS TO BUDGET ACTIVITIES

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

Budget Activity 1: Unit and Individual Training:	
14800 Pay Group A Training/AT Participation Rates	−18,000
Other Adjustments:	
15370 Emergency Spill Response Program	600
15390 Additional Full-Time Support	35,100
15400 DHP Accrual Reestimated	−34,200
15420 Adopted Legislative Proposals	$2,100

ACTIVE GUARD AND RESERVE PERSONNEL

The conferees recommend a total of $35,100,000 for additional Active Guard and Reserve (AGR) personnel, instead of $28,400,000 as proposed by the House and Senate. The additional $6,700,000, offset by a reduction in Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide, line 74, will provide 52 AGRs for security at the Missile Defense Agency Test Bed site at Fort Greely, Alaska and 33 AGRs for emergency defensive operations at Fort Greely, Alaska and Colorado Springs, Colorado.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
15450 NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE				
15500 ACTIVITY 1: UNIT AND INDIVIDUAL TRAINING				
15550 PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS & DRILLS 24/48)	776,478	776,478	776,478	776,478
15600 PAY GROUP F TRAINING (RECRUITS)	41,453	41,453	41,453	41,453
15650 PAY GROUP P TRAINING (PIPELINE RECRUITS)	1,174	1,174	1,174	1,174
15675 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM ACCRUAL	148,970	148,970	148,970	148,970
15750 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	968,075	968,075	968,075	968,075
15800 ACTIVITY 2: OTHER TRAINING AND SUPPORT				
15850 SCHOOL TRAINING	130,702	130,702	130,702	130,702
15900 SPECIAL TRAINING	109,752	109,752	109,752	109,752
15950 ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT	817,601	817,601	818,351	818,351
16000 EDUCATION BENEFITS	33,569	33,569	33,569	33,569
16025 DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM ACCRUAL	75,912	75,912	75,912	75,912
16100 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	1,167,536	1,167,536	1,168,286	1,168,286
16120 DHP ACCRUAL REESTIMATE	---	-11,200	-10,300	-11,200
16200 TOTAL, NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE	2,135,611	2,124,411	2,126,061	2,125,161

Adjustments to Budget Activities

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

Budget Activity 2: Other Training and Support:	
15950 Administration and Support/Additional AGR End Strength	750
Other Adjustments:	
16120 DHP Accrual Reestimate	-11,200

TITLE II – OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

A summary of the conference agreement on the items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

		Budget	House	Senate	Conference
50000	RECAPITULATION				
50050	O & M, ARMY	23,961,173	23,942,768	24,048,107	23,992,082
50150	O & M, NAVY	28,697,235	29,121,836	29,410,276	29,331,526
50250	O & M, MARINE CORPS	3,310,542	3,579,359	3,576,142	3,585,759
50300	O & M, AIR FORCE	26,772,768	27,587,959	27,463,678	27,339,533
50400	O & M, DEFENSE-WIDE	14,169,258	14,850,377	14,527,853	14,773,506
50500	O & M, ARMY RESERVE	1,880,110	1,976,710	1,963,710	1,970,180
50550	O & M, NAVY RESERVE	1,159,734	1,239,309	1,233,759	1,236,809
50600	O & M, MARINE CORPS RESERVE	185,532	189,532	185,532	187,532
50650	O & M, AIR FORCE RESERVE	2,135,452	2,165,604	2,160,604	2,163,104
50700	O & M, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD	4,049,567	4,231,967	4,266,412	4,261,707
50750	O & M, AIR NATIONAL GUARD	4,062,445	4,113,010	4,113,460	4,117,585
50790	OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND	50,000	---	50,000	5,000
50800	UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES	9,614	9,614	9,614	9,614
50850	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY	395,900	395,900	395,900	395,900
50900	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY	256,948	256,948	256,948	256,948
50950	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE	389,773	389,773	389,773	389,773
51000	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE-WIDE	23,498	23,498	23,498	23,498
51050	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, FORMERLY USED DEFENSE SITES	212,102	212,102	252,102	246,102
51200	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AID	58,400	58,400	58,400	58,400
51300	FORMER SOVIET UNION THREAT REDUCTION	416,700	416,700	416,700	416,700
51460	SUPPORT OF INTERNATIONAL SPORTING COMPETITIONS	19,000	19,000	19,000	19,000
51470	DEFENSE EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND	19,338,151	---	---	---
51480	RETIREMENT ACCRUALS	---	---	---	---
51490	TRAVEL	---	---	---	---
51600	GRAND TOTAL, O & M	131,553,902	114,780,366	114,821,468	114,780,258

MANAGEMENT RESERVE FUNDS

Each service headquarters retains a portion of its operation and maintenance appropriation as a reserve to meet emergent needs. From fiscal year 1999 through fiscal year 2002, the services set aside the following amounts in management reserve funds: Army, $278,000,000; Navy, $466,000,000; Air Force, $200,000,000; and, Marine Corps, $96,000,000. In fiscal year 2002 alone, the Army set aside $128,000,000; the Navy, $150,000,000; the Air Force, $50,000,000; and, the Marines, $30,000,000. These funds are used at the discretion of the service chiefs or service secretaries and, since fiscal year 1999, have been used for projects ranging in cost from $5,000 to $40,100,000.

The amount retained by the Army in the management reserve fund grew from $50,000,000 in fiscal year 2001 to $128,000,000 in fiscal year 2002. The Navy increased its management reserve from $81,000,000 in fiscal year 1999 to $150,000,000 in fiscal year 2002. The Marine Corps' management reserve historically has been between $30,000,000, and $40,000,000, significantly higher than the Army, Navy, and Air Force reserve funds when considered as a percentage of the operation and maintenance funding provided for each service. The Air Force management reserve fund has remained constant at $50,000,000 per year. The services have applied the reserve funds to address a broad range of requirements, ranging from employment kiosks at minority institutions, to funding for a North Atlantic Treaty Organization Meeting, to ship and aircraft depot maintenance.

The conferees acknowledge the utility of retaining a small amount of the operation and maintenance funds appropriate for each service in the service headquarters to address emergent requirements. the conferees are concerned, however, with the recent growth in the amounts retained in the management reserve funds. Further, the growing amounts that the service chiefs and service secretaries have chosen to withhold from distribution to field activities call into question the validity of the budget justification process.

The conferees direct that not more than the following amounts may be used for service chief/service secretary reserve funds:

Operation and Maintenance, Army	$50,000,000
Operation and Maintenance, Navy	50,000,000
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	10,000,000
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	50,000,000

Additionally, the conferees direct that not later than 60 days after the end of fiscal year 2003, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force shall each submit to the congressional defense committees a report detailing service chief/service secretary reserve fund expenditures during the fiscal year.

MIDWAY AIRFIELD

The conferees are aware of the continuing efforts to forge a long term solution for the operation and maintenance of the Midway Island airfield, and are aware that Department of Defense aircraft used the Midway facility 17 times in fiscal year 2002. The conferees encourage the Department of Defense, in conjunction with the Department of the Interior, to identify a long-term contracting solution to continue the availability of this airfield in a manner which meets the refueling and emergency divert airfield requirements of military aircraft.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
100 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY				
150 BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES				
200 LAND FORCES 250 DIVISIONS	1,425,204	1,439,304	1,425,204	1,436,404
300 CORPS COMBAT FORCES	424,191	424,191	424,191	424,191
350 CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	361,001	361,001	361,001	361,001
400 ECHELON ABOVE CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	405,752	405,752	405,752	405,752
450 LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,115,776	1,123,776	1,165,776	1,162,276
500 LAND FORCES READINESS 550 FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,529,998	1,581,498	1,573,998	1,576,498
600 LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	491,947	491,947	481,947	481,947
650 LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	808,666	808,666	808,666	808,666
700 LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT 750 BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	3,207,409	3,214,409	3,201,409	3,207,409
800 FAC SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MOD (OP FORCES)	1,146,516	1,150,516	1,152,616	1,152,216
850 MANAGEMENT & OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	297,834	307,234	306,834	305,234
900 UNIFIED COMMANDS	83,961	83,961	103,361	99,361
950 MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES	1,607,610	1,622,610	1,622,610	1,622,610
1045 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	12,905,865	13,014,865	13,033,365	13,043,565
1050 BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: MOBILIZATION				
1100 MOBILITY OPERATIONS 1200 STRATEGIC MOBILIZATION	365,257	365,257	365,257	365,257
1250 ARMY PREPOSITIONED STOCKS	158,237	158,237	158,237	158,237
1300 INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	9,497	9,497	9,497	9,497
1325 FAC SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MOD (OP FORCES)	11,473	11,473	11,473	11,473
1350 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	544,464	544,464	544,464	544,464

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
1400 BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING				
1450 ACCESSION TRAINING 1500 OFFICER ACQUISITION	88,026	88,026	88,026	88,026
1550 RECRUIT TRAINING	20,197	20,197	20,197	20,197
1600 ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING	22,486	22,486	22,486	22,486
1650 SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS	209,550	209,550	211,550	210,950
1700 BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT (ACCESSION TRAINING)	89,214	89,214	89,214	89,214
1750 FAC SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MOD (OP FORCES)	56,754	56,754	56,754	56,754
1800 BASIC SKILL/ ADVANCE TRAINING 1850 SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	365,041	400,941	399,941	401,641
1900 FLIGHT TRAINING	402,481	404,481	402,481	402,481
1950 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	133,572	133,572	133,572	133,572
2000 TRAINING SUPPORT	431,508	432,508	419,508	419,608
2050 BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT (BASIC SKILL/ADV TRAINING)	1,006,102	1,007,102	1,006,102	1,007,102
2100 FAC SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MOD (OP FORCES)	351,864	356,364	351,864	354,164
2150 RECRUITING/OTHER TRAINING 2200 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	458,788	458,788	453,788	453,788
2250 EXAMINING	87,568	87,568	87,568	87,568
2300 OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	208,860	208,860	208,860	208,860
2350 CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	99,193	100,193	99,193	100,193
2400 JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS	97,512	97,512	97,512	97,512
2450 BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT (RECRUIT/OTHER TRAINING)	250,316	252,616	252,616	252,616
2500 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3	4,379,032	4,426,732	4,401,232	4,406,732
2550 BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
2600 SECURITY PROGRAMS 2650 SECURITY PROGRAMS	572,013	587,013	593,007	587,013
2700 LOGISTICS OPERATIONS 2750 SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	608,608	590,608	592,508	592,608
2800 CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES	547,994	552,494	547,994	551,194
2850 LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	356,424	361,424	358,424	359,424
2900 AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	311,789	311,789	311,789	311,789
2950 SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT 3000 ADMINISTRATION	638,845	622,445	649,445	631,945
3050 SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	655,796	631,596	663,796	629,796

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
3100 MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	245,901	235,901	245,901	242,901
3150 OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	204,749	205,749	204,749	205,749
3200 OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT	623,408	613,408	627,408	616,808
3250 ARMY CLAIMS	112,215	112,215	112,215	112,215
3300 REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	54,282	54,282	51,282	52,282
3350 BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT (SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT)	1,298,623	1,303,623	1,303,623	1,303,623
3400 FAC SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MOD (OP FORCES)	257,333	261,333	277,633	277,808
3550 SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS 3600 INTERNATIONAL MILITARY HEADQUARTERS	205,623	205,623	205,623	205,623
3650 MISC. SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	58,091	58,091	58,091	58,091
3700 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	6,751,694	6,707,594	6,803,488	6,738,869
3710 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS UNDISTRIBUTED	---	5,994	41,760	42,153
3720 MEMORIAL EVENTS	---	800	---	800
3730 REPAIRS AT FT. BAKER	---	---	---	2,500
3870 RETIREMENT ACCRUALS	-612,382	-612,382	-612,382	-612,382
3880 UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION	-7,500	-7,500	-7,500	-7,500
3930 TRAVEL OF PERSONS	---	-14,000	---	---
3940 TRADOC TRANSFORMATION	---	-15,000	---	---
3960 FECA SURCHARGE	---	-8,799	---	-8,799
3970 UNOBLIGATED BALANCES	---	-50,000	---	-50,000
3980 CONOPS COSTS	---	-50,000	-50,000	-50,000
4035 ANTI-CORROSION PROGRAMS	---	---	1,000	1,000
4037 UTILITIES PRIVATIZATION	---	---	-9,000	-9,000
4040 DEPOT MAINTENANCE EXCESS CARRYOVER	---	---	-48,000	---
4045 PACOM INFRASTRUCTURE MODERNIZATION - TRANSFER TO OPA	---	---	-41,800	-41,800
4050 EUSA COMMAND AND CONTROL - TRANSFER TO OPA	---	---	-4,700	-4,700
4055 USARPAC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT FIELDING - TRANSFER	---	---	-3,200	-3,200
4060 PACOM INFRASTRUCTURE MODERNIZATION - TRANSFER TO OPA	---	---	-620	-620
4180 TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY	23,961,173	23,942,768	24,048,107	23,992,082

ADJUSTMENTS TO BUDGET ACTIVITIES

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

Budget Activity 1: Operating Forces:	
250 All Terrain Military Utility Vehicles	2,900
250 Hydration on the Move System, Including Chem/Bio Sys	1,000
250 Modular Lightweight Load-Carrying Equipment (MOLLE)	3,600
250 Modular General Purpose Tent System (MGPTS)	1,200
250 Expendable Light Air Mobility Shelter	2,500
450 Camera Assisted Monitoring System (CAMS)	4,000
450 SBCT Implementation	42,500
550 Continuity of Operations DERF—Alt Nat Cmd Ctr	44,000
550 CT/FP DERF—Physical Security Equipment	76,900
550 CT/FP DERF—Physical Security Equipment trans to OPA	−76,900
550 ITAM Program at Army NTC	1,000
550 Corrosion Prevention and Control Program at CCAD and Fort Hood	1,500
600 Studies, analysis and headquarters growth	−10,000
750 USARSO headquarters growth	−1,000
750 Other Contracts, unjustified program growth	−5,000
750 Training and Support Facilities—Continue Ft. Irwin facility and road improvements	6,000
800 Airborne Barracks—Ft. Benning, Georgia	2,000
800 Ft. Lewis SRM, Vancouver Barracks preservation	3,700
850 USARPAC C41 PACMERS	4,300
850 USARPAC C4 shortfalls	5,100
850 Management and Operational Headquarters, unjustified program growth	−2,000
900 DERF transfer—CINC AT/FP staff	9,400
900 Hunter UAV	6,000
950 Nuclear Posture Review DERF—Info Systems Security	15,000
Budget Activity 3: Training and Recruiting:	
1650 SROTC—Air Battle Captain Program	1,400
1850 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—Army Lang Pgm TIARA	19,500
1850 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—Contr Linguists TIARA	9,400
1850 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—Contract Linguists Interrogation	5,000
1850 Military Police MCTFT joint training	1,700
1850 SCOLA language training	1,000
2000 Defense Language Institute (DLI) LandNet	1,000
2000 TRADOC Transformation, unjustified program increase	−15,000
2000 Ft. Knox Distance Learning	2,100
2050 DoD Monterey Bay Center furniture and equipment	1,000
2100 Restoration and modernization of dining facilities	2,300
2200 Contract Recruiting Companies	−5,000
2350 Online Technology Training Pilot Program Ft. Lewis	1,000
2450 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—PE0135197	2,300
Budget Activity 4: Administration and Servicewide Activities:	
2650 Continuity of Operations DERF—CONUS Support	2,000
2650 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—Battle Space Character	2,000
2650 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—Sec & Invest backlog	10,000
2650 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—Information Dominance	1,000
2750 Second Destination Transportation, unjustified pgm growth	−18,000
2750 MTMC DRMEC demo project including RAPID	2,000
2800 Pulse Technology—Army Battery Management Program	3,200
2850 AIT/RFID Program at Sierra Army Depot	1,000
2850 Electronic Maintenance System (EMS)/Point-to-Point Wiring and Signal Tracing	1,000
2850 Logistics and Technology Program	1,000
3000 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—Crit Infr Protect (CIP)	600
3000 Administration	−17,000
3000 Biometrics Support	9,500
3050 Continuity of Operations DERF—JMIP CONUS Support	5,000
3050 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—Collaboration Planning/Enablers	2,500
3050 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—CONUS Support, CIP	500
3050 Servicewide Communications	−22,000
3050 Army Information Systems	−6,000
3050 Army Enterprise Architecture	−6,000
3100 Manpower Management	−3,000
3150 Chaplain—Building Strong and Ready Families Pgm	1,000
3200 Other Service Support	−10,000
3200 Army Conservation and Ecosystem Management	3,400
3300 Real Estate Management—underexecution	−2,000
3350 Worker Safety Pilot Program at Fort Bragg, NC and Watervliet, NY expansion	2,500
3350 Innovative Safety Management	2,500
3400 Army Chapel Renovation Matching Funds Program	3,400
3400 Rock Island Bridge Repairs	1,700
3400 Yukon training infrastructure and access upgrades	1,700
3400 Ft. Richardson Bldg. 802 repairs	3,900
3400 Ft. Wainwright utilidors	8,500
3400 Tanana River bridge study	1,275
Undistributed:	
3710 Classified Programs	42,153
3720 Memorial Events	800
3730 Repairs at Fort Baker	2,500
3960 FECA Surcharge	−8,799
3970 Un-obligated Balance	−50,000
3980 CONOPS Costs	−50,000
4035 Anti-corrosion programs	1,000
4037 Utilities privatization	−9,000
4045 PACOM Infrastructure Modernization Program—transfer To OPA	−41,800
4050 EUSA command and control—transfer to OPA	−4,700
4055 USARPAC Comms equipment fielding—transfer to OPA	−3,200
4060 PACOM Infrastructure Modernization Program—transfer To OPA	−620

ARMY BUDGET JUSTIFICATION MATERIALS

The conferees recognize the importance of the budgetary management improvement process undertaken by the Under Secretary of the Army to provide more meaningful budget justification materials for future budget submissions. The conferees strongly encourage further efforts to ensure programmatic accountability, integrity, management, and oversight, which may continue to benefit from an independent third party experienced in federal assurance services to mitigate program and operational risk, and to ensure quality.

SOLDIER EQUIPMENT—ORGANIZATIONAL CLOTHING AND INDIVIDUAL EQUIPMENT

The conferees are aware that experience in Afghanistan showed once again that while the Army is continuing to invest significant sums in developing better soldier equipment, the system to get that equipment to soldiers still has major shortcomings. Consequently, the Army now estimates that its soldiers spend on average about $300 per year out of pocket to buy additional necessary equipment ranging from hydration systems to GPS receivers. Equipment shortages reported by American soldiers in Afghanistan and elsewhere include modern knee and elbow pads, hydration systems to replace canteens, GPS receivers, lensatic compasses, sunglasses, helmet pads, polypropylene underwear, assault packs, close combat optics, soldier intercoms, viper binoculars, black fleece and ''bear suits'', thermal weapons sights, body armor, and other important basic gear. In Afghanistan, some soldiers reported the loss of circulation in their arms in situations where they had to wear the new

Interceptor Body Armor with the ALICE rucksack frame or the current Load Bearing Vest instead of the MOLLE pack for which it was designed. Many Reserve Components have a far worse equipment situation. For example, soldiers from the 1–151st Infantry of the Indiana Army National Guard personally purchased radios from local discount department stores to serve as soldier intercoms for their deployment to Bosnia. With the expected increased OPTEMPO of both active and reserve forces to sustain the war on terrorism, this problem is becoming evermore acute and unacceptable.

The conferees believe the Army leadership must take a fresh look at the entire system for issuing soldier equipment. It is unacceptable for American soldiers—both active and reserve—to be deployed with anything but the best equipment the Army has developed, and it must be a priority objective to dramatically improve the situation where soldiers deploy with lower quality gear that could cost their lives. In the short term this will require more investment in the Soldier Enhancement Program, the Centralized Funding and Fielding activity, and other accounts whose purpose is to field new equipment to soldiers expeditiously. In the long term, the Army must retool its practices and procedures for equipping its soldiers, in order to field the most advanced gear faster and to more soldiers. The Secretary of the Army is directed to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by May 1, 2003 assessing and identifying the major soldier equipment shortages in all major active and reserve component units, identifying the highest priority Army-wide soldier equipment items that require higher procurement rates and faster distribution, and explaining how the Army plans to address those needs. This report shall also present the Army's plan and timetable for transforming its practices and procedures for procuring and distributing soldier equipment in order to dramatically improve the distribution of modern soldier equipment across the board to all units—both active and reserve.

NATIONAL MEMORIAL CEMETERY OF THE PACIFIC

The conferees are pleased that the Department of the Army has been able to accomplish the necessary research and coordination with the Department of Veterans Affairs in order to bring about the remarking of 178 graves at the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific, to properly denote service members killed on December 7, 1941 on United States Ships *Oklahoma, West Virginia, California, Utah, Nevada,* and *Curtis*, as well as Hickam Air Field. The Conferees understand that the new grave markers will be provided to the National Cemetery in Hawaii by approximately November 20, 2002 with the goal of replacing the 178 grave markers by December 7, 2002.

INTERNET ACCESS KOREA

The conferees direct that of the funds provided in Operation and Maintenance, Army, $2,500,000 shall be available only to accelerate the Army Knowledge Online pilot program to full implementation in order to provide access to internet and electronic mail services for soldiers stationed in the Republic of Korea.

FORT BAKER

The conference agreement provides an additional $2,500,000 to continue infrastructure repairs at Fort Baker. The accompanying bill provides authority to transfer these funds under the same terms and conditions and to the same federal recipient as specified under Operation and Maintenance, Army, in P.L. 107–117

LOWRY BOMBING RANGE

The Conferees are aware of the unique environmental clean-up measures needed at the former Lowry Bombing and Gunnery Range, and recognize the importance of expediting restoration and containment activities to permit planned development in the surrounding area to proceed without delay. The conferees encourage the Corps of Engineers to provide sufficient resources, and select appropriate clean-up and containment methodologies, in a timely manner, to ensure that the Jeep demolition range and the 20-millimeter range areas are safe for future economic, educational and recreational activities.

SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION

The conferees direct that facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization funds recommended in this bill shall provide the following program baseline in fiscal year 2003. Any adjustments directed in the bill shall be applied to this baseline:

[In thousands of dollars]

AMC	126,000
ATEC	71,888
COE	8,050
EUSA	128,000
FORSCOM	400,206
MDW	57,674
MEDCOM	28,000
MTMC	22,229
OSA	14,275
TRADOC	358,430
USAREUR	332,702
USARPAC	207,420
USARSO	9,659
USMA	57,102
Site R	3,010
Total	1,823,945

BROADWAY ARMORY PROJECT

The conferees direct the Secretary of the Army to provide funding, from within available funds under Operation and Maintenance, Army, for the Chicago Park District's Broadway Armory project, consistent with Section 8161 of Public Law 107–117.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

	(In thousands of dollars)			
	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
4250 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY				
4300 BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES				
4350 AIR OPERATIONS				
4400 MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	3,247,197	3,247,197	3,247,197	3,247,197
4450 FLEET AIR TRAINING	1,030,024	1,030,024	1,030,024	1,030,024
4500 INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	69,945	74,945	69,945	74,245
4550 AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	109,072	109,072	109,072	109,072
4600 AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	785,052	775,052	785,052	785,052
4650 AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	55,930	55,930	55,930	55,930
4800 SHIP OPERATIONS				
4850 MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	2,442,911	2,442,911	2,442,911	2,442,911
4900 SHIP OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AND TRAINING	589,655	596,655	596,655	596,655
4950 INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	406,251	406,251	406,251	406,251
5000 SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	3,536,452	3,536,452	3,536,452	3,536,452
5050 SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,324,577	1,335,277	1,349,577	1,354,477
5200 COMBAT OPERATIONS/SUPPORT				
5250 COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	424,042	424,042	424,042	424,042
5300 ELECTRONIC WARFARE	15,485	15,485	15,485	15,485
5350 SPACE SYSTEMS & SURVEILLANCE	205,001	205,001	205,001	205,001
5400 WARFARE TACTICS	166,186	166,186	186,186	183,186
5450 OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY & OCEANOGRAPHY	273,412	273,412	276,912	275,912
5500 COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	767,833	819,833	811,333	816,633
5550 EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	169,941	175,441	169,941	173,441
5600 DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,676	1,676	1,676	1,676

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
5750 WEAPONS SUPPORT				
5800 CRUISE MISSILE	162,185	162,185	162,185	162,185
5850 FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE	806,150	813,150	813,150	813,150
5900 IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	43,314	43,314	40,314	40,314
5950 WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	420,864	429,864	443,864	438,364
6200 BASE SUPPORT				
6210 FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	1,153,732	1,378,432	1,375,432	1,378,032
6220 BASE SUPPORT	2,748,739	3,002,120	2,992,620	3,000,370
6230 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	20,955,626	21,519,907	21,547,207	21,566,057
6250 BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: MOBILIZATION				
6300 READY RESERVE AND PREPOSITIONING FORCES				
6350 SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE	528,795	528,795	528,795	528,795
6400 ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS				
6450 AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	3,432	3,432	3,432	3,432
6500 SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	156,037	160,037	161,037	182,337
6550 MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS				
6600 FLEET HOSPITAL PROGRAM	25,561	29,561	29,561	29,561
6650 INDUSTRIAL READINESS	1,207	1,207	1,207	1,207
6700 COAST GUARD SUPPORT	18,759	18,759	18,759	18,759
6750 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	733,791	741,791	742,791	764,091
6800 BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING				
6850 ACCESSION TRAINING				
6900 OFFICER ACQUISITION	115,943	115,943	115,943	115,943
6950 RECRUIT TRAINING	10,413	10,413	10,413	10,413
7000 RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	83,461	85,461	83,461	85,461
7150 BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING				
7200 SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	351,114	353,114	353,114	353,114
7250 FLIGHT TRAINING	371,096	371,096	371,096	371,096
7300 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	137,801	137,801	135,801	135,801
7350 TRAINING SUPPORT	218,765	228,265	218,765	226,765

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
7500 RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION				
7550 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	257,292	257,292	257,292	257,292
7600 OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	102,643	104,503	102,643	103,643
7650 CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	75,178	75,178	75,178	75,178
7700 JUNIOR ROTC	35,358	36,358	37,358	36,358
7800 BASE SUPPORT				
7820 FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	224,764	266,764	266,764	266,764
7830 BASE SUPPORT	375,698	377,698	377,198	377,698
7850 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3	2,359,526	2,419,886	2,405,026	2,415,526
7900 BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
7950 SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT				
8000 ADMINISTRATION	669,509	665,109	673,609	667,609
8050 EXTERNAL RELATIONS	4,639	4,639	4,639	4,639
8100 CIVILIAN MANPOWER & PERSONNEL MGT	119,785	119,785	119,785	119,785
8150 MILITARY MANPOWER & PERSONNEL MGT	106,986	106,986	106,986	106,986
8200 OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	199,531	199,531	199,531	199,531
8250 SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	732,372	737,432	745,432	738,532
8450 LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT				
8500 SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	186,872	185,872	186,872	185,872
8550 PLANNING, ENGINEERING & DESIGN	393,563	382,063	378,563	381,063
8600 ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	857,646	855,646	858,446	849,446
8650 AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	464,959	452,959	464,959	459,759
8700 HULL, MECHANICAL & ELECTRICAL SUPPORT	51,399	54,299	52,299	54,099
8750 COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	43,907	43,907	43,907	43,907
8800 SPACE & ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS	59,899	60,399	60,399	60,399
8950 SECURITY PROGRAMS				
9000 SECURITY PROGRAMS	767,090	781,290	781,290	781,290
9150 SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS				
9200 INTERNATIONAL HDQTRS & AGENCIES	9,349	9,349	9,349	9,349
9210 BASE SUPPORT				
9220 FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	99,406	112,406	112,406	112,406
9230 BASE SUPPORT	212,958	214,958	212,958	213,958
9250 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	4,979,870	4,986,630	5,011,430	4,988,630

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
9280 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS UNDISTRIBUTED	---	13,064	29,400	41,664
9340 RETIREMENT ACCRUALS	-324,278	-324,278	-324,278	-324,278
9350 UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION	-7,300	-7,300	-7,300	-7,300
9390 TRAVEL OF PERSONS	---	-9,000	---	---
9400 LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL NOT ADOPTED	---	-2,100	---	-2,100
9410 NON-NMCI IT SAVINGS	---	-120,000	---	-20,000
9430 FECA SURCHARGE	---	-14,764	---	-14,764
9440 UNOBLIGATED BALANCES	---	-82,000	---	-82,000
9510 ANTI-CORROSION PROGRAMS	---	---	1,000	1,000
9520 STAINLESS STEEL SANITARY SPACES	---	---	5,000	---
9530 CINCPACFLT ULTRA-THIN CLIENT PILOT PROGRAM	---	---	---	5,000
9750 TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY	28,697,235	29,121,836	29,410,276	29,331,526

ADJUSTMENTS TO BUDGET ACTIVITIES

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

Budget Activity 1: Operating Forces:	
4500 Sea Sparrow Test Set Upgrade	4,300
4900 Continuity of Operations DERF, software licenses CNSG	5,000
4900 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—Cryptologic Direct Support	2,000
5050 Apprentice, Engineering Technician and CO-OP Program NUWC Keyport	1,400
5050 Apprentice, Engineering Technician and CO-OP Program IMF Bangor	700
5050 Improved Engineering Design Process	4,000
5050 Shipyard Apprentice Program	10,000
5050 PHNSY SRM	13,800
5400 Warfare Tactics PMRF	17,000
5450 Hydrographic Center of Excellence	2,500
5500 Continuity of Operations DERF—Office of Navy Intelligence Data Backup	2,000
5500 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—classified	1,000
5500 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—Analysts	3,000
5500 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—SCI GCCS I3	3,800
5500 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—GENSER GCCS I3	5,400
5500 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—JDIS/LOCE/CENTRIX	5,300
5500 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—CMMA	1,500
5500 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—CMMA	17,000
5500 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—JWICS Connectivity	5,500
5500 Center of Excellence for Disaster Management and Humanitarian Assistance	4,300
5550 MROD testing, repair and replacement	1,000
5550 Central Command deployable HQ spares & tech supt	2,500
5850 CT/FP DERF—Strat Security Forces & Technicians	7,000
5900 In-service Weapons Systems Support, underexecution	−3,000
5950 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—Pioneer	6,000
5950 Mark-45 Gun, 5″ Depot Overhauls	10,500
5950 Mark-245 Decoys	1,000
6210 CT/FP DERF—Site Improvement, SRM	219,200
6210 Homeland Security—Guantanamo Bay Operations	2,500
6210 NAS North Island CNAF Facility Renovation Projects	2,600
6220 CT/FP DERF—Security Forces and Technicians	143,096
6220 CT/FP DERF—Law Enforcement	32,573
6220 CT/FP DERF—Management and Planning	1,712
6220 CT/FP DERF—Shipyard Security Forces and Tech	28,000
6220 Homeland Security DERF—Base Supt Svcs—Guantanamo	38,500
6220 Critical Asset Vulnerability Assessment, Navy Region NW	1,100
6220 Northwest Environmental Resource Centers	4,200
6220 Combating Terrorism Data Base Sys (CDTS) Remote Data Repository	1,200
6220 Earle Naval Weapons Station, N.J	1,250
Budget Activity 2: Mobilization:	
6500 Ex-Oriskany Remediation, Demil and Disposal	2,800
6500 Ship Disposal Project	3,500
6500 Ship Disposal Program—James River	20,000
6600 Homeland Security—Medical Operations—Guantanamo	4,000
Budget Activity 3: Training and Recruiting:	
7000 ROTC Unit Operating Costs	2,000
7200 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—Pre-deploy Training	1,000
7200 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—Imagery Training Init	1,000
7300 NPS unjustified program growth	−2,000
7350 Center for Civil-Military Relations at NPS	1,000
7350 CNET Distance Learning	3,400
7350 Prototype System for Embedded Training and Performance Supt—CNET	1,000
7350 Navy Learning Network Program CNET	2,600
7600 Continuing Education Distance Learning	1,000
7700 Naval Sea Cadet Corps	1,000
7820 CT/FP DERF—Site Improvement	42,000
7830 CT/FP DERF—Security Forces and Tech	1,500
7830 Fire Fighter Protective Equipment Maintenance Pilot, Puget Sound Federal Fire Dept, NW Region	500
Budget Activity 4: Administration and Servicewide Activities:	
8000 CT/FP DERF—HQ Management and Planning	1,600
8000 Administration Unsupported Growth	−6,000
8000 Navy-wide PVCS Enterprise license	2,500
8250 Continuity of Opns DERF—Various/ONI Data Backup	3,000
8250 CT/FP DERF—HQ Management and Planning	3,920
8250 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—Computer Network Def	3,800
8250 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—Enclave Boundary	1,200
8250 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—Intrusion Detection	1,140
8250 Servicewide Communications	−12,000
8250 Critical Infrastructure Protection Program	5,100
8500 Servicewide Transportation	−1,000
8550 Stainless Steel Sanitary Space System	2,500
8550 Planning, Engineering and Design	−15,000
8600 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—Acquisition and PM	5,500
8600 Acquisition and Program Management	−16,000
8600 Space and Naval Warfare Info Tech Center (SITC)	1,500
8600 Naval Armory Inventory and Custody Tracking	800
8650 Air Systems Support	−8,000
8650 Configuration Management Info System (CMIS)	2,800
8700 Advanced Technical Information Support	1,800
8700 Flash Detection System	900
8800 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—Carryon Cryptologic Sys	500
9000 Continuity of Operations DERF—Various/Navy Criminal Investigations	2,00
9000 CT/FP DERF—Intel Security & Invest Matters	3,500
9000 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—HUMINT	3,700
9000 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—Counter Surveillance and Law Enforcement	5,000
9220 CT/FP DERF—Site Improvement—SRM	13,000
9230 NAS Jacksonville and NAS Mayport Anti-Corrosion Init	1,000
Undistributed:	
9280 Classified Programs	41,664
9400 Legislative Proposals Not Adopted	−2,100
9410 Non-NMCI IT Savings	−20,000
9430 FECA Surcharge	−14,764
9440 Un-obligated Balance	−82,000
9510 Anti-corrosion programs	1,000
9530 CINCPACFLT Ultra-thin Client Pilot Program	5,000

EX-ORISKANY DISPOSAL

The conferees recommend an additional $2,800,000 in Operation and Maintenance, Navy for the remediation, demilitarization and disposal of the Ex-Oriskany in the manner determined by the Secretary of the Navy to be most advantageous.

NAVAL SHIPYARD APPRENTICE PROGRAM

The conferees agree to provide an increase of $10,000,000 for the Shipyard Apprentice program. The conferees direct that during

fiscal year 2003 the Navy shall induct classes of no fewer than 125 apprentices, respectively, at each of the Naval Shipyards. The conferees further direct the Navy to include the costs of the fiscal year 2004 class of apprentices in the budget request.

NAVY PILOT HUMAN RESOURCES CALL CENTER

The conferees direct that of the funds provided in Operation and Maintenance, Navy, not less than $1,000,000 shall be made available for the Navy Pilot Human Resources Call Center, Cutler, Maine.

CASUALTY CARE RESEARCH CENTER

The conferees recommend $4,300,000 for the Center of Excellence for Disaster Management and Humanitarian Assistance (COE), of which $600,000 shall be made available for the Casualty Care Research Center.

CENTRAL KITSAP SCHOOL

The conferees included a general provision, Section 8108, that includes $2,700,000 for a grant to the Central Kitsap School District for the construction and outfitting of the Central Kitsap School special needs learning center, to meet the needs of Department of Defense special needs students at Submarine Base Bangor, Washington.

CLASSIFICATION OF VESSELS

The American Bureau of Shipping has been expressly designated in 46 U.S.C. 3316(a) as the chosen instrument of the United States Government in classifying all vessels owned by the United States Government (including those leased or bareboat chartered) and in matters related to classification. The conferees therefore note with approval Military Sealift Command's compliance with those requirements in its recent request for proposal for a high speed vessel and expect continued compliance in all subsequent procurements, excluding experimental or service unique vessels, theater-assigned assets, or as designated by the service secretary. Congress designated the American Bureau of Shipping for those purposes in furtherance of the national interest in a strong merchant marine and industrial base, and the conferees expect all government agencies to comply with 46 USC 3316(a).

NAVY MARINE CORPS INTRANET

The conferees believe that the Navy has made significant progress in establishing an adequate test plan for the Navy Marine Corps Intranet. Accordingly, the conferees have included a general provision requiring that the next NMCI decision point include an evaluation of the Operational Assessment and a certification to the congressional defense committees that the results of the assessment are acceptable for additional seat orders.

The conferees remain concerned, however, about the legacy application challenges the program faces and believe that greater attention must be paid to innovative, commercially available secure technologies and solutions to address this problem. In an NMCI Stakeholders' Council Issue Paper dated more than one year ago, CINCPACFLT proposed the exploration of using ultra thin clients as a solution to both the security and software incompatibilities certain legacy applications present to the NMCI network. To date, these recommendations have not been acted on. The conferees recommend $5,000,000 to conduct a pilot program at CINCPACFLT using ultra thin clients integrated with a network security solution previously evaluated by the National Security Agency at a Level of Trust not less than B2, and currently at a minimum Common Criteria Evaluation Assurance Level (EAL) of not less than 4.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
9900 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS				
9950 BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES				
10000 EXPEDITIONARY FORCES				
10050 OPERATIONAL FORCES	631,065	655,465	649,965	656,065
10100 FIELD LOGISTICS	289,401	289,401	289,401	289,401
10150 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	138,576	143,576	138,576	142,876
10200 BASE SUPPORT	907,624	1,165,324	1,148,824	1,160,824
10250 FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	445,582	445,582	445,582	445,582
10300 USMC PREPOSITIONING				
10350 MARITIME PREPOSITIONING	80,743	80,743	80,743	80,743
10400 NORWAY PREPOSITIONING	3,813	3,813	3,813	3,813
10450 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	2,496,804	2,783,904	2,756,904	2,779,304
10500 BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING				
10550 ACCESSION TRAINING				
10600 RECRUIT TRAINING	10,516	10,516	10,516	10,516
10650 OFFICER ACQUISITION	355	355	355	355
10700 BASE SUPPORT	65,906	65,906	65,906	65,906
10750 FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	29,122	29,122	29,122	29,122
10800 BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING				
10850 SPECIALIZED SKILLS TRAINING	40,524	40,524	40,524	40,524
10900 FLIGHT TRAINING	175	175	175	175
10950 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	8,912	8,912	8,912	8,912
11000 TRAINING SUPPORT	112,202	112,202	112,202	112,202
11050 BASE SUPPORT	80,141	80,141	80,141	80,141
11100 FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	30,144	30,144	30,144	30,144

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
11150 RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING EDUCATION				
11200 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	121,345	121,345	121,345	121,345
11250 OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	34,695	34,695	34,695	34,695
11300 JUNIOR ROTC	13,312	13,312	13,312	13,312
11350 BASE SUPPORT	15,137	15,137	15,137	15,137
11400 FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	2,507	2,507	2,507	2,507
11450 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3	564,993	564,993	564,993	564,993
11500 BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
11550 SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT				
11650 SPECIAL SUPPORT	198,890	198,890	202,390	198,890
11700 SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	34,627	34,627	34,627	34,627
11750 ADMINISTRATION	39,262	39,262	39,262	39,262
11800 BASE SUPPORT	20,438	21,438	21,438	21,438
11850 FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	2,938	2,938	2,938	2,938
11900 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	296,155	297,155	300,655	297,155
11950 RETIREMENT ACCRUALS	-47,210	-47,210	-47,210	-47,210
11960 UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION	-200	-200	-200	-200
11980 TRAVEL OF PERSONS	---	-10,000	---	---
12000 FECA SURCHARGE	---	-1,283	---	-1,283
12010 UNOBLIGATED BALANCES	---	-8,000	---	-8,000
12020 ANTI-CORROSION PROGRAMS	---	---	1,000	1,000
12300 TOTAL, OPERATION & MAIN, MARINE CORPS	3,310,542	3,579,359	3,576,142	3,585,759

ADJUSTMENTS TO BUDGET ACTIVITIES

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

Budget Activity 1: Operating Forces:	
10050 Continuity of Operations DERF—Continuity of Intel	1,000
10050 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—I-SURSS	700
10050 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—TRSS	1,000
10050 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—TCAC	500
10050 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—RREP	200
10050 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—TPC	700
10050 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—MCIA Analytic Supt	2,400
10050 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—TEG	1,000
10050 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—TROJAN Lite	1,500
10050 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—ISR	2,900
10050 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—FLAMES/CESAS	2,000
10050 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—Computer Network Def	2,000
10050 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—Secure Wireless	800
10050 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—Deployed Security Interdiction Devices	700
10050 Modular General Purpose Tent System (MGPTS)	4,200
10050 Joint Service NBC Defense Equipment Surveillance	2,400
10050 Polar Fleece shirts	1,000
10150 Depot Maintenance of Radar Systems	4,300
10200 CT/FP DERF—Physical Security Equipment	228,000
10200 CT/FP DERF—CINC AT/FP Staffs	3,200
10200 CT/FP DERF—Physical Security Upgrades	10,000
10200 Training and Support Facilities	12,000
Budget Activity 4: Administration and Servicewide Support:	
11800 Continuity of Operations DERF—Site R	1,000
Undistributed:	
12000 FECA Surcharge	−1,283
12100 Un-obligated Balance	−8,000
12020 Anti-corrosion programs	1,000

TRAINING AND SUPPORT FACILITIES

The conferees recommend an additional $12,000,000 in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps of which $7,500,000 is provided only for mission critical requirements at the Marine Air-Ground Task Force Training Center, and $4,500,000 is provided only for the seismic retrofit of buildings at Barstow Marine Corps Logistics Base.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
12450 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE				
12500 BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES				
12550 AIR OPERATIONS				
12600 PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	3,244,026	3,785,026	3,684,026	3,680,226
12650 PRIMARY COMBAT WEAPONS	336,234	336,234	336,234	336,234
12700 COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	248,367	251,867	248,367	248,367
12750 AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING	1,250,537	1,250,537	1,250,537	1,250,537
12775 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,382,953	1,382,953	1,382,953	1,384,353
12800 COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	1,465,273	1,465,273	1,461,273	1,461,273
12850 BASE SUPPORT	2,357,450	2,413,650	2,421,650	2,420,450
12900 FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	960,912	1,062,997	1,068,497	1,069,097
12950 COMBAT RELATED OPERATIONS				
13000 GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	816,000	846,830	846,800	846,800
13050 NAVIGATION/WEATHER SUPPORT	187,671	187,671	191,671	191,071
13100 OTHER COMBAT OPS SUPPORT PROGRAMS	425,618	442,418	442,418	442,418
13150 JCS EXERCISES	39,406	39,406	39,406	39,406
13200 MANAGEMENT/OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	221,692	240,542	234,542	238,842
13250 TACTICAL INTEL AND OTHER SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	251,806	265,506	265,506	265,506
13300 SPACE OPERATIONS				
13350 LAUNCH FACILITIES	281,022	281,022	281,022	281,022
13400 LAUNCH VEHICLES	133,478	133,478	133,478	133,478
13450 SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	244,626	244,626	239,626	239,626
13500 SATELLITE SYSTEMS	60,989	60,989	58,989	58,989
13550 OTHER SPACE OPERATIONS	251,191	261,191	256,191	256,191
13600 BASE SUPPORT	493,528	493,528	493,528	493,528
13650 FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	157,715	157,715	157,715	157,715
13700 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	14,810,494	15,603,459	15,494,429	15,495,129

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
13750 BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: MOBILIZATION				
13800 MOBILITY OPERATIONS				
13850 AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	2,147,117	2,147,117	2,147,117	2,147,117
13900 AIRLIFT OPERATIONS C3I	42,298	44,098	42,298	44,098
13950 MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	175,023	175,023	175,023	175,023
13975 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	312,552	312,552	312,552	312,552
14000 PAYMENTS TO TRANSPORTATION BUSINESS AREA	470,700	470,700	355,043	355,043
14050 BASE SUPPORT	527,755	559,405	556,205	556,905
14100 FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	159,896	217,150	220,150	219,750
14150 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	3,835,341	3,926,045	3,808,388	3,810,488
14200 BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING				
14250 ACCESSION TRAINING				
14300 OFFICER ACQUISITION	69,262	69,262	69,262	69,262
14350 RECRUIT TRAINING	6,879	6,879	6,879	6,879
14400 RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	68,063	68,063	68,063	68,063
14450 BASE SUPPORT (ACADEMIES ONLY)	73,180	73,180	73,180	73,180
14500 FAC SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MOD (OP FORCES)	82,672	99,013	82,672	99,013
14550 BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING				
14600 SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	307,625	307,625	307,625	307,625
14650 FLIGHT TRAINING	663,762	663,762	667,762	667,062
14700 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	141,864	141,864	136,864	136,864
14750 TRAINING SUPPORT	92,646	92,646	92,646	92,646
14775 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	8,242	8,242	8,242	8,242
14800 BASE SUPPORT (OTHER TRAINING)	573,464	574,614	574,614	574,614
14850 FAC SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MOD (OP FORCES)	160,638	160,638	176,979	160,638
14900 RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION				
14950 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	152,289	152,289	152,289	152,289
15000 EXAMINING	3,222	3,222	3,222	3,222
15050 OFF DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	96,516	96,516	96,516	96,516
15100 CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	107,151	107,151	105,151	105,151
15150 JUNIOR ROTC	43,448	43,448	43,448	43,448
15200 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3	2,650,923	2,668,414	2,665,414	2,664,714

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
15250 BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
15300 LOGISTICS OPERATIONS				
15350 LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	922,106	922,106	922,106	922,106
15400 TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	429,543	429,543	425,543	425,543
15450 SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	237,503	235,503	237,503	235,503
15475 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	78,062	78,062	78,062	78,062
15500 BASE SUPPORT	1,154,363	1,161,863	1,168,263	1,171,363
15550 FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	245,436	249,412	245,436	249,412
15600 SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
15650 ADMINISTRATION	224,882	217,882	224,882	217,882
15700 SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	376,841	375,941	385,362	376,362
15750 PERSONNEL PROGRAMS	184,558	179,558	184,558	179,558
15800 RESCUE AND RECOVERY SERVICES	110,418	110,418	110,418	110,418
15900 ARMS CONTROL	33,092	33,092	32,092	32,092
15950 OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	572,320	555,820	575,320	558,420
16000 OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	44,716	44,716	44,716	44,716
16050 CIVIL AIR PATROL CORPORATION	19,668	19,668	19,668	19,668
16100 BASE SUPPORT	276,338	277,088	280,938	277,088
16150 FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	23,816	25,816	27,792	25,816
16200 SECURITY PROGRAMS				
16250 SECURITY PROGRAMS	1,054,171	1,061,171	1,061,171	1,061,171
16300 SUPPORT TO OTHER NATIONS				
16350 INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	20,032	20,032	20,032	20,032
16400 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	6,007,865	5,997,691	6,043,862	6,005,212
16410 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS UNDISTRIBUTED	---	17,422	81,440	27,462
16470 MTAPP	---	---	6,000	4,200
16510 RETIREMENT ACCRUALS	-531,055	-531,055	-531,055	-531,055
16520 UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION	-800	-800	-800	-800
16540 TRAVEL OF PERSONS	---	-15,000	---	---
16580 FECA SURCHARGE	---	-8,717	---	-8,717
16590 AERONAUTICAL SYS CTR ENTERPRISE INFOSTRUCTURE PROTYPE	---	6,500	---	4,600
16600 THREAT REPRESENTATION AND VALIDATION (TR&V)	---	1,000	---	1,000
16610 CLASSIFIED NAIC OPERATIONALIZING MASINT	---	4,500	---	3,200
16620 INFORMATION ASSURANCE INITIATIVE	---	1,500	---	1,100

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
16630 UNOBLIGATED BALANCES	---	-33,000	---	-33,000
16640 CONOPS COSTS	---	-50,000	-50,000	-50,000
16685 ANTI-CORROSION PROGRAMS	---	---	1,000	1,000
16690 UTILITIES	---	---	-55,000	-55,000
16910 TOTAL, O&M, AIR FORCE	26,772,768	27,587,959	27,463,678	27,339,533

ADJUSTMENTS TO BUDGET ACTIVITIES

Adjustments to budget activities are as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

Budget Activity 1: Operating Forces:	
12600 CONUS Combat Air Patrol DERF—Changed Alert Posture	380,000
12600 Unmanned Aerial Vehicles DERF—Predator O&M	9,000
12600 F–16 Distributed Mission Training System	8,500
12600 B–52 Attrition Reserve	28,000
12600 B–1 Bomber modifications	7,700
12600 B–52 Engine Modification Study	3,000
12775 Oklahoma City Air Logistics Center	1,400
12800 AFSAA HQ program growth	−4,000
12850 CT/FP DERF—AEF Force Prot Certification Tng	10,200
12850 CT/FP DERF—WMD 1st Responder	46,000
12850 PACAF server consolidation	6,800
12900 CT/FP DERF—AT/FP Facilities Upgrades	99,585
12900 Wright-Patterson AFB Dormitory Renovation	1,800
12900 11th AF Range upgrades—fiber optics and power	6,800
13000 CT/FP DERF—Geo Reach/Geo Base	25,800
13000 Nuclear Posture Review DERF—Info Warfare Support	5,000
13000 Sec, Comms & Info Opps DERF—Defense Recon Supt	68,630
13000 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—Defense Recon Trans	−68,630
13050 University Partnership for Operational Support	3,400
13100 Continuity of Ops DERF—Nat'l Abn Cmd Ctr	10,000
13100 Continuity of Ops DERF—Aircraft Comms Mods	3,600
13100 Continuity of Ops DERF—UH–1 Support, NCR	700
13100 Continuity of Ops DERF—Comms Sys Operators Tng	500
13100 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—Commercial Imagery	2,000
13200 CT/FP DERF—CENTCOM PSD and Forward HQ	700
13200 CT/FP DERF—CINC AT/FP Staff	5,500
13200 Nuclear Posture Review DERF—Mgt HQ STRATCOM	1,250
13200 Nuclear Posture Review DERF—Info Warfare Supt	4,000
13200 Nuclear Posture Review DERF—Tactical Deception	1,000
13200 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—Critical Infrastructure Protection	400
13200 Management Supt for Air Force Battle Labs	4,300
13250 Continuity of Ops DERF—Combat Air Intel Sys	2,300
13250 Continuity of Ops DERF—Special Purpose Comms	2,000
13250 Continuity of Ops DERF—Tactical Info Program	5,000
13250 Sec, Comms & Info Opps DERF—SEP classified	1,200
13250 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—DCGS Architecture	3,000
13250 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—Integrated Broadcast Service	100
13250 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—IBS Smart Pull Tech	100
13450 Space Control Systems, underexecution	−5,000
13500 Satellite Systems, underexecution	−2,000
13550 Continuity of Ops DERF—Recon Supt Activities	10,000
13550 Other Space Operations, headquarters growth	−5,000
Budget Activity 2: Mobilization:	
13900 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—Critical Infrastructure Protection	1,800
14000 Transportation Business Area, program growth	−115,657
14050 CT/FP DERF—AEF Force Protection Certification Training	4,800
14050 CT/FP DERF—WMD 1st Responder	21,850
14050 Combined Air Crew System Tester (CAST)	2,500
14100 CT/FP DERF—AT/FP Facility Upgrades	57,254
14100 PACAF strategic airlift	2,600
Budget Activity 3: Training and Recruiting:	
14500 CT/FP DERF—AT/FP Facility Upgrades	16,341
14650 MBU–20/P Oxygen Mask	2,800
14650 AWACS Modeling and Simulation System	500
14700 Professional Development Education—underexecution, unjustified growth in other costs	−5,000
14800 CT/FP DERF—WMD 1st Responder	1,150
15100 Workforce Shaping—civilian manpower mispricing	−2,000
Budget Activity 4: Administration and Servicewide Activities:	
15400 Technical support activities—unjustified growth in other contracts	−4,000
15450 Servicewide Transportation	−2,000
15500 CT/FP DERF—AEF Force Protection Certification Training	2,900
15500 CT/FP DERF—WMD 1st Responder	4,600
15500 Hickam AFB Alternative Fuel Vehicle Program	1,000
15500 Eielson AFB Utilidors	8,500
15550 CT/FP DERF—AT/FP Facilities Upgrades	3,976
15650 Tanker Lease Pilot Program	3,000
15650 Administration	−10,000
15700 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—Modernization, Sustainment and Dev	4,900
15700 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—Modernization, Sustainment and Dev	1,700
15700 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—Intrusion Detect Sys	1,500
15700 Servicewide Communications	−9,000
15700 ALCOM Wide Mobile Radio Network	421
15750 Personnel Programs	−5,000
15900 Arms control, underexecution	−1,000
15950 Other Servicewide Activities	−16,500
15950 Range residue recycling program	2,600
16100 William Lehman Aviation Center	750
16150 NAIC Foreign Materials Exploitation Facility	1,000
16150 Conformable Lithography System AFIT Wright-Patterson AFB	1,000
16250 Nuclear Posture Review DERF—Security and Investigative Activities/on-line threat collection	2,000
16250 Sec, Comms & Info Opns DERF—Def Security Service	5,000
Undistributed:	
16410 Classified Programs	27,462
16480 MTAPP	4,200
16580 FECA Surcharge	−8,717
16590 Aeronautical System Center Enterprise Infostructure Prototype	4,600
16600 Threat Representation and Validation (TR&V)	1,000
16610 Classified NAIC operationalizing MASINT	3,200
16620 Information Assurance Initiative for Air Force Material Command	1,100
16630 Un-obligated Balance	−33,000
16640 CONOPS Costs	−50,000
16685 Anti-corrosion programs	1,000
16690 Utilities	−55,000

EGLIN AFB BOS SIMULATION MODEL

The conferees recommend that of the funds provided in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force, $1,000,000 shall be made available for the Eglin Air Force Base, Base Operations and Support simulation model.

COMBAT SEARCH AND RESCUE (CSAR) PLATFORM

The accompanying bill provides that of the funds made available in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force, $2,000,000 may be obligated for the deployment of Air Force active

duty and Reserve CSAR air crews to the United Kingdom to participate in an Inter-fly program to train, operate, evaluate and exchange operational techniques and procedures on the EH–101. The Air Force has identified mission deficiencies with the current CSAR platform for future requirements, which include mission reaction time, inadequate range, insufficient cabin space, poor survivability, insufficient situational awareness, and inadequate adverse weather capability. Following the Inter-fly program, the Secretary of the Air Force shall report to the congressional defense committees on the suitability of this aircraft as the future CSAR platform.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
16950 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE				
17000 BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES				
17050 JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	398,341	399,404	398,341	405,341
17100 SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	1,531,330	1,532,330	1,533,330	1,534,030
17150 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	1,929,671	1,931,734	1,931,671	1,939,371
17200 BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: MOBILIZATION				
17250 DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	41,420	41,420	41,420	41,420
17350 BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING				
17375 AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION SERVICE	11,232	11,232	11,232	11,232
17400 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	6,869	---	6,869	---
17460 DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY	103,514	108,014	103,514	107,489
17465 DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	4,865	4,865	4,865	4,865
17470 DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE	9,160	9,160	9,160	9,160
17480 DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	89,161	45,756	65,411	46,256
17490 DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE	9,889	9,889	9,889	9,889
17510 DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY	1,292	1,292	1,292	1,292
17600 SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	62,982	62,982	62,982	62,982
17650 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3	298,964	253,190	275,214	253,165
17700 BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
17725 AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION SERVICE	98,564	98,564	98,564	98,564
17750 CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS	97,006	99,506	107,006	106,756
17775 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	5,864,228	6,245,214	5,981,398	6,249,300
17800 DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	377,495	377,495	377,495	377,495
17825 DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY	1,070,567	1,070,567	1,070,567	1,070,567
17850 DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE	2,282	8,682	8,182	8,182

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
17875 DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	256,042	236,542	256,542	236,542
17900 DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	956,644	961,144	921,644	909,244
17925 DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	201,171	191,771	206,771	195,271
17950 DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY	14,385	14,385	14,385	14,385
17975 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DEPENDENTS EDUCATION	1,616,135	1,653,385	1,646,335	1,654,075
18000 DEFENSE POW /MISSING PERSONS OFFICE	15,974	15,974	15,974	15,974
18025 DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	67,927	67,927	65,927	65,927
18050 DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE	170,447	170,947	170,947	170,947
18075 DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY	273,510	314,510	273,510	308,510
18100 OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT	14,740	46,240	33,740	50,915
18125 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	499,943	679,593	614,699	599,749
18150 SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	62,885	85,885	85,885	85,885
18175 SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	68,000	68,000	68,000	68,000
18200 JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	184,483	220,642	219,642	220,042
18225 WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES	332,821	350,821	350,821	350,821
18950 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	12,245,249	12,977,794	12,588,034	12,857,151
19000 LEGACY	---	---	12,000	8,400
19005 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS UNDISTRIBUTED	---	---	-14,440	---
19010 IMPACT AID	---	35,000	30,000	30,000
19015 IMPACT AID FOR CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES	---	---	5,000	3,000
19110 RETIREMENT ACCRUALS	-346,046	-346,046	-346,046	-346,046
19150 TRAVEL OF PERSONS	---	-11,260	---	---
19210 FECA SURCHARGE	---	-6,455	---	-6,455
19220 UNOBLIGATED BALANCES	---	-25,000	---	-25,000
19245 OPERATION WALKING SHIELD	---	---	5,000	3,500
19250 NIMA COMMERCIAL IMAGERY	---	---	---	15,000
19450 TOTAL, OPERATION & MAIN, DEFENSE-WIDE	14,169,258	14,850,377	14,527,853	14,773,506

ADJUSTMENTS TO BUDGET ACTIVITIES

The adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

Budget Activity 1: Operating Forces:	
17050 (TJS—Combating Terrorism Readiness Initiative Fund (Transfer from DERF)	12,000
17050 (TJS—JCS Exercise Program	−5,000
17100 SOCOM—Hydration on the Move (Camel Bak)	1,000
17100 SOCOM—SPECWARCOM Mission Support Center	1,700
Budget Activity 3: Training and Recruiting:	
17400 Classified Programs	−6,869
17460 DAU—DCMS/IT Organizational Composition Research	1,000
17460 DAU—Distance Learning and Performance	2,975
17480 DHRA—DLAMP	−19,155
17480 DHRA—JRAP	−24,250
17480 DHRA—Joint Military Education Venture Forum	500
Budget Activity 4: Administration and Servicewide Activities:	
17750 Civil Military Program—Innovative Readiness Training	8,500
17750 Civil Military Program—Challenge Program	1,250
17775 Classified Programs	385,072
17850 DFAS—Financial Operations (Transfer from DERF)	5,900
17875 DHRA—Critical Infrastructure Protection (Transfer from DERF)	500
17875 DHRA—Civilian Personnel Data System	−20,000
17900 DISA—Secure Voice Teleconferencing System (Transfer from DERF)	2,500
17900 DISA—Defense Conferencing Enhancement Program (Transfer from DERF)	8,900
17900 DISA—DISA Continuity of Operations (Transfer from DERF)	2,500
17900 DISA—Bandwidth Expansion (Transfer from DERF)	7,600
17900 DISA—IA, Intell/Coalition Encrp (CWAN) (Transfer from DERF)	5,000
17900 DISA—IA, Intell/Coalition Encrp (CFBL) (Transfer from DERF)	1,600
17900 DISA—IA Computer Network Defense (Transfer from DERF)	3,500
17900 DISA—On-site administrators for primary sites (Transfer from DERF)	3,000
17900 DISA—White House Communications (Transfer from DERF)	3,000
17900 DISA—Wireless Priority Service Program	−73,000
17900 DISA—Travel Program Growth	−1,000
17900 DISA—CWIN Contract Savings	−1,000
17900 DISA—DISA Tier One and DERF Reductions	−10,000
17925 DLA—Critical Infrastructure Protection (Transfer from DERF)	600
17925 DLA—Information Technology Network Consolidation	−10,000
17925 DLA—PTAP	3,500
17975 DODEA—Enhanced Force Protection (Transfer from DERF)	24,200
17975 DODEA—GAVRT Project Expansion	2,550
17975 DODEA—Lewis Center for Educational Research	3,440
17975 DODEA—Family Support Services	2,500
17975 DODEA—UNI Math Teacher Leadership	1,000
17975 DODEA—Galena IDEA	4,250
18000 DSCA—Program Growth	−2,000
18050 DSS—Critical Infrastructure Protection (Transfer from DERF)	500
18075 DTRA—Chemical & Biological Defense Capabilities Assessment	1,000
18075 DTRA—Unconventional Nuclear Threat	34,000
18100 OEA—George AFB	2,125
18100 OEA—Norton AFB	2,550
18100 OEA—Bayonne Military Ocean Terminal	2,500
18100 OEA—Philadelphia Naval Business Center	3,500
18100 OEA—Cecil Field	2,500
18100 OEA—Charles Melvin Price Support Center	1,000
18100 OEA—East Bay Conversion and Reinvestment Commission Pilot	1,000
18100 OEA—CCAT	2,000
18100 OEA—Hunters Point NSY	1,400
18100 OEA—Relocate Barrow Landfill	4,000
18100 OEA—Fitzsimmons Army Hospital	6,000
18100 OEA—Port of Anchorage Intermodal Marine Facility Program	5,000
18100 OEA—Security Lighting for Platt Bridge	600
18100 OEA—Commonwealth of Pennsylvania—Reimbursement of extraordinary Quecreek Mine disaster rescue/recovery expenses	2,000
18125 OSD—OSD Continuity of Operations (COOP) (Transfer from DERF)	18,000
18125 OSD—NCR COOP (Transfer from DERF)	10,500
18125 OSD—NICP Reserve Support (Transfer from DERF)	4,000
18125 OSD—Hard and Deeply Buried Targets (Transfer from DERF)	3,050
18125 OSD—CIP—Biological Agent Security (Transfer from DERF)	2,000
18125 OSD—CIP—Nuclear Security Command and Control (Transfer from DERF)	400
18125 OSD—CIP Technology & Consequence Management (Transfer from DERF)	6,600
18125 OSD—Information Operations (Transfer from DERF)	1,500
18125 OSD—Horizontal Fusion Analysis (Transfer from DERF)	2,000
18125 OSD—CENTRIX (Transfer from DERF)	14,000
18125 OSD—Classified (Transfer from DERF)	9,500
18125 OSD—Classified Programs (Change to DERF)	52,600
18125 OSD—Program Growth	−17,000
18125 OSD—Management Headquarters	−11,600
18125 OSD—Information Technology Network Consolidation	−10,000
18125 OSD—Legacy—CSS Alabama	600
18125 OSD—Middle East Regional Security Issues Program	1,500
18125 OSD—ADUSD (MPP&R) Wearable Computers—Existing Program	3,400
18125 OSD—Commercial Technologies for Maintenance Activities (CTMA)	5,750
18125 OSD—Clara Barton Center	3,000
18125 OSD—Pacific Command Regional Initiative	5,100
18125 OSD—National Dedicated Fiber Optic Network Feasibility Study	1,250
18125 OSD—Studies and Analysis, SECDEF Study Fund	−1,200
18125 OSD—PA&E Long Range Planning	−5,300
18125 OSD—Logistics Systems Modernization	−2,000
18125 OSD—C31 Mission Analysis Fund	−4,894
18125 OSD—Intelligence Fusion Study continuation	4,250
18125 OSD—Command Information Superior Architectures	2,800
18150 SOCOM—Combat Development Activities (Transfer to DERF)	7,000
18150 SOCOM—Combat Development Activities—Classified (Change to DERF)	16,000
18200 TJS—Critical Infrastructure Protection (Transfer from DERF)	300
18200 TJS—CINC for Homeland Security (Transfer from DERF)	41,000
18200 TJS—Other Combating Terrorism Initiatives (Transfer from DERF)	1,459

18200 TJS—Vulnerability Assessments, AT/FP requirements (Transfer from DERF)	400
18200 TJS—Program Growth	−12,000
18200 TJS—Counter Terrorism Analysis Method for Adaptive Threats	1,000
18200 TJS—NDU XXI	3,400
18225 WHS—Classified Program (Transfer from DERF)	28,000
18225 WHS—Information Technology Network Consolidation	−10,000
Undistributed:	
19000 Legacy	8,400
19010 Impact Aid	30,000
19015 Impact Aid for Children with Disabilities	3,000
19210 FECA Reduction	−6,455
19220 Un-obligated Balance	−25,000
19245 Operation Walking Shield	3,500
19250 NIMA Commercial Imagery	15,000

LEGACY

The conference agreement provides $8,400,000 for continuation of the Legacy program. From within these funds, the conferees direct the Department to continue naval archaeology programs in the Lake Champlain basin. Of equal importance to the conferees are the reclamation of the C.S.S. *Alabama*, the recovery and preservation of the U.S.S. *Monitor*, the U.S.S. *Constitution* Museum, the Graveyard of the Atlantic Museum, the U.S.S. *Massachusetts* and other naval vessels of Battleship Cove, the preservation of the cruiser *Olympia* of the Independence Seaport Museum, the preservation of the LST 325 in the Port of Mobile and restoration of the Lincoln Cottage of the Armed Forces Retirement Home. The Undersecretary of Defense (Comptroller) shall report to the Appropriations Committees no later than March 15, 2003, on the allocation of Legacy funding, and the status of the projects named above.

MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY INITIATIVES

The conferees are aware of Department of Defense data showing that the leading cause of death and serious injury for all military personnel is motor vehicle crashes as opposed to training accidents or combat. Between fiscal year 2001 and the first 10 months of fiscal year 2002, Department of Defense data show fatalities among military personnel in motor vehicle crashes have increased by 35 percent—from 191 to 258. Fiscal year 2002 would appear to be the highest motor vehicle fatality rate for military personnel in at least four years, with the Marine Corps experiencing an especially high death rate compared to the other services. The Marine Corps reports that of the 25 Marines killed in motor vehicle crashes in fiscal year 2001 and 46 killed in fiscal year 2002, well over half were not wearing seat belts. During the Thanksgiving holiday period, law enforcement officials across the nation will conduct special seat belt enforcement activities as part of the U.S. Department of Transportation Click It Or Ticket program. The conferees strongly encourage the Secretary of Defense to direct all services to join the Marine Corps in actively participating in this program and other similar seat belt usage efforts throughout the year. The Secretary is directed to submit a report to the congressional defense committees within 90 days of enactment of this Act summarizing personal motor vehicle safety statistics of each service for the last five fiscal years and outlining the plans of each service to increase efforts to reduce the level of deaths and injuries suffered by its personnel from motor vehicle accidents.

DLAMP

The conferees remain concerned about the focus and management of the Defense Leadership and Management Program (DLAMP). Though during fiscal year 2002 DLAMP restructured, the outcome of the restructure is unclear and the full costs of the program are poorly defined. The Department needs to insure that the restructured program is more mission-oriented, focused, efficient, and effective. Additionally, the conferees direct that any reductions to this program cannot be applied to the leased facility in Southbridge, Massachusetts.

STARBASE

The conferees are aware of the high demand and strong support for the STARBASE civil-military program that has reached over 200,000 youths and their families at 39 locations. The conferees urge the Department to strengthen its management of this program in line with the recommendations made in the STARBASE program annual report. The conferees direct the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by no later than March 1, 2003 summarizing the status of implementing program improvements in the areas of systematic assessment, core curriculum, host service component regulations, STARBASE resource/training center, startup program standardization, and quality control.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
19500 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE				
19510 BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES				
19520 LAND FORCES 19530 DIVISION FORCES	16,323	16,323	20,323	19,123
19540 CORPS COMBAT FORCES	33,211	33,211	33,211	33,211
19550 CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	281,583	281,583	281,583	281,583
19560 ECHELON ABOVE CORPS FORCES	128,348	128,348	128,348	128,348
19570 LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	461,173	461,173	461,173	461,173
19630 LAND FORCES READINESS 19640 FORCES READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	115,962	119,962	115,962	117,962
19650 LAND FORCES SYSTEM READINESS	62,255	93,755	93,755	95,255
19660 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	48,451	48,451	48,451	48,451
19670 LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT 19680 BASE SUPPORT	361,907	412,607	412,607	412,777
19690 FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	176,494	176,494	176,494	176,494
19700 ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	2,712	2,712	2,712	2,712
19900 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	1,688,419	1,774,619	1,774,619	1,777,089
19950 BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
19960 ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES 19980 ADMINISTRATION	48,752	48,752	43,752	43,752
19990 SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	34,842	37,242	37,242	37,242
20000 PERSONNEL/FINANCIAL ADMIN (MANPOWER MGT)	50,044	50,044	50,044	50,044
20010 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	101,273	101,273	101,273	101,273
20075 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	234,911	237,311	232,311	232,311
20150 RETIREMENT ACCRUALS	-43,220	-43,220	-43,220	-43,220
20160 ADDITIONAL MILITARY TECHNICIANS	---	8,000	---	4,000
20700 TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE	1,880,110	1,976,710	1,963,710	1,970,180

ADJUSTMENTS TO BUDGET ACTIVITIES

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

Budget Activity 1: Operating Forces:	
19530 Division Forces/ECWCS	2,800
19640 Forces Readiness Operations Support/Controlled Humidity Preservation	2,000
19650 Land Forces System Readiness/Homeland Security DERF Transfer—Enhanced Secure Communications	5,900
19650 Land Forces System Readiness/Homeland Security DERF Transfer—Enhanced Secure Communications	25,600
19650 Land Forces System Readiness/Information Operations Sustainment	1,500
19680 Base Support/CT–FP DERF Transfer—Access Control Program	20,000
19680 Base Support/Homeland Security DERF Transfer—Enhanced Secure Communications	30,700
19680 Base Support/Salute our Services Pilot Project	170
Budget Activity 4: Administration and Servicewide Activities:	
19980 Administration/Headquarters Program Growth	−5,000
19990 Servicewide Communications/Homeland Security DERF Transfer—Enhanced Secure Communications	2,400
Other Adjustments:	
20160 Additional Military Technicians	4,000

SECURE WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY

The conferees recommend that of the funds requested in the Defense Emergency Response Fund and transferred to Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve, for enhanced secure communications, $4,500,000 may be available to increase the availability of current generation NSA-approved secure nationwide digital cell phones to meet urgent service needs. Furthermore, the conferees believe that significant development opportunities have arisen in this area since the submission of the budget request. An accelerated research and development investment strategy could realize advancements that would greatly benefit all defense community users of this technology. The conferees direct the Department to consider accelerating the National Security Agency's continued development of secure cellular wireless technology and multi-band functionality. To accomplish this the conferees would be supportive of a reprogramming of $10,000,000 to support development of a more robust secure nationwide cellular capability with multi-band functionality.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
20850 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE				
20900 BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES				
20950 RESERVE AIR OPERATIONS 21000 MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	398,320	398,320	398,320	398,320
21100 INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	18,003	18,003	18,003	18,003
21150 AIR OPERATION AND SAFETY SUPPORT	2,268	2,268	2,268	2,268
21200 AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	129,532	134,532	129,532	132,032
21250 AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPS SUPPORT	366	366	366	366
21400 RESERVE SHIP OPERATIONS 21450 MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	68,219	68,219	68,219	68,219
21500 SHIP OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AND TRAINING	558	558	558	558
21550 INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	11,712	11,712	11,712	11,712
21600 SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	80,272	80,272	80,272	80,272
21650 SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	3,535	3,535	3,535	3,535
21700 RESERVE COMBAT OPERATIONS SUPPORT 21800 COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	69,864	69,864	69,864	69,864
21950 RESERVE WEAPONS SUPPORT 22000 WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	5,668	5,668	5,668	5,668
22020 BASE SUPPORT 22030 FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	66,599	135,926	135,376	135,926
22040 BASE SUPPORT	146,119	146,367	146,367	146,367
22090 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	1,001,035	1,075,610	1,070,060	1,073,110

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
22100 BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
22150 ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
22200 ADMINISTRATION	12,023	12,023	12,023	12,023
22250 CIVILIAN MANPOWER & PERSONNEL	2,161	2,161	2,161	2,161
22300 MILITARY MANPOWER & PERSONNEL	32,479	32,479	32,479	32,479
22350 SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	111,766	116,766	116,766	116,766
22400 COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEM	5,766	5,766	5,766	5,766
22450 OTHER SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT	731	731	731	731
22600 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	164,926	169,926	169,926	169,926
22670 RETIREMENT ACCRUALS	-6,227	-6,227	-6,227	-6,227
23150 TOTAL, OPERATION & MAIN, NAVY RESERVE	1,159,734	1,239,309	1,233,759	1,236,809

Adjustments to Budget Activities

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

Budget Activity 1: Operating Forces:	
21200 Aircraft Depot Maintenance	2,500
22030 Facilities Sustainment, Restoration and Modernization/CT-FP DERF Transfer-- Physical Security Site Improvement	68,777
22030 Facilities Sustainment, Restoration and Modernization/Grissom Navy Reserve Center Renovation	550
22040 Base Support/CT-FP DERF Transfer-- Management and Planning	61
22040 Base Support/CT-FP DERF Transfer-- Management and Planning	187
Budget Activity 4: Administration and Servicewide Activities:	
22350 Servicewide Communications/HS DERF Transfer—Continuity of Operations	5,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

	(In thousands of dollars)			
	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
23300 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE				
23350 BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES				
23400 MISSION FORCES 23450 OPERATING FORCES	80,723	80,723	80,723	80,723
23500 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	12,571	12,571	12,571	12,571
23550 BASE SUPPORT	29,473	29,473	29,473	29,473
23600 TRAINING SUPPORT	20,641	20,641	20,641	20,641
23650 FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	10,785	10,785	10,785	10,785
23700 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	154,193	154,193	154,193	154,193
23750 BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
23800 ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES 23850 SPECIAL SUPPORT	8,461	8,461	8,461	8,461
23900 SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	500	500	500	500
23950 ADMINISTRATION	9,977	9,977	9,977	9,977
24000 BASE SUPPORT	4,130	4,130	4,130	4,130
24050 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	8,271	8,271	8,271	8,271
24100 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	31,339	31,339	31,339	31,339
24200 INITIAL ISSUE	---	4,000	---	2,000
24600 TOTAL, O&M, MARINE CORPS RESERVE	185,532	189,532	185,532	187,532

Adjustments to Budget Activities

Adjustment to the budget activities is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

Other Adjustments:	
24200 Initial Issue	2,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
24750 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE				
24800 BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES				
24850 AIR OPERATIONS				
24900 PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	1,346,055	1,346,055	1,346,055	1,346,055
24950 MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	69,818	69,818	69,818	69,818
24970 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	337,113	342,113	337,113	339,613
25000 BASE SUPPORT	282,280	297,230	297,230	297,230
25050 FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	48,463	54,665	54,665	54,665
25150 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	2,083,729	2,109,881	2,104,881	2,107,381
25200 BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
25250 ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
25300 ADMINISTRATION	57,136	61,136	61,136	61,136
25350 MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	24,088	24,088	24,088	24,088
25400 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	18,683	18,683	18,683	18,683
25450 OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	6,593	6,593	6,593	6,593
25500 AUDIOVISUAL	688	688	688	688
25520 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	107,188	111,188	111,188	111,188
25630 RETIREMENT ACCRUALS	-55,365	-55,365	-55,365	-55,365
25650 UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION	-100	-100	-100	-100
25950 TOTAL, O&M, AIR FORCE RESERVE	2,135,452	2,165,604	2,160,604	2,163,104

Adjustments to Budget Activities

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

Budget Activity 1: Operating Forces:	
24970 Depot Maintenance	2,500
25000 Base Support/CT-FP DERF Transfer—WMD First Responders Program	14,950
25050 Facilities Sustainment, Restoration and Modernization/CT-FP DERF Transfer--Facility Upgrades	6,202
Budget Activity 4: Administration and Servicewide Activities:	
25300 Administration/Command Server Consolidation	4,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
26100 OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD				
26120 BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES				
26140 LAND FORCES				
26180 DIVISIONS	592,730	592,730	602,480	599,830
26200 CORPS COMBAT FORCES	652,895	652,895	649,895	649,895
26220 CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	313,967	313,967	313,967	313,967
26240 ECHELON ABOVE CORPS FORCES	516,742	516,742	516,742	516,742
26260 LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	48,443	48,443	48,443	48,443
26280 LAND FORCES READINESS				
26320 FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	75,746	75,746	75,746	75,746
26340 LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	107,925	107,925	107,925	107,925
26350 LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	178,733	178,733	178,733	178,733
26360 AZUR BLUE CANNON BORE CLEANING SYSTEM	---	1,000	---	1,000
26370 LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT				
26420 BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	561,967	706,667	561,967	696,667
26440 FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	363,571	363,571	366,571	366,571
26460 MANAGEMENT & OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	420,329	420,329	555,029	420,329
26480 MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES	46,673	46,673	47,568	47,568
26580 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	3,879,721	4,025,421	4,025,066	4,023,416

(In thousands of dollars)

		Budget	House	Senate	Conference
26600	BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
26620	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
26660	STAFF MANAGEMENT	104,409	104,409	104,409	104,409
26680	INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	15,565	16,565	21,565	20,765
26720	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	52,259	52,259	52,259	52,259
26740	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	84,868	84,868	84,868	84,868
26760	TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	257,101	258,101	263,101	262,301
26810	RETIREMENT ACCRUALS	-87,255	-87,255	-87,255	-87,255
26820	ANGEL GATE ACADEMY	---	2,000	---	2,500
26830	NATIONAL EMERGENCY AND DISASTER INFORMATION CENTER	---	3,000	---	2,600
26840	EMERGENCY SPILL RESPONSE	---	---	500	500
26850	DISTRIBUTED LEARNING PROJECT	---	---	50,000	30,000
26890	JOINT TRAINING AND EXPERIMENTATION PROGRAM	---	4,000	---	3,400
26940	RURAL ACCESS TO BROADBAND TECHNOLOGY	---	2,500	---	2,100
26960	ADDITIONAL MILITARY TECHNICIANS	---	11,300	11,300	11,300
26970	NATIONAL GUARD GLOBAL EDUCATION PROJECT	---	500	---	500
26980	ALL TERRAIN MILITARY UTILITY VEHICLE	---	3,100	---	2,170
26990	NORTHEAST CTR FOR HOMELAND SECURITY FEASIBILITY STUDY	---	1,500	---	1,000
27000	COURSEWARE TO EDUCATE IT MANAGERS	---	2,000	---	1,700
27010	INFORMATION ASSURANCE	---	1,500	---	1,275
27030	WMD RESPONSE ELEMENT ADV LAB INTEGRATED TRAINING AND I	---	2,000	---	1,700
27050	COLD WEATHER CLOTHING	---	300	---	300
27055	NATIONAL GUARD YOUTH CHALLENGE AT CAMP MINDEN	---	---	1,700	---
27057	SE REGIONAL TERRORISM TRAINING	---	---	2,000	1,200
27060	LOUISIANA NG TERRORISM TRAINING	---	2,000	---	---
27070	COMMUNICATOR EMERGENCY NOTIFICATION SYSTEM	---	---	---	1,000
27350	TOTAL, O & M, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD	4,049,567	4,231,967	4,266,412	4,261,707

ADJUSTMENTS TO BUDGET ACTIVITIES

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

Budget Activity 1: Operating Forces:	
26180 Divisions/ECWCS	4,200
26180 Divisions/Homeland Security Training, Camp Gruber	2,900
26200 Corps Combat Forces/Unjustified Growth for Other Purchases	−3,000
26360 Azure Blue Cannon Bore Cleaning System	1,000
26420 Base Operations Support/Homeland Security DERF Transfer—Long-Haul Communications	86,200
26420 Base Operations Support/Homeland Security DERF Transfer—General Communications	48,500
26440 Facilities Sustainment, Restoration and Modernization/1st Bn, 118th Infantry Brigade Rifle Range	3,000
26480 Miscellaneous Activities/Distributed Battle Simulation Program Support	895
Budget Activity 4: Administration and Servicewide Activities:	
26680 Information Management/Interoperable Automation Continuity of Operations	1,000
26680 Information Management/Information Operations	4,200
Other Adjustments:	
26820 Angel Gate Academy	2,500
26830 National Emergency and Disaster Information Center	2,600
26840 Emergency Spill Response	500
26850 Distributed Learning Project	30,000
26890 Joint Training and Experimentation Program	3,400
26940 Rural Access to Broadband Technology	2,100
26960 Additional Military Technicians	11,300
26970 National Guard Global Education Project	500
26980 All Terrain Military Utility Vehicle	2,170
26990 Northeast Center for Homeland Security Feasibility Study	1,000
27000 Courseware to Educate IT Managers	1,700
27010 Information Assurance	1,275
27030 WMD Response Element Advanced Laboratory Integrated Training and Indoctrination	1,700
27050 Cold Weather Clothing	300
27057 Southeast Regional Terrorism Training	1,200
27070 Communicator Emergency Notification Center	1,000

INFORMATION ASSURANCE

The conferees recommend $1,275,000 for information assurance only for a local community education agency in a collaborative information effort with the Software Engineering Institute.

SECURE WIRELESS TECHNOLOGY CAPABILITY

The conferees remain concerned that the Army National Guard lacks a near-term capability or plan to ensure a secure cellular phone capability for use in the event of a domestic emergency. Accordingly, the conferees direct the Director of the Army National Guard to report to the congressional defense committees within 30 days of enactment of this legislation on its plans to achieve that objective and would be supportive of a reprogramming to increase this capability.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
27500 OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD				
27550 BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES				
27600 AIR OPERATIONS				
27650 AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	2,637,374	2,637,374	2,641,374	2,640,174
27700 MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	341,385	341,385	341,385	341,385
27750 BASE SUPPORT	407,751	407,751	407,751	407,751
27800 FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	164,228	204,243	202,243	203,243
27850 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	565,224	570,224	565,224	567,724
27900 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	4,115,962	4,160,977	4,157,977	4,160,277
27950 BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
28050 ADMINISTRATION	24,871	24,871	29,871	28,371
28100 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	10,128	10,128	10,128	10,128
28110 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	34,999	34,999	39,999	38,499
28160 NATIONAL GUARD STATE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM	---	1,000	---	1,000
28170 PROJECT ALERT	---	2,750	---	1,375
28200 RETIREMENT ACCRUALS	-88,416	-88,416	-88,416	-88,416
28215 DEFENSE SUPPORT EVALUATION GROUP	---	---	4,000	2,800
28230 UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION	-100	-100	-100	-100
28250 SURVEYING TRAINING SYSTEMS	---	1,000	---	1,000
28260 INSTRUMENT LANDING SYSTEM AT RICKENBACKER	---	500	---	500
28270 COLD WEATHER CLOTHING	---	300	---	300
28280 MEDICAL EQUIPMENT	---	---	---	350
28550 TOTAL, O&M, AIR NATIONAL GUARD	4,062,445	4,113,010	4,113,460	4,117,585

ADJUSTMENTS TO BUDGET ACTIVITIES

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

Budget Activity 1: Operating Forces:	
27650 Aircraft Operations/ECWCS	2,800
27800 Facilities, Sustainment, Restoration and Modernization/CT–FP DERF Transfer—Facility Upgrades	38,015
27800 Facilities, Sustainment, Restoration and Modernization/Key Field Facility Renovation	1,000
27850 Depot Maintenance	2,500
Budget Activity 4: Administration and Servicewide Activities:	
28050 Administrastion/Information Operations	3,500
Other Adjustments:	
28160 National Guard State Partnership Program	1,000
28170 Project Alert	1,375
28215 Defense Support Evaluation Group	2,800
28250 Surveying Training Systems	1,000
28260 Instrument Landing System at Rickenbacker ANG Base	500
28270 Cold Weather Clothing	300
28280 Medical Equipment	350

OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND

The conference agreement provides $5,000,000 for the Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES

The conference agreement provides $9,614,000 for the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY

The conference agreement provides $395,900,000 for Environmental Restoration, Army.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY

The conference agreement provides $256,948,000 for Environmental Restoration, Navy.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE

The conference agreement provides $389,773,000 for Environmental Restoration, Air Force.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

The conference agreement provides $23,489,000 for Environmental Restoration, Defense-Wide.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, FORMERLY USED DEFENSE SITES

The conference agreement provides $246,102,000 for Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites, instead of $212,102,000 as proposed by the House and $252,102,000 as proposed by the Senate.

OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AID

The conference agreement provides $58,400,000 for Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid.

FORMER SOVIET UNION THREAT REDUCTION

The conference agreement provides $416,700,000 for the Former Soviet Union Threat Reduction program.

SUPPORT FOR INTERNATIONAL SPORTING COMPETITIONS, DEFENSE

The conference agreement provides $19,000,000 for the Support for International Sporting Competitions, Defense account.

DEFENSE EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND

The conference agreement provides amounts approved for those items requested in the Defense Emergency Response Fund in the appropriation accounts and lime items identified by the Department.

TITLE III – PROCUREMENT

The conference agreement is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
SUMMARY				
ARMY				
AIRCRAFT	2,061,027	2,214,369	2,249,389	2,285,574
MISSILES	1,642,296	1,112,772	1,585,672	1,096,548
WEAPONS, TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES	2,248,558	2,248,358	2,242,058	2,266,508
AMMUNITION	1,159,426	1,207,560	1,258,599	1,253,099
OTHER	5,168,453	6,017,380	5,783,439	5,874,674
TOTAL, ARMY	12,279,760	12,800,439	13,119,157	12,776,403
NAVY				
AIRCRAFT	8,203,955	8,682,655	8,849,955	8,812,855
WEAPONS	1,832,617	2,384,617	1,856,617	1,868,517
AMMUNITION	1,015,152	1,167,130	1,169,152	1,165,730
SHIPS	8,191,194	8,127,694	9,151,393	9,032,837
OTHER	4,347,024	4,631,299	4,500,710	4,612,910
MARINE CORPS	1,288,383	1,369,383	1,357,383	1,388,583
TOTAL, NAVY	24,878,325	26,362,778	26,885,210	26,881,432
AIR FORCE				
AIRCRAFT	12,067,405	12,492,730	13,085,555	13,137,255
MISSILES	3,575,162	3,185,439	3,364,639	3,174,739
AMMUNITION	1,133,864	1,290,764	1,281,864	1,288,164
OTHER	10,523,946	10,622,660	10,628,958	10,672,712
TOTAL, AIR FORCE	27,300,377	27,591,593	28,361,016	28,272,870
DEFENSE-WIDE	2,688,515	3,457,405	2,958,285	3,444,455
NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT	---	---	130,000	100,000
DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES	73,057	73,057	73,057	73,057
TOTAL PROCUREMENT	67,220,034	70,285,272	71,526,725	71,548,217

PROCUREMENT OF SECURITY VEHICLES

The conferees are concerned about the justification provided for the procurement of physical security vehicles. The services' budget requests provide little explanation for the number of vehicles requested or the fluctuation in costs from one year to the next. In fact, the current budget request presents a disparity in costs by service ranging from $180,000 to $250,000 per physical security vehicle. The conferees believe that a better presentation of the request for procurement of these vehicles is necessary. Accordingly, the conferees direct the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) to be the central coordinator of all budget justification material for physical security vehicle procurement. The Under Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a separate consolidated justification that clearly explains each service's requirement and the maximum purchase cost authority requested.

NATIONAL IMAGERY AND MAPPING AGENCY (NIMA)

NFIP/JMIP CONSOLIDATION

The House included language directing that all NIMA funding be consolidated within the National Foreign Intelligence Program (NFIP) account. The Senate did not include such language. In response to the House direction, the Secretary of Defense stated that he is working with the Director of Central Intelligence (DCI) to determine that most efficient resource strategy for NIMA and is committed to revising the NIMA budget appropriately in the fiscal year 2004 President's Budget Request. The conferees appreciate the commitment of the Secretary of Defense on this matter, and on the basis of this commitment, the House recedes.

