United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 150 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 19, 2004 No. 71

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 19, 2004.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM LATHAM to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Reverend Pete Wall, Pastor, Jackson Baptist Church, Sylvania, Georgia, offered the following prayer:

Lord, I thank You that You allow me the great privilege and opportunity to speak to You, the King of Kings and the Lord of Lords.

Lord, I know based on Your word that You respond favorably to those who obey You. Therefore, Lord, I ask that even now You might deal with all those in this House on the urgency of that obedience. Lord, we as a Nation face challenges in the days ahead, problems we have brought on ourselves because many have forgotten whose Nation we are.

Lord, help all to understand that the Earth does not just quake, that fires do not just burn, that the storms do not just show up, but that all are under the control of You, an awesome God who will be heard. Lord, that we might understand that it is not knowledge which is the opinion of man but wisdom which is the gift of God that needs to prevail here in this place this day and every day. Convict those who so foolishly overlook the guidance that You so wonderfully and generously offer. Deal with us now individually and collectively, that our hearts' desire might be Your desire, that our will might be given over to do Your will, that we would only think and say and do those things that we are led to do by You. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BRADY of Texas led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 923. An act to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to allow certain premier certified lenders to elect to maintain an alternative loss reserve.

H.R. 3104. An act to provide for the establishment of separate campaign medals to be awarded to members of the uniformed services who participate in Operation Enduring Freedom and to members of the uniformed services who participate in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

WELCOMING THE REVEREND PETE WALL

(Mr. BURNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the guest chaplain for today. The Reverend Pete Wall is the pastor of Jackson Baptist Church in rural Screven County, Georgia. It is my home church in my home community. It was the church of my father and my grandfather. It is just across the road from our family farm. As my colleagues might imagine, this church and the community that surrounds it has been a guiding force in my life and is dear to my heart.

We rarely call him ''Reverend'' at home. It is just ''Brother Pete.'' Pete Wall is a shepherd, both literally and figuratively. He is widely known for his knowledge of livestock, especially sheep. But he is more widely known and loved for his ministry to others. Pete has a shepherd's heart. He cares for his flock. His homespun wisdom and amazing storytelling ability easily wins friends and disarms those who might be put off by a more formal religion or a typical preacher. He has a deep and abiding faith in Jesus Christ, and he lives it every day. Pete readily shares his faith with those who wish to learn about a Christ-centered life, yet he never forces his views on others.

Pete has been a blessing to our church and our community for 7 years. It has been a great joy in my life to know him, his wife, Gina, and their family.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor and privilege to have the Reverend Pete Wall as our guest chaplain today. He is my pastor, he is my friend, but most importantly he is my brother in Christ.

COURT MARTIAL OF SPECIALIST JEREMY SIVITS

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, today the United States proved that we are a

Printed on recycled paper.

Nation of laws and a Nation of justice. In Baghdad, Army Specialist Jeremy Sivits pleaded guilty to three charges surrounding his mistreatment of prisoners in Abu Ghraib prison. The judge in the case sentenced him to confinement for 1 year, reduced his rank to private, and gave him a dishonorable discharge from the Army. Three other soldiers have appeared for arraignment of charges regarding their roles in these incidents.

While the outrage over the abuses at the prison are justified, I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that we will see greater justice for those murderers who committed the disgusting, vile act in the killing of American civilian Nick Berg. I hope the Iraqis and the Arab world realize that law and justice are universal values for all nations.

THE HEALTH OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE AND ECONOMY: WORSE OFF UNDER BUSH

(Mr. GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I look back to the year 2000 and I see a different country from the one we live in today. In 2000, we entered a new century having enjoyed a decade of unprecedented economic growth. During the 1990s we got our priorities together, erased the Federal budget deficit, and put in place the fiscal discipline that created a $5.6 trillion surplus. That $5.6 trillion surplus gave us the ability to tackle problems and ensure the solvency of Social Security and Medicare.

The election of President Bush, however, ushered in a new era of misguided priorities that have failed. Without a doubt, our country is worse off now than it was 4 years ago. We stand now, this administration has taken that $5.6 trillion surplus and turned it into $4 trillion of red ink. Their insistence on tax cuts we cannot afford has starved our States, forcing them to cut countless services. We have lost 2.8 million jobs, most of them in manufacturing. Today, 44 million Americans are uninsured. We have an administration that cuts people from overtime pay and prohibits lifesaving stem cell research.

Mr. Speaker, this administration's track record shows a derailment. The American people deserve a stable economy and a reliable health care system.

SENIORS BENEFIT FROM MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG DISCOUNT CARD

(Mr. GINGREY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, since May 3, the first day that seniors could sign up for a Medicare prescription drug discount card, I have had the opportunity to hold workshops at senior centers in Smyrna, Cedartown, Rome, Cartersville, Talbotton, and Thomaston, all cities in Georgia's 11th Congressional District.

Here is what I tell the people at these town hall meetings: call 1–800–Medicare, everybody can do that, or visit www.medicare.gov on the Web and find out which card will save you the most money and sign up ASAP. It is that simple. All the naysayers want to convince seniors that signing up for the card is too confusing or will not save them any money. I cannot think of any reason why any senior should not sign up for the card.

Beneficiaries with incomes of less than $12,000 for an individual or $16,000 for a couple, they get $600 in addition to the discount on the card. That is a total of almost $20 million in additional help for 16,500 seniors in Georgia's 11th District for 2004 and 2005.

Yes, we have already seen the power of market forces at work. The prices are coming down, and it is not by government price controls. For seniors who have struggled to buy drugs, they certainly are better off now than they were 4 years ago.

ARE WE BETTER OFF TODAY THAN WE WERE 4 YEARS AGO?

(Mr. ROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, are we better off today than we were 4 years ago? Let us look at the facts.

Three years ago, our country was thriving. We were running on a $236 billion budget surplus and 22 million jobs were created between 1992 and 2000. However, today 9 million Americans are out of work and 44 million Americans are without health insurance. Gas prices are at a 23-year high, and household income has decreased by almost $1,500. We have the largest budget deficit ever for the second year in a row in our Nation's history. Our government spends $900,000 more a minute than it takes in, and it borrows $1.1 billion a day. Corporate profits are up, but wages for working families are down. It is the most anemic growth since World War II.

So are we better off today than we were 4 years ago? I think it is easy to see the answer is clearly ''no.''

KERRY'S NEW SLOGAN—ARE YOU BETTER OFF NOW THAN 4 YEARS AGO?

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, here they go again. Candidate KERRY and the Democrats are trying to take a page out of President Reagan's handbook. Unfortunately, for the taxpayers, it is not a page dealing with tax relief. KERRY's consultants are telling Democrats to ask this question: Are you better off now than you were 4 years ago?

Four years ago under a different administration, this Nation slept while al Qaeda plotted. We were deceived by a hollow technology bubble. Our seniors had no assistance with prescription drugs. And 4 years ago, Americans paid a marriage tax, a death tax, an estate tax, and across the board Americans paid higher income taxes.

President Bush has led us through some of the most challenging times in our Nation's history. Our economy is growing hundreds of thousands of jobs each month. More Americans are working than ever. More Americans own a home than ever. Our Armed Forces have terrorists on the run.

In Candidate KERRY's world, we would treat terrorism as a law enforcement issue. Mr. Speaker, I think those advisers need to go back to the drawing board.

ECONOMIC INDICATOR?

(Mr. EMANUEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, on April 24, President Bush visited the Timken Company, a plant in Canton, Ohio. He touted there his economic program and his tax cuts. Just the other day in Timken, Ohio, they closed the plant, firing 1,300 employees.

The President went on to say on his visit that his tax cut would end the double taxation of stock dividends which would mean, and I quote the President, ''companies like Timken have got a better capacity to expand, more jobs.'' He went on to say, ''We can do whatever it takes to overcome the obstacles in our way. I know you're optimistic about the future of this company.''

Three tax cuts, $3 trillion in debt, 3 more million Americans without jobs, 3 more million Americans in poverty since he has been President, and 43 million uninsured Americans. I am not sure we can afford this much progress in America. After announcing his tax cut in Timken, Ohio, the other day, just 2 days ago, the executive closed the plant firing 1,300 workers.

We can do better. There is a new direction in America that puts working families at the center of our economic policies rather than dividend tax cuts for contributors who support the President's reelection.

MESSAGE TO TROOPS: WE ARE WITH YOU

(Mr. BRADY of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Abu Ghraib prison guards in Iraq betrayed their fellow soldiers and our Nation with their indefensible acts. But this past week in Washington watching some Members of the House and Senate exploit this behavior to degrade our entire military and just

score political points, I believe they betray our troops as well.

It is never wrong to seek the truth, and we will find it in Abu Ghraib. But let us not make a bad situation worse with ill-chosen words and broad accusations. I reject the claim that ''Saddam's torture chambers reopened under new management, U.S. management.'' I reject those who malign the character of our entire military. And I reject those around the world who clamor that the prison guards reform the values of America, our soldiers, or our President. They are wrong.

The real truth is that over 130,000 American fighting men and women endanger their own lives in Iraq each day. They serve far from the comfort of their families for long periods of time. The rest of the world should be down on its knees every night thanking them for it. We are.