SUPPORT TO SMALL BUSINESS

The conferees recognize the importance of small business to the Department's procurement chain. In order to effectively compete in federal procurement processes, small businesses require proficiency in electronic commerce and electronic business practices. As such, the conferees recommend the Department seek innovative methods for providing support to small business supply providers in these areas and full funding of the Supply Chain Management program.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY				
AIRCRAFT				
FIXED WING				
UTILITY F/W (MR) AIRCRAFT	---	---	15,200	8,300
ROTARY				
UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP)	153,361	242,561	249,661	269,916
UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP) (AP-CY)	26,859	26,859	26,859	26,859
HELICOPTER NEW TRAINING	---	9,600	9,600	9,600
TOTAL, AIRCRAFT	180,220	279,020	301,320	314,675
MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT				
GUARDRAIL MODS (TIARA)	9,229	14,229	14,229	14,229
ARL MODS (TIARA)	20,873	20,873	20,873	20,873
AH-64 MODS	93,622	96,902	159,622	136,902
CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS	382,061	387,061	385,061	385,761
CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS (AP-CY)	21,185	71,185	21,185	64,535
UTILITY/CARGO AIRPLANE MODS	16,954	16,954	16,954	16,954
OH-58 MODS	460	460	460	460
AIRCRAFT LONG RANGE MODS	744	744	744	744
LONGBOW	865,781	865,781	865,781	865,781
LONGBOW (AP-CY)	29,713	29,713	29,713	29,713
UH-60 MODS	41,863	45,363	50,863	52,463
KIOWA WARRIOR	42,406	42,406	42,406	42,406
AIRBORNE AVIONICS	97,003	97,003	97,003	97,003
GATM ROLLUP	70,414	71,914	70,414	71,514
SPARE PARTS (AIR)	7,697	7,697	7,697	7,697
TOTAL, MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT	1,700,005	1,768,285	1,783,005	1,807,035

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES				
GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS				
AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT	---	---	6,000	3,100
OTHER SUPPORT				
AIRBORNE COMMAND & CONTROL	27,738	10,000	---	2,200
AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	7,494	11,494	11,494	11,494
COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT	18,091	18,091	20,091	19,591
AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS	15,215	15,215	15,215	15,215
AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	64,410	64,410	64,410	64,410
INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	704	704	704	704
LAUNCHER, 2.75 ROCKET	2,677	2,677	2,677	2,677
AIRBORNE COMMUNICATIONS	44,473	44,473	44,473	44,473
TOTAL, SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES	180,802	167,064	165,064	163,864
TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY	2,061,027	2,214,369	2,249,389	2,285,574

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
[In thousands of dollars]

P-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
1	**UTILITY F/W (MR) AIRCRAFT**	**0**	**0**	**15,200**	**8,300**
	2 UC-35 aircraft		0	+15,200	+8,300
2	**UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP)**	**153,361**	**242,561**	**249,661**	**269,916**
	UH-60L AR (Note: only to complete fielding of D Company and A Company, 158 Aviation Regiment)		+34,000		+28,900
	HH-60L MEDEVAC		+40,200		+51,255
	UH-60L Blackhawk Flight Simulator (Note: only for a flight simulator for the 18th Airborne Corps that includes state-of-the-art image generators and motion queuing devices)		+15,000		+15,000
	Blackhawk helicopters			+96,300	+21,400
4	**HELICOPTER NEW TRAINING**	**0**	**9,600**	**9,600**	**9,600**
	TH-67 Creek		+9,600	+9,600	+9,600
5	**GUARDRAIL MODS (TIARA)**	**9,229**	**14,229**	**14,229**	**14,229**
	Guardrail Mods (TIARA)--Transfer from DERF		+5,000	+5,000	+5,000
7	**AH-64 MODS**	**93,622**	**96,902**	**159,622**	**136,902**
	Oil Debris Detection and Burn-off System		+2,000		+1,000
	Integrated Helmet and Display Sights for MO ARNG		+1,280		+1,280
	Apache engine spares			+64,000	+40,000
	Bladefold kits			+2,000	+1,000
8	**CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS**	**382,061**	**387,061**	**382,061**	**385,761**
	CH-47 Voice and Data Recorders		+5,000		+3,700
9	**CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS (AP-CY)**	**21,185**	**71,185**	**24,185**	**64,535**
	CH-47F Upgrade Program		+45,000		+39,100
	CH-47 crashworthy crew seats		+5,000	+1,000	+4,250
	Voice and data recorders			+2,000	0
17	**UH-60 MODS**	**41,863**	**45,363**	**50,863**	**52,463**
	Crashworthy Fuel Tanks--Active/ARNG		+3,500		+1,800
	Army NG Pacific CSAR Modifications			+3,000	+2,600
	Oregon NG CSAR Modifications				+2,000
	DCS-HUMS			+6,000	+4,200
22	**GATM ROLLUP**	**70,414**	**71,914**	**70,414**	**71,514**
	Longbow Photo Reconnaissance Intel Strike Module (PRISM)		+1,500		+1,100

P-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
24	**AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT**	**0**	**0**	**6,000**	**3,100**
	Laser detecting sets			+6,000	+3,100
26	**AIRBORNE COMMAND & CONTROL**	**27,738**	**10,000**	**0**	**2,200**
	Realignment to RDTE, Army PE 604818A		-17,738	-10,000	-17,738
	System not ready for LRIP			-17,738	-7,800
27	**AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT**	**7,494**	**11,494**	**11,494**	**11,494**
	AN/AVS-6 Goggles		+4,000	+4,000	+4,000
28	**COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT**	**18,091**	**18,091**	**20,091**	**19,591**
	HELO Maintenance Work Platform System (Note: only for the National Guard)		0	+2,000	+1,500

UH–60 BLACKHAWK HELICOPTERS

The conference agreement includes $269,916,000 to procure 19 UH–60 Blackhawk helicopters. This is an increase of $116,555,000, providing for an additional seven aircraft. Of the additional aircraft in the conference agreement, two UH–60L aircraft are available only for the Army Reserve as described in House Report 107–532. Of the additional aircraft, three shall be HH–60L Medical Evacuation (MEDEVAC) models available only for units of the Army National Guard, and two aircraft shall be UH–60L models available only for units of the Army National Guard.

CH–47F UPGRADE PROGRAM RESTRUCTURING

The conferees agree to provide an additional $39,100,000 to facilitate the restructuring of the CH–47F Chinook helicopter upgrade program. Given the critical importance of this improved helicopter to the Army's Objective Force, these funds should be used to facilitate a program restructuring in order to upgrade the full fleet of helicopters (which is currently 465) at the most efficient economic rate, which the conferees believe is between 36 and 48 helicopters per year. The Army is directed to ensure that out-year budgetary and program plans are implemented to meet 100 percent of the Army's CH–47F Objective Force helicopter requirement by no later than 2016.

ATIRCM

The conferees agree not to rescind $3,000,000 for ATIRCM as recommended by the House. These funds should have been reprogrammed to USSOCOM when responsibility for this program was moved to USSOCOM. The conferees direct the Army to expeditiously submit a reprogramming to the Congress in order to properly realign these funds to Procurement, Defense-Wide.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY				
OTHER MISSILES				
SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM				
PATRIOT SYSTEM SUMMARY	471,670	---	471,670	---
STINGER SYSTEM SUMMARY	30,893	30,893	25,893	25,893
AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM				
HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY	184,396	184,396	184,396	184,396
ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYSTEM				
JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY	250,506	223,052	250,506	223,052
LINE OF SIGHT ANTI-TANK (LOSAT) SYSTEM SUM	17,937	17,937	---	---
GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS)	29,698	29,698	44,698	37,198
MLRS REDUCED RANGE PRACTICE ROCKETS (RRPR)	15,924	15,924	15,924	15,924
MLRS LAUNCHER SYSTEMS	141,131	137,131	137,131	137,131
HIMARS LAUNCHER	128,402	128,402	133,402	130,902
ARMY TACTICAL MSL SYS (ATACMS) - SYS SUM	9,050	9,050	9,050	29,050
ATACMS BLKII SYSTEM SUMMARY	49,687	23,287	---	---
TOTAL, OTHER MISSILES	1,329,294	799,770	1,272,670	783,546
MODIFICATION OF MISSILES				
MODIFICATIONS				
PATRIOT MODS	151,307	151,307	151,307	151,307
STINGER MODS	1,492	1,492	1,492	1,492
ITAS/TOW MODS	59,962	59,962	59,962	59,962
MLRS MODS	31,734	31,734	31,734	31,734
TOTAL, MODIFICATION OF MISSILES	244,495	244,495	244,495	244,495

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	55,924	55,924	55,924	55,924
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES				
AIR DEFENSE TARGETS	3,408	3,408	3,408	3,408
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (MISSILES)	907	907	907	907
MISSILE DEMILITARIZATION	4,895	4,895	4,895	4,895
PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT	3,373	3,373	3,373	3,373
TOTAL, SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES	12,583	12,583	12,583	12,583
TOTAL, MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY	1,642,296	1,112,772	1,585,672	1,096,548

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
[In thousands of dollars]

P-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
1	**PATRIOT SYSTEM SUMMARY**	**471,670**	**0**	**471,670**	**0**
	Transfer of PAC-3 Program to MDA		-471,670		-471,670
	Command Launch System			-25,000	0
	Additional Missiles			+25,000	0
2	**STINGER SYSTEM SUMMARY**	**30,893**	**30,893**	**25,893**	**25,893**
	Program Cost Growth		0	-5,000	-5,000
5	**JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY**	**250,506**	**223,052**	**250,506**	**223,052**
	Quantity Reduction		-27,454		-27,454
6	**LINE OF SIGHT ANTI-TANK (LOSAT) SYSTEM SUM**	**17,937**	**17,937**	**0**	**0**
	Premature Procurement		0	-17,937	-17,937
9	**GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS)**	**29,698**	**29,698**	**44,698**	**37,198**
	Additional Missiles		0	+15,000	+7,500
11	**MLRS LAUNCHER SYSTEMS**	**141,131**	**137,131**	**137,131**	**137,131**
	Reduce Programmed Growth		-4,000		0
	Contract Savings			-4,000	-4,000
12	**HIMARS LAUNCHER**	**128,402**	**128,402**	**133,402**	**130,902**
	Additional Launchers		0	+5,000	+2,500
13	**ARMY TACTICAL MSL SYS (ATACMS) - SYS SUM**	**9,050**	**9,050**	**9,050**	**29,050**
	ATACMS Blk 1A Missiles (Note: only for the upgrade of Block IA missiles to the Quick Reaction Unitary variant--Transfer from DERF.)				+20,000
14	**ATACMS BLKII SYSTEM SUMMARY**	**49,687**	**23,287**	**0**	**0**
	Engineering Services/Production Engineering Support		-26,400		0
	Program Delay/Restructure			-49,687	-49,687

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS & TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY				
TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES				
ABRAMS TRNG DEV MOD	5,504	5,504	5,504	5,504
BRADLEY BASE SUSTAINMENT	397,053	457,053	395,253	444,903
BRADLEY FVS TRAINING DEVICES (MOD)	8,532	8,532	8,532	8,532
ABRAMS TANK TRAINING DEVICES	12,061	12,061	12,061	12,061
INTERIM ARMORED VEHICLE (IAV) FAMILY	811,831	772,031	788,031	788,031
MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES				
CARRIER, MOD	60,305	50,305	39,405	39,405
FIST VEHICLE (MOD)	6,966	6,966	6,966	6,966
MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP, FIST VEHICLE	692	692	692	692
BFVS SERIES (MOD)	35,033	35,033	70,033	60,033
HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD)	17,361	17,361	17,361	17,361
FAASV PIP TO FLEET	2,944	2,944	2,944	2,944
IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88 MOD)	50,311	50,311	50,311	50,311
ARMORED VEH LAUNCH BRIDGE (AVLB) (MOD)	10,021	10,021	10,021	10,021
M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD)	191,413	179,213	191,413	179,213
SYSTEM ENHANCEMENT PGM: SEP M1A2	123,697	123,697	122,697	122,697
ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM	376,268	376,268	376,268	376,268
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES				
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (TCV-WTCV)	146	146	146	146
PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV)	9,900	9,900	9,900	9,900
TOTAL, TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES	2,120,038	2,118,038	2,107,538	2,134,988

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES				
ARMOR MACHINE GUN, 7.62MM M240 SERIES	21,334	17,134	21,334	17,134
MACHINE GUN, 5.56MM (SAW)	---	6,000	---	3,000
GRENADE LAUNCHER, AUTO, 40MM, MK19-3	16,663	16,663	16,663	16,663
81MM MORTAR (ROLL)	9,821	9,821	9,821	9,821
M16 RIFLE	3,104	3,104	3,104	3,104
XM107, CAL .50, SNIPER RIFLE	8,913	8,913	8,913	8,913
5.56 CARBINE M4	9,155	9,155	9,155	9,155
MOD OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEH				
MARK-19 MODIFICATIONS	2,743	2,743	2,743	2,743
M4 CARBINE MODS	9,267	9,267	9,267	9,267
SQUAD AUTOMATIC WEAPON (MOD)	4,119	4,119	4,119	4,119
M119 MODIFICATIONS	4,852	4,852	4,852	4,852
MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (WOCV-WTCV)	817	817	817	817
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES				
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (WOCV-WTCV)	1,265	1,265	1,265	1,265
PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV)	5,832	5,832	5,832	5,832
INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	3,246	3,246	9,246	7,446
SMALL ARMS (SOLDIER ENH PROG)	1,954	1,954	1,954	1,954
TOTAL, WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES	103,085	104,885	109,085	106,085
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS (WTCV)	25,435	25,435	25,435	25,435
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY	2,248,558	2,248,358	2,242,058	2,266,508

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
[In thousands of dollars]

P-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
2	**BRADLEY BASE SUSTAINMENT**	**397,053**	**457,053**	**395,253**	**444,903**
	Bradley "AO" to "A2ODS"		+60,000		+51,000
	Excessive growth: unit fielding costs			-1,300	-1,300
	Excessive growth: engineering support			-5,000	-5,000
	Electronic obsolesence reduction			+4,500	+3,150
8	**INTERIM ARMORED VEHICLE (IAV) FAMILY**	**811,831**	**772,031**	**788,031**	**788,031**
	Transfer to Research & Development (MGS)		-39,800		0
	Transfer to R&D, Army for MGS			-23,800	-23,800
10	**CARRIER, MOD**	**60,305**	**50,305**	**39,405**	**39,405**
	Reduce Programmed Growth		-10,000		0
	Excessive growth: program management			-4,500	-4,500
	Track (T-150): buying ahead of need			-16,400	-16,400
13	**BFVS SERIES (MOD)**	**35,033**	**35,033**	**70,033**	**60,033**
	Bradley reactive armor		0	+35,000	+25,000
19	**M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD)**	**191,413**	**179,213**	**191,413**	**179,213**
	Reduce Programmed Growth		-12,200		-12,200
21	**SYSTEM ENHANCEMENT PGM: SEP M1A2**	**123,697**	**123,697**	**122,697**	**122,697**
	Excessive growth: unit cost		0	-1,000	-1,000
26	**ARMOR MACHINE GUN, 7.62MM M240 SERIES**	**21,334**	**17,134**	**21,334**	**17,134**
	Reduce Programmed Growth		-4,200		-4,200
27	**MACHINE GUN, 5.56MM SAW**	**0**	**6,000**	**0**	**3,000**
	M249 Squad Automatic Weapon		+6,000		+3,000
44	**INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS**	**3,246**	**3,246**	**9,246**	**7,446**
	Arsenal support program initiative		0	+6,000	+4,200

M113 Carrier Modifications

The Department of Defense's budget request for this program contained funding only for the fielding of current M113A3s and the purchase of new T-150 track to be used by the Counter Attack Corps. Unfortunately, the budget request contained no funding for upgrades of the M113A2 to the more modern, more survivable A3 variant. While the conferees support the Army's desire to fund those technologies and systems that best support the Army's goal of transformation, the conferees believe our current front line soldiers should not be denied the benefits of modern technology already in the industrial base. Therefore, in addition to funds requested for fielding current M113A3s, the conferees direct that up to $15,000,000 be used only for M113 upgrades.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or Senate is as follows:

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
	(In thousands of dollars)			
PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY				
AMMUNITION				
SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION				
CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES	89,870	103,175	99,175	101,975
CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES	15,975	18,174	18,174	18,174
CTG, 9MM, ALL TYPES	13,508	17,508	13,508	16,508
CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES	50,575	58,696	58,596	58,596
CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES	33,087	72,087	33,087	67,237
CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES	9,795	9,795	9,795	9,795
CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES	71,703	61,672	77,072	69,572
MORTAR AMMUNITION				
60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	31,696	31,696	31,696	31,696
81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	3,582	5,982	7,582	6,782
CTG, MORTAR, 120MM, ALL TYPES	50,425	50,425	63,425	56,925
TANK AMMUNITION				
CTG TANK 105MM: ALL TYPES	14,100	8,100	14,100	8,100
120MM TANK TRAINING, ALL TYPES	154,963	154,963	154,963	154,963
CTG, TANK, 120MM TACTICAL, ALL TYPES	43,254	43,254	43,254	43,254
ARTILLERY AMMUNITION				
CTG ARTY 75MM BLANK M337A1	4,201	4,201	4,201	4,201
CTG ARTY 105MM ILLUM M314 SERIES	5,208	5,208	5,208	5,208
CTG ARTY 105MM HE M1 W/O FUZE	25,200	26,837	26,837	26,837
PROJECTILE 155 MILLIMETER DP BASEBLED M864 P7	22,300	11,300	22,300	14,300
PROJ ARTY 155MM HE M107	30,200	32,700	31,200	32,450
MODULAR ARTILLERY CHARGE SYSTEM (MACS), ALL T	122,411	122,411	122,411	122,411

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
ARTILLERY FUZES				
ARTILLERY FUZES, ALL TYPES	69,180	69,180	69,180	69,180
MINES				
MINE, TRAINING, ALL TYPES	12,661	12,661	4,000	4,000
WIDE AREA MUNITIONS	12,466	---	---	---
ROCKETS				
BUNKER DEFEATING MUNITION (BDM)	7,795	12,795	12,795	12,795
ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES	22,400	22,400	62,400	52,400
OTHER AMMUNITION				
DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	28,001	33,001	30,001	31,901
GRENADES, ALL TYPES	37,552	40,773	40,773	40,773
SIGNALS, ALL TYPES	11,935	12,881	12,881	12,881
SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES	3,942	3,942	3,942	3,942
MISCELLANEOUS				
AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES	7,953	7,953	7,953	7,953
NON-LETHAL AMMUNITION, ALL TYPES	5,890	5,890	5,890	5,890
CAD/PAD ALL TYPES	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	8,739	9,041	9,041	9,041
AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT	4,792	4,792	7,792	6,292
FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO)	5,836	5,836	5,836	5,836
CLOSEOUT LIABILITIES	10,017	10,017	10,017	10,017
TOTAL, AMMUNITION	1,046,012	1,094,146	1,123,885	1,126,685
AMMUNITION PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT				
PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT				
PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	42,655	42,655	43,955	43,655
LAYAWAY OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	6,990	6,990	6,990	6,990
MAINTENANCE OF INACTIVE FACILITIES	9,082	9,082	9,082	9,082
CONVENTIONAL AMMO DEMILITARIZATION	50,030	50,030	60,030	55,030
ARMS INITIATIVE	4,657	4,657	14,657	11,657
TOTAL, AMMUNITION PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT	113,414	113,414	134,714	126,414
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY	1,159,426	1,207,560	1,258,599	1,253,099

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
[In thousands of dollars]

P-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
1	**CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES**	**89,870**	**103,175**	**99,175**	**101,975**
	CTG, 5.56mm, All Types--Transfer from DERF		+9,305	+9,305	+9,305
	Lake City Production Line Upgrades		+4,000	0	+2,800
2	**CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES**	**15,975**	**18,174**	**18,174**	**18,174**
	CTG, 7.62mm, All Types--Transfer from DERF		+2,199	+2,199	+2,199
3	**CTG, 9MM, ALL TYPES**	**13,508**	**17,508**	**13,508**	**16,508**
	9mm Ammunition		+4,000	0	+3,000
4	**CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES**	**50,575**	**58,696**	**58,596**	**58,596**
	CTG, .50 Cal, All Types--Transfer from DERF		+4,021	+4,021	+4,021
	.50 Caliber SLAP		+4,100	+4,000	+4,000
6	**CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES**	**33,087**	**72,087**	**33,087**	**67,237**
	Bradley Tracer Ammunition M793 Training Rounds		+15,000	0	+12,750
	M919		+24,000	0	+21,400
8	**CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES**	**71,703**	**61,672**	**77,072**	**69,572**
	CTG, 40mm, All Types (Training)--Transfer from DERF		+5,369	+5,369	+5,369
	Reduce Programmed Growth		-15,400	0	-7,500
10	**81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES**	**3,582**	**5,982**	**7,582**	**6,782**
	81MM M821A1 High Explosive Mortar Shells		+2,400		+1,200
	81MM Mortar, Infrared M816			+4,000	+2,000
11	**CTG, MORTAR, 120MM, ALL TYPES**	**50,425**	**50,425**	**63,425**	**56,925**
	White Phosphorous Facility Equipment		0	+13,000	+6,500
12	**CTG TANK 105MM: ALL TYPES**	**14,100**	**8,100**	**14,100**	**8,100**
	Reduce Programmed Growth		-6,000	0	-6,000
20	**CTG ARTY 105MM HE M1 W/O FUZE**	**25,200**	**26,837**	**26,837**	**26,837**
	CTG Arty 105mm HE M1 w/o Fuze (Training)--Transfer from DERF		+1,637	+1,637	+1,637
21	**PROJECTILE 155 MILLIMETER DP BASEBLED M864 P7**	**22,300**	**11,300**	**22,300**	**14,300**
	Reduce Programmed Growth--DPICM		-11,000	0	-8,000
24	**PROJ ARTY 155MM HE M107**	**30,200**	**32,700**	**31,200**	**32,450**
	155mm M485 Illuminating Rounds-Projectile		+2,500		+1,250
	Additional funding			+1,000	+1,000
27	**MINE, TRAINING, ALL TYPES**	**12,661**	**12,661**	**4,000**	**4,000**
	Wide Area Munition Trainers		0	-8,661	-8,661
29	**WIDE AREA MUNITIONS**	**12,466**	**0**	**0**	**0**
	Program Termination		-12,466	-12,466	-12,466

P-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
30	**BUNKER DEFEATING MUNITION (BDM)**	**7,795**	**12,795**	**12,795**	**12,795**
	SMAW-D (Bunker Defeat Munition)		+5,000	+5,000	+5,000
31	**ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES**	**22,400**	**22,400**	**62,400**	**52,400**
	Additional funding		0	+40,000	+30,000
32	**DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES**	**28,001**	**33,001**	**30,001**	**31,901**
	Linear Charges HE M58A4		+5,000		+2,500
	MDI Demolition Initiators			+2,000	+1,400
33	**GRENADES, ALL TYPES**	**37,552**	**40,773**	**40,773**	**40,773**
	Grenades, All Types (Training)--Transfer from DERF		+3,221	+3,221	+3,221
34	**SIGNALS, ALL TYPES**	**11,935**	**12,881**	**12,881**	**12,881**
	Signals, All Types (Training)--Transfer from DERF		+946	+946	+946
39	**ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION**	**8,739**	**9,041**	**9,041**	**9,041**
	Items Less than $5 million (Training)--Transfer from DERF		+302	+302	+302
40	**AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT**	**4,792**	**4,792**	**7,792**	**6,292**
	Additional funding		0	+3,000	+1,500
43	**PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES**	**42,655**	**42,655**	**43,955**	**43,655**
	Munitions Enterprise Technology Insertion (METI)		0	+1,300	+1,000
46	**CONVENTIONAL AMMO DEMILITARIZATION**	**50,030**	**50,030**	**60,030**	**55,030**
	Additional funding		0	+10,000	+5,000
47	**ARMS INITIATIVE**	**4,657**	**4,657**	**14,657**	**11,657**
	Additional funding		0	+10,000	+7,000

Hydra Rockets

The conferees strongly urge the Army to ensure that adequate funding is included in the fiscal year 2004-2009 Program Objectives Memorandum to sustain the industrial production base for Hydra Rockets until the Advanced Precision Kill Weapons System (APKWS) is in production in the fiscal year 2005-2006 timeframe.

Bradley Fighting Vehicle Ammunition

The conferees strongly urge the Army to ensure that adequate funding is included in the fiscal year 2004-2009 Program Objectives Memorandum to sustain the industrial production base for Bradley IFV KE rounds until a new round is in production in the fiscal year 2005-2006 timeframe.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or Senate is as follows:

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
	(In thousands of dollars)			
OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY				
TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES				
TACTICAL VEHICLES				
TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS	8,690	12,190	12,190	12,190
SEMITRAILERS, FLATBED	39,095	39,095	39,095	39,095
SEMITRAILERS, TANKERS	7,862	7,862	7,862	7,862
HI MOB MULTI-PURP WHLD VEH (HMMWV)	196,783	204,783	261,783	240,783
TRUCK, DUMP, 20T (CCE)	17,079	17,079	17,079	17,079
FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)	681,373	681,373	656,373	681,373
FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMEN	21,047	21,297	31,047	28,047
FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)	242,768	252,768	242,068	241,568
ARMORED SECURITY VEHICLES (ASV)	14,438	14,438	19,438	17,438
TRUCK, TRACTOR, LINE HAUL, M915/M916	50,829	50,829	50,829	50,829
TOWING DEVICE, 5TH WHEEL	2,005	2,005	2,005	2,005
TRUCK, TRACTOR, YARD TYPE, M878 (C/S)	4,884	4,884	4,884	4,884
HVY EXPANDED MOBILE TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SERV P	119,854	119,854	144,854	137,354
MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP	73,320	73,320	73,320	73,320
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (TAC VEH)	4,979	4,979	4,979	4,979
NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES				
HEAVY ARMORED SEDAN	581	11,281	581	581
PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	295	295	295	295
NONTACTICAL VEHICLES, OTHER	1,753	1,753	1,753	1,753
TOTAL, TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES	1,487,635	1,520,085	1,570,435	1,561,435
COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT				
COMM - JOINT COMMUNICATIONS				
COMBAT IDENTIFICATION PROGRAM	---	---	1,000	1,000
JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM)	6,120	6,120	6,120	6,120

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
COMM - SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS				
DEFENSE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM (SPAC	89,806	89,806	89,806	89,806
SHF TERM	33,166	24,866	18,166	24,866
SAT TERM, EMUT (SPACE)	2,641	9,641	2,641	8,641
NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE)	27,510	27,510	27,510	27,510
SMART-T (SPACE)	24,467	24,467	---	12,267
SCAMP (SPACE)	1,559	1,559	1,559	1,559
GLOBAL BRDCST SVC - GBS	11,402	11,402	11,402	11,402
MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT)	11,002	11,002	11,002	11,002
COMM - C3 SYSTEM				
ARMY GLOBAL CMD & CONTROL SYS (AGCCS)	21,149	21,149	21,149	21,149
COMM - COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS				
ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (DATA RADIO)	74,835	74,835	74,835	74,835
SINCGARS FAMILY	30,141	69,241	52,241	64,141
TRACTOR CAGE	4,112	4,112	4,112	4,112
JOINT TACTICAL AREA COMMAND SYSTEMS	869	3,869	869	2,369
ACUS MOD PROGRAM	75,905	82,905	105,905	102,905
COMMS-ELEC EQUIP FIELDING	12,924	17,924	18,624	21,874
SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM COMM/ELECTRONICS	6,114	14,114	6,114	11,714
COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR (CSEL)	16,879	16,879	11,879	11,879
MEDICAL COMM FOR CBT CASUALTY CARE (MC4)	4,975	4,975	4,975	4,975
COMM - INTELLIGENCE COMM				
CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE	1,755	1,755	1,755	1,755
INFORMATION SECURITY				
TSEC - ARMY KEY MGT SYS (AKMS)	10,150	10,150	10,150	10,150
INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP	39,055	67,755	62,755	66,755
COMM - LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS				
TERRESTRIAL TRANSMISSION	2,040	2,040	2,040	2,040
BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS	36,725	40,725	44,419	46,419
ARMY DISN ROUTER	6,039	6,039	6,039	6,039
ELECTROMAG COMP PROG (EMCP)	461	461	461	461
WW TECH CON IMP PROG (WWTCIP)	2,991	2,991	2,991	2,991
COMM - BASE COMMUNICATIONS				
INFORMATION SYSTEMS	279,592	459,592	427,992	406,092

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS)	26,829	26,829	26,829	26,829
LOCAL AREA NETWORK (LAN)	127,244	127,244	127,244	127,244
PENTAGON INFORMATION MGT AND TELECOM	14,501	14,501	14,501	14,501
ELECT EQUIP - NAT FOR INT PROG (NFIP) FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PROG (FCI)	1,624	1,624	1,624	1,624
GENERAL DEFENSE INTELL PROG (GDIP)	20,258	20,258	20,258	20,258
ELECT EQUIP - TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA) ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYS (ASAS) (TIARA)	57,886	62,886	57,886	60,886
JTT/CIBS-M (TIARA)	4,824	4,824	4,824	4,824
PROPHET GROUND (TIARA)	20,226	35,226	35,226	35,226
TUAV	84,290	95,290	105,290	101,790
ARMY COMMON GROUND STATION (CGS)	8,620	8,620	8,620	8,620
DIGITAL TOPOGRAPHIC SPT SYS (DTSS) (TIARA)	14,089	14,089	14,089	14,089
TACTICAL EXPLOITATION SYSTEM (TIARA)	17,576	17,576	17,576	17,576
DISTRIBUTED COMMON GRND SYSTEM (DCGS) (JMIP)	2,617	11,617	11,617	11,617
TROJAN (TIARA)	4,873	4,873	4,873	4,873
MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (TIARA)	1,655	1,655	1,655	1,655
CI HUMINT INFO MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (CHIMS) (TIA	9,735	9,735	9,735	9,735
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (TIARA)	3,675	8,175	8,175	8,175
ELECT EQUIP - ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) SHORTSTOP	---	6,000	---	3,000
COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES	2,310	4,310	2,310	4,010
ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL SURV (TAC SURV) FAAD GBS	31	31	31	31
SENTINEL MODS	26,519	26,519	46,519	40,519
NIGHT VISION DEVICES	60,475	60,475	57,775	55,975
LONG RANGE ADVANCED SCOUT SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	49,927	49,927	49,927	49,927
LTWT VIDEO RECON SYSTEM (LWVRS)	14,318	14,318	---	14,318
NIGHT VISION, THERMAL WPN SIGHT	52,071	52,071	52,071	52,071
COMBAT IDENTIFICATION / AIMING LIGHT	---	---	---	7,000
ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP	5,402	5,402	5,402	5,402
MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (MMS)	346	346	346	346
MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (MVS)	272	272	272	272
PROFILER	4,875	4,875	4,875	4,875

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SURV)	33,283	33,283	33,283	33,283
FORCE XXI BATTLE CMD BRIGADE & BELOW (FBCB2)	65,294	72,294	65,294	93,794
LIGHTWEIGHT LASER DESIGNATOR/RANGEFINDER (LLD	8,962	10,962	8,962	9,962
MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM	29,794	29,794	29,794	29,794
INTEGRATED MET SYS SENSORS (IMETS) - TIARA	7,230	7,230	7,230	7,230
ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS				
TACTICAL OPERATIONS CENTERS	42,332	42,332	42,332	42,332
ADV FA TAC DATA SYS / EFF CTRL SYS (AFATDS/EC	74,723	79,723	74,723	77,223
MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP, AFATDS	2,976	2,976	2,976	2,976
LIGHT WEIGHT TECNICAL FIRE DIRECTION SYS (LWT	12,413	12,413	12,413	12,413
CMBT SVC SUPT CONTROL SYS (CSSCS)	24,989	24,989	24,989	24,989
FAAD C2	24,779	24,779	24,779	24,779
AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS (AMD	9,750	9,750	9,750	9,750
FORWARD ENTRY DEVICE / LIGHTWEIGHT FED (FED/L	15,125	15,125	15,125	15,125
STRIKER FAMILY	28,543	28,543	32,043	30,293
LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS)	924	924	924	924
LOGTECH	7,701	7,701	7,701	7,701
TC AIMS II	11,496	11,496	11,496	11,496
GUN LAYING AND POS SYS (GLPS)	159	159	159	159
ISYSCON EQUIPMENT	31,366	31,366	31,366	31,366
JOINT NETWORK MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (JNMS)	6,868	6,868	6,868	6,868
TACTICAL INTERNET MANAGER	11,842	11,842	11,842	11,842
MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)	7,584	7,584	7,584	7,584
STAMIS TACTICAL COMPUTERS (STACOMP)	61,304	51,304	51,304	61,304
STANDARD INTEGRATED CMD POST SYSTEM	29,535	29,535	29,535	29,535
ELECT EQUIP - AUTOMATION				
ARMY TRAINING MODERNIZATION	19,233	19,233	19,233	19,233
AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP	156,546	176,046	219,746	219,496
RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS)	68,273	68,273	78,273	76,773
ELECT EQUIP - AUDIO VISUAL SYS (A/V)				
AFRTS	2,523	2,523	2,523	2,523
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (A/V)	5,756	5,756	5,756	5,756
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (SURVEYING EQUIPMENT)	1,002	1,002	1,002	1,002

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
ELECT EQUIP - SUPPORT				
PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E)	417	417	417	417
TOTAL, COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT	2,274,174	2,623,674	2,587,483	2,672,018
OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT				
SMOKE & OBSCURANT FAMILY: SOF (NON AAO ITEM)	25,953	25,953	25,953	25,953
BRIDGING EQUIPMENT				
TACTICAL BRIDGING	57,604	57,604	57,604	57,604
TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON	51,237	51,237	55,237	54,037
ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT				
DISPENSER, MINE M139	1,822	1,822	1,822	1,822
GRND STANDOFF MINE DETECTION SYSTEM (GSTAMIDS	17,425	19,425	22,425	20,925
WIDE AREA MUNITIONS (REMOTE CONTROL UNIT)	3,223	---	---	---
EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPMT)	10,965	10,965	10,965	10,965
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION, COUNTERMINE EQUIP	686	686	686	686
COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
HEATERS AND ECU'S	14,824	14,824	14,824	14,824
LAUNDRIES, SHOWERS AND LATRINES	32,399	32,399	32,399	32,399
FLOODLIGHT SET, ELEC, TRL MTD, 3 LIGHTS	498	498	498	498
SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT	2,488	2,488	2,488	2,488
LIGHTWEIGHT MAINTENANCE ENCLOSURE (LME)	7,730	7,730	7,730	8,730
AUTHORIZED STOCKAGE LIST MOBILITY SYSTEM (ASL	2,838	2,838	2,838	2,838
FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT	21,177	23,777	21,177	23,377
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (ENG SPT EQ)	7,918	7,918	7,918	7,918
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (CSS EQ)	---	4,000	---	3,400
PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT				
QUALITY SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT	7,522	7,522	7,522	7,522
DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER	35,280	35,280	35,280	35,280
INLAND PETROLEUM DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	12,364	12,364	12,364	12,364
WATER EQUIPMENT				
WATER PURIFICATION SYSTEMS	18,204	18,204	18,204	18,204
MEDICAL EQUIPMENT				
COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL	21,003	28,003	35,003	36,603

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT				
SHOP EQ CONTACT MAINTENANCE TRK MTD (MYP)	12,870	12,870	12,870	12,870
WELDING SHOP, TRAILER MTD	5,082	5,082	5,082	5,082
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (MAINT EQ)	1,075	6,075	1,075	5,575
CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT				
GRADER, ROAD MTZD, HVY, 6X4 (CCE)	3,854	8,854	3,854	7,354
SCRAPERS, EARTHMOVING	7,989	11,989	7,989	11,489
DISTR, WATER, SP MIN 2500G SEC/NON-SEC	---	4,000	---	2,500
MISSION MODULES - ENGINEERING	19,236	19,236	26,236	24,136
COMPACTOR	299	299	299	299
LOADERS	25,365	25,365	25,365	25,365
HYDRAULIC EXCAVATOR	300	300	300	300
DEPLOYABLE UNIVERSAL COMBAT EARTH MOVERS	299	299	299	299
TRACTOR, FULL TRACKED	14,950	14,950	14,950	14,950
CRANES	16,333	16,333	16,333	16,333
CRUSHING/SCREENING PLANT, 150 TPH	4,495	4,495	4,495	4,495
PLANT, ASPHALT MIXING	2,006	2,006	2,006	2,006
HIGH MOBILITY ENGINEER EXCAVATOR (HMEE)	5,014	5,014	5,014	5,014
CONST EQUIP ESP	9,567	9,567	9,567	9,567
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (CONST EQUIP)	12,880	12,880	12,880	12,880
RAIL FLOAT CONTAINERIZATION EQUIPMENT				
LOGISTIC SUPPORT VESSEL (LSV)	---	3,000	8,100	11,100
CAUSEWAY SYSTEMS	29,673	29,673	29,673	29,673
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (FLOAT/RAIL)	3,563	3,563	3,563	3,563
GENERATORS				
GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP	79,180	79,180	79,180	79,180
MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT				
ROUGH TERRAIN CONTAINER HANDLER (RTCH)	49,065	49,065	49,065	49,065
ALL TERRAIN LIFTING ARMY SYSTEM	21,963	26,963	21,963	25,463
MHE EXTENDED SERVICE PROGRAM (ESP)	2,304	2,304	2,304	2,304
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (MHE)	495	495	495	495
TRAINING EQUIPMENT				
COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS (CTC) SUPPORT	54,493	54,493	54,493	54,493
TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM	111,682	134,682	162,482	160,782

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER	52,472	52,472	52,472	52,472
AVIATION COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (AVCA	35,915	35,915	35,915	35,915
TEST MEASURE AND DIG EQUIPMENT (TMD)				
CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT	16,366	16,366	16,366	16,366
INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE)	59,596	59,596	59,596	68,096
TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD)	16,782	16,782	16,782	16,782
ARMY DIAGNOSTICS IMPROVEMENT PGM (ADIP)	7,982	17,982	7,982	7,982
OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3)	227,402	571,902	327,402	302,402
BASE LEVEL COM'L EQUIPMENT	12,297	14,297	12,297	12,297
MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA-3)	49,181	49,181	49,181	49,181
PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH)	2,522	2,522	2,522	2,522
SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING	14,311	24,311	14,311	24,311
MA8975	4,256	43,356	43,356	43,356
TOTAL, OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	1,346,274	1,813,251	1,571,051	1,586,751
SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS				
INITIAL SPARES - C&E	59,694	59,694	53,794	53,794
INITIAL SPARES - OTHER SUPPORT EQUIP	676	676	676	676
TOTAL, SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS	60,370	60,370	54,470	54,470
TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY	5,168,453	6,017,380	5,783,439	5,874,674

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
[In thousands of dollars]

P-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
1	**TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS**	**8,690**	**12,190**	**12,190**	**12,190**
	M871A3 22.5 Ton Drop Deck Platform Trailer Army		+3,500	+3,500	+3,500
5	**HI MOB MULTI-PURP WHLD VEH (HMMWV)**	**196,783**	**204,783**	**261,783**	**240,783**
	M1114 Up-Armored HMMWV			+50,000	+27,000
	M1114 Up-Armored HMMWV for ARNG		+6,000		+6,000
	M1114 Up-Armored HMMWV for AR		+2,000		+2,000
	Additional Vehicles for NG			+7,500	+4,500
	Additional Vehicles for Reserve			+7,500	+4,500
7	**FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)**	**681,373**	**681,373**	**656,373**	**681,373**
	Cost Savings/Program Support Growth		0	-25,000	0
8	**FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT**	**21,047**	**21,297**	**31,047**	**28,047**
	Portable Firefighting Equipment/Army Watercraft (Note: only to enhance Army watercraft firefighting capabilities)		+250		0
	Tactical Firefighting Equipment			+10,000	+7,000
9	**FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)**	**242,768**	**252,768**	**242,068**	**241,568**
	Movement Tracking System (MTS) FHTV for Army Reserve		+10,000		+8,500
	Driver Simulators			-9,700	-9,700
	Movement Tracking System (MTS)			+9,000	0
10	**ARMORED SECURITY VEHICLES (ASV)**	**14,438**	**14,438**	**19,438**	**17,438**
	Additional Vehicles		0	+5,000	+3,000
14	**HVY EXPANDED MOBILE TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SERV PROGRAM**	**119,854**	**119,854**	**144,854**	**137,354**
	Additional Vehicles		0	+25,000	+17,500
18	**HEAVY ARMORED SEDAN**	**581**	**11,281**	**581**	**581**
	Heavy Armored Sedan--Transfer from DERF		+10,700		0
21	**COMBAT IDENTIFICATION PROGRAM**	**0**	**0**	**1,000**	**1,000**
	Quick Fix Program (Note: only for the purchase of cloth thermal identification panels)		0	+1,000	+1,000
24	**SHF TERM**	**33,166**	**24,866**	**18,166**	**24,866**
	STAR-T		-8,300		-8,300
	Program Restructure			-15,000	0
25	**SAT TERM, EMUT (SPACE)**	**2,641**	**9,641**	**2,641**	**8,641**
	AN/PCS-5 Spitfire Radio		+7,000		+6,000
27	**SMART-T (SPACE)**	**24,467**	**24,467**	**0**	**12,267**
	Program Delays		0	-24,467	-12,200

P-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
33	**SINCGARS FAMILY**	**30,141**	**69,241**	**52,241**	**64,141**
	SINCGARS Family--Transfer from DERF		+22,100	+22,100	+22,100
	AN/GRM-122 SINCGARS Radio Test Kits		+2,000		+1,400
	SINCGARS Radios		+15,000		+10,500
35	**JOINT TACTICAL AREA COMMAND SYSTEMS**	**869**	**3,869**	**869**	**2,369**
	Electronics Sustainment Center--Upgrades of AYD-1 Communications		+3,000		+1,500
36	**ACUS MOD PROGRAM**	**75,905**	**82,905**	**105,905**	**102,905**
	AN/UXC-10 Digital Facsimile (TS-21 Blackjack)		+7,000		+6,000
	AN/TTC Single Shelter Switches			+30,000	+21,000
37	**COMMS-ELEC EQUIP FIELDING**	**12,924**	**17,924**	**18,624**	**21,874**
	Improved High Frequency Radio		+5,000		+4,500
	USARPAC Equipment Fielding--Transfer from Operation and Maintenance			+3,200	+3,200
	Virtual Patch Crisis Communication Coordination			+2,500	+1,250
38	**SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM COMM/ELECTRONICS**	**6,114**	**14,114**	**6,114**	**11,714**
	DISM, Army Digitization (Integration of DISM with SINCGARS Radio nets)		+8,000		+5,600
39	**COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR (CSEL)**	**16,879**	**16,879**	**11,879**	**11,879**
	Program Delays		0	-5,000	-5,000
43	**INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP**	**39,055**	**67,755**	**62,755**	**66,755**
	Information System Security Programs (ISSP)--Transfer from DERF		+26,700		+26,700
	Secure Terminal Equipment (STE)		+2,000		+1,000
	Transfer from DERF			+13,700	0
	Secure Terminal Equipment--Transfer from DERF			+10,000	0
45	**BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS**	**36,725**	**40,725**	**44,419**	**46,419**
	Upgrades of the Telecommunications Infrastructure-Ft. Monmouth		+4,000		+2,000
	AK Wide Mobile Radio Program			+7,694	+7,694
49	**INFORMATION SYSTEMS**	**279,592**	**459,592**	**427,992**	**406,092**
	Information Systems--Transfer from DERF		+215,000	+100,000	+120,000
	Army Information Systems		-41,000		-41,000
	C4 Requirements for PACOM		+6,000		0
	PACOM Infrastructure Modernization Program--Transfer from Operation and Maintenance			+42,400	+42,400
	USARPAC C4 Equipment			+6,000	+5,100
55	**ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYS (ASAS) (TIARA)**	**57,886**	**62,886**	**57,886**	**60,886**
	Procure and upgrade ASAS Communications Control Sets		+5,000		+3,000

P-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
57	**PROPHET GROUND (TIARA)**	**20,226**	**35,226**	**35,226**	**35,226**
	Prophet Ground (TIARA)--Transfer from DERF		+15,000	+15,000	+15,000
58	**TUAV**	**84,290**	**95,290**	**105,290**	**101,790**
	TUAV shelters/trailers--Transfer from DERF		+11,000	+9,500	+9,500
	Hunter upgrades--Transfer from DERF			+1,500	+1,500
	Shadow TUAV--Block II upgrades			+10,000	+6,500
64	**DISTRIBUTED COMMON GRND SYSTEM (DCGS) (JMIP)**	**2,617**	**11,617**	**11,617**	**11,617**
	DCGS--Data storage at selected sites--Transfer from		+9,000		+9,000
	DCGS--Transfer from DERF		0	+9,000	0
68	**ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (TIARA)**	**3,675**	**8,175**	**8,175**	**8,175**
	Items Less than $5 million (TIARA)--Transfer from DERF		+4,500		0
	TIARA COOP Support--Transfer from DERF			+2,000	+2,000
	JMEG--Transfer from DERF			+2,500	+2,500
69	**SHORTSTOP**	**0**	**6,000**	**0**	**3,000**
	Shortstop Electronic Protection System		+6,000		+3,000
70	**COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES**	**2,310**	**4,310**	**2,310**	**4,010**
	National Guard Vehicle Tracking System		+2,000		+1,700
72	**SENTINEL MODS**	**26,519**	**26,519**	**46,519**	**40,519**
	AN/MPQ-64		0	+20,000	+14,000
73	**NIGHT VISION DEVICES**	**60,475**	**60,475**	**57,775**	**55,975**
	AN/PVS-7		0	+6,000	+4,200
	Sniper Night Sight Program Delays		0	-8,700	-8,700
75	**LTWT VIDEO RECON SYSTEM (LWVRS)**	**14,318**	**14,318**	**0**	**14,318**
	Ltwt Video Recon System (Note: only for USASOC requirements)		0	-14,318	**0**
77	**COMBAT IDENTIFICATION / AIMING LIGHT**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7,000**
	Advanced Aviation Institutional Training Simulator (Note: transferred from line 174)			0	+7,000
83	**FORCE XXI BATTLE CMD BRIGADE & BELOW (FBCB2)**	**65,294**	**72,294**	**65,294**	**93,794**
	Blue Force Tracking (Note: only for the Balkans Digitization initiative Ku-Band Second hub and additional Ku-Band units)		+7,000		+3,500
	C2 Common Operating Picture				+25,000
84	**LIGHTWEIGHT LASER DESIGNATOR/RANGEFINDER (LLDDR)**	**8,962**	**10,962**	**8,962**	**9,962**
	Lightweight Laser Designator/Rangefinder (LLDR)		+2,000		+1,000

P-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
89	**ADV FA TAC DATA SYS / EFF CTRL SYS (AFATDS/EC)**	**74,723**	**79,723**	**74,723**	**77,223**
	Advanced Field Artillery Tactical Data System/EFF Control System		+5,000		+2,500
96	**STRIKER FAMILY**	**28,543**	**28,543**	**32,043**	**30,293**
	Additional Units		0	+3,500	+1,750
105	**STAMIS TACTICAL COMPUTERS (STACOMP)**	**61,304**	**51,304**	**51,304**	**61,304**
	GCSS		-10,000	-10,000	0
108	**AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP**	**156,546**	**176,046**	**219,746**	**219,496**
	Automatic Identification Technology (AIT)--Ammunition and prepositioned stocks		+3,500		+2,500
	Army Knowledge Online		+5,000		+2,500
	National Guard Distance Learning Courseware		+3,000	+7,500	+5,300
	Virtual Mission Preparation Project		+3,500		+3,000
	Automated Maintenance Records Technology		+4,500		+3,250
	Rock Island Arsenal Automatic Identification Technology (AIT)			+3,000	+2,100
	Regional Medical Distributive Learning			+8,000	+5,600
	ADP Equipment--Transfer from Operation and			+4,700	+4,700
	Digitization of DoD Technical Manuals			+40,000	+34,000
109	**RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS)**	**68,273**	**68,273**	**78,273**	**76,773**
	Pacific RCAS		0	+10,000	+8,500
117	**TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON**	**51,237**	**51,237**	**55,237**	**54,037**
	Common Bridge Transporter		0	+4,000	+2,800
119	**GRND STANDOFF MINE DETECTION SYSTEM (GSTAMIDS)**	**17,425**	**19,425**	**22,425**	**20,925**
	Handheld Standoff Mine Detection System (HSTAMIDS) (Note: only for accelerated production of the Handheld Mine Detection System (HSTAMIDS))		+2,000		+3,500
	Handheld Standoff Mine Detection System			+5,000	0
120	**WIDE AREA MUNITIONS (REMOTE CONTROL UNIT)**	**3,223**	**0**	**0**	**0**
	Program Termination		-3,223	-3,223	-3,223
128	**LIGHTWEIGHT MAINTENANCE ENCLOSURE (LME)**	**7,730**	**7,730**	**7,730**	**8,730**
	Two-Sided Expandable International Standards Organization (ISO) shelters (transferred from line 184)		0	0	+1,000
131	**FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT**	**21,177**	**23,777**	**21,177**	**23,377**
	Sanitation Center, Field Feeding System for Army Reserve		+2,600		+2,200

P-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
135	**ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (CSS EQ)**	**0**	**4,000**	**0**	**3,400**
	Ultra-high Intensity Miniature Illumination Systems for the XVIII Airborne Corps		+4,000		+3,400
141	**COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL**	**21,003**	**28,003**	**35,003**	**36,603**
	Portable Low-Power Blood Cooling and Storage Devices		+1,500		+1,100
	Rapid Intravenous (IV) Infusion Pump		+2,500	+2,500	+2,500
	Life Support for Trauma Transport (LSTAT)		+3,000		+2,100
	Hemorrhage Control Dressings			+4,000	+2,800
	Deployable Medical Systems			+5,000	+5,000
	Surgical Shelters			+2,500	+2,100
144	**ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (MAINT EQ)**	**1,075**	**6,075**	**1,075**	**5,575**
	Aviation Classification Repair Depot Activity (AVCRAD) ARNG (Note: only for paint stripping equipment and storage systems)		+5,000		+4,500
145	**GRADER, ROAD MTZD, HVY, 6X4 (CCE)**	**3,854**	**8,854**	**3,854**	**7,354**
	Construction Equipment Service Life Extension Program (SLEP)		+5,000		+3,500
146	**SCRAPERS, EARTHMOVING**	**7,989**	**11,989**	**7,989**	**11,489**
	Scrapers AR		+4,000		+3,500
147	**DISTR, WATER, SP MIN 2500G SEC/NON-SEC**	**0**	**4,000**	**0**	**2,500**
	Water Distributor System		+4,000		+2,500
148	**MISSION MODULES - ENGINEERING**	**19,236**	**19,236**	**26,236**	**24,136**
	2 Additional Companies		0	+7,000	+4,900
163	**LOGISTIC SUPPORT VESSEL (LSV)**	**0**	**3,000**	**8,100**	**11,100**
	Small Tug		+3,000		+3,000
	Vessel Completion			+8,100	+8,100
169	**ALL TERRAIN LIFTING ARMY SYSTEM**	**21,963**	**26,963**	**21,963**	**25,463**
	All Terrain Lifting Army System (ATLAS) (Note: only for Army Reserve)		+5,000		+3,500
174	**TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM**	**111,682**	**134,682**	**162,482**	**160,782**
	EST 2000 (Engagement Skills Trainer) ARNG		+5,000		+2,500
	EST 2000 (Engagement Skills Trainer) AR		+5,000		+2,500
	EST 2000			+5,000	+2,500
	Guard Unit Armory Device Full-Crew Interactive Simulation Trainer (GUARDFIST II) RL		+3,000		+1,500
	Laser Marksmanship Training System for ARNG		+5,000		+4,300
	Laser Marksmanship Training System for AR		+5,000		+5,300
	Advanced Aviation Institutional Training Simulator (Note: transferred to line 77)			+10,000	0
	MOUT Instrumentation at Ft. Campbell			+4,000	+2,800
	MOUT Instrumentation at Ft. Richardson			+4,300	+4,300
	172nd SIB Army Range Improvement Program			+7,500	+6,400
	SBCT Equipment			+20,000	+17,000

P-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
179	**INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE)**	**59,596**	**59,596**	**59,596**	**68,096**
	Integrated Family of Test Equipment (Transferred from line 181)		0		+8,500
181	**ARMY DIAGNOSTICS IMPROVEMENT PGM (ADIP)**	**7,982**	**17,982**	**7,982**	**7,982**
	Integrated Family of Test Equipment		+10,000		0
183	**PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3)**	**227,402**	**571,902**	**327,402**	**302,402**
	Physical Security Equipment--Transfer from DERF		+4,500		0
	Physical Security Equipment--Realignment		+340,000	+100,000	+75,000
184	**BASE LEVEL COM'L EQUIPMENT**	**12,297**	**14,297**	**12,297**	**12,297**
	Two-Sided Expandable International Standards Organization (ISO) shelters		+2,000		0
187	**SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING**	**14,311**	**24,311**	**14,311**	**24,311**
	Artillery Hunting Radar (ARTHUR) (Note: only to procure one ARTHUR system and spares.)		+10,000		+10,000
188	**MA8975**	**4,256**	**43,356**	**43,356**	**43,356**
	MA8975--Transfer from DERF		+39,100	+39,100	+39,100
190	**INITIAL SPARES - C&E**	**59,694**	**59,694**	**53,794**	**53,794**
	SMART-T Spares		0	-5,900	-5,900

CONTINUITY OF OPERATIONS

The budget request included $215,000,000 in funding under the Defense Emergency Response Fund for activities associated with upgrades and improvements to alternate relocation sites. The conferees have provided $120,000,000 for these activities. The conferees note that the Army, which is the executive agent, has provided little justification for these funds, no plan for their execution, has not coordinated military construction requirements at the sites, and has not demonstrated a commitment to support funding for these activities in subsequent years. For these reasons, the conferees direct that none of the funds provided for alternate relocation sites may be obligated until 30 days after the Secretary of the Army provides a report to the congressional defense committees which provides, in detail, the proposed use of funding, a timeline for execution, a review of necessary improvements to infrastructure, and a plan for funding in subsequent years.

STRYKER BRIGADE COMBAT TEAMS

In order to enhance the Army's transformation initiatives, the conferees provide an additional $59,500,000 for fielding of the Stryker Brigade Combat Teams (SBAT). Of this amount, $42,500,000 is provided in the ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'' appropriation and $17,000,000 in the ''Other Procurement, Army'' appropriation. The conferees direct that the additional operation and maintenance funding be made available to the Army Materiel Command Transformation Support Office, specifically to support the fielding of the six brigade teams.

GENERATORS

The conference agreement provides $79,180,000, as provided in the budget request, for generators and associated equipment. Of this amount, the conferees direct that no less than $2,400,000 shall be available only for the procurement of 2kW Military Tactical Generators, as proposed in the budget request.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY				
COMBAT AIRCRAFT				
AV-8B (V/STOL)HARRIER (MYP)	5,953	5,953	5,953	5,953
F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET (MYP)	3,073,233	3,076,233	3,209,133	3,165,933
F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET (MYP) (AP-CY)	86,259	86,259	86,259	86,259
V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT)	1,045,660	1,025,660	1,045,660	1,035,660
V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT) (AP-CY)	60,298	60,298	51,098	41,898
MH-60S (MYP)	284,155	279,155	284,155	279,155
MH-60S (MYP) (AP-CY)	88,000	88,000	78,000	78,000
MH-60R	86,871	86,871	91,871	90,371
MH-60R (AP-CY)	29,341	29,341	29,341	29,341
E-2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE (MYP)	267,851	267,851	253,351	263,851
E-2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE (MYP) (AP-CY)	27,600	27,600	27,600	27,600
TOTAL, COMBAT AIRCRAFT	5,055,221	5,033,221	5,162,421	5,104,021
AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT				
UC-35	---	8,300	---	8,300
C-40 A	---	---	126,000	63,000
TOTAL, AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT	---	8,300	126,000	71,300
TRAINER AIRCRAFT				
T-45TS (TRAINER) GOSHAWK	221,381	221,381	221,381	221,381
JPATS	---	15,000	42,500	26,000
TOTAL, TRAINER AIRCRAFT	221,381	236,381	263,881	247,381
OTHER AIRCRAFT				
KC-130J	---	334,000	315,200	315,200

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT				
EA-6 SERIES	223,527	229,527	267,527	263,127
AV-8 SERIES	32,232	44,232	72,232	60,232
F-14 SERIES	3,712	3,712	3,712	3,712
ADVERSARY	10,475	10,475	10,475	10,475
F-18 SERIES	421,704	421,704	377,904	400,404
H-46 SERIES	67,193	67,193	67,193	67,193
AH-1W SERIES	10,211	17,211	22,711	20,211
H-53 SERIES	22,517	29,517	22,517	28,517
SH-60 SERIES	15,419	15,419	24,419	21,719
H-1 SERIES	1,825	8,825	1,825	5,325
EP-3 SERIES	26,061	60,561	53,561	59,061
P-3 SERIES	102,698	143,598	152,698	171,898
S-3 SERIES	45,130	45,130	20,430	30,630
E-2 SERIES	17,195	24,195	17,195	24,195
TRAINER A/C SERIES	2,844	2,844	2,844	2,844
C-2A	29,819	29,819	29,819	29,819
C-130 SERIES	6,263	6,263	6,263	6,263
FEWSG	606	606	606	606
CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES	3,819	3,819	3,819	3,819
E-6 SERIES	57,099	57,099	57,099	57,099
EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES	10,157	16,157	16,157	16,157
SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT	---	6,500	9,000	8,600
T-45 SERIES	28,246	28,246	28,246	28,246
POWER PLANT CHANGES	13,673	13,673	13,673	13,673
COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT	28,006	34,506	20,306	29,406
COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES	63,228	63,228	63,228	63,228
V-22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY	4,961	4,961	4,961	4,961
TOTAL, MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT	1,248,620	1,389,020	1,370,420	1,431,420
AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS				
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	1,116,535	1,116,535	1,091,535	1,091,535
AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES				
COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT	442,330	442,330	400,630	430,630
AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	18,112	18,112	18,112	18,112

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
WAR CONSUMABLES	12,079	15,079	12,079	13,579
INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	25,309	25,309	25,309	25,309
SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	62,725	62,725	62,725	62,725
FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	1,643	1,643	1,643	1,643
TOTAL, AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES	562,198	565,198	520,498	551,998
TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY	8,203,955	8,682,655	8,849,955	8,812,855

EXPLANATION of PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
(in thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
2 F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET (MYP)	**3,073,233**	**3,076,233**	**3,209,133**	**3,165,933**
Cost growth - Support Equipment		-15,000		-7,500
ALQ-214 Radio Frequency Countermeasures System		+4,000		+2,400
Tactical ISR (Note: Only for the acquistion of additional shared Airborne Reconnaissance Pods (SHARP))		+14,000		+12,000
Ancillary equipment: fleet bags			-21,000	-21,000
Excessive Growth: peculiar training equipment			-15,000	
Shared Reconnaissance Pod: Program Termination			-54,900	
Excessive Growth: production engineering			-13,200	-13,200
Purchase 2 additional aircraft			+240,000	+120,000
4 V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT)	**1,045,660**	**1,025,660**	**1,045,660**	**1,035,660**
Unjustified Cost Resolution Claim		-20,000		-10,000
5 V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT) (AP-CY)	**60,298**	**60,298**	**51,098**	**41,898**
Authorized Level			-9,200	-18,400
8 MH-60S (MYP)	**284,155**	**279,155**	**284,155**	**279,155**
Support Cost Growth		-5,000		-5,000
9 MH-60S Advanced Procurement (CY)	**88,000**	**88,000**	**78,000**	**78,000**
Excessive unit cost growth			-10,000	-10,000
10 MH-60R	**86,871**	**86,871**	**91,871**	**90,371**
AQS-22 Airborne Low Frequency Sonar (ALFS)			+5,000	+3,500
12 E-2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE (MYP)	**267,851**	**267,851**	**253,351**	**263,851**
Peculiar Training Equipment			-19,500	-7,500
On-Board oxgen retrofit			+5,000	+3,500
16 UC-35	**0**	**8,300**	**0**	**8,300**
Additional Aircraft		+8,300		+8,300
17 C-40A	**0**	**0**	**126,000**	**63,000**
Purchase 1 aircraft			+126,000	+63,000
21 JPATS	**0**	**15,000**	**42,500**	**26,000**
Additional Aircraft		+15,000	+39,000	+22,500
Operational flight trainers			+3,500	+3,500
22 KC-130J	**0**	**334,000**	**315,200**	**315,200**
4 Aircraft - Transfer from DERF		+334,000	+334,000	+334,000
Airframe unit cost growth			-13,800	-13,800
Excessive growth: production support			-5,000	-5,000
23 EA-6 SERIES	**223,527**	**229,527**	**267,527**	**263,127**
ALQ-99 Band-4 TWT Improvements		+4,000		+2,000
On-Board Oxygen Generating System (OBOGS)		+2,000		+1,000
USQ-113 jammers			+15,000	+10,500
Band 9/10 transmitters			+20,000	+14,000
Wing Center Sections			+9,000	+9,000
EA-6B Ready Room Mission Rehearsal System				+3,100
24 AV-8 SERIES	**32,232**	**44,232**	**72,232**	**60,232**
LITENING AT Precision Attack Targeting System		+12,000	+40,000	+28,000
27 F-18 Series	**421,704**	**421,704**	**377,904**	**400,404**
ECP-583 Upgrades			+25,000	+17,500
MIDS Installations: buying ahead of need			-8,800	-8,800
ATFLIR installation equipment (non-recurring)			-60,000	-30,000
29 AH-1W SERIES	**10,211**	**17,211**	**22,711**	**20,211**
AH-1W Super Cobra Night Targeting System - Enhanced		+7,000	+6,000	+6,000
Tailboom strakes			+6,500	+4,000
30 H-53 SERIES	**22,517**	**29,517**	**22,517**	**28,517**
M3M .50 caliber heavy machine gun		+7,000		+6,000

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
31 SH-60 SERIES	**15,419**	**15,419**	**24,419**	**21,719**
Integrated Mechanical Diagnostics			+9,000	+6,300
32 H-1 SERIES	**1,825**	**8,825**	**1,825**	**5,325**
NTIS - AN/AQQ-22		+7,000		+3,500
34 EP-3 SERIES	**26,061**	**60,561**	**53,561**	**59,061**
EP-3E Upgrades - Transfer from DERF		+22,500	+22,500	+22,500
EP-3 Upgrades (Note: Only to design, build, integrate, install and flight test an upgraded Radio Frequency Distribution and Antenna System.)		+6,000		+3,800
JMOD Phase I upgrades		+6,000		+3,300
VME SIGINT Tuners			+5,000	+3,400
35 P-3 SERIES	**102,698**	**143,598**	**152,698**	**171,898**
FM Immune Multi-mode Receivers		+3,000		+2,100
AIP JSOW Modification		+7,000		+5,000
BMUP ALR-95 Upgrade		+4,000		+2,500
COTS Aircraft Health Monitoring System		+1,500		+1,100
Acoustic and Display Processor Upgrades		+7,500		+5,300
Advanced Multiband Optical Surveillance System		+5,000		+2,500
Acoustic Data Recorder / Data Replay Recorder		+4,000		+2,400
Digital Autopilot Upgrade		+1,900		+1,000
Digital Instantaneous Frequency Measurement (DIFM) Upgrade		+5,000		+4,300
P-3C Tactical Support Center (TSC) ALR-95 ESM System Upgrade Support		+2,000		+1,700
2 additional AIP Kits			+26,000	+26,000
CNS/ATM upgrades			+9,000	+6,300
AIP tactical common datalink			+15,000	+9,000
36 S-3 SERIES	**45,130**	**45,130**	**20,430**	**30,630**
Excess UHF radio mods			-24,700	-14,500
37 E-2 SERIES	**17,195**	**24,195**	**17,195**	**24,195**
CEC Equipment for Prior Year Hawkeye 2000 Upgrades		+7,000		+7,000
44 EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES	**10,157**	**16,157**	**16,157**	**16,157**
VH-3D/VH-60D Upgrade - Transfer from DERF		+6,000	+6,000	+6,000
45 SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT	**0**	**6,500**	**9,000**	**8,600**
Transfer from DERF		+4,000	+4,000	+4,000
Block Modification to 1106 configuration		+2,500		+1,200
AMOSS			+5,000	+3,400
48 COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT	**28,006**	**34,506**	**20,306**	**29,406**
AN/AAR-47		+3,000		+2,600
AN/APR-39B (V) 2 Passive Threat Warning Systems for CH-53 helicopters		+3,500		+3,000
IDECM: development delays			-7,700	-7,700
AN/ALR-67 (V) 3&4 Countermeasures Set (moved from AP,AF)				+3,500
51 SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	**1,116,535**	**1,116,535**	**1,091,535**	**1,091,535**
V-22 Initial Spares			-25,000	-25,000
52 COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT	**442,330**	**442,330**	**400,630**	**430,630**
Fleet aircrew simulator			-15,000	
Excessive growth: other trainer mods			-31,700	-16,000
Direct Squadron Support Training (DSSRT)			+5,000	+4,300
54 WAR CONSUMABLES	**12,079**	**15,079**	**12,079**	**13,579**
Aerial Refueling Store Advanced Power System		+3,000		+1,500

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY				
BALLISTIC MISSILES				
TRIDENT II	585,916	585,916	161,336	161,336
TRIDENT II MODS	---	---	424,580	424,580
MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	1,318	1,318	1,318	1,318
TOTAL, BALLISTIC MISSILES	587,234	587,234	587,234	587,234
OTHER MISSILES				
STRATEGIC MISSILES				
TOMAHAWK	145,820	664,820	248,820	248,820
ESSM	129,550	129,550	43,550	43,550
TACTICAL MISSILES				
AMRAAM	50,937	50,937	50,937	50,937
SIDEWINDER	53,250	53,250	53,250	53,250
JSOW	139,537	139,537	103,237	103,237
SLAM-ER	83,781	83,781	83,781	83,781
STANDARD MISSILE	156,423	156,423	156,423	156,423
RAM	58,379	58,379	68,379	65,379
AERIAL TARGETS	70,332	70,332	70,332	70,332
DRONES AND DECOYS	---	---	20,000	14,000
OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT	12,039	12,039	12,039	12,039
MODIFICATION OF MISSILES				
SIDEWINDER MODS	595	595	595	595
HARM MODS	4,959	4,959	4,959	4,959
STANDARD MISSILES MODS	56,163	56,163	56,163	56,163

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES				
WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	17,662	17,662	17,662	17,662
ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	5,422	5,422	5,422	5,422
TOTAL, OTHER MISSILES	984,849	1,503,849	995,549	986,549
TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT				
TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP				
ASW TARGETS	14,330	14,330	4,330	4,330
MOD OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP				
MK-46 TORPEDO MODS	38,783	38,783	20,083	38,783
MK-48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS	62,124	62,124	62,124	62,124
QUICKSTRIKE MINE	2,025	2,025	2,025	2,025
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	25,132	25,132	25,132	25,132
ASW RANGE SUPPORT	14,477	18,477	14,477	17,277
DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION				
FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	2,751	2,751	2,751	2,751
TOTAL, TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT	159,622	163,622	130,922	152,422
OTHER WEAPONS				
GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS				
SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS	2,856	9,856	6,856	6,856
AIRBORNE MINE NEUTRALIZATION SYSTEMS	1,539	1,539	1,539	1,539
MODIFICATION OF GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS				
CIWS MODS	32,226	39,226	70,226	60,626
GUN MOUNT MODS	8,351	8,351	8,351	8,351
TACTICAL UAV - PIONEER	---	15,000	---	9,000
TOTAL, OTHER WEAPONS	44,972	73,972	86,972	86,372
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	55,940	55,940	55,940	55,940
TOTAL, WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY	1,832,617	2,384,617	1,856,617	1,868,517

EXPLANATION of PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
(in thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
1 TRIDENT II	**585,916**	**585,916**	**161,336**	**161,336**
Transfer to Mods Line			-424,580	-424,580
2A TRIDENT II MODS	**0**	**0**	**424,580**	**424,580**
4 TOMAHAWK	**145,820**	**664,820**	**248,820**	**248,820**
Block II/III Conversions -Transfer from DERF		+598,000		
Block II/III Conversions -Reduction to DERF		-103,000		
Additional Tooling - Block IV Production		+24,000		
Transfer from DERF - for Block IV only			+103,000	+103,000
5 ESSM	**129,550**	**129,550**	**43,550**	**43,550**
Full Rate Production Delay			-86,000	-86,000
8 JSOW	**139,537**	**139,537**	**103,237**	**103,237**
B variant			-36,300	-36,300
11 RAM	**58,379**	**58,379**	**68,379**	**65,379**
Additional Missiles		0	+10,000	+7,000
14 DRONES AND DECOYS	**0**	**0**	**20,000**	**14,000**
ITALD			+20,000	+14,000
23 ASW TARGETS	**14,330**	**14,330**	**4,330**	**4,330**
Mk 30 Mod 2 Program Delays			-10,000	-10,000
24 MK-46 TORPEDO MODS	**38,783**	**38,783**	**20,083**	**38,783**
Program delays			-18,700	
28 ASW RANGE SUPPORT	**14,477**	**18,477**	**14,477**	**17,277**
Pacific Northwest Undersea Range Support		+4,000		+2,800
30 SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS	**2,856**	**9,856**	**6,856**	**6,856**
Coast Guard Small Arms - Transfer From DERF		+3,000		
Physical Security Equip. - Transfer From DERF		+4,000	+4,000	+4,000
32 CIWS MODS	**32,226**	**39,226**	**70,226**	**60,626**
Block 1B Upgrade OrdAlt Kits		+4,000	+38,000	+26,600
MK 45 5" Gun Upgrades		+3,000		+1,800
TACTICAL UAV	**0**	**15,000**	**0**	**9,000**
Pioneer Upgrades - Transfer from DERF		+15,000		+9,000

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MARINE CORPS				
PROC AMMO, NAVY				
NAVY AMMUNITION				
GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	243,395	304,695	304,695	304,695
JDAM	225,992	279,992	279,992	279,992
AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	28,979	52,279	52,279	52,279
MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION	26,375	30,875	30,875	30,875
PRACTICE BOMBS	65,623	65,623	65,623	65,623
CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES	26,355	26,355	26,355	26,355
AIRCRAFT ESCAPE ROCKETS	10,767	10,767	10,767	10,767
AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES	38,856	38,856	38,856	38,856
JATOS	4,536	4,536	4,536	4,536
5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION	12,252	12,252	12,252	12,252
EXTENDED RANGE GUIDED MUNITIONS (ERGM)	4,022	---	4,022	---
76MM GUN AMMUNITION	8,342	8,342	8,342	8,342
OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION	10,045	10,045	10,045	10,045
SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO	19,004	20,004	19,004	19,004
PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION	10,338	10,338	10,338	10,338
MINE NEUTRALIZATION DEVICES	2,725	2,725	2,725	2,725
AMMUNITION LESS THAN $5 MILLION	1,212	1,212	3,112	3,112
TOTAL, PROC AMMO, NAVY	738,818	878,896	883,818	879,796

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
PROC AMMO, MARINE CORPS				
MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION				
5.56 MM, ALL TYPES	31,600	31,600	31,600	31,600
7.62 MM, ALL TYPES	7,078	7,078	7,078	7,078
LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES	40,623	40,623	40,623	40,623
.50 CALIBER	10,514	10,514	10,814	10,814
40 MM, ALL TYPES	11,909	11,909	11,909	11,909
60MM, ALL TYPES	2,199	2,199	2,199	2,199
81MM, ALL TYPES	31,412	31,412	31,412	31,412
120MM, ALL TYPES	35,117	45,117	43,817	44,417
CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES	6,641	6,641	6,641	6,641
9 MM ALL TYPES	1,983	1,983	1,983	1,983
GRENADES, ALL TYPES	11,357	11,357	11,357	11,357
STINGER SLEP	1,577	1,577	1,577	1,577
ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	18,854	18,854	18,854	18,854
ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES	46,750	46,750	46,750	46,750
DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	4,089	4,089	4,089	4,089
FUZE, ALL TYPES	620	620	620	620
NON LETHALS	5,406	5,406	5,406	5,406
AMMO MODERNIZATION	6,990	6,990	6,990	6,990
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	1,616	3,516	1,616	1,616
TOTAL, PROC AMMO, MC	276,335	288,235	285,335	285,935
ADJUSTMENT	-1	-1	-1	-1
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MARINE CORPS	1,015,152	1,167,130	1,169,152	1,165,730

EXPLANATION of PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
(in thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
1 GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	**243,395**	**304,695**	**304,695**	**304,695**
LGB Kits - Transfer from DERF		+25,000	+25,000	+25,000
LGB Kits (Training Rounds) - Transfer from DERF		+36,300	+36,300	+36,300
2 JDAM	**225,992**	**279,992**	**279,992**	**279,992**
Additional JDAM Kits - Transfer from DERF		+54,000	+54,000	+54,000
3 AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	**28,979**	**52,279**	**52,279**	**52,279**
2.75" and 5" Rocket Motors - Transfer from DERF		+23,300	+23,300	+23,300
4 MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION	**26,375**	**30,875**	**30,875**	**30,875**
PGU 27 Link / Bulk - Transfer from DERF		+4,500	+4,500	+4,500
11 EXTENDED RANGE GUIDED MUNITIONS (ERGM)	**4,022**	**0**	**4,022**	**0**
Development Delay		-4,022		-4,022
14 SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO	**19,004**	**20,004**	**19,004**	**19,004**
Coast Guard Small Arms Ammo - Transfer from DERF		+1,000		
17 AMMUNITION LESS THAN $5 MILLION	**1,212**	**1,212**	**3,112**	**3,112**
MK-58 Marine Location Markers (Transfer from DERF)			+1,900	+1,900
22 .50 CALIBER	**10,514**	**10,514**	**10,814**	**10,814**
.50 Cal SLAP			+300	+300
26 120MM, ALL TYPES	**35,117**	**45,117**	**43,817**	**44,417**
Additional Ammunition		+10,000		
120 MM HEAT MP-T M830A1			+8,700	+9,300
37 ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	**1,616**	**3,516**	**1,616**	**1,616**
MK-58 Marine Location Markers (Transfer from DERF)		+1,900		

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY				
OTHER WARSHIPS				
CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM	---	250,000	---	90,000
CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM (AP-CY)	243,703	243,703	472,703	403,703
VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE	1,512,652	1,490,652	1,512,652	1,499,152
VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE (AP-CY)	706,309	706,309	645,209	645,209
SSGN CONVERSION	404,305	404,305	404,305	404,305
SSGN CONVERSION (AP-CY)	421,000	421,000	421,000	421,000
CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS	---	---	24,000	---
CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS (AP-CY)	296,781	296,781	195,781	221,781
SUBMARINE REFUELING OVERHAULS	271,292	231,292	435,792	435,792
SUBMARINE REFUELING OVERHAULS (AP-CY)	88,257	88,257	---	64,000
DDG-51	2,295,502	2,273,002	2,321,502	2,321,502
DDG-51 (AP-CY)	74,000	74,000	---	---
TOTAL, OTHER WARSHIPS	6,313,801	6,479,301	6,432,944	6,506,444
AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS				
LHD-1 AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT SHIP	243,000	---	243,000	243,000
LHD-1 AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT SHIP (AP-CY)	10,000	---	---	---
LPD-17	596,492	596,492	596,492	596,492
LPD-17 (AP-CY)	8,000	8,000	---	---
TOTAL, AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS	857,492	604,492	839,492	839,492
AUXILIARIES, CRAFT, AND PRIOR-YEAR PROGRAM				
LCU(X)	6,756	9,756	---	---
OUTFITTING	300,608	300,608	300,608	300,608
LCAC SLEP	67,638	81,638	89,638	89,638
MINE HUNTER	---	7,000	---	7,000
COMPLETION OF PY SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMS	644,899	644,899	1,481,955	1,279,899
SERVICE CRAFT	---	---	6,756	9,756
TOTAL, AUXILIARIES, CRAFT, AND PRIOR-YEAR PROGRAM	1,019,901	1,043,901	1,878,957	1,686,901
TOTAL, SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY	8,191,194	8,127,694	9,151,393	9,032,837

EXPLANATION of PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
(in thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
1 CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM (Note: Only	**0**	**250,000**	**0**	**90,000**
for the CVN-77 Integrated Warfare System (IWS))		+250,000		+90,000
2 CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM (AP-CY)	**243,703**	**243,703**	**472,703**	**403,703**
CVNX Schedule Restoral			+229,000	+160,000
3 VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE	**1,512,652**	**1,490,652**	**1,512,652**	**1,499,152**
Technical Engineering Services - Cost Growth		-1,500		
Sonar, Combat Control Architecture		-15,000		
SRWS		-1,000		
C3I Major Hardware		-7,500		
General Reduction	0	0	0	-15,000
(Note: Only for a pilot demonstration at two commercial shipyards of manpower scheduling software that targets cost reduction in the shipbuilding process.)		+3,000		+1,500
4 VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE (AP-CY)	**706,309**	**706,309**	**645,209**	**645,209**
Excessive Advance Procurement			-61,100	-61,100
8 CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS	**0**	**0**	**24,000**	**0**
9 CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS (AP-CY)	**296,781**	**296,781**	**195,781**	**221,781**
Excessive Advance Procurement			-101,000	-75,000
10 SUBMARINE REFUELING OVERHAULS	**271,292**	**231,292**	**435,792**	**435,792**
Mispricing of FY2002 Advanced Procurement		-40,000	-37,500	-37,500
1 Additional Refueling			+202,000	+202,000
11 SUBMARINE REFUELING OVERHAULS (AP-CY)	**88,257**	**88,257**	**0**	**64,000**
Excessive Advance Procurement			-88,257	-24,257
12 DDG-51	**2,295,502**	**2,273,002**	**2,321,502**	**2,321,502**
Design Plan Cost Growth		-5,000		
AIEWS Termination		-17,500		
DDG-51/LPD-17 Workload Exchange			+26,000	+26,000
13 DDG-51(AP CY)	**74,000**	**74,000**	**0**	**0**
Excessive Advance Procurement			-74,000	
14 LHD-1 AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT SHIP	**243,000**	**0**	**243,000**	**243,000**
Prior year fund availability		-243,000		
15 LHD-1 AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT SHIP (AP-CY)	**10,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Premature request prior to AOA		-10,000		
Transfer to R&D			-10,000	-10,000
17 LPD-17 (AP-CY)	**8,000**	**8,000**	**0**	**0**
Excessive Advance Procurement			-8,000	-8,000
20 LCU(X)	**6,756**	**9,756**	**0**	**0**
Yard Oilers	0	+3,000		
Transfer to new Service Craft line			-6,756	-6,756
22 LCAC SLEP	**67,638**	**81,638**	**89,638**	**89,638**
LCAC SLEP		+14,000	+22,000	+22,000
23 MINE HUNTER	**0**	**7,000**	**0**	**7,000**
Mine Hunter SWATH		+7,000		+7,000
24 COMPLETION OF PRIOR YEAR SHIPBUILDING PROGR/	**644,899**	**644,899**	**1,481,955**	**1,279,899**
Virginia Class Submarine			+213,132	+50,000
DDG-51 Prior Year			+167,724	+150,000
LPD-17 Prior Year			+150,000	+150,000
DDG-51 SWAP Costs			+119,200	+98,000
LPD-17 SWAP/PY			+187,000	+187,000
25 SERVICE CRAFT	**0**	**0**	**6,756**	**9,756**
Transfer from LCU(X) line			+6,756	+6,756
Yard Oilers				+3,000

CVN–77 INTEGRATED WARFARE SYSTEM (IWS)

The conferees agree to provide $90,000,000 for the CVN–77 Integrated Warfare System (IWS) instead of $250,000,000 as proposed by the House and no funding as proposed by the Senate. The conferees do not agree to the House restriction on the obligation of funds for the CVN–77 IWS contract data package.

It is the sense of the conferees that every opportunity should be taken to include potentially transformational technologies on the CVN–77 as it is being constructed. This will not only provide enhanced warfighting and defensive capabilities in the near-term, but also lay a cornerstone for risk and cost reduction on the CVN(X) program which is also strongly supported by the conferees.

To that end, the conferees direct that the additional funds provided are only for transformational technologies and initiatives for other CVN–77 IWS to include: (1) design and development of a common flexible island, (2) full service integrated networks to include data, voice, sensor, and HM&E monitoring and control, (3) multi-modal display workstation concepts using middleware and open system architectures, and (4) integrated advanced strike and mission planning capabilities for both the ship and embarked airwings.

The conferees also direct the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development, and Acquisition to provide, no later than March 15, 2003, a revised program acquisition strategy for the CVN–77 which incorporates these transformational initiatives and establishes a foundation for regular technology refresh and product improvements during the life cycle of the ship.