I have a message for our troops: Ignore the blowhards in Washington. Do not listen to the national media. You are good and decent people fighting for our freedom and security. Your friends and families know this. America knows this. We are with you.

□ 1015

LOWER GAS PRICES NOW

(Mr. ETHERIDGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call on this administration to take action now to reduce the price of gasoline in this country. Across my district folks are suffering painfully from the skyrocketing fuel costs to record levels. Yet this administration has failed to provide relief.

Last month, OPEC cut production of crude oil by 2 million barrels, and the national average price for a gallon of gasoline has risen to more than $2 a gallon. Yet the administration has done nothing to get OPEC to open the spigots back up.

North Carolina's economy is hurting. A truck driver approached me at church on Sunday and complained that his business is suffering because of the record high fuel prices. These gas prices will make the administration's record on job growth even worse while the big oil companies laugh all the way to the bank.

First quarter profits for Conoco-Phillips went up 44 percent. Exxon-Mobil reported a 125 percent increase. Chevron-Texaco hit a gusher with a 294 percent increase.

Mr. Speaker, I call on the White House and the administration to get to work, to get OPEC and the big oil companies to lower gas prices now.

BIPARTISAN PROBLEM SOLVING NEEDED

(Mr. SHAW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I have to address the previous speaker regarding the price of energy and the shortage of energy that is claimed throughout the world. I think it is important that all of us realize that for the gentleman from Massachusetts, the candidate for President of the United States in the other party, to go and complain about fuel prices is like the kids that kill their parents and then claim that they are orphans and should be given special treatment. That is absolutely absurd.

When the Senate blocked the energy bill, it blocked the administration's plan to have an energy bill, an energy bill for this country. It is time that we stop the rhetoric, we stop the bipartisan quibbling. Republicans and Democrats are paying too much for fuel. We need an energy policy in this country, and the first step was the energy bill that stalled over in the other body. It is time for us to work together to solve problems instead of just creating them.

HEALTH CARE IS NOT BETTER OFF

(Mr. WAXMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the audience here today.

Are we better off now than when President Bush took office? When you look at health care it certainly does not look like it.

Since President Bush took office an additional 3.8 million Americans are uninsured, and for Americans lucky enough to have health insurance, their premiums have increased by almost 50 percent since President Bush took office. In fact, total family premiums have risen more than $2,700 in 4 years, a rate four times as fast as workers' salaries. This is basically a tax increase on the middle class. It is hard to be healthy when you have to choose between paying rent and going to the doctor.

This is a real crisis. It has real consequence. Eighteen thousand people die prematurely each year because they do not have health insurance. And how do the administration and the Republicans running the Congress respond? With special interest proposals like tort reform, health savings account and association health plans.

These proposals will not lower health care costs. We are not better off in these last 4 years.

USER FRIENDLY MEDICARE DRUG CARD

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, there is no question in my mind that the availability of the Medicare prescription drug discount card this June is going to have a dramatic influence on the cost of prescription drugs in this country. For the first time, seniors are going to have an open and transparent market; and we have seen in the last 3 weeks how this has brought the price of medications down with people being able to be compare for the first time, go to a database on the Internet and compare drug prices for themselves.

1–800–Medicare, that the gentleman from Georgia pointed out, or www.Medicare.gov can take you through the process. I have done it myself. It is easy. It is simple. It is self-explanatory. Simplicity and efficiency are the keys to bringing the cost down in this market.

Liability reform is not a special interest reform. It affects everyone in this country. The embedded costs of liability in the medical justice system in this country and the results of defensive medicine that we all pay for cost the Medicare system $50 billion a year.

BROKEN PROMISES TO STUDENTS

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, are families and college students better off than they were 4 years ago? Not when it comes to being able to afford a higher education.

In the year 2000, when candidate George Bush said we should make the path to college open for all, that was his promise. Four years later that path is covered in weeds and broken promises, and President Bush and the Republicans must accept responsibility for their failed leadership in this area.

Since 2001 a 4-year public college tuition has increased by almost 30 percent. How has President Bush responded? Each year, he broke his promise to provide a $5,100 maximum Pell grant to all first-year college students. In fact, the Pell grant this year is worth $500 less than it was 30 years ago, and the President's 2005 budget eliminates Pell grants from 95,000 deserving students who need that money to pursue a higher education.

Now the Republicans are rubber-stamping the President's legislation that would force the typical student borrower to pay $5,500 more for their student loan than they currently do. I do not think those students believe they are better off than they were 4 years ago.

HONORING MARO K. ROGERS

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this week, one of South Carolina's most beloved educators will retire after 41 years. Maro K. Rogers has

been teaching at the Little Red Schoolhouse kindergarten since 1963, and has personally taught around 1,500 students in the community of Lexington, South Carolina. Maro and her husband, Hugh Rogers, a former mayor of Lexington, built the schoolhouse in their own back yard where it stands today.

Maro has taught the essentials of learning to three generations of children. Students learned their ABCs, sang songs, listened to Mrs. Rogers read stories, and took fields trips throughout the midlands of South Carolina for first-hand education.

Maro Rogers, a native of Baghdad, Iraq, of Armenian heritage, stands as a shining example of how one dedicated teacher can make a dramatic impact in the lives of our children. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in thanking Maro Rogers for her service to South Carolina's youngest students.

In conclusion, may God bless our troops and we will never forget September 11.

REFORM HEALTH CARE

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, like the economy the war and the United States' credibility around the world, health care is another casualty of the Bush administration.

Today, nearly 44 million Americans are without health insurance. The vast majority of those people live in households where someone is working full time. The cost to cover the uninsured is about 5 months' worth of the war in Iraq. Meanwhile, Americans who have health insurance are being forced to pay more than ever before. And the administration wants to shift even more of the burden to every American under the guise of reform.

A new study by researchers at Oregon Health and Science University put it bluntly, ''We spend much more than any other industrialized country in the world on a per capita basis and we get much less in return.''

Health care is a crisis that demands real leadership and real solutions. So health care will remain a crisis as long as the administration remains in office. The 2nd of November cannot come soon enough for Americans without health insurance.

BE HONEST TO OUR SENIORS

(Mr. BEAUPREZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEAUPREZ. Mr. Speaker, it has been 6 months since President Bush signed the historic Medicare prescription drug bill into law, and although the ink is hardly dry, there has been a steady campaign of misinformation by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

They say that these cards will not work, that they are too confusing, that they will not actually save seniors money. Mr. Speaker, the verdict is in. Medicare's new drug discount cards will save seniors money. In many instances, seniors will save hundreds, if not thousands of dollars.

For example, a senior living in Wheat Ridge, Colorado, my district, who takes three commonly prescribed drugs for seniors, Zocor, Nexium, and Fosamax, can save $1,365 per year on their prescription drugs. I have done the math. That is money you can take to the bank, pay the rent or give to the grandkids.

The false accusations and scare tactics used by the political opponents of the prescription drug cards reminds me of something my mother used to say, ''If ifs and buts were candy and nuts, we would all have a merry Christmas.''

Well, Mr. Speaker, these seniors do not deserve to be lied to. They deserve the truth and they deserve a prescription drug card that will save them money.

LOAD THE WAGON

(Mr. BERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, as I listen to the retorts from the other side, I think they must have adopted that great Republican philosophy that has kind of come back here recently, ''Do not worry about the mule going blind, just load the wagon.'' And that sure is what we are doing right now: loading the wagon for our children and grandchildren.

I hear them talking about drug cards. You just call that 800 number and see what happens. Nothing. It is just like the drug card. You get nothing. It is another way to trick people.

We are going to be asked this week to raise the debt ceiling again, by $700 billion, and to put our children again deeper and deeper and deeper in debt. It is insane to continue to do this to the next generations. If we are doing so frazzling good, then how come we are broke? I just do not understand that.

I hear them get up here every day and talk about how good things are. It is time to do the right thing.

MEDICARE CARD PROVIDES GREAT SAVINGS

(Mrs. CAPITO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, seniors throughout West Virginia are learning about potential savings on their prescriptions because of recent reforms to Medicare. No matter what critics may say, it is very easy to find out information about the new prescription drug card. Just ask Ann Brown, one of my constituents.

I worked with Ann. We went on line together. And she was able to see very easily what her savings would be by going onto the Medicare.gov website.

But Ann is not alone. A senior living in Charleston, West Virginia in a 25304 zip code who takes Fosamax for osteoporosis, Zocor for cholesterol, and Nexium for acid reflux can save $170 a month by using a Medicare-endorsed cards, which is a savings of over $2,000 a year. That is a real savings.

Why are they saving? Because the competition and buying power of over 40 million seniors across the country is driving down the cost of prescriptions.

Beginning on June 1, seniors will begin to realize these significant savings, and through the Medicare-endorsed prescription drug card, they will see that this benefit is significant, meaningful and hits the bottom line.

WE NEED A POLICY CHANGE

(Mr. HINCHEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, when the national Republican Party took us to war in Iraq, the average price of gasoline across the country was $1.40 cents a gallon, and we were told that the cost of the war in Iraq would be negligible because it would be paid for by the oil in Iraq.

Now, 14 months later, the price of gasoline in America is more than $2 a gallon and the war in Iraq is costing us $200 billion. The Republican energy plan is to increase our dependence on foreign oil. Their plan for Iraq is more of the same.

With, now, almost 800 American servicemen and -women dead, 4,000 injured, it is quite obvious we need a different policy and a different leadership. It is time for a change.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG CARD A BENEFIT

(Mr. BROWN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. On May 3, 2004, constituents of the First Congressional District of South Carolina began signing up for their new Medicare discount card. The enrollment fee for the discount card will range from zero to $30 per eligible person.

The discount card will save the seniors and disabled Medicare beneficiaries of my district between 10 and 25 percent off the retail price of most drugs. In addition to the discounts, seniors whose income is below $12,569 for individuals and $16,862 for married couples may qualify for an additional $600 credit to cover the full cost of their prescription.

Military retirees can now enroll in Medicare Part B without a late enrollment penalty through December 31, 2004.

Many seniors and disabled Medicare recipients have been waiting a long time for Medicare prescription drug coverage. I am proud that this Congress has answered their call.

□ 1030

This discount card is just the beginning of more health care options and a greater quality of life for our seniors.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE SHOULD HOLD HIMSELF ACCOUNTABLE

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this morning one of the military personnel whose actions were considered part of the horrific acts in the Iraqi prison stands for his court-martial. The words offered were a deep apology as members of his community indicated his service to his community, the kind of human being he was and to them still remains.

The reason why I rise is because his indictment and court-martial today does not in any way take away the ultimate responsibility all the way to the Secretary of Defense. Nothing I have heard from the Secretary of Defense commends me to believe that he should not go, and he frankly should hold himself accountable for the lack of procedures and lack of training and the lack of training given to these enlisted National Guard and others who came there without training, without resources, despite the fact that we all should know right from wrong.

Today, with the Defense authorization bill, nothing in the bill speaks to this issue; and this bill is wracked with problems because it does not address the tragedy in Iraq.

WE ARE BETTER OFF NOW THAN FOUR YEARS AGO

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, it really is a very good question posed frequently on the House floor today, Are we better off today than we were 4 years ago? Let us think.

Four years ago, we had a morally disgraced President in the United States of America in the Oval Office. Today we have a man of integrity, of virtue, of principle, of purpose.

Four years ago, the terrorists planned their attacks against America and our allies. Today, America attacks the terrorists while they cower in the mountains of Pakistan.

Four years ago, Saddam Hussein amassed weapons of mass destruction, the Taliban was in power, and Libya had a WMD program. Today, the Taliban is gone. Saddam Hussein is in a cell. We have found pieces of his WMDs, and Libya has ended its program.

Four years ago, the Clinton recession took hold. Today, last month, 300,000 new jobs.

Four years ago, partial birth abortion was legal in America. Today, that moral horror has ended.

We are better off today than we were 4 years ago.

PEOPLE IN THE 32ND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT ARE NOT BETTER OFF THAN FOUR YEARS AGO

(Ms. SOLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask, Are we better off now than we were 4 years ago? Unfortunately, for people that I represent in the 32nd Congressional District, including the San Gabriel Valley in East Los Angeles, it is a resounding ''no.''

Nearly 20,000 people have lost jobs in my district. Unemployment has hovered from 9 to 10 percent for 3 chronic years. Thirty-three percent of the people I represent have no health insurance, and a good number of those people are young children under the age of six.

Yet the House Republican leadership continues to push for wealthy families' tax breaks.

This week, the House will vote on a bill that would provide new tax breaks to rich families earning over $309,000 a year. Most of the people in my district do not make that much. They actually make anywhere around 20 and $10,000 a year. People making $10,000 a year would get nothing in this tax break, $150 at the most, compared to those at the very wealthy end who will get more money.

We need to do better, and our folks are not better off now. Four years ago they were.

LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES ACT TO STAMP OUT PEER-TO-PEER CHILD PORN

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, on Friday several Federal agencies announced a national law enforcement initiative aimed at combating the growing volume of illegal child pornography distributed through peer-to-peer file trading networks.

Since last fall, the effort has resulted in hundreds of searches nationwide, the identification of thousands of computers used to traffic in child pornography, and the arrest of more than 65 individuals.

This action should be commended and further action encouraged, but Friday's announcement is a disturbing confirmation that peer-to-peer programs are being manipulated. They are becoming an ever-more dangerous platform used by child predators, some convicted child molesters, to attack kids.

Parents need the ability to protect their kids before they are harmed by cyberpredators using peer-to-peer software. H.R. 2885 would give parents the tools and help parents prevent this from happening in the first place. I urge support.

DISCOUNT DRUG CARD IS A FARCE

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I listened to my colleagues on the Republican side talk about the discount drug card, so-called, that goes into effect June 1. It is such a farce.

First of all, there is no drug benefit. We all know that. They have postponed that to sometime 2 years from now, in 2006, when you will actually have to put out more money than the benefit you would get, so nobody would sign up for it anyway. But what a farce these cards are.

In my district in New Jersey, you can already get most of these cards. You do not even need to go through the Federal Government.

In addition to that, if you look on this Web site and it shows you that there is a lower price, well, if you look and compare with other Internet sites, the prices are usually lower in other Internet sites. You do not even need the drug card.

In addition to that, the price can change. Whatever price is on that Web site, a week later they can change the price and simply raise it.

In addition, my constituents have been complaining about how they go to a particular pharmacy, they will not even take the card.

I have never seen so much chaos. Seniors are disgusted by this proposal. It is just a bureaucratic nightmare. It gives them no discount whatsoever and no benefit.

REGULATORY BURDEN ON SMALL BUSINESSES

(Mr. HENSARLING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, as a former small businessman, I rise today in support of Republican efforts this week to reduce the regulatory burden on small businesses, the job engine of this country.

I know firsthand that the Federal regulatory burden strangles small business in America and keeps American-owned businesses from creating more jobs. In the year 2000, the estimated total regulatory burden in America was a job-crushing $843 billion. Along with high rates of taxation, which Democrats want to raise even further, nothing stifles job creation in America like the heavy hand of bureaucratic regulation.

Small businesses that employ fewer than 20 employees pay almost $7,000 a year in regulatory costs per employee. Instead of using these funds to create new jobs, pay higher salaries or fund new or expanded health care benefits, small business owners are forced to pay to comply with too many inflexible and Draconian Federal regulations.

Democrats are working hard to make bureaucrats more powerful. Mr. Speaker, Republicans are working hard to make American companies more competitive.

CALLING FOR RESIGNATION OF SECRETARY RUMSFELD

(Mr. CONYERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I regret to come here this morning to again call for the resignation of the Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld. The pictures, the videos that continue of our troops humiliating prisoners in Abu Ghraib and the acts of retaliation by Iraqi militants, the graphic accounts of sexual and physical abuse that go on and on and on, this is not about the failure of some rogue elements in the military. Quite the contrary.

It is a part of the total failure of leadership at our highest levels, and I refer my colleagues to The New Yorker magazine article by the distinguished investigative journalist Seymour Hersh.

MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

(Mr. ROGERS of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, relief from skyrocketing prescription drug prices is finally on its way.

Beginning in June, Alabama seniors previously without prescription drug coverage should begin to see savings of between 10 and 25 percent on their medications. For example, seniors who previously paid $100 per month for one prescription could now pay as little as $75 per month under this new 100 percent voluntary plan. These same seniors could now see savings of up to $300 per year just on this one medication; and for low-income seniors, even more help is on the way.

Thanks to a $600-per-month credit, 21,400 seniors in my congressional district should see an additional assistance with their drug bills. What is more, Alabama seniors will soon be eligible for important new features like diabetes screening and a free welcome-to-Medicare physical.

The legislation makes important new investments in our rural hospitals and clinics as well. These investments will help improve the health for all of our seniors, as well as all of our families and children.

TIME TO HELP SENIORS FIGURE OUT WHAT BENEFIT IS BEST FOR THEM

(Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, on the first day that seniors could sign up for prescription drug cards, the discount cards, I went to the Barelas Senior Center, and I sat down at one of the tables at lunchtime and chatted with a little lady and started talking about this new card that would be available.

She say, oh, I already know; I talked to AARP and I already have my card. She pulled it out of her wallet and she showed me, and it had the Medicare sign on it. She said, I asked the lady and I tried to use it, and I did on Saturday, and they let me use it, and I saved $7.

It is not too hard for people to understand what these prescription drug cards will do for them; and when I talked to more people at the Barelas Senior Center, they were very interested in the $600 that can be added to that debit-like card to help them with the cost of their drugs.

It is time to put aside the bickering and help seniors figure out which benefit is the best for them so that they can afford their prescription drugs.

BETTER HEARING AND SPEECH MONTH

(Mr. RYUN of Kansas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the month of May as Better Hearing and Speech Month.

I am one of 2 million Americans who have experienced a hearing loss personally, but my hearing loss was the result of a birth defect as an illness that took place early in my life, and there are many who need help as a result of this.

Today, we are exposed to harmful levels of toxic noise in our environment and must be aware of these harmful sounds and do our best to protect ourselves from them so that we can avoid problems in the future.

One-third of our seniors have hearing loss. Eighty percent of these seniors have not sought treatment, and 75 percent of those needing hearing aids do not have them.