ROPELESS ELEVATOR

The conferees understand the Department of the Navy is working on design concepts for ropeless elevator systems in aircraft carriers. The conferees support this effort and encourages the Navy to continue this development in future defense budgets.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or Senate is as follows:

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
	(In thousands of dollars)			
OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY				
SHIPS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT				
LM-2500 GAS TURBINE	9,402	9,402	9,402	9,402
ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE	13,710	13,710	13,710	13,710
PROPELLERS				
SUBMARINE PROPELLERS	10,641	4,241	10,641	4,241
NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT				
OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT	25,828	25,828	25,828	25,828
UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT				
UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT	1,460	1,460	1,460	1,460
PERISCOPES				
SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIP	31,401	31,401	31,401	31,401
OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT				
FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT	21,534	21,534	21,534	21,534
COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD	7,377	7,377	7,377	7,377
POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	67,502	67,502	67,502	67,502
SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	18,195	18,195	18,195	18,195
SUBMARINE BATTERIES	13,996	13,996	13,996	13,996
STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	26,692	41,692	26,692	39,492
DSSP EQUIPMENT	21,215	21,215	21,215	21,215
LCAC	5,105	5,105	5,105	5,105
MINESWEEPING EQUIPMENT	3,865	3,865	3,865	3,865
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	123,449	142,449	124,949	136,049
SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM	3,675	3,675	3,675	3,675
REACTOR PLANT EQUIPMENT				
REACTOR POWER UNITS	336,500	336,500	336,500	336,500
REACTOR COMPONENTS	211,020	211,020	211,020	211,020

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
OCEAN ENGINEERING				
DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT	7,726	7,726	7,726	7,726
SMALL BOATS				
STANDARD BOATS	33,832	35,832	33,832	35,232
TRAINING EQUIPMENT				
OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT	1,799	1,799	1,799	1,799
PRODUCTION FACILITIES EQUIPMENT				
OPERATING FORCES IPE	17,134	21,134	42,134	38,934
OTHER SHIP SUPPORT				
NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS	128,543	128,543	128,543	128,543
TOTAL, SHIPS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	1,141,601	1,175,201	1,168,101	1,183,801
COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT				
SHIP RADARS				
RADAR SUPPORT	---	10,000	---	13,700
SHIP SONARS				
AN/SQQ-89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM	24,247	24,247	24,247	24,247
SSN ACOUSTICS	251,909	231,009	236,909	237,909
UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	3,775	15,275	3,775	12,975
SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS	16,348	16,348	16,348	16,348
ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT				
SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM	21,686	24,686	21,686	23,186
FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	62,090	62,090	62,090	62,090
SURTASS	20,639	20,639	20,639	20,639
ASW OPERATIONS CENTER	5,109	5,109	5,109	5,109
ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT				
AN/SLQ-32	1,856	1,856	1,856	1,856
AIEWS	15,808	---	---	---
INFORMATION WARFARE SYSTEMS	5,158	7,158	7,158	7,158
RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT				
SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT	77,066	87,066	87,066	87,066
SUBMARINE SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT				
SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROG	89,508	89,508	89,508	89,508
OTHER SHIP ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT				
NAVY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	---	9,000	---	7,700

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY	66,736	74,736	66,736	72,736
GCCS-M EQUIPMENT	55,188	55,188	55,188	55,188
NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM (NTCSS)	46,818	46,818	46,818	46,818
ATDLS	7,608	7,608	7,608	7,608
MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT	1,974	1,974	1,974	1,974
NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE)	11,402	11,402	11,402	11,402
ARMED FORCES RADIO AND TV	4,186	4,186	4,186	4,186
STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	21,353	21,353	21,353	21,353
TRAINING EQUIPMENT				
OTHER SPAWAR TRAINING EQUIPMENT	1,001	1,001	1,001	1,001
OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT	15,430	15,430	15,430	15,430
AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT				
MATCALS	14,318	14,318	14,318	14,318
SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	7,815	7,815	7,815	7,815
AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM	17,447	17,447	11,747	11,747
NATIONAL AIR SPACE SYSTEM	20,000	20,000	5,000	5,000
AIR STATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	7,012	7,012	7,012	7,012
FACSFAC	4,356	4,356	4,356	4,356
ID SYSTEMS	32,633	31,833	32,633	31,833
TAC A/C MISSION PLANNING SYS(TAMPS)	6,597	6,597	6,597	6,597
OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT				
NAVAL SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	2,062	2,062	2,062	2,062
DIMHRS	4,675	4,675	4,675	4,675
COMMON IMAGERY GROUND SURFACE SYSTEMS	52,432	52,432	52,432	52,432
RADIAC	8,015	8,015	8,015	8,015
GPETE	6,700	6,700	6,700	6,700
INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY	4,498	8,498	4,498	7,898
EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION	5,409	5,409	5,409	5,409
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	9,037	13,037	9,037	12,437
SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS				
SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION	161,235	165,235	161,235	163,635
COMMUNICATIONS ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION	16,307	30,607	16,307	28,507
SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS				
SHORE LF/VLF COMMUNICATIONS	5,427	5,427	5,427	5,427

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT	132,874	127,874	117,874	122,874
SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS				
SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	149,636	156,136	149,636	154,236
SHORE COMMUNICATIONS				
JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT	4,256	4,256	4,256	4,256
ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS	1,270	1,270	1,270	1,270
NSIPS	12,281	12,281	12,281	12,281
JEDMICS	---	14,000	---	12,000
NAVAL SHORE COMMUNICATIONS	96,592	96,592	96,592	96,592
CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT				
INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)	78,473	89,873	86,873	88,373
CRYPTOLOGIC EQUIPMENT				
CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP	18,659	24,159	20,159	22,159
OTHER ELECTRONIC SUPPORT				
COAST GUARD EQUIPMENT	39,789	43,789	---	---
TOTAL, COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT	1,746,700	1,825,392	1,662,303	1,747,103
AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
SONOBUOYS				
SONOBUOYS - ALL TYPES	63,277	63,277	63,277	63,277
AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	7,733	7,733	27,533	23,233
EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS	7,540	7,540	7,540	7,540
AIRCRAFT REARMING EQUIPMENT	11,894	11,894	11,894	11,894
AIRCRAFT LAUNCH & RECOVERY EQUIPMENT	19,355	19,355	19,355	19,355
METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT	27,085	27,085	27,085	27,085
OTHER PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT	1,572	1,572	1,572	1,572
AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT	25,676	29,676	10,176	19,076
AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES	19,499	19,499	19,499	19,499
LAMPS MK III SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT	5,488	5,488	5,488	5,488
OTHER AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	12,440	14,440	27,440	23,940
TOTAL, AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	201,559	207,559	220,859	221,959
ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
SHIP GUN SYSTEM EQUIPMENT				
GUN FIRE CONTROL EQUIPMENT	27,108	36,108	27,108	32,508

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
NAVAL FIRES CONTROL SYSTEM	5,690	5,690	5,690	5,690
SHIP MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT				
NATO SEASPARROW	41,408	41,408	41,408	41,408
RAM GMLS	23,893	23,893	23,893	23,893
SHIP SELF DEFENSE SYSTEM	47,226	47,226	47,226	47,226
AEGIS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	155,654	169,154	155,654	164,854
SURFACE TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	53,614	53,614	53,614	53,614
SUBMARINE TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIP	5,262	5,262	5,262	5,262
VERTICAL LAUNCH SYSTEMS	6,483	6,483	6,483	6,483
FBM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIP	75,006	75,006	75,006	75,006
ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS	46,319	46,319	59,319	55,419
SUBMARINE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	7,538	7,538	7,538	7,538
SURFACE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	3,460	3,460	8,460	6,960
ASW RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	7,350	7,350	7,350	7,350
OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP	7,806	7,806	7,806	7,806
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	3,770	3,770	3,770	3,770
OTHER EXPENDABLE ORDNANCE				
ANTI-SHIP MISSILE DECOY SYSTEM	27,976	27,976	38,776	33,376
SURFACE TRAINING DEVICE MODS	6,557	6,557	6,557	6,557
SUBMARINE TRAINING DEVICE MODS	17,264	17,264	21,264	19,264
TOTAL, ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	569,384	591,884	602,184	603,984
CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
ARMORED SEDANS	481	481	481	481
PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	2,538	2,538	2,538	2,538
GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS	1,972	1,972	1,972	1,972
CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP	9,113	15,113	9,113	13,613
FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT	6,284	6,284	6,284	6,284
TACTICAL VEHICLES	42,238	42,238	77,238	67,238
AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT	47,193	47,193	47,193	47,193
POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	20,734	20,734	20,734	20,734

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION	14,963	14,963	14,963	14,963
TOTAL, CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	145,516	151,516	180,516	175,016
SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT	9,504	9,504	9,504	9,504
OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	10,959	10,959	16,959	15,159
FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	5,053	5,053	5,053	5,053
SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS	141,431	141,431	141,431	141,431
TOTAL, SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	166,947	166,947	172,947	171,147
PERSONNEL AND COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
TRAINING DEVICES				
TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	707	13,707	707	8,207
COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	34,770	46,770	34,770	43,170
EDUCATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	7,095	7,095	7,095	7,095
MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	9,145	12,645	9,145	9,145
INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	26,564	36,564	30,564	33,564
OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	16,505	16,505	16,505	16,505
MOBILE SENSOR PLATFORM	5,946	10,446	25,946	23,146
ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	19,978	19,978	19,978	19,978
PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	81,721	176,204	176,204	176,204
TOTAL, PERSONNEL AND COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	202,431	339,914	320,914	337,014
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	172,886	172,886	172,886	172,886
TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY	4,347,024	4,631,299	4,500,710	4,612,910

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
(in thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
3 SUBMARINE PROPELLERS	**10,641**	**4,241**	**10,641**	**4,241**
Seawolf Installation Availability Delay		-6,400		-6,400
12 STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	**26,692**	**41,692**	**26,692**	**39,492**
Submarine Common Electronics Equipment Replacement (Note: Only for procurement of AN/UYQ-70 family equipment to modernize submarine combat systems.)		+15,000		+12,800
16 ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	**123,449**	**142,449**	**124,949**	**136,049**
Fuel Catalyst		+3,000		+3,000
Fuel and Engine Maintenance Savings System (FEMSS)		+3,500		+1,800
Total Ship Information Management Systems (TSIMS) for CVNs		+2,500		+1,800
Wireless Network Capable Application Processors Factory		+10,000		+8,500
ICAS			+8,000	+4,000
Premature Smartship Procurement			-6,500	-6,500
22 STANDARD BOATS	**33,832**	**35,832**	**33,832**	**35,232**
25 Person Life Rafts (Note: The additional funds provided are only to be used for 25 Person Life Rafts.)		+2,000		+1,400
24 OPERATING FORCES IPE	**17,134**	**21,134**	**42,134**	**38,934**
Expeditionary Maintenance Facility		+4,000		+2,800
IPDE Enhancement and PDM Interoperability			+10,000	+7,000
PHNSY Equipment			+15,000	+12,000
27 RADAR SUPPORT	**0**	**10,000**	**0**	**13,700**
AN/SYS-2(V) 11 Track Management System for FFG-7s		+5,000		+4,300
Back Fit of Signal Processor ECP into DDG-51, LHA, LSD,LPDs, and CVs ships		+5,000		+4,300
SPS-73(V) (Note: Only for continued upgrade and installation of the SPS-73(V) radar on Navy ships.)				+5,100
29 SSN ACOUSTICS	**251,909**	**231,009**	**236,909**	**237,909**
TB-29A - Operational Testing Delay		-22,400	-15,000	-15,000
TB-23 Towed Array		+1,500		+1,000
30 UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	**3,775**	**15,275**	**3,775**	**12,975**
CV-TSC Modernization		+4,500		+3,200
Surface Ship Torpedo Defense (Note: Funds are only to procure new improvements to the AN/SLQ-25A torpedo countermeasure system.)		+7,000		+6,000
33 SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM	**21,686**	**24,686**	**21,686**	**23,186**
Submarine Acoustic Intercept Improvement Initiative		+3,000		+1,500
38 AIEWS	**15,808**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Program Termination		-15,808	-15,808	-15,808
39 INFORMATION WARFARE SYSTEMS	**5,158**	**7,158**	**7,158**	**7,158**
Transfer from DERF		+2,000	+2,000	+2,000
40 SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT	**77,066**	**87,066**	**87,066**	**87,066**
EW Readiness Support - Transfer from DERF		+10,000	+10,000	+10,000
42 NAVY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	**0**	**9,000**	**0**	**7,700**
AN/UYQ-70 Fleet Peripheral Emulation Fielding		+5,000		+4,300
Q-70 Shore Sites		+4,000		+3,400
43 COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY	**66,736**	**74,736**	**66,736**	**72,736**
CEC Accelerated Fleet Introduction / Low Cost Planar Array Antennas		+8,000		+6,000
56 AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM	**17,447**	**17,447**	**11,747**	**11,747**
Premature Procurement			-5,700	-5,700

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
57 NATIONAL AIR SPACE SYSTEM	**20,000**	**20,000**	**5,000**	**5,000**
Program Delays			-15,000	-15,000
61 ID SYSTEMS	**32,633**	**31,833**	**32,633**	**31,833**
MK XII Common Digital Transponder - Unjustified Cost Growth		-800		-800
70 INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY	**4,498**	**8,498**	**4,498**	**7,898**
Q-70 Integrated Combat Systems Test Facility Installations		+4,000		+3,400
72 ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	**9,037**	**13,037**	**9,037**	**12,437**
Production of Q-70 Computer Aided Dead Reckoning Tracer (CADRT)		+4,000		+3,400
73 SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION	**161,235**	**165,235**	**161,235**	**163,635**
Mission Systems Technology and Interoperability Center (MSTIC) communications upgrades		+4,000		+2,400
74 COMMUNICATIONS ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION	**16,307**	**30,607**	**16,307**	**28,507**
Q-70 Based IT-21 Advanced Tactical Servers (Note: Only for procurement of AN/UYQ-70 advanced tactical servers to support the IT-21 Block 1 Upgrade Program.)		+9,000		+7,700
AN/UYQ-70 Secure Voice System Hardware for Surface Ships		+5,300		+4,500
76 SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT	**132,874**	**127,874**	**117,874**	**122,874**
Installations costs		-5,000		
Program Cost Growth			-15,000	-10,000
77 SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	**149,636**	**156,136**	**149,636**	**154,236**
Mini-DAMA (Sub/Ships)		+6,500		+4,600
81 JEDMICS	**0**	**14,000**	**0**	**12,000**
JEDMICS (Note: Only for the continued procurement and integration of the same security solution implemented in the previous fiscal year, and its extension into other logistics processes.)		+7,000		+6,000
JEDMICS (Note: Only to procure and deploy to PACOM the Type I version of the network security solution previously evaluated at the B2 level of trust for use in U.S. military and coalition networks.)		+7,000		+6,000
83 INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)	**78,473**	**89,873**	**86,873**	**88,373**
Secure Wireless Comm. Eq. - Transfer from DERF		+3,000		+1,500
Computer Network Defense - Transfer from DERF		+4,600		+4,600
Enclave Boundaries - Transfer from DERF		+2,000		+2,000
Intrusion Detection System - Transfer from DERF		+1,800		+1,800
Transfer from DERF			+8,400	
85 CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP	**18,659**	**24,159**	**20,159**	**22,159**
Cryptological Direct Support -Transfer from DERF		+1,500	+1,500	+1,500
Secure Terminal Equipment		+4,000		+2,000
86 COAST GUARD EQUIPMENT	**39,789**	**43,789**	**0**	**0**
Night Vision Devices - Transfer from DERF		+4,000		
Funds Transfer - Deepwater			-39,789	
89 WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	**7,733**	**7,733**	**27,533**	**23,233**
Mobile Threat Emitter System - Fallon			+10,000	+7,000
PMRF Equipment			+9,800	+8,500
95 AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT	**25,676**	**29,676**	**10,176**	**19,076**
Universal Water Activated Release System		+4,000		+3,400
CSEL Program Delays			-15,500	-10,000
98 OTHER AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	**12,440**	**14,440**	**27,440**	**23,940**
Resource Allocation Management Plan (RAMP)		+2,000		+1,000
Joint Tactical Data Integration			+15,000	+10,500

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
99 GUN FIRE CONTROL EQUIPMENT	**27,108**	**36,108**	**27,108**	**32,508**
(Note: Only to accelerate the deployment of the AN/SPQ-9B self-protection radar to DDG-51 destroyers)		+9,000		+5,400
104 AEGIS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	**155,654**	**169,154**	**155,654**	**164,854**
Wireless Access Points for Aegis Ships (Note: Only to deploy the All-in-One Wireless Access Point ship alteration on CG-47ships.)		+3,500		+2,500
AEGIS Surface Combatant Integrated Bridge System		+3,000		+1,800
Aegis Computer Center (Note: Only for replacement of obsolete NTDS interface boards and emulators with current technology and low cost commercial equipment.)		+3,000		+1,500
Machinery and Damage Control System Computing Replacement Equipment		+4,000		+3,400
110 SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS	**46,319**	**46,319**	**59,319**	**55,419**
SSN Modernization			+13,000	+9,100
112 SURFACE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	**3,460**	**3,460**	**8,460**	**6,960**
Mk 32 SVTT Remanufacture			+5,000	+3,500
116 ANTI-SHIP MISSILE DECOY SYSTEM	**27,976**	**27,976**	**38,776**	**33,376**
NULKA			+10,800	+5,400
118 SUBMARINE TRAINING DEVICE MODS	**17,264**	**17,264**	**21,264**	**19,264**
INTERLOCKS Development Tools			+4,000	+2,000
122 CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP	**9,113**	**15,113**	**9,113**	**13,613**
Laser Leveling Systems		+1,000		+1,000
Earthmoving Equipment		+5,000		+3,500
124 TACTICAL VECHICLES	**42,238**	**42,238**	**77,238**	**67,238**
Additional MTVR			+35,000	+25,000
130 OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	**10,959**	**10,959**	**16,959**	**15,159**
Serial Number Tracking System			+6,000	+4,200
133 TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	**707**	**13,707**	**707**	**8,207**
Trident Sonar Manuals - Data Management and Conversion		+5,000		+3,500
Technical Data Knowledge Management in an Integrated Data Environment (TDKE-IDE)		+8,000		+4,000
134 COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	**34,770**	**46,770**	**34,770**	**43,170**
Man Overboard Indicator (MOBI) (Note: The Committee directs the Navy to immediately begin procuring and installing MOBI Systems fleet-wide with appropriated fiscal year 2002 funds.)		+8,000		+5,600
USNR Information Infrastructure Continuity of Operations		+3,000		+1,800
Advanced Technical Information Support (ATIS)		+1,000		+1,000
136 MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	**9,145**	**12,645**	**9,145**	**9,145**
Dendrimer Nanotechnology Research Laboratory		+3,500		
137 INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	**26,564**	**36,564**	**30,564**	**33,564**
Transfer from DERF		+4,000	+4,000	+4,000
Transfer from DERF		+6,000		+3,000
139 MOBILE SENSOR PLATFORM	**5,946**	**10,446**	**25,946**	**23,146**
AN / TSQ-108 V(3) Upgrades		+4,500		+3,200
Littoral Surveillance System			+20,000	+14,000
141 PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	**81,721**	**176,204**	**176,204**	**176,204**
Mobile Security Forces - Transfer from DERF		+14,000	+14,000	+14,000
Strategic Bases - Transfer from DERF		+4,000	+4,000	+4,000
Physical Security Equipment - Transfer from DERF		+76,483	+76,483	+76,483

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS				
WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES				
TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES				
AAV7A1 PIP	62,991	62,991	62,991	62,991
AAAV	14,718	14,718	14,718	14,718
LAV PIP	53,166	53,166	43,166	53,166
IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (IRV)	4,179	4,179	4,179	4,179
MODIFICATION KITS (TRKD VEH)	3,297	3,297	3,297	3,297
ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS				
HIMARS	7,869	7,869	7,869	7,869
155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER	62,643	62,643	62,643	62,643
MOD KITS (ARTILLERY)	4,890	4,890	4,890	4,890
MARINE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM	8,145	8,145	8,145	8,145
WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER $5 MILLION	312	312	312	312
WEAPONS				
MODULAR WEAPON SYSTEM	24,352	24,352	24,352	24,352
OTHER SUPPORT				
OPERATIONS OTHER THAN WAR	1,531	1,531	1,531	1,531
TOTAL, WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES	248,093	248,093	238,093	248,093
GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT				
GUIDED MISSILES				
EADS MOD	184	184	184	184
JAVELIN	1,049	1,049	1,049	1,049
PEDESTAL MOUNTED STINGER (PMS) (MYP)	1,565	1,565	1,565	1,565
PREDATOR (SRAW)	36,484	36,484	36,484	36,484
OTHER SUPPORT				
MODIFICATION KITS	7,967	7,967	7,967	7,967
TOTAL, GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT	47,249	47,249	47,249	47,249

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT				
REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT				
AUTO TEST EQUIP SYS	894	6,894	8,894	6,894
GENERAL PURPOSE ELECTRONIC TEST EQUIP	8,324	8,324	8,324	8,324
INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)				
INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	18,526	38,126	38,126	38,126
MOD KITS (INTEL)	2,570	11,370	11,370	11,370
ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (INTELL)	1,843	4,243	4,243	4,243
REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)				
GENERAL PURPOSE MECHANICAL TMDE	4,565	4,565	4,565	4,565
OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)				
NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT	23,204	23,204	23,204	23,204
OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)				
ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)	16,097	18,597	18,597	18,597
COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES	38,974	38,974	38,974	38,974
COMMAND POST SYSTEMS	33,512	33,512	33,512	33,512
RADIO SYSTEMS	25,528	32,528	20,028	28,528
COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS	3,974	3,974	28,974	23,974
COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT	16,426	28,026	21,026	27,026
MOD KITS MAGTF C41	31,470	34,470	34,470	37,770
AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS	6,525	6,525	6,525	6,525
INTELLIGENCE C2 SYSTEMS	22,362	22,362	22,362	22,362
FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM	34,855	34,855	34,855	34,855
TOTAL, COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT	289,649	350,549	358,049	368,849
SUPPORT VEHICLES				
ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES				
COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES	861	861	861	861
COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES	13,123	13,123	13,123	13,123
TACTICAL VEHICLES				
5/4T TRUCK HMMWV (MYP)	118,414	118,414	118,414	118,414
MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE REPLACEMENT	347,578	347,578	347,578	347,578
OTHER SUPPORT				
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	3,534	6,034	3,534	5,734
TOTAL, SUPPORT VEHICLES	483,510	486,010	483,510	485,710

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT				
ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT				
ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT	2,709	2,709	2,709	2,709
BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT	10,261	10,261	10,261	10,261
TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS	2,048	4,048	2,048	3,748
POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED	8,898	8,898	8,898	8,898
MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT				
AMPHIBIOUS RAID EQUIPMENT	22,295	22,295	22,295	22,295
PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	8,804	12,404	12,404	12,404
GARRISON MOBILE ENGR EQUIP	2,608	2,608	2,608	2,608
MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP	52,503	56,503	57,503	59,403
FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	8,221	8,221	8,221	8,221
GENERAL PROPERTY				
FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT	10,452	10,452	10,452	10,452
TRAINING DEVICES	18,651	18,651	20,651	19,651
CONTAINER FAMILY	7,120	7,120	7,120	7,120
FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT	14,709	17,709	14,709	16,809
RAPID DEPLOYABLE KITCHEN	21,505	21,505	21,505	21,505
OTHER SUPPORT				
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	5,772	10,772	5,772	9,272
TOTAL, ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT	196,556	214,156	207,156	215,356
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	23,326	23,326	23,326	23,326
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS	1,288,383	1,369,383	1,357,383	1,388,583

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
[In thousands of dollars]

P-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
3	**LAV PIP**	**53,166**	**53,166**	**43,166**	**53,166**
	Underexecution		0	-10,000	0
19	**AUTO TEST EQUIP SYS**	**894**	**6,894**	**8,894**	**6,894**
	Third Echelon Test System (TETS) (note: only to procure RF/electro optical TETS systems and associated Test Program Sets to facilitate consolidation of Marine Corps automatic test equipment into a single advanced test system platform)		+6,000	+8,000	+6,000
21	**INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT**	**18,526**	**38,126**	**38,126**	**38,126**
	Intelligence Support Equipment--Transfer from DERF		+19,600		0
	TPC (Transfer from DERF)			+3,300	+3,300
	TEG (Transfer from DERF)			+9,000	+9,000
	TROJAN Lite (Transfer from DERF)			+5,700	+5,700
	TACPHOTO (Transfer from DERF)			+1,600	+1,600
22	**MOD KITS (INTEL)**	**2,570**	**11,370**	**11,370**	**11,370**
	MOD Kits (Intell)--Transfer from DERF		+8,800		0
	TPCS (Transfer from DERF)			+8,300	+8,300
	TCAC (Transfer from DERF)			+500	+500
23	**ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (INTELL)**	**1,843**	**4,243**	**4,243**	**4,243**
	Items Under $5 million (Intell)--Transfer from DERF		+2,400		0
	I-SURSS (Transfer from DERF)			+2,400	+2,400
26	**ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)**	**16,097**	**18,597**	**18,597**	**18,597**
	Items Under $5 million (Comm & Elec)--Transfer from		+2,500		
	Secure Wireless (Transfer from DERF)			+800	+800
	ISR (Transfer from DERF)			+1,700	+1,700
29	**RADIO SYSTEMS**	**25,528**	**32,528**	**20,028**	**28,528**
	Tactical Hand Held Radio (THHR)		+4,000	+4,500	+4,000
	Lightweight Multi-Band Satellite Terminal (LMST) (Note: only to initiate the acquisition and fielding of additional terminals in support of Marine expeditionary Forces (MEF))		+3,000		+4,000
	SMART-T Program Delays			-10,000	-5,000
30	**COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS**	**3,974**	**3,974**	**28,974**	**23,974**
	Jt. Enhanced Corps Communication System		0	+25,000	+20,000
31	**COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT**	**16,426**	**28,026**	**21,026**	**27,026**
	Comm & Elec Infrastructure Support--Transfer from DERF		+4,600		0
	USMC Continuity of Operations		+7,000		+6,000
	Computer Network Defense (Transfer from DERF)			+1,900	+1,900
	Deployed Security Interdiction Devices (Transfer from DERF)			+700	+700
	Continuity of Intelligence (Trasnfer from DERF)			+2,000	+2,000

P-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
32	**MOD KITS MAGTF C41**	**31,470**	**34,470**	**34,470**	**37,770**
	MOD Kits MAGTF C4I--Transfer from DERF		+3,000		0
	FLAMES/CESAS (Transfer from DERF)			+3,000	+3,000
	AN/TPS-59 (v)3 Radar Environmental Simulator		0	0	+3,300
40	**ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION**	**3,534**	**6,034**	**3,534**	**5,734**
	Single Battlefield Fuel Motorcycle (Note: only to upgrade USMC motorcycles to incorporate JP-8/Diesel "single battlefield fuel" engines.)		+2,500		+2,200
43	**TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS**	**2,048**	**4,048**	**2,048**	**3,748**
	Newly Developed Fast Fuel System		+2,000		+1,700
48	**PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT**	**8,804**	**12,404**	**12,404**	**12,404**
	Physical Security Equipment--Transfer from DERF		+3,600	+3,600	+3,600
50	**MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP**	**52,503**	**56,503**	**57,503**	**59,403**
	Extendable Boom Forklift Program		+4,000		+3,400
	TRAM			+5,000	+3,500
53	**TRAINING DEVICES**	**18,651**	**18,651**	**20,651**	**19,651**
	Live Fire Training Range Upgrades			+2,000	+1,000
55	**FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT**	**14,709**	**17,709**	**14,709**	**16,809**
	Graders, Winches, and Rippers--Service Life Extension Program (SLEP)		+3,000		+2,100
58	**ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION**	**5,772**	**10,772**	**5,772**	**9,272**
	USMC Batteries		+5,000		+3,500

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE				
COMBAT AIRCRAFT				
TACTICAL FORCES				
F-22 RAPTOR	4,090,434	4,090,434	4,061,934	4,061,934
F-22 RAPTOR (AP-CY)	530,634	530,634	530,634	530,634
TOTAL, COMBAT AIRCRAFT	4,621,068	4,621,068	4,592,568	4,592,568
AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT				
TACTICAL AIRLIFT				
C-17A (MYP)	2,694,140	2,694,140	3,291,340	3,291,340
C-17A (MYP) (AP-CY)	391,890	391,890	391,890	391,890
C-17 ICS	612,452	621,952	553,252	553,252
EC-130J	---	---	87,000	87,000
OTHER AIRLIFT				
C-130H	18,672	23,672	18,672	21,172
C-130J	175,923	175,923	175,923	175,923
TOTAL, AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT	3,893,077	3,907,577	4,518,077	4,520,577
TRAINER AIRCRAFT				
JPATS	211,848	211,848	211,848	211,848
OTHER AIRCRAFT				
HELICOPTERS				
V-22 OSPREY	90,904	90,904	90,904	90,904
V-22 OSPREY (AP-CY)	10,100	10,100	---	10,100

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT				
CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C	2,616	10,616	2,616	5,216
OTHER AIRCRAFT				
TARGET DRONES	30,586	30,586	30,586	30,586
C-40 ANG	---	---	30,600	30,600
E-8C	279,268	279,268	279,268	279,268
HAEUAV	63,861	128,861	128,861	128,861
HAEUAV (AP-CY)	41,000	32,625	41,000	41,000
PREDATOR UAV	23,068	131,068	105,068	131,068
TOTAL, OTHER AIRCRAFT	541,403	714,028	708,903	747,603
MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE AIRCRAFT				
STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT				
B-2A	72,123	104,123	72,123	104,123
B-1B	98,026	98,026	109,026	106,026
B-52	---	---	35,200	24,700
F-117	21,079	21,079	21,079	21,079
TACTICAL AIRCRAFT				
A-10	21,775	21,775	21,775	21,775
F-15	232,500	259,900	300,000	283,700
F-16	265,007	269,007	268,107	281,007
F22 RAPTOR	11,200	11,200	11,200	11,200
T/AT-37	81	81	81	81
AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT				
C-5	86,008	59,408	59,408	59,408
C-9	1,346	1,346	1,346	1,346
C-17A	128,178	128,178	128,178	128,178
C-21	2,562	2,562	2,562	2,562
C-32A	26,684	26,684	26,684	26,684
C-37A	373	373	373	373
C-141	796	796	796	796
TRAINER AIRCRAFT				
T-38	168,112	176,112	168,112	174,912
T-41 AIRCRAFT	90	90	90	90
T-43	2,183	2,183	2,183	2,183

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
OTHER AIRCRAFT				
KC-10A (ATCA)	14,176	14,176	14,176	14,176
C-12	400	400	400	400
C-18	800	800	800	800
C-20 MODS	828	828	828	828
VC-25A MOD	12,171	80,171	80,171	80,171
C-130	138,533	155,633	173,283	170,783
C-135	108,670	197,670	115,670	113,570
DARP	150,123	139,423	156,123	142,423
E-3	29,478	29,478	29,478	29,478
E-4	39,139	39,139	39,139	39,139
E-8	19,307	19,307	19,307	19,307
H-1	473	473	473	473
H-60	40,640	40,640	40,640	40,640
OTHER AIRCRAFT	54,653	54,653	54,653	54,653
PREDATOR MODS	10,532	10,532	10,532	10,532
OTHER MODIFICATIONS				
CLASSIFIED PROJECTS	18,546	18,546	18,546	18,546
TOTAL, MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE AIRCRAFT	1,776,592	1,984,792	1,982,542	1,986,142
AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS				
INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	275,982	283,982	283,982	283,982
AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES				
COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	180,943	180,943	178,243	178,243
POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT				
B-1	1,969	1,969	1,969	1,969
B-2A	3,279	3,279	3,279	3,279
B-2A	33,484	33,484	33,484	33,484
C-130	10,922	10,922	1,922	10,922
F-15 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT	7,512	7,512	7,512	7,512
F-16 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT	14,200	14,200	14,200	14,200
INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	22,248	22,248	22,248	22,248
WAR CONSUMABLES	38,429	38,429	38,429	38,429
MISC PRODUCTION CHARGES	349,516	361,516	391,416	389,316

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT	1,182	1,182	1,182	1,182
DARP	83,751	93,751	93,751	93,751
TOTAL, AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES	747,435	769,435	787,635	794,535
TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	12,067,405	12,492,730	13,085,555	13,137,255

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
(In thousands of dollars)

P-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
1	**F-22 RAPTOR**	**4,090,434**	**4,090,434**	**4,061,934**	**4,061,934**
	Production support cost growth			-28,500	-28,500
5	**C-17A (MYP)**	**2,694,140**	**2,694,140**	**3,291,340**	**3,291,340**
	Fully fund purchase of 15 aircraft			+585,900	+585,900
	Maintenance trainer			+11,300	+11,300
7	**C-17 ICS**	**612,452**	**621,952**	**553,252**	**553,252**
	Aircraft Engine Trainer for the ANG (Funded in line P-5)		+9,500		0
	Excessive growth			-59,200	-59,200
8	**EC-130J**	**0**	**0**	**87,000**	**87,000**
	Purchase 1 additional aircraft			+87,000	+87,000
9	**C-130H**	**18,672**	**23,672**	**18,672**	**21,172**
	H2 Simulator / Air Force Reserve		+5,000		+2,500
13	**V-22 OSPREY (AP-CY)**	**10,100**	**10,100**	**0**	**10,100**
	Authorized level			-10,100	0
15	**CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C**	**2,616**	**10,616**	**2,616**	**5,216**
	CAP Modernization Program		+8,000		+2,600
18	**C-40 ANG**	**0**	**0**	**30,600**	**30,600**
	Leasing costs			+30,600	+30,600
21	**HAEUAV**	**63,861**	**128,861**	**128,861**	**128,861**
	Global Hawk UAV - Transfer from DERF		+65,000	+65,000	+65,000
22	**HAEUAV (AP-CY)**	**41,000**	**32,625**	**41,000**	**41,000**
	Use available FY02 advance procurement		-8,375		0
23	**PREDATOR UAV**	**23,068**	**131,068**	**105,068**	**131,068**
	Predator A - Transfer from DERF		+68,000	+68,000	+68,000
	Predator Equipment - Transfer from DERF		+14,000	+14,000	+14,000
	Predator B (Note: Only for acquisition of not less than 3 Predator B aircraft including spares.)		+26,000		+26,000
24	**B-2A**	**72,123**	**104,123**	**72,123**	**104,123**
	UHF SATCOM		+25,200		+25,200
	Low Observable Improvements		+6,800		+6,800
25	**B-1B**	**98,026**	**98,026**	**109,026**	**106,026**
	Wing components			+11,000	+8,000
26	**B-52**	**0**	**0**	**35,200**	**24,700**
	Attrition Reserve			+25,200	+17,700
	B-52 electronic countermeasures			+10,000	+7,000
29	**F-15**	**232,500**	**259,900**	**300,000**	**283,700**
	F-15 Engine Upgrades - E- Kits		+5,000	+20,000	+14,000
	BOL-515 IR Countermeasures Dispensers		+3,400		+2,400
	Signal Data Recorder Set		+1,000		+1,000
	ALQ-135 Band 1.5 Jammers		+10,000	+20,000	+14,000
	Joint Helmet Mounted Cueing System for the ANG		+8,000		+4,000
	Block upgrades			+15,000	+10,500
	AN/ALR-67 (V) 3&4 Countermeasures set (Moved to AP,N)			+5,000	0
	APG-63 (v)1 program			+7,500	+5,300
30	**F-16**	**265,007**	**269,007**	**268,107**	**281,007**
	Tactical Airborne Reconnaissance System (TARS) (Note: Only to upgrade TARS pods operated by the Air National Guard.)		+4,000		+2,000
	Block 42 engine upgrades			+15,000	+10,500
	On-board oxygen retrofit			+5,000	+3,500
	Unjustified growth: Falcon Star			-16,900	0

P-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
33	**C-5**	**86,008**	**59,408**	**59,408**	**59,408**
	Avionics Modernization Program (Transfer to RDTE, AF)		-26,600	-26,600	-26,600
40	**T-38**	**168,112**	**176,112**	**168,112**	**174,912**
	T-38 Ejection Seats		+8,000		+6,800
47	**VC-25A MOD**	**12,171**	**80,171**	**80,171**	**80,171**
	Passenger Data System - Transfer from DERF		+68,000	+68,000	+68,000
48	**C-130**	**138,533**	**155,633**	**173,283**	**170,783**
	Modular Airborne Firefighting System for ANG (Note: Only to complete AFFS procurement for Western States Firefighting Missions.)		+5,600		+4,800
	AN/AAQ-24 DIRCM for C-130H ANG Counterdrug Aircraft		+9,500		+8,100
	Terrain Awareness and Warning System (TAWS)		+2,000	+4,000	+2,500
	TCAS			+4,000	+2,500
	T-56 quick engine change kits			+13,000	+6,500
	AAN/AYW-1 dual autopilot (ANG)			+750	+750
	Senior Scout: COMINT system			+3,000	+2,100
	NP2000 propeller system			+10,000	+5,000
49	**C-135**	**108,670**	**197,670**	**115,670**	**113,570**
	Air Refueling - Transfer from DERF		+89,000		0
	KC-135 crew support upgrades			+7,000	+4,900
50	**DARP**	**150,123**	**139,423**	**156,123**	**142,423**
	Rivet Joint QRC Sustainment - Transfer from DERF		+1,000	+1,000	+1,000
	U-2 EMI Upgrades - Transfer from DERF		+5,000	+5,000	+5,000
	Duplicate QRC funding		-15,700		-12,700
	Rivet Joint QRC Sustainment		-1,000		-1,000
59	**INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES**	**275,982**	**283,982**	**283,982**	**283,982**
	Predator 3rd Squadron Initial Spares - Transfer from DERF		+8,000	+8,000	+8,000
60	**COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT**	**180,943**	**180,943**	**178,243**	**178,243**
	Common portable reprogramming equip			-2,700	-2,700
65	**C-130**	**10,922**	**10,922**	**1,922**	**10,922**
	Post production support			-9,000	0
71	**MISC PRODUCTION CHARGES**	**349,516**	**361,516**	**391,416**	**389,316**
	Classified - Transfer from DERF		+12,000	+12,000	+12,000
	AK Air CPT Training Upgrade/P4-BE Pods (Note: Transferred from Other Procurement, Air Force)			0	+4,300
	Magnetic bearing cooling turbine technology			+5,000	+3,500
	LITENING targeting pod upgrades (ANG)			+24,900	+20,000
74	**DARP**	**83,751**	**93,751**	**93,751**	**93,751**
	U-2 Systems - Transfer from DERF		+10,000	+10,000	+10,000

F–22

The conferees agree with the language in the House and Senate reports regarding the F–22 program. In addition, the conferees agree, with some modification, to a general provision included in the House bill related to the F–22 testing program. Finally, of the amounts provided for the F–22, the conferees designate $207,000,000, requested for the producibility improvement program, as a special interest item. If the Air Force believes it is necessary to use these funds for an alternative purpose, the Department must submit a prior approval reprogramming.

C–17 AIRCRAFT

In the Department of Defense's fiscal year 2003 budget submission, the Air Force did not request a sufficient amount to fully fund the purchase of 15 C–17 cargo aircraft per year. Instead, it requested only the amount of funds it expected to obligate each year to start production of 15 aircraft, and financed the remaining costs in later years. This financing scheme runs counter to the ''full funding'' principles which guide Federal government procurement practice, and thereby creates a future liability for the Air Force and Congress. For this reason, the conferees disapprove the Air Force's C–17 financing proposal. As such, the conference agreement includes an increase of $585,900,000 over the budget request to fully fund the purchase of 15 C–17 aircraft in fiscal year 2003. Additionally, the conferees agree to retain House language which directs that funds made available within the ''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force'' account be used for advance procurement of 15 aircraft.

NATO AWACS

Not later than 60 days after the enactment of this Act, the Commander in Chief of the United States European Command shall submit a plan to the congressional defense committees that provides for the refurbishment and re-engining of the NATO AWACS aircraft fleet. This report should reflect the significant contribution made by the NATO AWACS fleet in response to the attack on the United States on September 11, 2001, and the invocation of Article V of the North Atlantic Treaty. The plan shall also describe any necessary memorandum of agreement between the United States and NATO for the refurbishment and re-engining of these aircraft.

APPLICATION OF BERRY AMENDMENT TO MULTI-YEAR AIRCRAFT LEASE PILOT PROGRAM

Due to the special circumstances surrounding the Multi-Year Aircraft Lease Pilot Program authorized in fiscal year 2002, Congress enacted Section 308 of P.L. 107–206 to clarify Berry Amendment restrictions on the use of foreign sourced specialty metals in commercial aircraft to be leased under this program. In this case, the Congress concurred with views expressed by Air Force officials that the unique financial and time-sensitive requirements of the aircraft lease arrangements and the administrative complexity involved in making Berry Amendment determinations on a plane-by-plane basis for over 100 aircraft built under commercial practices instead of under military acquisition procedures would add so much cost and delay that the entire program would be undermined. Enactment of Section 308 was intended to provide the opportunity to ensure that the Air Force would be able to economically procure air refueling tanker replacement aircraft necessary to the national security while maintaining the overall integrity of the Berry Amendment for future application.

The conferees note the assertion expressed by some industry officials that if the aircraft manufacturer for this lease program were allowed to calculate Berry Amendment requirements on a system-level basis for the entire fleet of aircraft, it could demonstrate that these aircraft contain a very high percentage content of domestically produced specialty metals such as titanium. The conferees believe this data could be useful in future deliberations about this program. The Secretary of the Air Force is therefore directed to provide the congressional defense committees with estimates of the amount, value, and overall percentage of foreign and domestic-sourced specialty metals (under the definitions of the Berry Amendment) to be used in the fleet of leased aircraft under this program and how this compares to the specialty metal content of military aircraft that have been procured by the Air Force over the last five years. The Secretary shall use such methodology as he determines will provide the most accurate estimates at a reasonable cost after consultations with the specialty metals and aircraft manufacturing industries. This report shall be submitted to Congress no later than six months after enactment of this Act.

PREDATOR UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE (UAV)

The conferees agree to provide an additional $26,000,000 for the acquisition of not less than three Predator B turboprop aircraft, including spares. Should the program office determine there are additional costs for aircraft, spares, support equipment, sensors, and prductionization efforts which cannot be accommodated within the amount appropriated, the Air Force should consider submitting to Congress the appropriate reprogramming request to fund these requirements.

The conferees agree to provide an additional $68,000,000 in transfer from the Defense Emergency Response Fund for the acquisition of Predator A UAVs. This among, when added to the request of $23,068,000, is for the acquisition of 22 air vehicles.

DEFENSE AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE PROGRAM

The conferees agree to reduce funding for the RIVET JOINT Quick Reaction Capability (QRC) by $12,700,000 instead of $15,000,000 as proposed by the House and no reduction as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees are aware the Air Force preferred to have these funds transferred to a different line in the Aircraft Procurement, Air Force account to fund the same QRC on the COMPASS CALL platform. The conferees agree that should the Air Force determine that it wishes to proceed with putting this QRC on the COMPASS CALL aircraft, it should submit a request to reprogram funds and justify the requirement for expanding the program.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
	(In thousands of dollars)			
MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE				
BALLISTIC MISSILES				
MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLIS	48,685	48,685	48,685	48,685
OTHER MISSILES				
TACTICAL				
JASSM	54,240	54,240	54,240	54,240
JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON	55,740	19,540	10,040	12,440
SIDEWINDER (AIM-9X)	56,964	56,964	56,964	56,964
AMRAAM	89,593	89,593	89,593	89,593
HELLFIRE	---	10,000	10,000	10,000
INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES				
INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	2,105	2,105	2,105	2,105
TOTAL, OTHER MISSILES	258,642	232,442	222,942	225,342
MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE MISSILES				
CLASS IV				
ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE	3,376	3,376	3,376	3,376
MM III MODIFICATIONS	580,701	593,701	603,901	598,401
AGM-65D MAVERICK	333	333	4,333	3,133
AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE	1,998	1,998	1,998	1,998
TOTAL, MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE MISSILES	586,408	599,408	613,608	606,908
MISSILE SPARES & REPAIR PARTS	48,412	48,412	48,412	48,412

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
OTHER SUPPORT				
SPACE PROGRAMS				
ADVANCED EHF (AP-CY)	94,523	---	---	---
WIDEBAND GAPFILLER SATELLITES	189,666	189,666	189,666	189,666
SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC)	9,368	9,368	9,368	9,368
GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE)	206,470	234,470	234,470	234,470
GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE) (AP-CY)	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG(S	60,051	60,051	60,051	60,051
DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM(SPACE	114,382	114,382	114,382	114,382
DEFENSE SATELLITE COMM SYSTEM	20,669	20,669	20,669	20,669
TITAN SPACE BOOSTERS(SPACE)	335,303	235,303	315,303	295,303
EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH	158,867	158,867	173,367	166,867
MEDIUM LAUNCH VEHICLE (SPACE)	48,208	48,208	48,208	48,208
SPECIAL PROGRAMS				
DEFENSE SPACE RECONN PROGRAM	384,000	284,000	384,000	284,000
SPECIAL PROGRAMS	879,516	769,516	749,516	690,416
SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS	128,992	128,992	128,992	128,992
TOTAL, OTHER SUPPORT	2,633,015	2,256,492	2,430,992	2,245,392
TOTAL, MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	3,575,162	3,185,439	3,364,639	3,174,739

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
(In thousands of dollars)

P-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
4	**JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON**	**55,740**	**19,540**	**10,040**	**12,440**
	Termination of JSOW-B		-36,200	-45,700	-43,300
7a	**HELLFIRE**	**0**	**10,000**	**10,000**	**10,000**
	Hellfire - Transfer from DERF		+10,000	+10,000	+10,000
12	**MM III MODIFICATIONS**	**580,701**	**593,701**	**603,901**	**598,401**
	Guidance Replacement Program		+5,000	+5,200	+5,000
	Mk12/12A Shipping and Storage Containers		+8,000	+12,800	+9,000
	Propulsion Replacement Program			+5,200	+3,700
13	**AGM-65D MAVERICK**	**333**	**333**	**4,333**	**3,133**
	Additional Missiles			+4,000	+2,800
18	**ADVANCED EHF (AP-CY)**	**94,523**	**0**	**0**	**0**
	Program delays		-94,523	-94,523	-94,523
22	**GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE)**	**206,470**	**234,470**	**234,470**	**234,470**
	AF requested transfer		+28,000	+28,000	+28,000
28	**TITAN SPACE BOOSTERS(SPACE)**	**335,303**	**235,303**	**315,303**	**295,303**
	Chronic underexecution and excess end of year funds		-100,000	-20,000	-40,000
29	**EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE**	**158,867**	**158,867**	**173,367**	**166,867**
	Mission Assurance			+14,500	+8,000
31	**DEFENSE SPACE RECONN PROGRAM**	**384,000**	**284,000**	**384,000**	**284,000**
	Classified		-100,000		-100,000
32	**SPECIAL PROGRAMS**	**879,516**	**769,516**	**749,516**	**690,416**
	Classified		-110,000	-130,000	-189,100

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE				
PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, AIR FORCE				
ROCKETS	40,909	40,909	40,909	40,909
CARTRIDGES	154,620	154,620	154,620	154,620
BOMBS				
PRACTICE BOMBS	71,935	72,935	71,935	72,935
GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	108,589	134,589	133,589	134,589
SENSOR FUZED WEAPON	105,985	125,985	125,985	125,985
JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	378,863	484,863	484,863	484,863
WIND CORRECTED MUNITIONS DISP	71,165	71,165	71,165	71,165
FLARE, IR MJU-7B				
CAD/PAD	19,816	19,816	19,816	19,816
EXPLOSIVE ORDINANCE DISPOSAL I1063	2,727	2,727	2,727	2,727
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	3,008	3,008	3,008	3,008
MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	202	202	202	202
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	2,013	2,013	2,013	2,013
FUZES				
FLARES	131,967	135,867	132,967	135,267
FUZES	37,705	37,705	33,705	35,705
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, AIR FORCE	1,129,504	1,286,404	1,277,504	1,283,804
WEAPONS				
SMALL ARMS	4,360	4,360	4,360	4,360
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE	1,133,864	1,290,764	1,281,864	1,288,164

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
(In thousands of dollars)

P-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
3	**PRACTICE BOMBS**	**71,935**	**72,935**	**71,935**	**72,935**
	Cast Ductile Iron Practice Bombs (BDU-56)		+1,000		+1,000
4	**GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS**	**108,589**	**134,589**	**133,589**	**134,589**
	Transfer from DERF		+25,000	+25,000	+25,000
	Cast Ductile Iron Bombs (MK-84)		+1,000		+1,000
6	**SENSOR FUZED WEAPON**	**105,985**	**125,985**	**125,985**	**125,985**
	Increased Production		+20,000	+20,000	+20,000
7	**JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION**	**378,863**	**484,863**	**484,863**	**484,863**
	JDAM - Transfer from DERF		+106,000	+106,000	+106,000
14	**FLARES**	**131,967**	**135,867**	**132,967**	**135,267**
	MJU-52/B BOL IR Expendables for the Air National Guard		+3,900	+1,000	+3,300
15	**FUZES**	**37,705**	**37,705**	**33,705**	**35,705**
	Schedule Delay for Joint Programmable Fuze			-4,000	-2,000

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

	(In thousands of dollars)			
	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE				
VEHICULAR EQUIPMENT				
PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES				
SEDAN, 4 DR 4X2	552	552	552	552
STATION WAGON, 4X2	476	476	476	476
BUSES	7,982	7,982	7,982	7,982
AMBULANCES	755	755	755	755
LAW ENFORCEMENT VEHICLE	1,910	1,910	1,910	1,910
ARMORED VEHICLE	465	465	465	465
CARGO + UTILITY VEHICLES				
TRUCK, CARGO-UTILITY, 3/4T, 4X4	9,681	9,681	9,681	9,681
TRUCK, CARGO-UTILITY, 3/4T, 4X2	5,162	5,162	5,162	5,162
TRUCK MAINT/UTILITY/DELIVERY	10,475	10,475	10,475	10,475
HIGH MOBILITY VEHICLE (MYP)	11,881	11,881	11,881	11,881
CAP VEHICLES	792	792	792	792
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	39,616	39,616	39,616	39,616
SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES				
HMMWV, ARMORED	1,019	1,019	1,019	1,019
HMWWV, UP-ARMORED	3,629	3,629	3,629	3,629
TRACTOR, A/C TOW, MB-2	2,726	2,726	2,726	2,726
TRACTOR, A/C TOW, MB-4	6,143	6,143	6,143	6,143
TRACTOR, TOW, FLIGHTLINE	7,928	7,928	7,928	7,928
TRUCK HYDRANT FUEL	7,941	7,941	7,941	7,941
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	24,755	24,755	24,755	21,255

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT				
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	10,023	10,023	10,023	10,023
MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT				
TRUCK, F/L 10,000 LB	14,572	14,572	14,572	14,572
TUNNER LOADER	84,329	84,329	84,329	84,329
HALVERSEN LOADER	49,554	49,554	49,554	49,554
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	10,922	10,922	10,922	10,922
BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT				
RUNWAY SNOW REMOV AND CLEANIN	15,466	15,466	15,466	15,466
MODIFICATIONS	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	24,369	24,369	20,869	24,369
TOTAL, VEHICULAR EQUIPMENT	358,123	358,123	354,623	354,623
ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIP				
COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT(COMSEC)				
COMSEC EQUIPMENT	26,331	37,731	34,731	34,731
MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC)	460	460	460	460
INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS				
INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIP	1,310	1,310	1,310	1,310
INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIP	9,043	12,343	37,343	29,843
ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS				
AIR TRAFFIC CTRL/LAND SYS (AT	52,038	53,038	52,038	53,038
NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM	55,561	55,561	35,561	35,561
THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPRO	16,713	16,713	28,713	25,113
WEATHER OBSERVE/FORECAST	29,071	29,071	29,071	29,071
STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL	23,889	23,889	23,889	23,889
CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX	17,588	17,588	17,588	17,588
TAC SIGINT SUPPORT	406	10,406	10,406	10,406
SPECIAL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS				
GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	55,789	76,689	69,189	73,489
AF GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL S	28,182	28,182	28,182	28,182
MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL	9,735	9,735	9,735	9,735
AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY S	41,835	88,635	85,435	83,435
COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	17,242	31,242	50,956	41,056
MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY C	1,072	1,072	1,072	1,072

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
C3 COUNTERMEASURES	13,409	17,409	17,409	17,409
BASE LEVEL DATA AUTO PROGRAM	12,793	12,793	12,793	12,793
THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYS	56,202	56,202	56,202	56,202
AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS				
BASE INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE	214,727	214,727	221,415	221,415
USCENTCOM	9,839	9,839	9,839	9,839
DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS)	18,967	18,967	18,967	18,967
DISA PROGRAMS				
NAVSTAR GPS SPACE	13,110	13,110	13,110	13,110
NUDET DETECTION SYS (NDS) SPA	7,937	7,937	7,937	7,937
AF SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK	45,063	45,063	45,063	45,063
SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM SPACE	108,281	108,281	108,281	108,281
MILSATCOM SPACE	45,698	21,698	45,698	21,698
SPACE MODS SPACE	10,938	10,938	10,938	10,938
ORGANIZATION AND BASE				
TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT	134,427	134,427	134,427	134,427
COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATE	11,049	11,049	6,049	6,049
RADIO EQUIPMENT	8,801	10,301	8,801	10,551
TV EQUIPMENT (AFRTV)	2,620	2,620	2,620	2,620
CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT	3,259	3,259	3,259	3,259
BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE	202,900	217,900	182,900	193,700
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	9,278	9,278	9,278	9,278
MODIFICATIONS				
COMM ELECT MODS	68,894	68,894	58,894	58,894
TOTAL, ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIP	1,384,457	1,488,357	1,489,559	1,460,409
OTHER BASE MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT EQUIP				
TEST EQUIPMENT				
BASE/ALC CALIBRATION PACKAGE	13,809	13,809	13,809	13,809
PRIMARY STANDARDS LABORATORY	1,107	1,107	1,107	1,107
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	8,059	8,059	8,059	8,059
PERSONAL SAFETY AND RESCUE EQUIP				
NIGHT VISION GOGGLES	3,814	3,814	11,914	9,514
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	9,312	18,312	15,312	17,312

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
DEPOT PLANT + MATERIALS HANDLING EQ				
MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING	25,612	27,112	33,612	31,212
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	12,256	12,256	12,256	12,256
ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT				
FLOODLIGHTS	11,023	11,023	11,023	11,023
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	6,201	6,201	6,201	6,201
BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT	11,321	18,321	11,321	14,821
MEDICAL/DENTAL EQUIPMENT	13,992	13,992	13,992	13,992
ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS	817	817	817	817
AIR BASE OPERABILITY	5,700	5,700	5,700	5,700
PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT	5,893	5,893	5,893	5,893
PRODUCTIVITY ENHANCING CAPITA	7,806	7,806	7,806	7,806
MOBILITY EQUIPMENT	102,990	102,990	102,990	102,990
AIR CONDITIONERS	9,593	9,593	9,593	9,593
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	16,131	16,131	21,631	20,331
SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS				
INTELLIGENCE PRODUCTION ACTIVE	47,160	47,160	47,160	47,160
TECH SURV COUNTERMEASURES EQ	4,057	4,057	4,057	4,057
DARP RC135	13,123	13,123	13,123	13,123
DARP, MRIGS	115,777	115,777	115,777	115,777
SELECTED ACTIVITIES	8,098,917	8,066,231	8,056,127	8,138,231
SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM	178,876	188,876	178,876	188,876
DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE	6,694	6,694	25,294	6,694
MODIFICATIONS	201	201	201	201
FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORT	9,767	9,767	9,767	9,767
TOTAL, OTHER BASE MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT EQUIP	8,740,008	8,734,822	8,743,418	8,816,322
SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS				
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	41,358	41,358	41,358	41,358
TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	10,523,946	10,622,660	10,628,958	10,672,712

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
(In thousands of dollars)

P-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
20	**ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION**	**24,755**	**24,755**	**24,755**	**21,255**
	Unjustified Request				-3,500
30	**ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION**	**24,369**	**24,369**	**20,869**	**24,369**
	Unjustified Request			-3,500	0
32	**COMSEC EQUIPMENT**	**26,331**	**37,731**	**34,731**	**34,731**
	Computer Network Defense - Transfer from DERF		+4,600	+4,600	+4,600
	Enclave and Network Tools - Transfer from DERF		+2,000	+2,000	+2,000
	Intrusion Detection Systems - Transfer from DERF		+1,800	+1,800	+1,800
	Wireless Communications - Transfer from DERF		+3,000		0
35	**INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIP**	**9,043**	**12,343**	**37,343**	**29,843**
	Tactical Terminal - Transfer from DERF		+3,300	+3,300	+3,300
	Eagle Vision			+25,000	+17,500
36	**AIR TRAFFIC CTRL/LAND SYSTEM**	**52,038**	**53,038**	**52,038**	**53,038**
	Instrument Landing System at Rickenbacker ANG Base		+1,000		+1,000
37	**NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM**	**55,561**	**55,561**	**35,561**	**35,561**
	Program Delays			-20,000	-20,000
38	**THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPRO**	**16,713**	**16,713**	**28,713**	**25,113**
	AN/TPS-75			+12,000	+8,400
42	**TAC SIGINT SUPPORT**	**406**	**10,406**	**10,406**	**10,406**
	Tactical Information Program - Transfer from DERF		+10,000	+10,000	+10,000
44	**GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY**	**55,789**	**76,689**	**69,189**	**73,489**
	Integrated Broadcast Service - Transfer from DERF		+10,800	+10,800	+10,800
	Commercial Imagery - Transfer from DERF		+2,600	+2,600	+2,600
	REMIS		+2,500		+1,800
	Science and Engineering Lab Data Integration		+5,000		+2,500
47	**AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY**	**41,835**	**88,635**	**85,435**	**83,435**
	AT/FP Equipment -Transfer from DERF		+7,200		0
	Base Physical Security Systems - Transfer from DERF		+39,600	+39,600	+39,600
	Contaminant Air Processing System			+4,000	+2,000
48	**COMBAT TRAINING RANGES**	**17,242**	**31,242**	**50,956**	**41,056**
	Mobile Remote Emitter Simulator (Note: For Mountain Home AFB.)		+7,000	+11,000	+7,700
	AK Air CPT Training Upgrade/P4-BE Pods (Note: Transferred to Aircraft Procurement, Air Force)			+5,000	0
	11th AF Unmanned Threat Emitter Modification Program		+7,000	+11,000	+9,400
	11th AF JAWS-Scoring System Processor			+6,714	+6,714
50	**C3 COUNTERMEASURES**	**13,409**	**17,409**	**17,409**	**17,409**
	Information Warfare Support - Transfer from DERF		+2,000	+2,000	+2,000
	Computer Network Defense - Transfer from DERF		+2,000	+2,000	+2,000
53	**BASE INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE**	**214,727**	**214,727**	**221,415**	**221,415**
	AK Wide Radio (LMR) Program			+6,688	+6,688
60	**MILSATCOM SPACE**	**45,698**	**21,698**	**45,698**	**21,698**
	Defer 4th quarter award for GMT		-24,000		-24,000
63	**COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATE**	**11,049**	**11,049**	**6,049**	**6,049**
	Program Delays			-5,000	-5,000

P-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
64	**RADIO EQUIPMENT**	**8,801**	**10,301**	**8,801**	**10,551**
	Scope Command		+1,000		+1,000
	PRC-117F SATCOM Backpack Radios			[500]	+250
	Radio Upgrades for the 139th Air National Guard Wing		+500		+500
67	**BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE**	**202,900**	**217,900**	**182,900**	**193,700**
	GeoBase (Note: Only for GIS based facility and base management planning tools to deliver a comprehensive, integrated capability for the Air Force to attain, maintain, and sustain geospatial information infrastructure supporting basing requirements.)		+15,000		+10,800
	Underexecution			-20,000	-20,000
70	**COMM ELECT MODS**	**68,894**	**68,894**	**58,894**	**58,894**
	Weather Observation and Forecast Program Growth			-10,000	-10,000
74	**NIGHT VISION GOGGLES**	**3,814**	**3,814**	**11,914**	**9,514**
	Panoramic Night Vision Goggles			+8,100	+5,700
75	**ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION**	**9,312**	**18,312**	**15,312**	**17,312**
	Replacement of Inertia Reels for Fixed Wing and Rotary Aircraft		+1,000		+1,000
	Thinpack parachutes		+4,000	+3,000	+3,000
	Replacement of Transport Aircraft Troop Seats		+3,000	+3,000	+3,000
	Replacement of Tactical Aircrew Life Preservers with the Navy's LPU-36		+1,000		+1,000
76	**MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING**	**25,612**	**27,112**	**33,612**	**31,212**
	Point of Maintenance Initiative		+1,500	+8,000	+5,600
80	**BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT**	**11,321**	**18,321**	**11,321**	**14,821**
	Combat Arms Training System (CATS)		+7,000		+3,500
88	**ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION**	**16,131**	**16,131**	**21,631**	**20,331**
	Vaccine Facility Project			+1,000	+1,000
	Helibasket Technology			+4,500	+3,200
93	**SELECTED ACTIVITIES**	**8,098,917**	**8,066,231**	**8,056,127**	**8,138,231**
94	**SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM**	**178,876**	**188,876**	**178,876**	**188,876**
95	**DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE**	**6,694**	**6,694**	**25,294**	**6,694**

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE				
MAJOR EQUIPMENT				
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD/WHS				
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD	84,964	116,914	113,964	112,964
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS	18,452	16,452	57,752	16,452
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA				
CONSOLIDATED CRYPTOLOGIC PROGRAM	---	---	500	500
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA				
INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY	37,544	59,044	48,544	58,544
CONTINUITY OF OPERATIONS	3,325	3,325	3,325	3,325
DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM	19,425	19,425	19,425	19,425
GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYS	3,453	3,453	3,453	3,453
GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	2,442	2,442	2,442	2,442
TELEPORTS	53,542	53,542	53,542	53,542
GLOBAL INFORMATION GRID	517,000	499,400	514,400	509,400
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	25,474	32,374	32,374	32,374
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DIA				
INTELLIGENCE AND COMMUNICATIONS	---	---	10,000	---
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DLA				
MAJOR EQUIPMENT	9,304	9,304	9,304	9,304
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCAA				
MAJOR EQUIPMENT ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS				
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS	31,836	56,836	51,836	56,836

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION				
PATRIOT PAC-3	---	536,670	---	491,670
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DHRA				
PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	7,404	7,404	7,404	7,404
NATIONAL IMAGERY AND MAPPING AGENCY				
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NIMA	---	---	12,600	12,600
DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY				
VEHICLES	80	80	80	80
OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT	36,896	36,896	36,896	36,896
DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY				
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, AFIS				
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, AFIS	7,762	7,762	7,762	7,762
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DODDE				
AUTOMATION/EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT AND LOGISTICS	2,404	2,404	2,404	2,404
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCMA				
MAJOR EQUIPMENT	13,677	13,677	13,677	13,677
TOTAL, MAJOR EQUIPMENT	876,484	1,478,904	1,003,184	1,452,554
SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND				
AVIATION PROGRAMS				
SOF ROTARY WING UPGRADES	289,792	295,792	301,792	303,092
SOF TRAINING SYSTEMS	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000
MC-130H COMBAT TALON II	8,148	8,148	8,148	8,148
CV-22 SOF MODIFICATION	58,540	58,540	58,540	58,540
AC-130U GUNSHIP ACQUISITION	65,502	125,502	125,502	125,502
C-130 MODIFICATIONS	77,889	77,889	77,889	77,889
AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	101	101	2,301	1,301
SHIPBUILDING				
ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYS	21,804	23,504	29,804	27,804
ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYS (AP-CY)	34,730	---	---	---
MK VIII MOD 1 - SEAL DELIVERY VEH	8,484	8,484	11,484	10,884
AMMUNITION PROGRAMS				
SOF ORDNANCE REPLENISHMENT	28,628	28,628	28,628	28,628
SOF ORDNANCE ACQUISITION	7,078	11,078	7,078	9,278

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS				
COMM EQUIPMENT & ELECTRONICS	28,827	28,827	28,827	28,827
SOF INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS	8,166	31,766	14,166	34,766
SOF SMALL ARMS & WEAPONS	4,768	25,268	18,268	22,868
MARITIME EQUIPMENT MODS	650	2,650	2,650	2,650
SOF COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS	6,285	6,285	14,285	11,885
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	5,327	5,327	5,327	5,327
SOF MARITIME EQUIPMENT	3,155	3,155	3,155	3,155
MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	5,745	5,745	5,745	5,745
SOF PLANNING AND REHEARSAL SYSTEM	300	300	300	300
SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	93,233	93,233	111,833	93,233
PSYOP EQUIPMENT	5,642	5,642	5,642	5,642
TOTAL, SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	776,794	859,864	875,364	879,464
CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE				
CBDP				
INDIVIDUAL PROTECTION	125,276	125,276	132,276	129,576
DECONTAMINATION	15,561	16,561	23,561	20,561
JOINT BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	143,233	148,233	154,233	150,233
COLLECTIVE PROTECTION	34,749	56,249	44,249	51,249
CONTAMINATION AVOIDANCE	116,912	118,912	123,912	122,212
TOTAL, CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE	435,731	465,231	478,231	473,831
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	599,506	653,406	601,506	638,606
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE	2,688,515	3,457,405	2,958,285	3,444,455

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
[In thousands of dollars]

P-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
2	**MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD**	**84,964**	**116,914**	**113,964**	**112,964**
	OSD COOP - Network Improvements, Transfer From DERF		+9,000	+9,000	+9,000
	HDBT, Transfer From DERF		+3,750		-
	Horizontal Fusion, Transfer From DERF		+8,000	+8,000	+8,000
	Coalition Information Sharing, Transfer From DERF		+12,000	+12,000	+12,000
	Information Technology Network Consolidation		-2,000		-2,000
	Mentor-Protégé HBCU Technical Assistance Program		+1,200		+1,000
3	**MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS**	**18,452**	**16,452**	**57,752**	**16,452**
	Information Technology Network Consolidation		-2,000		-2,000
	Classified - DERF transfer & adjustment			+39,300	-
4	**MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA CONSOLIDATED CRYPTOLOGIC PROGRAM**			**500**	**500**
	Mobile Secure Communications, Transfer From DERF			+500	+500
8	**INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY**	**37,544**	**59,044**	**48,544**	**58,544**
	Suite of Enclave Security Tools, Transfer From DERF		+5,500	+5,500	+5,500
	Critical Database Backup, Transfer From DERF		+10,000		+10,000
	Mobile Secure Communications, Transfer From DERF		+500		-
	Wireless Gateway, Transfer From DERF		+500	+500	+500
	Intelligence Community Systems, Transfer From DERF		+5,000	+5,000	+5,000
15	**GLOBAL INFORMATION GRID**	**517,000**	**499,400**	**514,400**	**509,400**
	Bandwidth Expansion, Transfer From DERF		+7,400	+7,400	+7,400
	Bandwidth Expansion Contract Cost Savings		-25,000		-15,000
	Projected efficiencies			-10,000	-
16	**ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION**	**25,474**	**32,374**	**32,374**	**32,374**
	Teleconferencing System, Transfer From DERF		+1,000	+1,000	+1,000
	Transportable Systems, Transfer From DERF		+5,900	+5,900	+5,900
17	**MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DIA INTELLIGENCE AND COMMUNICATIONS**			**10,000**	**-**
	Critical Database Backup, Transfer From DERF			+10,000	-
22	**MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS**	**31,836**	**56,836**	**51,836**	**56,836**
	C4I Equipment, Transfer From DERF		+15,000	+10,000	+15,000
	Physical Security Equipment, Transfer From DERF		+10,000	+10,000	+10,000
23	**PATRIOT PAC-3**		**536,670**		**491,670**
	Transfer of PAC-3 Program from Army		+471,670		+471,670
	Non-Recurring and Support Costs				-25,000
	Additional PAC-3 Missiles		+65,000		+45,000
26	**MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NIMA**			**12,600**	**12,600**
	NIMA Airborne Integration - Transfer From DERF			+1,000	+1,000
	IEC workstations - Transfer From DERF			+2,000	+2,000
	Libraries communications - Transfer From DERF			+2,000	+2,000
	Libraries Storage - Transfer From DERF			+7,600	+7,600
33	**SOF ROTARY WING UPGRADES**	**289,792**	**295,792**	**301,792**	**303,092**
	A/MH-6J "Little Bird" Helicopter EO/IR Systems [Note: Only to accelerate planned procurement of upgraded EO/IR systems for TF160 Aviation.]		+6,000		+5,100
	ATIRCM/CMWS			+12,000	+8,200
37	**AC-130U GUNSHIP ACQUISITION**	**65,502**	**125,502**	**125,502**	**125,502**
	AC-130U Gunship, Transfer From DERF		+60,000	+60,000	+60,000
39	**AIRCRAFT SUPPORT**	**101**	**101**	**2,301**	**1,301**
	EC-130J Commando Solo spares			+2,200	+1,200

P-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
40	**ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYSTEM**	**21,804**	**23,504**	**29,804**	**27,804**
	Restructured Program		+1,700		+1,200
	Purchase lithium ion batteries			+8,000	+4,800
41	**ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYS (AP-CY)**	**34,730**			-
	Defer funding for purchasing Boat #2		-34,730	-34,730	-34,730
42	**MK VIII MOD 1 - SEAL DELIVERY VEH**	**8,484**	**8,484**	**11,484**	**10,884**
	SEAL delivery vehicle			+3,000	+2,400
46	**SOF ORDNANCE ACQUISITION**	**7,078**	**11,078**	**7,078**	**9,278**
	Gunshot/Sniper Detection System		+4,000		+2,200
48	**SOF INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS**	**8,166**	**31,766**	**14,166**	**34,766**
	Classified Program, Transfer From DERF		+18,600		+18,600
	Leviathon COMINT [Note: Only to procure additional Seabreeze, Typhoon and next generation Leviathon systems for deployment in support of Homeland Security missions.]		+5,000		+4,200
	Portable Intelligence Collection and Relay Capability			+6,000	+3,800
49	**SOF SMALL ARMS & WEAPONS**	**4,768**	**25,268**	**18,268**	**22,868**
	AT-4 Confined Space		+6,000	+6,000	+6,000
	Low Profile Night Vision Goggles		+1,500	+1,500	+1,500
	Electronic Digital Compass System		+3,000		+1,900
	Striker MK-47 Advanced Lightweight Grenade Launcher		+4,000	+2,000	+2,000
	AN/PVS-17 SOPMOD		+6,000		+3,600
	Modular integrated communications helmets			+3,000	+2,100
	LAW Trajectory Mounts (M72)			+1,000	+1,000
50	**MARITIME EQUIPMENT MODS**	**650**	**2,650**	**2,650**	**2,650**
	Advanced Shock Mitigation Seats for MK V [Note: Only to procure the advanced version of current Shock-Mitigating MK V SOC Seats.]		+2,000	+2,000	+2,000
51	**SOF COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS**	**6,285**	**6,285**	**14,285**	**11,885**
	SOF - Riverine craft			+8,000	+5,600
57	**SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS**	**93,233**	**93,233**	**111,833**	**93,233**
	Classified program adjustments; DERF			+18,600	-
59	**INDIVIDUAL PROTECTION**	**125,276**	**125,276**	**132,276**	**129,576**
	M40 masks			+3,000	+1,500
	M45 masks			+1,000	+1,000
	M48 masks			+500	+500
	MEU masks			+2,500	+1,300
60	**DECONTAMINATION**	**15,561**	**16,561**	**23,561**	**20,561**
	M291 Decontamination Kit		+1,000	+1,000	+1,000
	M12 Decon System upgrades			+6,000	+3,000
	M100 Sorbent Decontamination Kits			+1,000	+1,000
61	**JOINT BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM**	**143,233**	**148,233**	**154,233**	**150,233**
	Bio-Detection Kit Storage		+1,000	+1,000	+1,000
	Army Reserve JBPDS-BIDS		+4,000		-
	JBPDS-BIDS			+10,000	+6,000
62	**COLLECTIVE PROTECTION**	**34,749**	**56,249**	**44,249**	**51,249**
	Filter Surveillance Program		+1,500	+1,500	+1,500
	Chemical-Biological Protective Shelters		+20,000	+7,000	+14,000
	M49 Fixed Installation Filter (FIF)			+1,000	+1,000
63	**CONTAMINATION AVOIDANCE**	**116,912**	**118,912**	**123,912**	**122,212**
	Joint Chemical Agent Detector		+2,000		+1,000
	M22 Automatic Chemical Agent Alarms			+7,000	+4,300
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	**599,506**	**653,406**	**601,506**	**637,306**
			+53,900	+2,000	+37,800

Advanced SEAL Delivery System

The conferees agree to provide $4,800,000 for the procurement of lithium ion batteries for the Advanced SEAL Delivery System (ASDS). The conferees expect that USSOCOM will consider all available options and select the one most suitable to the operating environment of the ASDS.

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

	(In thousands of dollars)			
	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT				
RESERVE EQUIPMENT				
ARMY RESERVE MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	---	---	15,000	10,000
NAVY RESERVE MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	---	---	15,000	10,000
MARINE CORPS RESERVE MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	---	---	10,000	10,000
AIR FORCE RESERVE MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	---	---	10,000	10,000
TOTAL, RESERVE EQUIPMENT	---	---	50,000	40,000
NATIONAL GUARD EQUIPMENT				
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	---	---	40,000	30,000
AIR NATIONAL GUARD MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	---	---	40,000	30,000
TOTAL, NATIONAL GUARD EQUIPMENT	---	---	80,000	60,000
TOTAL, NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT	---	---	130,000	100,000

MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT

The conferees agree that the Chiefs of the Reserve and National Guard components could exercise control of modernization funds provided in this account. The conferees further agree that separate submissions of a detailed assessment of its modernization priorities by the component commanders is required to be submitted to the defense committees. The conferees expect the component commanders to give priority consideration to the following items: HMMWV, Family of Medium Tactical Vehicles, Commercial Construction Equipment, AN/TMQ–41A Meteorological Measuring Sets, Bladefold Kits for Apache Helicopters, Combat Arms Training Systems, Firefinder Systems, the National Guard Lightway Project and the Paul Revere Portal, Next Generation Small Loader, Modern Burner unit, APN–21 beacon radar, P4RC+(P5) airborne combat training pods, APN–241 radar, F–16 Re-engining, Abrams Full-crew Interactive Skills Trainer, Cockpit Air Bag System, and Deployable Force-on-Force Integrated Range System.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES

The conferees agree to provide a total of $73,057,000 for the Defense Production Act Purchases, the amount of the budget request.

TITLE IV – RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

The conference agreement is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
RECAPITULATION				
RDTE, ARMY	6,820,333	7,447,160	7,410,168	7,669,656
RDTE, NAVY	12,496,065	13,562,218	13,275,735	13,946,085
RDTE, AIR FORCE	17,564,984	18,639,392	18,537,679	18,822,569
RDTE, DEFENSE WIDE	16,598,863	17,863,462	16,611,107	17,924,642
OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION	222,054	242,054	302,554	245,554
GRAND TOTAL	53,702,299	57,754,286	56,137,243	58,608,506

Network Centric Warfare – Data Management

The conferees agree to the language contained in House Report 107-532 with respect to the need for several key capabilities for the network-centric environment. The conferees agree that the requested report be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate no later than March 15, 2003.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY				
BASIC RESEARCH				
IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	22,998	18,998	22,998	21,998
DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	139,633	141,633	155,133	152,183
UNIVERSITY AND INDUSTRY RESEARCH CENTERS	74,855	73,055	98,181	87,431
TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	237,486	233,686	276,312	261,612
APPLIED RESEARCH				
MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY	18,659	23,659	33,159	36,359
SENSORS AND ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY	24,305	24,305	26,305	24,305
TRACTOR HIP	6,839	10,339	6,839	8,589
AVIATION TECHNOLOGY	43,692	43,692	43,692	43,692
EW TECHNOLOGY	19,584	19,584	19,584	19,584
MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	31,884	56,384	40,884	57,234
ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	11,208	23,208	11,208	20,958
ADVANCED CONCEPTS AND SIMULATION	20,634	23,134	30,634	31,834
COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY	55,763	68,263	85,063	86,463
BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY	74,094	60,948	74,094	67,594
CHEMICAL, SMOKE AND EQUIPMENT DEFEATING TECHNOLOGY	3,675	8,675	18,175	16,525
JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	5,812	5,812	5,812	5,812
WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	38,090	96,090	43,090	77,440
ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES	27,448	58,048	43,548	63,998
NIGHT VISION TECHNOLOGY	22,333	22,333	22,333	22,333
COUNTERMINE SYSTEMS	13,186	18,686	18,185	17,886
HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	17,415	25,415	17,415	23,015

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	23,018	26,018	28,018	28,618
COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	21,821	24,821	21,821	23,321
COMPUTER AND SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY	4,354	4,354	4,354	4,354
MILITARY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	51,124	55,124	67,124	62,724
MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING TECHNOLOGY	14,335	18,335	14,335	16,735
WARFIGHTER TECHNOLOGY	25,502	38,502	29,002	37,052
MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	67,476	131,476	87,576	133,636
TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	642,251	887,205	792,251	930,061
ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT				
WARFIGHTER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	50,262	48,262	68,262	60,162
MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	16,590	204,090	53,840	175,040
AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	45,404	43,496	48,404	44,346
WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	66,514	68,514	66,514	66,564
COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	229,778	272,760	262,278	278,660
COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	4,826	4,826	8,826	7,626
MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	3,527	7,527	5,527	8,327
ELECTRONIC WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY (H)	28,254	28,254	28,254	28,254
TRACTOR HIKE	18,069	18,069	18,069	18,069
TRACTOR ROSE	4,895	4,895	4,895	4,895
COMBATING TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	---	48,900	43,900	43,900
GLOBAL SURVEILLANCE/AIR DEFENSE/PRECISION STRIKE TECHN	31,291	31,291	31,291	31,291
EW TECHNOLOGY	11,600	23,100	11,600	20,000
MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	87,890	103,390	136,950	104,790
TRACTOR CAGE	3,083	3,083	3,083	3,083
LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	24,104	25,104	31,604	30,404
JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	6,013	13,013	11,013	13,713
LINE-OF-SIGHT TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION	28,283	28,283	28,283	28,283
NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	36,494	78,494	43,994	77,544
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	8,980	12,980	8,980	13,480
MILITARY ENGINEERING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	2,921	9,921	14,421	14,371
ADVANCED TACTICAL COMPUTER SCIENCE AND SENSOR TECHNOLO	21,674	22,674	24,674	24,174
TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	730,452	1,100,926	954,662	1,096,976

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
DEMONSTRATION & VALIDATION				
ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	27,887	27,887	41,887	39,487
ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION (DEM/VAL)	7,417	43,917	68,417	60,517
LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER - ADV DEV	20,286	20,286	10,170	10,170
SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS-ADV DEV	2,432	2,432	2,432	2,432
TANK AND MEDIUM CALIBER AMMUNITION	11,354	20,354	26,354	27,854
ADVANCED TANK ARMAMENT SYSTEM (ATAS)	124,108	150,908	147,908	150,008
SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY	20,788	20,788	20,788	20,788
TACTICAL ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM - ADV DEV	16,392	16,392	16,392	16,392
NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	11,694	11,694	11,694	11,694
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY DEM/VAL	9,331	27,331	26,331	32,581
WARFIGHTER INFORMATION NETWORK-TACTICAL - DEM/VAL	60,809	60,809	40,809	50,809
NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	8,773	4,000	8,773	4,773
AVIATION - ADV DEV	8,643	12,643	8,643	11,443
WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS - ADV DEV	38,561	38,561	27,761	35,861
LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - ADV DEV	11,419	6,419	16,919	9,719
COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT CONTROL SYSTEM EVALUATION	8,971	8,971	8,971	8,971
MEDICAL SYSTEMS - ADV DEV	10,398	10,398	15,398	14,298
INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE (JMIP/DISTP)	1,962	1,962	1,962	1,962
ARTILLERY SYSTEMS - DEM/VAL	5,200	373,700	---	373,700
SCAMP BLOCK II DEM/VAL	21,006	21,006	15,006	15,006
MEDIUM EXTENDED AIR DEFENSE SYSTEM (MEADS) CONCEPTS	117,745	---	---	---
DEM/VAL TEST AND EVALUATION TRANSFER	---	---	-5,000	---
TOTAL, DEMONSTRATION & VALIDATION	545,176	880,458	511,615	898,465

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
ENGINEERING & MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT				
AIRCRAFT AVIONICS	40,308	41,808	40,308	41,358
ARMED, DEPLOYABLE OH-58D	1,873	1,873	1,873	1,873
COMANCHE	914,932	914,932	914,932	914,932
EW DEVELOPMENT	22,819	39,719	38,719	39,719
JOINT TACTICAL RADIO	65,818	65,818	65,818	65,818
ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM	42,322	54,622	55,622	55,622
TRACTOR CAGE	9,800	9,800	9,800	9,800
COMMON MISSILE	29,919	29,919	29,919	29,919
MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES	1,953	1,953	1,953	1,953
SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS-ENG DEV	8,153	8,153	8,153	8,153
JAVELIN	489	489	489	489
LANDMINE WARFARE	11,913	11,913	---	---
FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES	3,990	3,990	19,990	15,190
AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	2,339	2,339	2,339	2,339
TACTICAL UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLE (TUGV)	---	2,000	---	1,200
LIGHT TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLES	7,877	7,877	7,877	7,877
ARMORED SYSTEMS MODERNIZATION (ASM)-ENG DEV	369,869	174,369	813,469	250,610
ENGINEER MOBILITY EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	8,146	8,146	8,146	8,146
NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS - ENG DEV	32,328	39,328	32,328	38,278
COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT	94,474	92,274	94,474	91,274
NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES - ENG DEV	43,650	68,650	43,650	58,900
TERRAIN INFORMATION - ENG DEV	8,232	8,232	8,232	8,232
INTEGRATED METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT SYSTEM	3,417	3,417	3,417	3,417
JSIMS CORE PROGRAM	24,230	24,230	18,230	20,230
AIR DEFENSE COMMAND, CONTROL AND INTELLIGENCE - ENG DE	26,978	26,978	28,978	28,678
CONSTRUCTIVE SIMULATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	53,294	53,294	42,294	46,294
AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	11,839	13,839	11,839	13,539
DISTRIBUTIVE INTERACTIVE SIMULATIONS (DIS) - ENGINEER.	21,487	19,087	21,487	19,087
TACTICAL SURVEILLANCE SYSTEMS - ENG DEV	56,662	59,662	56,662	58,462
BRILLIANT ANTI-ARMOR SUBMUNITION (BAT)	190,293	38,060	38,060	45,000
JOINT SURVEILLANCE/TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM	4,740	4,740	4,740	4,740
COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (CATT) CORE	7,579	7,579	9,079	8,629

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
JOINT NETWORK MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	8,028	8,028	8,028	8,028
AVIATION - ENG DEV	3,150	3,150	3,650	3,650
WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS - ENG DEV	41,758	52,158	50,758	52,658
LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - ENG DEV	65,857	68,857	65,857	67,957
COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS - ENG DEV	82,238	90,238	99,238	94,238
MEDICAL MATERIEL/MEDICAL BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT	12,625	22,125	12,625	19,725
LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER - ENG DEV	128,992	114,992	128,992	128,992
ARTILLERY MUNITIONS - EMD	119,188	119,188	70,888	107,113
COMBAT IDENTIFICATION	1,995	1,995	6,595	5,215
ARMY TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL HARDWARE & SOFTWARE	80,672	102,410	90,672	101,010
LOSAT	14,463	14,463	14,463	14,463
FIREFINDER	26,122	26,122	26,122	26,122
ARTILLERY SYSTEMS - EMD	29,732	29,732	22,232	27,857
PATRIOT PAC-3 THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE ACQUISITION	150,819	---	---	---
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	50,865	50,865	76,865	73,365
EMD TEST AND EVALUATION TRANSFER	---	---	-18,000	---
TOTAL, ENGINEERING & MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	2,938,227	2,543,413	3,091,862	2,630,151
RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT				
THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	15,251	15,251	21,251	19,451
TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	10,772	10,772	10,772	10,772
MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	53,797	53,797	82,797	53,797
RAND ARROYO CENTER	22,148	20,000	22,148	22,148
ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL	132,831	132,831	132,831	132,831
CONCEPTS EXPERIMENTATION PROGRAM	22,627	22,627	25,627	24,727
ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES	144,183	113,451	153,683	144,883
ARMY TECHNICAL TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND TARGETS	43,222	34,719	43,222	43,222
SURVIVABILITY/LETHALITY ANALYSIS	39,200	34,514	39,200	39,200
DOD HIGH ENERGY LASER TEST FACILITY	14,410	15,910	17,410	17,560
AIRCRAFT CERTIFICATION	4,062	4,062	4,062	4,062
METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT TO RDT&E ACTIVITIES	7,310	7,310	7,310	7,310
MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS	10,189	10,189	10,189	10,189
EXPLOITATION OF FOREIGN ITEMS	3,490	3,490	3,490	3,490
SUPPORT OF OPERATIONAL TESTING	99,375	99,375	99,375	99,375

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
ARMY EVALUATION CENTER	41,250	41,250	41,250	41,250
PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES	78,452	64,952	78,452	64,952
TECHNICAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES	34,040	49,540	35,540	47,740
MUNITIONS STANDARDIZATION, EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY	16,014	37,014	18,014	31,514
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY MGMT SUPPORT	1,902	1,902	1,902	1,902
MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT)	11,533	11,533	11,533	11,533
TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	806,058	784,489	860,058	831,908
OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT				
MLRS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	112,825	112,825	57,825	99,075
AEROSTAT JOINT PROJECT OFFICE	29,081	31,081	29,081	30,081
DOMESTIC PREPAREDNESS AGAINST WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCT	---	3,000	---	2,550
ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	42,161	52,161	38,161	47,161
COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	83,065	84,065	57,965	86,515
MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM	44,444	44,444	44,444	44,444
AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS/PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	196,794	196,794	220,794	212,794
AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	3,689	9,189	3,689	7,089
DIGITIZATION	28,968	34,968	30,968	33,768
FORCE XXI BATTLE COMMAND, BRIGADE AND BELOW (FBCB2)	64,915	64,915	64,915	64,915
MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	43,738	43,738	43,738	43,738
OTHER MISSILE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	13,018	13,018	13,018	13,018
TRACTOR CARD	8,891	8,891	8,891	8,891
JOINT TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM (TRI-TAC)	14,121	14,121	14,121	14,121
JOINT TACTICAL GROUND SYSTEM	2,860	2,860	2,860	2,860
SPECIAL ARMY PROGRAM	7,031	7,031	11,031	10,031
SECURITY AND INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	5,438	25,938	22,638	26,638
INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	14,844	18,844	23,944	23,344
GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	71,864	51,864	71,864	51,864
SATCOM GROUND ENVIRONMENT (SPACE)	72,244	72,244	72,244	72,244
WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	17,895	17,895	17,895	17,895
TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEM-FY 1987	977	977	977	977
TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	57,879	81,779	58,579	68,579
AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	4,882	11,382	7,882	11,632

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS	15,683	42,083	37,383	45,583
END ITEM INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES	61,025	68,525	72,150	78,325
NATO JOINT STARS	512	512	512	512
TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	1,018,844	1,115,144	1,027,569	1,118,644
RETIREMENT ACCRUALS	-98,161	-98,161	-98,161	-98,161
OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT T&E TRANSFER	---	---	-6,000	---
TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY	6,820,333	7,447,160	7,410,168	7,669,656

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
[In thousands of dollars]

R-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
1	**IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH**	**22,998**	**18,998**	**22,998**	**21,998**
	Reduce Programmed Growth		-4,000	0	-1,000
2	**DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES**	**139,633**	**141,633**	**155,133**	**152,183**
	Reduce Programmed Growth		-1,000		-1,000
	PASIS: Perpetually Assailable and Secure Information Systems, Research, Training and Education		+3,000		+2,550
	Animal Modeling Genetics Research			+1,000	+1,000
	Biofilm Research			+1,000	+1,000
	Integrated Desert Terrain Analysis			+4,000	+2,800
	Knowledge Management Fusion Center			+5,000	+3,000
	Optical Technologies Research			+2,000	+1,400
	Prediction of Land-Atmosphere Interactions			+2,500	+1,800
3	**UNIVERSITY AND INDUSTRY RESEARCH CENTERS**	**74,855**	**73,055**	**98,181**	**87,431**
	Reduce Programmed Growth		-1,800		-1,800
	Armor Materials Design--Laser-based material processing			+2,500	+1,250
	Composite Materials Center of Excellence			+826	+826
	Dendrimer Nanotechnology Research			+3,500	+3,500
	Ferroelectric Materials Nanofabrication			+1,500	+1,000
	Institute for Creative Technologies			+5,000	+3,500
	Jidoka Project			+3,000	+1,500
	NAC University Automotive Research Coalitions			+4,000	+2,800
	University Program in Mobile Robotics (move to line 12)			+3,000	0
4	**MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY**	**18,659**	**23,659**	**33,159**	**36,359**
	Precision magnetorheological fluids to polish large optics		+4,000		+3,400
	Advanced Coatings Research to Extend the Service Life of Vehicles and Equipment		+1,000		+1,000
	Advanced Materials Processing			+4,000	+2,800
	Electronics Components Reliability			+2,500	+2,500
	FCS Composite Research			+3,000	+1,500
	Future Affordable Multi-Utility Materials for FCS			+2,000	+1,400
	Low Cost Enabling Technologies			+3,000	+2,100
	Materials Joining for Army Weapons		0	[5,000]	+3,000
5	**SENSORS AND ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY**	**24,305**	**24,305**	**26,305**	**24,305**
	Advanced Sensors and Obscurants (moved to line 14)		0	+2,000	0
6	**TRACTOR HIP**	**6,839**	**10,339**	**6,839**	**8,589**
	Distributed Chemical Agent Sensing and Transmission (DICAST)		+3,500		+1,750

R-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
9	**MISSILE TECHNOLOGY**	**31,884**	**56,384**	**40,884**	**57,234**
	Quantum Optics		+1,000		+1,000
	MEMS Technology Development Acceleration		+15,000		+12,750
	LENS Facility Modifications for Advance Testing of Endo- and Exo- Missile Interceptors and Launch Vehicles (Note: only to assemble a system to be employed in large-scale Shock-Tunnel/Ludweig Tube Facility at the Army's Aerothermal and Aero-optics Evaluation Center)		+2,000		+1,000
	Multiple Component Army Flight Test		+3,000		+2,550
	MEMS IMU/M-Code GPS (Note: only to accelerate the development of low-cost guidance units for precision guided weapons and munitions through MEMS IMU/M-code GPS technology integration)		+3,500		+1,750
	Advanced Composite Chassis			+2,000	+1,400
	E-STRIKE Short Range Air Defense Radar			+3,000	+2,100
	Jet Interaction CFD Testbed			+4,000	+2,800
10	**ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY**	**11,208**	**23,208**	**11,208**	**20,958**
	Rapid Target Acquisition Tracking System (RTATS)		+4,000		+4,000
	MEMS for Defense Applications		+5,000		+4,250
	High Intensity Laser Diode Arrays for SSHCL (Note: only to build industrially-developed solid state laser diode arrays for the Solid State Heat Capacity Laser Weapon program)		+3,000		+1,500
11	**ADVANCED CONCEPTS AND SIMULATION**	**20,634**	**23,134**	**30,634**	**31,834**
	Institute for Creative Technologies (Simulation Capabilities for the Warfighter)		+2,500		0
	Institute for Creative Technologies--Interactive Training Technology transition			+5,000	+3,500
	Combat Trauma Patient Simulation Program (CTPS) (moved from line 31)		0	0	+4,200
	On-Line Contract Document Management				+1,000
	Photonics			+5,000	+2,500
12	**COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY**	**55,763**	**68,263**	**85,063**	**86,463**
	Nuclear, Biological, and Chemical (NBC) Agent Water Contamination Monitoring and Removal Technologies		+2,000		+1,200
	Combat Vehicle Mobility System		+4,000		+3,400
	Integration of Army Voice Interactive Device with Onboard Central Processing Unit		+2,000		+1,700
	Military Wheeled Vehicle Electronic Architecture Integration (EAI)		+2,000		+1,700
	National Automotive Center University Research Coalition Manufacturing and Design (moved to line 3)		+2,500		0
	21st Century Truck			+17,000	+11,900
	Advanced Coatings Research			+1,500	+1,100
	COMBATT			+5,000	+3,500
	Fastening and Joining Research			+1,800	+1,300
	Next Generation Smart Truck			+4,000	+3,400
	University Program in Mobile Robotics (moved from line 3)			0	+1,500
13	**BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY**	**74,094**	**60,948**	**74,094**	**67,594**
	Reduce Programmed Growth		-13,146		-6,500