Left untreated, hearing loss leads to isolation, depression, and dangerous situations.

I introduced the Hearing Health Accessibility Act, H.R. 2821, to give seniors direct access to audiologists under Medicare. This would provide effective care for our seniors with hearing loss because hearing aids are expensive, and most insurance companies do not cover them.

I have also introduced the Hearing Aid Assistance Tax Credit, H.R. 3103. This $500 tax credit would be available once every 5 years to children and those over 55.

I encourage my colleagues to cosponsor these initiatives.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. CON. RES. 95, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 649 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 649

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 95) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2005 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2006 through 2009. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read. The conference report shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

SEC. 2. (a) Upon adoption in the House of the conference report to accompany Senate Concurrent Resolution 95, and until a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2005 has been adopted by the Congress—

(1) the provisions of the conference report and its joint explanatory statement shall have force and effect in the House; and

(2) for purposes of title III of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the conference report shall be considered adopted by the Congress.

(b) Nothing in this section may be construed to engage rule XXVII.

SEC. 3. The House being in possession of the official papers, the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on H.R. 2660 shall be, and they are hereby, discharged to the end that H.R. 2660 and its accompanying papers, be, and they are hereby, laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1045

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 649 waives all points of order against the conference report to accompany S. Con. Res. 95, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2005, and its

consideration. The rule provides that the conference report shall be considered read and provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

Section 2 of the rule provides that upon adoption in the House of the conference report, and until a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2005 has been adopted by Congress, the provisions of the conference report and its joint explanatory statement shall have force and effect in the House.

The rule provides that for the purposes of title III of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the conference report shall be considered for the purposes of the House to have been adopted by the Congress. The rule provides that nothing in section 2 may be construed to engage rule XXVII.

Section 3 of the rule provides that the conferees of the House on H.R. 2660, shall be, and they are hereby, discharged and that H.R. 2660 and its accompanying papers be, and are hereby, laid upon the table.

This conference report adheres to the principal goals of the House-passed budget, Mr. Speaker, strengthening America, growing our economy, and continuing our Nation's long history as a land of opportunity. This budget provides for increased funding to help secure America's borders, defend against biological attacks, protect our critical infrastructure, and to prepare first responders. It takes a comprehensive and responsible approach to protecting our Nation, winning the war on terror, and preparing us for future security needs and challenges.

Mr. Speaker, our economy is growing. It is headed in the right direction. By avoiding tax increases and protecting the child tax credit, relief from the marriage penalty, and tax relief for lower-income workers, this budget continues the policies that are helping to grow our economy. The budget also provides for full funding of Medicare so that seniors can get help paying for their prescription drugs for the first time ever.

It also includes a $3.3 billion increase in budget authority for education to accommodate increases in programs like Pell Grants, special education, and Title I. And it provides for the full funding of No Child Left Behind.

Mr. Speaker, it helps us keep promises to our veterans by providing an additional $1.2 billion over the President's requested increase for veterans' health care.

The budget provides for these priorities and puts us on track to cut the deficit in 4 years, with deficits declining each and every year, and this is accomplished without raising taxes on the American people.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on the Budget, I would like to congratulate the chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), and the conferees for producing a budget that is focused on securing America, creating jobs, and responsibly planning for the future. I encourage, therefore, my colleagues to support both the rule, H.R. 649, and the underlying bill.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes, and I want to thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, since this mammoth budget was made available to Members of this House only a couple of hours ago, it is difficult to know exactly what goodies and gimmicks are hidden inside of it. We know enough, however, to know that this Republican budget is bad for the economy, bad for American working families, and bad for the future of this country.

Two months ago, the Republican leadership proposed a budget resolution that had tax cuts that were not paid for and slashed Medicaid by $2 billion. On top of that, that budget did not include any legitimate plan for bringing our country out of the skyrocketing, record deficits, deficits made worse by the policies of this President and this Republican Congress. That budget resolution passed by only three votes.

And now the Republican leadership wants the House to consider a conference report that they claim is very similar to that bill.

Mr. Speaker, that budget was bad then and it is bad now.

This conference report continues the Republican pattern of fiscal mismanagement. Contrary to their claims, this conference report is only a 1-year budget.

Now, we used to consider 10-year budgets so we could fully assess the consequences of our fiscal actions. Then the Republican leadership changed the budgets to 5 years, so they could better mask the long-term impact of their misguided policies. And now we are considering 1-year budgets. What is next, 6-month budgets? 1-week budgets? How about a budget for the next 5 minutes?

This is the worst kind of shell game. It is a gimmick, a smoke screen that the American people will see right through.

It is time the Republicans in this body face the facts. They squandered a $6 trillion surplus, turning it into an almost $3 trillion deficit. This is the most fiscally irresponsible congressional leadership and administration in the history of the United States of America, and now they are seeking to make it worse by continuing to extend tax cuts that are not paid for.

Now, my grandfather always told me, you cannot dig your way out of a hole, and that is exactly where we are today, in a fiscal hole. Extending these various tax cuts without paying for them may make for good press releases, but it is lousy fiscal policy.

And I do not know if my colleagues are aware of the inclusion of the Hastert Rule in this conference report. The Hastert Rule allows this body to raise the debt limit, also known as the national debt, without a direct vote by the Members of this House. In other words, Mr. Speaker, we busted our credit limit and we are giving ourselves an increase without even having the decency of taking responsibility for it. And guess what? We are sending the bill to our kids and our grandkids. That is wrong.

It is important for my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to know that a vote for this conference report is a vote to increase the debt. A ''yes'' vote will raise the debt over the $8 trillion level for the first time in American history. Now, I hope Members will think long and hard about what kind of future we are creating for our kids and grandkids.

I believe that we have a responsibility to vote up or down on increasing the debt. Burying this debt increase in the conference report shirks the responsibility of the Members of this House.

You know, my Republican friends always complain about protectionists, but this conference report is one of the most protectionist things I have ever seen. But instead of protecting jobs, it protects politically vulnerable Republicans from being forced to vote up or down on increasing the national debt. It protects the Republicans from having to pay for their tax cuts.

And one other thing: As if the policies in this conference report were not bad enough, the Republican leadership added a provision to this rule that closes the conference on the fiscal year 2004 Labor, HHS, and Education bill. My colleagues and many Americans may be asking themselves, is that bill not already law?

Well, the truth is, the provisions that make up the FY 2004 Labor, HHS, and Education appropriations bill were included in the omnibus appropriations bill signed into law early this year. But the conference report on that bill was never formally closed. Under the rules of the House, Members of the majority and minority can still offer motions to instruct. My good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), has attempted to do just that several times over the past couple of weeks.

Now, adoption of this rule today will formally close the conference, meaning that no Member can instruct conferees on any issue. The motions to instruct by the gentleman from California have focused on the administration's overtime policies. It is clear that the Republican leadership is scared to death of talking about the Bush administration's misguided plan to take away overtime pay for millions of American workers. The purpose of this section in the rule is to muzzle the gentleman

from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) and any other Members who attempt to bring this important issue to the attention of the House and to the American people.

Why is this leadership so afraid of open and fair debate?

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad rule and it is a bad conference report, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the rule.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to respond to a couple of points.

The gentleman correctly pointed out that within this rule there is the provision that the debt limit will be raised. I think most people in this body recognize that.

I mean, after all, we inherited 4 years ago a recession, then 9/11 happened, and we certainly had to fund the war on terror and all of those efforts, and that took more money than we had. In fact, in every budget that we considered on the floor, the other side acknowledged that we had to raise the debt limit.

So, yes, if this is passed, and if the Senate passes this conference report, the debt limit will have been raised. However, if the Senate does not act on this, then we will have another opportunity to look at that debt limit in a different manner.

I just wanted to make that clarification.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking Democrat on the Committee on the Budget.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, at 6:20 a.m. this morning, this budget resolution, the conference report, so-called, was filed. At 7:15 a.m., it was before the Committee on Rules. No one outside the actual drafters of the legislation had had any time to look at its contents.

It only applies to $2.3 trillion of spending authority. Some way to run a railroad.

And now, when the bill comes before the House, it comes because the rules of the House require a 1-day layover for a rule, so that we have a little time at least and not get surprised with provisions that we did not see on quick notice. That was overturned by meeting early this morning, adjourning and meeting again and deeming 1 day to have expired. So this budget resolution comes to us under sham circumstances.

You have to ask why? Why should something of this gravity, of this importance to the fiscal policy of this country come to us under these circumstances? And there is only one answer I can give you. It will not stand scrutiny. It simply will not stand scrutiny.

The Budget Act calls for spending in major functions of the budget, about 19 all together, and it calls for revenues, and it calls for those expenditures and revenues to be taken function by function and spread out, projected out over a period of 5 years. This budget resolution has real numbers for only 1 year. It is not extended out with real numbers. It has plugged numbers, but not real numbers. For only 1 year are there real numbers.

For the first time in 20 years, we will take up today, if this rule passes, a budget resolution that does not contain a 5-year run-out of the spending levels that we are approving.

In addition, when we set out with this budget, it was recognized that there were some budget process rules we adopted in the 1990s that worked and had a profound effect on our ability to move the budget from a deficit of $290 billion to a surplus of $236 billion in the year 2000. One of those rules was the so-called PAYGO rule which says, if you want to cut taxes and you have a deficit, you have to offset the cut in taxes with an increase elsewhere, or at least with a cut in entitlement spending that is commensurate to your tax revenue cut.

That rule no longer applies because it has legislatively expired. We have tried and tried to restore that rule so that we can put some discipline, some starch into the process here in the House, and we have not succeeded because of opposition on the other side.

What we now get in this so-called budget resolution is an extension of the PAYGO bill, the PAYGO rule for 1 year that applies in one House. It will not apply here in the House of Representatives. That means all sorts of tax cuts can still originate in the House of Representatives, will not be subject to a PAYGO point of order, can be sent to the Senate; there they may be defeated on 60-vote PAYGO point of order, but otherwise we have a crippled, broken-down PAYGO rule that applies for only 1 year.

When you read this bill, this resolution, and see what little it contains, you have to ask yourself, why bring it up at all? If you are not going to comply with the Budget Act, if you are not going to give 5-year extensions, if you are not going to use real numbers, if you are not going to extend PAYGO, why bring it up at all? Well, it does a couple of things. It allows you to claim that you are doing a budget resolution without doing the single most important objective in a budget resolution, and that is laying down a plan for erasing this huge deficit we have.

□ 1100

Members should understand that if they vote for this budget resolution, they will be voting to have a deficit next year of $367 billion by the calculation of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. That includes an offset in Social Security. If they wipe out the offset in Social Security, the total deficit would be $541 billion.

And guess what, because of deficits we have sustained every year, we are right up against the statutory ceiling for the national debt. It has to be raised and raised soon, or we will bump the ceiling again. And guess what, if Members vote for this resolution, buried under all of these plug numbers, these phony numbers, buried under them is a critically important feature and that is it will indirectly trigger an increase in the debt ceiling. At least with respect to the House of Representatives, we will be deemed to have voted for an increase in the debt ceiling of $690 billion. I am putting Members on notice of that.

So Members who vote for this resolution should know there is a critical working component of it and Members will vote to raise the debt ceiling by $690 billion to $8.1 trillion.

So in a thumbnail, here is what you will be voting for when you vote for this sham resolution: First, Members will vote to raise the deficit to $541 billion without Social Security, for $367 billion including Social Security, add $25 billion more in supplementals for defense, and we are right back up to a $400 billion deficit.

Members will not be voting for any plan in process, any solution to the deficit, but will be putting us on a path, according to the Congressional Budget Office, of accumulating, and this is their number, $5.132 trillion over the next 10 fiscal years.

That is what Members will be voting for if they vote for this resolution. It would be better that we vote down this resolution, send the conferees back to conference and tell them to do what the Budget Act requires them to do and tell them to get a handle on the deficit and put our fiscal house in order. Vote against the rule.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, for all of the reasons mentioned by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), not only does this budget resolution graphically demonstrate the incompetency of the Republicans to deal with the budget of this country and the budget resolution in this House, but it does something much more sinister than that.

Buried in this resolution is the prohibition against any votes to be taken in the House of Representatives against the provisions offered by the administration, the rules that they put forth to deny millions of working people in this country the right to overtime. When these rules go into effect, if we cannot vote against them as the Senate has voted against them, when these rules go into effect, millions of Americans will be required to work overtime

in the future; they just will not get overtime pay.

That means for millions of America's families, families that use overtime that is so important to them to qualify for the mortgages on their house, to qualify to buy an automobile, to put their kids through school, they are not going to have that in their paycheck in the future because they are going to be excluded from being eligible for overtime.

Now the Senate addressed this rule, and they voted against it. They voted to change it. We fought hard against the original rule because the original rule would have excluded maybe 11 million Americans from the right to have overtime pay when they work overtime. Americans understand why they get overtime pay, because when their employer comes and says they have to work late on Thursday night or Friday night, that means they have to rearrange their child care, that means they have to rearrange their ability to spend time with their family, that may mean they have to rearrange their doctor's appointments, and you have to change your life around for the convenience of the employer. So you get overtime pay.

Now when the employer comes to the worker and says he or she has to work overtime, there will be no overtime pay. That is why this House and the Senate defeated those rules on a bipartisan basis, and the administration now has come up with a new rule. And we find out that even the new rule excludes millions of hard-working Americans from overtime pay, people struggling to hold onto a middle-class lifestyle and standard of living for their families. That is about to evaporate. That is about to evaporate because this House will not allow us, the Republican leadership will not allow us to have an up-or-down vote.

We are fighting so hard for democracy in Iraq, but we cannot have an up-or-down vote in the House of Representatives. We cannot have an up-or-down vote. We cannot have an up-or-down vote because the majority, on a bipartisan basis, will vote to overturn these rules. By a vote of 99–0, the Senate voted to change these rules and exclude from the impact of these rules, to try to save these middle-class families, computer programmers, licensed practical nurses, nurse midwives, oil and gas pipeline workers, oil and gas field workers, oil platform workers, refinery workers. Get the message here?

Millions of hard-working Americans, the Senate voted 99–0 to exclude steelworkers, shipyard workers, teachers, technicians, journalists, chefs, cooks, police officers, firefighters, fire sergeants, police sergeants, emergency medical technicians; 99 to nothing the Senate voted, that means bipartisan. That means all of the Republicans and all of the Democrats voted to protect these workers and their families. In the House of Representatives, the Republicans will not let Members have a vote on this.

We tried twice in the last week to have a vote, and they voted on a partisan straight party line to subject these workers to these rules that will cut their pay this year.

When workers are faced with outsourcing, plant closings, no wage growth, higher health care premiums, now the Republicans have decided to cut their overtime pay. Not only do they show no concern for people who are unemployed; but if you have a job, the Republican's initiative is to cut your pay. But what are they going to do, they are going to continue the cover-up because buried in this rule they have denied the ability of this House to vote on this rule.

Again, the Senate, 99–0, voted to protect construction employees, production line employees, carpenters, mechanics, plumbers, ironworkers, craftsmen, anybody earning an hourly wage because the rule does not protect hourly wage earners. It helps painters, cement masons, stationary engineers, longshoremen, utility workers, welders. Does this sound like Members' constituency? Does this sound like the people who work in our congressional districts every day? Yes, it does.

Mr. Speaker, these are the people who built America, they built the middle class; and now the Republicans are taking away their overtime. But Members will not get to have a vote on that because the Republicans are afraid of the vote. They are afraid of democracy. They are afraid of the people's House working its will so they have shut down the debate and shut down the ability to have a vote.

The Senate had a vote, and they even voted on a bipartisan basis to exclude anybody who has overtime today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. So apparently the Senate can have bipartisan representation, apparently the Senate can have democracy, but this House cannot have democracy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. * * *

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. * * *

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. * * *

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. * * *

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington will state his point of order.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. My point of order is when a Member yields time to another Member, does that Member have responsibility to abide by the time he was yielded to speak?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's point of order is sustained. All Members are reminded to heed the gavel.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the chairman of the Democratic Caucus.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, we would not have Members who feel they are oppressed if we had rules that permitted full and free debate in the greatest democracy in the world. We go abroad, sending our troops to promote democracy, but we cannot seem to have a modicum of comity and democracy here in the House of Representatives.

This conference report on the budget was filed this morning at 6:20 a.m., less than 5 hours ago. The Nation's budget, multi-trillion dollar budget filed 5 hours ago, and we do not even have a chance to review it.

Under the Republican leadership, this budget resolution is, and the entire budget process has become, a complete fraud on the American people. Just like the way they have covered up the cost of the Iraq war and the Medicare prescription drug bill, with this budget congressional Republicans are trying to hide not only the true costs of making the tax cuts permanent, but also the huge size of the rapidly exploding deficit.

And instead of giving us an opportunity to debate and vote separately on raising the Nation's debt limit for the third straight year by almost $700 billion this year alone, the Republicans have included that increase under the cover of all of these other shenanigans in this budget resolution.

So let us be clear so when Members come to the floor representing their constituencies, they understand a vote for this budget resolution is a vote to increase the debt ceiling of the United States to over $8 trillion. Yes, I said $8 trillion. Now, this will ensure that our tax dollars go not to shoring up Social Security and Medicare, or investing in our people, in their health care, education, or taking care of our veterans so that their widows do not get taxed, but to simply paying interest on this debt that Republicans continue to raise and just do not seem to care how far they continue to go.

Republicans talk all the time about fiscal responsibility, but by restoring the budget enforcement rules, the rules that say you have to pay for the expenditures of the Nation as you go, they do that for only 1 year, and they do that where? Not in the House. They

impose that upon the Senate. So they continue to spend wildly here in the House, have all of the tax cuts proposals in the world, keep driving us into deficit, but we have no budget enforcement rules here.

Mr. Speaker, these priorities are making the wealthy tax cuts permanent regardless of the damage that will be caused not only to the citizens of this country, but to the Nation's economic well-being. Vote ''no'' against the rule and against the resolution. It is ultimately the last opportunity to preserve America's future and the intergenerational responsibility this Republican majority has forfeited.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

(Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

Mr. Speaker, remember that old commercial, when E.F. Hutton talks, people listen? Well, I hope no one on Wall Street is listening today, and I certainly hope that Alan Greenspan is not listening or watching because this Republican budget is $8 trillion of debt. Yes, Members heard me correctly.