R-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
14	**CHEMICAL, SMOKE AND EQUIPMENT DEFEATING TECHNOLOGY**	**3,675**	**8,675**	**18,175**	**16,525**
	Advanced Sensors and Obscurants		+2,000		+2,000
	Metallic Particles in Defense Applications (MPDA) Obscurant Smokes		+3,000		+1,500
	Systems for Sampling and Detecting Bioaerosols			+6,500	+4,550
	Vaporous Hydrogen Peroxide Technology			+8,000	+4,800
16	**WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY**	**38,090**	**96,090**	**43,090**	**77,440**
	Phyto-Extraction mil decontamination technology		+2,000	+3,000	+2,500
	Public Private Partnership, Non-Munitions		+2,500		+1,750
	Applied Research Integration		+2,000		+1,400
	Homeland Defense Technologies		+7,000		+4,900
	Green Armaments Technology		+8,000		+5,600
	Nano Technology in SmartCoatings Partnership (Note: only to develop nano-coatings for use in advanced munitions technology where the state of the environment in the vicinity of energetic materials is of critical importance.)		+2,500		+1,750
	Nano Technology for Smart Munitions (Note: only to develop nanotechnologies specifically for warhead/energetics components and to identify and prototype these technologies on a lab scale and conduct munitions demonstrations)		+2,000		+1,400
	Generation-2 Warhead Development (X-caliber) Explosively Formed Penetrators		+2,000		+1,400
	Information Assurance		+5,000		0
	Seamless Data Display (SDD)		+3,000		+1,500
	Single Crystal Tunsten Alloy Penetrators		+5,000		+3,000
	Alloy Tungsten (LA-T) Armor Piercing Ammunition (Note: only to continue research, development, performance verification, system integration and demonstration of LA-T as a high performance kinetic energy armor piercing ammunition)		+5,000		+4,250
	Armament Systems Network IA Center		+4,000		+3,500
	Corrosion Measurement & Control Project		+4,000		+3,400
	M795 Extended Range HE Baseburner Projectile		+4,000		+2,000
	Nanotechnology Consortium			+2,000	+1,000
17	**ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES**	**27,448**	**58,048**	**43,548**	**63,998**
	Logistics Fuel Reformer Development Program (Note: only to continue development of fuel reformers)		+2,500		+1,750
	Center for Advanced Fuel Cell Technology (NDCAFCT)		+2,000		+2,000
	Soldier Fuel Cell System		+1,500		+1,050
	Cylindrical Zinc Air Battery for Land Warrior Applications		+2,000		+1,000
	Improved High Rate Alkaline Cell		+1,500		+1,000
	Rechargeable Cylindrical Cell System--Lithium Ion/Nickel Metal Hydride		+2,000		+1,000
	Dry Polymer Extrusion for Battery Cathode and Electrode Research		+4,300		+3,700
	Extrusion on Multilaminate Battery Packaging		+5,300		+4,500
	Solid State Polymer Battery for Land Warrior System		+2,000		+1,000
	Intelligent Power Control for Sheltered Systems		+4,500		+3,800
	Liquid Silicone Lithium Rechargeable Battery		+3,000		+1,500
	Display and Development and Evaluation Laboratory			+3,500	+1,750
	Flat Panel Displays			+10,000	+7,000

R-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
	Low Cost Reusable Alkaline Manganese-Zinc			+600	+600
	Portable Hybrid Electric Power Systems			+2,000	+1,400
	Miniature and Micro Fuel Cells		0	[5,000]	+3,500
19	**COUNTERMINE SYSTEMS**	**13,186**	**18,686**	**18,186**	**17,886**
	Acoustic Landmine Detection		+5,500	+3,000	+3,300
	Polymer-based landmine detection			+2,000	+1,400
20	**HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY**	**17,415**	**25,415**	**17,415**	**23,015**
	Omni Direction Treadmill Upgrade		+5,000		+3,500
	MANPRINT Modeling		+3,000		+2,100
21	**ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY**	**23,018**	**26,018**	**28,018**	**28,618**
	Rangesafe		+3,000		+2,100
	Environmental Response and Security Protection (ERASP) Program			+5,000	+3,500
22	**COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY**	**21,821**	**24,821**	**21,821**	**23,321**
	Mobile Emergency Broadband System		+3,000		+1,500
24	**MILITARY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY**	**51,124**	**55,124**	**67,124**	**62,724**
	DoD Stationary Fuel Cell Buy Down Program		+4,000	+10,000	+7,000
	Center for Geosciences			+2,000	+1,200
	University Partnership for Operational Support (UPOS)			+4,000	+3,400
25	**MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING TECHNOLOGY**	**14,335**	**18,335**	**14,335**	**16,735**
	Refugee Management and Tracking System		+4,000		+2,400
26	**WARFIGHTER TECHNOLOGY**	**25,502**	**38,502**	**29,002**	**37,052**
	Soldier Systems Center (Note: only to support continued research in the combat feeding program)		+3,000		+2,100
	Center for Reliable Wireless Communications Technology for Digital Battlefield (WAND Lab)		+3,000		+3,000
	Standoff Precision Aerial Delivery System (S/PADS) aerial drops		+5,000		+3,000
	Chemical, Biological Command, Natick Soldier Center		+2,000		+1,000
	Chemical/Biological Reactive Nanoparticle Materials			+3,500	+2,450

R-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
27	**MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY**	**67,476**	**131,476**	**87,576**	**133,636**
	Tissue Replacement and Repair for Battlefield Injuries		+2,500	+2,500	+2,500
	Bone Health		+1,500		+1,050
	Center for Military Biomaterials Research		+1,000		+1,000
	Clinical Trial utilizing a Piezoelectric Dry Powder Inhalation Device		+2,000		+1,700
	Controlling Mosquito and Tick Transmitted Disease		+3,500		+2,100
	Diagnostics in Traumatic Brain Injury-Blood Based		+3,000		+1,500
	Emergency Hypothermia for Advanced Combat Casualty and delayed resusitation		+2,600		+2,210
	Future Medical Shelter System (moved to line 71)		+2,000		0
	Medical Area Network for Virtual Technologies		+4,000		+3,400
	Minimally Invasive Surgery Modeling and Simulation		+3,500		+2,100
	Operating Room of the Future		+3,000		+3,000
	Pre-Clinical and Clinical Evaluation of High Resolution Mobile Gamma Camera and Positron Imaging Devices		+2,000		+1,700
	Portable Biochip Analysis System for Rapid Detection of Biowarfare Agents		+3,000		+1,800
	Remote Acoustic Hemostasis		+10,400	+4,600	+7,000
	Rugged Textile Electronic Garments		+2,000		+1,000
	Synchrotron-Based Scanning Research (Note: $8 million only to continue Synchrotron-based scanning for precision proton therapy, delivery to breast and lung tumor sites; $3.75 million for development of advanced diagnostic Synchrotron-based imaging techology; and $1 million to continue expansion of proton telemedicine initiatives.)		+15,000		+12,750
	Tissue Engineering Initiative		+3,000		+2,550
	Proton Beam Radiation Therapy Program (Note: only to initiate a civilian-military collaborative proton beam therapy initiative on the East Coast of the United States in conjunction with Walter Reed Army Medical Center to provide state-of-the-art radiation treatment with fewer side effects and the possibility of recurrent radiation treatment for numerous forms of cancer to include: lung, prostate, head and neck cancer in adults and brain tumors and other kinds of tumors in children as well as clinical and non-clinical research.)				+5,000
	Speech Capable Personal Digital Assistant (Note: only for the development of a Speech Capable Personal Digital Assistant (SCPDA) engineering prototype with a focus on accurate, hands-free control and/or voice input that would enable medical personnel to retrieve and/or input medical data while working on a patient.)				+2,000
	SEATreat				+2,000
	Digital Imaging and Catheterization Equipment				+800
	Dermal Phase Meter			+1,500	+1,050
	EndoBiologics Vaccination Program			+2,000	+1,000
	Gulf War Illness			+1,000	+1,000
	International Rehabilitation Network			+5,000	+3,500
	Hemorrhage Control Dressings			+3,500	+2,450

R-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
30	**WARFIGHTER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY**	**50,262**	**48,262**	**68,262**	**60,162**
	Objective Force Warrior		-3,500		-3,500
	Metrology		+1,500		+1,000
	Biosystems Technology			+5,000	+4,300
	Personal Navigation of the Future Warfighter			+5,000	+2,500
	Scorpian Future Combat Helmet			+8,000	+5,600
31	**MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY**	**16,590**	**204,090**	**53,840**	**175,040**
	Biology, Education, Screening, Chemoprevention and Treatment (BESCT) Lung Cancer Research Program (MDACC)		+9,500		+9,000
	Bioprocessing Initiative		+4,000		+2,000
	Blood Safety (Note: only for the continuation of the current program to provide improved blood products and safety systems compatible with military field use.)		+11,000		+8,350
	Brain, Biology and Machine Initiative		+3,000	+5,000	+3,000
	Center for Integration of Medicine and Innovative Technology (CIMIT)		+5,000	+10,000	+7,000
	Center for Untethered Health Care		+1,000		+1,000
	Clinical Information Systems Initiative		+2,000		+1,200
	Combat Trauma Patient Simulation Program (CTPS) (moved to line 11)		+6,000		0
	Comparative Functional Genomics Initiative		+3,000		+1,500
	Hemoglobin Based Oxygen Carrier		+7,000		+4,500
	Institute for Research and Education		+6,000		+4,200
	Intravenous Membrane Oxygenator		+1,000		+1,000
	Joint U.S.-Norwegian Telemedicine		+4,000		+2,800
	Joslin Diabetes Project		+5,000		+4,250
	Joint Diabetes Project		+5,000		+4,250
	Life Support for Trauma and Transport (LSTAT)		+2,500		+1,750
	Medvizer Secure Telemedicine Program		+3,000		+1,800
	Mobile Integrated Diagnostic and Data Analysis System (MIDDAS)		+2,000		+1,000
	Molecular Genetics and Musculoskeletal Research Program (Note: only to continue the current program)		+10,000		+8,500
	National Bioterrorism Civilian Medical Response Center (CIMERC)		+4,000	+1,000	+2,000
	National Center for Behavioral Genomics		+3,000		+1,550
	National Functional Genomics Center		+10,000		+5,000
	Neurofibromatosis Research Program (NF)		+23,000		+20,000
	Neurology Gallo Center-alcoholism research		+5,000		+3,500
	Neurotoxin Exposure Treatment Research Program (NETRP) Parkinsons & neurological disorders		+25,000		+21,250
	Polynitroxylated Hemoglobin		+1,000		+1,000
	Prostate Cancer Research-Gallo Center		+1,500		+1,050
	Retinal Scanning Display Technology		+4,000		+2,000
	Saccadic Fatigue Measurement		+1,000		+1,000
	Stable Hemostat		+3,500		+1,750
	Technologies for Metabolic Monitoring		+2,500		+1,750
	Texas Training and Technology for Trauma and Terrorism (DREAMS)		+11,000	+11,000	+11,000
	Vectored Vaccine Research Program (moved to RDT&E,N line 141)		+3,000		0
	Center for Prostate Disease Research (WRAMC)				+5,700

R-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
	Children's Hospice Program (Note: only for a demonstration project at Walter Reed Army Medical Center to structure, implement, and provide oversight of a program serving children with life threatening illnesses, diseases, or conditions who have parents or custodial care givers serving in the US military (including the Reserve components) or retired from the US military.)				+1,500
	Juvenile Diabetes Research			+3,000	+2,550
	Laser Fusion Elastin			+5,000	+4,250
	Medical Simulation Training Initiative (MSTI)			+1,000	+1,000
	Rural Telemedicine Demonstration Project			+1,250	+1,000
	Medical Vanguard for Diabetes Management		0	[5,000]	+2,500
32	**AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY**	**45,404**	**43,496**	**48,404**	**44,346**
	Reduce Programmed Growth		-6,908		-6,908
	Radar Surveillance and Assimilation Network		+5,000		+4,250
	UAV Data Links-AMUST			+3,000	+1,600
33	**WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY**	**66,514**	**68,514**	**66,514**	**66,564**
	Reduce Programmed Growth		-8,500		-4,500
	Development Mission Integration		+5,000		+3,500
	Blended Metals Technology Small Arms Ammunition (Note: only to support government-wide testing of revolutionary small arms ammunition with full spectrum of lethal and penetrating effects.)		+1,500		+1,050
	SMAW-D (Disposable Confined Space)		+4,000		0
34	**COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY**	**229,778**	**272,760**	**262,278**	**278,660**
	Reduce Programmed Growth		-9,018		-9,018
	Truck Research (Note: only for a Center for Automotive Research)		+1,000		+1,000
	Rotary, Multi Fuel, Auxiliary Power Unit Development Program		+3,000	[5,000]	+3,000
	Fuel Catalyst		+1,500		+1,000
	Mobile Parts Hospital		+7,000	+8,000	+7,500
	NAC Standardized Exchange of Product Data (N-STEP)		+2,000	+3,000	+2,500
	Digital Human and Virtual Reality for Future Combat System		+4,000		+3,500
	Hybrid Electric Drive		+3,000		+1,500
	Aluminum Reinforced MMC's for Track Shoes on Ground Based Vehicles		+3,000		+1,500
	Advanced Thermal Management System		+2,000		+1,000
	Geisel (Note: only to complete development of Geisel 6V53T diesel engine prototype and high power density Geisel opposed 2-stroke engine prototype for laboratory performance and durability testing)		+2,500		+1,250
	Integrated Program Management Framework (Program Link)		+2,000		+1,000
	Ultra-high Performance Hybrid Structures and Armors		+3,000		+2,550
	Electrochromatic glass for combat vehicles		+2,000		+1,700
	Future Scout and Cavalry Vehicle demonstration		+10,000		+8,500
	Objective Force Cost Module		+6,000		+3,600
	Turbo Fuel Cell Engine				+1,000

R-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
	Composite Body Parts-CAV Technology Transition			+3,000	+2,100
	Hybrid Electric Vehicles			+7,500	+5,250
	IMPACT			+5,000	+3,500
	Pacific Rim Corrosion Project			+3,000	+2,550
	Rapid Prototyping			+2,000	+1,400
	Tracked Hybrid Electric Vehicle			+1,000	+1,000
35	**COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY**	**4,826**	**4,826**	**8,826**	**7,626**
	Networking Environment for C3 Mobile Systems			+4,000	+2,800
36	**MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY**	**3,527**	**7,527**	**5,527**	**8,327**
	Army Training Support Center Education Training		+4,000		+3,400
	Army Aircrew Coordination Training			+2,000	+1,400
42a	**COUNTERTERRORISM/FORCE PROTECTION**		**48,900**	**43,900**	**43,900**
	Language Translation (transfer from DERF)			+7,300	+7,300
	Blue Force awareness suite (transfer from DERF)			+10,000	+10,000
	Remote observation & confirming sensors (transfer from DERF)			+600	+600
	Multi-function remote unattended ground sensor (transfer from DERF)			+1,500	+1,500
	Laser induced breakdown spectroscopy (transfer from DERF)			+1,500	+1,500
	Universal soldier sensor (transfer from DERF)			+8,000	+8,000
	CT echelon surveillance & reconnaissance (transfer from DERF)			+15,000	+15,000
44	**EW TECHNOLOGY**	**11,600**	**23,100**	**11,600**	**20,000**
	AN/AVVR-1 Laser Warning Receivers		+4,000		+2,000
	Multi-Functional Intelligence & Remote Sensing System		+7,500		+6,400
45	**MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY**	**87,890**	**103,390**	**136,950**	**104,790**
	Hypervelocity Missile Program Growth		-5,500		-5,500
	Loitering Attack Munition for Aviation (LAM-A)		+5,000		+3,000
	CKEM Distributed Prototyping Simulation		+2,000		+1,200
	Army Maintenance and Manufacturing Organization (AMMO) (Note: only to focus on remanufacturing efforts through advanced materials and materials processing technologies.)		+5,000		+2,500
	M-72 LAW		0	0	+2,000
	Volumetrically Controlled Manufacturing		+9,000		+6,000
	Transfer from PE 0604768A--BAT Seeker Integration and Test Analysis			+38,060	0
	Missile Simulation Technology			+11,000	+7,700

R-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
47	**LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY**	**24,104**	**25,104**	**31,604**	**30,404**
	Landmine Detection System using Terahertz Radiation Technology		+1,000		+1,000
	Advanced Demining Technology			+5,000	+3,500
	Electromagnetic Wave Detection and Imaging Transceiver Landmine Detection			+2,500	+1,800
48	**JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM**	**6,013**	**13,013**	**11,013**	**13,713**
	Anti-Material Sniper Rifle (AMSR)		+7,000		+4,200
	Objective Crew Served Weapon			+5,000	+3,500
50	**NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY**	**36,494**	**78,494**	**43,994**	**77,544**
	Passive Millimeter Wave Imager		+6,000		+6,000
	BUSTER UAV (Note: only for continued development of the BUSTER backpack UAV)		+15,000		+10,000
	Personal Miniature Thermal Vision System		+1,000		+1,000
	Multi-Color, Multi-Functional Focal Plane Array (FPA) for Targeting and Fire Control (Note: only for advanced development, integration and testing of next generation infrared focal plane arrays and related technologies)		+5,000		+2,500
	Sensor Technology for Force Protection (Note: only for advanced technology to support the global war on terror, force protection, and peacekeeping operations. This technology is to be explored for operations and security for both land and sea through the use of a variety of methods to include advanced sensors; cameras and biometrics-assisted monitoring devices for entry/exit control; and underwater chemical and intrusion detection devices.)		+13,000		+11,050
	Firefighter and Warfighter Helmet Mounted Thermal		+2,000		+1,000
	AN/TAS-4 Upgrade Program (from RD,N line 69)				+4,250
	Night Vision Fusion			+4,500	+3,150
	Warfighter/Firefighter Position, Location and Tracking (PLT) Sensor			+3,000	+2,100
51	**ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS**	**8,980**	**12,980**	**8,980**	**13,480**
	Proton Exchange Membrane (PEM) Fuel Cell Demonstration Program		+4,000	0	+4,500
52	**MILITARY ENGINEERING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY**	**2,921**	**9,921**	**14,421**	**14,371**
	DoD Fuel Cell Test and Evaluation Center		+7,000		+5,950
	Canola Oil Fuel Cell			+1,500	+1,000
	Proton Exchange Membrane (PEM) Fuel Cell Technology (moved to line 51)		0	+5,000	0
	Solid Oxide Fuel Cell Development			+5,000	+4,500

R-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
53	**ADVANCED TACTICAL COMPUTER SCIENCE AND SENSOR TECHNOLOGY**	**21,674**	**22,674**	**24,674**	**24,174**
	Automated Passive Propagation Sensor/Analyzer (Note: only for the Weather Intelligence and Prediction Advances through Atmospheric Propogation Research and Experimentation.)		+1,000		+1,000
	IMRSV Program for Simulation Based Operation			+3,000	+1,500
54	**ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION**	**27,887**	**27,887**	**41,887**	**39,487**
	Kodiak Launch Infrastructure, Transportation and Security Upgrades			+10,000	+8,500
	SMDC Institute for Chemical Assembly of Nanoscale and Molecular Electronics			+3,000	+2,100
	Targeted Defense for Asymmetric Biological Attack (TDABA)			+1,000	+1,000
55	**ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION (DEM/VAL)**	**7,417**	**43,917**	**68,417**	**60,517**
	P-3 Micro Power Devices for Missile Defense Applications		0	+3,000	+1,800
	P3 Power Systems (Note: only to develop a micro engine to operate off of waste heat more efficiently than batteries)		+1,500		0
	Supercluster Distributed Memory Technology		+3,000	+4,000	+3,500
	Gallium Nitride High Power Microwave Switch		+3,000		+1,500
	Battlefield Ordnance Awareness (BOA)		+3,000	+6,500	+4,550
	Thermionics Technology		+4,000		+2,000
	Advanced Battery Technology		+2,000		+1,700
	Mobile Tactical High Energy Laser (MTHEL)		+10,000	+20,000	+15,000
	Cooperative Micro-Satellite Experiment (CMSE)		+10,000	+5,000	+7,000
	Advanced Tactical Operations Center			+1,000	+1,000
	Eagle Eyes			+4,000	+2,800
	Enhanced Scramjet Mixing			+3,000	+2,100
	Family of Systems Simulators (FOSSIM)			+2,000	+1,400
	Low Cost Interceptor (LCI)			+8,000	+5,600
	Radar Power Technology			+4,500	+3,150
56	**LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER - ADV DEV**	**20,286**	**20,286**	**10,170**	**10,170**
	Termination of Wide Area Munition			-10,116	-10,116
58	**TANK AND MEDIUM CALIBER AMMUNITION**	**11,354**	**20,354**	**26,354**	**27,854**
	Mid Range Munition/Tank Extended Range Munition Tri-Mode Munition (MRM/TERM TM3)		+1,000	+15,000	+10,500
	Global Positioning System Interference Supression Unit		+1,000		+1,000
	Mid-Range Munition (MRM) KE		+7,000		+5,000
59	**ADVANCED TANK ARMAMENT SYSTEM (ATAS)**	**124,108**	**150,908**	**147,908**	**150,008**
	Interim Armored Vehicle (IAV)--Mobile Gun System, Vehicle Testing transfer from WTCV Line G85100		+23,800	+23,800	+23,800
	Common Remote Stabilized Sensor System (CRS3) (Note: only for the Advanced Tank Armament System to accelerate design and qualification testing of the Common Remote Stabilized Sensor System (CRS3))		+3,000		+2,100
64	**ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY DEM/VAL**	**9,331**	**27,331**	**26,331**	**32,581**
	Dual Use Commercialization		+4,500		+3,150
	Casting Emissions Reduction Program (CERP)		+3,000	+8,000	+5,600

R-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
	Casting Emissions Reduction Program (CERP) for Automotive Demonstration site in Saginaw, MI		+1,000		+1,000
	Technology Development for Unexploded Ordnance in Support of Military Readiness (Note: Only for the National Defense Center for Environmental Excellence to demonstrate and validate technologies to efficiently identify, characterize and remediate unexploded ordnance.)		+5,000		+4,250
	Continuation of technology to reduce non-hazardous waste		+2,000		+1,700
	Vanadium Technology Program		+2,500		+1,250
	Army Environmental Enhancement Program			+1,000	+1,000
	Transportable Detonation Chamber			+5,000	+3,500
	Waste Minimization and Pollution Prevention			+3,000	+1,800
65	**WARFIGHTER INFORMATION NETWORK-TACTICAL - DEM/VAL**	**60,809**	**60,809**	**40,809**	**50,809**
	Reduced Program Growth			-20,000	-10,000
66	**NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT**	**8,773**	**4,000**	**8,773**	**4,773**
	Reduce Programmed Growth		-4,773	0	-4,000
67	**AVIATION - ADV DEV**	**8,643**	**12,643**	**8,643**	**11,443**
	Virtual Cockpit Optimization Program (VCOP) (Note: only to develop full color, high resolution retinal scanning displays for rotorcraft)		+4,000		+2,800
68	**WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS - ADV DEV**	**38,561**	**38,561**	**27,761**	**35,861**
	Precision Guided Mortar Munition (PGMM)--Crusader Budget Amendment		0	-10,800	-2,700
69	**LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - ADV DEV**	**11,419**	**6,419**	**16,919**	**9,719**
	Reduce Programmed Growth		-5,000		-5,000
	Composite Prototype Hull Design for Theater Support Vessel			+5,500	+3,300
71	**MEDICAL SYSTEMS - ADV DEV**	**10,398**	**10,398**	**15,398**	**14,298**
	Future Medical Shelter System (moved from line 27)		0	0	+1,400
	Combat Support Hospital--Mobile Surgical Unit		0	+5,000	+2,500
74	**ARTILLERY SYSTEMS - DEM/VAL**	**5,200**	**373,700**	**0**	**373,700**
	Objective Force--Indirect Fire (Transfer from Armored Systems Modernization for NLOS Cannon)		+195,500		+195,500
	Objective Force--Indirect Fire (Technology Integration)		+173,000		+173,000
	Reduction			-5,200	0
75	**SCAMP BLOCK II DEM/VAL**	**21,006**	**21,006**	**15,006**	**15,006**
	Execution Delay		0	-6,000	-6,000
76	**MEDIUM EXTENDED AIR DEFENSE SYSTEM (MEADS) CONCEPTS -**	**117,745**	**0**	**0**	**0**
	Transfer to RDT&E, Defense-Wide		-117,745	-117,745	-117,745
	DEM/VAL TEST AND EVALUATION TRANSFER	**0**	**0**	**-5,000**	**0**
	Transfer out		0	-5,000	0

R-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
77	**AIRCRAFT AVIONICS**	**40,308**	**41,808**	**40,308**	**41,358**
	Airborne Separation Video System		+1,500		+1,050
80	**EW DEVELOPMENT**	**22,819**	**39,719**	**38,719**	**39,719**
	Electronic Warfare (Prophet block II-IV acceleration)--Transfer from DERF		+15,900	+15,900	+15,900
	Upgrades to the Leviathon COMINT system for SOCOM		+1,000		+1,000
82	**ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM**	**42,322**	**54,622**	**55,622**	**55,622**
	All Source Analysis System (ASAS)--Transfer from DERF		+12,300		0
	FALCON language translator (Transfer from DERF)			+8,000	+8,000
	Analysis & control element (ACE) software development (Transfer from DERF)			+4,300	+4,300
	Non-Traditional Intelligence Analysis Tool Set			+1,000	+1,000
89	**LANDMINE WARFARE**	**11,913**	**11,913**	**0**	**0**
	Termination of Wide Area Munition		0	-11,913	-11,913
90	**FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES**	**3,990**	**3,990**	**19,990**	**15,190**
	HEMTT 2 Technology Insertion Program		0	+16,000	+11,200
92	**TACTICAL UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLE (TUGV)**	**0**	**2,000**	**0**	**1,200**
	Viking Mine Clearing System (Note: only to complete development and pre-series production testing for the Viking Mine Clearing System in the Army's Tactical Unmanned Ground Vehicle.)		+2,000		+1,200
94	**ARMORED SYSTEMS MODERNIZATION (ASM)-ENG DEV**	**369,869**	**174,369**	**813,469**	**250,610**
	Objective Force--Indirect Fire (transfer to Artillery Systems dem/val)		-195,500		-195,500
	Objective Force--Indirect Fires--Crusader Budget Amendment			-195,500	0
	Netfires Systems Tech--Crusader Budget Amendment			-57,000	-14,250
	Netfires--C4ISR Tech--Crusader Budget Amendment			-57,509	-14,509
	Crusader Follow-on Indirect Fires			+475,609	0
	Future Combat System Risk Reduction			+105,000	+105,000
	Non-Line of Sight Cannon Development			+173,000	0
96	**NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS - ENG DEV**	**32,328**	**39,328**	**32,328**	**38,278**
	Avenger Upgrade of 1st Generation Forward Looking Infrared (FLIR) Equipment		+7,000		+5,950
97	**COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT**	**94,474**	**92,274**	**94,474**	**91,274**
	Reduce Programmed Growth		-4,200		-4,200
	Extended Cold Weather Clothing System		+2,000		+1,000
98	**NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES - ENG DEV**	**43,650**	**68,650**	**43,650**	**58,900**
	National Training Center Fiber Optic Network (Note: to design and install a Common Training Instrumentation Architecture (CITA) compliant fiber optic network.)		+25,000		+15,250
101	**JSIMS CORE PROGRAM**	**24,230**	**24,230**	**18,230**	**20,230**
	Schedule Slippage		0	-6,000	-4,000

R-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
103	**AIR DEFENSE COMMAND, CONTROL AND INTELLIGENCE - ENG DEV**	**26,978**	**26,978**	**28,978**	**28,678**
	FAADC2		0	+2,000	+1,700
104	**CONSTRUCTIVE SIMULATION SYSTEMS**	**53,294**	**53,294**	**42,294**	**46,294**
	WarSim schedule slippage		0	-11,000	-7,000
105	**AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT**	**11,839**	**13,839**	**11,839**	**13,539**
	Integrated Family of Test Equipment		+2,000		+1,700
106	**DISTRIBUTIVE INTERACTIVE SIMULATIONS (DIS) - ENGINEERING**	**21,487**	**19,087**	**21,487**	**19,087**
	Computer Generated Forces		-2,400		-2,400
107	**TACTICAL SURVEILLANCE SYSTEMS - ENG DEV**	**56,662**	**59,662**	**56,662**	**58,462**
	Broadband Intelligence Training System		+3,000		+1,800
108	**BRILLIANT ANTI-ARMOR SUBMUNITION (BAT)**	**190,293**	**38,060**	**38,060**	**45,000**
	Seeker Technology Development and Testing		-152,233	-152,233	-145,293
111	**COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (CATT) CORE**	**7,579**	**7,579**	**9,079**	**8,629**
	AVCATT-A Upgrade		0	+1,500	+1,050
113	**AVIATION - ENG DEV**	**3,150**	**3,150**	**3,650**	**3,650**
	High Level Ballistic Protection		0	+500	+500
114	**WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS - ENG DEV**	**41,758**	**52,158**	**50,758**	**52,658**
	Mortar Anti-Personnel Anti-Materiel (MAPAM)		+1,000	+5,000	+3,500
	155mm M795E1 Extended Range Base Burner		+3,000		+1,500
	Common Remotely Operated Weapon Station (CROWS) (Note: only for integration of pre-planned product improvements with intention of reducing weight, profile and unit cost, integration of sensor improvements, design data communication bus and interface to Armored Security Vehicles)		+3,400	+2,000	+2,700
	Pyrotechnic Self-Destruct Fuze		+3,000		+1,500
	SLAMRAAM			+2,000	+1,700

R-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
115	**LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - ENG DEV**	**65,857**	**68,857**	**65,857**	**67,957**
	2kW Military Tactical Generator Product Improvements (Note: only for the purpose of providing product improvements in the areas of weight and noise reduction for the Army's current, lightweight, manportable 2kW military tactical generator.)		+3,000		+2,100
116	**COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS - ENG DEV**	**82,238**	**90,238**	**99,238**	**94,238**
	Applied Communications and Information Network (ACIN)		+8,000	+17,000	+12,000
117	**MEDICAL MATERIEL/MEDICAL BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT**	**12,625**	**22,125**	**12,625**	**19,725**
	Cartledge Infuser		+3,000		+1,500
	Raman Chemical Imaging Biothreat Detection Program (Note: Only for continued chemical imaging biothreat database development and field hardening of a transportable chemical imaging microscope.)		+6,500		+5,600
118	**LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER - ENG DEV**	**128,992**	**114,992**	**128,992**	**128,992**
	Reduce Programmed Growth		-14,000		0
119	**ARTILLERY MUNITIONS - EMD**	**119,188**	**119,188**	**70,888**	**107,113**
	Excalibur Artillery Projectile--Crusader Budget Amendment		0	-48,300	-12,075
120	**COMBAT IDENTIFICATION**	**1,995**	**1,995**	**6,595**	**5,215**
	Integrated Battlefield Combat Situational Awareness (IB-CSAS)		0	+4,600	+3,220
121	**ARMY TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL HARDWARE & SOFTWARE**	**80,672**	**102,410**	**90,672**	**101,010**
	Reduce Programmed Growth		-3,000		-3,000
	Realignment from Aircraft Procurement, Army (Transfer from A2C2S procurement--APA 26)		+17,738	+10,000	+17,738
	TOC 3D & Survivable Carrier (CECOM) (Note: Only to leverage the Army's Advanced Warfare Environment's commercial 3D display technology development to support the Army's command and control modernization initiatives.)		+7,000		+5,600
125	**ARTILLERY SYSTEMS - EMD**	**29,732**	**29,732**	**22,232**	**27,857**
	Paladin Rebuild--Crusader Budget Amendment		0	-7,500	-1,875
126	**PATRIOT PAC-3 THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE ACQUISITION - EM**	**150,819**	**0**	**0**	**0**
	Transfer to RDT&E, Defense-Wide		-150,819	-150,819	-150,819
127	**INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT**	**50,865**	**50,865**	**76,865**	**73,365**
	JCALS		0	+25,000	+21,500
	Electronic Commodity Program		0	+1,000	+1,000
	DEM/VAL TEST AND EVALUATION TRANSFER	**0**	**0**	**-18,000**	**0**
	Transfer out		0	-18,000	0

R-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
128	**THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT**	**15,251**	**15,251**	**21,251**	**19,451**
	Multi-Mode Top Attack Threat Simulator Program		0	+3,000	+2,100
	RF/SAM Threat Simulator		0	+3,000	+2,100
130	**MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT**	**53,797**	**53,797**	**82,797**	**53,797**
	Transfer from acquisition programs		0	+29,000	0
131	**RAND ARROYO CENTER**	**22,148**	**20,000**	**22,148**	**22,148**
	Reduce Programmed Growth		-2,148	0	0
133	**CONCEPTS EXPERIMENTATION PROGRAM**	**22,627**	**22,627**	**25,627**	**24,727**
	Battle Lab at Ft. Knox		0	+3,000	+2,100
135	**ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES**	**144,183**	**113,451**	**153,683**	**144,883**
	Reduce Programmed Growth		-30,732		-7,500
	Cold Region Test Activity Infrastructure			+2,500	+2,200
	Hybrid Electric Vehicle testing only at Cold Region Test Activity			+5,000	+4,300
	Non-Discarding SABOT Technology only at Cold Region Test Activity			+2,000	+1,700
136	**ARMY TECHNICAL TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND TARGETS**	**43,222**	**34,719**	**43,222**	**43,222**
	Reduce Programmed Growth		-8,503		0
137	**SURVIVABILITY/LETHALITY ANALYSIS**	**39,200**	**34,514**	**39,200**	**39,200**
	Reduce Programmed Growth		-4,686		0
138	**DOD HIGH ENERGY LASER TEST FACILITY**	**14,410**	**15,910**	**17,410**	**17,560**
	Sealite Camera Upgrade HELSTF		+1,500		+1,050
	HELSTF infrastructure upgrades			+3,000	+2,100
145	**PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES**	**78,452**	**64,952**	**78,452**	**64,952**
	Reduce Programmed Growth		-13,500		-13,500
146	**TECHNICAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES**	**34,040**	**49,540**	**35,540**	**47,740**
	Army High Performance Computing Research Center (AHPCRC)		+15,500		+12,700
	Knowledge Management Fusion			+1,500	+1,000

R-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
147	**MUNITIONS STANDARDIZATION, EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY**	**16,014**	**37,014**	**18,014**	**31,514**
	Public Private Partnership		+9,000		+6,300
	Life Cycle Pilot Process		+7,000		+4,200
	Manufacturing RDE Center, Nanotechnologies (Note: only to accelerate the production and weaponization of nanotechnologies at Picatinny Arsenal.)		+2,000		+1,400
	Micro Electrical Mechanical Systems Technology Applications (Note: only for the Nanotechnology/ MEMS Research and Development Foundry (NanoConsortium) to design and fabricate MEMS prototypes for armament/munitions systems.)		+2,000		+1,400
	CVT Detection for Automated Munitions Inspection and Surveillance		+1,000		+1,000
	Plasma Ordnance Demilitarization System (PODS)			+2,000	+1,200
152	**MLRS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**	**112,825**	**112,825**	**57,825**	**99,075**
	Guided MLRS Unitary--Crusader Budget Amendment		0	-45,000	-11,250
	HIMARS P3I--Crusader Budget Amendment		0	-10,000	-2,500
153	**AEROSTAT JOINT PROJECT OFFICE**	**29,081**	**31,081**	**29,081**	**30,081**
	Lightweight X-Band Radar Antenna Technology		+2,000		+1,000
154	**DOMESTIC PREPAREDNESS AGAINST WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCT**	**0**	**3,000**	**0**	**2,550**
	WMD 1st Responder Training at National Preparedness Institute		+3,000		+2,550
155	**ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM**	**42,161**	**52,161**	**38,161**	**47,161**
	AFATDS		+10,000		+5,000
	AFATDS--Crusader Budget Ammendment			-4,000	0
156	**COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**	**83,065**	**84,065**	**57,965**	**86,515**
	Combat Vehicle Improvement Program (Note: only for the continuing development and evaluation of a new generation electronics architecture and other migrating rearchitecture projects for the Bradley Fighting Vehicle and other combat vehicles).		+1,000		+1,000
	Abrams M1A1 Fleet Sidecar/Embedded Diagnostics			+3,500	+2,450
	LV100 Engine (ACCE) program--Crusader Budget Amendment			-28,600	0
158	**AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS/PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS**	**196,794**	**196,794**	**220,794**	**212,794**
	Blackhawk Dual Digital Flight Control Computer		0	+4,000	+2,000
	Integrated Mechanical Diagnostics-HUMS, UH-60L Demonstration		0	+20,000	+14,000
159	**AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**	**3,689**	**9,189**	**3,689**	**7,089**
	Liquid or Light-air End (LOLA) Boost Pump		+1,500		+1,000
	Universal Fuel Authority Digital Engine Control (FADEC)		+4,000		+2,400

R-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
160	**DIGITIZATION**	**28,968**	**34,968**	**30,968**	**33,768**
	DISM (Note: only to continue research to enable full integration of DISM equipment with all SINCGARS radio sets.)		+4,000		+2,800
	University XXI Effort--Digitization at Ft. Hood		+2,000	+2,000	+2,000
168	**SPECIAL ARMY PROGRAM**	**7,031**	**7,031**	**11,031**	**10,031**
	Authorized Increase		0	+4,000	+3,000
169	**SECURITY AND INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES**	**5,438**	**25,938**	**22,638**	**26,638**
	Distributed Data Visualization & Management		+8,000		+3,600
	Expanded Processing for Intelligence Data Analysis		+2,500		+1,900
	INSCOM Global Information Portal		+5,000		+2,500
	Asymmetric Warfare Intelligence Analysis Advanced Tool Set		+4,000		+2,500
	Project Madison		+1,000		0
	Language Training Software			+5,200	+3,700
	Base Protection and Monitoring System			+4,000	+2,000
	Contiguous Connection Model (CCM)			+4,000	+2,000
	Classified Programs			+4,000	+3,000
170	**INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM**	**14,844**	**18,844**	**23,944**	**23,344**
	Information Systems Security Program (Note: only for rapid prototyping of combined bandwidth management technology that includes dynamic allocation, information security and networkling/knowledge management)		+4,000	+3,500	+3,500
	Biometrics			+5,600	+5,000
171	**GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM**	**71,864**	**51,864**	**71,864**	**51,864**
	Reduction		-20,000		-20,000
175	**TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES**	**57,879**	**81,779**	**58,579**	**68,579**
	Hunter ground control system (Transfer from DERF)		+12,100	+12,100	+12,100
	Tactical Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (Note: only to provide one I-GNAT system with sensors, spares, training, logistics and deployment support to develop TTP for Army medium range UAV employment)		+11,800		+10,000
	TUAV--Target Location Error--Crusader Budget Amendment			-11,400	-11,400
176	**AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS**	**4,882**	**11,382**	**7,882**	**11,632**
	Hyperspectral Long Wave Imager for the Tactical Environment		+4,000		+2,000
	HyLITE (Note: only to develop an extended bandwidth longwave detector, enhanced target detection algorithms, and to incorporate target detection hardware and algorithms.)		+2,500		+1,750
	Signature-based unattended MASINT sensors (Transfer from DERF)			+3,000	+3,000

R-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
177	**DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS**	**15,683**	**42,083**	**51,083**	**45,583**
	Wideband ISR network (Transfer from DERF)		+24,700	+21,700	+21,700
	Request Duplicates Supplemental Funding		-8,300		-8,300
	Only to continue upgrades to DCGS		+10,000		+2,800
	MASINT tools (Transfer from DERF)			+2,000	+2,000
	Integrate DCGS-A at EAC (Transfer from DERF)			+2,000	+2,000
	Integrate common data link (CDL) into DCGS-A (Transfer from DERF)			+5,000	+5,000
	MTI/MP-RTIP integration (Transfer from DERF)			+4,700	+4,700
178	**END ITEM INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES**	**61,025**	**68,525**	**72,150**	**78,325**
	Industrial Short Pulse Laser Development/Femtosecond Laser		+3,500	[7,000]	+4,200
	Reactive Atom Plasma Processing		+2,500		+2,200
	21st Century High Technology for Legacy Parts Reinvention (Note: only for an advanced center for laser data acquisition and reverse engineering that leverages the existing solid model creation capability).		+1,500		+1,000
	National Center for Defense Manufacturing and Machining				+1,500
	Bipolar wafer-cell NiMH			+2,000	+1,000
	Continuous Manu. Process for Metal Matrix Composites			+450	+450
	MANTECH for Cylindrical Zinc Air Battery for Landwarrior System			+3,000	+2,100
	MERWS--Phase II			+5,675	+4,850
	OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT T&E TRANSFER	**0**	**0**	**-6,000**	**0**
	Operational System Development T&E Transfer		0	-6,000	0

MAGNETO INDUCTIVE INITIATOR

The President's budget request includes $3,000,000 to be used for Engineering and Manufacturing Development of the Magneto Inductive Initiator. The conferees support the rapid fielding of this capability which will allow for U.S. forces to have a remote precision demolition capability that is highly reliable in hardened structures, bunkers, caves, buildings, and in the littoral surf zone. The conferees ask to be kept apprised of the progress of this important program.

SOLID STATE LASERS

There has been substantial technical progress in the ongoing solid state laser development efforts, and the need to continue rapid progress toward developing an Army tactical laser weapons capability for the Objective Force. Therefore, the conferees urge the Army to allocate $11,200,000, as proposed in the fiscal year 2003 budget request, for High Energy Laster Technology to the current Solid State Heat Capacity Laser program.

BRILLIANT ANTI-ARMOR TECHNOLOGY (BAT) AND BAT P3I SUBMUNITION PROGRAM

The conferees agree with the recommendations found in both the House and Senate reports to terminate the BAT program, and accordingly, include a reduction of $145,293,000 to this program. The conference agreement also provides $45,000,000 of the funds requested for this program for the purpose of developing and testing a multi-mode seeker technology. In addition, the conferees direct the Army establish a new project code for the seeker development to distinguish this work from the base BAT and BAT P3I programs.

LOITERING ATTACK MISSILE REQUIREMENTS REVIEW

The conferees direct the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by no later than March 31, 2003, comparing and contrasting the cost, technical risk, schedule risk, and combat capability of replacing the planned Loitering Attack Missile (LAM) with a comparable capability centered on the use of Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAV) with a smart seeker munition. This report shall assess whether a UAV with a smart seeker munition can provide equal or better combat capability within the same or a shorter timeframe compared to use of the LAM under the existing Army Objective Force Transformation plan. This report shall also include an analysis of the relative capabilities of each system to discern friend or foe in real time and to limit collateral damage. It shall also assess whether a UAV/smart munition option provides better value and greater overall combat effectiveness to the Army when considering the added potential of combining surveillance and strike capability on the same platform.

FUTURE COMBAT SYSTEM AND INTELLIGENT MINEFIELDS

The conferees agree to provide an additional $105,000,000 for the Army's next generation warfighting capability, the Future Combat System. The conferees also agree with the Senate's language that encourages the Army to invest part of this additional funding into a development program for a next generation intelligent minefield. The conferees direct that the Army clearly define the requirements for a next generation intelligent minefield and ensure compliance with the Ottawa Treaty, and report back to the House and Senate Appropriations Committee with detailed plans for such a system. The conferees understand that the Army has already begun this process with plans to incorporate the Intelligent Munitions System (IMS) into the Future Combat System. The conferees urge that the Army consider using a portion of this additional funding to begin development of the IMS. Funds for the intelligent minefield may be obligated before the Milestone B decision for the Future Combat System program, for demonstration and validation of technologies as appropriate.

FUTURE TESTING REQUIREMENTS

The conferees agree with the House report language requiring the Secretary of Defense to provide a report on Future Testing Requirements. The Senate did not address this matter. The conferees direct the Secretary of Defense to submit this report to the congressional defense committees not later than May 1, 2003. The report should provide an analysis of the capabilities of the test ranges, including the need for investment in new equipment; the capabilities of current modeling and simulation techniques used in testing and evaluation; recommend a means of using modeling and simulation techniques to make the testing of weapons systems more efficient and effective; and propose a five-year plan of integrated investment for both ranges and modeling and simulation techniques.

NON-LINE OF SIGHT (NLOS) CANNON

The conferees agree to align the funding proposed in the Crusader budget amendment of the Non-Line of Sight (NLOS) Cannon to the Artillery Systems-Demonstration/Validation program to ensure that the experienced Army staff who were developing the Crusader will lead the effort to migrate these technologies, and to develop the NLOS cannon. The conferees, therefore, have included a total of $368,500,000, for the Non-Line of Sight Cannon and Resupply Vehicle Program in Artillery Systems Demonstration/Validation, to develop a Non-Line of Sight Cannon. This amount is an increase of $173,000,000 above the President's budget request. The conferees direct that this additional funding be used to integrate cannon technologies with a suitable platform and munitions to ensure that this NLOS Cannon can be delivered in the 2008 timeframe. Finally, the conferees direct the NLOS Cannon program office to closely coordinate its program with the Army's Future Combat Systems program office.

CRUSADER BUDGET AMENDMENT/NLOS CANNON

	Amended Budget	House	Senate	Conference
Artillery Systems--Dem/Val PE 0603854A: Crusader termination and migration of cannon technologies, and platform and munitions integration	-246,465	-246,465	-246,465	-246,465
Objective Force--Indirect Fires	0	+195,500	0	+195,500
Technology Integration	0	+173,000	0	+173,000
Reduction	0	0	-5,200	0
Artillery Systems EMD PE 0604854A				
Crusader Termination	-229,144	-229,144	-229,144	-229,144
Paladin Upgrades	+7,500	+7,500	0	+5,625
Armored Systems Modernization PE 0604645A				
Netfires System Technology	+57,000	+57,000	0	+42,750
Netfires C4ISR	+57,509	+57,509	0	+43,000
Objective Force--Indirect Fires	+195,500	0	0	0
Crusader follow-on Indirect Fires	0	0	+475,609	0
Technology Integration	0	0	+173,000	0
Weapons and Munitions Adv Dev PE 0603802A: Includes Precision Guided Mortar Munition (PGMM)	+10,800	+10,800	0	+8,100
Excalibur/TCM PE 0604814A: Includes Excalibur artillery projectile development	+48,300	+48,300	0	+36,225
MLRS Product Improvement Program PE 0603778A: Includes Guided MLRS Unitary and HIMARS	+55,000	+55,000	0	+41,250
Advanced Field Artillery Tactical Data System (AFATDS) PE 0203726A	+4,000	+4,000	0	+4,000
Combat Vehicle Improvement Program PE 0203735A: Includes Abrams engine program (ACCE)	+28,600	+28,600	0	+28,600
Tactical Unmanned Aerial Vehicles PE 0305204A: Includes TUAV--Target Location Error (funding included in Other Procurement, Army, line 58, Shadow TUAV--Block II Upgrades)	+11,400	+11,400	0	0
Missile Technology PE 0602303A: MEMS Technology Development Acceleration	0	+15,000	0	+12,750
Subtotal Increases	+475,609	+663,609	+663,609	+590,800
Subtotal Decreases	-475,609	-475,609	-480,809	-475,609
TOTAL	0	+188,000	+182,800	+115,191

COMBAT SUPPORT HOSPITAL-MOBILE SURGICAL UNIT

The conferees understand that the Army is working to develop a replacement system to the deployable medical hospital. Accordingly, $2,500,000 is provided to the U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command, Ft. Detrick, MD, to prototype a 44-bed Combat Support Hospital consistent with the concept design of the U.S. Army Medical Center and School's ICT report on the Future Medical Support System.

M934 MORTAR—LOW COST COURSE CORRECTION MODULE

The conferees are aware of recently concluded tests sponsored by Army PM-Mortar which support further demonstration and evaluation of the Low Cost Course Correction (LCCC) module for the M934 Mortar. The conferees also note the positive performance of the LCCC module as reported by the Army and encourage the Secretary of the Army to address future funding requirements for the LCCC module and future testing requirements.

ARMY ASSAULT RIFLE EARLY TRANSFORMATION

The conferees are aware of significant Army progress in developing the XM–8 assault rifle as a stand-alone module of the XM–29 assault weapon program. The XM–8 appears to offer significant improvements over the current M–4 assault rifle and may be worthy of fielding on an expedited basis. The conferees direct the Secretary of the Army to review the costs, benefits and feasibility of accelerating replacement of the M–4 with the XM–8. The Secretary shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees by no later than April 1, 2003, comparing and contrasting the cost, weapon performance/capabilities, technical risk, schedule risk, and improvements in overall combat capability of fielding the XM–8 assault rifle module of the XM–29 assault weapon under an initial block development approach compared to the current fielding plan. This report shall specifically assess the benefits of an early block development fielding of the XM–8 in providing equal or better combat capability in a shorter timeframe, and the overall benefits to soldier effectiveness and survivability, compared to waiting for final development of the XM–29 under the existing Army Objective Force Transformation Plan.

PSEUDOFOLLICULITIS BARBE

The Conferees agree that Pseudofolliculitis Barbe (PFB) is a serious condition that impacts many African American military personnel and deserves additional attention. The conferees strongly encourage the Department of Defense to act quickly on a plan of action to initiate research into more effective treatments and control of this problem.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or Senate is as follows:

	(In thousands of dollars)			
	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY				
BASIC RESEARCH				
IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	16,352	16,352	16,352	16,352
DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	393,557	391,557	411,557	405,457
TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	409,909	407,909	427,909	421,809
APPLIED RESEARCH				
POWER PROJECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	76,612	115,412	80,612	106,687
FORCE PROTECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	89,390	94,890	123,390	121,115
MARINE CORPS LANDING FORCE TECHNOLOGY	30,274	30,274	30,274	30,274
C3I AND SURVEILLANCE	---	---	3,000	1,400
HUMAN SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	---	1,500	---	1,050
MATERIALS, ELECTRONICS AND COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY	---	14,000	1,000	10,000
COMMON PICTURE APPLIED RESEARCH	75,594	96,094	150,594	151,594
WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	68,852	102,552	93,152	109,162
RF SYSTEMS APPLIED RESEARCH	56,263	66,763	74,763	75,963
OCEAN WARFIGHTING ENVIRONMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	55,180	70,730	65,680	71,630
UNDERSEA WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH	71,294	81,694	85,194	86,444
MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH	56,813	56,813	56,813	56,813
TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	580,272	730,722	764,472	822,132
ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT				
POWER PROJECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	78,247	170,647	105,247	170,962
FORCE PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	57,604	93,104	99,104	87,479
COMMON PICTURE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	37,753	44,753	50,753	48,353
WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	82,542	98,042	90,542	98,492
RF SYSTEMS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	65,098	65,098	65,098	76,148
SURFACE SHIP & SUBMARINE HM&E ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	---	6,000	---	---
MARINE CORPS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD)	51,606	66,206	63,106	76,816
MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	---	62,800	---	---
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY & LOGISTICS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	---	2,000	4,000	3,800
NAVY TECHNICAL INFORMATION PRESENTATION SYSTEM	97,872	97,872	97,872	97,872
WARFIGHTER PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	19,040	38,040	19,040	39,940
UNDERSEA WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	40,125	42,125	45,125	44,625
NAVY WARFIGHTING EXPERIMENTS AND DEMONSTRATIONS	43,460	43,460	43,460	43,460

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY....	43,725	47,225	43,725	46,000
ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION.....	---	---	5,000	2,500
TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.....	617,072	877,372	732,072	836,447
DEMONSTRATION & VALIDATION				
AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS.....	32,549	35,049	32,549	33,799
AVIATION SURVIVABILITY.....	7,486	20,986	14,486	20,836
DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL.....	39,772	7,500	47,272	32,500
ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT.....	13,207	26,707	18,207	25,907
TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE.....	1,922	15,922	1,922	13,822
ADVANCED COMBAT SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY.....	3,350	3,350	3,350	3,350
SURFACE AND SHALLOW WATER MINE COUNTERMEASURES.....	155,016	160,516	155,016	158,866
SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE.....	3,244	18,244	5,244	14,644
CARRIER SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT.....	88,913	89,913	94,913	92,513
SHIPBOARD SYSTEM COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT.....	243,111	253,111	257,111	260,361
PILOT FISH.....	72,637	72,637	72,637	72,637
RETRACT LARCH.....	28,482	28,482	28,482	28,482
RADIOLOGICAL CONTROL.....	1,078	1,078	1,078	1,078
SURFACE ASW.....	3,219	8,219	3,219	14,819
SSGN CONVERSION.....	82,527	82,527	82,527	82,527
ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT.....	107,389	136,389	126,789	134,539
SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS.....	11,601	11,601	11,601	11,601
SHIP CONCEPT ADVANCED DESIGN.....	5,820	23,820	9,820	28,220
SHIP PRELIMINARY DESIGN & FEASIBILITY STUDIES.....	2,983	2,983	2,983	2,983
ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS.....	216,091	216,091	216,091	216,091
ADVANCED SURFACE MACHINERY SYSTEMS.....	2,931	2,931	2,931	2,931
CHALK EAGLE.....	20,978	20,978	20,978	20,978
COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION.....	40,464	66,964	40,464	62,364
CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS.....	22,445	24,945	18,445	20,570
MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES.....	272,092	277,592	272,092	276,767
MARINE CORPS MINE/COUNTERMEASURES SYSTEMS - ADV DEV...	497	497	497	497
MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM.....	27,777	37,777	33,277	31,777
JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT.....	12,877	12,877	12,877	12,877
COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT.....	86,144	118,144	86,144	112,094

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
OCEAN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	15,257	15,257	15,257	16,257
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	44,206	48,206	44,206	46,906
NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	5,060	17,060	12,560	15,310
FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT	2,124	4,624	2,124	3,374
CHALK CORAL	50,704	67,104	50,704	67,104
NAVY LOGISTIC PRODUCTIVITY	13,023	32,023	13,023	26,723
RETRACT MAPLE	212,506	276,506	276,506	276,506
LINK PLUMERIA	82,909	82,909	82,909	82,909
RETRACT ELM	21,900	21,900	21,900	21,900
SHIP SELF DEFENSE - DEM/VAL	5,930	5,930	5,930	5,930
LINK EVERGREEN	55,971	55,971	55,971	55,971
SPECIAL PROCESSES	39,756	39,756	39,756	39,756
NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	11,581	11,581	11,581	11,581
LAND ATTACK TECHNOLOGY	108,693	130,693	110,693	126,943
NONLETHAL WEAPONS - DEM/VAL	24,082	24,082	28,082	26,482
ALL SERVICE COMBAT IDENTIFICATION EVALUATION TEAM	14,414	14,414	14,414	14,414
JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS - DEM/VAL	11,932	11,932	11,932	11,932
SINGLE INTEGRATED AIR PICTURE (SIAP) SYSTEM ENGINEER	73,966	73,966	73,966	73,966
SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) ARCHITECTURE/ENGINE	31,623	33,623	31,623	33,323
DEM/VAL TEST AND EVALUATION TRANSFER	---	---	-15,000	---
TOTAL, DEMONSTRATION & VALIDATION	2,432,239	2,745,367	2,561,139	2,747,717
ENGINEERING & MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT				
OTHER HELO DEVELOPMENT	31,123	38,623	32,623	36,223
AV-8B AIRCRAFT - ENG DEV	18,565	18,565	18,565	18,565
STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT	37,757	42,957	37,757	40,357
MULTI-MISSION HELICOPTER UPGRADE DEVELOPMENT	88,969	95,969	88,969	94,919
S-3 WEAPON SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT	422	422	422	422
AIR/OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENGINEERING	5,725	9,725	5,725	7,725
P-3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	2,348	2,348	2,348	2,348
TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM	81,475	81,475	61,475	74,475
E-2C RADAR MODERNIZATION	113,681	113,681	121,681	113,681
H-1 UPGRADES	241,384	241,384	241,384	241,384

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS	13,929	13,929	13,929	13,929
V-22A	420,109	420,109	420,109	420,109
AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	6,695	7,695	6,695	7,695
EW DEVELOPMENT	74,742	75,642	84,742	81,342
JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM - NAVY (JTRS-NAVY)	20,373	20,373	20,373	20,373
SC-21 TOTAL SHIP SYSTEM ENGINEERING	717,397	642,397	749,397	732,797
SURFACE COMBATANT COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING	300,748	323,748	311,748	348,148
LPD-17 CLASS SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	10,133	10,133	10,133	10,133
TRI-SERVICE STANDOFF ATTACK MISSILE	14,943	14,943	14,943	14,943
SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)	1,989	1,989	1,989	1,989
STANDARD MISSILE IMPROVEMENTS	16,288	16,288	16,288	21,288
AIRBORNE MCM	67,240	69,240	67,240	68,240
SSN-688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION	98,516	133,016	98,516	126,641
AIR CONTROL	4,951	4,951	4,951	4,951
ENHANCED MODULAR SIGNAL PROCESSOR	513	513	513	513
SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS	24,619	24,619	28,619	26,619
NEW DESIGN SSN	238,253	250,253	238,253	246,153
SSN-21 DEVELOPMENTS	3,981	3,981	18,981	16,731
SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM	13,975	13,975	28,475	25,675
SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN/LIVE FIRE T&E	184,545	159,545	231,645	206,645
NAVY TACTICAL COMPUTER RESOURCES	2,185	25,685	2,185	16,160
MINE DEVELOPMENT	1,491	1,491	1,491	1,491
UNGUIDED CONVENTIONAL AIR-LAUNCHED WEAPONS	12,142	12,142	18,142	15,142
LIGHTWEIGHT TORPEDO DEVELOPMENT	7,769	13,769	12,769	14,969
JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	48,861	48,861	48,861	48,861
JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	7,781	7,781	7,781	7,781
PERSONNEL, TRAINING, SIMULATION, AND HUMAN FACTORS	1,331	1,331	1,331	1,331
NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	5,691	5,691	8,191	6,941
BATTLE GROUP PASSIVE HORIZON EXTENSION SYSTEM	14,070	14,070	19,070	17,470
JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON SYSTEMS	16,652	16,652	16,652	16,652
SHIP SELF DEFENSE (DETECT CONTROL)	61,966	61,966	61,966	61,966
SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: HARD KILL)	19,528	26,528	34,528	30,028
SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: SOFT KILL/EW)	28,064	42,064	12,409	44,964

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	7,154	7,154	20,079	71,259
NAVIGATION/ID SYSTEM	46,618	46,618	46,618	46,618
DISTRIBUTED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	35,861	35,861	40,861	38,461
JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF) - EMD	1,727,500	1,727,500	1,752,500	1,747,250
SMART CARD	711	711	711	711
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	8,079	8,079	8,079	8,079
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	43,213	81,713	43,813	72,538
DEFENSE INTEGRATED MILITARY HUMAN RESOURCES SYSTEM	51,297	51,297	51,297	51,297
JOINT COUNTER-INTELLIGENCE ASSESSMENT GROUP (JCAG)	2,337	2,337	2,337	2,337
MULTI-MISSION MARITIME AIRCRAFT (MMA)	74,531	64,531	74,531	69,531
NAVY STANDARD INTEGRATED PERSONNEL SYSTEM (NSIPS)	12,798	12,798	12,798	12,798
EMD TEST AND EVALUATION TRANSFER	---	---	-32,000	---
TOTAL, ENGINEERING & MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	5,093,018	5,169,118	5,245,488	5,429,648
RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT				
THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	30,599	30,599	30,599	30,599
TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	45,562	45,562	45,562	45,562
MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	42,453	44,453	106,453	42,453
STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT - NAVY	4,071	8,071	4,071	6,071
CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSES	45,435	45,435	45,435	45,435
FLEET TACTICAL DEVELOPMENT	2,771	2,771	2,771	2,771
TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES	929	16,429	929	18,754
MANAGEMENT, TECHNICAL & INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	50,787	35,787	52,787	51,987
STRATEGIC TECHNICAL SUPPORT	2,340	2,340	2,340	2,340
RDT&E SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT	59,447	59,447	59,447	59,447
RDT&E INSTRUMENTATION MODERNIZATION	13,289	14,214	13,289	14,214
RDT&E SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	71,519	71,519	71,519	71,519
TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	278,838	278,838	278,838	278,838
OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION CAPABILITY	12,642	12,642	12,642	12,642
NAVY SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) SUPPORT	3,242	3,242	3,242	3,242
SEW SURVEILLANCE/RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT	12,120	12,120	12,120	12,120
MARINE CORPS PROGRAM WIDE SUPPORT	12,208	29,708	21,208	28,133
TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	688,252	713,177	763,252	726,127

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT				
STRATEGIC SUB & WEAPONS SYSTEM SUPPORT	40,278	110,178	40,278	40,278
SSBN SECURITY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	34,567	34,567	34,567	34,567
SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	1,091	1,091	1,091	1,091
NAVY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS	21,452	21,452	21,452	21,452
F/A-18 SQUADRONS	204,466	214,466	210,466	215,666
E-2 SQUADRONS	19,011	19,011	19,011	19,011
FLEET TELECOMMUNICATIONS (TACTICAL)	12,576	12,576	12,576	12,576
TOMAHAWK AND TOMAHAWK MISSION PLANNING CENTER (TMPC)	94,265	102,265	94,265	99,865
INTEGRATED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	20,405	26,405	20,405	26,005
AMPHIBIOUS TACTICAL SUPPORT UNITS	6,352	6,352	6,352	6,352
CONSOLIDATED TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	31,421	35,421	31,421	33,821
ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) READINESS SUPPORT	6,731	35,731	15,731	26,731
HARM IMPROVEMENT	60,758	61,758	60,758	61,758
TACTICAL DATA LINKS	42,667	42,667	42,667	42,667
SURFACE ASW COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	24,424	24,424	24,424	24,424
MK-48 ADCAP	22,052	22,052	22,052	22,052
AVIATION IMPROVEMENTS	40,915	40,915	40,915	40,915
NAVY SCIENCE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM	4,801	4,801	14,801	13,301
OPERATIONAL NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	56,804	56,804	56,804	56,804
MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	174,664	218,964	190,464	208,464
MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYSTEMS	36,004	39,004	38,904	39,834
MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT	21,041	21,041	21,041	21,041
TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	1,957	1,957	1,957	1,957
ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	8,124	8,124	8,124	8,124
SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)	115,903	115,903	115,903	115,903
INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	18,436	18,436	20,436	24,236
NAVY METEOROLOGICAL AND OCEAN SENSORS-SPACE (METOC)	19,801	19,801	19,801	22,801
JOINT C4ISR BATTLE CENTER (JBC)	21,970	21,970	25,970	24,770
JOINT MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS	6,709	6,709	6,709	6,709
TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	206,359	249,659	263,659	262,459
AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	5,469	14,469	9,469	16,569
MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	11,166	11,166	8,266	11,166

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS	4,482	9,482	7,482	8,782
NAVAL SPACE SURVEILLANCE	9,548	9,548	9,548	9,548
MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT	7,783	7,783	10,783	9,883
DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	7,119	7,119	7,119	7,119
INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	70,631	76,631	70,631	75,131
MARITIME TECHNOLOGY (MARITECH)	9,943	14,693	9,943	13,093
TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	1,502,145	1,745,395	1,616,245	1,686,925
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,178,723	1,178,723	1,187,723	1,280,845
RETIREMENT ACCRUALS	-5,565	-5,565	-5,565	-5,565
OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT T&E TRANSFER	---	---	-17,000	---
TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY	12,496,065	13,562,218	13,275,735	13,946,085

EXPLANATION of PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
(in thousands of dollars)

	Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
2 DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	**393,557**	**391,557**	**411,557**	**405,457**
Growth Reduction		-2,000		-1,000
Quantum Optics			+7,000	+4,900
Consortium for Military Personnel Research			+2,000	+1,400
Naval Basic Research at the Naval Research Lab (Note: Only to increase core funding for the Naval Research Laboratory.)			+6,000	+5,100
Robotic Mine Countermeasures			+3,000	+1,500
4 POWER PROJECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	**76,612**	**115,412**	**80,612**	**106,687**
Strategic Systems Tech. Modernization-Transfer from DERF		+7,300		
Naval Precision Strike (Note: Only to continue development and demonstration of UAV mounted high resolution SAR for all weather precision targeting.)		+6,000		+7,000
Accelerate development of low-cost SWARM UAV		+4,000		+2,500
High Efficiency Piezoelectric Crystals		+2,500		+1,750
Pulse Detonation Engine Risk Reduction		+1,500		+1,050
Real World Based Immersive Imaging Technology		+4,000		+2,000
Phase II - Integrated Bio. Warfare Technology Program		+4,000	[8,000]	+4,000
Panoramic Night Imaging System		+4,000		+3,400
Millimeter Wave Infrared Imaging		+2,000		+1,700
Tunable oxide film and capacitor technology and integration of oxide film and wide bandgap semiconductor technology for the advanced multi-function RF system		+2,000		+1,700
Ultra-short pulse laser micromachining		+1,500		+1,275
Interrogator for High Speed Retro-Reflectometer			+2,000	+1,700
Low-cost Fused Remote Sensors for Target Identification			+2,000	+1,000
Hybrid Fiberoptic/Wireless Systems for High Capacity Secure Shipboard Communication				+1,000
7 FORCE PROTECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	**89,390**	**94,890**	**123,390**	**121,115**
Battery Charging Technology (Note: Only to continue and expand the current program to develop advanced battery charging algorithms.)		+2,500		+2,125
Center for Advanced Power Systems (CAPS)		+3,000	[6,000]	+5,100
Anti-Corrosion Modeling Software			+2,500	+1,250
Endeavor			+4,000	+3,400
Fusion Processor			+4,000	+3,400
Integrated Fuel Processor - Fuel Cell System			+3,000	+1,800
Laser Welding and Cutting			+3,000	+2,000
Minature Autonomous Vehicles (MAVs)			+1,500	+1,000
Modular Advanced Composite Hull Form			+2,000	+1,000
Small Watercraft Demonstrator			+5,000	+4,250
Unmanned Sea Surface Vehicles (USSV)			+9,000	+5,400
Structural Reliabilty of FRP Composites			[2,000]	+1,000
9 COMMUNICATIONS, COMMAND AND CONTROL, INTELLIGENCE, SURVEILLANCE	**0**	**0**	**3,000**	**1,400**
Common Sensor Module			+3,000	+1,400
10 HUMAN SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	**0**	**1,500**	**0**	**1,050**
Bio-Detection Surveillance system		+1,500		+1,050
11 MATERIALS, ELECTRONICS AND COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY	**0**	**14,000**	**1,000**	**10,000**
Battlespace Information Display Technology (BIDT)		+3,000		+2,100
Laser Welding and Cutting Technologies - moved to line 7		+2,000		
Virtual Company / Dist. Mfg. Demonstration Project		+3,000		+1,800
Advanced Fuel Additive		+2,000		+1,700
Printed Wiring Board Manufacturing Technology		+4,000		+3,400
Innovative Communications Materials - Thick				

	Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
Ferrite Magnetic Materials			+1,000	+1,000
12 COMMON PICTURE APPLIED RESEARCH	**75,594**	**96,094**	**150,594**	**151,594**
Research in Augmented and Virtual Environment Systems (RAVES)		+5,000		+2,500
Naval Automation and Information Management Tech.		+5,000		+2,500
National Center for Advanced Secure Systems Research (NCASSR)		+7,500		+5,750
Submarine Enabling Airborne Data Exchange and Enhancement Program		+3,000		+1,500
Modular Command Center			+15,000	+12,750
Tactical Component Network Applications Integration			+35,000	+29,750
Theater Undersea Warfare			+10,000	+8,500
UESA			+15,000	+12,750
13 WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	**68,852**	**102,552**	**93,152**	**109,162**
Characterization of Novel Materials		+4,000		+2,800
National UUV Test and Evaluation Center		+6,700		+4,700
3-Dimensional Printing Metalworking Project		+5,500		+3,850
Marine Mammal Research Program		+2,000		+1,000
Formable Aligned Carbon Thermosets (FACTS)		+2,000		+1,000
Rhode Island Disaster Initiative		+2,000		+1,200
Human Systems Technology		+1,000		+1,000
IMPRINT Modeling		+1,500		+1,050
Fibrous Monolithic Materials Insertion		+4,500		+2,250
Rapid Detection and Response for Chem/Bio Defense Systems Research		+1,500		+1,000
Automated Diode Array Manufacturing		+3,000		+2,500
Advanced Fouling and Corrision Control Coatings			+7,000	+4,900
Advanced Materials and Intelligent Processing			+3,000	+1,500
Biodegradable Polymers for Naval Applications			+1,250	+1,000
Bioenvironmental Hazards Research Program			+2,000	+1,200
Carbon Foam for Navy Applications			+450	+450
Modernization through Remanufacturing and Conversion (MTRAC) - moved to line 27			+4,000	
Ceramic and Carbon Based Materials			+2,000	+1,000
Titanium Matrix Composites Program			+2,600	+2,210
Visualization of Technical Information			+2,000	+1,700
Agile Vaccinology				+4,000
15 RF SYSTEMS APPLIED RESEARCH	**56,263**	**66,763**	**74,763**	**75,963**
Advanced Semiconductor Material Research		+1,500	+1,500	+1,500
Tri-Service Reliance Vacuum Electronics Research Program (Note: In addition to the funds provided in the President's Budget, the Committee provides an additional $5,000,000 only for Vacuum Electronics research.)		+8,000		+5,000
Highly Mobile Tactical Communications (HMTC) (Note: Only to demonstrate integration of Iridium satellite communications with existing tactical systems.)		+1,000		+1,000
High Brightness Electron Source Program			+3,000	+2,100
Maritime Synthetic Range			+6,000	+5,100
Nanoscale Science and Technology Program			+3,000	+1,500
Silicon Carbide High Power Diode Development			+2,500	+1,750
Wide Bandgap Silicon Carbide Semiconductor Research Initiative			+2,500	+1,750

	Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
OCEAN WARFIGHTING ENVIRONMENT APPLIED				
18 RESEARCH	**55,180**	**70,730**	**65,680**	**71,630**
Southeast Atlantic Coastal Ocean Observing System (SEA-COOS)		+2,000	+8,000	+5,600
Bioluminescence Truth Data Measurement and Signature Detection		+1,800		+1,000
Extended Capability Underwater Imaging		+4,000		+2,000
South Florida Ocean Measurement Center		+1,750		+1,000
Oceanographic Sensors For Mine Countermeasures		+6,000		+5,100
Hydrography Research			+2,500	+1,750
20 UNDERSEA WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH	**71,294**	**81,694**	**85,194**	**86,444**
Lithium Carbon Monofluoride Battery		+1,000		+1,000
Magnetorestrictive Transduction (TERFENOL-D)		+5,400	+5,400	+5,400
Undersea Def. Warfare Systems (6.25" ATT Tech.)		+2,000		+1,200
Undersea Defensive Warfare Systems (Rapid Response ATT Weapon)		+2,000		+1,200
Acoustic Temperature Profiler			+3,000	+2,550
Low Acoustic Signature Motor (LAMPREY)			+3,500	+2,100
SAUVIM			+2,000	+1,700
23 POWER PROJECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	**78,247**	**170,647**	**105,247**	**170,962**
High Speed Anti-Radiation Missile Demonstration (Note: Only to fully fund modifications to the AARGM seeker to support the HSAD program and to provide additional seekers for an expanded demonstration test program.)		+9,000		+6,300
High Speed Anti-Radiation Missile Demonstration (Note: Only to fully fund development, fabrication, integration and test of a producible Digital Control Actuator System for the missle aft-steering system of the HSAD Airframe/Propulsion/Steering section.)				+7,650
Magdalena Ridge Observatory		+30,000		+21,000
HEL-Low Aspect Target Tracking		+6,500		+4,550
Affordable Weapon		+10,000		+6,000
Littoral Support Craft (X)		+13,000		+9,100
Littoral Support Craft (X) - Lifting Body			+12,000	+10,200
DP-2 Thrust Vectoring System		+8,000		+5,000
Integrated Hypersonic Aeromechanics Tool (IHAT)		+4,400		+3,740
Vectored Thrust Ducted Propellor Helicopter Technology Demonstration		+3,000	+4,000	+3,500
Advanced Camouflage Coatings for UAV Demonstration (Note: To expand on previous LO successes to demonstrate advanced coatings.)		+8,500		+7,225
HYSWAC Lifting Body Development			+7,000	+5,950
Precision Strike Navigator			+1,000	+1,000
Variable Engine Nozzle			+3,000	+1,500
24 FORCE PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	**57,604**	**93,104**	**99,104**	**87,479**
Transfer from DERF		+36,000		+36,000
Reduction to DERF		-36,000		-36,000
Technology, unmanned surface vehicle (Trans. from DERF)			+22,500	
Center for Maritime Systems		+2,000		+1,400
Smart Sensor Web		+1,500		+1,050
Modular Advanced Composite Hull Forms-moved to line 7		+1,000		
Superconducting DC Homopolar Motor		+4,000		+2,800
Ship Service Fuel Cell		+4,000		+3,000
Marine Direct Ship Service Fuel Cell Technology Validation Trainer		+2,000		+1,200
High Temperature Superconducting AC Propulsion Motor and Generator		+4,000	+10,000	+5,000

	Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
Smart Microsensor Arrays for Shipboard Damage Control (Note: Only to continue development of a prototype compact, fully integrated sensor system for use in a reduced manning shipboard environment.)		+8,000		+5,300
Project M (Note: Only to continue development of advanced shock mitigating seats for Mk V Patrol Craft.)		+2,500		+2,125
Facility Security (Note: Only to demonstrate facility security enhancements using an advanced first responder tool set to support direct tactical application.) - moved to RDTE, DW.		+2,500		
Graphite Fiber Sandwich Composites for Advanced Warship Design		+1,000		+1,000
Deployable Smart-Link Communications Upgrade		+3,000		+1,500
High Speed Permanent Magnet Generator			+5,000	+3,500
Wave Powered Electric Power Generating System for Remote Naval Sites			+4,000	+2,000
26 COMMON PICTURE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	**37,753**	**44,753**	**50,753**	**48,353**
Command Center Visualization - Transfer from DERF		+7,000	+7,000	+7,000
Improved Shipboard Combat Information Center			+6,000	+3,600
27 WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	**82,542**	**98,042**	**90,542**	**98,492**
Emerging / Critical Interconnection Technologies Program (ECIT)		+2,000		+1,000
Defense Systems Modernization and Readiness Initiative		+7,000		+4,000
COTS Carbon Fiber Qualification Program		+3,000		+1,500
Low Volume Production Technology		+3,500		+2,950
Energy and Environmental Technology			+4,000	+3,400
Integrated Aircraft Health			+2,000	+1,700
Wire Chaffing Detection Technology			+2,000	+1,400
30 RF SYSTEMS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	**65,098**	**65,098**	**65,098**	**76,148**
Common Affordable Radar Processing Program			[5,000]	+4,250
E-2C Technical Upgrade for Optimized Radar -moved from line 104				+6,800
31 SURFACE SHIP & SUBMARINE HM&E ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	**0**	**6,000**	**0**	**0**
32 MARINE CORPS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD)	**51,606**	**66,206**	**63,106**	**76,816**
Center for Emerging Threats and Opportunities		+1,000		+1,000
Advanced Light Strike Vehicle		+4,500		+3,150
Mobile Counter Fire System		+4,000		+2,500
Rapid Deployment Fortification Wall		+1,500		+1,050
C3RP (ONR)		+3,600		+3,060
Project Albert			+7,000	+5,950
Transportable Transponder Landing System			+4,500	+2,250
Expeditionary Unit Water Purification Technology - moved from line 169				+6,250
33 MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	**0**	**62,800**	**0**	**0**
Institute of Technology Biomedical Research and Development Complex		+1,500		
National Bone Marrow Program		+34,000		
Rural Health		+6,800		
Biomedical Research Imaging Core -CoH National Medical Center (Note: Only for the Biomedical Research Imaging Core related to bone marrow transplantation, breast and prostate cancer.)		+5,000		
Community Hospital Telehealth Consortium		+1,000		
Dental Research		+4,000		

	Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
National Center for Collaboration in Medical Modeling and Simulation		+4,500		
Low Cost Retractable Needle and Safety Syringe		+1,000		
Minimally Invasive Surgical Technology Institute		+1,500		
Center for Disaster Management and Humanitarian Assistance		+3,500		
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND LOGISTICS				
35 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	**0**	**2,000**	**4,000**	**3,800**
Real Time Infra-Red Scene Generator		+2,000		+1,000
National Surface Treatment Center			+4,000	+2,800
WARFIGHTER PROTECTION ADVANCED				
37 TECHNOLOGY	**19,040**	**38,040**	**19,040**	**39,940**
Portable Device for Remote Production of Sterile Water for Injection & IV		+2,000		+1,000
Navy Medical System Configuration & Test Bed (NMSCTB) (Note: Expedites the delivery of medical research and development prototypes needing development and systems integration prior to field testing.)		+6,000		+8,100
Distributed Simulation-Warfighting Concepts to Future Weapons System Design (WARCON)		+4,000		+3,400
Medical Data Mining Tool (MDMT)		+4,000		+5,400
Medical Procedures Reference Tool (MPRT) -moved to line 141		+3,000		0
Organ Transfer Safety				+3,000
38 UNDERSEA WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	**40,125**	**42,125**	**45,125**	**44,625**
Motorized Airgun Program		+2,000		+1,000
University Oceanographic Laboratory System (UNOLS)			+5,000	+3,500
MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE ADVANCED				
40 TECHNOLOGY	**43,725**	**47,225**	**43,725**	**46,000**
Ocean Modeling for Mine and Expeditionary Warfare		+2,000		+1,000
Modeling the Warrior as a Cognitive System		+1,500		+1,275
41 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY TRANSISTION	**0**	**0**	**5,000**	**2,500**
Man-portable Quadrupole Resonance Landmine Detection Program			+5,000	+2,500
43 AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS	**32,549**	**35,049**	**32,549**	**33,799**
Prototype Regional Forecast Hub		+2,500		+1,250
44 AVIATION SURVIVABILITY	**7,486**	**20,986**	**14,486**	**20,836**
Aviation Integrated Life Support System (AILSS)		+6,500		+5,250
Modular Advanced Vision System		+3,000		+1,800
Naval Aviation Network Centric Warfare Analysis, Modeling, Simulation and Stimulation		+3,000		+1,800
Advanced Aircraft/Explosion Protection and Extinguishing Systems		+1,000		+1,000
Modular Helmet			+3,000	+1,500
Rotorcraft External Airbag Protection System (REAPS)			+4,000	+2,000
45 DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL	**39,772**	**7,500**	**47,272**	**32,500**
Transfer from DERF		+7,500	+7,500	+7,500
Program Reduction		-39,772		-14,772
46 ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**13,207**	**26,707**	**18,207**	**25,907**
Nonlinear Dynamics / Stochastic Resonance for ASW		+3,500		+2,450
Automatic Radar Periscope Detection and Discrimination System		+10,000		+6,000
LASH ASW			+5,000	+4,250
47 TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE	**1,922**	**15,922**	**1,922**	**13,822**
F-18D Tactical Reconnaissance Aircraft Solid State Recorder Upgrades		+14,000		+11,900

	Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
SURFACE AND SHALLOW WATER MINE				
49 COUNTERMEASURES	**155,016**	**160,516**	**155,016**	**158,866**
Surface Navy Integrated Undersea Tactical Technology (SNIUTT) (Note: Only for development of a test-bed demonstration to enhance mine warfare operator training and performance for the detection, identification, and classification of mine and mine-like objects.)		+5,500		+3,850
50 SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE	**3,244**	**18,244**	**5,244**	**14,644**
Surface Ship Torpedo Defense - Tripwire Torpedo Defense System (Note: $7,200,000 is only for the anti-torpedo torpedo and the distributed engineering center; and $3,000,000 is for redesign of smaller / lighter D winch for smaller ships, flexible NIXIE for AN/SLQ-25A, and to implement a test and integration center.)		+15,000		+10,200
Anti-Torpedo Torpedo Low Cost Component Development			+2,000	+1,200
51 CARRIER SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**88,913**	**89,913**	**94,913**	**92,513**
Advanced Battlestation / Decision Support System		+1,000	+6,000	+3,600
52 SHIPBOARD SYSTEM COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT	**243,111**	**253,111**	**257,111**	**260,361**
Advanced Variable Speed Drive Transmission (AVSD)		+1,000		+1,000
ElectroMagnetic Launcher (EML) Railgun (Note: Only to demonstrate the feasability of kinetic energy electromagnetic railgun consistent with EML program mission objectives.)		+5,000		+3,250
Automated Maintenance Environment		+4,000		+3,400
MTTC/IPI			+8,000	+5,600
REPTILE - Regional Electric Power Technology Integration and Leveraging			+1,000	+1,000
Surface Vessel Torpedo Tubes - Airbag Technology			+5,000	+3,000
56 SURFACE ASW	**3,219**	**8,219**	**3,219**	**14,819**
AN/SQQ-89 Modernization and Sensor and Signal Processing Improvements begun under SBIR N97-090.		+5,000		+11,600
58 ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	**107,389**	**136,389**	**126,789**	**134,539**
Conformal Acoustic Velocity Sensor (CAVES)		+4,000		+2,800
MK-48 ADCAP Torpedo Improvement Program		+8,000		+5,600
Multi-Line Towed Array		+2,500		+1,750
Fiber Optic Multi-Line Towed Array (FOMLTA)			+5,000	+2,500
High Performance Brush Program		+1,500		0
Electronic Motor Brush Technology			+3,000	
High Performance Metal Fiber Brushes Program			+7,500	+6,000
Universal Gravity Module		+2,000		+1,000
Submarine Payload and Sensors		+7,000		+3,500
Advanced Composite Sail Phase II		+4,000		+2,000
Electromechanical Actuator Development			+1,900	+1,000
Rotary Electromagnetic (Torpedo) Launcher System			+2,000	+1,000
60 SHIP CONCEPT ADVANCED DESIGN	**5,820**	**23,820**	**9,820**	**28,220**
Small Combatant Craft		+8,000	[8,000]	+8,000
Metallic Materials Advanced Development and Certification Program		+4,000		+3,400
Total Fleet Support for Emergency Operations Centers and First Responders		+3,000		+2,550
Document Automation for Condition Based Maintenance		+3,000		+2,550
Advanced, Integrated Low-Profile Antenna (HF, VHF, UHF)			+4,000	+2,400
Advanced Stealth Ship Radars				+1,000
Sealion Technology Demonstration (Note: Only for electronics development.)				+1,000
Autonomous Maritime Navigation				+1,500

	Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
65 COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	**40,464**	**66,964**	**40,464**	**62,364**
Combat Systems Integration and Battleforce Interoperability		+2,000		+1,000
Navy Common Command and Decision System - Common Network Interface (Note: Only for SBIR Phase III efforts to develop common network interface capabilities for theater air and missile defense.)		+20,000		+16,000
High Energy Laser Enhancement of Ship Self-Defense		+4,000		+3,400
Marine Corps Institute		+500		+500
Trouble Reports Information Data Warehouse			[1,000]	+1,000
66 CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	**22,445**	**24,945**	**18,445**	**20,570**
M72 LAW Product Improvement		+2,500		+2,125
Unexplained Warhead Development			-4,000	-4,000
67 MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES	**272,092**	**277,592**	**272,092**	**276,767**
AAAV (Note: Only to develop an integrated display / processor and an alternative to the current AAAV Display Processor Unit (DPU).)		+5,500		+4,675
69 MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM	**27,777**	**37,777**	**33,277**	**31,777**
Innovative Stand-Off Door Breaching Munitions (ISOD)		+5,000	+2,500	+2,500
Imaging System Upgrade Development (AN/TAS-4 Upgrade) - moved to RDTE,A line 50		+5,000		
Nanoparticles for the Neutralization of Facility Threats			+3,000	+1,500
71 COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT	**86,144**	**118,144**	**86,144**	**112,094**
CEC Technology Refresh		+25,000		+20,000
CEC E-2C FOT&E		+7,000		+5,950
72 OCEAN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**15,257**	**15,257**	**15,257**	**16,257**
Southern Coastal Ocean Observation Program				+1,000
73 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	**44,206**	**48,206**	**44,206**	**46,906**
Marine Mammal Detection and Mitigation		+2,000		+1,000
Field Demonstration of Containment Stablization Technology (Note: Only to continue and expand the on-going field demonstration of Organic, Inorganic, and Radionuclide Containment Stablization Technology.)		+2,000		+1,700
74 NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	**5,060**	**17,060**	**12,560**	**15,310**
PEM Fuel Cell Demonstration Program		+4,000	+5,000	+4,500
Plasma Energy Pyrolysis (PEPS)		+8,000		+4,000
Thermally Activated Chiller / Heater			+2,500	+1,750
75 FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT	**2,124**	**4,624**	**2,124**	**3,374**
(Note: Only to complete the ongoing demonstration of solar energy and planning and design for research and development of renewable energy, hydrogen and fuel cells.)		+2,500		+1,250
76 CHALK CORAL	**50,704**	**67,104**	**50,704**	**67,104**
Transfer from DERF - Classified Program		+5,000		+5,000
Transfer from DERF - Classified Program		+11,400		+11,400
77 NAVY LOGISTIC PRODUCTIVITY	**13,023**	**32,023**	**13,023**	**26,723**
JEDMICS		+3,000		+2,100
Rapid Retargeting		+4,000		+2,800
Compatible Processor Upgrade (CPUP)		+4,000		+2,000
Collaborative Logistics Productivity		+8,000		+6,800
78 RETRACT MAPLE	**212,506**	**276,506**	**276,506**	**276,506**
Transfer from DERF - Classified Program		+64,000	+64,000	+64,000
85 LAND ATTACK TECHNOLOGY	**108,693**	**130,693**	**110,693**	**126,943**
Naval Fires Network (Note: $2,500,000 only to continue development and demonstration of the Tactical Dissemination Module.)		+13,000		+7,500
Autonomous Naval Support Round		+5,000		+4,250
Advanced Medium Gun Demonstrator		+4,000		+3,400
Semi-Automated IMINT Processing (SAIP)			+2,000	+1,100

	Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
ERGM Risk Reduction - moved from PANMC				+2,000
Integrated Deepwater System - Gun Qualification			[11,000]	[11,000]
87 NONLETHAL WEAPONS - DEM/VAL	**24,082**	**24,082**	**28,082**	**26,482**
Joint Non-Lethal Weapons Technology Innovation			+2,000	+1,400
Urban Ops Environment Research			+2,000	+1,000
SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW)				
92 ARCHITECTURE/ENGINE	**31,623**	**33,623**	**31,623**	**33,323**
IT-21 Block 1 C4ISR Computing Equipment Upgrades (Note: Only to develop a common AN/UYQ-70 based solution for the IT-21 Block Upgrade.)		+2,000		+1,700
96 OTHER HELO DEVELOPMENT	**31,123**	**38,623**	**32,623**	**36,223**
VH-3D/VH-60D Upgrade - Transfer from DERF		+1,500	+1,500	+1,500
High Tech Training in Support of DoD legacy parts solutions		+2,000		+1,400
SH-60B Hellfire Laser Aim Scoring System (LASS)		+2,000		+1,000
Advanced Cable Design for Mine and Submarine Warfare		+2,000		+1,200
98 STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT	**37,757**	**42,957**	**37,757**	**40,357**
Metrology		+5,200		+2,600
MULTI-MISSION HELICOPTER UPGRADE				
99 DEVELOPMENT	**88,969**	**95,969**	**88,969**	**94,919**
Preventive Maintenance Life Cycle Criteria (PMLCC) of H-60 Helicopter Components		+4,000		+3,400
H-60 Helicopter FLIR Housing Configuration		+3,000		+2,550
101 AIR/OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENGINEERING	**5,725**	**9,725**	**5,725**	**7,725**
SPY-1 Radar Tactical Environmental Processor (TEP)		+4,000		+2,000
103 TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM	**81,475**	**81,475**	**61,475**	**74,475**
Reduce FORCEnet			-20,000	-7,000
104 E-2C RADAR MODERNIZATION	**113,681**	**113,681**	**121,681**	**113,681**
E-2C Technical Upgrade for Optimized Radar - moved to line 30			+8,000	
108 AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**6,695**	**7,695**	**6,695**	**7,695**
Safety Improvements for USMC and allied SIIIS ejection seats		+1,000		+1,000
109 EW DEVELOPMENT	**74,742**	**75,642**	**84,742**	**81,342**
ICAP III Minaturization		-13,100		-13,100
IDECM Production Transisition		+11,000		+7,600
Location GPS Interferers		+3,000		+2,100
EA-6B Follow-on			+10,000	+10,000
111 SC-21 TOTAL SHIP SYSTEM ENGINEERING	**717,397**	**642,397**	**749,397**	**732,797**
DD(X) Downselect Delay		-75,000		-16,000
Littoral Combat Ship Research and Development			+30,000	+30,000
Power Node Control Centers			+2,000	+1,400
SURFACE COMBATANT COMBAT SYSTEM				
112 ENGINEERING	**300,748**	**323,748**	**311,748**	**348,148**
Knowledge Projection for Fleet Maintenance		+3,000		+1,500
AEGIS Tactical Display Upgrade		+20,000		+18,400
Silicon Carbide MMIC Producibility Program			+3,000	+1,500
DDG-51 Optimized Manning Initiative			+5,000	+2,500
Solid-State SPY-1E Multi-Mission Radar			+3,000	+1,500
S-band Radar Research - Transfer from MDA				+22,000
116 STANDARD MISSILE IMPROVEMENTS	**16,288**	**16,288**	**16,288**	**21,288**
Extended Range Anti-Air Warfare			[10,000]	+5,000
117 AIRBORNE MCM	**67,240**	**69,240**	**67,240**	**68,240**
Remote Technical Assistance Support System (RTASS)		+2,000		+1,000
118 SSN-688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION	**98,516**	**133,016**	**98,516**	**126,641**
Affordable Towed Array (Note: Only to accelerate the introduction of the Affordable Towed Array Construction Program (ATAC) in order to begin achieving fleet life cycle cost savings.)		+1,000		+1,000
SSN/SSBN modernization (Non-Propulsion Electronics Systems)		+9,000		+6,300

	Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
MPP/APB/A-RCI Model for Tactical Control Information Management and Net-Centric Warfare (SSN-688 & & Trident Modernization) (Note: Only to continue SBIR Phase III efforts to extend APB/MPP technology insertion to enable submarines to achieve Navy network -centric warfare objectives and to accelerate development and extension of common processing efforts.)		+22,500		+19,125
Submarine Common Electronic Equipment Replacement, Research		+2,000		+1,700
121 SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS	**24,619**	**24,619**	**28,619**	**26,619**
IASS/ITI			+4,000	+2,000
124 NEW DESIGN SSN	**238,253**	**250,253**	**238,253**	**246,153**
Virginia Class SSN Combat System Technology Refresh (Note: Only for SBIR Phase III follow-on research to establish and extend a technology insertion program for the NAS combat system.)		+8,000		+5,000
Shipmates for Virginia Class Submarine		+2,000		+1,700
COTS Combat Control Framework (Note: Only for SBIR Phase-III for COTS Combat Control Framework (N98-128).)		+2,000		+1,200
125 SSN-21 DEVELOPMENTS	**3,981**	**3,981**	**18,981**	**16,731**
SEAFAC Range Upgrade			+15,000	+12,750
126 SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM	**13,975**	**13,975**	**28,475**	**25,675**
CCS MK2 - Submarine Combat System Modernization Program			+14,500	+8,700
Accelerated Submarine Fleet-Wide Modernization				+3,000
127 SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN/LIVE FIRE T&E	**184,545**	**159,545**	**231,645**	**206,645**
CVN(X) CDP		-25,000		
Unexplained increases in manpower and training studies			-1,900	-1,900
LHA[R] - Transfer from LHD-1 AP (SCN 15)			+10,000	+10,000
LHA[R] Design			+55,000	+30,000
JCC(X) Ship Design Reduction			-16,000	-16,000
128 NAVY TACTICAL COMPUTER RESOURCES	**2,185**	**25,685**	**2,185**	**16,160**
AN/UYQ-70 (V) System Technology Improvements (Note: Only to maintain, develop and implement technology refresh capabilities to incorporate into the future AN/UYQ-70 workstation/server production across surface, submarine, and air platforms.)		+20,000		+11,000
Multi-level Security for Network Centric Q-70 Program		+3,500		+2,975
130 UNGUIDED CONVENTIONAL AIR-LAUNCHED WEAPONS	**12,142**	**12,142**	**18,142**	**15,142**
Light Defender			+6,000	+3,000
131 LIGHTWEIGHT TORPEDO DEVELOPMENT	**7,769**	**13,769**	**12,769**	**14,969**
Mk-54 Test and Evaluation		+6,000		+4,200
Align lightweight and heavyweight torpedo baselines for commonality			+5,000	+3,000
135 NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	**5,691**	**5,691**	**8,191**	**6,941**
Photovoltaic Energy Park			+2,500	+1,250
136 BATTLE GROUP PASSIVE HORIZON EXTENSION SYSTEM	**14,070**	**14,070**	**19,070**	**17,470**
Cooperative Outboard Logistics Update Digital Upgrade			+5,000	+3,400
139 SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: HARD KILL)	**19,528**	**26,528**	**34,528**	**30,028**
Phalanx CIWS SEA RAM Ordalt development		+5,000	+15,000	+10,500
Multi-mission Weapon based on anti-torpedo torpedo technology		+2,000		

	Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
140 SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: SOFT KILL/EW)	**28,064**	**42,064**	**12,409**	**44,964**
Surface Ship EW Improvement		+4,000		+2,800
Improved Control and Display (ICAD) (Note: Only for SBIRS Phase III CAPS Integration for EW-RCI.)		+10,000		+8,500
AIEWS Cancellation			-25,855	
NULKA decoy improvements			+9,200	+4,600
Radar Tiles for Reduced Surface Ship Signatures			+1,000	+1,000
141 MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	**7,154**	**7,154**	**20,079**	**71,259**
Security Equipment for Medical Labs (Transfer from DERF) - moved to line 163			+475	
Site Improvement for medical labs (Transfer from DERF) -moved to line 163			+450	
Coastal Cancer Center			+5,000	+4,500
Naval Blood Research Laboratory			+3,000	+1,500
Treatment of Radiation Sickness Research			+4,000	+3,400
Institute of Technology Biomedical Research and Development Complex - moved from line 33				+1,000
National Bone Marrow Program - moved from line 33				+28,900
Rural Health - moved from line 33				+5,780
Biomedical Research Imaging Core -CoH National Medical Center (Note: Only for the Biomedical Research Imaging Core related to bone marrow transplantation, breast, and prostate cancer.) - moved from line 33				+3,500
Community Hospital Telehealth Consortium - moved from line 33				+1,000
Dental Research -moved from line 33				+3,000
National Center for Collaboration in Medical Modeling and Simulation - moved from line 33				+2,250
Low Cost Retractable Needle and Safety Syringe - moved from line 33				+1,000
Minimally Invasive Surgical Technology Institute - moved from line 33				+1,200
Center for Disaster Management and Humanitarian Assistance - moved from line 33				+2,975
Medical Procedures Reference Tool (MPRT) - moved from line 37				+2,600
Vectored Vaccine Research Program - moved from RDTE, A line 31				+1,500
143 DISTRIBUTED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	**35,861**	**35,861**	**40,861**	**38,461**
Advanced Deployable System			+5,000	+2,600
144 JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF) - EMD	**1,727,500**	**1,727,500**	**1,752,500**	**1,747,250**
Excessive Inflation and Overhead Increases			-10,000	-10,000
F136 Interchangeable Engine			+35,000	+29,750
147 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**43,213**	**81,713**	**43,813**	**72,538**
Web Centric Network Warfare (WeCAN) (Note: Only for continued evolution of WeCAN and development of the associated Naval Collaboration Toolset.)		+8,000		+5,600
Horizontal Integrated Data Environment		+2,000		+1,000
SPAWAR Information Technology Center		+6,000	[7,000]	+6,000
Distance Learning IT Center		+15,000		+9,750
Institute for Systems Test and Productivity		+3,500		+2,975
Navy Predictive Response Center		+4,000		+3,400
Condition Based Maintenance Enabling Technologies			+600	+600
150 MULTI-MISSION MARITIME AIRCRAFT (MMA)	**74,531**	**64,531**	**74,531**	**69,531**
Excessive Technical Support for Proposal Evaluation		-10,000		-5,000

	Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
154 MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	**42,453**	**44,453**	**106,453**	**42,453**
Navy Test and Evaluation Range Airborne Telemetry System (ATS)		+2,000		0
Transfer from acquistion programs			+64,000	
155 STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT - NAVY	**4,071**	**8,071**	**4,071**	**6,071**
Technology Obsolescence Reduction Facility		+4,000		+2,000
159 TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES	**929**	**16,429**	**929**	**18,754**
Commercialization of Advanced Technologies		+10,000		+7,000
Navy Advanced Education Demonstation Project		+1,000		+1,000
Lean Pathways distance learning component		+4,500		+3,825
Joint Information Technology Center - moved from RDTE, DW line 141				+6,000
160 MANAGEMENT, TECHNICAL & INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	**50,787**	**35,787**	**52,787**	**51,987**
Excessive Growth - Project CHENG		-15,000		0
Combating Terrorism Wargaming and Research			+2,000	+1,200
163 RDT&E INSTRUMENTATION MODERNIZATION	**13,289**	**14,214**	**13,289**	**14,214**
Security Equip. for Medical Labs - Transfer from DERF		+475		+475
Site Improvement for Medical Labs - Transfer from DERF		+450		+450
169 MARINE CORPS PROGRAM WIDE SUPPORT	**12,208**	**29,708**	**21,208**	**28,133**
Reverse Osmosis Advanced Technology - moved to line 32		+6,500	+6,000	
Corrosion Center of Excellence		+1,000		+1,000
Chemical Biological Incident Response Force (CBIRF)		+7,000		+4,500
Marine Corps Research University Initiative		+500		+500
Chemical Biological Multi-Sensor Analyzer/Detector		+2,500		+2,125
Nanoparticles Responses to Chemical and Biological Threats			+3,000	+1,500
Biological Decontamination Research-ECASOL			[4,000]	+2,800
Chemical-Biological Warfare Agent Chip Detector			[5,000]	+3,500
176 STRATEGIC SUB & WEAPONS SYSTEM SUPPORT	**40,278**	**110,178**	**40,278**	**40,278**
Hardened Target Munitions - Transfer from DERF		+30,000		
Rentry Vehicle Sustainment Tech. - Transfer from DERF		+7,500		
Rentry Vehicle Sustainment Tech. (RSAP/GAP) - DERF Transfer		+14,400		
Rentry Vehicle Sustainment Tech. (RadHard) - DERF Transfer		+18,000		
180 F/A-18 SQUADRONS	**204,466**	**214,466**	**210,466**	**215,666**
F-18 Enhanced Durability Engine		+10,000		+7,000
F/A-18 APG-73 Radar Upgrades			+6,000	+4,200
183 TOMAHAWK AND TOMAHAWK MISSION PLANNING CENTER (TMPC)	**94,265**	**102,265**	**94,265**	**99,865**
Precision Terrain Aided Navigation		+8,000		+5,600
184 INTEGRATED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	**20,405**	**26,405**	**20,405**	**26,005**
Integrated Undersea Surveillance System (IUSS) Mission Planning System		+3,000		+3,000
Fiber Optic Wavelength Division Multiplier		+3,000		+2,600
186 CONSOLIDATED TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**31,421**	**35,421**	**31,421**	**33,821**
Integrated Training for TAC Air Fleet		+4,000		+2,400
187 ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) READINESS SUPPORT	**6,731**	**35,731**	**15,731**	**26,731**
Transfer from DERF		+20,000		+11,000
Information Warfare System - Transfer from DERF		+9,000	+9,000	+9,000
188 HARM IMPROVEMENT	**60,758**	**61,758**	**60,758**	**61,758**
Low Cost High Temperature Materials for Radome and Antennas		+1,000		+1,000
193 NAVY SCIENCE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM	**4,801**	**4,801**	**14,801**	**13,301**
LASH Airship test platform support			+2,000	+1,700
LASH ISR/ Mine Countermeasures			+8,000	+6,800

	Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
196 MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	**174,664**	**218,964**	**190,464**	**208,464**
TCAC - Transfer from DERF		+2,500	+2,500	+2,500
MANPACK SIDS - Transfer from DERF		+300	+300	+300
TPCS - Transfer from DERF		+3,400	+3,400	+3,400
I-SURSS - Transfer from DERF		+2,500	+2,500	+2,500
RREP - Transfer from DERF		+300	+300	+300
TENCAP - Transfer from DERF		+1,500	+1,500	+1,500
TEG - Transfer from DERF		+1,000	+1,000	+1,000
ISR - Transfer from DERF		+1,200	+1,200	+1,200
TACPHOTO - Transfer from DERF		+100	+100	+100
Crane Surface Warfare Center Air Deployment Testing Facility Upgrade (Balloon modification for sonobuoy drops)		+2,000		+1,400
Critical Infrastructure Protection Center		+4,000		+2,000
AN/TPS-59 Modernization (Note: Only for risk mitigation for AN/TPS-59 modernization efforts including $1,500,000 for automatic false alarm reduction.)		+6,000		+3,600
AN/TPS-59 (V) 3 Radar Environmental Simulator - moved to PMC line 32		+5,500		
CAST Upgrade - CACCTUS Intelligent Tutor System		+4,000		+3,400
Marine Corps Electronic Warfare Support Enhancements		+4,000		+3,400
Marine Corps Ship to Objective Manuever		+6,000		+5,100
Improved High Performance Long-Range Radar Transmitter			+3,000	+2,100
Project Athena - Coastal Defense Beta Site				[11,000]
197 MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYSTEMS	**36,004**	**39,004**	**38,904**	**39,834**
Integrated Digital Camera Riflescope		+3,000		+1,500
Navy Body Armor Upgrade			+1,000	+1,000
Target Location, Designation and Hand-off System (TLDHS)			+1,900	+1,330
205 INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	**18,436**	**18,436**	**20,436**	**24,236**
Navy Intelligence Security Module (Transfer from CCP)				+4,500
KG-40A Modernization Program			+2,000	+1,300
207 NAVY METEROLOGICAL AND OCEAN SENSORS - SPACE (METOC)	**19,801**	**19,801**	**19,801**	**22,801**
Radiation Hardened Vector Processor System				+3,000
208 JOINT C4ISR BATTLE CENTER (JBC)	**21,970**	**21,970**	**25,970**	**24,770**
Strategic Interoperability Initiative			+4,000	+2,800
210 TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	**206,359**	**249,659**	**263,659**	**262,459**
USMC Pioneer - Transfer from DERF		+7,000	+7,000	+7,000
ISR (BAMS UAV) - Transfer from DERF		+28,300	+28,300	+28,300
VTOL UAV - Operational Testing		-9,000		-4,000
Tactical Control System (TCS) (Note: Only for modifications necessary for TCS to receive sensor data from a variety of UAVs, including the Global Hawk HAEUAV)		+4,500		+3,000
Tactical Control System (TCS) (Note: Only for the Joint Operational Test Bed (JOTBS) for enhancements to accommodate multiple UAVs.)		+7,000		+4,100
Miniaturized High Definition Digital Camera		+2,000		+1,000
Multiple Link Antenna System (MLAS) ACTD		+1,500		+1,000
UAV Payload (Note: Only for Miniature Detection Devices as part of the Naval UAV Payload effort to be used only for the continuation of an industry-based research program for for light-weight, low power Nuclear, Chemical and Biological sensors and isotope indentification techniques.)		+2,000		+1,700
Global Hawk BAMS			+22,000	+14,000

	Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
211 AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	**5,469**	**14,469**	**9,469**	**16,569**
(Note: Only for the Naval Research Laboratory 's applied optics branch to continue development of tactical reconnaissance technologies.)		+3,000		+2,500
Electro-optical Framing Reconnaissance (Note: Only for sensor P3I for manned and unmanned platforms, only to develop prototype focal plane arrays with integrated electronic shutter technology for SHARP sensor upgrade, upgrade sensor with autonomous zoom lens and support prototype development of cellular neural network airborne processor.)		+6,000		+5,100
Hyperspectral Upgrade to Airborne Sensors			+4,000	+3,500
212 MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	**11,166**	**11,166**	**8,266**	**11,166**
Shared Reconnaissance Pod - program termination			-2,900	
213 DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS	**4,482**	**9,482**	**7,482**	**8,782**
JSIPS - Transfer from DERF		+3,000	+3,000	+3,000
Converged Architecture for Naval Fires Network		+2,000		+1,300
215 MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT	**7,783**	**7,783**	**10,783**	**9,883**
Naval Modeling and Simulation			+3,000	+2,100
217 INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	**70,631**	**76,631**	**70,631**	**75,131**
General Increase		+6,000		+4,500
218 MARITIME TECHNOLOGY (MARITECH)	**9,943**	**14,693**	**9,943**	**13,093**
High Speed Cargo Craft		+750		+750
Maritime Technology Center of Excellence		+4,000		+2,400
DEM/VAL TEST AND EVALUATION TRANSFER			-15,000	
EMD TEST AND EVALUATION TRANSFER			-32,000	
OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT T&E TRANSFER			-17,000	

FORCENET

The conferees agree to provide an appropriation of $13,000,000 for the Navy's FORCEnet program instead of $20,000,000 as proposed by the House and no appropriation as proposed by the Senate.

Despite the conferees interest in the goals of FORCEnet, a program the Chief of Naval Operations considers a key transformation enabler for the 21st Century Navy, concerns remain about the lack of specificity and documentation provided thus far by the Navy. While a solid organizational structure for the development of FORCEnet requirements has been established, the Navy must now refine the program's plan and scope. To ensure continued oversight of this important program, the conferees direct that the Secretary of the Navy submit, by May 1, 2003, a detailed report on the FORCEnet program. At a minimum, the report shall identify the five-year estimated cost of the program, describe the long term and short term program objectives, define requirements, detail the spiral development and testing milestone plan, and indicate how each existing system will be integrated into the FORCEnet approach.

JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER—F136 INTERCHANGEABLE ENGINE

The conferees have included an additional $29,750,000 for the Joint Strike Fighter Interchangeable Engine Program only to continue the current effort to develop and maintain two, competing, interchangeable engine programs for the Joint Strike Fighter.

UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES

The conferees agree to provide a total of $262,459,000 for the Navy's tactical unmanned aerial vehicles program.

Broad Area Maritime Surveillance (BAMS): The conferees agree to provide an additional $42,300,000 for the Navy BAMS UAV. Of this amount, $28,300,000 is a transfer from the Defense Emergency Response Fund and shall only be used for the projects and activities as described in justification material submitted by the Navy and detailed in House Report 107–532; $7,000,000 is to determine the requirement for utilizing existing infrastructure resident in the Tactical Support Centers (TSCs) at P–3/EP–3 bases for hosting the BAMS mission planning and control and to initiate equipment upgrades as necessary; and $7,000,000 is for Global Hawk HAEUAV producibility initiatives such as tooling enhancements and improvements and special test equipment, an effort which the Navy shall coordinate with the Air Force.

The conferees believe the Navy should initiate a technology program to improve maritime ISR, including space-time processing algorithms from electro-optical data.

The conferees agree with the reporting requirements contained in House Report 107–532 with respect to the BAMS UAV.

VTOL UAV Operational Testing: The conferees agree to reduce by $4,000,000 the Navy's request for operational testing of the Vertical Take Off and Landing UAV instead of $9,000,000 as proposed by the House. This reduction is taken without prejudice and may be applied as a general reduction to the program.

USMC Pioneer upgrades: The conferees agree to provide a total of $16,000,000 for upgrades to the Pioneer UAV used in support of the Marine Corps; $7,000,000 is provided in the Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy appropriation and $9,000,000 is provided in the Weapons Procurement, Navy appropriation. The conferees direct that these funds, and any additional funds as required, shall be used only to upgrade the Pioneer UAV in support of the Marine Corps.

VTOL UAV Rescission: The conferees agree not to rescind $2,000,000 from the $5,000,000 appropriated to the Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy account in fiscal year 2002 as proposed by the House. The conferees agree that these funds are excess to the requirement for which originally appropriated and therefore direct that these funds instead be used by the Navy to establish a Joint Program Office with the Air Force for the Predator B and Global Hawk UAVs. To the extent that there may be similar vehicle and sensor requirements for the Navy and the Air Force, the Joint Program Office could facilitate the development of requirements, program management, acquisition support, testing and training.

Joint Operational Test Bed (JOTBS): The conferees further agree to provide an additional $4,100,000 for the Joint Operational Test Bed System (JOTBS) project. The conferees further agree to the language contained in House Report 107–532 with respect to designation of the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Warfare Requirements and Programs (N7/N78), as the program sponsor. The conferees direct the Navy to evaluate the JOTBS prototype to determine if the system adequately addresses Service requirements and if so initiate the development of the necessary documentation of requirements.

NAVAL FIRES NETWORK

The conferees agree to provide an additional $7,5000,000 in the Land Attack Technology program for Naval Fires Network (NFN), of which $2,500,000 is for the tactical dissemination module. The conferees agree that remaining funds shall be used to continue architecture design for NFN, to study and initiate a design for the Joint Fires Center, improve training devices, and support major Fleet exercises.

The conferees have also provided an additional $1,300,000 in the Distributed Common Ground Station line to continue development of an open architecture and sustain modernization and enhancement of precision strike capabilities for NFN.

TREATMENT OF RADIATION SICKNESS RESEARCH

The conference agreement provides $3.4 million for the establishment of a blood bank for the purpose of treating patients exposed to high doses of radiation. The conferees agree that these funds are to establish a blood bank with an entity that has a demonstrated track record in this specific area.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AIR FORCE				
DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	219,144	226,144	219,144	223,744
TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	219,144	226,144	219,144	223,744
APPLIED RESEARCH				
MATERIALS	75,272	89,272	112,672	110,872
AEROSPACE VEHICLE TECHNOLOGIES	78,789	80,789	78,789	79,989
HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS APPLIED RESEARCH	66,000	75,500	75,800	80,800
AEROSPACE PROPULSION	107,659	148,959	113,359	137,859
AEROSPACE SENSORS	75,799	79,799	78,299	80,099
MULTI-DISCIPLINARY SPACE TECHNOLOGY	53,592	103,592	96,592	100,592
SPACE TECHNOLOGY	58,582	67,582	83,042	79,942
CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	60,343	60,343	61,843	61,443
DIRECTED ENERGY TECHNOLOGY	39,936	39,936	39,936	39,936
COMMAND CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS	70,951	83,451	78,951	82,451
DUAL USE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	10,626	10,626	10,626	10,626
TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	697,549	839,849	829,909	864,609
ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT				
ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS	21,138	36,638	35,138	41,838
ADVANCED AEROSPACE SENSORS	50,589	54,589	50,589	53,689
FLIGHT VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY	---	---	5,000	3,500
AEROSPACE TECHNOLOGY DEV/DEMO	22,315	30,315	27,315	29,565
AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY	85,650	91,050	89,650	90,150
CREW SYSTEMS AND PERSONNEL PROTECTION TECHNOLOGY	29,690	40,190	34,690	39,990
ELECTRONIC COMBAT TECHNOLOGY	23,350	24,350	23,350	24,350
BALLISTIC MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	---	22,900	---	13,300
UNMANNED AIR VEHICLE DEV/DEMO	18,000	18,000	18,000	18,000
ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY	42,315	46,315	55,815	56,015
TRANSFORMATIONAL WIDEBAND MILSATCOM	195,000	115,000	---	---
MAUI SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM (MSSS)	6,472	10,472	56,472	48,472
MULTI-DISCIPLINARY ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT SPACE TECHNOLO	50,538	50,538	57,538	55,438
CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	38,001	43,001	45,001	44,501
ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	28,271	48,771	28,271	54,271
ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	---	2,500	---	1,200

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
C3I ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	34,288	46,788	38,288	45,938
SPECIAL PROGRAMS	97,300	97,300	97,300	97,300
TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	742,917	778,717	662,417	717,517
DEMONSTRATION & VALIDATION				
INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	4,545	4,545	4,545	4,545
NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM III	100,217	50,217	86,017	60,217
ADVANCED EHF MILSATCOM (SPACE)	825,783	844,783	844,783	844,783
POLAR MILSATCOM (SPACE)	19,554	19,554	19,554	19,554
NATIONAL POLAR-ORBITING OPERATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL SATE	237,199	237,199	237,199	237,199
SPACE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	13,814	13,814	13,814	13,814
COMBAT IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY	12,434	12,434	12,434	12,434
NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	4,355	4,355	4,355	4,355
INTERNATIONAL SPACE COOPERATIVE R&D	643	643	643	643
ADVANCED WIDEBAND SYSTEM (AWS)	4,982	4,982	119,982	119,982
INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE (DEM/VAL)	19,870	39,070	39,070	39,070
INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE - DEM/VAL	63,025	70,525	63,025	63,025
WIDEBAND GAPFILLER SYSTEM RDT&E (SPACE)	20,009	14,009	20,009	14,009
AIR FORCE/NATIONAL PROGRAM COOPERATION (AFNPC)	8,829	8,829	2,529	2,529
SPACE-BASED RADAR DEM/VAL	47,859	47,859	47,859	47,859
POLLUTION PREVENTION (DEM/VAL)	2,743	2,743	3,743	3,743
JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS - DEM/VAL	13,267	13,267	11,267	11,267
HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYSTEM (HDBTDS)	7,482	7,482	7,482	7,482
COBRA JUDY (H)	51,000	51,000	51,000	---
DEM/VAL TEST AND EVALUATION TRANSFER	---	---	-9,000	---
TOTAL, DEMONSTRATION & VALIDATION	1,457,610	1,447,310	1,580,310	1,506,510
ENGINEERING & MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT				
GLOBAL BROADCAST SERVICE (GBS)	22,589	22,589	22,589	22,589
JOINT HELMET MOUNTED CUEING SYSTEM (JHMCS)	1,859	1,859	1,859	1,859
NUCLEAR WEAPONS SUPPORT	13,627	13,627	13,627	13,627
B-1B	160,688	78,688	120,688	160,688
SPECIALIZED UNDERGRADUATE PILOT TRAINING	1,909	1,909	1,909	1,909
F-22 EMD	627,266	627,266	627,266	627,266
B-2 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY BOMBER	225,327	265,327	266,962	265,327

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
EW DEVELOPMENT	65,082	36,582	71,082	69,582
JOINT TACTICAL RADIO	17,358	17,358	17,358	17,358
SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB) EMD	54,368	54,368	54,368	54,368
COUNTERSPACE SYSTEMS	40,053	40,053	40,053	40,053
SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) HIGH EMD	814,927	744,927	714,927	784,927
MILSTAR LDR/MDR SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)	148,936	106,936	149,936	150,536
MUNITIONS DISPENSER DEVELOPMENT	---	7,000	---	3,500
ARMAMENT/ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	9,160	9,160	9,160	9,160
SUBMUNITIONS	4,739	4,739	4,739	4,739
AGILE COMBAT SUPPORT	6,318	6,318	8,818	8,118
JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	16,594	16,594	16,594	16,594
LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS	925	9,725	11,425	7,825
UNMANNED COMBAT AIR VEHICLE (UCAV)	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000
COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	13,524	15,524	16,524	16,024
INTEGRATED COMMAND & CONTROL APPLICATIONS (IC2A)	226	13,226	3,226	13,226
INTELLIGENCE EQUIPMENT	1,326	1,326	1,326	1,326
COMMON LOW OBSERVABLES VERIFICATION SYSTEM (CLOVERS)	4,781	4,781	4,781	4,781
JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER EMD	1,743,668	1,743,668	1,733,668	1,733,668
INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE - EMD	133,291	133,291	133,291	133,291
EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM (SPACE)	57,562	57,562	57,562	57,562
RDT&E FOR AGING AIRCRAFT	19,871	34,871	27,871	33,471
LINK-16 SUPPORT AND SUSTAINMENT	44,146	44,146	52,146	51,146
FULL COMBAT MISSION TRAINING	3,731	3,731	3,731	3,731
COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR	14,274	14,274	14,274	14,274
CV-22	11,449	11,449	11,449	11,449
EMD TEST AND EVALUATION TRANSFER	---	---	-27,000	---
TOTAL, ENGINEERING & MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	4,319,574	4,182,874	4,226,209	4,373,974
RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT				
THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	30,351	30,351	30,351	30,351
MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	46,338	64,838	152,338	61,138
RAND PROJECT AIR FORCE	25,462	25,462	25,462	25,462
RANCH HAND II EPIDEMIOLOGY STUDY	11,029	11,029	11,029	11,029

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
INITIAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION	27,070	27,070	27,070	27,070
TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	398,266	398,266	398,266	398,266
ROCKET SYSTEMS LAUNCH PROGRAM (SPACE)	16,237	34,237	16,237	31,037
SPACE TEST PROGRAM (STP)	49,882	49,882	49,882	49,882
GENERAL SKILL TRAINING	313	313	313	313
JUDGMENT FUND REIMBURSEMENT	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES	3,878	3,878	3,878	3,878
TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	628,826	665,326	734,826	658,426
OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT				
ANTI-TAMPER TECHNOLOGY EXECUTIVE AGENCY	8,000	9,000	8,000	9,000
B-52 SQUADRONS	55,794	55,794	55,794	55,794
ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE	2,788	2,788	2,788	2,788
AIR-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)	26,713	26,713	20,513	20,513
STRAT WAR PLANNING SYSTEM - USSTRATCOM	1,895	1,895	1,895	1,895
ADVANCED STRATEGIC PROGRAMS	5,879	5,879	5,879	5,879
REGION/SECTOR OPERATION CONTROL CENTER MODERNIZATION	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000
WARFIGHTER RAPID ACQUISITION PROCESS (WRAP) RAPID TRAN	25,057	25,057	25,057	25,057
JOINT EXPEDITIONARY FORCE EXPERIMENT	27,161	27,161	27,161	27,161
A-10 SQUADRONS	7,650	7,650	7,650	7,650
F-16 SQUADRONS	81,338	85,338	81,338	83,338
F-15E SQUADRONS	81,726	81,726	81,726	81,726
MANNED DESTRUCTIVE SUPPRESSION	23,699	23,699	23,699	23,699
F-22 SQUADRONS	181,239	181,239	181,239	181,239
F-117A SQUADRONS	3,525	3,525	3,525	3,525
TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	2,943	2,943	2,943	2,943
ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	37,008	37,008	37,008	37,008
AF TENCAP	10,496	15,996	13,496	15,296
SPECIAL EVALUATION PROGRAM	110,080	130,280	113,280	130,280
COMPASS CALL	3,877	12,877	3,877	9,377
AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	186,690	186,690	186,690	186,690
CSAF INNOVATION PROGRAM	1,920	1,920	1,920	1,920
JOINT AIR-TO-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE (JASSM)	42,097	52,097	57,097	52,097
AEROSPACE OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC)	35,875	93,075	35,875	73,075

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
CONTROL AND REPORTING CENTER (CRC)	6,652	6,652	6,652	6,652
AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS)	173,956	173,956	173,956	173,956
ADVANCED COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	29,133	29,133	29,133	29,133
EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS PROGRAM	230,218	233,218	230,218	232,818
ADVANCED PROGRAM TECHNOLOGY	104,651	104,651	128,151	104,651
THEATER BATTLE MANAGEMENT (TBM) C4I	34,700	34,700	34,700	34,700
FIGHTER TACTICAL DATA LINK	39,034	39,034	39,034	39,034
MC2C (MULTI-SENSOR COMMAND AND CONTROL CONSTELLATION)	191,089	596,089	321,089	338,089
JOINT SURVEILLANCE AND TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM	55,515	67,515	55,515	61,515
SEEK EAGLE	16,972	16,972	16,972	16,972
ADVANCED PROGRAM EVALUATION	220,088	237,088	220,088	237,088
USAF MODELING AND SIMULATION	21,895	22,895	21,895	22,895
WARGAMING AND SIMULATION CENTERS	5,278	7,278	9,778	8,478
MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	17,002	17,002	17,002	17,002
INFORMATION WARFARE SUPPORT	7,837	7,837	11,337	7,837
TECHNICAL EVALUATION SYSTEM	135,588	190,588	145,588	190,588
SPECIAL EVALUATION SYSTEM	41,518	41,518	41,518	41,518
NATIONAL AIR INTELLIGENCE CENTER	---	---	3,000	2,500
COBRA BALL	---	---	6,000	---
E-4B NATIONAL AIRBORNE OPERATIONS CENTER (NAOC)	47,867	47,867	47,867	47,867
DEFENSE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM (SPACE)	2,046	2,046	2,046	2,046
MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK	2,423	2,423	2,423	2,423
INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	9,353	22,853	16,853	24,753
GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	29,168	27,168	29,168	25,968
GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	3,565	3,565	3,565	3,565
COMMUNICATIONS SECURITY (COMSEC)	4,765	4,765	4,765	4,765
MILSATCOM TERMINALS	72,712	72,712	72,712	72,712
SELECTED ACTIVITIES	150,243	147,243	222,243	149,243
GLOBAL AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT (GATM)	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200
SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK (SPACE)	17,542	17,542	17,542	17,542
WEATHER SERVICE	14,488	14,488	14,488	14,488
AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH, AND LANDING SYSTEM	9,865	9,865	9,865	9,865

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES	475	475	475	475
AIR FORCE TACTICAL MEASUREMENT AND SIGNATURE INTELLIGE	6,486	15,486	15,486	15,486
DEFENSE RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES (SPACE)	42,076	42,076	162,376	42,076
DEFENSE METEOROLOGICAL SATELLITE PROGRAM (SPACE)	3,875	3,875	3,875	3,875
NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (USER EQUIPMENT)	86,799	86,799	86,799	86,799
NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE & CONTROL)	324,098	296,098	296,098	296,098
SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM (SPACE)	82,108	104,408	82,108	96,808
DRAGON U-2 (JMIP)	17,442	20,142	30,942	23,942
ENDURANCE UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	309,743	354,743	326,743	352,743
AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	66,810	55,035	87,410	61,535
MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	---	8,000	4,000	8,000
DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS	20,708	31,908	46,908	31,108
NCMC - TW/AA SYSTEM	15,639	15,639	15,639	15,639
SPACETRACK (SPACE)	21,917	21,917	21,917	21,917
DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM (SPACE)	2,090	2,090	2,090	2,090
NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM (SPACE)	21,180	21,180	21,180	21,180
MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT	1,995	1,995	1,995	1,995
SHARED EARLY WARNING (SEW)	4,027	4,027	4,027	4,027
C-130 AIRLIFT SQUADRON	158,978	158,978	158,978	158,978
C-5 AIRLIFT SQUADRONS	277,795	304,395	277,795	291,095
C-17 AIRCRAFT	157,213	157,213	157,213	157,213
C-130J PROGRAM	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
LARGE AIRCRAFT IR COUNTERMEASURES (LAIRCM)	47,539	47,539	47,539	47,539
KC-135S	1,497	1,497	1,497	1,497
KC-10S	10,506	10,506	10,506	10,506
DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	1,340	2,840	1,340	2,340
INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	37,581	49,081	39,581	45,281
LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	10,375	10,375	10,375	10,375
PRODUCTIVITY, RELIABILITY, AVAILABILITY, MAINTAIN PRO.	4,767	7,767	8,767	9,667
SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	35,813	46,813	37,813	43,513
COMPUTER RESOURCES SUPPORT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CRSIP)	2,094	2,094	2,094	2,094
SERVICE-WIDE SUPPORT	4,090	4,090	4,090	4,090
CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROGRAM	7,132	7,132	7,132	7,132

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT..	21,326	---	21,326	21,326
TRANSFER TO MAJOR TEST AND EVALUATION.....	---	---	-60,000	---
TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT.....	4,516,327	5,217,426	4,981,927	4,929,252
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS.....	5,019,286	5,317,995	5,399,186	5,584,786
RETIREMENT ACCRUALS.....	-36,249	-36,249	-36,249	-36,249
TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF.....	17,564,984	18,639,392	18,537,679	18,822,569

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
(In thousands of dollars)

R-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
1	**DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES**	**219,144**	**226,144**	**219,144**	**223,744**
	Center for Adaptive Optics		+4,000		+2,000
	Coal Based Jet Fuel		+3,000		+2,600
2	**MATERIALS**	**75,272**	**89,272**	**112,672**	**110,872**
	Nanostructured Materials (Note: To be performed through a not-for-profit collaboration with industry and affiliated universities within the facilities of AFRL.)		+4,500	+5,000	+3,250
	Environmentally Sound Aircraft Coatings		+1,000		+1,000
	Thermal Management for Military Aircraft and Space Structures		+2,500		+1,300
	Tyndall AFRL		+2,000		+1,200
	Advanced Wide Bandgap Materials Technology		+4,000		+3,400
	Composite materials training program			+500	+500
	Advanced materials Deposition for Semiconductor Nano			+1,500	+1,100
	Closed cell foam material			+1,000	+1,000
	Durable coatings for aircraft systems			+4,000	+2,800
	Free electron laser materials processing			+3,000	+2,100
	Titanium matrix			+4,400	+4,400
	Metals affordability initiative			+7,500	+5,300
	Nanostructured protective coatings			+2,000	+1,000
	Strategic partnership for nanotechnology research			+6,000	+6,000
	Cost-effective composite materials for UAVs			+2,500	+1,250
	Nanoenergetic Materials			[1,000]	[1,000]
3	**AEROSPACE VEHICLE TECHNOLOGIES**	**78,789**	**80,789**	**78,789**	**79,989**
	Intelligent Flight Control Simulation Research Laboratory		+2,000		+1,200
4	**HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS APPLIED RESEARCH**	**66,000**	**75,500**	**75,800**	**80,800**
	Biotechnology - Cellular Dynamics and Engineering (Note: To be performed through a not-for-profit collaboration with industry and affiliated universities within the facilities of AFRL.)		+3,500		+2,500
	3-D Audio Display Technology		+1,000		+1,000
	Rapid Detection of Biological Weapons of Mass Destruction (Note: Only to continue the design and development of probe kits to identify Biological WMD.)		+5,000		+4,300
	Solid State Electric Oxygen Generation			+9,800	+7,000
5	**AEROSPACE PROPULSION**	**107,659**	**148,959**	**113,359**	**137,859**
	Transfer from DERF		+5,700	+5,700	+5,700
	Pulse Detonation Engine		+6,000		+3,000
	Advanced Vehicle and Propulsion Center (Note: For a common AFRL/SMC product center co-located with the Rocket Propulsion Laboratory)		+5,000		+2,500
	Cryo Installation for Jet and Rocket Engine Test Site (Note: Only for cryogenic propellant storage and delivery systems with related control and safety systems.)		+9,000		+7,700
	Reusable Launch Vehicle Technology (Note: To upgrade space infrastructure to support RLV development.)		+2,600		+2,300
	Lithium Ion Battery Development		+6,000		+4,000
	High Power Advanced Low Mass (HPALM)		+3,000		+1,500

R-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
	PBO Membranes for Advanced/High Performance Fuel Cells (Note: For developing and certifying this material for the Air Force UCAV.)		+3,000		+2,500
	UCAV Integrated Starter Generator		+1,000		+1,000
6	**AEROSPACE SENSORS**	**75,799**	**79,799**	**78,299**	**80,099**
	Wireless Surveillance of Hostile Threats		+1,000		+1,000
	Advanced FT-IR Gas Analysis		+2,000		+1,000
	Phased Array Antenna and Control System		+1,000		+1,000
	AFRL information and sensors directorate			+2,500	+1,300
7	**MULTI-DISCIPLINARY SPACE TECHNOLOGY**	**53,592**	**103,592**	**96,592**	**100,592**
	Transfer from DERF		+43,000	+43,000	+43,000
	Engineering Tool Improvement Program		+3,000		+2,000
	Integrated High Payoff Rocket Propulsion Technology		+4,000		+2,000
8	**SPACE TECHNOLOGY**	**58,582**	**67,582**	**83,042**	**79,942**
	Mixed Signal VLSI for Space Vehicle Communication Subsystems		+2,000		+1,400
	Seismic Monitoring Research		+3,000	+5,000	+3,000
	Lightweight and Novel Structures for Space (Note: Funds are provided only to develop advanced mirror systems and space structures for the Air Force.)		+1,000	+1,000	+1,000
	Techsat 21		+3,000	+5,000	+3,000
	HAARP incoherent scatter radar			+3,000	+2,600
	HAARP (space technology)			+6,000	+5,100
	ICASS			+2,000	+1,400
	Substrates for solar cells			+2,000	+1,400
	Carbon foam for aircraft and spacecraft			+460	+460
	Electromagnetic Gradiometer research				+2,000
9	**CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS**	**60,343**	**60,343**	**61,843**	**61,443**
	Defense against WMD			+1,500	+1,100
11	**COMMAND CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS**	**70,951**	**83,451**	**78,951**	**82,451**
	Agile R&D/S&T COE		+5,000		+3,500
	Information Protection and Authentication		+1,500	+3,000	+1,500
	Information Management for Crisis Response		+6,000		+3,000
	Secure knowledge management			+5,000	+3,500
14	**ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS**	**21,138**	**36,638**	**35,138**	**41,838**
	Vapor Grown Carbon Fiber		+1,500		+1,100
	Handheld Holographic Radar Gun		+1,500		+1,100
	Advanced Material Corrosion Research for LM Alloys		+1,000		+1,000
	Quantitative Inspection Techniques for Assessing Aging of Military Aircraft		+2,500		+2,500
	Hybrid Bearing		+2,000		+1,200
	Tyndall AFRL		+3,000		+1,800
	Ceramic Matrix Composites for Engines		+2,000	+5,000	+3,500
	Advanced Laser Program for Plasma Enhanced Chemical Vapor Deposition Techniques for Laser Protection Coatings		+2,000		+1,700
	Low bandwidth medical collaboration			+2,000	+1,400
	Powdered programmable process (House carried this on line R-18)			+5,000	+4,000
	Assessing aging of military aircraft			+2,000	+1,400
16	**ADVANCED AEROSPACE SENSORS**	**50,589**	**54,589**	**50,589**	**53,689**
	Advanced Physical Vapor Transport		+1,000		+1,000
	National Operational Signature Production and Research Capability		+3,000		+2,100

R-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
17	**FLIGHT VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY**	**0**	**0**	**5,000**	**3,500**
	E-SMART threat agent network			+5,000	+3,500
18	**AEROSPACE TECHNOLOGY DEV/DEMO**	**22,315**	**30,315**	**27,315**	**29,565**
	Powdered Programmable Preform Process (Note: To be performed through a not-for-profit collaboration with industry and affiliated universities within the facilities of AFRL.) (Funded in line R-14)		+4,000		0
	Ultra-lightweight Composites		+500		+500
	Advanced Aluminum Aerostructures (Senate carried this in line R-19)		+3,500		+3,750
	Sensor craft (UAV)			+5,000	+3,000
19	**AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY**	**85,650**	**91,050**	**89,650**	**90,150**
	Transfer from DERF		+4,400		0
	Joint Expendable Turbine Engine Concept Phase III		+1,000		+1,000
	Advanced Aluminum Aerostructures (Funded in line R-18)			+4,000	0
	Variable Flow Ducted Rocket Propulsion System			[5,000]	+3,500
21	**CREW SYSTEMS AND PERSONNEL PROTECTION TECHNOLOGY**	**29,690**	**40,190**	**34,690**	**39,990**
	Combat Automation Requirement Testbed		+2,500		+1,800
	Special Operations Crew Research at Brooks AFB		+3,000		+2,100
	Laser Eye Protection Research		+2,000		+900
	Battlespace Logistics Readiness and Sustainment		+1,000		+1,000
	Helmet Queuing System Technology		+2,000		+1,000
	TALON			+5,000	+3,500
24	**ELECTRONIC COMBAT TECHNOLOGY**	**23,350**	**24,350**	**23,350**	**24,350**
	Only for a study to be conducted by AFRL to assess the "see and avoid" requirement for UAVs to operate in national airspace and to conduct an analysis of capabilities for meeting this requirement.		+1,000		+1,000
26	**BALLISTIC MISSILE TECHNOLOGY**	**0**	**22,900**	**0**	**13,300**
	Transfer from DERF		+4,900		0
	BMT - Advanced Guidance Technologies for Ballistic Missiles and Range Safety Instrumentation. (Note: To include advanced accelerometer, flight computer and vehicle structure technology.)		+15,000		+11,800
	BMT - Common Guidance Development Program of Sensor Technologies		+3,000		+1,500
28	**ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY**	**42,315**	**46,315**	**55,815**	**56,015**
	Next Generation Hybrid Orbital Maneuver Vehicle		+1,000		+1,000
	Capacitively Coupled Interconnect (Note: To develop new integrated circuit interconnection technology.)		+2,000		+1,200
	Integrated Spacecraft Engineering Tool (Note: Only to develop, demonstrate and validate an integrated spacecraft engineering, modeling, simulation and design tool to support rapid prototyping and collaborative RDT&E of advanced spacecraft and satellites.)		+1,000		+1,000
	Robust aerospace composite materials/structures			+3,500	+2,500
	Streaker Small Launch Vehicle				+1,000
	Thin amorphous solar arrays			+10,000	+7,000
30	**TRANSFORMATIONAL WIDEBAND MILSATCOM**	**195,000**	**115,000**	**0**	**0**
	Defer 4th quarter Phase B contract award		-80,000	-80,000	-80,000
	Transfer to PE 63845F (RDTE, AF line R-52)			-115,000	-115,000

R-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
31	**MAUI SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM (MSSS)**	**6,472**	**10,472**	**56,472**	**48,472**
	High Accuracy Network Determination System		+4,000		+2,000
	MSSS operations and research			+35,000	+27,000
	PANSTARS			+15,000	+13,000
32	**MULTI-DISCIPLINARY ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT SPACE TECHNOLOGY**	**50,538**	**50,538**	**57,538**	**55,438**
	Aerospace relay mirror system			+7,000	+4,900
33	**CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY**	**38,001**	**43,001**	**45,001**	**44,501**
	BLU-109 Heavy Warhead (Note: For construction of warheads with tungsten heavy alloy core and for integration with JDAM and B-1B.)		+5,000		+3,000
	LOCAAS			+7,000	+3,500
34	**ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY**	**28,271**	**48,771**	**28,271**	**54,271**
	Laser Illuminated Viewing and Ranging Sensor Development		+6,000		+4,200
	GLINT		+6,000		+3,000
	Sodium Wavelength Laser		+2,500		+2,200
	Mobile Active Targeting Resource for Integrated Experiments		+6,000		+5,100
	Field Laser Demonstration Upgrades (ALVA)				+11,500
35	**ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY**	**0**	**2,500**	**0**	**1,200**
	Bioreactor Technologies Evaluation and Testing		+2,500		+1,200
37	**C3I ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT**	**34,288**	**46,788**	**38,288**	**45,938**
	Information Protection and Authentication		+4,500		+3,200
	Automatic Acoustic Target Recognition		+3,500		+1,750
	Identification of Time Critical Targets (Note: Only to provide enhanced target identification capability using the MIDAS and FOPEX technology.)		+4,500		+3,900
	Fusion SIGINT enhancements to ELINT			+4,000	+2,800
42	**NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM III**	**100,217**	**50,217**	**86,017**	**60,217**
	1 year slip in GPS III		-50,000		-40,000
	Program delay/execution			-14,200	0
43	**ADVANCED EHF MILSATCOM (SPACE)**	**825,783**	**844,783**	**844,783**	**844,783**
	Transfer from DERF		+19,000	+19,000	+19,000
52	**ADVANCED WIDEBAND SYSTEM (AWS)**	**4,982**	**4,982**	**119,982**	**119,982**
	Transfer from PE 63436F (RDTE, AF line R-30)			+115,000	+115,000
53	**INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE (DEM/VAL)**	**19,870**	**39,070**	**39,070**	**39,070**
	Smart Pull Technology - Transfer from DERF		+12,600	+12,600	+12,600
	IBS - Transfer from DERF		+6,600	+6,600	+6,600
54	**INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE - DEM/VAL**	**63,025**	**70,525**	**63,025**	**63,025**
	Transfer from DERF		+7,500		0
55	**WIDEBAND GAPFILLER SYSTEM RDT&E (SPACE)**	**20,009**	**14,009**	**20,009**	**14,009**
	Six month delay in 2002 CCS-C contract award		-6,000		-6,000
56	**AIR FORCE/NATIONAL PROGRAM COOPERATION (AFNPC)**	**8,829**	**8,829**	**2,529**	**2,529**
	Program delay: SBIRS-TI			-6,300	-6,300
58	**POLLUTION PREVENTION (DEM/VAL)**	**2,743**	**2,743**	**3,743**	**3,743**
	Diesel air quality improvement at Nellis AFB			+1,000	+1,000
59	**JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS - DEM/VAL**	**13,267**	**13,267**	**11,267**	**11,267**
	Excessive growth/program delays			-2,000	-2,000
61	**COBRA JUDY (H)**	**51,000**	**51,000**	**51,000**	**0**
	Classified Adjustment (Transfer to another account)				-51,000

R-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
65	**B-1B**	**160,688**	**78,688**	**120,688**	**160,688**
	ALE-55 Towed Decoy Delay		-82,000	-40,000	0
69	**B-2 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY BOMBER**	**225,327**	**265,327**	**266,962**	**265,327**
	B-2 Radar - Transfer from DERF		+50,000	+50,000	+50,000
	EHF Integration		-27,000	-18,365	-27,000
	Low Observable Improvements		+17,000	+10,000	+17,000
71	**EW DEVELOPMENT**	**65,082**	**36,582**	**71,082**	**69,582**
	ALE-55 Towed Decoy Delay		-43,000	-8,700	-8,700
	Loitering Electronic Warfare Killer		+4,500		+3,200
	Precision Location and Identification (PLAID)		+10,000	+14,700	+10,000
75	**SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) HIGH EMD**	**814,927**	**744,927**	**714,927**	**784,927**
	Unexecutable growth in ground segment		-70,000	-100,000	-30,000
77	**MILSTAR LDR/MDR SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)**	**148,936**	**106,936**	**149,936**	**150,536**
	Excess end of year funds		-50,000		-4,000
	Joint Integrated SATCOM Technology		+8,000		+5,600
	Painting and coating pollution prevention (Moved to RDTE, DW)			+1,000	0
	MUNITIONS DISPENSER DEVELOPMENT	**0**	**7,000**		**3,500**
	WCMD - ER		+7,000		+3,500
80	**AGILE COMBAT SUPPORT**	**6,318**	**6,318**	**8,818**	**8,118**
	Deployable oxygen system			+2,500	+1,800
83	**LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS**	**925**	**9,725**	**11,425**	**7,825**
	Fixed Aircrew Standardized Seats		+4,800	+2,500	+2,500
	Advanced Concept Ejection Seat II Improvement		+4,000		+2,400
	SEE-RESCUE distress streamer			+4,000	+2,000
	Distributed Mission Interoperability toolkit (DMIT) (Note: This item is funded in R-87.)			+4,000	0
86	**COMBAT TRAINING RANGES**	**13,524**	**15,524**	**16,524**	**16,024**
	Integration of tactical information and ground tracking into the Nellis Air Combat Training System.		+2,000	+3,000	+2,500
87	**INTEGRATED COMMAND & CONTROL APPLICATIONS (IC2A)**	**226**	**13,226**	**3,226**	**13,226**
	Distributed Mission Interoperability Toolkit (Note: Senate carried this item in R-83.)		+4,000		+4,000
	National Product Line Asset Center (NPLACE)		+7,000		+4,200
	Interactive Three Dimensional Human Interface		+2,000		+1,200
	AF Center for Acquisition Reengineering and Enabling Technology				+1,000
	ASSET/eWing			+3,000	+2,600
92	**JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER EMD**	**1,743,668**	**1,743,668**	**1,733,668**	**1,733,668**
	Excessive growth: inflation and overhead cost estimates			-10,000	-10,000
96	**RDT&E FOR AGING AIRCRAFT**	**19,871**	**34,871**	**27,871**	**33,471**
	Aging Aircraft Enterprise Knowledge Portal		+2,500		+1,800
	Viable Combat Avionics Initiative		+2,500		+1,800
	Aging Landing Gear Life Extension		+10,000	+10,000	+10,000
	Program delays/execution			-2,000	0
99	**LINK-16 SUPPORT AND SUSTAINMENT**	**44,146**	**44,146**	**52,146**	**51,146**
	611th AOG enhanced tactical data display link			+8,000	+7,000
104	**MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT**	**46,338**	**64,838**	**152,338**	**61,138**
	Holloman High Speed Test Track		+3,000		+2,100
	Airborne Separation Video System		+1,500		+1,100
	Laser Induced Surface Improvement Technology		+1,000		+1,000
	Mariah II Hypersonic Wind Tunnel		+6,000	+10,000	+6,000

R-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
	Electronic Countermeasures Upgrades for the Generic Radar Target Generator		+4,000		+2,000
	ILIAD		+3,000		+2,600
	Maglev Upgrade Program			[2,500]	[2,500]
	Transfer from other R&D, AF activites			+96,000	0
110	**ROCKET SYSTEMS LAUNCH PROGRAM (SPACE)**	**16,237**	**34,237**	**16,237**	**31,037**
	Support MTD -3b Flight Demonstration		+4,000		+2,800
	Ballistic Missile Range Safety Technology		+14,000		+12,000
116	**ANTI-TAMPER TECHNOLOGY EXECUTIVE AGENCY**	**8,000**	**9,000**	**8,000**	**9,000**
	Active Protection for Integrated Circuits (Note: To accelerate and implement an active anti-tamper device using a hands-safe 3mm 'micro detonator'.)		+1,000		+1,000
119	**AIR-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)**	**26,713**	**26,713**	**20,513**	**20,513**
	Program delays/execution			-6,200	-6,200
127	**F-16 SQUADRONS**	**81,338**	**85,338**	**81,338**	**83,338**
	F-16 Advanced IFF Interrogator (Note: To integrate the AN/APX-113 into the F-16C Block 40 aircraft)		+4,000		+2,000
134	**AF TENCAP**	**10,496**	**15,996**	**13,496**	**15,296**
	Adverse Weather Ballistic Imaging and Targeting		+2,500		+1,800
	GPS - Jammer Detection and Location System		+3,000	+3,000	+3,000
135	**SPECIAL EVALUATION PROGRAM**	**110,080**	**130,280**	**113,280**	**130,280**
	Transfer from DERF		+17,000		+17,000
	Transfer from DERF		+3,200	+3,200	+3,200
136	**COMPASS CALL**	**3,877**	**12,877**	**3,877**	**9,377**
	TRACS-F and Signal Analysis Subsystem upgrades		+9,000		+5,500
139	**JOINT AIR-TO-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE (JASSM)**	**42,097**	**52,097**	**57,097**	**52,097**
	JASSM-ER		+10,000	+15,000	+10,000
140	**AEROSPACE OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC)**	**35,875**	**93,075**	**35,875**	**73,075**
	Upgrades to Aerospace Operations Centers		+57,200		+37,200
144	**EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS PROGRAM**	**230,218**	**233,218**	**230,218**	**232,818**
	Adaptive Information Protection Technology		+3,000		+2,600
145	**ADVANCED PROGRAM TECHNOLOGY**	**104,651**	**104,651**	**128,151**	**104,651**
	DERF Transfer: Advanced program technology			+10,000	0
	Excessive growth/duplication			-3,500	0
	DERF Transfer: Advanced program technology			+17,000	0
148	**MC2C (MULTI-SENSOR COMMAND AND CONTROL CONSTELLATION)**	**191,089**	**596,089**	**321,089**	**338,089**
	Transfer from DERF		+488,000	+488,000	+488,000
	Network Centric Collaborative Targeting Integration		-8,000		-8,000
	Excessive growth		-75,000	-358,000	-333,000
149	**JOINT SURVEILLANCE AND TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM**	**55,515**	**67,515**	**55,515**	**61,515**
	Global Air Traffic Management (GATM) Upgrades		+5,000		+2,500
	Joint Services Work Station		+7,000		+3,500
151	**ADVANCED PROGRAM EVALUATION**	**220,088**	**237,088**	**220,088**	**237,088**
	Transfer from DERF		+17,000		+17,000
152	**USAF MODELING AND SIMULATION**	**21,895**	**22,895**	**21,895**	**22,895**
	Synthetic Theater Operations Research Model		+1,000		+1,000
153	**WARGAMING AND SIMULATION CENTERS**	**5,278**	**7,278**	**9,778**	**8,478**
	Theater Air Command and Control Simulation Facility		+2,000	+4,500	+3,200
156	**INFORMATION WARFARE SUPPORT**	**7,837**	**7,837**	**11,337**	**7,837**
	CIAS (Funded in R-171)			+3,500	0

R-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
159	**TECHNICAL EVALUATION SYSTEM**	**135,588**	**190,588**	**145,588**	**190,588**
	Transfer from DERF		+55,000		+55,000
	Transfer from DERF		+30,000		+30,000
	Payload for UAVs		-30,000		-30,000
	DERF Transfer: classified program			+10,000	0
162	**NATIONAL AIR INTELLIGENCE CENTER**	**0**	**0**	**3,000**	**2,500**
	NAIC space threat assessment			+1,000	+1,000
	NAIC threat modeling			+2,000	+1,500
163	**COBRA BALL**	**0**	**0**	**6,000**	**0**
	Program increase			+6,000	0
171	**INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM**	**9,353**	**22,853**	**16,853**	**24,753**
	Transfer from DERF		+4,000		+2,000
	Center for Information Assurance Security (Senate carried this item in R-156)		+3,500		+3,500
	World Infrastructure Support Environment (Note: Only to continue the existing program.)		+6,000		+5,100
	Information Assurance for Enabling Technologies				+1,000
	Lighthouse cyber security program			+7,500	+3,800
172	**GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM**	**29,168**	**27,168**	**29,168**	**25,968**
	Non-compliance with Clinger-Cohen Act		-6,000		-6,000
	Enterprise Data Warehouse		+4,000		+2,800
177	**SELECTED ACTIVITIES**	**150,243**	**147,243**	**222,243**	**149,243**
	Classified Programs - Transfer from DERF		+1,000		+1,000
	Classified Program reduction		-4,000		-2,000
	DERF Transfer: special activities			+72,000	0
185	**AIR FORCE TACTICAL MEASUREMENT AND SIGNATURE INTELLIGE**	**6,486**	**15,486**	**15,486**	**15,486**
	ARGUS MASINT - Transfer from DERF		+9,000	+9,000	+9,000
186	**DEFENSE RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES (SPACE)**	**42,076**	**42,076**	**162,376**	**42,076**
	Defense Reconnaissance Support Activities - Transfer from DERF		+120,300	+120,300	+120,300
	Defense Reconnaissance Support Activities		-120,300		-120,300
189	**NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE)**	**324,098**	**296,098**	**296,098**	**296,098**
	AF requested transfer		-28,000	-28,000	-28,000
191	**SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM (SPACE)**	**82,108**	**104,408**	**82,108**	**96,808**
	Eastern Range Core Crew		+7,000		+3,500
	Range Technology Demonstration (Note: Only to implement SMC's planned Range Technology Demonstration initiative to improve tracking, telemetry and commanding communications.)		+4,000		+3,400
	Space Technology		+8,000		+4,000
	Space Homeland Security (Note: To demonstrate the application of space technologies to improve Homeland Security.)		+3,300		+2,800
	Civil Reserve Space Service Initiative			[1,000]	+1,000
192	**DRAGON U-2 (JMIP)**	**17,442**	**20,142**	**30,942**	**23,942**
	U-2 SIGINT - Transfer from DERF Sensor NRE		+13,500	+10,800	+10,800
	U-2 SIGINT - Transfer from DERF Sensor demo unit		0	+2,700	+2,700
	U-2 sensors		-10,800		-7,000

R-1	Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
193 ENDURANCE UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	**309,743**	**354,743**	**326,743**	**352,743**
Global Hawk Defensive Systems - Transfer from DERF		+30,000		+30,000
Global Hawk SIGINT - Transfer from DERF		+5,000	+5,000	+5,000
Predator A&B - Transfer from DERF		+10,000	+10,000	+10,000
Global Hawk Defensive Systems		-30,000		-30,000
Global Hawk SIGINT Sensors Development		-59,000		-59,000
Global Hawk - Advanced Payload Development and Support		+84,000		+84,000
Global Hawk - Producibility Initiatives		+7,000		+5,000
Global Hawk		-5,000		-5,000
MAEUAV - (Note: Only to transition the Predator view mission planning system to production.)		+3,000		+2,000
Global Hawk - lithium batteries			+2,000	+1,000
194 AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	**66,810**	**55,035**	**87,410**	**61,535**
Sensor Development - Moved to Global Hawk Line		-15,775		-15,775
Tactical Airborne Reconnaissance System (TARS) (Note: Only for the development of the data link and SAR integration into the TARS pods/P3I.)		+4,000	+13,600	+6,800
SYERS			+4,000	+2,000
Ultra-wideband airborne laser communications			+3,000	+1,700
195 MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	**0**	**8,000**	**4,000**	**8,000**
Network Centric Collaborative Targeting (NCCT) (From R-148)		+8,000		+6,000
Network Centric Collaborative Targeting (NCCT)			+4,000	+2,000
196 DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS	**20,708**	**31,908**	**46,908**	**31,108**
Commercial Imagery - Transfer from DERF		+2,400	+2,400	+2,400
DCGS MASINT - Transfer from DERF		+5,000	+5,000	+5,000
AF DCGS Geospatial Services - Transfer from DERF		+3,800	+3,800	+3,800
DCGS/U2-SIGINT Network - Transfer from DERF		+15,000	+15,000	+15,000
Ground Systems Upgrades		-15,000		-7,000
Duplication of Supplemental Funding				-8,800
204 C-5 AIRLIFT SQUADRONS	**277,795**	**304,395**	**277,795**	**291,095**
Avionics Modernization Program (Transfer from AP, AF)		+26,600		+13,300
211 DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	**1,340**	**2,840**	**1,340**	**2,340**
Metrology		+1,500		+1,000
212 INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	**37,581**	**49,081**	**39,581**	**45,281**
Prototype LO Coatings Development		+4,500		+3,200
Technology Insertion Demonstration and Evaluation (TIDE) (Note: For the TIDE program's Manufacturing Technology Initiative.)		+3,000		+1,500
Laser Peening for F119 Engine		+4,000		+2,000
Bipolar wafer-cell NiMH battery			+2,000	+1,000
214 PRODUCTIVITY, RELIABILITY, AVAILABILITY	**4,767**	**7,767**	**8,767**	**9,667**
Aircraft Turbine Engine Sustainment		+3,000		+2,100
Modeling/Re-engineering for Oklahoma City ALC			+4,000	+2,800
216 SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**35,813**	**46,813**	**37,813**	**43,513**
Low Emission/Efficient Hybrid Aviation Refueling Truck Propulsion		+3,000		+1,500
Center for Aircraft and System/Support Infrastructure		+5,000		+3,000
Aging Aircraft (Note: To accelerate implementation of an integrated data environment for the C-5 and C-17.)		+3,000		+1,500
Commodity management system consolidation			+2,000	+1,700

R-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS				
220	**DEVELOPMENT**	**21,326**	**0**	**21,326**	**21,326**
	SECDEF Systems Initiatives Policy		-21,326		0
999	**CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS**	**5,019,286**	**5,317,995**	**5,399,186**	**5,584,786**
	Classified		+298,709	+379,900	+565,500
	DEM/VAL TEST AND EVALUATION TRANSFER			-9,000	0
	EMD TEST AND EVALUATION TRANSFER			-27,000	0
	OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT T&E TRANSFER			-60,000	0

B–1 DSUP PROGRAM

Despite development problems which have plagued the Air Force's B–1 Defense System Upgrade Program (DSUP), the conferees agree to provide the fiscal year 2003 funding requested for this program. Concerned, however, by the need to continue modernizing the B–1 bomber so the aircraft can undertake combat missions in various threat environments, the conferees direct the Air Force to use these funds to explore alternative towed decoy and defensive systems other than the ALE–55 towed decoy included in the Department of Defense's original request. The Secretary of the Air Force shall report to the congressional defense committees on the allocation of these funds not later than January 1, 2003. Finally, the conferees approve a rescission totaling $45,500,000 of prior year funds in excess to the Air Force's DSUP requirements.

MC2C

The conference agreement provides a total of $338,089,000 for the Multi-sensor Command and Control Constellation (MC2C) program. This level is more than sufficient to fully fund all planned MP–RTIP design and platform adaption activities for the coming year. Given the reported technical difficulties this program recently experienced in initial testing, the conferees strongly urge the Air Force to use any remaining funds for sensor and command and control system integration development efforts.

SPACE SURVEILLANCE (MSSS)

The conference agreement includes funding of $48,472,000 for the MSSS program. Of this amount, $13,000,000 shall be used to continue the Panoramic Survey Telescope and Rapid Response System. In addition, $2,000,000 shall be used only to fund the High Accuracy Network Determination System. The conferees are aware of security and electromagnetic interference concerns from antennas located near the site, and recommend allocating up to $5,000,000 for assisting in the relocation of the antennas. The remaining research funds should be allocated by on-site officials to programs which offer the greatest potential return. The conferees expect the officials to consider the following programs for funding: MATRIX, NEAT, and HSN.

ADVANCED POWER TECHNOLOGY

To improve technology transition and the incorporation of advanced power concepts into vehicles and facilities, the conferees direct the Secretary of the Air Force to prepare a plan for establishing an Advanced Power Technology office to support the program manager for support equipment, ground vehicles, and bare base. The plan should be provided to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees with the submission of the Department of Defense fiscal year 2004 budget request.

ENDURANCE UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES

The conferees agree to provide a total of $352,743,000 for the Air Force's endurance unmanned aerial vehicles program, including an additional $31,000,000 for the continued development and testing of the Global Hawk endurance UAV system and sensor requirements.

Global Hawk Defensive System: The conferees do not agree to the Budget request for an additional $30,000,000 for the development of a U–2 like defensive system for the Global Hawk UAV.

Global Hawk SIGINT Sensor Development: The conferees agree to transfer $59,000,000 requested for Global Hawk SIGINT sensor development, and the development efforts these funds were requested to support, into a new line entitled Global Hawk Advanced Payload Development and Support.

Global Hawk Advanced Payload Development and Support: The conferees agree to provide a total of $84,000,000 in this new line, of which $59,000,000 is a transfer from the SIGINT Sensor Development line, including the High Band Subsystem development effort, and $15,775,000 is a transfer from the Airborne Reconnaissance Systems Sensor Development line. It is the intent of the conferees that the Air Force work with the Navy and the Army to identify new and existing sensor technologies for a high altitude UAV, including a day/night hyperspectral sensor system developed by an Air Force laboratory, and use the funds appropriated to develop, test and demonstrate payload options to enhance Global Hawk UAV mission capabilities. The conferees directed the Air Force to submit by January 15, 2003, a plan for expenditure of these funds.

The conferees support the Air Force's Airborne Signals Intelligence Payload (ASIP) program, a common high altitude SIGINT sensor based on the ongoing HBSS program and a new low band effort based on existing technology. The ASIP program is the Office of Secretary of Defense approved program designed to replace the failed Joint SIGINT Avionics Family (JSAF) program. The fiscal year 2003 estimated cost for ASIP is $31,400,000, of which $17,900,000 shall be funded from Global Hawk SIGINT sensor development (Advanced Payload Development and Support) and $13,500,000 from funds provided in a separate line for U–2 SIGINT systems. The conferees direct the Navy to evaluate its requirements and participate in the ASIP effort as appropriate.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

	(In thousands of dollars)			
	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE-WIDE				
BASIC RESEARCH				
IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	2,126	2,126	2,126	2,126
DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	175,646	198,546	189,646	206,946
UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	221,610	236,235	243,110	242,685
FORCE HEALTH PROTECTION	9,973	9,973	9,973	15,173
HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH INITIATIVES	12,082	12,082	12,082	12,082
GOVERNMENT/INDUSTRY COSPONSORSHIP OF UNIVERSITY RESEAR	3,467	10,067	3,467	9,067
DEFENSE EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM TO STIMULATE COMPETITIVE	9,864	9,864	19,864	16,864
CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	64,119	71,119	87,319	81,619
TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	498,887	550,012	567,587	586,562
APPLIED RESEARCH				
MEDICAL FREE ELECTRON LASER	---	9,000	15,000	12,000
HISTORICALLY BLACK & HISPANIC SERVING INSTITU SCIENCES	13,970	21,970	20,470	26,570
LINCOLN LABORATORY RESEARCH PROGRAM	27,732	27,732	27,732	27,732
COMPUTING SYSTEMS AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	424,940	425,440	417,940	419,440
EMBEDDED SOFTWARE AND PERVASIVE COMPUTING	60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000
BIOLOGICAL WARFARE DEFENSE	133,000	166,950	146,350	166,050
CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	262,177	291,177	287,177	316,977
TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY	180,952	180,952	171,952	173,952
MATERIALS AND ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY	440,500	447,500	446,700	445,300
WMD DEFEAT TECHNOLOGY	146,143	182,943	165,943	167,143
STRATEGIC DEFENSE TECHNOLOGIES	131,199	131,199	121,199	121,199
HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH	39,310	48,310	39,310	45,310
TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	1,859,923	1,993,173	1,919,773	1,981,673
ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT				
EXPLOSIVES DEMILITARIZATION TECHNOLOGY	8,935	11,935	21,215	18,565
SO/LIC ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	13,800	25,800	10,800	19,100
COMBATING TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	49,015	143,115	108,615	113,615
COUNTERPROLIFERATION ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT TECHNOLOGIES	77,389	93,389	82,389	82,389
BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY	121,751	128,251	145,451	154,951
JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	25,420	25,420	19,420	19,420
AUTOMATIC TARGET RECOGNITION	7,404	7,404	5,604	5,604

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
ADVANCED AEROSPACE SYSTEMS	246,000	253,000	235,500	241,200
CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - ADVANCED DEV	249,842	266,342	271,842	275,142
SPECIAL TECHNICAL SUPPORT	11,168	12,168	12,668	13,268
ARMS CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	37,646	46,646	39,146	44,446
GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	25,451	66,201	91,451	119,401
STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM	60,468	68,468	49,468	54,568
JOINT WARFIGHTING PROGRAM	9,610	9,610	9,610	9,610
ADVANCED ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGIES	150,400	159,900	153,900	164,500
ADVANCED CONCEPT TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	199,580	204,580	204,580	207,880
HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	188,642	188,642	217,142	209,642
COMMAND, CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	130,101	130,101	120,101	120,101
SENSOR AND GUIDANCE TECHNOLOGY	224,000	234,000	212,000	224,000
MARINE TECHNOLOGY	33,000	33,000	33,000	33,000
LAND WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	162,100	170,100	170,100	170,100
CLASSIFIED DARPA PROGRAMS	275,899	294,899	294,899	294,899
DISTRIBUTED LEARNING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	14,000	18,000	14,000	16,000
SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE	22,983	22,983	22,983	22,983
QUICK REACTION SPECIAL PROJECTS	25,430	40,430	25,430	25,430
JOINT WARGAMING SIMULATION MANAGEMENT OFFICE	49,929	49,929	49,029	48,029
HIGH ENERGY LASER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	13,567	13,567	13,567	13,567
COUNTERPROLIFERATION SUPPORT	1,806	1,806	1,806	1,806
TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	2,435,336	2,719,686	2,635,716	2,723,216
DEMONSTRATION & VALIDATION				
PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	33,553	49,553	43,553	48,853
JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM	11,305	12,305	20,305	20,405
ADVANCED SENSOR APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	15,994	20,994	12,994	15,994
CALS INITIATIVE	1,647	1,647	8,647	7,647
ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY TECHNICAL CERTIFICATION PROGRAM	28,334	28,334	21,334	21,334
MEADS	---	---	69,745	117,745
BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM SEGMENT	1,065,982	1,075,982	733,982	1,073,282
BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TERMINAL DEFENSE SEGMENT	169,974	261,719	195,974	139,974
BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SEGMENT	3,195,104	3,195,104	3,034,104	3,185,504
BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE BOOST DEFENSE SEGMENT	796,927	706,927	546,927	736,927

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - DEM/VAL.....	144,790	149,390	146,090	148,090
BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SENSORS.....	373,447	304,447	340,447	359,447
STRATEGIC CAPABILITY MODERNIZATION.....	---	---	10,000	---
HUMANITARIAN DEMINING.....	13,355	13,355	13,355	13,355
COALITION WARFARE.....	12,444	7,444	6,444	6,944
JOINT SERVICE EDUCATION AND TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPME	---	---	1,000	1,000
JOINT ELECTROMAGNETIC TECHNOLOGY (JET) PROGRAM.....	5,085	5,085	11,085	10,285
TRANSFER TO OT & E CTEIP.....	---	---	-37,000	---
TOTAL, DEMONSTRATION & VALIDATION.....	5,867,941	5,832,286	5,178,986	5,906,786
ENGINEERING & MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT				
CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - EMD.....	169,018	169,018	174,518	172,318
JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM - EMD.....	13,643	16,643	28,393	28,543
ADVANCED IT SERVICES JOINT PROGRAM OFFICE (AITS-JPO)..	28,393	28,393	28,393	28,393
JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS)	10,797	10,797	10,797	10,797
THEATER HIGH-ALTITUDE AREA DEFENSE SYSTEM - TMD - EMD.	932,171	932,171	892,171	912,171
PATRIOT PAC-3 THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE ACQUISITION	---	180,819	150,819	180,819
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.....	3,938	3,938	3,938	3,938
PROTOTYPE ACCOUNTING SYSTEMS.....	700	700	700	700
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT-STANDARD PROCUREMEN	10,427	7,927	7,927	7,927
FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS.....	96,250	36,250	96,250	96,250
DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM.....	11,803	11,803	11,803	11,803
INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM.....	17,620	111,770	103,020	103,770
GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM.....	17,239	17,239	17,239	17,239
ELECTRONIC COMMERCE.....	24,265	25,765	24,265	25,365
EMD TEST AND EVALUATION TRANSFER.....	---	---	-8,000	---
TOTAL, ENGINEERING & MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT.....	1,336,264	1,553,233	1,542,233	1,600,033
RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT				
UNEXPLODED ORDNANCE DETECTION AND CLEARANCE.....	1,185	1,185	1,185	1,185
THERMAL VICAR.....	7,058	7,058	7,058	7,058
TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS.....	30,023	18,523	30,023	30,023
CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT.....	1,862	1,862	1,862	1,862
BLACK LIGHT.....	5,000	15,000	5,000	15,000

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
GENERAL SUPPORT TO C3I	14,979	19,879	23,979	22,979
FOREIGN MATERIAL ACQUISITION AND EXPLOITATION	32,382	32,382	24,482	24,482
INTERAGENCY EXPORT LICENSE AUTOMATION	10,702	1,202	10,702	1,202
DEFENSE TRAVEL SYSTEM	30,358	30,358	30,358	30,358
JOINT THEATER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION	72,919	72,919	64,519	70,419
CLASSIFIED PROGRAM USD(P)	---	25,000	---	25,000
FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING	31,670	31,670	27,970	27,970
CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	42,959	47,459	42,959	47,159
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS - C3I	60,708	137,068	85,108	115,168
SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH/CHALLENGE ADMINISTR	2,103	2,103	2,103	2,103
DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS	5,201	5,201	5,201	5,201
FORCE TRANSFORMATION DIRECTORATE	20,000	20,000	---	10,000
DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES (DTIC)	45,249	45,249	45,249	45,249
R&D IN SUPPORT OF DOD ENLISTMENT, TESTING AND EVALUATI	8,963	8,963	8,963	8,963
DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION	48,913	51,913	53,913	51,013
MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT)DARP	43,572	43,572	43,572	43,572
PENTAGON RESERVATION	7,457	7,457	7,457	7,457
MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS-BMDO	27,909	27,909	27,909	27,909
TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	551,172	653,932	549,572	621,332
OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT				
COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT SAVINGS INITIATIVE	10,320	18,320	10,320	15,920
PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE (PFP) INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SYS	1,920	1,920	2,920	2,920
C4I INTEROPERABILITY	43,199	47,199	43,199	46,599
JOINT ANALYTICAL MODEL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	12,531	8,531	10,831	8,531
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS	550	550	550	550
NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND SYSTEM-WIDE SUPPORT	1,053	1,053	1,053	1,053
DEFENSE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATIO	7,554	7,554	7,554	7,554
LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS (DCS)	1,407	1,407	1,407	1,407
SUPPORT OF THE NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM	15,046	15,046	15,046	15,046
MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK	7,199	7,199	7,199	7,199
INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	394,257	394,257	398,257	403,057
C4I FOR THE WARRIOR	10,190	10,190	10,190	10,190
C4I FOR THE WARRIOR	20,536	25,036	20,536	20,536

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	15,604	6,904	22,604	15,604
JOINT SPECTRUM CENTER	19,102	19,102	19,102	19,102
TELEPORT PROGRAM	6,678	6,678	6,678	6,678
DEFENSE IMAGERY AND MAPPING PROGRAM	143,488	---	173,638	172,588
FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	13,916	13,916	13,916	13,916
FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	474	474	474	474
DEFENSE JOINT COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PROGRAM (JMIP)	6,058	54,058	69,058	73,308
C3I INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS	75,682	128,082	123,482	124,682
TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	120,458	263,058	202,558	263,058
DRAGON U-2 (JMIP)	3,353	3,353	3,353	3,353
AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	11,934	11,934	11,934	11,934
MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	4,649	9,649	4,649	7,249
DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES	113,159	113,159	115,159	113,159
NATIONAL SECURITY SPACE ARCHITECT (NSSA)	11,185	11,185	6,185	11,185
INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	13,072	35,072	19,072	33,072
MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (OJCS)	12,887	12,887	12,887	12,887
SPECIAL OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	6,741	13,741	6,741	10,241
SPECIAL OPERATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	62,276	38,776	62,276	65,876
SPECIAL OPERATIONS TACTICAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	281,443	342,943	278,143	329,043
SPECIAL OPERATIONS INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	1,590	27,590	2,590	27,590
SOF MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	1,962	2,212	1,962	2,212
SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	77,308	81,308	112,308	88,208
STRATEGIC CAPABILITY MODERNIZATION	---	125,000	---	20,000
TRANSFER TO OT & E CTEIP	---	---	-25,000	---
TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	1,529,781	1,860,343	1,773,831	1,966,981
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	2,534,247	2,715,485	2,458,097	2,552,747
RETIREMENT ACCRUALS	-14,688	-14,688	-14,688	-14,688
TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DEF-WIDE	16,598,863	17,863,462	16,611,107	17,924,642

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS

[In thousands of dollars]

R-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
2	**DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES**	**175,646**	**198,546**	**189,646**	**+206,946**
	Ultra-Performance Nanotechnology Center		+3,000		+3,000
	Center for Nanostructure Materials		+400		+400
	Nanotechnology Research and Training Facility		+4,500		+2,300
	Spin Electronics [Note: Transfer from University Research Initiatives.]		+15,000		+15,000
	Advanced photonics composites			+2,000	+1,400
	Joint Collaboration on Nanotechnology			+3,000	+1,800
	University Optoelectronics			+2,000	+1,000
	Life Science Education and Research			+5,000	+5,000
	Molecular Electronics			+2,000	+1,400
3	**UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES**	**221,610**	**236,235**	**243,110**	**242,685**
	Spin Electronics [Note: Transfer to Defense Research Sciences.]		-15,000		-15,000
	Photovoltaic Hydrogen for Portable on Demand Power		+1,000		+1,000
	Anti-Corrosion Studies		+1,000		-
	Center of Excellence in Bioinformatics		+2,300		-
	Defense Commercialization Research Initiative		+4,000		+3,500
	Wireless Rural Communications Demonstration		+5,000		+3,000
	Technology Transfer - IEE Pilot Program		+525		+525
	Institute of Bioengineering and Nano-Science in Advanced Medicine		+2,000		+5,000
	Center for Computer Security		+300		+300
	Remote Sensing		+2,500		+1,250
	Desert Environmental Research [Note: Only for the ongoing University based GIS program.]		+3,500		+3,000
	Small Business Alliance Center		+3,000		+1,800
	National Security Training		+1,500		+1,000
	MEMS Sensors for Rolling Element Bearings		+3,000	+1,500	+2,100
	Infotonics			+4,000	+2,000
	Nanoscience and Nanomaterials			+5,000	+2,500
	Corrosion protection of aluminum alloys in aircraft			+2,000	+1,500
	Fastening and Joining Research			+1,000	+1,000
	Secure group communications			+2,000	+1,200
	University Bioinformatics			+2,000	+2,000
	AHI			+4,000	+3,400
	Nanophotonic Systems Fabrication Facility			[2,170]	[2,000]
4	**FORCE HEALTH PROTECTION**	**9,973**	**9,973**	**9,973**	**15,173**
	Chronic Multi-Symptom Illnesses				+5,200
6	**GOVERNMENT/INDUSTRY COSPONSORSHIP OF UNIVERSITY RESEARCH**	**3,467**	**10,067**	**3,467**	**9,067**
	Semi-Conductor Research (Focus Center Research Program (FCRP))		+6,600		+5,600
7	**DEFENSE EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM TO STIMULATE COMPETITIVE RESEARCH**	**9,864**	**9,864**	**19,864**	**16,864**
	DEPSCOR			+10,000	+7,000
8	**CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM**	**64,119**	**71,119**	**87,319**	**81,619**
	Engineered Pathogen Identification and Countermeasure Program		+7,000	+5,000	+5,000
	Chemical warfare protection			+1,200	+1,000
	Detection of chem-bio pollutant agents in water			+5,000	+3,500
	Nanoemulsions for decontamination			+5,000	+3,500
	Bioprocessing facility			+7,000	+3,500
	Agroterrorist Attack Response			[1,000]	+1,000

R-1	Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
11 MEDICAL FREE ELECTRON LASER	-	9,000	15,000	12,000
HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND 12 UNIVERSITIES SCIENCES	13,970	21,970	20,470	26,570
Enhanced Skills Training Program for Electronic Engineering Technology Program		+2,000		+1,000
Hispanic Serving Institutions		+1,000		+1,000
HSI Project Grants		+5,000		+5,000
American Indian Tribal Colleges			+3,500	+3,000
Technical Assistance Program			+3,000	+2,600
COMPUTING SYSTEMS AND COMMUNICATIONS 14 TECHNOLOGY	424,940	425,440	417,940	419,440
Center for Critical Languages		+500		+500
Execution delays/limit new start growth; GENISYS and mis-information direction			-7,000	-6,000
15 COMPUTING	60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000
Software for autonomous robots (AE-02)			+2,000	+2,000
Execution delays/limit new start growth; Automated light transport aircraft			-2,000	-2,000
16 BIOLOGICAL WARFARE DEFENSE	133,000	166,950	146,350	166,050
Transfer From DERF		+11,250	+11,250	+11,250
Asymmetric Protocols for Biological Defense		+4,000		+2,000
Biological Warfare Post-Exposure Therapeutics		+15,000		+15,000
Hydrate Fractionalization Desalination Technology		+2,700		+2,300
Center for Water Security		+1,000		+1,000
Bioscience Center for Informatics			+2,100	+1,500
17 CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	262,177	291,177	287,177	316,977
Monoclonal Antibody Based Technology [Note: Only to continue the development of the Heteropolymer Monoclonal Antibody-based Technology for vaccines and antibiotics]		+1,000		+1,000
National Consortium for Countermeasures to Biological and Chemical Threats		+7,000		+4,900
Anthrax Biodefense Technologies		+7,500		+5,300
Mustard Gas Antidote		+3,000		+2,100
Bioinformatics [Note: To extract and analyze data.]		+1,500		+1,000
Polymer Based Chemical and Biological Sensors		+3,000		+2,000
Countermeasures to Biological and Chemical Threats [Note: Only for a joint biological and chemical terrorism response training program.]		+6,000		+3,000
Chem-bio defense initiative fund			+25,000	+25,000
Bio-Compact Disk Application Development				+2,000
ADCIP				+4,000
Needleless Delivery Methods for Recombinant Protein Vaccines				+1,000
Organic Vaccine Production			[5,000]	+2,500
Air Containment Monitoring System				+1,000
18 TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY	180,952	180,952	171,952	173,952
Hypersonics (TT-03)			-10,000	-8,000
Execution delays/limit new start growth: Network extreme env. training superiority			-6,000	-5,000
CEROS			+7,000	+6,000
20 MATERIALS AND ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY	440,500	447,500	446,700	445,300
Nanostructured Photonic and Biomedical Materials		+1,000		+1,000
Center for Optoelectronics and Optical Communications		+6,000		+5,000
Execution delays/limit new start growth: Adaptive vocal plane arrays and ultra-high speed circuits			-9,800	-9,000
Heat actuated coolers			+2,000	+1,000

R-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
	Optoelectronics			+5,000	-
	Fabrication of 3D structures			+4,000	+2,400
	Strategic materials			+4,000	+3,400
	Friction stir welding			+1,000	+1,000
22	**WMD DEFEAT TECHNOLOGY**	**146,143**	**182,943**	**165,943**	**167,143**
	CT Info Network, Transfer From DERF		+5,500		-
	Vulnerability Reduction Technology Measures, Transfer From DERF		+9,800		+9,800
	Hazard Prediction and Decision Support Tools, Transfer From DERF		+5,000		+5,000
	Hard Target Defeat, Transfer From DERF		+7,000		+2,000
	Enhanced Blast Weapons Effects, Transfer From DERF		+7,000		-
	WMD Material Assessment		+1,500		+1,100
	Discrete Particle Methods		+1,000		+1,000
	DERF transfer: vulnerability reduction technology; hazard prediction; and hard target defeat only			+16,800	-
	Deep Digger			+3,000	+2,100
23	**STRATEGIC DEFENSE TECHNOLOGIES**	**131,199**	**131,199**	**121,199**	**121,199**
	Program delays/execution			-10,000	-10,000
25	**HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH**	**39,310**	**48,310**	**39,310**	**45,310**
	Joint Technology Office		+9,000		+6,000
27	**EXPLOSIVES DEMILITARIZATION TECHNOLOGY**	**8,935**	**11,935**	**21,215**	**18,565**
	Fixed Chamber Prototype		+3,000		+1,800
	Program delays/execution			-2,000	-2,000
	Explosives Demilitarization technology project			+3,000	+2,100
	Hot gas decontamination -HWAD			+3,150	+1,200
	Innovative demilitarization technologies			+4,000	+2,400
	Metal reduction and processing			+1,500	+1,500
	Pollution abatement incinerator system			+1,480	+1,480
	Rotary furnace - HWAD			+550	+550
	Water gel explosive system - HWAD			+600	+600
	Supercritical Waters Systems Explosives Demilitarization Technology			[3,000]	[3,000]
28	**SO/LIC ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT**	**13,800**	**25,800**	**10,800**	**19,100**
	Special Reconnaissance Capabilities, Transfer From DERF		+5,000		+5,000
	Measures and Signatures Information, Transfer From DERF		+4,000		-
	Special Reconnaissance Capabilities		+3,000		+1,800
	Excessive growth/program delays			-3,000	-1,500
29	**COMBATING TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT**	**49,015**	**143,115**	**108,615**	**113,615**
	Entry Point Screening & Perimeter Protection, Transfer From DERF		+11,000		+11,000
	Reconnaissance Tool Kit, Transfer From DERF		+19,500		-
	Super Zoom Digital Camera, Transfer From DERF		+6,000		-
	Combating Terrorism BAA, Transfer From DERF		+19,500		+19,500
	Attribution CT Tools and Deployable Comms, Transfer From DERF		+5,600		+3,600
	Detection of Bio Agents in Food, Transfer From DERF		+3,000		+3,000
	Alternate Power Sources for Battery Charging, Transfer From DERF		+5,000		-
	Stand off Surveillance Camera, Transfer From DERF		+2,000		-
	Distributed Chemical Agent Sensing and Transmission System		+3,500		+3,000
	Electrostatic Decontamination System (EDS)		+4,500	+9,000	+6,300
	Facial Recognition Access Control & Surveillance		+3,000		+1,500
	Explosive Loading Laboratory Testing		+7,000		+3,500
	National Guard Multi-Media Security Technology		+2,500	+2,500	+2,500

R-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
	Integrated Planar Waveguide Biological Agent Detection System		+2,000		+1,400
	DERF transfer: Entry Point Screening, Combating Terrorism BAA, Attribution CT Tools, and detecting bio agents only			+37,100	-
	Asymmetric warfare initiative			+3,000	+2,100
	Blast mitigation testing			+5,000	+3,500
	Counter-terrorism ISR system (CT-ISR)			+3,000	+2,200
	Facility Security [Note: Only to demonstrate facility security enhancements using an advanced first responder tool set to support direct tactical application]				+2,200
	Execution delays				-700
30	**COUNTERPROLIFERATION ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT TECHNOLOGIES**	**77,389**	**93,389**	**82,389**	**82,389**
	SOF Support Defeat Terrorist, Transfer From DERF		+11,000		-
	Anti-Biological Weapon Defeat Device, Transfer From DERF		+5,000	+5,000	+5,000
33	**BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY**	**121,751**	**128,251**	**145,451**	**154,951**
	Bottom Anti-reflective Coating		+4,000	+5,000	+4,000
	Massively parallel optical interconnects			+2,000	+1,000
	Wide Bandgap Silicon Carbide semiconductor research		+2,500	+5,000	+3,500
	Gallium Nitride high power microwave switch			+4,000	+2,800
	Improved materials for optical memories			+3,300	+2,000
	Thick film silicon coatings			+3,000	+2,600
	High data rate communications			+5,000	+4,300
	Advanced RF technical development			+4,000	+3,400
	AEOS MWIR adaptive optics			+3,000	+2,600
	Wafer scale (ultra flat) planarization			+5,000	+3,500
	High resolution color imaging			+5,000	+3,500
	PMRF upgrades (TM, RADAR, UPS, THAAD) (moved to line 74)			+25,000	-
	ESPRIT (moved to line 74)			+3,500	-
	Range data monitor (moved to line 74)			+3,500	-
	SHOTS (moved to line 74)			+5,000	-
	Program reduction			-57,600	-
34	**JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT**	**25,420**	**25,420**	**19,420**	**19,420**
	Project 225 execution delays			-6,000	-6,000
35	**AUTOMATIC TARGET RECOGNITION**	**7,404**	**7,404**	**5,604**	**5,604**
	Program delays/execution			-1,800	-1,800
36	**ADVANCED AEROSPACE SYSTEMS**	**246,000**	**253,000**	**235,500**	**241,200**
	Hummingbird Rotary Wing UAV Program [Note: Only to repair/upgrade AV01.]		+2,000		+1,700
	Suborbital Space Launch Operations		+5,000		+2,500
	Execution delays/limit new start growth: tactical imager, optical sensing, and pointing			-10,500	-9,000
37	**CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT**	**249,842**	**266,342**	**271,842**	**275,142**
	Miniature Chemical and Biological Detectors		+2,500		+2,200
	Rapid Response Countermeasures to Biological and Chemical Threats		+9,000		+7,700
	CBRN Threat Test Using Public/Private Assets		+5,000		+3,000
	Bio-adhesion research			+3,000	+1,800
	Advance chemical detector			+6,000	+3,600
	Agroterror prediction and risk assessment			+5,000	+2,000
	High intensity pulsed radiation facility for chem-bio defense			+2,000	+1,400

R-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
	Vaccine stabilization			+3,000	+1,500
	Bioterrorism defense and advanced sensors			+3,000	+2,100
38	**SPECIAL TECHNICAL SUPPORT**	**11,168**	**12,168**	**12,668**	**13,268**
	Data Standards for the Integrated Digital Environment		+1,000		+1,000
	Graphic Oriented Electronic Technical Manuals			+1,500	+1,100
39	**ARMS CONTROL TECHNOLOGY**	**37,646**	**46,646**	**39,146**	**44,446**
	Early Warning Detection Program Using Metal Oxide		+1,000		+1,000
	Innovative Technologies and Equipment to Counter NCB Threat [Note: Only for continuation of an industry-based mercuric iodide research program.]		+5,000		+4,300
	Advance CBRNE Sensor & Information Fusion, Transfer From DERF		+3,000	+3,000	+3,000
	Program delays/execution			-1,500	-1,500
	GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY				
40	**DEMONSTRATIONS**	**25,451**	**66,201**	**91,451**	**119,401**
	Silicone Germanium Technology (DMEA)		+4,000		+2,000
	Homeland Defense Technology Collaboration Center		+3,000		+1,800
	Center for Nanosciences Innovation [Note: only to continue the existing program]		+10,000		+8,750
	Optimizing Electronics for Advanced Controlled Environmental Systems (ACES) [Note: To expand the existing program to integrate high-density electronics with ACES technology]		+8,000		+6,400
	High Power Microelectronics (DMEA)		+4,750		+2,300
	DMS Data Warehouse Solution		+1,000		+1,000
	Advanced Spray Cooling Technology [Note: only to expand existing development efforts to standardize spray cooling hardware and integration processes.]		+10,000		+7,000
	Fuel cell locomotive			+1,000	+1,000
	Computer Assisted Tech Transfer (CATT)			+4,000	+2,800
	Microelectronics testing technology/obsolescence program			+10,000	+7,100
	Ultra-low power battlefield sensors			+25,000	+25,000
	Mini wireless system			+5,000	+7,000
	Vehicle fuel cell program			+10,000	+7,000
	Agile Port Demonstration (CCDOTT)			+5,000	+4,300
	New England Manufacturing Supply Chain			+6,000	+6,000
	Maintainers Remote Logistics Network			[5,000]	+3,500
	Milstar painting and coating pollution prevention				+1,000
41	**STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM**	**60,468**	**68,468**	**49,468**	**54,568**
	National Environmental Education and Training Center		+3,000		+2,600
	Toxic Chemical Cleanup Criteria		+5,000		+2,500
	Program delays/execution			-11,000	-11,000
45	**ADVANCED ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGIES**	**150,400**	**159,900**	**153,900**	**164,500**
	Novel Crystal Growth for Imaging and Communications		+2,000		+1,700
	Microactuator Technology and Integration into MEMS		+2,500		+1,500
	Laser Plasma X-Ray Lithography System		+3,000		+2,600
	Advanced X-Ray Lithography Demonstration		+2,000		+4,000
	Execution delays/limit new start growth: very high speed microsystems and MEMS microcooler			-4,000	-4,000
	Defense Tech-link			+1,500	+1,000
	Advanced Lithography - thin film research			+6,000	+4,200
	Ferrite Diminishing Manufacturing Program			[3,000]	+1,500
	ICP InP Etch Process Module [Note: only for a module at the ARL, Zahl Physical Sciences Laboratory]				+1,600

R-1	Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
ADVANCED CONCEPT TECHNOLOGY				
46 DEMONSTRATIONS	199,580	204,580	204,580	207,880
Portable Radiation Search Tool		+1,000	+5,000	+2,500
Joint US-Norwegian ISSP Secure D		+4,000		+2,800
Homeland Security Command and Control ACTD				+3,000
HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION				
47 PROGRAM	188,642	188,642	217,142	209,642
Missile defense engineering and assessment center			+20,000	+14,000
High performance visualization initiative			+1,500	+1,200
MHPCC			+5,000	+4,300
Simulation center HPC upgrade			+2,000	+1,500
COMMAND, CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS				
48 SYSTEMS	130,101	130,101	120,101	120,101
Execution delays/limit new start growth: battle managers and network effects-based targeting			-10,000	-10,000
49 SENSOR AND GUIDANCE TECHNOLOGY	224,000	234,000	212,000	224,000
Large Millimeter Wavelength Telescope		+10,000	+3,000	+10,000
Execution delays/limit new start growth: NEMESYS, dynamic tactical sensing, and exploitation of precision data			-15,000	-10,000
51 LAND WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	162,100	170,100	170,100	170,100
Support to Homeland Security, Transfer From DERF		+8,000		+8,000
52 CLASSIFIED DARPA PROGRAMS	275,899	294,899	294,899	294,899
Transfer From DERF		+19,000	+19,000	+19,000
DISTRIBUTED LEARNING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY				
53 DEVELOPMENT	14,000	18,000	14,000	16,000
Advanced Distributed Learning Prototypes		+4,000		+2,000
56 QUICK REACTION SPECIAL PROJECTS	25,430	40,430	25,430	25,430
Challenge Program		+15,000		+12,800
Program reduction				-12,800
JOINT WARGAMING SIMULATION MANAGEMENT				
57 OFFICE	49,929	49,929	49,029	48,029
Program delays/execution			-2,900	-2,900
Rapid 3D visualization database			+2,000	+1,000
60 PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	33,553	49,553	43,553	48,853
Classified Security, Transfer From DERF		+10,000	+10,000	+10,000
Under-Vehicle Mobile Inspection System		+5,000		+4,300
Security Enhancement Through Mobile Devices		+1,000		+1,000
61 JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM	11,305	12,305	20,305	20,405
Upgrades to Robotics Technology		+1,000		+1,000
Deployable/mission-oriented robots			+5,000	+5,000
Tactical unmanned ground vehicle			+2,000	+1,400
Unmanned ground vehicles			+2,000	+1,700
62 ADVANCED SENSOR APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	15,994	20,994	12,994	15,994
Active Sensors Components Development for Advanced Tactical Systems		+4,000		+2,000
Multi-Wavelength Surface Scanning Biologics Sensor		+1,000		+1,000
Program delays/execution			-3,000	-3,000
63 CALS INITIATIVE	1,647	1,647	8,647	7,647
CALS			+7,000	+6,000
ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY TECHNICAL				
64 CERTIFICATION PROGRAM	28,334	28,334	21,334	21,334
Program delays/execution			-7,000	-7,000
66 MEADS CONCEPTS - DEM/VAL			69,745	117,745
Transfer from R&D Army			+117,745	+117,745
Program reduction			-48,000	-

R-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
72	**BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM SEGMENT**	**1,065,982**	**1,075,982**	**733,982**	**1,073,282**
	Solid State High Energy Laser Transmitters for LADAR		+5,000		+4,300
	Wide Bandwidth Technology		+5,000		+3,000
	System engineering and integration			-140,000	-
	Additional SE&I and BMC2 Reductions			-202,000	-
	Maintain T&E levels			+10,000	-
73	**BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TERMINAL DEFENSE SEGMENT**	**169,974**	**261,719**	**195,974**	**139,974**
	Transfer of MEADS Program from Army		+117,745	-	-
	Transfer to Sea-based Midcourse				-30,000
	Sea Based Terminal		-90,000	-40,000	-60,000
	Arrow		+64,000	+80,000	+70,000
	Program operations			-14,000	-10,000
74	**BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SEGMENT**	**3,195,104**	**3,195,104**	**3,034,104**	**3,185,504**
	Concept development studies			-2,000	-
	SE&I			-95,000	-
	Transfer from Sea-based Terminal				+30,000
	Transfer of S-band Radar Research to RDTE, Navy				-22,000
	Sea Based Midcourse			-40,000	-40,000
	Program Operations			-24,000	-
	PMRF upgrades (TM, RADAR, UPS, THAAD) (moved from line 33)			-	+21,300
	ESPRIT (moved from line 33)			-	+3,000
	Range data monitor (moved from line 33)			-	+3,000
	SHOTS (moved from line 33)			-	+1,800
	Physical Security - Transfer to National Guard Personnel, Army				-6,700
	Small Kill Vehicle Technology Development			[5,000]	[2,500]
	Advanced Research Center			[20,400]	[20,400]
	Space and Missile Defense Center Simulation Program			[6,200]	[6,200]
	Kauai test facility			[4,000]	[4,000]
75	**BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE BOOST DEFENSE SEGMENT**	**796,927**	**706,927**	**546,927**	**736,927**
	Airborne Laser		-30,000	-135,000	-
	Sea Based Boost		-20,000	-55,000	-
	Space Based Kinetic Energy		-40,000	-30,000	-
	Kinetic Energy Boost				-50,000
	Space-based laser			-10,000	-10,000
	Program operations			-20,000	-
76	**CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - DEM/VAL**	**144,790**	**149,390**	**146,090**	**148,090**
	Miniature Chemical Analysis System, Transfer From DERF		+2,600	+2,600	+2,600
	Enhanced M93A1 FOX Simulation Training Suites		+1,000		+1,000
	Center for Bio-Defense		+1,000		+1,000
	Execution delays			-1,300	-1,300
77	**BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SENSORS**	**373,447**	**304,447**	**340,447**	**359,447**
	RAMOS		-69,000		-26,000
	SBIRS - Low			-43,000	
	Airborne infrared surveillance (AIRS)			+10,000	+5,000
	Program operations			-10,000	
	Ramos solar arrays			+10,000	+7,000
77a	**STRATEGIC CAPABILITY MODERNIZATION (DERF)**			**10,000**	**-**
78	**HUMANITARIAN DEMINING**	**13,355**	**13,355**	**13,355**	**13,355**
79	**COALITION WARFARE**	**12,444**	**7,444**	**6,444**	**6,944**
	Reduction		-5,000		-
	Program delays/execution			-6,000	-5,500

R-1	Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
JOINT SERVICE EDUCATION AND TRAINING				
80 SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			1,000	1,000
Academic advanced distributed learning co-lab			1,000	+1,000
JOINT ELECTROMAGNETIC TECHNOLOGY (JET)				
81 PROGRAM	5,085	5,085	11,085	10,285
HIPAS Observatory			+3,000	+2,600
Delta Mine Training Center			+3,000	+2,600
DEM/VAL TEST AND EVALUATION TRANSFER			-37,000	-
CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM -				
83 EMD	169,018	169,018	174,518	172,318
Laser interrogation of surface agents (LISA)			+5,500	+3,300
84 JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM - EMD	13,643	16,643	28,393	28,543
Defense Robotics Center		+3,000		+1,500
Field Testing Support			+10,000	+10,000
Tactical Mobile Robot			+4,750	+3,400
THEATER HIGH-ALTITUDE AREA DEFENSE SYSTEM -				
87 TMD - EMD	932,171	932,171	892,171	912,171
Excess missile purchases			-40,000	-20,000
PATRIOT PAC-3 THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE				
88 ACQUISITION - EMD	-	180,819	150,819	180,819
Transfer of PAC-3 Program from Army		+150,819	+150,819	+150,819
Additional Testing		+30,000		+30,000
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT-				
93 STANDARD PROCUREMENT	10,427	7,927	7,927	7,927
Schedule Slip		-2,500		-2,500
Production development program delays			-2,500	-
94 FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS	96,250	36,250	96,250	96,250
Transfer to DWCF		-60,000		-
95 DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM	11,803	11,803	11,803	11,803
96 INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	17,620	111,770	103,020	103,770
Secure Bandwidth, Transfer From DERF		+30,000	+30,000	+30,000
Mobile Secure Communications, Transfer From DERF		+20,400	+20,400	+20,400
Classified, Transfer From DERF		+7,000	+7,000	+7,000
NC-2 COMSEC, Transfer From DERF		+10,000	+10,000	+10,000
Coalition Interoperability/Information Security, Transfer From DERF		+18,000	+18,000	+18,000
Computer Science and Internet Security Degree Program		+750		+750
98 ELECTRONIC COMMERCE	24,265	25,765	24,265	25,365
Microelectronics Test & Obsolescence		+1,500		+1,100
EMD TEST AND EVALUATION TRANSFER			-8,000	-
101 TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS	30,023	18,523	30,023	30,023
Reduced in order to fund higher priority items		-11,500		-
103 BLACK LIGHT	5,000	15,000	5,000	15,000
Black Light, Transfer From DERF		+10,000		+10,000
104 GENERAL SUPPORT TO C3I	14,979	19,879	23,979	22,979
DERIS, Transfer From DERF		+2,000		+2,000
CIP - Technology & Consequence Management, Transfer From DERF		+2,900		+2,900
DERF Transfer			+4,900	-
Program delays/execution			-2,900	-2,900
Pacific Disaster Center			+7,000	+6,000
FOREIGN MATERIAL ACQUISITION AND				
105 EXPLOITATION	32,382	32,382	24,482	24,482
Program delays/execution			-7,900	-7,900

R-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
106	INTERAGENCY EXPORT LICENSE AUTOMATION	10,702	1,202	10,702	1,202
	Program Restructure		-9,500		-9,500
108	JOINT THEATER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION	72,919	72,919	64,519	70,419
	Missile defense requirements documents			-2,500	-2,500
	Virtual Warfare Center			-5,900	-
109	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM USD(P)	-	25,000	-	25,000
110	FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING	31,670	31,670	27,970	27,970
	Program delays/execution			-3,700	-3,700
111	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	42,959	47,459	42,959	47,159
	Mobile Chemical Agent Detection for Critical Site Protection		+4,500		+4,200
114	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS - C3I	60,708	137,068	85,108	115,168
	Intel Support to Hard and Deeply Buried Targets, Transfer From DERF		+5,800	+5,800	+5,800
	Classified Program, Transfer From DERF		+9,000		-
	Classified Program, Transfer From DERF		+3,000		-
	NIPC, Transfer From DERF		+1,600	+1,600	+1,600
	Hard and Deeply Buried Targets, Transfer From DERF		+3,200		-
	Intel - IO-21, Transfer From DERF		+4,500		-
	Collaborative Planning Tools, Transfer From DERF		+32,760		+32,760
	Global Infrastructure Data Capture		+9,000		+6,300
	Information Security Scholarships			+10,000	+7,000
	DERF Transfer: Classified program			+7,000	-
	Automated Speech Recognition Technology				+1,000
117	FORCE TRANSFORMATION DIRECTORATE	20,000	20,000		10,000
	Duplication of other DoD programs			-20,000	-10,000
120	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION	48,913	51,913	53,913	51,013
	UAV Long Range Test Range		+3,000		+2,100
	Big Crow test support activities - moved to OT&E			+5,000	-
125	COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT SAVINGS INITIATIVE	10,320	18,320	10,320	15,920
	Aircraft Affordability/Digital PIP		+8,000		+5,600
126	PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE (PFP) INFORMATION	1,920	1,920	2,920	2,920
	Information Systems			+1,000	+1,000
127	C4I INTEROPERABILITY	43,199	47,199	43,199	46,599
	System of Systems Engineering Center [Note: Only for management of the Center by a non-profit corporation in direct support to the USD (AT&L)]		+4,000		+3,400
128	JOINT ANALYTICAL MODEL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	12,531	8,531	10,831	8,531
	Limited Enhancements		-4,000		-4,000
	Program delays/execution			-1,700	-
138	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	394,257	394,257	398,257	403,057
	Protection of Vital Data (POVD)		+8,000		+6,800
	Network, Information and Space Security Center			+4,000	+2,000
	NBSP [Note: Of the funds provided, other than those funds provided for congressional interest items, up to $15,000,000 may be used for the National Biometric Security Program]				
140	C4I FOR THE WARRIOR	20,536	25,036	20,536	20,536
	Interoperability Certification Tests, Transfer From DERF		+4,500		-
141	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	15,604	6,904	22,604	15,604
	Command and Control Systems Review		-8,700		-
146	DEFENSE IMAGERY AND MAPPING PROGRAM	143,488	-	173,638	172,588
	Airborne Integration, Transfer From DERF		+8,300	+8,300	+8,300
	IEC Workstations, Transfer From DERF		+1,000		+1,000
	Libraries Storage, Transfer From DERF		+1,000	+1,000	+1,000
	PGM Targeting Workstations, Transfer From DERF		+1,700	+1,700	+1,700

R-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
	Transfer to NFIP		-155,488		
	Future -level database development			+4,150	+2,100
	Intelligent spatial technologies for smart maps			+1,000	+1,000
	BRITE			+4,000	+2,800
	PIPES			+9,000	+7,700
	DERF transfer: Softcopy exploitation infrastructure			+1,000	-
	Commercial Joint Mapping Tool Kit				+3,500
149	**DEFENSE JOINT COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PROGRAM (JMIP)**	**6,058**	**54,085**	**69,058**	**73,308**
	Counter Intelligence, Transfer From DERF		+48,000		
	Joint Counterintelligence Assessment Group (JCAG)			+15,000	+13,000
	DERF transfer: Advanced info. systems & support for critical asset protection			+48,000	+48,000
	Defense Joint Counterintelligence Center		+7,500		+6,250
150	**C3I INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS**	**75,682**	**128,082**	**123,482**	**124,682**
	Hard and Deeply Buried Targets, Transfer From DERF		+5,800	+3,200	+3,200
	NPR - IO-21, Transfer From DERF		+25,000	+25,000	+25,000
	NPR-IO-14, Transfer From DERF		+9,000	+9,000	+9,000
	Horizontal Fusion Analysis, Transfer From DERF		+5,600	+5,600	+5,600
	Coalition-Intelligence Information Sharing (CENTRIX), Transfer From DERF		+5,000	+5,000	+5,000
	Picket Fence		+2,000		+1,200
151	**TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT**	**120,458**	**263,058**	**202,558**	**263,058**
	Transfer From DERF		+110,500	+50,000	+110,500
	Transfer From DERF		+32,100	+32,100	+32,100
154	**MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS**	**4,649**	**9,649**	**4,649**	**7,249**
	RC-135 COMBAT SENT [Note: Only for modifications to incorporate high-bandwidth datalink to upgrade data distribution.]		+5,000		+2,600
159	**TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES**	**113,159**	**113,159**	**115,159**	**113,159**
	DERF Transfer			+2,000	-
161	**NATIONAL SECURITY SPACE ARCHITECT (NSSA)**	**11,185**	**11,185**	**6,185**	**11,185**
	Program reduction			-5,000	-
162	**INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS**	**13,072**	**35,072**	**19,072**	**33,072**
	Laser Additive Manufacturing Initiative		+4,000	+6,000	+6,000
	Defense Supply Chain Technology Program		+14,000		+12,000
	Twelve Screw Extruder for Fuel Cell Technology		+4,000		+2,000
166	**SPECIAL OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY**	**6,741**	**13,741**	**6,741**	**10,241**
	Spike Urban Warfare System		+7,000		+3,500
167	**SPECIAL OPERATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT**	**62,276**	**38,776**	**62,276**	**65,876**
	Advanced Tactical Laser ACTD		-39,500		-7,500
	Foreign Language Translator-Special Operations		+1,000		1,000
	Robot Reconnaissance and Surveillance		+1,000		1,000
	Adaptive Deployable Sensor Suite		+9,000		4,800
	Night Vision Fusion and Rapid Transmission		+3,000		2,600
	Short Wave Infrared Imagers		+2,000		1,700
168	**SPECIAL OPERATIONS TACTICAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT**	**281,443**	**342,943**	**278,143**	**329,043**
	Underwater Systems Advanced Development		+22,500		21,000
	Leading Enhanced Digital Geodata Environment (EDGE)		+3,000		1,500
	Rebreather [Note: Only to continue development of state of the art military closed-circuit rebreather applications.]		+1,500		1,300
	SOCOM Rotary Wing UAV (ICW existing DARPA program) [Note: Only to continue and expand SOCOM deployment and testing of rotary wing UAV systems.]		+26,000		22,100
	Mark V Computer Upgrade		+1,000		1,000
	Knowledge Superiority for Transitional Warfighter		+2,000		1.700

R-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
	Blue Force Tracking Equipment		+2,500		2,200
	Imaging Micro-Sensors for Autonomous Vehicles		+2,000		1,700
	Large Format Uncooled Infrared Sensors		+1,000		1,000
	Execution delays			-12,200	-12,200
	Joint Threat Warning System			+1,800	1,300
	Precision Target Locator Designator (PTLD)			+4,100	3,500
	TACNAV light vehicle-mounted land nav system			+3,000	1,500
	Reconnaissance Surveillance Target Acquisition System			[2,000]	-
	SPECIAL OPERATIONS INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS				
169	**DEVELOPMENT**	**1,590**	**27,590**	**2,590**	**27,590**
	Classified Program, Transfer From DERF		+25,000		+24,000
	Optimal Placement of Unattended Sensors		+1,000		+1,000
	Embedded IBS receivers			+1,000	+1,000
170	**SOF MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT**	**1,962**	**2,212**	**1,962**	**2,212**
	Special Operations Medical Diagnostic System		+250		+250
171	**SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS**	**77,308**	**81,308**	**112,308**	**88,208**
	Integrated Command and Control System		+4,000		+2,400
	Fusion goggle system			+5,000	+3,500
	Nano-technology research			+5,000	+5,000
	DERF Transfer: Classified program			+25,000	-
	STRATEGIC CAPABILITY MODERNIZATION		**+125,000**	**-**	**20,000**
	OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT T&E TRANSFER			**-25,000**	**-**
999	**CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS**	**2,534,247**	**2,715,485**	**2,458,097**	**2,552,747**
			+181,238	-76,150	+18,500

CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE

The conferees agree to establish a ''Chem-bio Defense Initiatives Fund'' within the Department of Defense's Chemical and Biological Defense program, and provide an increase of $25,000,000 for this purpose. The Secretary of Defense is directed to allocate these funds among the program proposals listed below in a manner which yields the greatest gain in our chem-bio defensive posture. The program proposals to be considered are:

The National Center for Biodefense;
Chem-bio Threat Mitigation technologies;
Global Pathogen Science Portal;
Advanced Sensors for Chem-bio Agents;
Rapid Sensitive Biowarfare Protection;
Diagnostic Tool for Biowarfare;
Ultra-High Field Instrumentation;
Urban Security Initiative;
Chemical Imaging Biothreat Detection;
Biological Agent Sensor/Detection System;
Chem-bio Air Filtration System;
Food Safety and Security Sensors;
Bioinformatics;
Phylogenetic- and PCR-based Detector System
Field Portable Nucleic Acid Bioterrorism Detection;
LISA-Inspector Transportable Chem-bio Detection System;
Distributed Chemical Agent Sensing and Transmission;
Wide-Area Standoff Chem-bio Agent Detection System;
Air Purification for Protection System;
Rapid Antibody-based Countermeasures;
Oral Anthrax Antibiotic;
Plant Vaccine Development;
Rapid Response Sensor Networking for Multiple Applications; and
Chemical Biological Incident Response Force (CBIRF).

ANTHRAX VACCINE SUPPLY PREPAREDNESS

The conferees are concerned about the adequacy of the supply and production capacity for the only FDA-licensed anthrax vaccine currently available in the U.S. to protect our military and civilian defense personnel from the demonstrated and potential future threat of anthrax. The Secretary of Defense is directed to provide a report which assesses the immediate and short-term preparedness and potential future total biowarfare defense need for the FDA-licensed anthrax vaccine, the potential need for expanded production capacity to mitigate risks of an event which could result in a halt to current vaccine production. The Secretary shall submit this report to the congressional defense committees within 90 days after enactment of this Act.

CHRONIC MULTI-SYMPTOM ILLNESSES

The conferees have provided $5,200,000 to extend research on chronic multi-symptom illnesses with a special focus on the relationship between Gulf War Illnesses and other diseases, fibromyalgia, chronic fatigue syndrome, and multiple chemical sensitivity. Within this amount up to $2,000,000 may be made available for research in the Upper Great Plains Region.

MEDICAL FREE ELECTRON LASER

The conferees agree that the work the universities are doing in conjunction with the Department of Defense to develop the medical free electron laser is vital to address a wide variety of research problems that are important to military personnel and civilian populations. The conferees provide $12,000,000 to continue research within the Department of Defense for this program and expect that these funds, along with any associated out-year funding, be retained within the Department of Defense.

BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE

The conferees agree to provide a total of $7,387,856,000 for ballistic missile defense research and development and related procurement activities. This reflects a reduction of $14,400,000 from the President's request and transfers to other accounts totaling $28,700,000.

Last year the conferees provided guidance in the Statement of Managers accompanying the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2002 regarding special interest projects, budget justification material and reprogrammings. The conferees agree to sustain that guidance and, unless exceptions to the countrary are provided explicitly, expect the Department to continue abiding by this guidance in the future.

RADAR RESEARCH

The conferees agree to transfer $22,00,000 from the Missile Defense Agency's sea-based midcourse program to the Navy (PE 0604307N) only for the development of Solid State S-Band radar. In addition, the conferees agree that $10,000,000 in sea-based midcourse funds shall be made available for radar development, the exact technology to be decided by the agency after a careful consideration of relevant radar options.

SEA-BASED X-BAND RADER

Subsequent to submission of the budget for fiscal year 2003, the Missile Defense Agency proposed acquisition of a sea-based X-band radar, in lieu of the land based concept previously funded by Congress. At this juncture, the conferees have little insight about the technical and cost feasibility of this initiative, or about the impact of this change on the schedule and test plan for the ground based mid-course segment. On that basis, the conferees direct that none of the funds provided for the ground based mid-course segment program may be obligated to acquire the proposed, foreign built sea-based platform until 30 days after the Director of the Missile Defense Agency provides a report to the congressional defense committees on the cost and schedule impact of this approach, including a comparison to the cost and capability of the previously proposed land based site and the technical criteria used to determine that a sea/based platform will provide effective test and operational performance for the missile defense system.

TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION PROGRAMS

The conferees agree to provide $25,430,000 for technology transition efforts, including the Challenge program, the Quick Reaction Special Projects program, and the Technology Transition Initiative. Of this amount, $12,800,000 shall be used only to fund the Challenge program. The remainder shall be allocate between the other listed programs, at the discretion of the Secretary of Defense. The Secretary is directed to provide to the congressional defense committees a report detailing his funding allocation decisions with the submission of the fiscal year 2004 Defense budget request.

HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES SCIENCE

The conferees direct the Department of Defense to evaluate the programmatic impact of combining funding and administration for the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Science program, the Hispanic Serving Institutions program, and American Indian Tribal Colleges program under a new program element.

The Department shall provide a report to the congressional defense committees on the results of this evaluation within 120 days of enactment of this legislation.

ADVANCED SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICES

The conferees recommend that the Department of defense conduct a study to examine the long-term DoD acquisition model for advanced semiconductor devices used in military and intelligence applications. This study should address whether a consolidated U.S. semiconductor foundry could offer the U.S. Government a solution to the impending advanced technology procurement challenge. The Department is encouraged to make this study a high priority so that a preliminary assessment can be available by December 2002.

JOINT ROBOTICS

Based on reports received from the Department of Defense and U.S. military field commanders, the conferees agree the Department should proceed expeditiously to test, produce, and field technologically mature robots and other unmanned vehicles for use in combat. As such, the conferees recommend a total increase of $24,000,000 for the Joint Robotics program. Further, the conferees strongly encourage the Department to retain oversight of this program under the Office of the Secretary of Defense, given the applicability of robots to numerous joint and combined combat missions.

STRATETIC CAPABILITY MODERNIZATION

The conference agreement includes $20,000,000 to fund the Department of Defense Strategic Capability Modernization program. The Department shall give priority to upgrading command and control systems and related Strategic Command communication systems in the use of these funds.

INFORMATION SYSTEMS ENGINEERING

The conferees remain interested in the Department of Defense providing a greater focus on its information systems engineering (ISE) effort. This effort is important to enabling the engineering of large-scale information systems for transformation to network-centric operations. Thus, the conferees direct DARPA to continue its efforts to pursue and support ISE research. The conferees urge that the expertise of ICICX and others be used to assist in developing and implementing new management strategies, consistent with the recommendations of the President's Information Technology Advisory Committee.

HOMELAND SECURITY COMMAND AND CONTROL ADVANCED CONCEPT TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION

The conferees recommend $3,000,000 for the Homeland Security Command and Control Advanced Concept Technology Demonstration for upgrades to communication and display equipment, and subsequent demonstrations and spiral development at the C2 nodes in Louisiana.

OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

	(In thousands of dollars)			
	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE				
ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT				
TEST & EVALUATION SCIENCE TECHNOLOGY	6,010	6,010	10,010	8,810
TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	6,010	6,010	10,010	8,810
RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT				
CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT (CT	123,276	128,276	194,276	126,776
OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION	19,725	28,725	19,725	27,325
LIVE FIRE TESTING	10,102	16,102	15,602	16,202
DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION	62,941	62,941	62,941	66,441
TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	216,044	236,044	292,544	236,744
TOTAL, OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE	222,054	242,054	302,554	245,554

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS

[In thousands of dollars]

R-1		Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
1	**TEST & EVALUATION SCIENCE TECHNOLOGY**	**6,010**	**6,010**	**10,010**	**+8,810**
	Test and Evaluation Science and Technology			+4,000	+2,800
2	**CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT (CT**	**123,276**	**128,276**	**194,276**	**+126,776**
	Digital Video Laboratory		+5,000		+2,500
	T&E Transfers from DOD-Wide Acquisition programs			+70,000	-
	Joint Directed Energy Combat Operations and Employment (JDECOE)			+1,000	+1,000
3	**OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION**	**19,725**	**28,725**	**19,725**	**+27,325**
	Legacy Systems Information Assurance		+9,000		+7,600
4	**LIVE FIRE TESTING**	**10,102**	**16,102**	**15,602**	**+16,202**
	Live Fire Test and Training Initiative Program		+6,000	+4,000	+5,000
	Reality Fire Fighting/Homeland Security Training			+1,500	+1,100
5	**DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION**	**62,941**	**62,941**	**62,941**	**+66,441**
	Big Crow Test Support Activities - Moved from RDTE, D-W, line 120				+3,500

TITLE V—REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

The conference agreement provides $1,784,956,000 for Defense Working Capital Funds, instead of $1,832,956,000 as proposed by the House.

NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND

The conferees agree to provide $942,629,000 for the National Defense Sealift Fund, an increase of $8,500,000 to the budget request. The conferees also agree that the additional funds provided are only to finance the cost of constructing additional sealift capacity.

TITLE VI – OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS

The conference agreement is as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
Defense Health Program	14,579,997	14,600,748	14,961,497	14,843,542
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army	1,490,199	1,490,199	1,490,199	1,490,199
Drug Interdiction and Counter Drug Activities, Defense	848,907	859,907	916,107	881,907
Office of the Inspector General	157,165	157,165	157,165	157,165
Total, Other Department of Defense Programs	17,076,268	17,108,019	17,524,968	17,372,813

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
Operation and Maintenance	**14,234,041**	**13,916,791**	**14,283,041**	**14,100,386**
In-House Care	**3,999,451**	**4,036,701**	**4,048,451**	**4,051,796**
Madigan Army Medical Trauma Center		1,000		1,000
White River Junction-Fort Ethan Allen Community Out Patient Clinic		500		500
Defense and Veterans Head Injury Program		3,000	3,000	3,000
Amputee Care Center of Excellence at Walter Reed		3,000		2,550
Vaccine Healthcare Center Network at Walter Reed		3,000		2,550
Shared BL-3 Biocontainment Research Facility		500		500
Optimization		25,000		0
Betances Health Center (Note: Only to support the restoration of health care services at the Betances community health center (a federally qualified health center) lost due to the September 11 terrorist attack.)		500		500
Chiropractic Initiative		750		750
Automated Clinical Practices Guidelines			7,500	6,375
Tri-Service Nursing Research Program			6,000	6,000
Pacific Island Health Care Referral Program			5,000	4,500
Alaska Federal Health Care Network			2,500	2,125
Graduate School of Nursing			2,500	2,495
Brown Tree Snakes			1,000	1,000
Health Study at the Iowa Army Ammunition Plant			1,000	1,000
Critical Infrastructure Protection (Transfer from DERF)			500	500
Outcomes Management Initiative			10,000	8,500
Digital Access and Analysis of Historic Records at AFIP			10,000	8,500
Center for Disaster and Humanitarian Assistance Medicine (USUHS)			[960]	[960]
Private Sector Care	**7,159,674**	**6,805,174**	**7,159,674**	**6,973,674**
TRICARE cost estimates		-354,500		-186,000
Consolidated Health Care Support	**795,358**	**795,358**	**795,358**	**795,358**
Information Management	**655,019**	**655,019**	**655,019**	**655,019**
Management Activities	**217,896**	**217,896**	**217,896**	**217,896**
Education and Training	**343,952**	**343,952**	**343,952**	**343,952**
Base Operations/Communications	**1,062,691**	**1,062,691**	**1,062,691**	**1,062,691**
Procurement	**278,742**	**283,743**	**284,242**	**284,242**
Deployable Medical Systems (DEPMEDS) (Note: Only for the Army Reserve.)		5,001		0
High Energy Linear Accelerator/Cardiac Catheter Lab (Keesler Air Force Base)			5,500	5,500

	Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	**67,214**	**400,214**	**394,214**	**458,914**
Army Peer-Reviewed Breast Cancer Research Program		150,000	150,000	150,000
Army Peer-Reviewed Prostate Cancer Research Program		85,000	85,000	85,000
Chronic Mylogenous Leukemia Research		5,000		4,250
Comprehensive Breast Care Project (CBCP) (Note: Only for the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences to continue on-going efforts among Walter Reed Army Medical Center, an appropriate non-profit medical foundation, and a rural primary health care center.)		15,000		12,750
Coronary and Prostate Disease Reversal Program (Note: Only for the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences to continue on-going effort among Walter Reed Army Medical Center, an appropriate non-profit medical foundation, and a rural primary health care center.)		6,000		5,100
Global HIV/AIDS Prevention		10,000		7,000
HIV Research Program		9,000		6,300
Hyperbaric Oxygen Therapy for Cerebral Palsy		1,000		1,000
Military Complementary & Alternative Medicine (Mil-Cam)		2,000		2,000
Muscular Dystrophy Research		4,000		3,400
Neuroscience Research (Note: Only for coordinated effort among DOD medical treatment facilities, the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, a primary healthcare center, with funding management accomplished by the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences.)		7,000		5,950
Nursing Telehealth Research Program		3,000		2,550
Ovarian Cancer Research Program		10,000	10,000	10,000
Peer Reviewed Breast Cancer Imaging Research		10,000		6,000
Periscopic Surgery Research Project		3,000		2,550
Post-Polio Syndrome (Note: Only for a coordinated effort among the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, an appropriate non-profit medical foundation, and a primary health care system, with funding management accomplished by the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences.)		4,000		3,400
Tuberous Sclerosis Complex (TSC) Research (Note: Only for Tuberous Sclerosis Complex research to better understand the role and function of proteins produced by the TSC1 and TSC2 tumor suppressor genes.)		4,000		2,000
U.S. Military Cancer Institute at Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences		3,000		2,550
Veterans Collaborative Care Model Program		2,000		1,700
Medical Error Demonstration Project				1,500
Peer Reviewed Medical Research Program			50,000	50,000
Hawaii Federal Health Care Network			22,000	19,700
Clinical Coupler Integration			10,000	7,000
Operation and Maintenance	14,234,041	13,916,791	14,283,041	14,100,386
Procurement	278,742	283,743	284,242	284,242
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	67,214	400,214	394,214	458,914
Total	**14,579,997**	**14,600,748**	**14,961,497**	**14,843,542**

DHP REPROGRAMMING PROCEDURES

The conferees share the concerns expressed in the report accompanying the House version of the Department of Defense Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2003 regarding the diversion of funds from DoD military medical treatment facilities (MTFs) to pay for contractor-provided medical care. To limit such transfers within the Defense Health Program operation and maintenance account, the conferees agree that the Department of Defense shall follow prior approval reprogramming procedures for transfers with a cumulative value in excess of $25,000,000 into the Private Sector Care activity group.

In addition, the conferees agree that the Department of Defense shall provide budget execution data for all of the Defense Health Program accounts. Such budget execution data shall be provided quarterly to the congressional defense committees through the DD–COMP(M) 1002.

PEER REVIEWED MEDICAL RESEARCH PROGRAM

The Senate recommended $50,000,000 for a Peer Reviewed Medical Research program. The conferees agree to provide $50,000,000 for this program, and recommend the following projects as candidates for study: acellular matrix research for military orthopedic trauma; alcoholism research; amyotrophic lateral sclerosis; and anti-diarrhea supplement; Army nutrition research; augmented care in the chain of stroke survival (ACCESS); blood-related cancer research; bone-related disease research; cell response to anti-cancer agents; Mt. Sinai cancer research program; casualty care research center; chiropractic care; epilepsy; infectious disease tracking system; interstitial cystitis research; low vision research; medical digital assistance; miniature renal assist devices; natural toxin detection technology; neuroscience research; Paget's disease; personal intelligent medical assistant; Providence cancer center; respiratory research; smoking cessation; social work research; and Volume Angio CAT (VAC) research.

CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, ARMY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or Senate is as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, ARMY CHEM DEMILITARIZATION—O&M	974,238	974,238	974,238	974,238
CHEM DEMILITARIZATION—PROC	213,278	213,278	213,278	213,278
CHEM DEMILITARIZATION—RDTE	302,683	302,683	302,683	302,683
TOTAL, CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, ARMY	1,490,199	1,490,199	1,490,199	1,490,199

DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES DEFENSE

The conference agreement includes $881,907,000 for ''Drug Interdiction and Counter-drug Activities, Defense'' as opposed to $859,907,000 as proposed by the House and $916,107,000 as proposed by the Senate. Adjustments to the budget request are as follows:

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS

[In thousands of dollars]

	House	Senate	Conference
Recommended Increases:			
SOUTHCOM Reconnaissance UAV Counter-drug Initiative	15,100		0
National Counter-narcotics Training Center, Hammer	1,000		1,000
Indiana National Guard Counter-drug Activities	1,000		1,000
Nevada National Guard CD RAID Counter-drug Program	2,000		1,000
Florida National Guard Counter-drug Port Initiative	2,500		2,100
Southwest Border Fence	6,700		4,700
Multi-jurisdictional Counter-drug Task Force Training	5,000		4,300
Southwest Anti-drug Border States Initiative	5,000		4,300
Tethered Aerostat Radar System at Morgan City, LA	4,000		2,200
C–26 Counter-drug Electro Optical Sensor Upgrades	6,200		5,200
Young Marines Program	1,500	2,500	1,500
Kentucky National Guard Counter-drug Activities	1,000	3,600	2,600
Northeast Counter-drug Training Center	8,000	5,000	6,800
Tennessee National Guard Counter-drug Activities	1,000	1,000	1,000
National Guard Counter-drug Support		35,000	20,000
OH–58 RAID EO/IR upgrades; ANG		4,000	2,400
Alaska National Guard Counter-drug Program		3,000	2,700
West Virginia National Guard Counter-drug Program		3,500	3,000
Regional Counter-drug Training Academy, Mississippi		2,000	1,400
Hawaii Counter-drug Activities		3,000	2,700
NGB-Counter-drug Technology Consortium		2,600	1,800
P–3 Counter-drug EO/IR Upgrades		2,000	1,000
Midwest Regional Counter-drug Training		5,000	3,500
Recommended Reductions:			
Tethered Aerostat Radar System Procurement	−5,000	−5,000	−5,000
DEA Support	−1,300		−1,300
Transit Zone Maritime Patrol Aircraft	−9,000		−4,000

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	House	Senate	Conference
Riverine Training Deployments	−1,000		−1,000
TAC OPS Support	−1,800		−1,000
T–AGOS	−13,000		−13,000
Classified	−17,900		−17,900

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

The conferees agree to provide $157,165,000, as proposed by both the House and Senate, for the Office of the Inspector General. Of this amount $155,165,000 shall be for operation and maintenance, and $2,000,000 shall be for procurement.

TITLE VII—RELATED AGENCIES

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM FUND

The conferees agree to provide $222,500,000 for CIARDS instead of $212,000,000 as proposed by both the House and Senate.

INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT

The conferees agree to provide $163,479,000, of which $34,100,000 is for transfer to the Department of Justice, instead of 162,254,000 as proposed by the House and $122,754,000 as proposed by the Senate.

PAYMENT TO KAHO'OLAWE ISLAND CONVEYANCE, REMEDIATION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FUND

The conference agreement provides $75,000,000 for payment to the Kaho'olawa Island Conveyance, Remediation, and Environmental Restoration Fund, instead of $25,000,000 as proposed by the House and $80,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL SECURITY EDUCATION TRUST FUND

The conferees agree to provide $8,000,000 as proposed by both the House and the Senate.

TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

The conference agreement incorporated general provisions of the House and Senate versions of the bill which were not amended. Those general provisions that were amended in conference follow:

The conferees included a general provision (Section 8005) which amends lanaguage providing transfer authority of $2,000,000,000; requires a request for multiple reprogramming to be made prior to May 31, 2003; and provides additional fiscal year 2002 transfer authority.

The conferees included a general provision (Section 8021) which amends language to clarify the original intent that incentives authorized in the Indian Financing Act be applied broadly. The conferees expect these adjustments will be implemented expeditiously by the publication of an interim final rule.

The conferees included a general provision (Section 8029) which amends language directing that not more than 6,321 staff years may be funded, and reduces the amount appropriated for defense FFRDCs by $74,200,000.

The conferees included a general provision (Section 8050) that amends lanaguage recommending rescissions. The recissions agreed to are:

	(Rescissions)
Fiscal Year 2001:	
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army C2V	$9,500,000
Procurement of Ammunition, Army: WAM	4,000,000
Other Procurement, Army: Semitrailers, Tankers	8,000,000
Other Procurement, Navy: JTCTS	5,000,000
Missile Procurement, Air Force: Titan	93,600,000
Fiscal Year 2002:	
Missile Procurement, Army:	
Stinger	5,150,000
Avenger Mods	10,000,000
TOW Fire and Forget	13,200,000
LOSAT	9,300,000
Procurement of Ammunition, Army: RADAM	19,000,000
Other Procurement, Army:	
Combat Identification Program	11,000,000
Spares—EHF Terminal	10,200,000
Missile Procurement, Air Force:	
MALD	8,900,000
JSOW–B	18,000,000
Titan	87,700,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy:	
Naval T&E Airborne Telemetry System	1,700,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force:	
B–1B DSUP	45,500,000
B–2 EHF SATCOM	23,500,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide:	
Towed Decoy	3,000,000

	(Rescissions)
Combat Development Activities	4,000,000
VSWMMCM–SAHRV	1,500,000
Passive RW Survivability	1,000,000
Chemical and Biological Defense Program	10,000,000

(Note: The conferees agree to rescind Titan funding in fiscal year 2001 and fiscal year 2002 budgeted for program closeout and facilities shutdown. The conferees note that launch delays have deferred the last Titan launch to fiscal year 2005. The conferees believe it is more appropriate to budget for these activities in the year of performance. The conferees have made no adjustments to funds budgeted for special termination costs.)

The conferees included a general provision (Section 8065) which amends language limiting the use of funds. The amended provision includes a government-wide appropriations limitation intended by the conferees to protect the status of a national memorial established under Section 8137 of Public Law 107–117.

The conferees included a general provision (Section 8095) which amends language making funds available for the Arrow Missile Defense Program.

The conferees included a general provision (Section 8099) which amends House language providing $1,700,000 for the Fisher House Foundation, Inc.

The conferees included a new general provision (Section 8100) which amends Senate language which reduces funds available by $850,000,000 to reflect savings to be achieved from efficiencies in the procurement of advisory and assistance services.

The conferees included a general provision (Section 8101) which amends language which allows the Secretary of Defense to transfer $1,279,899,000 to fund increases in the cost of prior year shipbuilding programs.

The conferees included a general provision (Section 8105) which restores and amends a fiscal year 2002 provision which, for the period of fiscal years 2003 through 2005, provides the authority to transfer $20,000,000 of unobligated balances in ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army'' to a current year account only for the continuation of the Army Venture Capital Fund demonstration.

The conferees included a general provision (Section 8108) which amends Senate language appropriating $7,750,000 to provide assistance by grant or otherwise to public schools that have unusually high concentrations of special needs military dependents enrolled.

The conferees included a new general provision (Section 8109) which amends Senate language which reduces funds available by $400,000,000 for cost growth in information technology development.

The conferees included a new general provision (section 8112) which amends House language reducing funds available in operation and maintenance accounts by $120,000,000 for Working Capital Fund cash balance and rate stabilization adjustments.

The conferees included a new general provision (Section 8113) which amends House language reducing funds available in operation and maintenance accounts by $48,000,000 for excess funded carryover.

The conferees included a new general provision (Section 8114) which amends Senate language providing funds for combating terrorism. The conferees note that the conference agreement includes funds in title II, Operation and Maintenance, above those requested by the President for the service, Defense-Wide, and Reserve component operation and maintenance appropriations. This includes funds specifically requested in the Defense Emergency Response Fund for combating terrorism and related activities, which in this conference agreement have been provided in the operation and maintenance appropriations for proper execution. The provision provides that not less than $1,000,000,000 of these funds are available for operations of the Department of Defense to prosecute the war on terrorism. The conferees direct that these funds be executed as specifically delineated elsewhere in this statement.

The conferees included a new general provision (Section 8115) that amends House language which provides $3,400,000 in ''Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard'' funds for a grant to the Center for Military Recruitment, Assessment and Veterans Employment.

The conferees included a new general provision (Section 8117) that amends Senate language amending Section 8159 of Public Law 107–117.

The conferees included a new general provision (Section 8118) that amends House language placing limitations on additional NMCI contract work stations until an Operational Assessment has been conducted and certified as acceptable to the congressional defense committees.

The conferees included a new general provision (Section 8119) which amends House language which prohibits acquisition of more than 16 F–22 aircraft until the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics provides a risk assessment to the congressional defense committees.

The conferees included a new general provision (Section 8120) which amends House language that allows for the transfer of funds from the Pentagon Reservation Maintenance Revolving Fund to the Defense Emergency Response Fund.

The conferees included a new general provision (Section 8121) which amends House language concerning development of the Non-Line of Sight (NLOS) Objective Force cannon and resupply vehicle program. Language directs the Army to implement an interim capability before complete fielding of the Objective Force, and ensure that budgetary and programmatic plans will provide for no fewer than six Stryker Brigade Combat Teams.

The conferees included a new general provision (Section 8123) which amends House language that limits expenditure of funds until certain audit decisions have been made.

The conferees included a general provisions (Section 8126) which amends Senate language making funds available from amounts appropriated in Public Law 107–206 under the heading ''DEFENSE EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND'', for an amount up to the fair market value of the leasehold interest in adjacent properties necessary for the force protection requirements of Tooele Army Depot, Utah.

The conferees included a general provision (Section 8128) which amends Senate language providing $3,000,000 of ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'' funds for impact aid for children with severe disabilities.

The conferees included a general provision (Section 8129) which amends Senate language appropriating $8,100,000 for grants to the American Red Cross, the United Service Organizations, Inc., and the Intrepid Sea-Air-Space Foundation.

The conferees included a new general provision (Section 8135) that amends Senate language which reduces available funds by $1,674,000,000 to reflect savings from revised economic assumptions.

The conferees included a new general provision (Section 8140) which amends Senate language which earmarks $3,000,000 of funds available in this Act for a grant to the National D-Day Museum.

The conferees included a new general provision (Section 8144) which amends Senate language authorizing that up to September 30, 2003, the President may waive conditions described in section 1305 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65; 22 U.S.C. 5952 note) if the President submits to Congress a written certification meeting several criteria.

The conferees included a new general provision (Section 8145) which amends Senate language amending sections 305 and 309 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act for Fiscal year 2002 (Public Law 107–206).

The conferees included a new general provision (Section 8146) which amends Senate language amending section 310 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–206) modifying a grant for the purpose of supporting community adjustment activities relating to the closure of a Naval Security Group Activity.

The conferees included a general provision (Section 8148) which amends Senate language which provides $5,000,000 of ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'' funds for operation of domestic violence fatality review teams.

The conferees included a general provision (Section 8149) which limits the issuance of government purchase and travel charge cards for Department of Defense personnel. The provision requires the Secretary of Defense to conduct a credit check before issuing to an individual a charge card, and prohibits the issuance of a charge card to an individual who is not found credit worthy. The conferees understand that this provision allows an individual with no credit history to be issued a restricted-use charge, debit, or stored value card.

The conferees included a new general provision (Section 8150) which amends Senate language directing the Secretary of the Navy to transfer administrative jurisdiction of the law enforcement training facility at the former Charleston Naval Base.

The conferees included a new title IX which provides the Secretary of Defense the authority to make loan guarantees to eligible U.S. commercial providers for the purpose of producing commercial reusable inspace transportation services or systems.

CONFERENCE TOTAL—WITH COMPARISONS

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 2003 recommended by the Committee of Conference, with comparisons to the fiscal year 2002 amount, the 2003 budget estimates, and the House and Senate bills for 2003 follow:

[In thousands of dollars]

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2002	$334,239,062
Budget estiimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2003	366,671,630
House bill, fiscal year 2003	354,712,914
Senate bill, fiscal year 2003	355,405,941
Conference agreement, fiscal year 2003	355,107,380
Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2002	+20,868,318
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2003	−11,564,250
House bill, fiscal year 2003	+394,466
Senate bill, fiscal year 2003	−298,561

JERRY LEWIS,
BILL YOUNG,
JOE SKEEN,
DAVE HOBSON,
HENRY BONILLA,
GEORGE R. NETHERCUTT, Jr.,
RANDY ''DUKE'' CUNNINGHAM,
RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN,
TODD TIAHRT,
JOHN P. MURTHA,
NORMAN D. DICKS,
MARTIN OLAV SABO,
PETER J. VISCLOSKY,
JAMES P. MORAN,
DAVE R. OBEY
(Except for sec. 8149 relating to corporate expatriates),
Managers on the Part of the House.

DANIEL K. INOUYE,
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
PATRICK J. LEAHY,
TOM HARKIN,
BYRON L. DORGAN,
RICHARD J. DURBIN,
HARRY REID,
DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
HERB KOHL,
TED STEVENS,
THAD COCHRAN,
ARLEN SPECTER,
PETE V. DOMENICI,
CHRISTOPHER S. BOND,
MITCH MCCONNELL,
RICHARD C. SHELBY,
JUDD GREGG,
KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ RESOLUTION OF 2002

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, any nation engaged in a program of building weapons of mass destruction presents a danger to international peace and stability. Any leader who flouts the rule of law is a menace to liberty and democracy.

In my mind, the President has made a strong case that Iraq must disarm, pursuant to the United Nations resolutions enacted following the close of the Persian Gulf War. But the President did not convince me that we should go to war and go it alone, nor has he made the case that we should change our longstanding policy and defy international law and commit to a first strike.

The threat posed by Iraq is a threat which confronts the entire world, not just America. This resolution before us gives the President authorization to send American troops into Iraq to strike unilaterally and, indeed, to strike first. Congress has never before granted this extraordinary power to any previous President. We can address the threat posed by Saddam Hussein without expanding Presidential authority beyond constitutional standards.

A declaration of war is the ultimate act of humankind. It presumes to endow the declarant with the right to kill. In many instances, it amounts to a sentence of death, not just for the guilty but for the innocent as well, whether civilian or soldier. In measurable respects, that is why the Framers of our Constitution wisely assigned the power to commit America to war not to the President but to the people's democratic representatives in Congress.

The President should approach Congress and ask for a declaration of war when and only when he determines that war is unavoidable. The resolution before us leaves the question of war open-ended by both expressing support for diplomacy and authorizing the President to use force when he feels it is the correct course of action. Yet, in his own words, President Bush stated that ''war is not unavoidable.'' So why, then, is he insisting on being given now, today, the power to go to war?

We are the lone superpower economically and militarily in the world. Our words have meaning, our actions have consequences beyond what we can see.

The implications of a unilateral first strike authorization for war are chilling. A unilateral attack could lead the world into another dangerous era of polarization and create worldwide instability. It would also set a dangerous precedent that could have a devastating impact on international norms.

Consider India and Pakistan, Armenia and Azerbaijan, Russia and Chechnya, Cyprus, Taiwan, Colombia, Northern Ireland, Central Africa. How might the people or the government in any of these countries which are engaged in or at the brink of hostilities interpret this resolution today? Why should not other countries adopt the President's unilateral and first strike policy to address conflicts or threats themselves? Would not a unilateral attack galvanize other potential enemies around the globe to strike at the United States and our interests?

In our efforts to focus on what the President described as a grave and gathering danger thousands of miles away in Iraq, let us not lose sight of the dangers which are grave and present, not gathering but present, here at home: the al Qaeda plots targeting our airports, our water treatment facilities, our nuclear power plants, our agricultural crops.

Just this Tuesday, CIA director George Tenet told Congress that Saddam Hussein, if provoked by fears that an attack by the United States was imminent, might help Islamic extremists launch an attack on the United States with weapons of mass destruction. We must consider how our actions may impact on the safety of the American people. The answer may not be always what we expect.

We must also ask, will the death and destruction it takes to eliminate a sovereign, albeit rogue government, lead to good will by the Iraqi people toward America and Americans?

Well, let us look at the record. During the Gulf War of 1999, we dropped some 250,000 bombs, many of them smart bombs, over a 6-week period on Iraqi forces. That is close to 6,000 bombs per day. We deployed over 500,000 troops. The war cost over $80 billion. None of that money was spent on reconstruction in Kuwait, and all of this is what it took simply to expel Iraq from tiny Kuwait.

And what is our, and for that matter the world's, recent record on supporting post-war reconstruction? Ask the people of Bosnia and of Kosovo, and now ask the Afghanis.

Certainly there are situations where the United States must prepare or be prepared to act alone. I voted in September, 2001, to give the President that power to punish those who attacked this Nation on September 11. But the question is, are we at the point on the question of Iraq to go to war without international support?

Mr. Speaker, the President was clear in his speech on Monday. Iraq can lead us down a dangerous course, but I believe it is time for us to recognize that if we do this, we do this together, not alone.

Let us vote for the separate resolution, go the right way and send a good message, not just to Iraq but to the rest of the world.

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

Mr. Speaker, in order to have the dialogue stay focused, I think we need to periodically look at the threat.

We have no doubt in this body. Speakers on both sides of the aisle have repeated the need to deal with someone who has used mustard gas and other agents against his own people. There is no question in this body about the war crimes committed by this dictator.

But when we talk about the threat not being imminent, I just want to read from an unclassified document something for us all to focus on as we again talk about do we or do we not empower the President to deal with all the cards in his hand, not missing the one of potential military action.

''Mustard gas, potential agents based on best estimates, 200 metric tons; sarin gas, 200 metric tons; VX, up to 200 metric tons; and anthrax, at least 8,500 liters. That is 2,245 gallons, but it could be as much as 10-fold that, 22,457 gallons of anthrax.

We all know in this body all too well what an almost infinitesimal amount in an envelope can do. I hope that we will think about this as we talk about whether or not to empower the President to have all the full force of our military at his disposal in negotiations.

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress is now debating the most serious and sobering of issues, whether we go to war, war against Iraq. We do this as we stand on the threshold of a new century.

I believe this debate is as much about voting to declare war as it is about what kind of country we are and what we want our country to be in the future. This resolution of war is an extraordinary and unwise departure from our history of a principled American tradition, that we stand foursquare against unprovoked attacks and for a foreign policy of deterrence.

The Bush doctrine reverses this policy and sets forth that the United States of America has the unrestricted right to attack other nations. This resolution trades deterrence for preemption. This resolution trade multilateralism for unilateralism.

This go-it-alone policy has become the imprimatur of this administration. We have witnessed their abrogation of nearly every international treaty they inherited from previous Republican and Democratic administrations.

This administration has allowed the underfunding of the Nunn-Lugar law, leaving the tools of terrorists unprotected and up for grabs across the former Soviet Union.

This administration has withdrawn from the ABM Treaty, withdrawn from the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, withdrawn from START II, rejected the Biological Weapons Convention, and rejected the International Criminal Court.

This administration makes war the first and only option, rather than a last resort. It has, in one brief summer and fall, upended decades of our time-tested, tenacious foreign policy of deterrence, which has served our Nation and the world so well.

□ 2330

The President has not answered the haunting questions of thousands of my constituents and the American people. Why now? How many troops will we need to wage this war? What will it cost? How long will we be there? What is the plan to manage the chaos in the aftermath of regime change; and, finally, how will it affect the war on terrorism?

Respected military leaders and statesmen have testified to Congress about their deep concerns with preemption and unilateralism. These experts have seriously undercut the President's case of what Saddam Hussein has and the President's remedy to deal with it. And classified briefings have raised more questions than answers.

Today's newspapers were filled with the information that our own intelligence agencies have concluded that Saddam Hussein is unlikely to initiate a chemical or biological attack against the United States. Not one of us carries a brief for Saddam Hussein. We know what he has done and we know how he rules. We know about his accumulation of chemical and biological weapons and the other weapons that threaten his neighbors and us.

Our answer today, send a thousand troops of weapons inspectors to Iraq. This time they must have unrestricted access to everything and with deadlines to achieve disarmament. The world community will watch and as we disarm him. He will loosen the noose he holds.

We can be tough and principled as we have been in the past. We can bring other nations with us and when we do, Saddam will know he cannot dodge or be deceitful any longer. That is why I support the Spratt resolution which calls for action only if the U.N. determines action is required and the President seeks approval from the Congress.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, when the framers wrote our Constitution, their vision spoke to the innermost yearnings of every human being, then, over the centuries, and now. They created what I have called the best idea that is ever been born: democracy. Their call is the same today in this new century that we lead through the enduring strength of our democratic principles backed by the might we possess. Today our Constitution and my conscience beckon me to oppose the President's resolution for war. I shall vote against the resolution and I urge my colleagues to do so as well.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. LARSON of Connecticut asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in an effort to unite this body behind the Spratt resolution. I oppose House Joint Resolution 114 because this resolution sets a dangerous new precedent in foreign policy, a policy of preemptive first strikes and go-it-alone unilateralism. This is a radical departure from long-standing United States policy of deterrence, diplomacy, containment and collective security. We are drifting away from the successful coalition-building of former-President George Bush in Desert Storm and our current President's administration's coalition that is currently prosecuting the war on terror in Afghanistan.

We are united behind the President in his continued prosecution of this war on terror, a mission we need to relentlessly pursue and not be deterred from. We are united behind the President in our efforts before the United Nations, and strongly support a tough, new, robust, unfettered weapons inspection process that is currently being negotiated by Colin Powell. We are in unanimous agreement about the brutal dictatorship of Saddam Hussein, the atrocities he has perpetuated against other nations and his own people, and the need to remove him. We stand united behind our men and women of our armed services no matter the outcome of the vote.

Where we differ is not whether, but how, we address this threat. As former Secretary of State Jim Baker points out it is not whether to use military force to achieve this, but how we go about it. While we address the near-term danger presented by Saddam Hussein, we must be equally mindful of the dangerous long-term consequences of first-strike, go-it-alone policy. To that extent, there is a notable divide in past and current Bush administrations and within this Congress and amongst people across this Nation.

This divide stems from those advocating the abandonment of long-standing policy in favor of going it alone. This is not about the use of force. I voted for the use of force in Kosovo and in Afghanistan. It is about the preemptive and unilateral use of force. The United States is the undisputed preeminent military, social and economic leader in the world; but there are many issues we simply cannot solve alone. Issues like the environment, disease and global economic stability are but a few examples and only further underscore the problematic concerns of our ongoing debate about going alone.

There is no question that we have the military might or that we will prevail against Iraq or any nation. But what lingers is whether we have the restraint as the world's lone superpower to lead by the rule of law and use our terrible swift swords only as a last resort.

The goal of the administration is to isolate Saddam Hussein and bring about his demise. In the process we must make sure that it is not the United States that is isolated and alone. For even with all our military might and resources, we cannot solve all the global problems by ourselves. The internationalist wing of the Republican Party best expressed the perils of preemption, in going it alone in Brent Scowcroft, the former National Security Advisor to both President Ford and former President Bush, who has argued that attacking Iraq will take away from the effort against the war on terror and do long-term damage to the stability needed in the Middle East.

Retired generals like Norman Schwarzkopf and Secretary of State Eagleburger, hardly appeasers, come down on the side of caution and coalition building. General Zinni, retired Commander in Chief of U.S. Central Command, talks about the need to be intensely involved in the peace process between Israel and Palestine. In staying focused on Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda, he wonders aloud about those in the administration who have never served in the military who seem so anxious to place our troops in harm's way; and those in the administration

who characterize heroes like General Wesley Clark, former Commander in Chief of the U.S. European Command, who urged the two-step approach of the Spratt resolution and calls them dreamers.

This is a time that the President, Congress, and the people need to be united. It is why we have introduced the Spratt resolution. This resolution strengthens the President's hand and demonstrates national resolve. It preserves the constitutional authority that resides with Congress and does not abrogate our role to the executive branch.

The people in my district feel strongly about this and have spoken out in town hall meetings. They are deeply opposed to a go-it-alone policy; and while understanding the potential threat posed by Saddam, they want us to pursue the course the President outlined before the United Nations.

Make no mistake, there is broad support for the President and implicit understanding of the awesome responsibility he bears as Commander in Chief. There is also an equal expectation that elected representatives will ask the tough questions and will measure the consequences and collateral damage of our actions. Our system is one of checks and balances; and clearly from my perspective, the use of force preemptively and unilaterally needs to be held in check, debated, discussed and not rubber stamped in a climate of fear and crisis.

The people's House must question the unintended consequences of this new policy. What are those consequences? What will be the collateral damage associated with preemptive unilateral attacks?

I say it can be said no better than our Ambassador to Saudi Arabia, Robert Jordan, when I asked him if we were facing a gathering storm in the Middle East. He replied, no, Congressman, you are from New England. Surely you have read the book or seen the movie. This is not a gathering storm. This has all the makings of the perfect storm.

Our relationship with our allies in the Middle East in the prosecution of the war on terrorist is fragile. There is great unrest in the region from economic instability to religious fanatics spewing hate towards the United States. A preemptive unilateral attack on Saddam Hussein could accomplish what Osama bin Laden failed to do, and that is unite the Islamic world in a jihad against the United States. Going it alone may well bring down a tin pan dictator, but will the consequences of that be the recruitment of tens of thousands of new terrorists bound for our shores?

□ 2340

Thomas Friedman, noted New York Times columnist, spoke at a recent book tour about the long-term consequences of our doctrine, and I was struck by the reaction of a man who simply reached into his wallet and showed a picture to Friedman of his children.

Nothing else need be said. Support the Spratt amendment.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA), a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding me the time.

I rise this evening as Congress considers one of the most difficult decisions a nation must make. President Bush and leaders from the House negotiated a resolution to authorize the use of force against Iraq. However, this new resolution still allows the President to launch a unilateral, preemptive attack without providing any evidence to Congress that the U.S. is under imminent threat.

The President says that he is willing to go it alone against Iraq as a last resort, but there is no mechanism in this resolution to ensure that it is just that, a last resort.

Let one thing be clear. A vote for this resolution is more than an authorization for use of force. It is a declaration of war, and I will oppose it.

We all agree that it is critical for the United States and the world community to ensure that Saddam Hussein is not developing weapons of mass destruction. I believe we can accomplish this goal by working with the U.N. Security Council to gain consensus on a tough and effective plan to gain unfettered access to inspect Iraq facilities. A powerful multinational force created by the U.N. would carry legitimacy and strong support in the United States and abroad. If the U.N. does not heed our call to action, then other options should be explored.

As of today, it is clear that the administration has yet to exhaust diplomatic options.

Many generals, military strategists and Republican policy-makers have expressed reservations with President Bush's approach to Iraq. Iraq does not exist in a vacuum. The decisions our government makes relative to Iraq will have consequences that will extend to all corners of the world, as well as potentially destabilize the Middle East. Will the concentration of our Armed Forces in Iraq limit our resources for a war against al Qaeda?

Additionally, experts agree that a war against Iraq will be much different than the Gulf War. Intensive, urban combat against an entrenched force is likely. How many thousands of American lives is the administration willing to imperil? What are the long-term plans for the stabilization of Iraq, and how many billions of dollars will this cost American taxpayers?

After September 11, the United States made great strides with the international community in our war against terror. A unilateral effort by the United States would not only weaken our relationship with our allies but also will increase resentment in the volatile Middle East and further embolden anti-American opinion throughout the world.

We must rid Saddam Hussein of any weapons of mass destruction. However, I urge the administration to continue to work with the U.N. to gain support for a tough resolution with an accompanying national multinational force, if necessary. Diplomatic efforts must continue. This war can still be avoided; and, as such, I cannot vote to put American lives and innocent civilians in harm's way, straight from our war against terror, or create uncertainty that could further hamper our struggling economy.

I will not support this resolution.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), a member of the Committee on International Relations, in fact, the Chairman of the Subcommittee on East Asia and the Pacific and a man who has great insight into this region.

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

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, as all Members know, this resolution involves a difficult set of decisions that neither the Congress nor the executive can duck. Anyone who is not conflicted in their judgment is not thinking seriously.

For myself, I have enormous regard for our President and great respect for his sworn policy advisers, but I have come to the conclusion that this resolution misfits the times and the circumstances. There may be a case for a regime change, but not for war against Iraq and its people.

Because time is brief, I would like to emphasize three points:

One, given the events of 9/11, a doctrine of preemption has a modicum of legitimacy. But the greater our power, the more important it is to use it with restraint. Otherwise, it will be seen as hubristic, with a strong prospect of counterproductive ramifications. Engaging in war the wrong way can too easily jeopardize the underlying conflict against terrorism and undercut core American values and leadership around the world.

Two, there are many so-called end game elements that have not been adequately addressed. They range from the dilemma of street combat to problems of postwar governance to worldwide Muslim reaction.

Three, and most profoundly, this resolution is based on a misunderstanding of modern science as it applies to weapons of war. The assumption is that there is a compelling case to preempt a nuclear weapons program, but what is little understood is that Iraq already controls a weapon of mass destruction more dangerous than nuclear bombs,

biological agents, and what is underestimated is the nature of his likely response to outside intervention.

The tactical assumption is that Saddam will be on the defensive with an American and British attack, but the likelihood is that, as troubling as end game problems are, the ''beginning conflict'' issues may be the most difficult ever confronted in the region and possibly in all of modern warfare. When a cornered tyrant is confronted with the use or lose option with his weapons of mass destruction and is isolated in the Arab world unless he launches a jihad against Israel, it is not hard to imagine what he will choose.

Israel has never faced a graver challenge to its survival. The likelihood is that weapons of mass destruction, including biological agents, will be immediately unleashed in the event of Western intervention in Iraq. In the Gulf War, Saddam launched some 40 Scud missiles against Israel, none with biological agents. Today, he has mobile labs, tons of such agents and an assortment of means to deliver them.

It is true that his stockpiles could be larger in years to come, but Members must understand that the difference between a few and a few hundred tons of anthrax or plague may not be determinative. These are living organisms that can multiply. They can invade a region and potentially the planet.

The most important issue is not the distinction between the various resolutions before us, each should be defeated, but the need to rethink our responsibilities in the manner in which they are carried out. Regime change can be peaceful, it can be discreetly violent, but it need not necessarily entail war.

Over the last half century America's led the world in approaches expanding international law and building up international institutions. The best chance we have to defeat terrorism and the anarchy it seeks is to widen the application of law and the institutions, including international ones that make law more plausible, acceptable and, in the end, enforceable.

Strategies of going it alone, doctrines of unilateralism must be reviewed with care. Nothing plays more into the hands of terrorists than America lashing out. Nothing is more difficult for them than international solidarity. Americans would be wise to craft strategies which are based on our original revolutionary appeal to a decent respect for the opinions of mankind.

We used to have a doctrine of MAD, mutually assured destruction, between United States and the USSR. No one seriously contemplated aggression because of the consequences.

Today, for the first time in human history, we have a doctrine of mutually assured destruction between two smaller countries, Iraq and Israel, one with biological weapons, the other nuclear. The problem is that an American intervention could easily trigger an Iraqi biological attack on Israel which could be met by a nuclear response. Not only would we be the potential precipitating actor but our troops would be caught in crosswinds and crossfire.

□ 2350

This is a strategic precipice we should step back from.

The United States today faces a series of challenges unprecedented in our history.

The 20th century was symbolized by three great international struggles: World War I and the challenge of aggressive nationalism, World War II and the battle against fascism, and the Cold War challenge of defeating communism.

Now the United States is confronted with the menace of international terrorism, a phenomenon as old as recorded history, but with elements that are new because of the potential for access to weapons of mass destruction (WMD), the manipulation of religious precepts, and the transnational character of international terrorism in a globalized world.

At issue today is the potential crystallization of these challenges in the Iraqi regime of Saddam Hussein, and the appropriate response of the United States and the world community.

In American history explaining what we do and why we do it is important. Our first revolutionary document, the Declaration of Independence, was an exposition of political philosophy and an explanation of grievances that compelled Americans to act. Today, in a world in which rumor and paranoia and distrust is pervasive, we are obligated to be precise in laying out our objectives and the rationale for military or other actions.

In this regard, there is in Eastern history a hallowed intellectual methodology for determining when a particular military intervention may be considered ethical. This doctrine, developed by ecclesiastics and jurists, followed by statesmen, instinctively accepted by the peoples of many countries in tradition and right, is the doctrine of just war. What is this doctrine? Briefly, it holds that for war to be considered just, it must be animated by a just cause and informed by righteous intention, that it be undertaken by lawful political authority and only as a last resort, and that resort to force be proportionate to the nature of the wrongs committed.

The just war issue is relevant for two interrelated reasons. First, the issue of war involves the gravest of moral questions. Second, not merely the theory but the history of international relations since the First World War embodies distinctions between just and unjust causes of war. The Covenant of the League of Nations, the United Nations Charter, and the Charter of the Military Tribunal at Nuremberg all reject the doctrine of realpolitik, the anarchical notion that ours is a Hobbesian world where might makes right.

Although there is a ''realist'' school of international relations theory which asserts that raw national interest considerations alone should govern all policy making, the more progressive view is that modern world politics are founded upon a conception of international society analogous to the laws and customs of coercion in domestic societies, that resort to violence in international affairs must be regarded either as response to lawful police action or crime. In other words, resort to armed force in international affairs is legitimate only if it is used on behalf or in service to the fundamental principles and purposes undergirding international law.

Thus the moral philosopher Michael Walzer observes that ''aggression is the name we give to the crime of war.'' Indeed, the founders of the United Nations were determined, in the words of the Charter, ''to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war . . . and to ensure, by the acceptance of the principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest.'' Similarly, the Charter obligates the Member States of the UN to ''settle their international disputes by peaceful means,'' as well as ''refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations'' (Articles 2(3) and 2(4)). Instead, the Charter attempts to enshrine a system of collective security in which the security Council is authorized to ''determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression'' and to ''decide what measures shall be taken . . . to maintain international peace and security'' (Article 39).

In postwar American diplomacy, the classic exposition of this principle was stated by President Truman in October 1945, when he declared that the fundamentals of American foreign policy would rest in part on the proposition ''that the preservation of peace between nations requires a United Nations Organization comprised of all the peace-loving nations of the world who are willing to use force if necessary to insure peace.''

The concept of international law enforcement through collective security, therefore, is embodied in the UN Charter and is an integral part of international law, as well as—through the Supremacy Clause—the law of the United States.

Here, the constitutional duty of Congress is clear. Not only does the Constitution vest the power to declare war in Congress, but also it further contemplates that a status or condition fairly described by armed hostility between the U.S. and another state—whether a declared or undeclared war—must be legislatively authorized.

The framers of the Constitution believed that the gravest of all governmental decision—the making of war—should not be the responsibility of a single individual. It should be taken by a democratically elected, geographically and socially balanced legislature after careful debate and deliberation. It would either be tyrannical or irresponsible for a Congress of, by, and for the people to shirk its responsibility and transfer the power to make war to the Presidency. In America, after all, process is our most important product.

In this context, neither the Congress nor the Executive can duck the fundamental question of Constitutional fidelity.

Perspective is always difficult to apply to events of the day, but it would appear that in wake of the events of 9/11 a watershed in American history occurred. A concerned terrorist attack was perpetrated against our institutions, people, and way of life. The imperative to respond is clear. Less clear how and against whom.

In the period following 9/11 the Executive Branch began to articulate a bold new doctrine

of national security, both to shape our response to the new dangers of international terrorism and to define a new vision of leadership for the United States in world affairs.

According to this new national security concept, the United States should be prepared to act decisively and unilaterally to eliminate potential terrorist threats. Because suicidal terrorists use anarchist techniques rather than rely on traditional armies, the case for America to reserve the right to take preemptive, anticipatory military action in the name of self-defense must be considered. In practical terms, since terrorist groups may either be assisted by foreign powers, or seek sanctuary in weak countries with limited control of their own borders, the option to intervene in another nation-state to constrain rogue behavior cannot be ruled out. Likewise, the doctrine contemplates the need to counter the threat that certain despotic regimes—like those the President labeled as evil: Iran, Iraq and North Korea—may develop or actually possess weapons of mass destruction and threaten to use them or put them in the hands of terrorists. In addition, because our own power is so disproportionate, and because the threat from international terrorists so grave, the strategy suggests that America need no longer be constrained in its actions by international rules, treaties, and even traditional security partnerships.

While elements of the new doctrine are not new, the public articulation of a doctrine of preemption is in fact a novel departure. In terms of precedents, the Congressional Research Service reports that the U.S. ''has never, to date, engaged in a 'preemptive' military attack against another nation. Nor has the U.S. ever attacked another nation militarily prior to its having first been attacked or prior to U.S. citizens or interests having first been attacked, with the singular exception of the Spanish-American War.'' The latter being unique, in that the principal stated goal of U.S. military action was to compel Spain to grant Cuba its political independence.

There is of course ample precedent for the United States using its military to intervene in other nations to support our national security interests. Citing the Monroe Doctrine, which outlined American objection to European colonialism in this hemisphere, the United States intervened repeatedly in the Caribbean and Central America in the 19th and 20th centuries. In addition, the U.S. employed overt military force to seek regime change in Mexico in 1914 and Panama in 1989, as well as covert action in Iran and Central America in the 1950s.

Of greater historical relevance, the most significant instance in which the U.S. seriously contemplated preemptive military action was during the Cuban missile crisis of October 1962. Despite the introduction by the Soviet Union of nuclear-capable ballistic missiles into Cuba that could threaten most of the eastern United States, President Kennedy considered and rejected preemptive options, imposed a U.S. military ''quarantine'' around Cuba, and ultimately reached a peaceful diplomatic solution.

Hence it is imperative that Congress and the American people debate the long-term foreign policy consequences of a potential, largely unilateral, strike against Iraq that may well not be supported by many of our historic allies. It is also crucial that Congress review the logic and implications of a new global strategy apparently premised on go-it-alone interventionist themes which, if taken to extreme, could erode the foundation of the rule-based, post-World War II international system the United States largely helped to create.

While the threat of transnational terrorism self-evidently requires a robust response, the implication of the United States using its extraordinary power and authority at this critical juncture in world history to ensconce and legitimize the principle of preemption as a basis for conduct in international relations is profound. One need only to contemplate the application of this principle by others elsewhere, such as South Asia, the Taiwan Strait, or the Middle East, to grasp its potential reach.

It is suggested to many around the world that the United States may be disproportionately relying on military power rather than the strength of law and persuasion to attempt to ''lock in'' a favorable order that commands the allegiance of others. In the language of political scientists, our new approach could suggest a strategy less of transformation than dictation.

The question is not simply whether the new doctrine of preemption has a modicum of legitimacy—the events of 9/11 suggest it does—but whether it is applied with proper judgment and appropriate restraint. The greater the power, the more important it is used with care. Otherwise, the danger is the use of force will be viewed as hubristic with its application likely to be counterproductive. Iraq is a case in point. The goal of regime change must involve an approach that enhances rather than retards international support for core American values like democracy and respect for individual rights. Engaging in war the wrong way can jeopardize the outcome not only of the underlying conflict against terrorism but American leadership on a host of international issues from arms control to commerce to the environment.

Unilateralist approaches sow unease and distrust of American power and American motives from Brussels to Johannesburg, from Sao Paulo and to Seoul. They dissipate reservoirs of good will for the United States and reduce, rather than expand, the pool of cooperation that we can draw on in the future.

The nature of the foreign policy challenges we face—curbing the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, eliminating terrorism, combating the spread of diseases like HIV/AIDs, promoting free trade and market economics, advancing respect for human rights and the rule of law—cannot be met by one country, no matter how powerful, acting alone.

Three years ago in one of the most irrational acts of the Senate in the 20th century a comprehensive test ban (CTB) was turned down. Upon taking office, the Bush Administration concurred in this judgment, and then in a little noticed decision rejected a protocol that had been long in negotiation to the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BWC) which would have added new verification provisions to that treaty. Ironically, if a CTB had been ratified, there would be more worldwide support for U.S. efforts to deter small states from obtaining nuclear arms and if the BWC protocol had been adopted the case for inspectors entering Iraq would be iron clad.

Count me among those who believe Saddam Sussein must be removed from office and his weapons of mass destruction destroyed, but also as one who is concerned with the unilateral veer in American foreign policy. We cannot lead the world unless we pay attention and, to the maximum degree appropriate, give respect to the judgments and opinions of others.

Policeman for the world is a lonely beat. It makes us a target. More, not less, vulnerable.

Leadership requires resolve; it also demands restraint, and an understanding that there are both prudential and real limits to America's unparalleled power. Likewise leadership requires magnanimity, an understanding of what causes people to rebel, and an uplifting, inclusive vision of a world order which realistically deals with the causes of conflict.

At issue with the Iraqi crisis is less an outcome where individual nation-states may be winners or losers, but one in which the international system has an enormous stake. From challenge springs opportunity. Hopefully, once the storm clouds have passed, the international community will be able to conclude that the United Nations has functioned as its founders intended. But if this conflict is not resolved in a way that upholds the authority and the credibility of the United Nations, our current international structure will be seriously deranged and grievously jeopardized.

In this regard, as the prospect for conflict increases, the danger of unintended martyrdom also rises. The United States must be careful to ensure that its policies do not turn a tinhorn Hitler into an Islamic Allende.

Hence I would urge the Administration to make it clear to Saddam that in the event he continues to defy the will of the United Nations he will inevitably find himself in the docket before Nuremberg-like proceedings—either the newly established International Criminal Court or perhaps an ad hoc tribunal—for egregious violations of internationally recognized human rights and arms control conventions.

Potentates, whether petty or mighty, who through violation of international law attempt to take the world hostage must be held accountable.

Likewise, the U.S. and UN should make clear that if any individual in Iraq participates in usage or unleashing of a weapon of mass destruction, they also will be held accountable as war criminals.

Tragically, the United States has not been able to become a party to the new ICC, which will be the first permanent international court with jurisdiction to prosecute the most heinous individual violators of human rights—genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity.

By background, the United Nations, many human rights organizations, and many U.S. allies have expressed support for the new court. The Administration, however, has renounced any U.S. obligations under the treaty.

Although the U.S. has valid concerns about the ICC—chiefly that the ICC might become politicized and capriciously assert jurisdiction over U.S. soldiers or high officials charged with ''war crimes''—our belligerent opposition to the Court also carries obvious downside risks to American leadership.

America's well-deserved reputation as a champion for human rights and extension of the rule of law has been called in question. Our efforts to play hardball in the UN Security Council by threatening to withhold support for UN peacekeeping missions unless the U.S. is granted immunity from the ICC alienated friends and allies abroad. The withholding of

military assistance to members of the ICC may be seen as an attempt to undermine the court and influence the decisions of other countries to join the ICC. By demanding special treatment in the form of immunity from the ICC, the United States is seen as bolstering the perception of its preference for a unilateral approach to world affairs and a determination to operate in the world exclusively on our own terms. As a result, U.S. efforts to build coalitions in support for the war against terrorism as well as the enforcement of UN resolutions against Iraq may have been impaired.

As an early advocate for the establishment of a permanent international criminal court based on balanced recognition of international statutes, I confess to being chagrined both at the inability of the international community to accommodate legitimate American concerns, and the all-or-nothing approach of our government that has left us without effective means to ensure that the ICC operates in ways that are consistent both with credible rule-of-law principles and with sensitivity to U.S. interests designed to advance democratic governance.

The problem is that as a great power called upon to intervene in areas of the world or disputes such as the Balkans, Afghanistan and troubled areas of the Middle East, the U.S. is vulnerable to charges being leveled against actions which we might reasonably consider to be peacekeeping, but another power or government might charge to be something very different. For instance, what would happen if Serbia were to bring a case against an American naval pilot when such a pilot is operating under both a U.S. and NATO mandate? The President has suggested we should, exclusive of all other countries, be allowed to veto over applicability of international law with regard to the ICC. Many other countries, including strong U.S. allies, have angst about this demand because they see this approach as establishing the principle of one country being entitled to operate above the law.

This is not an irresolvable dilemma. When the ICC treaty was under negotiation, it was the assumption of many that the Security Council where all the permanent members have a veto would play a determinative role in bringing matters better the ICC. If such was the case, the United States because of its veto power within the Security Council could fully protect itself as could the other permanent members. Unfortunately, because the past administration played an ambivalent role in development of the treaty, it failed to get the nuances right. This common sense approach was not adopted and the Bush administration was put in the embarrassing position of objecting to an important treaty because of the failed diplomacy of its predecessor.

Based on discussions with European officials it is my understanding that there may be an inclination to seek a reasonable compromise on treaty language, even at this late date. It would appear to be an umbrage to many countries to craft a provision excluding the United States alone from ICC jurisdiction, but it would seem reasonable on a process basis to return to a Security Council role. On this basis the U.S. and the international community could be credibly protected.

The court would function as a treaty organization founded on state consent, while respecting Security Council authority to refer any matters affecting international peace and security to the court's jurisdiction. This approach has the advantage that it does not make a pure exception for the United States. Understandable concerns of some countries about inequitable protection of the nationals of permanent members of the Council would need to be balanced against the enhanced durability and legitimacy of the court. A protocol to the Treaty ensconcing this approach should be actively pursued today.

Laws, to be effective, must constrain governments in their foreign policies as well as individuals in domestic acts. In order to hold governments accountable there must be individual accountability at the highest as well as lowest levels of society. Justice must be brought to the international frontier or life for too many will, in Hobbes' piercing phrase, continue to be ''nasty, brutish, and short.''

The central issue in classic just-war theory is the cause question. Just-war theorists from Augustine to Grotius typically referred to an offense that was a just cause for war as an ''injuria,'' a term that meant both injury and injustice. There were three generally accepted just causes of war: defense against aggression, recovery of property, and punishment. Wars waged for the first cause were by their nature defensive. Wars taken to avenge injustice and to punish the perpetrators of injustice were offensive in the sense that defense of one's own territory was not necessarily at issue.

It is sometimes forgotten that the United States is engaged in military combat operations over Iraq almost every day, maintaining ''no-fly'' zones over the northern and southern parts of the country. A decision by Iraq to ban almost all U.N. inspections on October 31, 1998, led the U.S. and Britain to conduct a 4-day air operation against Iraq on December 16–20, 1998 (Operation Desert Fox). The two allies launched approximately 415 missiles and dropped more than 600 bombs targeted at Iraqi military and logistical facilities. Since the December 1998 operation, the U.S. and Britain have carried out air strikes against Iraqi air defense units and installations on a frequent basis, in response to Iraqi attempts to target allied aircraft enforcing the no-fly zones. However, to launch a full-scale military invasion of Iraq, fully considering its potential consequences, based solely on violations of the no-fly zones would appear to be out of proportion to the offense occasioning it.

A potentially more compelling basis for just cause would be action undertaken in self-defense, in this case anticipatory self-defense.

Although the UN Charter is premised on the concept of collective security, it is important to recognize that the Charter also recognizes the right of nations to use force for the purpose of self-defense. Article 51 provides that nothing in the Charter ''shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense'' in the event of ''armed attack.'' The question, of course is what constitutes armed attacks.

In this regard, no American administration has ever sought to give an expansive interpretation to the definition of an armed attack. Indeed, none of our interventions since the end of World War II have relied for justification on the doctrine of preemptive attack.

Tellingly, when the United States was directly threatened during the 1962 Cuban missile crisis, President Kennedy did not invoke any notion of ''anticipatory self-defense.'' While the risks of nuclear conflagration were high, the president's legal arguments were conservative: the imposition of a naval quarantine was justified by reference to the regional peacekeeping provisions of the U.N. Charter. More recently, when America has claimed self-defense, it has been in less controversial settings—citing a clearly defined threat to U.S. citizens or, after September 11, the need prevent a second attack by hostile terrorists.

Rather than expanding the scope of preemptive attack, American statesmen have historically played leading roles in carefully limiting the doctrine.

The classic formulation of the right of preemptive attack was provided by secretary of State Daniel Webster. In 1837, the British sought to stamp out a simmering revolt in Canada that had received support from private militias in the Untied States. To cut off this source of support, British troops launched a night raid into New York, burning an American ship and sending it over Niagara falls.

Some five years later, Secretary of State Webster reached an agreement with the Foreign Office that prohibited future cross-border raids. Preemptive force under customary international law could be justified only if there was a ''necessity of self-defense, instant, overwhelming, leaving no choice of means, and no moment for deliberation,'' and if the use of force in such circumstance were proportional to the threat—not ''unreasonable or excessive.'' Webster's formulation remains the core sense of international law today.