If this budget passes for the third time in as many years on a Republican rule, we are not bringing down the national debt. What we did so successfully under the years of Clinton and Rubin, we are undoing during this administration's time. No, our vote today increases yet again the debt of this Nation. How we could have gone from $5 trillion in budget surpluses under Clinton-Rubin to $8 trillion in debt ought to be shocking to all.

Surpluses as far as the eye could see, we were suggesting just a few years ago. Today, $2 trillion in revenue cuts; and now 4 years later, surpluses are but a memory, and we have debt as far as the eye can see.

Well, here is the simple strategy: we will have two wars with three tax cuts. A billion dollars a week for Iraq, do not worry about it, we need a tax cut.

□ 1115

A billion dollars a month in Afghanistan. Do not worry about it. We need a tax cut.

Troops to Haiti? Let us have a tax cut.

That is government by declaration. Things are always getting better even though we do not see any evidence of that. And then we hear from the party that built its base in American history on fiscal responsibility, increased spending and cut taxes. The evidence is there for all to see.

Then we are told on this floor that they inherited a recession. Everybody in America knows they inherited the best economy in the history of America, all due, I believe, to what at that time was bipartisan relationships in this House. They are nonexistent now. These Members on the other side come to the floor day after day and insist on tax cuts while fighting two wars at the same time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, a vote for this budget resolution conference report is a vote to automatically approve a $690 billion increase in the national debt. Under the Hastert rule, passage of the budget resolution conference report would deem that the House had passed separate legislation.

My friends on the other side of the aisle used to criticize this rule when the House of Representatives was under Democratic control and repealed it in 1997. But when the national debt started growing at a record pace, they reinstated it. I agreed with them when they criticized it in the past. Why have they changed?

A vote against the previous question would require the House and Senate to have a full and open debate and vote on increasing the debt limit instead of using the budget resolution to avoid a debate on increasing the debt limit. Last year the leadership slipped through a $984 billion increase in the debt limit, the largest increase in the history of our country, without an up-and-down vote. This came less than 8 months after we raised the Federal debt ceiling by a whopping $450 billion. Now the House leadership is trying to slip through another $690 billion increase in the debt ceiling without a debate.

The national debt has increased by $670 billion over the last 12 months and $1.5 trillion over the last 3 years. Approximately 70 percent of our borrowing from the public last year came from foreign investors. At the end of March, foreign investors held $1.7 trillion of our national debt. The $323 billion we spent last year for interest on our $7 trillion national debt represents a debt tax that must be paid by all future generations. Continuing to run up debt as we are doing will guarantee our children and grandchildren are overtaxed for the rest of their lives.

If my Republican colleagues honestly believe that tax cuts with borrowed money is good economic policy, they should be willing to stand up and take credit for the increase in the national debt that is necessary to pay for these tax cuts. Just like credit card spending limits serve as tools to force families to examine their household budgets, the debt limit reminds Congress and the President from time to time to reevaluate our budget policies.

Before we vote to increase our national debt by another $690 billion, Congress should sit down and figure out how to stop running up this debt rather than just bringing us a continued reinstatement of what we are doing. I would say to my friends on the other side again, I would gladly join them and will to increase the debt ceiling if they would agree to add budget enforcement rules that they supported in 1997. I hope the four Senators will stay fast in the other body that they will do those things that they said they are going to do to send this budget right back to us until we at least get serious about restoring fiscal discipline.

Put PAYGO into this and we have got a deal. But, no, I read where the majority leader said recently the only thing he cares about in the budget is making it easier to pass tax cuts and that everything else in the budget really does not matter to him. Increasing the debt limit over $8 trillion matters to me. I think it matters to a lot of other Members on both sides of the aisle. The decision on whether or not we make it harder for Congress and the President to pass legislation that puts us deeper into debt matters a great lot to me.

If cutting taxes with borrowed money is all that matters to you, then vote for this rule and vote for this budget. But if you are concerned about a national debt approaching $8 trillion, if you are concerned about deficits of several hundred billion dollars structural as far as the eye can see, vote against the rule and against this budget.

Vote against the previous question. The vote on the previous question will be a clear up-and-down vote as to whether or not we should have at least 1 hour to discuss increasing our debt ceiling, at least 1 hour in which we would have an honest discussion between both sides as to whether or not we should continue in the path that we are on believing that that is the best for our country. Vote against the previous question.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, let me just make Members painfully aware of what this rule will entail, since they have only had minutes to even acquaint themselves with the fact that it was coming before them today.

If Members vote for this rule, they will vote to make in order a budget resolution with the following consequences for our deficit and our national debt. Per the calculation in this budget resolution, the deficit for 2005 will be $367 billion. That is probably the best dated sum they can come up with. There will undoubtedly be some more defense supplementals, probably another $25 billion, before 2005 is out. That will take the deficit to $392 billion. If we take Social Security out of the calculation, as we should, we should not include it, the non-Social Security deficit, the deficit in the basic accounts of the Federal budget in 2005 if Members vote for this resolution will be $566 billion, which will necessitate another increase in the debt ceiling.

If Members vote for this resolution, they will, make no mistake about it, be

voting to raise the statutory debt ceiling by $690 billion. That is the first in a series of raises, because if you read CBO's report on the President's budget which is essentially embodied in this resolution and run that budget out over 10 years between 2005 and 2014, according to CBO, we will cumulatively incur a debt of $5.132 trillion.

Vote for this rule and you will be voting against any plan or any process to come to terms with this enormous, record-breaking deficit. There is no plan. There is no solution. Do not fool yourself in this resolution. Vote for it and you vote to tread water while the problem gets worse. You vote to kick the can down the road. If you want to deal with the deficit, deal with this debt, vote against this resolution, and send the conferees back to the conference. If you want to dodge the issue for another year while it gets worse, vote for this resolution. I would suggest we vote against it.

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

I will be urging Members to vote ''no'' on the previous question in order to expose a part of this budget resolution that my Republican colleagues would rather not talk about. When Members vote for this budget conference report, they will be voting to increase the statutory debt limit by almost $700 billion for the next fiscal year. An uncomfortable fact they would rather not talk about today is that this budget raises our national statutory debt limit to the highest level in our history, to more than $8 trillion. This comes on top of the fact that last year Republicans used the budget resolution to slip through a $984 billion increase in the debt limit, the largest increase in the debt limit in the history of the United States of America without an up-or-down vote in this House.

Mr. Speaker, there is an honest disagreement in this House over our Nation's fiscal priorities. Many of us think that with large deficits and the growing costs of the war in Iraq, we need to rethink our budget priorities and figure out how to make our revenues match up better with our spending needs. My Republican colleagues do not seem to think there is a problem. They think it is just fine to continue on with the spending and the tax policies that have led us into this current fiscal mess. They seem to think it is fine to keep building up our national debt and leave it to our kids and our grandkids to figure out how to pay for it.

I would say to my Republican colleagues, if they honestly believe that tax cuts with borrowed money is good economic policy, they should be willing to stand up in this House and vote to increase the national debt to pay for their tax cuts instead of relying on undercover parliamentary tricks. Republicans used to criticize Democrats for using House rules to slip through increases in the national debt without a separate vote. That is exactly what they are doing here today. If they believe in the fiscal policies that are sending the national debt through the roof, they should be willing to stand up on the floor of this House and vote for them.

I want to emphasize that a ''no'' vote will not stop the House from taking up the budget conference report. All it does is require Republicans to take responsibility for a fiscal policy that by the end of this year will cost our kids and our grandkids $8 trillion.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to insert the text of the amendment immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Again I would urge a ''no'' vote on the previous question.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important document. It is an important document because this sets the parameters of congressional spending to fund the government for 2005. We have heard a great deal from the other side in this debate about the debt limit. I addressed that earlier. I acknowledge that because we inherited a recession 4 years ago and we were attacked by terrorists and now we are engaged in an international war on terrorism, yes, we have spent more than we have taken in, and we do have to address this issue of raising the debt limit. But if we do not pass a budget resolution, that means we will not have any discipline on the appropriation process as we go through appropriating dollars for fiscal year 2005. That means if we have no discipline that the debt limit will increase higher because that is the way this body has always worked. Passing this budget is very important to put that discipline in place.

I would also make the observation, as I made earlier, every budget substitute amendment that was presented earlier when we were debating the House version of the budget, every one of those budgets acknowledged that we were going to have to address raising the debt limit in the future. Every one of them. They had it in different ways, different opportunities. Nevertheless, everyone acknowledged the fact that we have to address the debt limit problem.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me just suggest this, and I have learned this in the time that you and I have been here in this body. We will go through the appropriation process one way or the other. I think it is better to have the discipline of having a budget. But if we do not have the discipline of having a budget agreed to by both Houses, I suspect that what we will see when we go through the appropriation process from the other side, we will see, continually, amendments offered to raise more spending, which, of course, if it followed what they would be suggesting, we will have to raise the debt limit even higher. Sometimes I wonder what the debate is when I hear their rhetoric as we go through this process.