Some might object that these standards are unreasonable and inappropriate for a new era of global insecurity hallmarked by the threat of stateless terrorism. On the other hand, it surely cannot be in our interest to legitimize war by hunch. The danger is that new standards we seek to reserve exclusively for our use become legitimate as well for other nations—such as Russia, China, India and Pakistan. Do we want to empower others to claim that issues relating to self-defense are not a proper subject of international concern, but are solely unilateral national decisions unreviewable by any state or multilateral organization? Without clear standards, whenever a nation believes that its interests, which it is prepared to characterize as vital, are threatened, then its use of force in response would become permissible.

As to the precise nature of the threat posed by Saddam, the historical record is well-known. Saddam Hussein is a menace to his own people and a continuing threat to the Middle East and the Persian Gulf. Saddam is without question an international criminal with a long rap-sheet.

He began successive wars of aggression against Iran and Kuwait, amassed a large inventory of chemical and biological weapons in violation of the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BWC), and has feverishly sought to build nuclear arms in violation of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT). On the orders of Saddam Hussein, his army committed some of the worst war crimes in half a century, gassing Kurdish villages and killing thousands of innocent civilians. Even after its defeat in the Persian Gulf War, Saddam sought to hide and even reconstitute his weapons of mass destruction in violation of numerous UN Security Council Resolutions. There is little dissent, therefore, from the proposition that the Iraqi regime represents a continuing threat to the region and a challenge to international

order. Indeed, regime change has been the official policy of the United States under two presidents, Bill Clinton and George Bush, since 1998.

What is the urgency of the current threat from Saddam Hussein? Despite some uncertainties, a great deal is known about Iraqi military capabilities, particularly its conventional forces.

Despite the loss of some 40 percent of its army and air force as a result of the Gulf War, Iraq remains a major military power by regional standards. Iraq still has armed forces with around 425,000 men, with some 2,200 main battle tanks, 3,700 other armored vehicles, and 2,400 major artillery pieces. It also has 300 combat aircraft with potential operational status.

By all accounts, sanctions and the impact of the Gulf War have had a substantial negative impact. The regime's inability to recapitalize and modernize its armed forces means that much of its nominally large military capacity is either obsolescent or obsolete, with doubtful combat readiness, and will be difficult to sustain in combat.

Much more ominous are Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. By way of background, UN Security Resolution 687, passed in April 1991, established the formal cease-fire between Coalition forces and Iraq. Key among the terms was the prohibition against Iraq retaining, acquiring, or developing WMD and long range missiles. In addition, there was a demand that Iraq unconditionally accept the destruction, removal or rendering harmless its WMD under international supervision. However, from the start of United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) in 1991 through their termination in 1999 Iraq engaged in the techniques of deception and denial in order to conceal the full extent of its WMD programs. Although there were some successes in defeating Iraq's concealment efforts, many other failed.

In December 1999, one year after UNSCOM left, the UN Security Council passed Resolution 1284, reaffirming all previous UN Security Council resolutions, disbanding UNSCOM, and establishing the UN Monitoring, Verification, and Inspection Commission (UNMOVIC). Until September 16, Iraq had rejected resolution 1284 on the grounds that it does not set a clear timetable or criteria for lifting sanctions. Although the Iraqi position may well be a ruse, Baghdad now claims with semantic waffling to be willing to allow the return of weapons inspectors without conditions.

As is well known, on the eve of the Gulf War, and in violation of its commitments under the NPT, Iraq was on the verge of producing significant amounts of heavily enriched uranium that would have allowed it within two or three years to produce a nuclear weapon. Fortunately, the Gulf War heavily damaged Iraq's nuclear facilities. By the end of UN inspections in 1998, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) was confident that Iraq's indigenous nuclear weapons program had not produced more than a few grams of weapons useable material. However, Iraq's nuclear potential was not completely eliminated. The scientific and technical expertise of Iraq's nuclear program survived, and Baghdad has tried to keep its core nuclear teams in place working on various civilian projects.

Publicily available consensus analysis produced by the London Institute of International Strategic Studies and others suggests that: Iraq does not possess facilities to produce fissile material in sufficient amounts for nuclear weapons, that it would require several years and extensive foreign assistance to build such fissile material production facilities, but that it could assemble nuclear weapons within several months to perhaps one or two years if it could obtain relevant fissile material.

Prior to the Gulf War, Iraq produced Biological Weapons (BW) agents in volume. Subsequent to it invasion of Kuwait, Baghdad accelerated large scale BW agent production and assembled rudimentary BW munitions. These weapons were distributed to military units, who were delegated to use them if allied forces advanced on Baghdad or used nuclear weapons. Most of the regime's key BW facilities, which had been hidden from Western intelligence agencies, escaped attack during the Persian Gulf conflict. But in violation of the BWC that Iraq ratified as a condition of the 1991 Gulf War cease-fire agreement, Saddam continued to conceal his BW program until 1995. Since December 1998 when UN inspectors left the country, there has been virtually no verifiable information about the status of Iraq's BW program.

Credible, public reports suggest Iraq can produce new stocks of bulk BW agent, including botulinum toxin and anthrax. BW agent could be delivered by short range munitions including artillery shells. Delivery by ballistic missile is more problematic. Refurbished L–29 trainer aircraft could operate as weapons-carrying unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) with a range of over 600km. Such UAVs might be considerably more effective than ballistic missiles in delivering CBW. Commando and terrorist attack is also possible.

The best estimates of the current situation suggest that: (1) Iraq has retained substantial growth media and BW agent (perhaps thousands of liters of anthrax) from pre 1991 stocks, and the regime is capable of resuming BW agent production on short notice at existing civilian facilities and in new mobile laboratories; (2) it could have produced thousands of liters of anthrax, botulinum toxin and other agents since 1998, but actual stocks are unknown.

As is well known, Iraq used chemical weapons extensively against Iranian troops from 1982–1988. In the years immediately prior to the Gulf War, Iraq made further progress in developing binary chemical munitions, producing and weaponizing the advanced nerve agent, VX. The Gulf War however devastated Iraq's primary CW production facilities and a large portion of its stockpile of CW munitions.

Through 1998, UNSCOM was able to dispose of large quantities of CW munitions, bulk agent, precursors and production equipment that were not destroyed in combat. In addition, unless Iraq has managed to modernize its 1990-era special warheads, its ability to disseminate effectively CW agent on ballistic missiles is questionable, since so much agent would be destroyed on impact. Iraq's known ability to marry chemical warheads to its rocket and artillery pieces (with ranges up to about 18.5 miles) could complicate operations for opposing forces, who would be required to wear protective gear.

The best publicly available assessment of the current situation is that: (1) Iraq has probably retained a few hundred tons of mustard and precursors for a few hundred tons of sarin/cyclosarin and perhaps similar amounts of VX from pre-1991 stocks; (2) it is capable of resuming CW production on short notice (months) from existing civilian facilities; and (3) it could have produced hundreds of tons of agent (mustard and nerve agents) since 1998. Actual stocks, however, are not known.

Iraq of course prohibited by UN Resolutions from possessing ballistic missiles with a range greater than 150km. In the 1970s Iraq began to import Scud B missiles with a range of 300km from the Soviet Union and acquired roughly 820. In the 1980s Iraq worked to modify the Scud missiles in order to double their range. The new missile, called the al Hussein, with a range of 650km, was used during the war against Iran. In the wake of the Gulf War, much of Iraq's missile infrastructure lay in ruins. Moreover, the U. S. and U. K., during Operation Desert Fox in December 1998, attacked a number of missile related facilities.

During the inspections period Iraq continued to conduct small scale covert research and development on proscribed missiles. In addition, Iraq continued missile related procurement efforts. UNSCOM attempted to account for all imported missiles and for indigenously produced missiles, but that accounting was incomplete. It is prudent to assume that Iraq has been able to retain some of its proscribed missiles. Also, it is likely that Iraqi engineers will have been able to increase the range in its short-range al Samoud missiles to 200km with a few hundred kilograms payload suitable for CBW delivery.

The publicly available estimates of Iraq's missile capabilities suggest that: (1) Iraq has probably retained a small force of about a dozen 650km range al-Hussein missiles, which could be armed with CBW warheads, capable of striking Israel, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Iran and Kuwait; (2) the Iraqi regime does not possess facilities to produce long range missiles and it would require several years and extensive foreign assistance to construct such facilities; (3) it may have a small number of al Samoud missiles with ranges of up to 200km able to strike Kuwait but only if deployed within the southern no fly zone; (4) Iraq is capable of manufacturing rudimentary CBW warheads, while its development of more advanced designs is unknown; and (5) Iraq has been developing very small unmanned aircraft suitable for CBW delivery.

According to the Department of State, Iraq is also a state sponsor of terrorism. Saddam Hussein's brutal regime has provided headquarters, operating bases, training camps, and other support to terrorist groups fighting the governments of neighboring Turkey and Iran, as well as to hard-line Palestinian groups. During the 1991 Gulf War, Saddam also commissioned several failed terrorist attacks on U.S. facilities. After the war, Saddam attempted to assassinate former President Bush. More recently, the question of Iraq's link to terrorism has become more urgent with Saddam's determination to develop weapons of mass destruction, which could be shared with terrorists.

At the present time, there is no hard evidence linking Saddam to the 9/11 attacks, and Iraq denies any involvement. However, his government expressed sympathy for those who attacked us and some Iraq watchers suspect Saddam was at least indirectly involved. In this regard, Czech officials reported last

year that Muhammad Atta, one of the September 11 ringleaders, met an Iraqi intelligence agent in Prague months before the hijackings, but U.S. and Czech officials subsequently cast doubt on whether such a meeting ever happened. Some militants trained in Taliban-run Afghanistan are helping Ansar al-Islam, a Kurdish extremist group that Suddam uses to harass his own Kurdish foes. Finally, al-Qaeda members fleeing Afghanistan have reportedly hid in northern Iraq, but in areas beyond Saddam's control. In addition, evidence has recently come to public light suggesting a wider array of contacts between al-Qaeda and the Iraqi regime than had previously been know, including hospital care for an al-Qaeda leader.

In this context, the case for military intervention at this time rests on three key assumptions: that the containment of Iraq through sanctions is a failed policy; that the Cold War concept of deterrence is no longer a viable strategy for dealing with an erratic Iraqi leadership potentially allied with al-Qaeda or other terrorists; and that new unrestricted weapons inspections, even if Saddam were to agree to them, are unlikely to be effective.

There is perhaps a fourth, albeit often unstated basis for intervention: that deposing Saddam and establishing a democratic, western-oriented government in Baghdad would decisively reshape the politics of the region in a manner highly beneficial to the United States, by delegitimizing the forces of radicalism and creating a powerful model of Islamic modernity and moderation.

Taken together, these assumptions make a compelling case for the United States and the United Nations to seek, both through the enforcement of existing resolutions as well as the enactment of one or more additional resolutions, Iraq's complete and unconditional compliance with all relevant UN resolutions, particularly those demanding the disarmament of its weapons of mass destruction.

To paraphrase the just war theologian Michael Walzer in his discussion of the ethics of Israel's preemptive intervention against Egypt in 1967 and an Iraqi nuclear reactor in 1981, Saddam Hussein, through his continued efforts to develop weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery has demonstrated a manifest capability and intent to injure, and a degree of active preparation that makes that intent a positive danger. The great judgmental question is, to again cite Walzer, whether in the current situation waiting, or doing anything other than military engaging, magnifies the risk.

It is perhaps likely, even highly likely, that Saddam will ultimately refuse to meet the demands of the world community. Particularly if this is the case, authorization by the Security Council for regime change would be an appropriate response. But there is little evidence that suggests the immediate, urgent ''necessity of self-defense,'' so instant, and overwhelming, as to leave the United States no choice of means, and no moment for deliberation. The case for regime change is compelling, but precipitating a change in leadership is different than going to war with a country and its people.

Containment through targeted sanctions—in effect, coercive arms control—is fraying, in part because of irresolution on the part of key members of the U.N. Security Council, such as Russia and France, and because both Iraq and key regional states profit from sanctions-busting. According to the General Accounting Office, Iraq may have earned as much as $2.2 billion last year in illicit exports and oil surcharges. Over time, the breakdown in containment would almost certainly create conditions under which Iraq could produce a nuclear weapon.

Nevertheless, flawed as sanctions may be, published reports in the press this summer suggested many senior U.S. military officers believed that Saddam Hussein poses little immediate threat and have concluded that the United States should for the time being continue its policy of containment rather than intervening directly.

Can Saddam be deterred from aggressive action now and in the future, particularly if he is able to successfully accelerate development of weapons of mass destruction? The evidence is mixed. During the Persian Gulf War, he refrained from using weapons of mass destruction because of American and Israeli threats of nuclear retaliation. He was likewise deterred from again attempting to attack Kuwait in 1994.

Yet he is so hostile to the United States and Israel, so bent on regional domination, his frames of reference and decision-making processes so opaque, and possibly irrational, and his ties to international terrorism such as obvious source of concern, that it is at best an open question whether a nuclear-armed Saddam is ultimately deterrable. In the long run, it is highly probable that no American president can afford to take that risk.

As to inspections, the evidence suggests that an intrusive inspections regime can produce positive results, but can never be fully reliable or completely effective. In their first five years, the United Nations Special Commission in Iraq (UNSCOM) made some progress toward inspecting and disarming Iraq's chemical, biological, and missile materials and capabilities. The so-called IAEA Action Team, did the same for Iraq's nuclear program. The main problem was that UNSCOM was never allowed to fully scan the country or finish its work. Since the Iraqi government terminated its work four years ago, the country has been free of monitoring and inspection.

Just war doctrine focuses on right intentions and prospects for success. Intentions and goals matter in war. A nation should only wage war for the cause of justice, rather than for self-interest or aggrandizement. The issue of intention must be balanced with concern for practicalities as well as consequences, both of which should be considered before declaring war. The decision to go to war must be essentially protective; the goal of war is to obtain a just and durable peace. The ancillary requirement that there must be prospects for success means that the use of arms must not produce negative effects and disorders graver than the evil to be eliminated.

In this case the risks of inaction are real; the risks of action extraordinary. The only certainty is that any military action involving a great power will bring about unintended consequences. It is a distinct possibility but not certainty that conflict with Saddam will be short and decisive, as it was during the Gulf War. It is also possible that a new regime can be found and put in place with as much ability and legitimacy as in Afghanistan.

On the other hand, one should always hope for the best but plan for the worst. America's greatest living statesman, George F. Kennan, recently made the sage observation that ''war has a momentum of its own, and it carries you away from all thoughtful intentions when you get into it. Today, if we went into Iraq . . . you know where you begin. You never know where you are going to end.''

Many have expressed concern about the ''end game''—the difficulty of potential street combat, of establishing legitimate government, of dealing with the long-term implications for American interests in the Muslim world of an intervention in Iraq. But concern for the ''end game'' should not cloud the enormous difficulties of the ''beginning game.'' What happens when a strike commences?

What happens to our ability to secure cooperation in the long-term campaign against global terrorism? What about American leadership in the global economy?

From an operational perspective, the assumption in some quarters appears to be that once we initiate conflict Saddam will be on the defensive, hunkering down, perhaps waging defensive guerrilla warfare in the cities and countryside, while the United States and its allies enjoy the initiative.

This may be the case, but Saddam has had a lot of time to strategize on how to maximize American casualties, energize potential support outside Iraq—including terrorists—and increase his martyrdom.

My concern is that Israel may be underestimating the potentially devastating effects of a biological weapons assault while the United States may be understanding the potential of a pan-Muslim backlash.

In terms of military pitfalls for the United States, one ''nightmare'' scenario involves determined resistance in Baghdad and perhaps other major cities by the Iraqi Republican Guard. Should we be compelled to engage, the casualties on both sides, including civilians, could be substantial.

But the greatest danger that we cannot ignore is the possibility that a campaign against Iraq expands into a wider conflict within the Arab world against Israel. Indeed, it is virtually inconceivable that military intervention against Iraq will not cause an immediate retaliatory strike against Israel. In the Gulf War, Iraq sent 39 scud missiles against Israel—missiles that could have been but were not tipped with chemical weapons. Chemical weapons were used with some devastation in World War I and in closed settings with gruesome ramifications in the Holocaust. Today the vastly greater danger is biological agents. Biological weapons pose a danger thousands of times greater than chemical weapons. The delivery of such weapons on missiles, unmanned aircraft, by hand and or through the mail could be traumatic for Israel and world society. Likewise, if Iraq were to launch any kind of weapons of mass destruction against Israel, Israel would have to seriously consider a retaliatory response, perhaps including nuclear weapons.

It is also conceivable that action against Iraq, particularly a prolonged campaign with significant civilian casualties, could spark outrage in the Muslim world, and unleash a new surge of anti-Americanism. While there is little support for Saddam Hussein outside of Iraq, there is extraordinary opposition to America going to war against a Muslim country. Terrorism around the world could be supercharged. Even without Israeli involvement, friendly governments in Jordan, Pakistan and

Saudi Arabia might be destabilized. A multi-year, multi-decade or multi-century conflict could ensue.

Should Saddam's hold on power or his personal security be in imminent jeopardy, it would appear probable that he may utilize the techniques of terrorism—possibly including weapons of mass destruction—to defend his regime and wreak revenge on his enemies.

In addition, it is also conceivable that new dangers would emerge with a feeble or hostile successor regime. Chaos, bloodshed and revenge might follow. Weapons of mass destruction might fall into a greater number of hands. An unstable Iraq could be a haven for terrorists and a continuing threat to regional peace.

Indeed, it is impressive how little, not how much we know, especially attitudinally in Iraq and the Muslim world about the potential of American intervention in Iraq. To what extent will support be manifested for Saddam? Will there be disorder, chaos, bloodshed and revenge? Will the Shia turn on the Sunni minority. Will the Kurds seek an independent state?

Moreover, it is important to ponder whether an invasion of Iraq would worsen rather than reduce the threat of terrorists gaining control of weapons of mass destruction. Saddam could decide to disperse his weapons stockpiles, and the scientists who build them, into the hands of global terrorists. Even if he did not order such, in the chaos of war it is conceivable that individual Iraqi commanders and scientists might make their own profit-oriented accommodation with terrorists.

More broadly, it is by no means clear that regime change in Iraq, even if successfully carried out, will significantly diminish the threat from Islamic extremists who share little in common with Saddam Hussein.

Hence the need for the United States to pursue a vigorous two-pronged approach in the Middle East: intensified efforts to resolve the Palestinian-Israeli conflict and greater focus on economic development and democratization in the region.

The importance of resolving the Israeli-Palestinian standoff cannot be underestimated. We know from attitudinal surveys that Muslims generally like Americans and admire American culture. Many have chosen to immigrate to the United States. They do not, however, trust our government. To win the war on terrorism we will have to convince Muslims throughout the world that we are, in fact, favor justice and the creation of just societies everywhere.

All Americans understand we share a common concern for the fate of the Israeli people and the viability of the Israeli state. The commitment of the United States to Israel must be bedrock. We must support Israel and help bring peace and stability to the region. There must be continuity of commitment, but there must also be recognition of opportunities to lead. Unfortunately, critical opportunities have been lost in partial measure because Presidents were imperfectly skilled and in some cases wanted to operate in relationship to timing they hoped to control rather than in relationship to circumstances and events in the region.

For example, optimism surrounded the Oslo accord precipitated by President Bush's father. Yet the United States lagged in efforts to push immediately thereafter the logical steps that should have been taken to create a long-term framework for peace. To his credit, President Clinton pressed at the end of his administration for a breakthrough agreement. At Camp David, Arafat turned his back on the most forthcoming peace proposal Israel has ever formally made. The tragedy of Arafat was not that he had to accept every parameter of the proposal put forward by Prime Minister Barak, but that he failed to make a counteroffer, thereby destroying prospects for peace, implicitly thumbing his nose at Israel and the prestige of the American presidency.

Following the breakdown of the Camp David talks in July 2000, and the subsequent outbreak of violence on September 28, the sides nevertheless agreed to continue negotiations at lower levels during December and January 2001 at the Egyptian town of Taba. As President Clinton left office, Barak's government had but a few weeks of life left before the election that brought Ariel Sharon to power. The outbreak of the violence had made it unlikely that Israelis would approve any proposal of concessions to the Palestinians in a referendum. Nonetheless, both sides hammered out proposals that came much closer to each other's positions than before.

No official summaries of the proposals were issued, but subsequent leaks provided some details. The Palestinians, according to Israeli sources, agreed to a map that would allow Israel to keep most of its settlements and about 4 percent of the territory.

But given the short time left to the Barak government, the preoccupation with the transition in Washington, and the continuing violence, the proposals came to nothing. Both sides had agreed that the proposals would be binding only if they resulted in an agreement. The joint communique noted, however, that foundations had been laid for future discussions.

The new administration held that President Clinton had attempted to negotiate on his time frame and increased tension by seeking a resolution that was not ripe. My sense is that the Bush team was half right. President Clinton had pressed on his time frame but erred by being tardy instead of premature. If pressed two or three years earlier by the Clinton Administration, the Barak approach would have been more sympathically received. And if the Taba framework had been immediately pressed on the parties by the new Bush foreign policy team which was initially so well received in the Arab world, quite possibly a breakthrough agreement could have been made.

Two opportunities for resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian issue, one in this and the other in the prior Administration, were not grasped and this circumstance hangs like dangling fruit to terrorists the world over.

The major US foreign policy concern in the region must be resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian issue. All administrations at all times must dedicate themselves to this challenge. In this context, the need to achieve peace between Israel and the Palestinians is of far greater significance than waging war with Iraq. Whether we like it or not, whether it is fair or rational or not, we are simply in a far better position to deal in whatever way we choose with Iraq after an Israeli-Palestinian settlement. It is a far less favorable circumstance if we attempt to deal with Iraq beforehand.

Some contend that Israel is in a far stronger strategic position if the United States quickly and successfully disarms Iraq. This may be the case. But no country carries greater risks during the conflict and in its aftermath than Israel if intervention proves messy, if Iraq is able to unleash an attack on Israel.

In the Middle East, there are two sets of value scales. From a Western perspective, the case for creating and protecting the state of Israel because of the history of pogroms and the Holocaust is compelling. From a Muslim perspective, an argument can be made that Arab peoples have a historical claim to parts of the Holy Land and its holy places and no responsibility for the Holocaust. The challenge is to take these juxtaposed value systems and reach a reconciliation both sides can respect and live with on a long-term basis. My sense is that somewhere around the points laid on the table at Camp David and Taba there is a basis for a credible resolution, but it is very doubtful given the current state of enmity and distrust between the parties between the parties that slow-paced, partial steps can lead incrementally to a larger vision of peace and accommodation.

Nation-building was used pejoratively during the last campaign, but America has no choice but do more ourselves and to press our allies much more forthrightly for assistance to Afghanistan, a country in which we effected a constructive change of government. For all the unfortunate consequences that can sometimes befall policy, we are most fortunate to have a leader in charge that the world can respect. This circumstance, however, may change quickly based on reaction to actions inside and outside of Afghanistan. A U.S. war with a Muslim country will have wide consequences elsewhere, some good, some bad, most unpredictable.

Here it should be noted that there has been relatively little discussion about the commitments, likely to be of a long-term character, that Washington must undertake after a military campaign against Iraq. The term ''regime change'' does not adequately describe the full scope of what we expect to achieve as a result of a military campaign in Iraq. We would be expected to work with Iraqis, including those outside Iraq, to both develop a new constitutional structrue as well as find credible post-Saddam leadership—leadership that hopefully would share our objectives with respect to the elimination of weapons of mass destruction, development of democratic institutions, etc. We will almost certainly need substantial forces on the ground in order to prevent bloodletting, secure important economic and military assets, and prevent possible Iranian meddling. And although Iraq has substantial oil reserves and therefore a better resource base than Afghanistan from which to assist in financing reconstruction, the costs of humanitarian assistance and rehabilitation could nevertheless be in the billions of dollars.

We lack firm estimates of the domestic cost to the U.S. of a potential conflict. Seat of the pants White House estiamtes range from $100 billion to $200 billion, with the price of oil estimated to rise to perhaps $30 a barrel for some unknown period of time. More recently, the Congressional Budget Office estimated that fighting a war with Iraq could cost the U.S. between $6 and $9 billion a month, with preparing for a conflict and terminating it later adding other $14 billion to $20 billion to the total.

The 1991 Persian Gulf War cost $60 billion in 1991 dollars, with the brunt picked up by

our friends and allies, notably the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and Japan. It is unlikely there will be comparable help in defraying the costs of a military action and any subsequent nation-building in Iraq.

Our war aims with Iraq also need clarification. The goal of the U.S. should not be the total disarmament of Iraq, as some appeared to have call for, but the elimination of his weapons of mass destruction. Disarmament implies that Iraq cannot have an army, a proposition no sovereign state is likely to accept. Indeed, Western policy in the region for decades advocated a balance of power, not vacuum of power. The reason to distinguish the elimination of weapons of mass destruction versus total disarmament is more than theoretical. U.S. policy should be based on establishing a strong unitary Iraq with a professional army accountable to democratic forces. As we proceed toward possible invasion, the goal should be to seek the Iraq army to identify with the United States, not Saddam.

The challenge is to make it clear that our goal is more democracy, prosperity, and the uplifting of Iraqi society, one which can lead the Muslim world with a model of modern democracy and prosperity.

Saddam is a rogue leader, but Iraqis are not a rogue people. Care must be taken to distinguish the leadership from the country itself. No country or peoples are intrinsically evil, though individual leaders such as Saddam can clearly be malevolent.

In historical terms, Saddam is a Stalinist. The case for regime change is real, but the prospect of our demolishing Iraqi society or Saddam blowing up his own country's infrastructure—bridges and oil fields—is not a happy one. Perhaps the prospect of such a catastrophe will lead to regime change precipitated internally, which could be the maximum outcome for all.

In Just War theory, the criterion of right authority determines who is to decide whether or not resorting to war is justified.

Reasonable men and women can agree in a ''just war'' context on the moral and legal authority of the President, acting with the express authorization of the Congress of the United States, to initiate a police action to enforce international law.

Likewise, reasonable men and women generally ought to be able to agree on the moral and legal authority of the Security Council to authorize the enforcement of UN resolutions requiring a country to abide by international conventions on weapons of mass destruction.

It should be self-evident that while a country like the United States has an obligation to protect its citizens without a formal UN resolution, it is vastly preferable for American strategy to be based on formal international support.

UN support would impress upon Saddam Hussein that he is not just facing a United States Administration, but the will of the world community. Security Council endorsement would bolster American security by helping make it politically possible for others to join in enforcing international law and by undercutting the legal and moral base of those who might object.

In this context, the President is to be commended for taking the case to the United Nations. He is to be commended for endeavoring to reach out to the world community by deciding that the United States should rejoin UNESCO. He is to be commended for laying out the challenges Iraq poses to the world community and to the region. He is further to be commended to bringing his case to the Congress.

Words matter. Care must be taken in their use. Words lead to processes that sometimes make careful judgments difficult to obtain. At this time, for instance, the case for regime change is powerful. But this does not necessarily mean that urgency for military intervention, even with UN authorization, is compelling. There have been too many instances in history where leaders have boxed themselves in with words, and when actions tied to words may cause, domino fashion, further actions to transpire which might not be contemplated or warranted by the initial statements made.

Utterance restraint is an attribute that has received less attention and less approval than should be the case in statesmanship. In this context, the unintended consequence of describing countries as evil and personalizing strategic doctrines must be recognized.

In Vietnam, for instance, the basis for our engagement stemmed more from a domino theory of decision-making than the more widely discussed domino government-toppling potential. When American presidents make statements, policy decisions can result which lead to actions which may not fit the circumstance in which the statement was originally framed.

More recently, in the Balkans, America got involved after giving a series of warnings that if Serbia didn't go along with the Rambouillet Accord, the United States and NATO would intervene. The United States made threats which were not taken seriously by adversaries which led to intervention that might not have occurred if the warnings weren't made. The decisions to intervene was made in part because of a concern about preserving presidential credibility, and the need to make a particular president's words meaningful, despite the fact that few Americans knew the president had made statements in this arena.

In the case before us it is suggested that authorization for use of force may cause others to act in such a way as to make use of force unnecessary. But the greater problem seems to me to be problem of a leader who pushes for authorization and then faces the question of follow through. The logic is force may not be inevitable but its authorization surely makes a decision for restraint difficult.

There is a thin line between the exercise of superpower responsibility and the prospect of superpower folly. The timing, perhaps more than the substance of this resolution is in doubt. Judgment and timing must go hand in hand. It may have been a mistake back in 1991 not to have pursued Saddam because of our assumption that the Iraqi people would come to their senses and replace him. But that failure to act does not necessarily legitimize assumptions that intervention today can legally be carried out in the context of resolutions both Congress and the UN applied a dozen years ago. The greatest legal case against Saddam relates less to Security Council resolutions than his development of biological weapons which contravene international law and jeopardizes the health of the region.

In general, the criterion of last resort has a common sense interpretation in which it functions as a reminder that the resort to violence must be, to a significant degree, reluctant. It enjoins us to make serious efforts at peaceful resolutions of our political problems before going down the path of war. The term ''peaceful'' is itself open to varied interpretations, but is usually taken to include a comprehensive range of nonviolent methods that may involve ''coercive diplomacy,'' including sanctions of an economic and political character.

The principle of proportionality evaluates the effects or ends of war. In this regard, proportionality is ''counting the costs'' or cost-benefit analysis. In just was theory this principle insists that there be due proportion, that is, less evil following from acting rather than not acting in the manner contemplated. War is not justifiable if it will produce more death and destruction that it prevents. Understood properly, proportion has the potential for overriding just cause.

Although Iraq is clearly a menace, there is little evidence to suggest that it poses a direct and immediate threat to the vital interests of the United States sufficiently grave as to lead to no other credible alternative to war. As former NATO commander General Wesley Clark testified before congress, ''There is nothing that indicates that in the immediate—the next hours—the next days—that there is going to be nuclear missiles put on launch pads to go against our forces or our allies in the region. And so I think there is, based on all the evidence available, sufficient time to work through the diplomacy of this.''

Former National Security Advisor Brent Scowcroft argued this summer in the Wall Street Journal, that Saddam's strategic objectives appear to be to dominate the Persian Gulf, to control oil from the region, or both. This clearly poses a real threat to U.S. interests. But there is little hard evidence to suggest Saddam has close ties to al-Qaeda, and even less to the 9/11 attacks. Given Saddam's psychology and aspirations, Scowcroft considers it unlikely that he would be willing to risk his investment in weapons of mass destruction by handing them over to terrorists who could use them for their own purposes ''and leave Baghdad as the return address.'' Saddam, Scrowcroft suggests, seeks weapons of mass destruction not to arm terrorists, but to deter us from intervening to block his aggressive designs.

In addition, as of this moment, with current sanctions in place and the Security Council contemplating reintroducing weapons inspectors under existing of new UN resolutions, it cannot credibly be claimed that America or the world have exhausted non-violent alternatives.

I accept in principle that military intervention against Iraq might be considered legitimate law enforcement under just war doctrine. What I do not accept is that it is justified at this time because of the disproportionately horrendous consequences such action may precipitate.

The reason I am doubtful relates less to the risks to American national interests which accompany intervention in the Muslim world, as real and as large as I believe them to be, but principally because of the risks invasion may pose to civilization itself.

As I have listened to various proponents, the efficacy of military intervention is based on the assumption that a cornered tyrant will not initiate the use of weapons of mass destruction, providing the U.S. and others the opportunity to destroy or otherwise seize effective control of such weapons before Baghdad can issue orders to strike.

This assumption may represent the most dangerous intelligence estimate and the frailest tactical assumption in human history.

What is known is that Saddam Hussein controls tons of biological agents. What is known is that he is attempting to develop a nuclear explosive device, and while it is unlikely, it is conceivable he may control such a weapon today. Even if we assume our intelligence to be correct and his nuclear capacity is yet to be achieved, we can be sure he has a BW capacity, portable and hidden. We know he has the means of delivery.

Therefore, intervention assumes Saddam's delayed contemplation of BW usage. But what if Saddam is prepared to use BW immediately? What if he seeks wider Arab support by attempting to engage Israel? And what if Israeli leadership responds proportionately, perhaps disproportionately?

If biological agents are released in Haifa or Tel Aviv, the prospect of a nuclear response is not remote. American troops could be caught in the crossfire and crosswind of two sets of weapons of mass destruction coming from different sources, each equally dangerous. Is not the next 6–8 weeks the most dangerous in the history of the region?

Before any strike, it would seem to me the U.S. must know the location of every biological weapon cache in Iraq and have a clear plan and capacity to destroy or control these weapons within minutes of the initiation of military action. Absent that capability, military intervention would be based upon inadequate intelligence and a potentially catastrophic misjudgment of intent.

The risks are extraordinary. However, it is suggested that as large as the risks are today, they will be graver in subsequent years. Surely, it is said, we cannot allow Saddam's weapons of mass destruction to deter the United States from taking necessary action.

This line of argument has substantial merit. But it does not necessarily provide a compelling rationale to intervene today. The reason it doesn't is because of a lack of understanding of the danger of biological agents. Pounds or ounces of biological agents, such as plague or anthrax, can be devastating. Saddam Hussein controls tons. Given these quantities, adding more does not make him that much more dangerous.

While a shield may be technologically feasible to develop to shoot down a missile that leaves the earth's orbit, there is no such thing as a biological shield. Delivery systems can be rudimentary and multi-faceted.

The coming conflict with Iraq is not only symptomatic of the problem of terrorism but arguably stands as the most difficult confrontation in world history. If biological weapons through usage are legitimized as instruments of war, the survival of man is in desperate jeopardy. While the Middle East contains many conflicts rooted in differing approaches to faith, the Iraq issue is fundamentally different. It has far more to do with the conjunction of science and despotism than a clash of civilizations.

The reason the United States led the world community in the development of the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention in the 1970s to prevent the development, production, and stockpiling of biological weapons is that we came to the conclusion not only that the use of biological weapons could jeopardize society itself but we also decided that even experimenting with these weapons was too dangerous in the world's most sophisticated scientific community. It is a public health trauma of unprecedented proportions to stockpile these agents, let alone use them in war.

In this context, the case that Iraqi leadership is lawless is compelling. And the case for lawful regime change is real. But we are courting unprecedented danger to the American national interest and the existence of the state of Israel to move from a policy of containment and deterrence to a policy of military intervention that may actually precipitate usage of such horrendous weapons of mass destruction.

Based upon the mendacity of leadership in Iraq, it is hard not to provide our President with full discretionary support. The problem is that this resolution contemplates an act of war of unprecedented consequences. The logic of its words leads to consequences too awful to contemplate. I must vote no.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY), a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the September 11 attack claimed the lives of thousands of Americans, and dozens more have perished in our war against terrorism. Just yesterday, a U.S. Marine was killed in Kuwait by al Qaeda-trained terrorists. According to press reports, our Marine was killed in a supposedly secure area, and Kuwaiti authorities are baffled over how the terrorists were able to carry out their murder.

I bring up the death of this Marine because it should serve as a reminder that there are no guarantees in war. We must think through the consequences of a war in Iraq and get answers to our questions. Because if we do not ask the tough questions now, in a few short weeks, while Americans are comfortably at home doing their last-minute holiday shopping, hundreds of thousands of our troops are going to be deployed to another combat zone. That, in turn, makes each and every one of us taking part in this debate responsible for our national security and the welfare of our troops.

This vote is undoubtedly one of the most important that many of us will ever cast. This is not a vote on whether the President of the United States should be able to broaden our war against terrorism to include Saddam Hussein. It is a vote on whether now is the best time to attack, given that we do not yet have a new U.N. Security Council resolution or the support of our closest friends and allies in the international community. It is a vote on whether now is the best time to attack given that we have not used the full weight of our economic and diplomatic might to avert a war. It is a vote on whether we proceed with war when we have not determined what its objectives are, how long it will last, how much it will cost, or what kind of a regime will be set up afterwards.

This is not Desert Storm, where Iraq invaded Kuwait, where we had clear goals and the support of the international community, and we only paid about 10 percent of the cost of that war.

Mr. Speaker, I would not raise any of these questions if Congress had been informed that Iraq posed an imminent threat to the security of the United States. We have not received that information. And I have many more unanswered questions, such as: How will the war affect our economy? How will the war affect our homeland security? What happens to international cooperation in our hunt for terrorists? What happens if Iraq lashes out at Israel? Are we prepared to recast our military as an army of occupation for the entire Middle East?

I am raising these questions because they are the same ones posed to me every weekend back in Oregon. While there has been a lively debate on this resolution, it has been far from persuasive. Nobody seems to have the answers. And, trust me, I have tried, through briefings, through talking to experts, through going through classified materials. At this time, I cannot go home with a clear conscience and explain why I voted to broaden this war with so many questions left unanswered.

So I will oppose the resolution. And for those who have committed themselves to voting for this measure, please consider asking these tough questions. It is easier to ask questions before we go to war, not after we commit ourselves and our young people to battle. When we have received answers to our questions, and when we have received assurances that we have tried everything, and that the only way left to nullify Iraq's threat to our national security is military action, only then would I vote to use force.

We do not have the answers to the questions. We do not have those assurances, and so I will vote ''no'' and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD), a spokesperson really for justice.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in this historic debate with some trepidation and troubled feelings. I have been marshaling views, like many of my esteemed colleagues, not only to contribute to this dialogue but, more poignantly, to try to make sense of what lies ahead for our great country.

Each Member has been consumed with this very critical issue. I am sure that none of us wants a war, as we know its great cost in human capital. Therefore, we must go the extra mile necessary to exhaust all possibilities before America commits to force. That is why this debate is so critical. And the implications of our decision that follows will have such portent, not only for us but also for the parents of

the young men and women whom we ask to make perhaps the greatest sacrifice.

Until this past weekend, I was quite undecided as to how to respond to the President's insistence on moving against Iraq, and I took particular notice of the open-ended nature of the original draft resolution. Now, as the result of ongoing discussions with the leadership of the House and Senate, he has thought twice in seeking unilateral authority. Instead, this revised resolution allows for a preemptive use of force against Iraq and for his reporting to Congress after the fact. In short, Mr. Speaker, more questions were raised in my mind than answers given.

In the past, I have voted to support legislation designed to protect America's security. After 9–11, I was a clear and avid supporter of many pieces of legislation to support the President. Thus, I believe it is clear to all observers that I am a woman of conscience and not afraid to go on record when this Nation is faced with a clear and present danger to our way of life, our liberties, and our security.

I too believe that the world is dealing with a tyrannical dictator in Iraq and that he should not be allowed to terrorize neighboring states nor his own citizens. Saddam Hussein must and should be stopped. But how? What is the best and most appropriate way to contain him and destroy his unbridled power? Is it by having the U.S. go alone to confront this geopolitical problem that has a far-reaching impact on the entire world?

That is why this debate needs to be thorough and public, Mr. Speaker. We must look at the long-term domestic and international consequences and policy implications of intervening in Iraq. Before a declaration of war can be proclaimed, there must be an accounting of the cost both at home and abroad.

In his talk to the American people this past Monday, the President upped the ante, so to speak, and I, for one, was pleased to hear him say that war is the last resort. We must not forget that we are already fighting a war in Afghanistan and are deeply obligated to help bring security and reconstruction to that country. The costs are great, more than $1 billion a month. Can we continue to meet such expenditures? How long will our commitments continue there? Can we afford to fight two wars? What is the exit strategy after we go into Iraq when there is none in place for Afghanistan as yet?

Mr. Speaker, many of my constituents have overwhelmingly called me to let me know they do not stand for having their sons and daughters go to war and return home in body bags until all possible diplomatic avenues have been exhausted. They want to see us, the political leaders of this great country, commit ourselves to working with the United Nations in every conceivable manner to exercise international action against a tyrant in Iraq. They want to see us enter into a rigorous international alliance under the U.N.'s banner to force the dismantling of Iraq's massive weaponry through a comprehensive inspection system.

The American people are not fools. They know that war with Iraq inevitably will mean that their domestic priorities would suffer from a lack of attention and resources. Our unfinished business on health care, prescription drugs, welfare reform, and a faltering economy, due in large part to corporate greed and malfeasance, and the President's top tax cut, would remain on the back burner.

□ 0000

I agree that Iraq has carried out regression on its own people and has not met its obligations under the U.N. resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, I will not be supporting this resolution.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield 40 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), and ask that he may control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHUSTER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me the additional time. We appreciate the cooperation from the other side.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD), a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution of the United States reserves to the Congress of the United States the authority to declare war. That is as it should be, for no more weighty matter confronts a nation, and it is fitting in a Republic that a decision such as this be made by the people's representatives.

Let us be clear. Saddam Hussein is a dangerous, malicious dictator. He has committed multiple atrocities, both towards his own people and others in the Middle East. He has refused to comply with U.N. resolutions or to allow weapons inspectors to fully identify and destroy his arsenal of chemical, biological and potential nuclear weapons. He has circumvented economic sanctions and has spent money from oil sales on weapons systems and personal luxuries for himself and his political cronies, rather than on the Iraqi people.

Given those facts, I believe we must increase the pressure on Iraq and insist on expanded weapons inspections with much greater resources and no restrictions. This should be done through a multinational effort coordinated through the United Nations and with the support of allies and other nations throughout the world.

The United States is absolutely right to insist on this and to take the lead in this effort. With international support, the United States stands the greatest chance for a successful outcome; and if military intervention is necessary, the number of casualties will be reduced and the regional repercussions will be lessened.

That is why I will support the Spratt amendment authorizing the President to seek international support for expanded inspections; and if Saddam Hussein refuses to comply with such inspections and an international coalition exists, the President would be authorized to commit U.S. military resources under U.S. command.

If, however, it is not possible to achieve a multinational coalition, in those circumstances the risks, the costs, and the international implications of a unilateral attack will be far more severe. Such an attack may be necessary, but before taking that step, the President should return to the Congress, explain why agreements have not been reached. And if in his judgment force is still necessary, he should, consistent with Article I of the Constitution, seek the authorization of the Congress for military force.

Throughout the discussions of war with Iraq, I have asked fundamental questions: What threat is posed by Iraq now and in the future? What is the military strategy for reducing that threat? What will the cost of that strategy be in human casualties on all sides? What are the international implications and potential regional scenarios that might be developed, and what is our long term strategy for the region?

I believe the first question has been answered. It is apparent that, while the threat to our own Nation may not be imminent, if allowed to go on Saddam Hussein will eventually develop even more dangerous weapons. Beyond that, however, the remaining questions have not been fully addressed. For each of the issues I have raised, and many others have as well, the potential risks and costs would be dramatically greater if the U.S. acts unilaterally rather than in a multinational effort.

Even some of our strongest allies have indicated they would not support us militarily or financially if we go it alone. Yet the risks, costs and consequences of unilateral action have not been adequately explained to the American people. Whatever course is chosen, I believe we will not solve the problem of international terrorism or weapons of mass destruction solely by attacking Saddam Hussein or solely through the broad use of military force. I understand well the impulse and the desire to do something and do it now to reduce the threat and fear created by September 11, and I believe it may yet be necessary to disarm Saddam Hussein, but we must all recognize that there is no course of action without risk or that we will eliminate all risk in the future.

Ultimately, we must look at the source of international conflicts; and

we must work to reduce the perceptions and the real conditions that allow terrorists and others to foment hatred toward our Nation. If we do not understand and deal with how our actions are perceived internationally, we will run the risk of defeating Saddam Hussein only to foster new threats and new hatreds elsewhere.

We can and must dedicate ourselves to the battle against terrorism, and we can and must hope the pressure applied to the Iraqi regime will bring about change and greater security. But as we seek that end, we must not neglect the challenges we face here at home; and we must not neglect our responsibility to address those challenges with honesty, forthrightness, and a sense of justice, fairness and a sense of shared sacrifice befitting a truly great Nation in times such as these.

The President of the United States and all Members of Congress have dedicated their hearts, minds and souls to protecting the safety and well-being of the American people. There are legitimate differences about how to achieve that in these times; but whatever the result of this vote, let no one question the motives, the courage, or the patriotism of those who will make this fateful decision.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BARRETT), a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, President Bush spoke on Monday night about the many threats Saddam Hussein poses to international security and why the President believes he should have the authority to launch a preemptive, unilateral attack on Iraq to force a regime change in that nation.

While I respect the President and his sincerity in seeking this authority, I am not convinced that such an attack is in the best interest of our Nation.

We all agree that Saddam Hussein is a dangerous man, yet that is not the topic under discussion here tonight. We are debating whether a unilateral military invasion is the best way to address the threats posed by Iraq. I must vote no on this grave issue because I am not persuaded that a preemptive, unilateral attack is the most effective way to control Saddam Hussein.

I agree with President Bush that the United States, in conjunction with our allies in Europe and the Middle East, must make a new effort to readmit a weapons inspectors into Iraq. A new inspection policy must give U.N. personnel unfettered access to any and every facility and have the ability to conduct unannounced surprise inspections. This new effort needs the full and vigorous cooperation of the U.N., NATO and nations in the Middle East. A united front is essential to success, and the international community must join the U.S. in enforcing U.N. resolutions.

As we survey the international community, however, nations in Europe and the Middle East, including key allies, range from lukewarm to downright hostile to the idea of launching a solo strike against Iraq. Many nations would react negatively to such an action, viewing such a preemptive U.S. attack as overly aggressive.

The world's response to our attack could easily include a global anti-American backlash, severely hampering our ability to fight the war on terrorism, build security and peace in the Middle East, and protect vital U.S. interests. We must not forget that the war on terror requires the support and cooperation of our key allies in the Middle East, Europe and around the world. We rely on these nations to root out terror cells within their borders and share with us important information.

We must also remember that since the end of the Gulf War the U.S. has kept a close eye on Iraq. We have maintained a strong military presence in the region, imposed sanctions, conducted thousands of military flights over no-fly zones, and focused our intelligence community on Baghdad. We have made clear that any misbehavior by Saddam would be met immediately by overwhelming force. As a result of our deterrence, Saddam Hussein has not attacked Saudi Arabia, Israel, Kuwait or others since the Gulf War because he knows that such a move would bring the full weight of the U.S. and the world upon him. His desire to cling to power supersedes his hunger for conquest.

If we strike first, we change that dynamic. Knowing his survival would be at stake, Saddam would have a powerful incentive to use every weapon in his arsenal to defeat American troops. He might target Israel, hoping to fan the flames of conflict between Israel and the Arab world to create chaos in the region.

I am concerned that our preemptive unilateral strike would trigger the very events we hope to avoid: regional war, rampant instability, and use of weapons of mass destruction.

We also must recognize that a preemptive unilateral attack against Iraq would represent a major shift in American diplomatic and strategic thinking.

□ 0010

For nearly 50 years we relied upon deterrence to check upon Soviet expansionism. Deterrence brought us victory in the Cold War without having to fight a hot shooting war under the shadow of nuclear annihilation. That same strategy has kept Iraq at bay for more than a decade.

Now that doctrine is on the verge of being discarded. The potential consequence of such a shift in strategic thinking includes an emboldened China moving against Taiwan, Russia acting aggressively against the nations of her former empire, and India and Pakistan attacking each other with nuclear weapons.

There are several other critical questions to which we have heard very few answers. We must have a clear plan on how an attack on Iraq would transpire, including identifying our military options, determining our strategy to change the regime, calculating the potential casualties, and estimating how much an operation would cost and how it would be funded. We must also see a plan to build democratic and free market institutions in a post-Saddam Iraq. History teaches us that how we win the peace is just as critical as how we win war. Thus far these critical issues have received scant attention.

The international community has an important obligation to ensure that Saddam Hussein cannot repeat the aggression of his past; and as the world's most powerful country, we have a commitment to lead. Through U.N. inspections, continued monitoring, and increased scrutiny of Bagdad we can meet that responsibility. We cannot, however, move in a unilateral manner that could jeopardize the peace and security of the Middle East if not the world. I must vote ''no'' on H.J. Resolution 114 and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), one of our top constitutional lawyers in this House.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, if our goal is to disarm Iraq, I believe the best way to accomplish that goal would be to utilize the strategy articulated a few weeks ago by Secretary of State Colin Powell, that is, to reinstate, utilizing established rules and supported by multilateral military force if necessary. This policy has the best chance of working, and it has the support of the international community. If military force is needed to enforce the inspections, it will be targeted, focused, and not requiring a massive invasion force. It will be unlikely to provoke widespread warfare all over the Middle East; and it is just as likely to fulfill the goal of disarming Iraq as widespread bombing.

If on the other hand we merely start dropping bombs, how do we even know where to bomb if we have not inspected first? If we do know where the weapons are, those locations can be placed first on the inspection list, and if there is any resistance to the inspection, multilateral military force could be targeted on those sites.

But today we are discussing a resolution authorizing the use of force before the inspectors have even had an opportunity to do their jobs. This resolution represents the last opportunity for Congress to have a meaningful input in the decision to go to war, and unfortunately there are many problems and unanswered questions with granting this authority now.

The first problem is that although the resolution suggests that the President first try to work with the U.N., that provision is unenforceable. This is a problem especially because the President has already stated that he did not

need the United Nations, and this resolution allows the President to just notify Congress that, based on the authority granted in this resolution, he has decided to attack Iraq. Furthermore, the broad authority granted in this resolution is inappropriate because of the timing of this vote, less than a month before the election.

Twelve years ago under the first President Bush, the vote to use military force in the Persian Gulf was taken after the election. The timing of this resolution also raises questions because there is nothing shown to be urgent about the situation in Iraq. If the President discovers that the U.S. is in imminent danger, he is already authorized to defend the Nation and no one would expect him to wait for a congressional resolution. If the argument is that the urgency was created a year ago on September 11, the evidence supporting the connection between 9–11 and Iraq is at best tenuous.

In addition to these problems, granting the authority in the resolution is premature because many questions are unanswered. For example, what plans have been made for the governance of Iraq after we win the war? And what chance is there that a regime change will create any better situation than we have now? And to the extent that Iraq has chemical and biological weapons, is it a good idea to invade Iraq and place our troops right in harm's way? And what will the war cost, and how will we pay for it?

Eighteen months ago we had the largest budget surplus in American history. Today even without the cost of a war, we are approaching the largest deficit in American history with huge deficits already projected for the next 10 years. So what is the plan to pay for the war? Are we going to cut funds for education and health care? Are we going to raise taxes, or will we just run up additional deficits? And what will the domino effect be? If we attack Iraq, Iraq may attack Israel, Israel will attack back, and then everyone in the Middle East will choose sides, and how will that make us better off than we are now?

If we are to make progress against terrorism, we have to recognize that hate is as big an enemy as complex weapons. That hatred may increase because others will resent the fact that we have chosen to apply rules to others that we are unwilling to have applied to us. We would not tolerate applying regime change to the United States, nor would we accept preemptive strikes as an acceptable international policy. The CIA has now reported that the chance that Iraq will use chemical or biological weapons has actually increased since all of the talk about a war began.

Mr. Speaker, all of these problems persist and questions remain unanswered, and they lead to the same basic uncertainty. What is the plan both before and after the war and what are the consequences? Some have argued that a vote against the resolution is a vote to do nothing. That is not true. We should act, but based on the information we now have, I believe the wisest course is to proceed with the strategy proposed by Colin Powell, and that is U.N. weapons inspections in Iraq enforced with multilateral military power. That strategy has the support of the international community. It is most likely to actually disarm Iraq; it does not require a massive unilateral invasion force; and it reduces the risk of provoking widespread armed conflict in the Middle East and terrorism in the United States.

I therefore urge my fellow Members to vote against the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, these votes on the Iraq resolution pose difficult questions for all of us. A large part of the difficulty is caused by the Administration's inconsistent policies on what we should do, when we should do it, and whose approval we need. Not many days ago, the Administration articulated the policy that it could proceed unilaterally, without U.N. support, and without Congressional approval, to attack Iraq, with a preemptive strike, without the necessity of an imminent threat to the United States, for the purpose of ''regime change''. On one recent Sunday, Vice President CHENEY and Secretary of State Powell articulated inconsistent descriptions of the Administration's policy. This resolution, which the Administration is now supporting, repudiates the initial Administration policy by requiring the Administration to seek both U.N. cooperation and Congressional approval. Last weekend, the Boston Globe began an article on the Administration's position on Iraq with the sentence ''As administration officials struggle to reach an agreement with U.S. allies about Iraq, President Bush has been shifting his rhetoric in favor of less aggressive language that emphasizes disarming Saddam Hussein rather than ousting him.'' So because of these constant changes, formulating a response to the Administration's position has been difficult.

The first question we must address is this: what is the goal? If the goal is to disarm Iraq, I believe that the best way to accomplish that goal would be to utilize the strategy articulated a few weeks ago by Secretary of State Powell: reinstate U.N. inspections, utilizing the established rules, supported by multilateral military force, if necessary. This policy has the best chance of working. At a minimum, it is an important first step. And it has the support of the international community. If military force is needed to enforce the inspections, it will be targeted, focused and not requiring a massive invasion force; it would be unlikely to provoke widespread warfare all over the Middle East; and it is also just as likely to fulfill the goal of disarming Iraq as widespread bombing.

If, on the other hand, you merely start dropping bombs—how do you even know where to bomb, if you haven't inspected first? If you do know where the weapons are, those locations could be placed first on the inspection list, and if there is any resistance to the inspection, multilateral military force could be targeted to those sites.

But today we are discussing a resolution authorizing the use of force, before inspectors have had an opportunity to do their jobs. Unlike the first Administration resolution offered a few days ago, this resolution does require the President to cooperate with Congress and to try to work with the U.N. This resolution is not as broad as the previous draft. It is limited to Iraq, not the entire Middle East, but it still gives the President the authority to attack, if *he* determines it to be necessary and appropriate.

This resolution represents the last opportunity for Congress to have meaningful input in the decision to go to war. And unfortunately there are many problems and unanswered questions with granting this authority now.

The first problem is that although the resolution suggests that the President try to work with the U.N., the provision is unenforceable. The President merely has to notify Congress, if he chooses to launch an attack. If we are truly interested in making sure that the President fully exhausts diplomatic efforts before using force, then the resolution should not authorize a military attack without a subsequent statement from Congress.

There is a consensus in the United States that we should work with the U.N. to the extent possible. But after this vote, Congress will have no opportunity to require meaningful efforts to seek cooperation with the U.N. This is a problem especially because the President has already state his disdain for the U.N. by saying at first that he didn't need the U.N., and when he finally sought U.N. support, he implied that if they failed to support the United States, he would proceed to attack without them. Furthermore, the Administration is now insisting on new, unprecedented rules for inspections, a position which may provoke Iraq into resisting the inspections and creating an unnecessary impasse at the U.N. A more prudent strategy would be to require the President to come back to Congress and explain that he made the good faith effort to work with the U.N.—rather than allowing the President to just notify Congress that based on the authority granted in this resolution, he had decided to attack Iraq.

Furthermore, the broad authority granted by this resolution is inappropriate, because of the timing of this vote—less than a month before the election. This problem is magnified by the fact that nearly all of the President's statements on the need for this resolution have been made at partisan political fundraisers, where he attacks Democratic officeholders. Twelve years ago—under the first President Bush—the vote to use military force in the Persian Gulf was taken after the election. That would be a good model to follow, because then members voted without the interests of personal political considerations competing with the national interests.

The timing of the vote on this resolution also raises questions because there is nothing urgent about the situation with Iraq. We have the same information now that we had 2 years ago. For example, we have known that Iraq has had the capability to build biological and chemical weapons for years; in fact we know this because they bought some of the materials from the United States. Furthermore, no case has been made that there is an imminent threat to the United States. So why is it essential for the President to have the authority to attack Iraq now? If the President discovers that the United States is in imminent danger, he is already authorized to defend the nation, and no one would expect him to wait for a Congressional Resolution. So what is different now? If the argument is that the urgency was

created a year ago on September 11th, the evidence supporting the connection between 9/11 and Iraq is at best tenuous. So what is the urgency to authorize force right before the election?

Another problem with the broad authority granted in the resolution is that this issue appears to be personal for the President. He admitted as much when he described Saddam Hussein as ''the man who tried to kill my Dad.'' The United States should not go to war to settle a personal vendetta.

In addition to these problems, granting the authority in the resolution is premature because many questions are unanswered. For example, if the President uses the authority granted in this resolution and attacks Iraq, what plans have been made for the governance of Iraq after we win the war.

And what chance is there that a regime change will create any better situation than we have now. We cannot forget that the United States was involved in the regime change in Cuba in which Batista was kicked out and we ended up with Castro. So why isn't it likely that Iraq will select someone who hates us even more than Saddam Hussein.

And other questions need to be addressed, such as, to the extent that Iraq has chemical and biological weapons, is it a good idea to invade Iraq and put our troops right in harm's way. ''And what will the war cost and how will we pay for it? There is no question that we are willing to pay whatever it costs to be successful in the war, but we can't ignore the questions of ''how long'' and ''how much money.'' Eighteen months ago, we had the largest budget surplus in American history. Today, even without the costs of a war, we are approaching the largest deficit in American history, with huge deficits projected for the next 10 years. The direct costs of the war have been estimated at $100 billion; the indirect costs, such as higher oil costs, have not even been estimated. And so, what will we be giving up in terms of being able to fund education and health care and other needs here in the United States? Or is the plan to raise taxes? Or is the plan to just run up more deficits?

What will be the domino effect? If we attack Iraq, Iraq will attack Israel, Israel will attack back, and then everyone in the Middle East will choose sides. How will that make us better off than we are now, especially in our fight against terrorism?

And in the end, what will we have won? In making progress against terrorism, we have to recognize that hate is as much of an enemy as complex weapons. The weapons used to cause mass destruction on 9/11 were boxcutters. Firearms and explosives are easily available in the United States and can be used against buildings or modes of transportation. If the result of the war is that others hate us worse than they do now, then we have to understand that suicide bombings in the United States may increase.

Moreover, that hatred may increase because others will resent that we have chosen to apply rules to others that we are unwilling to have applied to us. We would certainly not tolerate another country applying ''regime change'' to the United States. And we would never approve of preemptive strikes when there is no imminent threat as an acceptable international policy. Recently, the Administration threatened Iraqi military personnel with trials as war criminals; but the U.S. policy is not to subject our personnel to the jurisdiction of international criminal tribunals. The CIA has now reported that the chance that Iraq will use chemical or biological weapons has actually increased since all of the talk about war began.

Mr. Speaker, all of these problems persist and questions remain unanswered, and they lead to the same basic uncertainty—what is the plan, both before and after the war, and what are the consequences. Some have argued that a vote against the Resolution is a vote to do nothing. That is not true. We should act, but based on the information we have now, I believe the wisest course is to proceed with the strategy proposed by Secretary of State Powell—U.N. weapons inspections in Iraq enforced with multilateral military power. That strategy has the support of the international community; it is most likely to actually disarm Iraq; it does not require a massive, unilateral invasion force; and it reduces the risk of provoking widespread armed conflict in the Middle East and terrorism in the United States.

I therefore urge my fellow members to vote against this resolution.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE), a member of the Committee on Financial Services.

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, at its heart this debate tonight is not about Saddam Hussein. That debate is finished. We know that he is a tyrant and a thug. The debate tonight is about what our vision of America in this new age of new threats should be, and the one thing we should all agree on is America is the greatest Nation on Earth because it has always hued to certain principles. It has always matched the might of its Armed Forces with the force of its principles. It has never resorted through trial and tumult and storm to shortcuts even in times of difficulty.

And there are three principles that we should think about tonight: number one, it is an American principle that we engage the international community in a system of mutual security and international law; number two, it is an American principle that countries do not engage in first strikes absent international accord or truly imminent threat; number three, it is an American principle that the United States Congress is the group that makes the declaration of war. And unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this resolution violates every single one of those basic tenets of American democracy.

They have put some legislative lipstick on it. They put some nice fuzzy language around it. But ultimately it violates this rule: no Congress should give any President a blank check to start a unilateral, ill-timed war, to let him start a war for any reason at any time with or without any allies. And in doing so, these principles are violated.

Let me address the first one, the basic principle that America stands for international cooperation, and this has been a bipartisan principle for decades in this country. Republican and Democratic Presidents alike have worked with the international community to develop international law, international support systems; and we have led the Nation in doing so.

□ 0020

We have led the Nation, because a world where countries can strike one another without international support, without a true imminent threat, is a law of the jungle. This Nation, even in today's threat, should lead the world forward to international law, rather than backward to the law of the jungle.

This concept is more important after September 11 than less, and it is more important because of what the generals have told us, General Hoar, General Zinni, General Clark. We need to heed their advice, because what they have told us is simple and alarming.

They have told us that if we engage in a unilateral attack in the Middle East, it has the capacity of supercharging Osama bin Laden's recruitment efforts. There is no victory in the destruction of one tyrant while breeding 10,000 terrorists. It is true that a unilateral attack that inflames the Middle East has the capacity of reducing our security rather than increasing it. This violates an American principle.

Second, we have a principle of honoring our troops. We do not owe Saddam Hussein any more time. We do not owe Saddam Hussein anything. But we owe the soldiers and sailors and our sons and our daughters who we would send into the streets of Baghdad the ultimate effort to go the last mile to see if we can resolve the disarmament, and the total disarmament of weapons of mass destruction, before war. We owe our soldiers and sailors to make war the last option, not the first step.

I got a letter from a mother from Wenatchee, Washington, this week making one plea to me that when I took this vote, to say that she understood her son could be involved in a sacrifice at the cause of liberty, but not until every option is exhausted, and every option has not been exhausted. That is why we should pass the separate resolution, which will call for the President to go to the United Nations, get a tough, certain, guaranteed disarmament effort, and get this job done.

Third, we are a people who keep our eye on the ball. We have a principle in this Nation of not becoming distracted, and we do not know why we should take our eye off the ball, off the threat of al Qaeda, which 1 month ago was listed as a high threat of repeated terrorist attacks in this Nation, and go put our precious resources in dealing with what the CIA yesterday said was a low threat of terrorist activities. It does not make sense to the American people to do that.

So for those purposes and those principles, international cooperation, honoring our troops, and keeping our eye

on the ball, Mr. Speaker, we should reject this resolution and pass the Spratt amendment. This is the American way.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation once again considers a course of action that will define our moral standing in the history of free peoples. I agree that America should speak with one voice in response to the challenges to international peace, security, and human rights posed by the regime in Iraq. That voice must be founded on the most fundamental of moral principles: the sanctity of human life.

The value of human life has been the basis for the settled, bipartisan international policy toward Iraq that we in this Congress have expressed in the past. In 1998, Congress reflected a strong, unified voice when we voted to support legislation that noted Iraq's violation of U.N. disarmament demands to eliminate all weapons of mass destruction, as well as their development.

In that same year, we also enacted the Iraq Liberation Act that authorized U.S. support for Iraqi liberation forces in their efforts to replace the Iraqi regime of Saddam Hussein. We did so because Saddam Hussein has proven himself to be a serious threat to regional stability in the Middle East, a growing threat to the United States, and a leader who deserves to be tried in an international tribunal for crimes against humanity. However, we did not authorize the unilateral use of U.S. military forces towards that end.

Neither the American people nor their elected representatives have wavered in our support for the values of human rights, security, international stability, and democracy reflected in those 1998 congressional resolutions.

However, as we consider this resolution, we must not forget one essential fact. As the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has concluded, we have seen no evidence or no intelligence to suggest that Iraq indeed poses an imminent threat to our Nation. In the absence of an imminent threat to the United States, I cannot support the resolution proposed by the Bush administration that would authorize preemptive military strikes by the U.S. forces to enforce all relevant U.N. resolutions, some of which deal with issues other than Iraqi weapons of mass destruction.

I agree with the senior Senator from West Virginia, who has observed that the President's proposed resolution is dangerously hasty, redefines the nature of defense, and reinterprets the Constitution to suit the will of the executive branch.

The resolution proposed by the administration would codify the doctrine of preemption, the assertion that America has the unilateral right to attack a nation that has not attacked us. This, in my view, would be a precedent with disastrous consequences. A unilateral first strike would almost certainly result in substantial loss of life, both among American troops and among Iraqi civilians. A unilateral first strike would undermine the moral authority of the United States and could set a devastating international precedent that we could then see echoed in conflicts between India and Pakistan, Russia and Georgia, China and Taiwan, and in many other corners of the world.

In addition, unilateral U.S. action may well destabilize the Middle East, harming the international cooperation that we need to defend America against terrorism.

Experts tell us that the United States might have to remain in Iraq for a decade, a commitment requiring international support and engagement.

Finally, the economic costs of going it alone would undermine the ability of our Nation to address our unmet domestic priorities.

Although this resolution would authorize the President to take this Nation to war, it is not a declaration of war, it is a blank check to use force without the moral or political authority of a declaration of war. Congress must not abandon its authority under the Constitution. This resolution would do just that.

The course of action that is more consistent with the values and security interests of the United States is to support a multinational collective security strategy towards the threats to regional peace and international stability that are posed by the regime in Iraq. The administration has indicated some progress within the United Nations Security Council towards that goal. I join the President in urging all members of the Council to act with due diligence.

I also join in the position advanced by our colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), who has proposed that we once again authorize U.S. military support for a renewed and strengthened U.N. Security Council resolution that demands true disarmament by Iraq. This is a threat that the civilized world must face together. The regime of Saddam Hussein, after all, is the world's problem as well as our own.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation is on the verge of opening a new front in the global war on terror. It is a front fraught with peril. It is a front that may send thousands of young Americans, men and women, to uproot a ruthless dictator that has committed unspeakable acts against his own people and wrought havoc on the world.

No decision is more difficult, more wrenching for a U.S. President, the Congress, or the American people than to commit our soldiers and our Nation's prestige to a military conflagration. It is for this reason that we must consider all possible diplomatic and military options short of war.

As noted 19th century French author Guy de Maupassant wrote, ''Every government has as much of a duty to avoid war as a ship's captain has to avoid a shipwreck.''

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Spratt substitute to House Joint Resolution 114. It offers the best and most certain way to achieve our objectives of disarming Iraq of weapons of mass destruction and the best chance of avoiding a hasty decision to go to war. It is a sensible, prudent approach to managing the use of force by our country.

Eleven years ago, then President George Bush created one of the most impressive multinational coalitions that the world has ever seen. He very wisely determined that it was not in our Nation's interest to act unilaterally to liberate Kuwait.

The Spratt substitute is informed by that experience. It limits the opportunity of our current President for unilateral action to liberate Iraq.

I am pleased that President George W. Bush has engaged the U.N. during the current crisis. I am grateful that he has recognized that our Nation should work with the United Nations Security Council and allow weapons inspections to go forward and this process to occur.

□ 0030

I am relieved the President said that war is not inevitable. And I am encouraged that he has said that he would give a diplomatic course to disarm Iraq through a U.N. process every chance to work ahead of using force.

Mr. Speaker, the Spratt resolution guarantees the President's stated intentions are made law. As set forth in the Spratt substitute, our Armed Forces should take action only against Iraq only in conjunction with a new U.N. Security Council resolution that calls for the complete elimination of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction.

If the U.N. Security Council resolution is violated or the U.N. does not act, the President would need approval from Congress for unilateral action, and then only after making certain important certifications to Congress. Thus, this vote would occur only if the President has certified that further U.N. action is not forthcoming, force remains the only viable option, a broadbased international coalition is being formed, and the global war on terrorism would not be adversely affected by an Iraqi invasion.

Mr. Speaker, there is no such thing as prudent haste. It is an understatement to say that we should take the

time for calm deliberation by the Congress in a proceeding uncomplicated by any question other than whether we should commit to a course of action that may cost a heavy toll in human lives, hundreds of billions of dollars, and the good will of the international community.

I urge support of the Spratt substitute. But what is our course if Spratt is not adopted? What then is the best course for us to address the threat of terrorism and the threat of the use of chemical and biological weapons in the hands of a brutal dictator? What is our best chance to evoke the response from Iraq that will lead to unfettered weapons inspections and eventual disarmament?

With long and careful thought I have come to the conclusion that the leadership of Iraq will only submit to a credible disarmament process based on inspections if it is faced with a credible threat of the use of force. It is the use of force authorization that I pray will never be used. And it is the use of force authorization that should never be used unilaterally. After Spratt, H.J. Res. 114 provides the only remaining prudent chance to stem these new threats of unthinkable horrific terror that our Nation and the world now face, threats that we are now only just beginning to understand. It is a chance that I believe our country through this Congress must commit to take at this time.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT), who has been a very active Member on this resolution.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) for his perseverance. I know he has been here until the wee hours of the morning last night and this evening. And for those of us who oppose the underlying resolution, we are indeed in his debt. And I also want to thank him for his leadership within our caucus, not just simply on this particular issue but on many issues, particularly in terms of the continent of Africa. He is certainly someone who commands our respect.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to bring to the attention of the House disturbing reports that have recently appeared in the national press about alleged efforts to tailor intelligence information about Iraqi intentions and capabilities to fill the contours of administration policy. And I wish to note two particular stories from today's Washington Post and yesterday's Miami Herald.

Mr. Speaker, I will insert the articles now in the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 9, 2002]

ANALYSTS DISCOUNT ATTACK BY IRAQ

(By Dana Priest)

Unprovoked by a U.S. military campaign, Iraqi President Saddam Hussein is unlikely to initiate a chemical or biological attack against the United States, intelligence agencies concluded in a classified report given to select senators last week.

However, the report added, ''should Saddam conclude that a US-led attack could no longer be deterred,'' he might launch a chemical-biological counterattack. Hussein might ''decide that the extreme step of assisting Islamist terrorists in conducting a WMD [weapons of mass destruction] attack against the United States would be his last chance to exact vengeance by taking a large number of victims with him.''

The assessment was first made in a classified National Intelligence Estimate, which includes the analysis and opinions of all relevant U.S. intelligence agencies, that was given to the Senate intelligence committee last week. A declassified ''white paper'' on Iraq was released days later. At the urging of the committee, which is controlled by Democrats, additional portions of the intelligence report were declassified by the CIA Monday and released last night.

With lawmakers poised to vote this week on a resolution giving President Bush authority to attack Iraq, the new intelligence report offers grist both for supporters and critics of the administration's policy. The CIA assessment appears to suggest that an attack on Iraq could provoke the very thing the President has said he is trying to forestall: the use of chemical or biological weapons by Hussein.

But the CIA also declassified other elements of analysis that seem to back up the President's assertion that Iraq has active ties to al Qaeda—a growing feature of the administration's case for considering military action.

Among the intelligence assessments linking Iraq with al Qaeda is ''credible reporting'' that the group's ''leaders sought contacts in Iraq who could help them acquire WMD capabilities,'' according to a letter to senators from CIA Director George T. Tenet.

Tenet added: ''Iraq's increasing support to extremist Palestinians, coupled with growing indications of a relationship'' with al Qaeda, ''suggest Baghdad's links to terrorists will increase, even absent U.S. military action.''

In his speech to the nation Monday night, Bush said: ''Iraq could decide on any given day to provide a biological or chemical weapon to a terrorist group or individual terrorists. Alliance with terrorists could allow the Iraqi regime to attack America without leaving any fingerprints.''

The letter's release shed light on a behind-the-scenes battle over Iraq-related intelligence. The CIA's detailed, unvarnished view of the threat posed by Iraq is central, say many lawmakers, to how they will vote on the matter. Yet an increasing number of intelligence officials, including former and current intelligence agency employees, are concerned the agency is tailoring its public stance to fit the administration's views.

The CIA works for the president, but its role is to provide him with information untainted by political agendas.

Caught in the tug of war over intelligence, say former intelligence officials familiar with current CIA intelligence and analysis on Iraq, have been the CIA's rank and file and, to some extent, Tenet.

There is a tremendous amount of pressure on the CIA to substantiate positions that have already been adopted by the administration,'' said Vincent M. Cannistraro, former head of counterterrorism at the CIA.

Tenet last night released a statement meant to dispel assertions that the letter contained new information that would undercut the case Bush made Monday night.

''There is no inconsistency between our view of Saddam's growing threat and the view as expressed by the President in his speech,'' the statement read. ''Although we think the chances of Saddam initiating a WMD attack at this moment are low—in part because it would constitute an admission that he possesses WMD—there is no question that the likelihood of Saddam using WMD against the United States or our allies in the region for blackmail, deterrence, or otherwise grows as his arsenal continues to build.''

In explaining why the items in the letter were not also released before, Tenet said he did not want to provide ''Saddam a blueprint of our intelligence capabilities and shortcomings, or with insight into our expectations of how he will and will not act.''

Still, he noted, the agency could nevertheless declassify further information not previously disclosed. Included in his letter were snippets of an Oct. 2 closed-door session.

Included in that was questioning by Sen. Carl M. Levin (D-Mich.), in which he asked an unnamed intelligence official whether it ''is likely that [Hussein] would initiate an attack using a weapon of mass destruction?''

The official answered: ''... in the foreseeable future, given the conditions we understand now, the likelihood I think would be low.''

Levin asked: ''If we initiate an attack and he thought he was in extremis ... what's the likelihood in response to our attack that he would use chemical or biological weapons?''

The answer came: ''Pretty high, in my view.''

In his letter, Tenet responded to senators' questions about Iraq's connections to al Qaeda. ''We have solid reporting of senior-level contacts between Iraq and Al Qaeda going back a decade,'' Tenet wrote. ''Credible information'' also indicates that Iraq and al Qaeda ''have discussed safe haven and reciprocal non-aggression.''

[From The Miami Herald, Oct. 8, 2002]

DISSENT OVER GOING TO WAR GROWS AMONG U.S. GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

(By Warren P. Strobel, Jonathan S. Landay and John Walcott)

WASHINGTON.—While President Bush marshals congressional and international support for invading Iraq, a growing number of military officers, intelligence professionals and diplomats in his own government privately have deep misgivings about the administration's double-time march toward war.a

These officials charge that administration hawks have exaggerated evidence of the threat that Iraqi leader Saddam Hussein poses—including distorting his links to the al Qaeda terrorist network—have overstated the extent of international support for attacking Iraq and have downplayed the potential repercussions of a new war in the Middle East.

They charge that the administration squelches dissenting views and that intelligence analysts are under intense pressure to produce reports supporting the White House's argument that Hussein poses such an immediate threat to the United States that preemptive military action is necessary.

''Analysts at the working level in the intelligence community are feeling very strong pressure from the Pentagon to cook the intelligence books,'' said one official, speaking on condition of anonymity.

VIEWS ECHOED

A dozen other officials echoed his views in interviews with the Knight Ridder Washington Bureau.

They cited recent suggestions by Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld and National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice that Hussein and Osama bin Laden's al Qaeda network are working together.

Rumsfeld said on Sept. 26 that the U.S. government has ''bulletproof'' confirmation

of links between Iraq and al Qaeda members, including ''solid evidence'' that members of the terrorist network maintain a presence in Iraq.

The facts are much less conclusive. Officials said Rumsfeld's statement was based in part on intercepted telephone calls in which an al Qaeda member who apparently was passing through Baghdad was overheard calling friends or relatives, intelligence officials said.

The intercepts provide no evidence that the suspected terrorist was working with the Iraqi regime or that he was working on a terrorist operation while he was in Iraq, they said.

In his Monday night speech, President Bush said a senior al Qaeda leader received medical treatment in Baghdad this year—implying larger cooperation—but he offered no evidence of complicity in any plot between the terrorist and Hussein's regime.

Rumsfeld also suggested that the Iraqi regime has offered safe haven to bin Laden and Taliban leader Mullah Mohammed Omar.

While technically true, that too is misleading. Intelligence reports said the Iraqi ambassador to Turkey, a longtime intelligence officer, made the offer during a visit to Afghanistan in late 1998, after the United States attacked al Qaeda training camps with cruise missiles to retaliate for the bombings of the U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania. But officials said the same intelligence reports said bin Laden rejected the offer because he didn't want Hussein to control his group.

NO IRONCLAD PROOF

In fact, the officials said, there's no ironclad evidence that the Iraqi regime and the terrorist network are working together, or that Hussein has ever contemplated giving chemical or biological weapons to al Qaeda, with whom he has deep ideological differences.

None of the dissenting officials, who work in a number of different agencies, would agree to speak publicly. But many of them have long experience in the Middle East and South Asia, and all spoke in similar terms about their unease with the way that U.S. political leaders are dealing with Iraq.

All agreed that Hussein is a threat who eventually must be dealt with, and none flatly opposes military action. But, they say, the U.S. government has no dramatic new knowledge about the Iraqi leader that justifies Bush's urgent call to arms.

''I've seen nothing that's compelling,'' said one military officer who has access to intelligence reports.

Some lawmakers have voiced similar concerns after receiving CIA briefings.

Sen. Richard Durbin, D–I11., said some information he had seen did not support Bush's portrayal of the Iraqi threat.

''Its troubling to have classified information that contradicts statements made by the administration,'' Durbin said, ''There's more they should share with the public.''

Florida's Sen. Bob Graham, chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, last week expressed frustration with the information he was receiving from the CIA and questioned the need to elevate Iraq to ''our No. 1 threat.''

In his Monday night speech, Bush stressed that if Hussein gained control of radioactive material no bigger than ''a softball'' he could build a nuclear weapon sufficient to intimidate his region, blackmail the world and covertly arm terrorists. But a senior administration intelligence official notes that Hussein has sought such highly enriched uranium for many years without success, and there is no evidence that he has it now.

Moreover, the senior official said, Hussein has no way to deliver a nuclear weapon against a U.S. target.

''Give them a nuclear weapon and you have the problem of delivery. Give them delivery, even clandestine, and you have a problem of plausible denial. Does anyone think that a nuclear weapon detonating in a Ryder truck or tramp freighter would not automatically trigger a response that would include Iraq, Iran, North Korea?'' the intelligence official asked.

Here are some other examples of questionable statements:

Vice President Dick Cheney said in late August that Iraq might have nuclear weapons ''fairly soon.''

A CIA report released Friday said it could take Iraq until the last half of the decade to produce a nuclear weapon, unless it could acquire bomb-grade uranium of plutonium on the black market.

Also in August, Rumsfeld suggested that al Qaeda operatives fleeing Afghanistan were taking refuge in Iraq with Hussein's assistance.

Rumsfeld apparently was referring to about 150 members of the militant Islamic group Ansar al Islam (Supporters of Islam) who have taken refuge in Kurdish areas of northern Iraq. One of America's would-be Kurdish allies controls that part of the country, however, not Hussein.

WALKOVER NOTION

Current and former military officers also question the view sometimes expressed by Cheney, Rumsfeld and their civilian advisors in and out of the U.S. government that an American-led campaign against the Iraqi military would be a walkover.

''It is an article of faith among those with no military experience that the Iraqi military is low-hanging fruit,'' one intelligence officer said.

He challenged that notion, citing the U.S. experience in Somalia, where militiamen took thousands of casualties in 1993 but still managed to kill U.S. soldiers and force an American withdrawal.

Iraqi commanders, some officials warned, also could unleash chemical or biological weapons—although the American military is warning them they could face war crimes charges if they do—or U.S. airstrikes could do so inadvertently.

Hussein also might try to strike Israel or Saudi Arabia with Scud missiles tipped with chemical or biological weapons.

Mr. Speaker, the Herald story states, and I am quoting now, ''that a growing number of military officers, intelligence professionals and diplomats within the administration have deep misgivings about the march toward war.'' The story continues, and again I am quoting from the Miami Herald, ''These officials charge that the administration hawks have exaggerated evidence of the threat that the Iraqi leader Saddam Hussein poses, including distorting his links to the al Qaeda terrorist network. They have overstated the extent of international support for attacking Iraq and have downplayed the potential repercussions of a new war in the Middle East. They charge that the administration squelches dissenting views and that intelligence analysts are under intense pressure to produce reports supporting the White House's arguments that Hussein poses such an immediate threat to the United States that preemptive military action is necessary. 'Analysts at the working level in the intelligence community are feeling very strong pressure from the Pentagon to cook the intelligence books,' said one official speaking on the condition of anonymity.''

The article goes on to note that, again, I am quoting, ''a dozen officials echoed his views.''

Now today's Washington Post discusses what it calls a ''behind-the-scenes battle over Iraq-related intelligence.'' And, again, I am quoting: ''The CIA's detailed, unvarnished view of the threat posed by Iraq is central, say many lawmakers, as to how they will vote on the matter. Yet, increasing numbers of intelligence officials, including former and current intelligence agency employees are concerned the agency is tailoring its public stance to fit the administration's views.''

The article goes on to quote a former head of counterterrorism of the CIA, one Vincent Cannistraro, who says that ''there is a tremendous amount of pressure on the CIA to substantiate positions that have already been adopted by the administration.''

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if these reports are accurate, they represent a dangerous state of affairs. When we began our debate on this resolution yesterday morning, we did not have the benefit of declassified intelligence estimates released only last night, which indicate that Saddam Hussein is unlikely to initiate a chemical or biological attack against the United States unless he concludes that a U.S.-led attack is inevitable. Such contradictions between classified information in the administration's public statements make it very difficult for Congress to have a meaningful debate. It puts those few Members of Congress who have access to this information as members of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in a truly awkward position and leaves the rest of us and the American people in the dark.

Senator GRAHAM, who chairs the Senate Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, has said that the classified information he has received does not tally with the public statements of the administration. But, of course, he is not permitted to explain why. Based on what he knows, he has described the focus on Iraq as a distraction from the war on terrorism that allows Syria and Iran, countries which should be at the forefront of any intelligence effort against state sponsors of terrorism, off the hook.

Let me conclude by saying that we cannot discharge our constitutional responsibilities by allowing the administration to control the flow of information and simply trusting that they know what they are doing. That is an unacceptable situation in a democracy, Mr. Speaker. And that is not what the founders had in mind when they gave Congress, not the President, the power to declare war.

Mr. Speaker, what is the responsibility of a great power? Sometimes it is to act when others cannot, or will not, do so. Sometimes it is to refrain from acting when others would, so

as not to set a dangerous precedent that others might follow. Always it is to recognize that for better or worse our actions shape the rules by which the international system operates. The rule of law is a fragile thing. And through our actions, we either strengthen or erode it.

If you think this is merely a theoretical concern, let me share with you an article from last Sunday's New York Times. It is by Stephen Sestanovich, a senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations and professor international diplomacy at Columbia University.

The article is entitled, ''Putin Has His Own Candidate for Pre-emption.'' It described the efforts of senior Russian officials to co-opt the rhetoric of the Bush Administration in their war of intimidation against the neighboring Republic of Georgia, where some Chechen fighters have taken refuge. Allow me to quote a few lines:

''On the eve of President Bush's Sept. 12 speech to the United Nations on Iraq, Mr. Putin wrote Secretary General Kofi Annan charging that Georgia's passivity toward Chechen fighters on its territory violated Security Council resolutions. Russia might therefore have to act unilaterally. The chief of Russia's general staff insisted that Mr. Shevardnadze was 'in no way' different from Mullah Omar of the Taliban.''

''The Russian defense minister announced that no United Nations vote was needed to attack Georgia. One Russian newspaper published military plans to occupy all of Georgia—and thereby 'dictate the terms' of its future existence as a state. The headline: 'Pre-emption Moscow-Style.' ''

Such are the dangers of unilateral assertions of power by the leader of the free world. Such are the risks that other nations with aggressive intentions may use stale evidence and ill-defined allegations to settle local grievances.

This is not to deny that there are times when it is necessary to strike first against an enemy who poses a ''clear and present danger'' to the safety and security of the Nation. The Constitution is not a suicide pact, as Justice Jackson famously said. And the same is true of the international legal order. We are not compelled to stand by and allow ourselves to be attacked before we can lawfully take action.

But any nation that engages in the preemptive use of force bears a heavy burden of showing that its actions were justified by the nature of the threat confronting it.

The principles that apply were formulated by none other than Daniel Webster, who was Secretary of State when the British launched a surprise attack on an American ship, the *Caroline,* in 1837.

Webster set forth the two conditions that must exist: first, the need for self-defense must be ''instant, overwhelming, and leaving no choice of means and no moment for deliberation.'' And second, the degree of force used must be proportionate to the threat.

The resolution before us permits the President to take us into war without satisfying either of these requirements. It imposes no obligation upon him to show that the danger is truly immediate and the use of force truly necessary. Indeed, it speaks of a ''continuing threat,'' which suggests an ongoing situation of indefinite duration. And it imposes no requirement that U.S. military actions be measured or proportionate to the threat we face.

In short, the resolution offers no rationale for the exercise of its broad grant of authority. Nor has the President provided one.

Last night, President Bush presented his case for a preemptive military strike against Iraq. I studied his speech with care, hoping that he would set forth clear and convincing evidence of the threat he perceives.

The speech offered ample evidence that Saddam Hussein is a bloodthirsty tyrant who has terrorized his own people and endangered his neighbors.

The speech offered ample evidence that Saddam Hussein has defied Security Council resolutions for 11 years by continuing to develop weapons of mass destruction.

And the speech made clear—in case anyone doubted it—that Saddam Hussein is deeply hostile to American interests.

What the speech failed to demonstrate is that Saddam Hussein poses a threat to America or vital U.S. interests that—Webster's words—is ''instant, overwhelming, . . . leaving no choice of means and no moment for deliberation.''

In fact, it demonstrated just the opposite. The President did not say, ''Saddam Hussein presents an imminent threat to the United States.'' He said, ''The danger is . . . significant and it only grows worse with time.''

That is an argument for containment. It is an argument for coercive measures, including unconditional inspections, disarmament, and the freezing of assets. It may even be an argument for sanctions. But it is not an argument for launching an unprovoked military attack.

NUCLEAR WEAPONS

The President stated that the Iraqi regime has continued to pursue the development of nuclear weapons, and could one day soon be in a position to threaten America or the Middle East. He cited the Cuban missile crisis as precedent for a preemptive strike to contain that danger.

But the missile crisis involved the imposition of a naval quarantine to interdict the delivery of nuclear missiles capable of hitting the United States—as clear an example of a proportionate response to an imminent threat as can be imagined. In the present situation, the CIA's best estimate is that Iraq ''will probably have a nuclear weapon during this decade.''

Perhaps anticipating that some future administration might one day cite the missile crisis to justify preemptive military action, President Kennedy's own legal adviser expressly distinguished the Cuban missiles from what he called ''threatening deployments or demonstrations that do not have imminent attack as their purpose or probable outcome.''

CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

The President noted that Saddam Hussein has used chemical agents against civilian populations in his own country. This is true. It is also true that these attacks last occurred some 14 years ago—with the full knowledge of a U.S. government that did nothing to prevent them.

What is the imminent threat that such weapons might be used against the United States? The President didn't say. He said that Saddam Hussein ''could decide on any given day to provide a biological or chemical weapon to a terrorist group.'' Indeed he could. So could any number of other nations, from Iran to North Korea.

But the historical record suggests that he can be deterred from deploying these weapons. One the eve of Operation Desert Storm, Secretary of State Baker notified Iraq that any use of its weapons of mass destruction would result in a devastating American response. And the weapons were never used.

In fact, according to declassified intelligence estimates released only last night, Saddam is unlikely to initiate a chemical or biological attack against the United States unless he concludes that ''U.S.-led attack could no longer be deterred.'' In other words, Saddam will unleash his arsenal only when he is facing annihilation—with nothing left to lose.

SUPPORT FOR TERRORISM

The President claimed that Saddam Hussein has links to international terrorism that justify a preemptive strike against his regime. What is the evidence? The President offered four arguments. First, he said that Iraq and al-Qaida ''share a common enemy—the United States of America.'' Well, the United States and Iraq share a common enemy—Iran. But that's hardly evidence that we support Iraqi aggression.

Second, he said that the Iraqi regime ''gleefully celebrated the terrorist attacks on America.'' This is hardly admirable, but it is also hardly evidence that they were behind the attacks. Any more than others who shared such sentiments elsewhere in the Arab world.

The President's last two arguments are more serious: that Iraq is continuing to finance terror in the Middle East and has continued to associate with leaders of al-Qaida, offering them safe harbor, medical treatment, and training in terrorist techniques. Yet assuming that these allegations are correct, they argue, not for invasion, but for treating Iraq as we treat the many other countries that provide various kinds of support for terrorism but against whom we are not making plans for war.

I do not mean to minimize these concerns. They are serious and deserve to be addressed, whether they occur in Iraq or in any other country—especially one in which internal repression, the appetite for conquest, and the possession of advanced weaponry go hand in hand.

I applaud the President's demand for immediate Iraqi compliance with Security Council resolutions. I would support a resolution that authorizes the limited use of our Armed Forces in support of international efforts to locate and dismantle Iraq's weapons of mass destruction should Iraq fail to comply.

Such a resolution would achieve the President's desire that we ''tell the United Nations and all nations that America speaks with one voice.''

Instead, the President insists on a resolution that goes further. That authorizes the President to ''use the Armed Forces as he determines to be necessary and appropriate.''

The President says that ''approving this resolution does not mean that military action is imminent or unavoidable.'' If so, I am relieved to hear it. But if military action is imminent or unavoidable.'' If so, I am relieved to hear it. But if military action is not imminent, then the broad language that would authorize it premature.

If the American people are satisfied that our cause is just and war is forced upon us, they will do what needs to be done. But before we risk the lives of our soldiers and countless innocent Iraqi civilians, before we divert untold billions of dollars from our other battles, before

we forfeit the moral authority that has distinguished America among the family of nations, we had better be sure we've taken every reasonable step to resolve this crisis without bloodshed.

Until then, I cannot support a resolution that gives the President a blank check to launch a military strike that meets none of the legal requirements for preemptive action. We have been down that road before. It is not a lesson we should have to learn again. And it's not the kind of example that the United States should set for the world.

□ 0040

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

Let me conclude by thanking the majority for the kindness and the thoughtfulness that they have given us. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) should be commended, as I mentioned earlier, a gentleman always, but to allow everyone to have a word to say.

The past 2 days with over 24 hours of debate has been an historic time in this House. A debate has endured that will be noted and will be long-remembered what was said here. We have debated fundamental changes in the manner in which this country operates, first strike preemptive. Definitely a new course of action for this Nation.

Of course, first strikes are nothing new. In the medieval times there were many, France into Germany, Spain into Italy. In 1918, Germany entered France. December 7, Japan attacked the United States. So there has been preemptive strikes but never the greatest Nation in the world taking a decision to make first strikes preemptive, and so this is a new day for this great Nation.

The Framers of the Constitution, the Jeffersons and the Adams and Washingtons and Hamiltons, said let us be careful about power. We do not want a king or emperor or dictator, and, therefore, let us give the power of war to the Congress.

Here we are abdicating that responsibility and giving the right to declare war to one person, to say it is his decision to do what he wants and he has 48 hours to tell us later what he has done. Another principle that we have changed.

We jeopardize a coalition because I believe right now our number one fight is the battle against terror. The al Qaeda cells that are in this country and in 50 other countries and a false feeling of security will emerge when we attack Iraq if that is done, and Americans will, therefore, believe that there is a sense of security now and al Qaeda is gone. There is definitely a difference between the al Qaeda cells and the government of Iraq, and so we are leading people down a wrong path to believe that a defeat of Iraq, therefore, eliminates the war on terror.

We have heard recently that there is a connection between al Qaeda and the government of Iraq. This only was revealed in the last week or so. Many wonder where this information is coming from and whether, in fact, it is indeed true. And, once again, we should not lull our people into a false feeling of security when we look over there and say Iraq is done, we are safe again, when the war on terror will still be here.

So we talk about a new concept, regime change, Saddam Hussein should go. This is a tall order. How do we do it? How long do we stay? How dangerous will it be? How costly will it be? How are we going to rehabilitate Afghanistan? We have not drilled the pumps to reach the low water tables as we promised. We have not started construction of schools as we said. We have not built the hospitals as we promised, but now we will go into Iraq and for how much? What will the cost be? $100 billion? $200 billion? No one really knows.

As the DOW has dropped from close to 11,000 down to close to 7,000, almost a 40 percent drop, how can we fund this? We spend $1 billion a day today on a $350 billion defense budget, with another couple of hundred billion dollars on the side. How can we do it with the unmet needs of PELL grants and student loans, the needs for prescription drug benefits for seniors and section 8 housing, vouchers funding for elementary and secondary schools in the leave no child behind legislation? How do we deal with that?

So as we move to vote we should engage the U.N., we should encourage them and support the inspectors to find and destroy those biological and chemical weapons of mass destruction. We should leave no stone unturned. We should go unfettered. We should demand that, and I believe then we can have the avoidance of war. We should attempt to avoid war at any cost. I do not believe that the United States is eliminating the danger of the al Qaeda cells in this country by us having a war and attack on Iraq.

I would like to say that we are a mighty powerful country. Let us use our power and might. We love this country. In school I used to recite the poem, This is my country, land of my birth; this is my country, the grandest on earth; and I pledge thee my allegiance, America the bold, because this is my country to have and to hold.

Let us not misuse the power that we have, but let us be sure that Saddam Hussein is contained, that this world is free of tyrants like that. Let us support the inspectors going in.

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

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

Mr. Speaker, as I close, I would like to thank the gentleman from New Jersey. This has been, in fact, a long debate. It has been spirited at times, but, in fact, it has always lived up to the gravity of what we are considering, and we owe that in no small part to the gentleman from New Jersey.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) has empowered me to close, and I take that as a very unusual thing for a freshman and something that is pretty important for somebody who not only supports this resolution but who supports this resolution often to the dismay of other Arab Americans.

My family emigrated from the Middle East, one side of my family emigrated from the Middle East, and I bear an Arab surname, and so for me and I think for many people who are going to support this resolution tomorrow, this has to be a special case. We are not pushing an 11-year or 12-year war to the brink of a final military conflict lightly.

I would call the Speaker's attentions to these advertisements that came out of Baghdad September 11 and a year after September 11 as just another example of what is different about Saddam Hussein's regime.

After September 11, both as a member of the Committee on International Relations and I believe as one of the Members of this body whose ancestry goes back to the Middle East, I was visited by not just one but every single ambassador from the Middle East represented in this country. In every case they expressed their horror, their sympathy and distanced themselves from the terrible events of September 11; and they did so in private, not intending to do it for the camera, but so that I would understand. And I am sure they visited virtually every other Member so they would understand that that is not what the Arab people are about, that is not what Arab society, one of the great societies that helped create the world as we know it today, is about.

It is not what the Iraqi people are about, and to put out propaganda in the Baghdad press talking about September 11 being Allah's revenge, in fact, says it all about this regime.

Saddam Hussein and his party and his almost 30-year rule has been all about killing and violence and hatred. He is not alone, but he is in a league of his own. And as we close for tonight and we move into tomorrow's short debates of 1 hour and final passage probably by midday, I hope that all of us will remember that this is not about Arab people, not in this country and not anywhere in the world.

The need to empower the President to take this action, should it become necessary, is all about the uniqueness of this administration of Saddam Hussein and the actions he has taken in the past, he takes in the present, and we are quite certain that if that regime is not changed or replaced, he will take in the future.

I say as one Arab American to the many Arab Americans and Muslim Americans in this country and perhaps to the Arabs around the world, America and particularly my community in America has absolutely no hatred and no willingness to participate in anything that is adverse to the Arab people.

□ 0050

But we do have to insist that the kind of tyranny that has gone on in Iraq for so many decades must in fact stop, either by Saddam Hussein living up to his obligations under the U.N. resolutions or his being driven from power and an Arab leader who will respect the rule of law and who will provide the kind of fairness for his own people can be found.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight with a heavy heart but with determined resolve. A member of Congress faces no more important debate than authorizing the President to use military force.

Just over a year ago, Mr. Speaker, the eyes of the world were opened to the depths to which evil men will descend in order to put fear in the hearts and minds of peace loving people.

In the post-September 11th world, Americans now understand that there are those who have no regard for human life, and that they will kill the innocent in untold numbers to achieve evil goals.

We now also know that sometimes our Nation must act to prevent that which may happen in the future.

Which brings us to Saddam Hussein and Iraq's pursuit of weapons of mass destruction.

Saddam has a unique brand of state-sponsored terror that threatens the world like no other.

Unchecked, he pursues chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons and has demonstrated the capacity to use them.

Among dictators and despots, his record stands by itself: he has brutally murdered and repressed his own people, he has used chemical weapons against his neighbors and his countrymen including women and children, he has launched unprovoked attacks on other nations, he sponsored an assassination attempt on former President Bush, he harbors terrorists including members of Al Qaeda, and he defies the will of the United Nations and the international community by refusing to disarm and continuing to develop every conceivable weapons of mass destruction known to man.

That is why it is critical that the United States asserts its unique leadership role in the international community and put an end to Saddam's pursuit of weapons of mass destruction.

Now is the time to work within the United Nations Security Council to move a tough Resolution calling for the complete disarmament of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction under threat of force by a global coalition.

It must be the policy of the United States to exhaust all forms of diplomacy within the United Nations and other appropriate forums before considering any other course of action relative to disarming Iraq.

And if that diplomacy fails, then we must act with the broadest coalition of nations as possible to force the disarmament of Saddam's weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. Speaker, the strategy that Secretary Powell briefed me on that we are pursuing with the U.N. Security Council is precisely the reason why I am such a strong supporter of the Alternative being offered by John Spratt of South Carolina.

The Spratt Alternative authorizes the use of U.S. military force in pursuit of a Security Council-sanctioned effort to disarm Iraq, by force if necessary.

That is what Secretary Powell and the Administration are pushing for within the U.N. right now and that is what the Congress should be supporting.

This alternatives makes clear that if the Security Council fails to take action that Congress will act immediately to vote on authorizing the President to use unilateral, if necessary, force against Iraq to disarm.

We are also considering the underlying resolution that provides the President with the authority to use force in accordance with United Nations Security Council Resolutions and unilaterally.

It is a significantly broader authorization than the Spratt Alternative. However, changes have been made including: (1) support for and prioritization of U.S. diplomatic efforts at the U.N.; (2) limiting the scope of the authorization to Iraq only; (3) requiring presidential determinations to Congress before the president may use force; (4) and requiring the President to consult with and report to Congress throughout this process.

I had hoped that there would have been more opportunity for the House to improve on the underlying resolution during the course of this historic debate.

However, I was deeply encouraged by the President's words Monday night when he said, ''Approving this resolution does not mean that military action is imminent or unavoidable.''

Likewise, I was deeply encouraged by my meeting yesterday with Secretary Powell in which he spelled out in detail our strategy for action within the U.N. Security Council.

I take both President Bush and Secretary Powell at their word. In the coming days, weeks and months, I plan on holding them to their words.

As a Ranking Member of the House Armed Services Committee, I've seen the bravery of our men and women in uniform.

In fact, I was able to visit many earlier this year in Afghanistan and I was struck by their determination to secure the peace for that nation thousands of miles from home.

It pains me that more families may be missing their loved ones soon.

Nevertheless, let there be no doubt that Saddam Hussein's unfettered pursuit of weapons of mass destruction are a real and growing threat to the United States and the international community, and that whatever course others may take—America will defend herself.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak against this resolution. We all recognize that Suddam Hussein is a tyrant and that he is a dangerous enemy. The question is whether this resolution is the right way to address the threats presented by his regime.

The Administration says that Iraq presents an imminent threat to the United States, that unless we give the President carte blanche to launch a unilateral, preemptive attack, we will be subject to attack by weapons of mass destruction. No one needs to convince us of the horror of weapons of mass destruction or the evil intentions of Saddam Hussein. But does that justify the blank check this resolution gives the President? We have listened to the testimony, read the briefs, and weighed the arguments presented by the Administration. In my view, they have yet to prove their case. They have presented no credible evidence that the United States faces imminent attack. They have presented no credible evidence that Iraq was involved in the September 11th terrorist attacks or that it is giving material aid to those involved in those attacks.

Are we setting the bar too high? I don't think so. The evidence of imminent threat should be credible, conclusive and irrefutable if we are talking about the United States unleashing the dogs of war. Striking the first blow is unprecedented in American history. It has always been a point of honor that the United States does not start wars. If we are going to depart from a fundamental principle that has guided U.S. foreign policy for more than 200 years, the evidence of necessity must be iron clad.

This is much more than a point of pride. It is not an abstract argument. Through this action, the world's only remaining superpower is asserting a principle that the nations of the world—including the United States—have struggled to consign to the past. We have rejected the old idea that any nation which claims to feel threatened or aggrieved can unilaterally and preemptively attack another without the sanction of the international community. The power to initiate war is no longer untrammeled and absolute. Think for a moment of the precedent we are setting, of the pandora's box we are opening. What if, tomorrow, India or Pakistan says the other constitutes an unacceptable threat? Would this justify one of these nuclear-armed countries attacking the other? What about China and Taiwan? What about any number of other countries whose relations with a neighbor are beset with tension, suspicion, threats, and insecurity?

More immediately, what about our relations with our allies, the nations on which we depend to help us keep the peace and bear the burden of protecting our interests? We should be careful not to initiate a new age of American unilateralism that leaves us without allies. The Administration thinks they are dispensable in the case of Iraq. Maybe they are. But if our alliances fray and disintegrate, it is certain that there will come a time when we do need them. Will they be there for us? Maybe, maybe not. But one thing we can be sure of: it is foolhardy in the extreme to ignore our allies' importance to the system of international relations and the maintenance of America's prosperity and national security interests.

I have every confidence that our troops will display the bravery and professionalism we have come to expect from them. But the consequences of a U.S. victory are liable to be a huge burden for the United States. We will have taken on the responsibly for peace and order, for feeding and sustaining an entire population, and guaranteeing the territorial integrity of Iraq. All this in the context of a population which may or may not be receptive to the presence of our armed forces. We will have to counter the centrifugal dynamics that drive the Kurds in the north and the Shiites in the south away from the Iraqi state. We will be responsible for defending Iraq's long border with Iran against incursions. We are talking about committing tens of thousands of troops, perhaps hundreds of billions of dollars, for many years, maybe decades.

And what will be the impact of an invasion in the rest of the Muslim world? The reaction will not be an outpouring of support for the United States. It will feed the flames of fanaticism. It could well destabilize Egypt, Jordan and other friendly nations. Are we prepared to commit more troops, more money, more prestige to shoring up these governments?

Finally, let me offer some observations as a member of the Armed Services Committee. Implications of a war against Iraq will reverberate at every level of the Department of Defense. Problematic issues the military faces today—global international commitments, increased personnel tempo, and over-reliance on the Reserves and National Guard—will only be exacerbated when military requirements for Iraq are thrown in the mix.

Of foremost concern is the inevitable enormous strain on military manpower. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld testified before the Armed Services Committee that no increase in troop end strength is necessary to carry out an invasion and peacekeeping activities in Iraq. No one else whom our Committee spoke to held this opinion. In fact, retired flag officers and distinguished military analysts all agreed that increased end strength was imperative for the ultimate success of our reconstruction of Iraq.

And the personnel problem extends far beyond the full time, active duty forces. Since the Persian Gulf war, our reliance on the Reserves and National Guard has grown to the point where it would be impossible for DoD to meet its worldwide commitments without the presence of these units. Reservists and Guardsmen no longer talk about the rare mobilization in support of a national emergency; rather, some units routinely deploy overseas alongside their active duty counterparts. How long can we continue to call upon these volunteers to shoulder more than their fair share? How long can we ask civilian employers and families of our Guard and Reserve to carry on without them? I sincerely hope that one of the first orders of business in the 108th Congress is a comprehensive overhaul of our military personnel system in order to ease the stress on our citizen soldiers. Otherwise, our Reservists and Guardsmen are sure to vote with their feet.

These considerations do not exhaust the questions raised by the prospect of an attack on Iraq. Serious as they are, the most serious questions of all are the ones none of us can anticipate. War has a way of creating new dynamics and unleashing new forces in the world. All too frequently, those consequences are inimical to the interests of established powers. Those who see the dawn of a new era of peace, stability and democracy in the Middle East as a result of a strike against Iraq would do well to think again.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution.

The threat from Iraq is very real and increasingly dangerous. Saddam Hussein's belligerent intentions and his possession and ongoing development of weapons of mass destruction to fulfill those intentions make him a clear and present danger to the United States and the world.

Particularly worrisome is the evidence of Iraq's UAV capability. Iraq's ability to use unmanned aerial vehicles to deliver biological and chemical weapons far outside its national borders represents a qualitative increase in the danger it poses.

History demonstrates Saddam Hussein's willingness to use such weapons against unarmed civilians, including his own people. And it demonstrates his unhesitating instincts to invade his neighbors—Iran and Kuwait—and to attack Israel.

That he appears, to quote Director Tenet's recent letter, to be ''drawing a line short of conducting terrorist attacks'' does not persuade me that he won't.

He is impulsive, irrational, vicious, and cruel.

Unchecked, he will only grow stronger as he develops capability to match his disdain for America and his Middle East neighbors.

History shows that had Israel not destroyed Iraq's nuclear reactor in 1981, Saddam Hussein would now have nuclear capability. But he did not cease his nuclear ambitions. Had coalition military forces not swept through Iraq in 1991, he would have possessed nuclear weapons by 1993.

The CIA now reports that Iraq is one year away from a functional nuclear device once it acquires missile material. Waiting one hour, one day, one month in such an environment, as some suggest, is too risky.

We have to act now because the U.N. resolutions following the gulf war have not contained the Iraqi threat.

With the passage of time, international resolve to enforce United Nations resolutions has weakened.

This resolution will demonstrate to the U.N. American resolve to act if necessary, but preferably in a peaceful and multilateral way.

The strong and forceful language in this resolution will help Secretary Powell persuade his counterparts at the U.N. and around the globe to join us.

The resolution we are considering is greatly improved from the draft the Administration proposed and I commend Leader GEPHARDT for negotiating these improvements.

This resolution narrows the scope of action to the threats to national security posed by Iraq and enforcing compliance with U.N. Resolutions.

This resolution stresses a strong preference for peaceful and diplomatic action, authorizing the use of force only if all peaceful options have failed.

This resolution requires the President to comply with the War Powers Act and report regularly to Congress should military action become necessary, as well as after the use of force is completed.

This resolution addresses post-disarmament Iraq and the role of the United States and international community in rebuilding.

And of crucial importance, this resolution requires the President to certify to Congress that action in Iraq will not dilute our ability to wage the war on terrorism.

Removing WMD from Iraq is an important priority, but it cannot replace our counterterrorism efforts at home and abroad. We must ensure that we do not divert attention from protecting our homeland—beginning with the creation of a Department of Homeland Security.

We must also strengthen and expand programs and policies aimed at stopping the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their components. The ready availability of matieral for chemical, biological and nuclear weapons, and the know-how to make them, has allowed Iraq to rebuild rapidly since 1991 and the expulsion of inspectors in 1998. But nonproliferation programs have been underfunded at a time when they need to be expanded.

If we don't stop the flow of scientists and materials for weapons of mass destruction, we will soon be faced with another Iraq. The axis of evil will grow to include more states. We will encounter the nightmare scenario of nuclear-armed terrorist groups, capable of blackmailing or attacking our cities and citizens from within, with little hope of deterrence or diplomacy to stop them.

Sentiment in my district is high—both in favor and opposition to this resolution. I thank my constituents for sharing their views with me. I have listened carefully, learned as much as I could, and now it is time to lead.

Like all my colleagues, I fervently hope that the U.S. will not need to use force. But the best chance to avoid military action is to show the U.N. and Iraq that we will not flinch from it.

Giving diplomatic efforts every chance is the right policy and this resolution gives diplomacy its maximum chance to succeed.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, September 11, 2001, brought to light a horror that the American people and the world had up until then only seen in movies. On that day, we learned, as a nation, what it means to be terrorized. The nineteen men who hijacked airliners and used them as guided missiles showed us that even on our home soil Americans are not shielded from the reach of terrorism. Bearing in mind, we must continue to defend against these forces of evil and those who support them. We cannot spend the rest of our lives in fear. I support this resolution in order to protect the life of every American, at home and abroad, I also believe it offers the best chance for peace because it clearly communicates U.S. resolve to Saddam Hussein and makes clear that his continued refusal to disarm will be his undoing.

Mr. Speaker, granting the authority to send our brave men and women in uniform overseas to fight in hostile territory is the most difficult decision we make in Congress. That was true last year and it remains true today. Since the beginning of the first mission in Afghanistan on October 7, 2001, our military men and women have fought terrorists and disrupted their networks, liberated a country, and brought the prospect of peace and democracy to a nation that had not seen either in decades. While our military campaign in Afghanistan is slowly coming to a close, we must not lose sight of our primary objective, to rid the world of terrorists and those who sustain them. Saddam Hussein and his regime in Iraq fit this description.

Mr. Speaker, after sifting through the evidence, reviewing the facts, and probing the Administration, I am convinced Saddam Hussein's regime is a clear and present threat to the security of the United States and our allies. Since he came to power in Iraq in 1979, Hussein has waged war on his neighbors and terrorized his own people with chemical weapons. He has allowed terrorists groups, such as al Qaeda, to operate safety in Iraq. He has supported terrorist actions by compensating the families of Palestinian suicide bombers for their attacks on innocent Israeli citizens. He orders his military to fire missiles and artillery on U.S. and a coalition aircraft that patrol the U.N.-imposed no-fly zones that protect Kurd and Shi'a Muslims in Northern and Southern Iraq, respectively. He has attempted to assassinate a former U.S. President. Moreover, he has violated the basic human rights of his people, causing them to live in fear and poverty, while he builds Presidential palaces and lives of life of luxury. Currently, there is nothing stopping him from using weapons of mass destruction against the United States and our allies, or from giving them to terrorists.

After the gulf war in 1991, Saddam Hussein agreed to abide by United Nations Security Council Resolutions 686, 687, and 688. By agreeing to these resolutions, Hussein was required to, among other things: allow international weapons inspectors to oversee the destruction of his weapons of mass destruction; not develop new weapons of mass destruction; destroy all of his ballistic missiles with a range greater than 150 kilometers; stop support for terrorism and prevent terrorist organizations from operating within Iraq; help account for missing Kuwaitis and other individuals; return stolen Kuwaiti property and bear the financial liability for damage from the gulf war; and end his repression of the Iraqi people. Mr. Speaker, he has taken none of these required actions.

As a matter of fact, over the past decade, Saddam Hussein has shown nothing but contempt for the United Nations and its member-states. In all, Hussein has violated sixteen critical U.N. resolutions. It became obvious that Hussein had no intention of cooperating with the U.N. when Iraq ceased cooperation with weapons inspectors on October 31, 1998, after several years of evading, deceiving, and even harassing U.N. weapons inspectors. This flagrant violation of U.N. Resolution 687 prompted the passage of U.N. Resolution 1205, which called on Iraq to continue ''immediate, complete and unconditional cooperation'' with U.N. weapons inspectors. These events led to the Clinton Administration signing the Iraqi Liberation Act of 1998 into law, which clarifies the official position of the United States as promoting regime change in Iraq. Regardless, it has been four years since weapons inspectors last visited Iraq. There is no doubt that within this time Hussein has reinvigorated his weapons programs, and according to the International Institute for Strategic Studies, an independent research center based in London, there is little doubt that Hussein's nuclear capabilities are within reach.

If Saddam Hussein persists in violating U.N. Security Council resolutions and refuses to disarm and the use of force becomes our only option, then the goal of military action should not just be to remove weapons of mass destruction from Iraq. Military action must also have the end result of removing Hussein from power. In the end, nothing short of a regime change will liberate the Iraqi people, whom Saddam Hussein has repressed for more than two decades. Since April of 1991, Hussein has continued to ignore U.N. Resolution 688, which requires him to allow immediate access to international humanitarian organizations to help those in need of assistance in Iraq. Furthermore, Hussein punishes his people by diverting funds from the U.N.'s ''oil-for-food'' program to pay for his weapons programs. I believe Saddam Hussein will continue to do what he has done so effectively in the past: violate the basic human rights of every Iraqi citizen.

I would now like to read to you the following excerpt from the book The Threatening Storm: The Case for Invading Iraq by Kenneth M. Pollack. Mr. Pollack, a former analyst on Iraq for the Central Intelligence Agency who served on the National Security Council during the Clinton Administration, is one of the foremost experts on Saddam Hussein and the Iraqi regime.

This is a regime that will gouge out the eyes of children to force confessions from their parents and grandparents. This is a regime that will crush all of the bones in the feet of a two-year-old-girl to force her mother to divulge her father's whereabouts. This is a regime that will hold a nursing baby at arm's length from its mother and allow the child to starve to death to force the mother to confess. This is a regime that will burn a person's limbs off to force him to confess or comply. This is a regime that will slowly lower its victims into huge vats of acid, either to break their will or simply as a means of execution. This is a regime that applies electric shocks to the bodies of its victims, particularly their genitals, with great creativity. This is a regime that in [the year] 2000 decreed that the crime of criticizing the regime (which can be as harmless as suggesting that Saddam's clothing does not match) would be punished by cutting out the offender's tongue. This is a regime that practices systematic rape against its female victims. This is a regime that will drag in a man's wife, daughter, or other female relative and repeatedly rape her in front of him. This is a regime that will force a white-hot metal rod into a person's anus or other orifices. This is a regime that employs thalium poisoning, widely considered one of the most excruciating ways to die. This is a regime that will behead a young mother in the street in front of her house and children because her husband was suspected of opposing the regime. This is a regime that used chemical warfare on its own Kurdish citizens—not just on the fifteen thousand killed and maimed at Halabja but on scores of other villages all across Kurdistan. This is a regime that tested chemical and biological warfare agents on Iranian prisoners of war, using the POWs in controlled experiments to determine the best ways to disperse the agents to inflict the greatest damage.

This is the fate that awaits thousands of Iraqis each year. The roughest estimates are that over the last twenty years more than two hundred thousand people have disappeared into Saddam's prison system, never to be heard from again. Hundreds of thousands of others were taken away and, after unforgettable bouts of torture that left them psychologically and often physically mangled, eventually were released or escaped. To give a sense of scale, just the numbers of Iraqis never heard from again would be equivalent to about 2.5 million Americans suffering such a fate.

It is true that Iraq has said publicly that it will allow weapons inspectors to return. While some members of the United Nations believe Iraq is taking the necessary steps to rectify its past transgressions, Iraq has placed several conditions that can only hamstring the U.N.'s efforts. If the U.N. bows to Hussein's demands, the legitimacy of the entire organization could be called into question.

The purpose of this resolution is to authorize the President to use such force as may be necessary to protect the national security of the United States from threats posed by Iraq and to enforce U.N. Resolutions. Yet even more clear than this language is the message it sends. This resolution sends the message of resolve. It shows that we are resolved to protect ourselves and our allies with whatever means are necessary. And, it is precisely because of this message that we open up the possibility of a peaceful settlement to this great threat. To be clear, after eleven years of dealing with Iraq one thing is certain: Saddam Hussein is motivated only when he finds he has no other options. This resolution demonstrates our unity behind action, should he fail to meet the demands of the international community. Without it, we can be assured that Hussein's Iraq will continue stockpiling and developing weapons of mass death, providing safe haven for terrorists, and tormenting his own people. Meanwhile, the danger for American and our allies will grow even worse.

Additionally, we seem to be experiencing quite a logjam in the U.N. I believe that passage of this resolution will help break that impasse and secure a meaningful and direct resolution from the U.N., which will help build a larger multilateral coalition around this just cause. If these last attempts at a peaceful solution do fail, then we must show that we are resolved to act to rid the world of this great threat.

Mr. Speaker, war should always take a backseat to peace. I still hold out hope that a peaceful solution can be reached. Unfortunately, time and time again, Saddam Hussein has forsaken his opportunities for peace. He is aggressively seeking to acquire nuclear weapons and build up his other weapons of mass destruction. The longer he is allowed to make progress on these deadly projects, the greater the threat to us—including the threat that Iraq could supply terrorists with weapons of mass destruction. If Hussein refuses to comply, the United States must take action, or risk the use of biological, chemical, or nuclear weapons against us on our own soil.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, the decision before the Congress this week is whether or not to give the President the option to use force with Iraq if all else fails. It is similar to the one before the Congress early in my career when the elder Bush was in the White House. The main difference was that Iraq had invaded a sovereign nation, Kuwait, to the outrage of the world community.

The world agreed that Iraq was the aggressor and must be driven out. The U.N. voted for precisely that and we led the effort. Although much clearer in circumstance, it was an extremely difficult decision.

Today things are not quite so clear. There has been no invasion and there, at least at the moment of this writing, is no U.N. sanction for military action.

The arguments are more like piling straws on a camel's back. Saddam Hussein is a murderer of his own people. He is a warmonger, witness Kuwait, Iran and the Kurds in his own country. He aggressively pursues the development of nuclear weapons. Remember Israel bombed an Iraqi nuclear facility many years ago. Hussein still pursues that goal. He has accumulated thousands of liters of chemical and biological weapons and is not afraid to use them, in fact he has used them against Iran and his own people. He planned an attempted assassination of an American president. He defies U.N. resolutions that ended the '91 Gulf War, which called for the destruction of all weapons of mass destruction. He refused to allow weapons inspectors to do their job and threatened and intimidated them at every turn.

Now we are told that Iraq may have become a weapons supermarket for terrorism. Some al Qaeda leaders are there and other terrorist organizations have close ties; i.e. Abu Nidal. We are told that Hussein provides $25,000 to each family of the suicide bombers who attack Israel. And we can't forget that during the Gulf War Hussein rained Scud missiles down on innocent Israeli civilians in Tel Aviv and other communities. Iraq now is working to extend the range of their missiles.

Now, under the threat of U.S. action, Hussein agrees to let weapons inspectors back into his country. Can there be any doubt that the only thing this man responds to is the threat of deadly force? One is tempted to believe Hussein is now prepared to admit weapons inspectors. And indeed we should and must let that scenario play out before any act of war. But the skeptic in me doesn't believe a word that he says. History is a wonderful teacher and we all know this man's history.

The U.N. has shown itself to be incapable and unwilling to enforce its own resolutions. As a guarantor of world peace they have a checkered past at best. Without having the threat of military intervention, the U.N. is a paper tiger. I have long been a supporter of the U.N. I believe that the nations of the world must have a forum in which to settle their differences but when a tyrant like Hussein thumbs his nose at the world, something isn't right.

One last point, since the 9/11 attack on our country we have been pouring over the coals, literally and figuratively. One by one we have connected the dots that led to the attack. We have seen the threat that connects the plans to do great harm to our country and our people.

The President in these past weeks has connected the dots for us. He has pointed to Iraq with great alarm and tried to help us to understand the threat. It is real. What we don't know is how imminent and what shape the threat will take.

After much thought and prayer and consultation with my constituents and with people I love and trust, I have decided to support the resolution before the House. Not because I want to go to war. I don't, I remember the last one. I remember meeting with Marsha Connor, the mother of Patrick Connor of Marcellus who was killed in action. It was heartbreaking.

But if we don't give the President that option, Saddam Hussein and Iraq will continue to grow more troublesome and if they ever develop a nuclear weapon it would be horrific. I'll vote for the resolution but I will implore the President not to use force unless all else fails. Negotiation, weapons inspectors, and U.N. sanctions should come first.

And if we do indeed go, we should do so with the other nations of the world who should feel as threatened as we.

Mrs. McCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 114 and the need to protect the United States from any threat posed by Iraq. However, my support for the resolution is coupled with several concerns associated with potential unilateral action against Iraq.

The September 11 attacks on the United States demonstrated the will of misguided, vengeful leaders whose determination to harm Americans seem boundless. Clearly, Saddam Hussein is one of these leaders. This dictator harbors terrorists, invokes chemical warfare upon his own people and openly defies United Nations Security Council Resolutions. His support of international terrorism, and pursuit of stockpiling weapons of mass destruction poses not only a threat to the United States, but also to the world.

Since 1998, this body has voted on four separate measures that appropriate funds for Iraqi opposition forces, as well as call upon Iraq to allow U.N. inspectors immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access to areas they wish to inspect. Today's resolution takes a step further and acknowledges that sanctions, weapons inspection and containment have failed. It recognizes that Iraq and Saddam Hussein present an unrelenting hostility to the United States. And we know when it comes to the United States, Hussein has a very prolific partner in hate: al Qaeda. In fact, Saddam Hussein has openly praised the September 11 attacks.

The resolution before us authorizes United States military force under two circumstances: (1) In order to defend our national security against a threat by Iraq, and (2) enforce U.N. Security Council Resolutions relevant to Iraq.

Disarming Iraq is necessary to ensure our national security. I was encouraged to hear President Bush emphasize that Iraq can avoid military force if all weapons of mass destruction are destroyed. I hope that Saddam Hussein will heed this advice.

I was also encouraged to hear President Bush stress the importance of seeking a coalition, as I believe the support of the United Nations Security Council is critical. The President must persist in his efforts with the U.N. to approve a tougher inspection resolution. If inspection efforts fail, a U.N.-sanctioned military force is the best course of action, as it would garner support in neighboring countries, and enhance the chances of post-war success. If the U.N. were to fail to authorize force, then the President should come back to Congress and let us have a say about whether we go in unilaterally.

Finally, I was glad to hear the President pledge to rebuild a post-war Iraqi economy. This is very important, as the cost of military action must not only be weighed economically, but regionally.

Although this is one of the most difficult votes a Member of Congress will cast, I'm afraid it is an inevitable action needed to protect the United States from Iraq and the destructive weapons it seeks to acquire and use.

Today, each and every member will vote their conscience. Regardless of how we each vote, at the end of the day we must remember one thing: that we represent the people of the United States and we must come together as a body, and a people, just as we did on September 11.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, today I find myself standing here on the floor of the House with anguish in my heart. I have read and listened to all sides, and I have struggled to understand why our great nation would want to contemplate going to war.

When September 11th, 2001, happened, I was in New York City, and as the enormity of what terrorism could do to my City hit me, I was stunned. Then I wept for all of those innocent people who were simply doing their jobs and living their lives, who in one moment of hate lost their lives. There has, however, not been any conclusive evidence that links al Qaida, those responsible for the tragedy of September 11th, with Iraq.

Some question whether those who oppose this resolution are forgetting those who died on September 11th; some question our patriotism. Though I should not have to affirm my patriotism, I say simply that I love my country, I love my city of New York, and I am not afraid to deal with those who attacked it. It is the most basic of our purposes as a national government, to defend our nation. But here we speak of a different matter.

I am certainly pleased that the President now recognizes that he must secure the approval of the Congress before taking our nation to war. This is progress and what our Constitution requires. However, if our ultimate goal is to disarm Iraq of all chemical and biological weapons, how does giving our President this right to go to war accomplish that goal? Wouldn't working with the United Nations to implement a program of rigorous inspections move us closer to our goal? I believe that force should always be used as a last resort, and never as the first way to accomplish a goal.

The new doctrine announced by the President, that the United States has the right to engage in a preemptive strike, which he seeks to implement through this resolution, frightens me and establishes a troubling precedent. This is a doctrine better left unused. It contravenes a half century of developed international law, of which the United States has been a champion. Taking this idea to its logical conclusion means that India and Pakistan, for instance, nations with nuclear weapons and a history of conflict, may no longer feel bound by the limitations on the use of force that have been agreed to by the family of nations. The United Nations will become irrelevant and the checks and balances that membership in the United Nations places on the member states will no longer apply. Even if we strike and successfully defeat Iraq militarily, will this make our nation a safer place to live?

The Bush Administration often talks about ''regime change'' in Iraq and the need to remove Saddam Hussein from power. In 1991 we decided against regime change because of concern about the overall stability of the region. What has happened since that time that has changed the goals of a military action?

As a nation we need to plan and think beyond what passage of this resolution and a military victory would mean. The United States would need to spend at least the next ten years involved in an occupation, reconstruction, and re-building effort. This will require a serious commitment of American resources and troops. Are we ready to commit to the rebuilding that will follow military action?

As a nation have we carefully considered what the impact of a unilateral attack by the United States would be on Israel? If everything that has been attributed to Hussein this evening is true, are we prepared to guarantee the stability of the entire region when Hussein finds himself threatened and decides to strike out at his neighbors?

Our State Department is actively involved in trying to improve the image of the United States in the Arab world and particularly among young Arab men and women. We do not want them to perceive the United States as an enemy. When we engage as a nation in a unilateral military action against an Arab nation, an action that our allies are cautioning against, how will the United States be viewed in the Arab world? Perhaps the result will be an increase in al Qaida's membership and a renewed hatred toward Americans.

The United States is founded on the principles of justice and due process. If we disregard these principles and adopt a unilateral, macho and aggressive stance, we lose our moral authority in the world. Seeking the consensus of nations does not weaken us or expose us to danger; instead, it fortifies us and brings to our cause the strength of our allies.

We want nations to look at us with respect and not fear, outrage, and scorn. It is time for us to take the lead in removing all weapons from Iraq, but in a way that embraces other nations instead of isolating us from them.

I will vote against this resolution, which permits a unilateral military attack, because I do not believe that the President has made a convincing case or provided sufficient evidence to merit its passage. However, let me also make it clear that my vote against this resolution, which I do not believe will make our nation any safer, should not in any way imply that I think the men and women in our armed services are anything less than heroes. They are courageous and brave.

So I end this speech as I began it, with great sadness. I cannot agree with the course that our great nation is embarking on, one that brings the threat of war closer and the goal of peace further away.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, as Saddam Hussein continues to defy the United States and the world, the avenue of options available in dealing with Hussein shrinks with every step he takes toward attaining nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction. It is clear that Hussein does not aspire to acquire these weapons for the sake of self-defense. The goal of these weapons is aggression. This is not a man of peace. This is a man of war. He has made a mockery of the agreement ending the first Persian Gulf War, and now he holds out hope that he can continue to manipulate the world to hold on to power. And he intends to hold power and use it till he is successful in acquiring weapons of mass destruction and with it, the ability to bully and destabilize the Gulf region.

Hussein intends to use the currency of these weapons to hold hostage the entire region. What then? Some argue that if the attack is not on the U.S. (which we cannot guarantee), we should not get involved. But who believes that if he again invades another country that the United States will be able to sit on its hands as the stability of the Middle East unravels? If he uses these weapons against his neighbors, where will this nation be on moral ground to allow him to continue without reprisal? Appeasement will not be an option. Further, who believes that our country is better positioned fighting a nuclear armed Hussein than one that is currently without that capability? Who believes that the welfare of our men and women in uniform is better served in having them face an enemy with nuclear weapons than one who has not yet been successful in doing so? The answer is no one. With that being said, the urgency of dealing with Hussein is ever increasing.

If Hussein attacks, the most brilliant diplomatic minds combined will not be able to bring a peaceful end. However well intended those hopes may be, eleven years of defiance have shown that peaceful talks and negotiations are not an option for Hussein. Rather, they are an opportunity to a man who does not deserve to lead the Iraqi people and who we cannot continue to appease.

Between 1987–1989, he ordered the deaths of the Kurdish population by the tens of thousands—indescriminately spraying their villages with poisonous gas. He has proven his imperialist nature through a path of destruction against Kuwait. He has allowed the Iraqi people to starve in favor of diverting resources to maintaining his grip on ruling Iraq. He has engaged in the periodic shake-up of his own administration, brutally eliminating threats to his reign of power. He has suppressed every effort of democracy and change in Iraq with bloodied and unremorseful hands. Saddam Hussein has committed acts so far beyond the pail of decency and acceptability that it leaves one to wonder in shock why we have waited so long to end this madman's career of carnage.

Our nation stands for freedom and humanity and because it does, we had hoped we could reason with Hussein. We hoped he would comply with the conditions of the peace agreement ending the Persian Gulf War. In the 1990s, we hoped he would end the shenanigans of denying access to inspection teams and end his lies and deceit by ending his weapons program. In all these things, Saddam Hussein failed. Through no lack of effort, we have given diplomacy a chance.

No Saddam Hussein wants to fool the world again. And it is the job of this body to ensure that he does not. We have exhausted all reasonable efforts to deal with an unreasonable madman. We have risked all too much in the hope of peace, only to have these efforts manipulated by a illusional director. It has not been our President, but Saddam Hussein himself that has made the most compelling case for the need for his removal. Saddam Hussein has in his actions, told the world that he is a threat, that he is dangerous, and that he will never be able to be held accountable unless removed.

We can wait no longer as with each passing day, Saddam Hussein draws closer to attaining unclear weapons and he exponentially increases the threat he poses to this nation, our allies, and peace and stability. We owe to the future generations not to make the mistake of holding out hope for Hussein. We must act with diligence to protect this country and we must act decisively.

Let this be clear that this country loves freedom and loves peace. We deserve (and the Iraqi people deserve) more than to be held in fear by a ruthless dictator whose actions have been unconscionable and continue to pose a threat to humankind. We know what Hussein is capable of and it is time to end the nightmare that he has unleashed on his people and bring a complete end to his imperialist aspirations. Therefore, I strongly urge an aye on this resolution.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, in view of Iraq's history of violence, deception and hostility, and the mounting evidence about its pursuit of powerful weapons, our objective must be the disarmament of Iraq and the fundamental reform of its current political leadership.

The Administration and many members of this body realize that this task is one that must be undertaken to protect America and its citizens. As we have learned, failing to recognize the seriousness of threats posed by our enemies can have grave consequences. I support this resolution because it is critical to our national security.

It does not obligate us to carry out military action, but it makes clear to Iraq and all nations the depth of our commitment to extinguishing the threat, and ensures that the Administration has every option available to achieve our objectives, including the use of military force.

There is a looming menace to America, and we ought not delay our efforts to neutralize it.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 114, which expresses the support of Congress for the Administration's efforts to enforce the United Nations Security Council resolutions mandating the disarmament of Iraq. Passage of this measure by the Congress will authorize the President to use American military forces to defend the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq.

Let me state at the outset that it is my judgment that the situation in Iraq is very serious and very perilous. I have served on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee for 24 years, and on the Intelligence Committee for eight of those years. I have thus had a continuing interest in the campaign of deceit waged by Iraqi President Saddam Hussein ever since the day he agreed to abandon his weapons of mass destruction following the Gulf War. Based on the briefings I have had, and based on the information provided by our intelligence agencies to Members of Congress, I now believe there is credible evidence that Saddam Hussein has developed sophisticated chemical and biological weapons, and that he me be close to developing a nuclear weapon. And furthermore, I believe he will not hesitate to use these and any other weapons he has in his arsenal against America and against our ships and bases in the Middle East region.

The CIA's most recent report on Iraq clearly indicates that, after the ejection of weapons inspectors in 1998, Iraq continued its chemical weapons program, energized its missile program, and invested more heavily in biological weapons. Furthermore, Iraq's growing ability to sell oil—despite the ban—increases Baghdad's capabilities to finance weapons of mass destruction programs. Using these funds, it largely has rebuilt the missile and biological weapons facilities that were damaged during Operation Desert Fox and has expanded its chemical and biological infrastructure under the cover of civilian production. The Iraqis have also exceeded UN range limits of 150 kilometers for their ballistic missiles and they are also developing unmanned aerial vehicles, which would allow for a more effective and more lethal means to deliver biological and chemical warfare agents.

Beyond these weapons programs, there is the question of nuclear weapons. In 1991, inspectors from the International Atomic Energy Agency uncovered a secret Iraqi effort to build nuclear weapons after they intercepted a shipment of trucks loaded with huge electromagnetic isotope separators used to make weapons-grade uranium. These inspectors remained on the ground, working with U.N. arms inspectors, until the day they were thrown out of Iraq by Saddam Hussein, flagrantly violating the terms of the disarmament agreements he signed to save himself in the Gulf War cease fire. Since 1998, there is credible evidence that he has attempted to purchase uranium and the hardware necessary to produce the kind of weapon that could inflict infinitely greater damage than any of the destruction we witnessed on September 11th of last year. There can be no doubt that Saddam Hussein represents a growing menace. In the four years since he expelled United Nations arms inspectors from Iraq, he has become an emboldened dictator whose hatred of the United States has only grown stronger as he has regained his military capability.

I believe that it is extremely important that we continue our diplomatic efforts to gain international support for action. Saddam Hussein has blatantly violated 16 important UN Resolutions as he has continued the arms buildup he pledged to curtail. With the growing threat of those weapons, with the assistance Iraq is providing to terrorist groups—including al Qaeda—and with the compelling need to assert the authority of the international community, President Bush has appropriately urged the UN to enforce the sanctions that its members have approved over the last 11 years. I believe H.J. Res. 114—by showing Congress's strong support for the President's position on the issue—will substantially strengthen our effort to develop a consensus at the United Nations for a new and stronger resolution demanding the verifiable removal of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction.

I believe that it is important, in the language of our Joint Resolution in Congress, to emphasize that we are determined in this cause: that if these efforts to build an international coalition within the United Nations are not successful, we believe that the United States must still take action, joined by the British and other nations who support us already, to ensure that Iraq is never able to use the weapons of mass destruction it has and those it is actively developing. In my judgment, the possibility of Saddam Hussein using these weapons against U.S. targets or our allies in the region justifies the commitment of American military forces, however much I truly hope that diplomatic efforts can succeed and that war can be avoided.

Mr. Speaker, for our own safety and national security, I believe that we should support the position that the President expressed at the United Nations last month. It is time for action. We can no longer ignore the reality of what Saddam Hussein is doing and we should no longer postpone our response to the growing dangers of this weapons programs. I urge my colleagues to vote for H.J.Res. 114.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. Speaker, Saddam Hussein has repeatedly demonstrated he is a threat to peaceful nations around the world. He has the money to finance his hostile intentions, he has the capabilities to blackmail nations with the use of weapons of mass destruction, and has shown a willingness to use them.

Everyday our pilots in the northern and southern no-fly zones of Iraq are the targets of Iraqi fire. Perhaps even more frightening, Saddam Hussein continues to develop and stockpile weapons of mass destruction and actively support international terrorism—both in violation of bona fide international agreements. In fact, in all of his actions, Hussein has demonstrated a persistent refusal to comply with every U.N. Security Council resolution in force regarding his country.

U.N. Resolutions called for Saddam to end both his WMD programs and his support for terrorism. Yet, before Hussein kicked them out of Iraq in 1998, weapons inspection teams could testify to the large amount of research, development, and materials associated with nuclear, biological and chemical weapons—despite Iraq's success in concealing the extent of its capabilities. However, Hussein did manage to hide a great deal from these inspectors, and it was not until defectors shared crucial information about hidden stockpiles that Saddam programs were set back, but never completely shut down. Now some people say we should have new inspections and do nothing else, believing this time that inspectors will be able to do what they could not before—identify and dismantle Iraq's WMD capabilities. Sadly, recent history teaches us otherwise.

The same can be said about Iraq's involvement with terrorism. Hussein continues to maintain his ties with terrorist organizations. Today his terrorist training camps continue to breed more people intent on harming prosperous, free, and democratic nations around the world—and endangering innocent civilians in the process.

Hussein also targets innocent civilians in his own country in violation of U.N. Security Resolutions. For example, the U.N. oil-for-food program allows Iraq to sell enough oil to provide its citizens sufficient food and medicine to sustain a decent standard of living. However, the profits from the oil never make it to the Iraqi people; instead Saddam funnels this money into his weapons programs. He then bolsters his programs with illegal proceeds from smuggled oil.

In light of these actions, it is clear that the world has a problem with Saddam and the international community agrees. Yet instead of action, many people want to limit the United States to building broad coalitions and placing international pressure on Saddam. Unfortunately, history—and the past ten years—has shown us that no amount of international pressure can stop a dictator with such disregard for international agreements and no diplomatic coalition can change his contempt for human life.

For decades Saddam Hussein has brutally trampled on freedom and muzzled the self-expression of his people. He has threatened his neighbors, supported terrorists, and stockpiled weapons of mass destruction. We cannot remove ourselves from the struggle between freedom and tyranny—good and evil. Saddam Hussein is already engaged in a battle, and he has been firing shots for the past decade. Doing nothing is not an option.

With this resolution, Congress acknowledges that something must be done and expresses full support for the President. President Bush's speech on Monday demonstrated that he—like the rest of us—does not want to go to war. And the fact that President Bush waited almost a month before using force in Afghanistan makes obvious his desire to build coalitions and utilize every peaceful opportunity to end international disagreement before resorting to war.

However, he also understands the United States carries an incredible burden of leadership in the world. For this reason when he took office, President Bush assembled one of the finest national security teams this nation has ever seen. They have proven their leadership in previous military conflicts and understand the cost of military action. Their role in the war on terrorism has also demonstrated how much they care about U.S. troops and the loss of life for anyone involved—both military and civilian. Now is the time to have faith in the President's proven leadership and allow him and his advisors to implement the strategy that finally ends the threat Saddam poses to the free world.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 114, authorizing the President to employ the use of our Armed Forces against Iraq, and urge its adoption by this Chamber. For the past 2 days, the House of Representatives has had under consideration one of the most serious resolutions it is capable of adopting and, like my colleagues, I take it very seriously. Some have argued that this resolution is not necessary, that Iraq poses no immediate danger to the United States or any other nation, and that we should not employ military force against a sadistic terrorist regime that displays not the slightest regard for human life. Mr. Speaker, I disagree.

For the past 10 years, Saddam Hussein had developed and stockpiled chemical and biological weapons and continued to construct facilities capable of producing nuclear weapons. Evidence of this and other destructive activities on the part of Saddam Hussein is overwhelming. Mr. Speaker, for the sake of our Nation's safety and that of our neighbors and allies we cannot ignore this problem any longer. Either Saddam Hussein gives the U.N. weapons inspectors full, un-fettered, and unconditional access to all Iraqi facilities or the United States will take action to disarm him.

I applaud President Bush, who has prudently and methodically made a strong case for why the United States has the moral and political authority to take action against Iraq, if necessary. Mr. Speaker, we are at the end of the line and words and international declarations will no longer do against a dictator who has nothing but contempt for the freedom-loving world and his own people.

In addition to its stockpile of weapons of mass destruction, Saddam Hussein has repeatedly violated the Persian Gulf War cease-fire agreement, snubbed numerous U.N. resolutions, brutalized and killed his own people, plotted to assassinate a former U.S. President, and has aided and harbored members of terrorists cells, including al-Qaida. Clearly, we must act.

Mr. Speaker, the foremost responsibility of government is to ensure the safety and security of its citizens. We demand safety and security in our neighborhoods, schools, and workplaces; we should expect the same in the international community as well. Although I remain hopeful that this conflict with Iraq can be resolved peacefully, I am prepared, for the sake of our Nation's security, to employ force. This resolution is not, as some have stated, a ''blank check'' for the President. Congress has and will continue to maintain its constitutional prerogatives if armed conflict with Iraq should ensue, but as a nation, we have the right to take action. Thus, I urge the adoption of House Joint Resolution 114.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, today, we are debating the most fundamental issues we face as a Congress and as a country. Today we are debating whether to send America's sons and daughters into harm's way, whether a threat exists to America's security and whether we need to act now or wait. We have no more grave responsibility as legislators than defending our Nation and democratic way of life.

American foreign policy has had a single objective since the foundation of our republic. That objective has been to defend our independence and freedoms. Over the years the policies America has followed have changed to meet the changing threat.

During America's first century we followed a policy of staying out of foreign conflicts, comfortable in the security offered by two oceans.

The Monroe Doctrine represented the first expansion of American policy in its vigorous assertion of America's right to ensure that no foreign power intervenes in our hemisphere. The last century saw a further expansion of American power as we acted to prevent any hostile power or ideology from dominating the eastern hemisphere and threatening our continued independence.

Today, we face a new challenge, a homicidal dictator striving to acquire the means to threaten our civilization and kill millions of our fellow Americans. Saddam Hussein already has the means; he only lacks the material needed to build an atomic bomb. It has been widely reported that he could build a bomb within a year were he to acquire certain materials. A nuclear armed Saddam Hussein would represent a clear and present danger to our nation.

No one who has objectively looked at the facts, no one who has seen the Kurdish villagers gassed on Saddam Hussein's order, no one who remembers the invasion and looting of Kuwait, no one looking at the facts can doubt that a nuclear Saddam Hussein would be a threat to our Nation and civilization.

Given these facts I think it is important we understand what we are debating today. We are not debating whether a nuclear Saddam Hussein is a threat. No honest analysis can deny that. We are not debating how to confront Saddam Hussein. No one wants war and it is my earnest hope that our actions today will convince Saddam Hussein that he must disarm and give up his goal of acquiring nuclear weapons. However, we can only succeed in avoiding war if Saddam Hussein is convinced that he risks war and the destruction of his regime if he continues to defy us.

What we are debating today is timing. Do we confront Saddam Hussein today or wait. Do we act now when he does not possess nuclear weapons or wait until he does. Common sense tells us that the risky course is to wait. Our responsibility as legislators dictates we act against any threat to our independence. Opponents of this resolution say the risks are too great and that there is too much that is unknown, but the risks of not acting are far greater and the unknown far more terrifying.

Let us remain true to previous generations of Americans who have been vigilant in protecting our freedom and vote for this resolution. Let us live up to the expectations set by the Founding Fathers and support this resolution.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution before us today. The principle purpose of the resolution is to authorize the use of military force—if deemed necessary—to remove Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq. The Hussein regime poses a direct threat to the security of the United States and our partners in the world. And this threat must not be allowed to stand.

In the aftermath of the Persian Gulf War, Saddam Hussein agreed to numerous United Nations Security Council resolutions—16 of them—as conditions of his political survival. Now, almost 12-years later, Iraq's leader has failed outright to comply with these terms of peace. Hussein has continued to stockpile weapons of mass destruction, subjected the people of Iraq to squalor and starvation, openly sponsored terrorist attacks, and has in all ways defied the international community. He has lied repeatedly and there is no doubt that he cannot be trusted.

Yet still, many wonder if Saddam's distant rogue regime is a real threat to our national security, and the safety of American citizens?

To answer this question we need look no further than the horrors of 9–11 and how terrorists from afar were able to strike at America. Hussein's hatred of our country has been made plain. Despite our best efforts at border security, it is conceivable that terrorists, sponsored by Hussein, might smuggle Iraqi weapons into the United States for use in an attack against our citizens.

Our intelligence reports confirm this threat as real. Iraq maintains an extensive stockpile of sophisticated chemical and biological weapons, and is continuing in its program to develop nuclear weapons and the means to deliver them. We also know that Iraq supports terrorist groups and encourages violence against Israel with cash payments to the families of suicide bombers. Under Hussein's regime, Iraq has become a new safe-harbor for al-Qaeda and other terrorist groups.

Just as we must vote to pass the resolution before us, so too must the United Nations reaffirm its importance in the global theater, approving the use of force against Iraq. As in the Gulf War, a unified coalition effort from the beginning would help foster consensus to rebuild Iraq and reconstitute a new Iraqi government following military action.

As we prepare for what may be an inevitable war scenario in Iraq, we must acknowledge the possible outcomes of such an action, both positive and negative.

Our objective would be to eliminate the threat posed by Hussein's regime, and thereby create a more stabile political environment in the Middle East. Still, the decision to commit American troops to the battlefield is never easy. In addition, there are also other considerations, such as, if we are successful in our mission, what happens next? What kind of force will it take to successfully see through a transition in Iraq and foster a new democracy?

While these possibilities must be considered when weighing any action, the immediate issue is clear: Iraq is a threat that must be dealt with swiftly.

I firmly believe that our President will make the right decision, in the best interest of the United States, and I have the utmost confidence in the integrity of his counsel. Mr. Speaker—at times we must be willing to use force to protect the security of our people and of our Nation.

Now is one of those times.

I would like to thank my colleagues in the House for introducing this strong resolution, and would like to urge all to stand by the President and vote for its passage.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, more than 200 years ago, the first President of the United States addressed the Nation's first Congress with these prophetic words, ''the preservation of the sacred fire of liberty and the destiny of the Republican model of government are . . . finally, staked on the experiment entrusted to the hands of the American people.''

Now we find ourselves in a new century, confronted by new trials.

We have withstood attempts at invasion, survived a bloody civil war, endured two world wars and prevailed in the long twilight struggle President Kennedy spoke of more than forty years ago.

Ten years ago, confronted by the specter of Kuwait brutally overrun by Iraqi forces, the United Nations and the United States led a coalition of more than 28 nations in a war of liberation.

Then President Bush plainly outlined our war aims. ''Our objectives'' he said ''are clear. Saddam Hussein's forces will leave Kuwait. The legitimate Government of Kuwait will be restored. . . . and Kuwait will once again be free.'' All of this was achieved.

He then went on to say that once peace was restored, it was our Nation's hope, ''that Iraq will live as a peaceful and cooperative member of the family of nations.'' this hope has gone unfulfilled.

And so, in Franklin Roosevelt's words, ''there has come a time, in the midst of swift happenings, to pause for a moment and take stock—to recall what our place in history has been, and to rediscover what we are and what we may be. There is no greater example of what we are than how we responded to the terrible events of September 11.

Confronted with a massacre of innocent lives; the attack on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, and the horror of the instruments of modern technology being used as the means of our destruction, we did not falter.

In the weeks and months since, we have buried our dead, cared for our wounded, aided the widows and orphans, improved our defenses and taken the war to our enemy.

Now we are asked to do more.

Over the past few months, I have agonized, along with many of my neighbors and constituents, on the degree of threat the renegade regime in Iraq represents to our safety and security.

It is for these and other reasons that I set the bar so high on what I would require before I would embrace any presidential action that included the use of force to remove Hussein and his henchmen from power.

The most compelling reason, as I wrote to my constituents was the realization that, ''any decision to finally remove Hussein and his regime, once begun, could not be permitted to fail.

For those reasons, I urged the administration to work to promote a regime change short of the use of the military option.

I went on to argue that, should those efforts fail, then it was incumbent upon the administration to make their case to the United Nations, to the American people and to Congress before inaugurating any major military undertaking against Iraq.

This they have done. Now it is time for us to decide. I will vote ''yes'' on this resolution.

While I still hold out some hope that by its passage the United Nations will be empowered, to force Iraq to comply with the will of the international community, that they eliminate all their weapons of mass destruction, I bear too great a responsibility to allow my actions to be governed by that hope alone.

As a Member of Congress, I must act upon information I possess in a way that most clearly protects our people and our way of life. And what I know is this. Should the U.N. fail in its mission, we will have very little choice but to act.

I am now persuaded that, left to his own devices, Saddam Hussein will not be content until he has the means to murder his own people and the people of many nations with the most horrible weapons of war. This we cannot permit.

Neither can we permit him to cause the kind of world economic blackmail and chaos that

could ensue, should he be allowed to continue his arms build-up. As President Eisenhower once observed, ''We are linked to all free peoples not merely by a noble idea but by a simple need. No free people can for long cling to any privilege or enjoy and safety in economic solitude.''

I do not take this step lightly. To knowingly spend the precious blood of our sons and daughters and the wealth of this peaceable people, even in the noblest cause, is a burden no sensible man desires. But, in the end, our place in the world as the pre-eminent champion of human rights and human liberty leaves us very little choice.

At the close of his 3rd Inaugural Address, on the eve of our Nation's being drawn into the Second World War, Franklin Roosevelt spoke these words, ''In the face of great perils never before encountered, our strong purpose is to protect and to perpetuate the integrity of democracy. For this we muster the spirit of America, and the faith of America. We do not retreat. We are not content to stand still. As Americans, we go forward, in the service of country. . . .''

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. It is both reasonable and necessary.

At its essence, our debate is about the critical need to ensure Saddam Hussein fully understands our resolve to protect our citizens and to promote peace around the world. There is no question we would all prefer it if the path ahead did not include military action. Unfortunately, Saddam Hussein may not allow us that option.

The President and other members of his administration have provided a sober, convincing picture of the threats our nation faces from Iraq's current regime. As the President said earlier this week, ''While there are many dangers in the world, the threat from Iraq stands alone because it gathers the most serious dangers of our age in one place.''

And this ''one place'' is led by an evil, evil dictator who directs his intense hatred toward America, Americans, our interests and our allies.

Iraq's leadership has continued to aggressively pursue the development of weapons of mass destruction to add to his arsenal. We've all talked about these weapons but it's worth spelling out what they can be: chemical weapons, biological weapons and even nuclear weapons. Saddam Hussein has shown his cruel willingness to use such devastating weapons against his own citizens and his neighboring countries in the past. I sincerely doubt he's had a change of heart.

We must also not ignore the support of terrorism found in Hussein's Iraq. September 11, 2001 was a horrific reminder that terrorists are serious in their intent to harm Americans. This step is a continuation of the war against terrorism that our nation has been forced to undertake.

It is Saddam Hussein himself who provides the final proof that we must act. He has a robust history of disregard of the international community and its laws. Time and again, he has willingly and defied the United Nations and the world community by ignoring the agreements he has made. He has constructed a wall of delay and deception that at times is as thick as the cloud of black smoke from the malicious oil fires that greeted our troops in 1991 as they liberated Kuwait.

It's obvious that Iraq's current regime presents problems not just for the United States, but problems for international peace and stability. We can not deny the seriousness of the situation, and I believe America should provide its leadership for the sake of peace and justice.

The President has earned our confidence through his leadership since last fall's terrorist attacks. The President is determined to pursue a course of action with regard to Iraq that will both ensure our own nation's security and promote international stability and I support his efforts.

At the same time, I want to make it clear that I respect those who have sincere opposing views on the question before us. The freedom to disagree is one among many freedoms that we are vigorously trying to preserve and I would never want that to change. Few in Iraq who disagree with Saddam Hussein can share their opinions openly.

The resolution we are considering makes it clear that America prefers to find solutions together with the United Nations and other international leaders. It also provides authority for the President to use force if diplomatic or other peaceful means are not effective. It preserves America's right to act on its own as we must in self-defense of our nation's interests.

Mr. Speaker, the first major vote I took as a Member of Congress in 1991 was to support the international coalition's effort to liberate Kuwait from Iraqi aggressors. No one wanted war then, but it was necessary. No one wants war now. We don't seek it. It is my fervent hope that war with Iraq may yet be avoided. And it may. But our shared and firm commitment to the security of our nation should not be questioned by Saddam Hussein or the world community.

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 114, the bipartisan resolution authorizing the use of military force against Iraq.

Like most Americans, I understand that our security is threatened by rogue nations suspected of crafting biological and chemical weapons, and by those who seek access to nuclear weapons. I am convinced that Iraq is building an arsenal of weapons of mass destruction, following repeated refusals, over many years, to comply with United Nations weapons inspections. I believe it is our responsibility to ensure that Saddam Hussein is no longer positioned to pose a major and imminent threat to U.S. national security. I further believe that the President should have the authority to use force against Iraq, if he deems it necessary.

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, let's get this straight: a preemptive war is a war nonetheless, a war the would-be preemptor starts.

According to our Congressional Budget Office, the aggressive war the President wants to start against Iraq would cost our taxpayers between $6 and $9 billion a month. With most people's retirement accounts in the tank, the Federal accounts drenched in red ink and so many people out of work, don't we have better and less violently fatal ways to spend money?

Despite our using parts of Iraq for bombing practice over a ten year period, Iraq hasn't attacked us. But if we carried out a campaign to destroy the regime entirely, what would Saddam have to lose by trying to sneak biological weapons into the U.S.? As we have seen in Afghanistan, it is not physically possible for us to bottle up a country so that no one can slip away.

A preemptive strike without U.N. Security Council compliance is, by definition, aggression and a treaty violation. A duly entered into treaty is the law of the land. Moreover, the mandate of our Constitution is that Congress alone has the authority to start a war. And the Constitution does not permit Congress to delegate any part of that authority to the President as this proposed resolution would do. In discussing that Constitutional provision (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Clause 11), Congressman Abraham Lincoln wrote in part:

> Allow a President to invade a neighboring nation whenever he shall deem it necessary to repel an invasion, and you allow him to do so whenever he may choose to say he deems it necessary for such purpose—and you allow him to make war at pleasure.

There are twenty million people in Iraq not named Hussein. An invasion would kill untold thousands of those already weakened people.

On Saturday the President said, ''We must do everything we can to disarm this man before he hurts one single American.'' Could that possibly mean that the President believes the American soldiers who would be slaughtered in the war he wants to start against Iraq would not be ''hurt.'' Should such stark horror be so casually inflicted on so many young Americans on such flimsy and dubious evidence?

Let's get another thing straight: the al-Qaida did not invent terrorism; it is anything but ''a new kind of war.'' It went on during the reconstruction period in America and periodically since.

Not long ago, President Reagan and Vice-President Bush were telling us one of the good things about their then-friend Hussein was that he was secular and not a religious fanatic. Now suddenly this President Bush is telling us that Hussein is in cahoots with religious fanatics who, even the most casual student of the mideast knows, hate Hussein's guts and would be delighted to overthrow him. Bear in mind that the Bush/Hussein friendship was still going strong after both the Hussein invasion of Iran and his use of gas weapons against his own people.

For 40 years, the Soviet Union was our adversary and was armed to the teeth with awesome nuclear weapons with intercontinental capability that made Hussein the pipsqueak he is. The Soviet Union also slaughtered millions of its own people and invaded neighboring countries. The Soviets were our Saddam Hussein of the time. But no U.S. ''preemptive war.'' Not necessary because the Soviets knew use of nuclear weapons would mean their suicide.

For the sake of argument, let's say Hussein had primitive nuclear weapons now, which he almost certainly does not. He and his gang aren't so dumb that they don't know use of such weapons would mean that he and his ''grizzly gang'' would be vaporized within minutes by our awesome nuclear capability.

So why war now? Mr. Rove, the White House politics man, is on record as saying that war is good for his party to win elections. Is this, then, a political question or a moral one?

One of the greatest dangers to an American soldier is a poor economy at election time.

In good conscience, I cannot cast my constituents' vote for this latter-day Gulf of Tonkin

Resolution. It is said that the only thing we learn from history is that we do not learn from history.

Mrs. BONO. Mr. speaker, since coming to Washington, I have taken part in many significant and historical debates. Most of the time, Republicans and Democrats have been at odds with one another. But last week, as I and a group of my Democrat and Republican colleagues, discussed this issue with the President of the United States in the Cabinet Room of the White House, I felt a sense of purpose and bipartisanship that made me proud to serve as a Member of Congress.

To grant our President the authority to use force against the regime of Saddam Hussein as a last resort is not a vote I take lightly. However, over the course of our nation's young history, there have been many times when I wish we had been able to prevent a variety of calamities. From the assault on Pearl Harbor to the terrorist attacks of 9–11, we have been reminded time and time again that we do not live in splendid isolation.

It is for this reason we must consider taking up arms yet again to defend ourselves. While I realize the human cost of war on both sides is sobering, the cost of inaction in this case could far exceed our worst fears.

Saddam Hussein has used weapons of mass destruction on his own people. He has used them against the Iranians. There is no question in my mind that this international outlaw has a diabolical drive to acquire nuclear weapons to use against our Nation and our allies. If we do not act now, we will have put the lives of our citizens at risk and we will have failed our future generations. We will go down in history as having given up our principals out of fear. History will not forgive us.

Our World War II generation of men and women, under the leadership and strength of FDR and Churchill, fought and died to give us the freedoms we enjoy today. It is now up to us to rise to this new threat. While I believe we must work with our allies to exhaust all reasonable diplomatic means, we must also be prepared to take military action to defend our country from a tyrant who can unleash a reign of terror upon the civilized world never before seen.

Mr. Speaker, it was quite significant for so many of us with such varied backgrounds and philosophies to come together with the President in the Cabinet Room last week. We were able to prove that national security is an issue that transcends party lines and sends a signal to our aggressors that we will stand firm and united in order to protect our country and her citizens.

The world is watching us. The United States and this Congress cannot be afraid to lead and defend. We have a sacred obligation to our people and our way of life.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, just a few short weeks ago, I believed the President's focus on unilateral U.S. action raised more questions than it answered. Chief among my concerns were issues such as international support, the existence of a clear and present danger to the United States, conditions for maximizing success and minimizing casualties, and the effect of unilateral action of Middle East stability.

I was pleased to see the President listen to these concerns, work closely with the Congress, and produce the bipartisan resolution currently under debate in the House. One thing is clear, the strength of our Republic, our commitment to debate, democracy and freedom is as strong today as in any time in our Nation's history.

Like most Americans, I have wrestled with the question of how to neutralize the threat of Saddam Hussein. During my travels in Michigan, thousands of constituents have shared their concerns about a unilateral and full-scale American invasion of Iraq. In fact, I continue to share those very concerns.

This week, I will cast the toughest vote of my time in public service—a vote that may commit American men and women to a war against Iraq and its brutal dictator. This is a war in which lives surely will be lost. The first time I faced such a tough decision was in giving the President authority to send troops into Afghanistan to hunt down the terrorist who attacked our Nation on September 11, 2001.

As we all are learning, the face of war is changing. Formal declarations of war by our enemies are going the way of trench warfare and cavalry charges—relics of a different era. The resolution currently before Congress reflects that changing reality.

Today's enemies do not distinguish between civilian and military targets. Today's enemies are just as likely to use chemical and biological weapons as bullets and bombs. These are the very real threats posed by modern enemies that do not allow us to wait for an attack of catastrophic proportions.

Going to war, however, requires more than recognizing the threat. It is the immediacy of these threats that pose a clear and present danger to U.S. citizens. This was underscored in my recent briefings at the White House with National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice, CIA Director George Tenet, and other military intelligence and foreign policy experts. Their information, some of it classified, reinforced the very real threat Saddam poses with nuclear, biological and chemical weapons, and his willingness to use them. Even against the United States.

A great deal of soul searching has gone into the process that began with talk about the U.S. attacking Iraq and has now come to an agreement on four very important points:

(1) Multilateral Action. Last month, after returning from a Middle East trip, it was absolutely clear that Saddam's neighbors who know him best, fear him deeply and would shed few tears if he were removed from power. However, the region's leaders, especially Saudi Arabia, were concerned about the fragile future of the Middle East. They want Saddam removed, but through a strong alliance, not one-on-one, America versus Saddam. This bipartisan congressional resolution authorizes President Bush to ''obtain prompt and decisive action'' by the United Nations Security Council to ensure that Iraq abandons its strategy of ''delay, evasion and noncompliance'' with all relevant international resolutions.

(2) Force As Last Resort. The Bush administration and our allies must exhaust all diplomatic efforts before resorting to armed force in Iraq. The resolution provides that President Bush must certify to Congress, before any military strike, if feasible, or within 48 hours of a U.S. attack, that diplomatic and other peaceful means alone are inadequate to protect Americans from Saddam's weapons of mass destruction. If America must go to war against a regime that threatens our lives, it will not happen until all other possible solutions have been exhausted.

(3) Congressional Oversight. In addition to the certification to Congress before a military strike, this resolution requires President Bush to report to Congress every 60 days on ''matters relevant'' to the confrontation with Iraq.

(4) Retaining American Sovereignty. While the resolution authorizes the United States to work through a U.N. Security Council resolution, no American sovereignty is forfeited. If all efforts fail and the national security of the United States is under direct threat by Iraq, the resolution authorizes the President to use the Armed Forces of the United States as he determines ''necessary and proper'' in order to defend America.

God Bless America!

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I am committed to the war against terrorism, and believe that stopping Saddam Hussein from developing weapons of mass destruction is a necessary part of that effort. At this time, however, I believe it is premature to authorize a unilateral attack on Iraq.

Working with the international community is the surest means of addressing this threat effectively, sharing costs and resources, and ensuring stability in Iraq and throughout the Middle East in the event of a regime change. While the President has spoken of the value of a coalition effort, the resolution before the House today undermines the importance of our allies and of maintaining the momentum of international cooperation in the wider war on terrorism.

I support the Spratt amendment to the resolution. This amendment would authorize the use of U.S. forces in support of a new U.N. Security Council resolution mandating the elimination, by force if necessary, of all Iraqi weapons of mass destruction and means of producing such weapons. Should the Security Council fail to produce such a resolution, the amendment calls on the President to then seek authorization for unilateral military action. In this way, the amendment emphasizes our preference for a peaceful solution and coalition support while recognizing that military force and unilateral action may be appropriate at some point.

We should not rush into war without the support of our allies. We should not send American troops into combat before making a good faith effort to put U.N. inspectors back into Iraq, under a more forceful resolution. We should not turn to a policy of preemptive attack, which we have so long and so rightly condemned, without first providing a limited-time option for peaceful resolution of the threat. America has long stood behind the principle of exhausting diplomacy before resorting to war, and at times like this we must lead by example.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.J. Res. 114, a resolution granting President Bush the authorization to use military force against Iraq. Never in my 8 years as a Member of Congress has there been a vote with as far reaching consequences as this one.

I am under no illusions. War is a serious matter with the real possibility of casualties. I have given this decision a great deal of thought, have sought wise counsel and have spent much time in prayer. It is with a heavy heart that I have come to the conclusion that military action against Iraq may be our only option.

For more than a decade the United States has been working with the United Nations and the international community to use diplomatic means to bring a peaceful solution to the troubling situation in Iraq. We had all hoped Saddam Hussein and his regime would ultimately comply with what the United Nations has demanded. Instead, he has violated, disregarded and openly flouted the 16 U.N. resolutions.

We now know Saddam Hussein is actively seeking nuclear weapons capability, and with fissile material, could build one within a year. A nuclear strike made against us or our allies in the region could result in millions dead. Either Saddam Hussein acquires a nuclear weapon, or we ensure he is stopped. Additionally, Hussein may have the propensity to sell or given nuclear weapons to terrorist organizations one he had acquired them. This could have devastating results.

Traditional nuclear deterrence and containment will not be effective with this regime. Hussein has consistently shown no moral concern for the Iraqi people. Instead, he has a record of acting with selfish deeds of violence against his own family and people. He has mortgaged everything in an effort to obtain nuclear weapon capability. In fighting international sanctions, he has forfeited $180 billion in oil revenue, impoverished many of his people and allowed degradation of his military forces.

Saddam Hussein has already shown the propensity to use chemical weapons on his neighbors in the region and on his own people, and he continues to possess and develop significant chemical and biological weapons capability. One source indicates that Saddam Hussein has already used chemical and biological weapons 250 times.

In addition to these threats, the Iraqi regime continues to aid and harbor international terrorist organizations, including groups that have threatened the lives and safety of American citizens.

I have had the opportunity to participate in several classified briefings led by President Bush, National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice and Deputy Director of Central Intelligence John McLaughlin. I am convinced that Iraq poses an unquestionable and near-term threat to the peace and security of the United States and our allies abroad.

We can not allow those who wish harm on the United States, and have the propensity to deliver that harm, to acquire weapons of terror and mass destruction. Inaction on our part could lead to the massive loss of innocent lives. The ten-year cat and mouse game Hussein has played with weapons inspectors must come to an end. There is too much at stake, and time is rapidly dwindling.

I believe it is in the national security interest of the United States to prevent Saddam Hussein from obtaining a nuclear weapon and to prosecute the war on terrorism, including Iraq's support for international terrorist groups.

President Bush must continue his efforts to get support from the United Nations Security Council and must exhaust all reasonable diplomatic options available in hopes of avoiding war. However, if Saddam Hussein and the Iraqi regime continue to rebuff the international community and threaten the peace and security of the United States, we must take swift and decisive action. To do anything less would be immoral and irresponsible.

Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution and urge my colleagues on both sides of the isle to do the same.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHUSTER). Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 574, the Chair postpones further consideration of the joint resolution until the legislative day of Thursday, October 10, 2002.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

CONTINUED PRODUCTION OF THE NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES BEYOND APRIL 5, 2003—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 107–272)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 201(3) of the Naval Petroleum Reserves Production Act of 1976 (10 U.S.C. 7422(c)(2)), I am informing you of my decision to extend the period of production of the Naval Petroleum Reserves for a period of 3 years from April 5, 2003, the expiration date of the currently authorized period of production.

Enclosed is a copy of the report investigating the necessity of continued production of the reserves as required by section 201(3)(c)(2)(B) of the Naval Petroleum Reserves Production Act of 1976. In light of the findings contained in the report, I certify that continued production from the Naval Petroleum Reserves is in the national interest.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 9, 2002*.

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 12 o'clock and 54 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 0752

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington) at 7 o'clock and 52 minutes a.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mrs. MYRICK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107–735) on the resolution (H. Res. 577) waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 5011, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2003

Mrs. MYRICK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107–736) on the resolution (H. Res. 578) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 5011) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 5010, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2003

Mrs. MYRICK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107–737) on the resolution (H. Res. 579) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 5010) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MANZULLO (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PAYNE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2127. An act for the relief of the Pottawatomi Nation in Canada for settlement of certain claims against the United States; to the Committee on Resources.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 53 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Thursday, October 10, 2002, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

9573. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Technical Assistance for Specialty Crops Program (RIN: 0551-AA63) received October 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9574. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting a bill entitled, ''Black Lung Consolidation of Administrative Responsibilities Act''; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

9575. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Plans For Designated Facilities and Pollutants: Massachusetts; Plan for Controlling MWC Emissions From Existing Large MWC Plants [MA-01-7203a; FRL-7387-5] received October 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9576. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Iowa [IA 154-1154a; FRL-7392-6] received October 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9577. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Indiana [IN144-1a; FRL-7390-3] received October 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9578. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; To Prevent and Control Air Pollution from the Operation of Hot Mix Asphalt Plants [WV 047-6021a; FRL-7391-3] received October 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9579. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Utah; Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Programs; Salt Lake County and General Requirements and Applicability [UT-001-0038, UT-001-0039, UT-001-0040; FRL-7262-2] received October 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9580. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Hampshire; Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) of Air Quality Permit Requirements [NH-01-48-7174a; A-1-FRL-7376-5] received October 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9581. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Implementation of the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992; Development of Competition and Diversity in Video Programming Distribution: Section 628(c)(5) of the Communications Act; Sunset of Exclusive Contract Prohibition [CS Docket No. 01-290] received October 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9582. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.622(b), Table of Allotments, Digital Television Broadcast Stations (Fort Wayne, Indiana) [MB Docket No. 01-302, RM-10333] received October 8, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9583. A letter from the Secretary of the Commission, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Rule Concerning Disclosures Regarding Energy Consumption and Water Use of Certain Home Appliances and Other Products Required Under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (''Appliance Labeling Rule'') — received October 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9584. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Specification of a Probability for Unlikely Features, Events and Processes (RIN: 3150-AG91) received October 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9585. A letter from the Chairman and Co-Chairman, Congressional Executive Commission on China, transmitting the Commission's first 2002 annual report; to the Committee on International Relations.

9586. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Schedule of Fees for Consular Services, Department of State and Overseas Embassies and Consulates — received October 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

9587. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of a report entitled, ''Mismanaged Special Education Payment System Vulnerable to Fraud, Waste and Abuse,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 47—117(d); to the Committee on Government Reform.

9588. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of a report entitled, ''Certification of the Fiscal Year 2002 Revenue Projection in Support of the District's $283,870,000 Multimodal General Obligation Bonds and Refunding Bonds,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 47—117(d); to the Committee on Government Reform.

9589. A letter from the Executives Resources and Special Programs Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9590. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Fisheries; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna [I.D. 083002D] received October 8, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9591. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Closure of the Fishery for Pacific Sardine North of Pt. Piedras Blancas, CA [Docket No. 011218302-1302-01; 091202B] received October 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9592. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Stone Crab Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Amendment 7 [Docket No. 020606141-22212-02; I.D. 031402C] (RIN: 0648-AN10) received October 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9593. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Catching Pacific Cod for Processing by the Inshore Component in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 011218304-1304-01; I.D. 092502E] received October 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9594. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atka Mackerel in the Western Aleutian District [Docket No. 011218304-1304-01; I.D. 092402D] received October 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9595. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Trawl Gear in the Chum Salmon Savings Area of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 011218304-1304-01; I.D. 091902D] received October 1, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9596. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's proposed legislation entitled, ''Child Abduction and Sexual Abuse Prevention Act of 2002''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9597. A letter from the Program Analyst,FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL-600-2B19 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-196-AD; Amendment 39-12887; AD 2002-19-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9598. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Vulcanair S.p.A. P 68

Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-CE-13-AD; Amendment 39-12888; AD 2002-19-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9599. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Textron Lycoming IO-540, LTIO-540, and TIO-540 Series Reciprocating Engines [Docket No. 2002-NE-03-AD; Amendment 39-12883; AD 2002-19-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9600. A letter from the Program Analyst,FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; SOCATA — Groupe AEROSPATIALE Model TBM 700 Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-CE-15-AD; Amendment 39-12881; AD 2002-19-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9601. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30331; Amdt. No. 3024] received October 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9602. A letter from the FMCSA Regulations Officer, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Development of a North American Standard for Protection Against Shifting and Falling Cargo (RIN: 2126-AA27) received October 1, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9603. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30330; Amdt. No. 3023] received October 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9604. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Contract Numbering (RIN: 2700-AC33) received October 8, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

9605. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Regulatory Law, Department of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Enrollment — Provision of Hospital and Outpatient Care to Veterans (RIN: 2900-AK38) received October 7, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

9606. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Extension of Transition Relief for Foreign Partnerships and their Withholding Agents under Notice 2001-4 [Notice 2002-66] received October 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9607. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Examination of returns and claims for refund, credit or abatement; determination of correct tax liability (Rev. Proc. 2002-66) received October 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9608. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Qualified covered call options (Rev. Rul. 2002-66) received October 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9609. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Tax Treatment of Payments Made Under the USDA Peanut Quota Buyout Program [Notice 2002-67] received October 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9610. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Weighted Average Interest Rate Update [Notice 2002-68] received October 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9611. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Summary of Revenue Procedure 2002-64 (Rev. Proc. 2002-64) received October 3, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HOBSON: Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 5011. A bill making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes (Rept. 107–731). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LEWIS of California: Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 5010. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes (Rept. 107–732). Ordered to be printed.

[October 10 (legislative day of October 9), 2002]

Mr. THOMAS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 5558. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to accelerate the increases in contribution limits to retirement plans and to increase the required beginning date for distributions from qualified plans; with an amendment (Rept. 107–733). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMAS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 1619. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the limitation on capital losses applicable to individuals; with an amendment (Rept. 107–734). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 577. Resolution waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules (Rept. 107–735). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. MYRICK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 578. Resolution waiving points or order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 5011) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes (Rept. 107–736). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. MYRICK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 579. Resolution waiving points or order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 5010) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes (Rept. 107–737). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. EVANS:

H.R. 5583. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to establish a Government-wide procurement goal for small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans, to establish a presumption that service-disabled veterans and other handicapped individuals are eligible for benefits under the Small Business Development Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 5584. A bill to protect certain lands held in fee by the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians from condemnation until a final decision is made regarding a pending fee to trust application for that land, to provide an environmentally sound process for the expeditious consideration and approval of an electricity transmission line right-of-way through the Trabuco Ranger District of the Cleveland National Forest and adjacent Federal lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. CASTLE (for himself and Mr. BOEHNER):

H.R. 5585. A bill to provide for improvement of Federal education research, statistics, evaluation, information, and dissemination, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ENGLISH (for himself, Ms. HART, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. COYNE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. PITTS):

H.R. 5586. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 141 Erie Street in Linesville, Pennsylvania, as the ''James R. Merry Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. ENGLISH (for himself, Mr. WELLER, Ms. HART, Mr. HERGER, Ms. DUNN, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. EHRLICH, and Mr. FOLEY):

H.R. 5587. A bill to extend the program under which temporary extended unemployment compensation is provided, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEKAS (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 5588. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish penalties for aggravated identity theft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAVES:

H.R. 5589. A bill to provide emergency disaster assistance to agricultural producers to respond to severe crop losses incurred in 2001 and 2002; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAYES (for himself, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mr. JEFF MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 5590. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the enforcement and effectiveness of civilian orders of protection on military installations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KELLER (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, and Mr. CASTLE):

H.R. 5591. A bill to provide relief to teachers, administrators, and related services providers from an excessive paperwork burden, and to reduce time spent by teachers on non-

instructional activities, as required under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KING:

H.R. 5592. A bill to eliminate the backlog in performing DNA analyses of DNA samples collected from convicted child sex offenders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE (for himself and Ms. McCARTHY of Missouri):

H.R. 5593. A bill to provide assistance to certain airline industry workers who have lost their jobs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MORELLA (for herself and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio):

H.R. 5594. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require labeling containing information applicable to pediatric patients; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SANCHEZ (for herself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. BONO, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. DICKS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GREENWOOD, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Ms. LEE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mr. UNDERWOOD):

H.R. 5595. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to establish and appoint the members of a Marine Protected Areas Advisory Committee in accordance with a Department of Commerce document; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

H.J. Res. 120. A joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KNOLLENBERG (for himself, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. PENCE, and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan):

H. Con. Res. 507. Concurrent resolution urging the President to request the United States International Trade Commission to conduct an expedited review of the temporary safeguards on imports of certain steel products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Mr. HONDA, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. STARK, Ms. LEE, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. BACA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. REYES, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. FARR of California):

H. Res. 576. A resolution honoring the life of Dr. Roberto Cruz; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 40: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.

H.R. 488: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 664: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 831: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 1086: Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1108: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 1269: Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

H.R. 1342: Mr. ARMY.

H.R. 1412: Mr. CHAMBLISS.

H.R. 1465: Mr. VELAZQUEZ.

H.R. 1509: Mr. PHELPS.

H.R. 1520: Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. SKELTON.

H.R. 1724: Mr. GILLMOR and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1918: Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 1983: Mr. HOSTETTLER.

H.R. 2373: Mr. LAMPSON, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 2458: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 2630: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 2874: Mr. HONDA and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 3027: Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 3109: Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 3183: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 3320: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3430: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 3431: Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. TANNER, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. WU, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Mr. HILLEARY.

H.R. 3592: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 3834: Mr. SULLIVAN and Mr. REYES.

H.R. 3884: Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 3956: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 3973: Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 4075: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 4152: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.

H.R. 4611: Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 4614: Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 4667: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.

H.R. 4693: Mr. MICA.

H.R. 4698: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 4704: Mr. HOEFFEL and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 4726: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 4760: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 4763: Mr. PASTOR, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. GRUCCI, and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 5031: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. SHAW, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. ETHERIDGE, and Mr. GRUCCI.

H.R. 5044: Mr. CARDIN, Ms. SANCHEZ, and Mr. FERGUSON.

H.R. 5079: Mrs. LOWERY.

H.R. 5098: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 5119: Mrs. THURMAN and Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 5146: Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 5191: Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 5197: Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

H.R. 5250: Ms. McCOLLUM, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. BERKELEY, Ms. HART, and Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 5268: Mr. SABO.

H.R. 5319: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 5334: Mr. FOSSELLA and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 5350: Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 5333: Mr. EHRLICH.

H.R. 5380: Mr. SOUDER and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 5383: Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. JOHN.

H.R. 5411: Ms. RIVERS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. FRANK, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 5412: Mr. PASCRELL and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 5433: Mr. WELLER.

H.R. 5441: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 5455: Mr. OTTER, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, and Mr. BARCIA.

H.R. 5457: Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 5491: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. FROST, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Ms. RIVERS.

H.R. 5493: Ms. BERKLEY and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 5499: Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. INSLEE, Mrs. MALONEY of New York and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 5509: Mr. DEMINT and Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 5511: Mr. LANTOS and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 5528: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. DAN MILLER of Florida, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. OSE, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. SPRATT, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BASS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 5534: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. PAUL, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. FROST, Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. PHELPS.

H.R. 5541: Mr. FROST, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. McCARTHY of New York, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. DINGELL, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 5545: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 5578: Mr. ORTIZ.

H.J. Res. 113: Mrs. CLAYTON.

H.J. Res. 114: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. NEY, Mr. CALLAHAN, and Mr. COX.

H. Con. Res. 417: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H. Con. Res. 445: Mr. DEMINT, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. MICA, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, and Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota.

H. Con. Res. 466: Mr. PETRI.

H. Con. Res. 473: Ms. WATERS and Mr. PAYNE.

H. Con. Res. 474: Mr. FROST.

H. Con. Res. 489: Mr. TANCREDO.

H. Con. Res. 497: Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. WALSH, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.

H. Con. Res. 501: Ms. CARSON of Indiana and Ms. KAPTUR.

H. Con. Res. 502: Mr. HONDA, Mr. WAMP, Mr. KELLER, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. BAKER, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H. Res. 429: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. PITTS.

H. Res. 486: Mr. RADANOVICH.

H. Res. 491: Ms. LOFGREN.

H. Res. 532: Mr. WAMP and Mr. FARR of California.

H. Res. 557: Mr. BERRY.

H. Res. 558: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.