I would urge my colleagues to vote for the previous question, vote for the rule and the underlying resolution.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION FOR H. RES. 649

H. CON. RES. 95, THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE BUDGET 2004

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 649 OFFERED BY REPRESENTATIVE MCGOVERN

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 4. Upon the adoption of this resolution rule XXVII shall not apply to the conference report to accompany S. Con. Res. 95, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2005 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2006 through 2009.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4200, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 648 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 648

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4200) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2005 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2005, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and the amendments made in order by this resolution and shall not exceed two hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Armed Services now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived.

(b) No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution.

(c) Each amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report (except as specified in section 4 of this resolution), may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. Each amendment printed in the report shall be debatable for 10 minutes (unless otherwise specified in the report) equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and shall not be subject to amendment (except that the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services each may offer one pro forma amendment for the purpose of further debate on any pending amendment).

(d) All points of order against amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time for the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. The original proponent of an amendment included in such amendments en bloc may insert a statement in the Congressional Record immediately before the disposition of the amendments en bloc.

SEC. 4. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may recognize for consideration of any amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution out of the order printed, but not sooner than one hour after the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services or a designee announces from the floor a request to that effect.

SEC. 5. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1130

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

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

Yesterday, the Committee on Rules met and granted a structured rule for H.R. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005. The rule provides for 2 hours of general debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. Finally, the rule allows that the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may recognize for consideration any amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules out of the order printed, but not sooner than 1 hour after the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services or a designee announces from the floor a request to that effect.

H.R. 4200 comes at a particularly crucial time for our Nation's Armed Forces. The Iraqi conflict and our continuing war on terrorism have brought a renewed and proper focus to national defense. This legislation addresses the needs of a Nation at war on multiple fronts. It contains $422.2 billion for the Department of Defense, DOD, and the national security programs of the Department of Energy, DOE. It also provides an additional $25 billion in emergency budget authority to partially cover the projected costs of continuing operations in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The primary focus of this legislation is protecting our troops on the battlefield. Our men and women in uniform depend on having the necessary systems and equipment to be successful in accomplishing their mission. Many of us have been concerned about the lack of armor available for our Humvees and other trucks. This bill addresses that concern by providing $829.6 million for production of up-armored Humvees. This improved ballistic Humvee will protect our soldiers from anti-personnel, armor-piercing munitions and improvised explosive devices. These are most commonly referred to as IEDs when we hear news reports.

It also provides $358.2 million for vehicle add-on armor kits for the Army's truck fleet. Most importantly, it gives the military new authorities to speed critical weapons and equipment to the troops in the battlefield.

In the near future, the outcome of our war against terror depends on the courage of our personnel who are on the front lines. We owe so much to our men and women in uniform, and their success in Iraq and Afghanistan is a testimony to their bravery, training, and equipment and their commitment to defend our freedoms. It is the means by which we meet our commitment to provide them a decent quality of life with an across-the-board 3.5 percent pay increase for military personnel.

We need pay to sustain the commitment and professionalism of America's all-volunteer armed services and the families that support them. It increases the limit on hardship duty pay from $300 to $750 per month. It makes permanent the increased rate for imminent danger pay from $150 to $225 a month and more than doubles the rate for the family separation allowance from $100 to $250 per month.

Our soldiers also need to know that while they are deployed, we are praying for them and their safe return. I was told by a soldier in my district that the most important thing to a soldier who is serving overseas was knowing that their family is being taken care of and supported and they are safe at home. If these men and women are willing to lay down their lives for us, then the least we can do for them is to pray for them and to take care of their families while they are gone.

For this purpose, I have created a Web site. It is Honoring Heroes.com. It is a one-stop-shopping resource where folks can go to learn about supporting our troops and their families at home. On the site visitors will find links and resources to help support the families of our men and women who are overseas. And as we approach Memorial Day, one can also find on the Web site a list of those who have given the ultimate sacrifice during the war in Iraq. We must always remember them.

I commend the gentleman from California (Chairman HUNTER) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking member, for crafting this legislation that will really, truly strengthen America's military. It proposes the largest increase in military end strength in decades by increasing the active duty Army by 30,000 personnel and the Marine Corps by 9,000.

Even before Operation Iraqi Freedom, the global war on terrorism, and the commitment to homeland security, the Armed Forces had insufficient manpower for existing wartime and peacetime requirements.

Now more than anytime in our Nation's history, we are relying on these men and women who so faithfully serve our country in the National Guard. H.R. 4200 contains language that will help us to continue to provide strong support for our National Guard.

In my State of North Carolina, universities and community organizations will be coming together to help develop a comprehensive program to effectively support these soldiers. The bill recognizes the importance of this program and provides language to help integrate the National Program for Citizen Soldier support with the Defense Department's ongoing effort to support our men and women in uniform.

The bill also recognizes the importance of our Nation's continued development of advanced weaponry and technology. Included in this bill is the support of further exploration of the use of lithium batteries on the battlefield.

Finding a safe, cost-effective, and portable energy source for our men and women in the Armed Forces should be a top priority of the Department of Defense. I am pleased to see this year's bill addresses the need for our military to develop new and powerful alternative energy sources.

However, there is one amendment the Committee on Rules made in order that I strongly oppose, the Davis of California amendment. It would allow abortions on our military bases overseas. Military treatment centers, which are dedicated to healing and nurturing life, should not be forced to facilitate the taking of the most innocent human life, the child in the womb. For the past 7 years, the House has voted to keep abortion on demand out of military medical facilities, and I urge my colleagues to stay on this course and vote against this amendment.

That said, this is a fair rule. So let us pass the rule and pass the underlying defense authorization bill. At the end of the day, we will be making our homeland safer and we will be supporting our sons and daughters who are serving us in the military. We will be preparing for war, thereby ensuring victory. And at this crucial time in our history, this bill is most important.

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

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

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, the annual defense authorization bill is always one of the most important bills this Congress considers. Having spent my last 25 years in Congress working hard to ensure a strong national defense, it is a bill that I have always supported, and this year the defense authorization bill is more important than ever.

This past December, I spent several days in Iraq where I had the opportunity to meet with rank-and-file soldiers on the front lines and thank them personally for their distinguished service and personal sacrifice. And I was reminded of this enormous sacrifice upon my return. The cargo plane that took us out of Baghdad carried the coffins of two American soldiers who had been killed just 3 days before Christmas.

It seems like almost every night, Americans turn on the news at home and see nothing but reports of the violence in Iraq and hear comments from politicians and pundits debating decisions made here in Washington. But when I turn on NBC News or CNN or any of the other networks, I cannot help but recall the selflessness and courage that I saw in our soldiers, and the mix of pride and sorrow I felt on that flight home.

America's sons and daughters in Iraq represent our country well, but their job continues to be very difficult and very dangerous, and it will not be over anytime soon. It is clear that American troops will be based in Iraq for at least the next year and possibly longer.

And that is why the bill before us today is so important. Before anything else, the defense authorization bill is a bill to support our troops. The funding in the bill today will keep our service men and women in Iraq and around the world safe, provide them with the tools they need to fight the war on terror, and give them and their families a better quality of life.

First and foremost, we provide $25 billion in supplemental funding for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan to ensure that our troops have everything they need to conduct the war on terror and return home to their families safely. We provide over $1 billion for armored Humvees and body armor. We help ensure the strength of our military by adding 39,000 more Army and Marine Corps troops.

We make sure that our troops experience a good quality of life by giving them a 3.5 percent pay raise, and we help ensure that all of our fighting men and women receive health care by expanding TRICARE coverage to Reservists and their dependents.

The bill also helps those who have served our country so honorably over the years by making sure that those who are left behind when a soldier falls receive the full benefits that they deserve through the Survivor Benefit Plan.

And while there are a great many provisions here we can take pride in, Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today is by no means perfect. There remain a number of serious issues that we must resolve.

This morning, in the Committee on Rules, my colleagues and I tried to offer an amendment to the rule which would have more than doubled the amount authorized for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan in the supplemental. Similarly, we tried to provide $414 million to provide fair pay and benefits for our troops.

There are a great many Members who support these provisions, Mr. Speaker. They have broad support throughout the House, but they were, like dozens of other important amendments offered in the Committee on Rules, denied a vote on the floor by the Republican leadership. That is a shame, Mr. Speaker, because we all want what is best for our troops.

Because this House was denied the opportunity to consider a great many important amendments, I will be voting ''no'' on today's rule. I will also be urging a ''no'' vote on the previous question so that we may consider one of the amendments that was denied, the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) to provide fair pay and benefits for the troops.

That said, despite what happened at the Committee on Rules this morning, I stand in strong support of the underlying bill and our troops. There has never been any doubt that this House, this Nation, and its people stand 100 percent behind our men and women in uniform, fighting to secure peace the world over.

I hope we can soon continue the discussion on how best to provide for our service men and women and keep our Nation safe. And although I will be voting against the rule today, I will be voting for the underlying bill. It is the right thing to do, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting ''yes'' on the authorization bill today.

I only wish that the majority leadership, in the spirit of bipartisanship that normally surrounds defense measures, had permitted some very important amendments to be offered. And we will be hearing from some of my colleagues in the rest of the debate on this rule about how strongly they feel about their rights being denied here on the floor today.

□ 1145

When we are trying to promote our military and trying to do the right thing around the world, we should promote democracy here on the floor of the House and not stifle it.

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

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule for the defense authorization bill. In total, this rule provides 9½ hours of debate on a number of key issues affecting our military and our national defense. The underlying legislation, H.R. 4200, passed the Committee on Armed Services by a vote of 60 to 0, and it meets the challenges of a Nation whose soldiers are at work in Afghanistan, Iraq, and across the globe in the fight against terror.

Following almost 5 hours of hearings yesterday in the Committee on Rules, we have provided the opportunity for further debate by making in order 28 amendments, including 10 Democrat amendments, 15 Republican amendments, and three bipartisan.

This is a fair and traditional rule for a DoD authorization bill that will permit the House to support our Nation's men and women in uniform and ensure that our defense capabilities remain second to none while having excellent debate later today on a wide array of amendments.

Mr. Speaker, this important bill falls well in line with what the Founders envisioned when they crafted article I, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution, which states that Congress shall have the power to ''raise and support Armies,'' as well as to ''provide and maintain a Navy.''

Mr. Speaker, on September 11, 2001, our Nation bore witness to one of the most horrific crimes in history. Today, our Nation's servicemen and -women are fighting for freedom in the civilized

world on multiple fronts across the globe. Our commitment to these ideals depends on our military and our military personnel, and this bill is a statement that we will continue to defend freedom and ensure that our homeland remains safe.

First, this legislation provides the funding needed to continue the U.S. military's transition into the 21st century. H.R. 4200 authorizes nearly $2 billion for the U.S. Army to procure weapons-tracked combat vehicles; $10 billion for the U.S. Navy for shipbuilding and conversion; and over $13.5 billion for the U.S. Air force to procure additional aircraft. The authorization for these and other programs will help ensure that the U.S. military remains the most efficient, most lethal, and most effective fighting force in the world.

But, Mr. Speaker, we cannot possibly hope to maintain the level of excellence obtained by the U.S. military without the achievements of the men and women who proudly wear the uniform. I am continually impressed by the resolve, patriotism, and commitment exhibited by these heroes day in and day out. As such, this Congress must work to reinforce this strength, and H.R. 4200 makes good progress towards that end.

I am pleased that the underlying legislation contains a 3.5 percent pay increase in base pay for military personnel. H.R. 4200 also recommends the elimination of out-of-pocket expenses military personnel must contribute toward housing costs. Both of these provisions will not only help ease the burden placed on military personnel and their families but should also help to ensure that the U.S. military is able to retain these highly trained personnel.

Mr. Speaker, it is undoubtedly true that not everyone will be satisfied with this measure. What we must remember, however, is that the primary responsibility of this government is to provide for the common defense of this country. As one of the Founders put it, wise and free people direct their attentions first to their own safety.

As such, I urge my colleagues to support both this rule and the underlying measure, H.R. 4200, to not only uphold the obligations of the Congress and the Federal Government, but also to show our men and women in uniform that their service to this Nation and their fellow Americans does not now nor will it ever go unappreciated.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, who was denied the opportunity to offer key amendments.

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule; I rise in strong opposition to the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorely distressed over this rule. The base bill that our Committee on Armed Services worked on and put out is a pretty good bill. We have done some good things, particularly for the troops. But I raise the question as to why in the world the Committee on Rules, at my request to have 6 hours of debate, 3 hours on each side on a $422 billion bill, has limited it to 2 hours, 1 hour on each side. Is the Committee on Rules majority afraid of debate?

Specifically, there are several issues we need to debate. This is the crucible of democracy; young men, young women in uniform, all across this world, all across the globe, standing firm for democracy and decency and what we stand for. And we are limited in our debate time?

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that they limit us. We should discuss the cost of the war in Iraq; the cost of the war in Afghanistan; the role of contractors. This is a serious role that has arisen recently and that needs to be discussed on the floor of this House.

The issue of the Iraqi prisoner detainee abuse, which has flooded the world news media, needs to be talked about from both sides of the aisle; and the transition to a new government in Iraq, on June 30, which we really have no idea what it will look like, needs a discussion and a thorough airing here in this Chamber. These are important issues, and we are limited to 1 hour on each side to discuss them.

I am sorry that has happened. Two hours is not nearly enough. It does the young men and young women in uniform a disservice, it does democracy in this Chamber a disservice.

Mr. Speaker, I also pointed out four amendments that I wished to be made in order, and only one was approved by the Committee on Rules. I studied the amendments; and, as ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, I thought I spoke with some knowledge.

These are serious, thoughtful amendments which, I believe, deserve full and extended debate on the House floor. These issue areas and the amendments to which I refer are:

Sanchez amendment to modify the Uniform Code of Military Justice to bring it into conformity with modern criminal sexual assault statutes;

Cooper/Ryan amendment authorizing a total of $67 billion for operations in Iraq and Afghanistan;

Spratt amendment on increasing pay for our troops and their quality of life by making targeted cuts in missile defense programs; and

Tauscher amendment on Department of Energy nuclear weapons policy.

Only one of these, the Tauscher amendment, was made in order. This is simply unacceptable. These are serious amendments that try to deal responsibly with complex issues. They reflect broadly held views by members on this side. A meaningful debate on these issues would reflect well on the House and would serve the country well. The failure to make them in order is disappointing, unfair and reflects badly on the House. It is an outrage!

If the previous question is defeated, the House will have the chance to at least partially redress this wrong by considering the Spratt amendment, which will directly benefit the troops.

I strongly urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question and to vote "no" on the rule.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the 2005 National Defense Authorization Act and the rule. This bill contains tremendous support for our military. Among those items that I think are particularly noteworthy is increased housing benefits for our troops; a pay raise, including an increased pay raise for hardship duty; additional health care benefits for Reservists; additional armor for Humvees; body armor; better survivor benefits; an increase of 30,000 troops, which I think at the present time we very badly need; and the most efficient weapons system available.

A few months ago, Mr. Speaker, I visited Landstuhl Hospital in Germany, Afghanistan, Kuwait, Iraq, and talked to an awful lot of our troops over there; and I was singularly impressed with the quality, the commitment, and the expertise of the troops that I met. This was one week before Christmas, and yet I did not hear one complaint from any one of the soldiers that I talked to. They seemed to have a tremendously strong sense of mission.

A young captain from my home State of Nebraska who had been away from his wife and infant child for 1 year made two comments that stuck with me that I think are worth repeating.

First of all, he said that it is better that we fight terrorists here in the Middle East than we fight them at home. I think that all of us realize we are not completely immune from terrorism on these shores. However, we would also have to recognize the fact that terrorism has certainly been crippled. It has had to focus its attacks primarily in the Middle East. It certainly has made the United States a safer place over the last year and a half.

Then the second comment that he made I think is particularly important. He said it is really important that the American people not lose patience, and I would say that includes Congress as well, because the captain was proud of the accomplishments that our military had accomplished in that area.

What he was pointing out, simply, was the improvement in the infrastructure; the increase in commerce in that part of the world; the improvement in health care; the fact that infants, young people, about 90 percent of them had been vaccinated in Iraq; the improvement in government, at least the potential for a representative government to be formed.

So we certainly believe that the quality of people we have over there is exceptional, they deserve our support, and this bill does that.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I have served here for 22 years and served all those years on the House Committee on Armed Services, and today I am the recognize second ranking Democrat on that committee; and if there is any comity left in this institution, surely I should have the right to offer one well-considered, carefully crafted, very serious amendment. That is what I proposed. That is what I offered.

I knew that the Committee on Rules had been narrowing down the debate for years and years, so I went prepared to the Committee on Rules and asked for simply one amendment.

Now, I do not stand here in personal pique because my amendment has not been made in order. Far from it. It is not that this rule shuts me out or shuts out the people I represent in South Carolina. It shuts out our troops. It shuts out our sergeants and warrant officers. It denies every trooper who goes into combat the opportunity to have $250,000 of group life insurance at Uncle Sam's expense. That is what it does.

The amendment that I proposed would take $414 million out of ballistic missile defense and move it, first of all, $300 million for targeted pay increases for noncommissioned officers, NCOs, who bear the burden of fighting, who are the backbone of our military in Iraq and Afghanistan. These personnel, grades E–5 through E–9, are the troops we need most to keep. If they vote with their feet and leave the Army, we will have a broken Army.

What I proposed is what the Quadrennial Review proposed 3 years ago, what we have voted up twice in the last 2 fiscal years, but do not in this budget, is a targeted increase for these troops.

In addition, I proposed we take 25 to $50 million and say to every soldier, sailor, airman, and Marine going into harm's way, into combat, once you draw imminent danger pay, the Government of the United States of America will pick up the premium, we will provide you with $250,000 in group life insurance, SGLI, a great idea.

It is the least we can do for these troops. After all, we did, and I think rightly, $1.4 million in average benefits for the victims of 9/11. Can we not guarantee our troops in combat at least $250,000 in light of that?

So what they have denied me with this rule is the opportunity to have a hearty, healthy debate on our priorities. Can we take a little bit out of a program that is slated to increase by $1.2 billion, take $400 million out of it and move it around, put it into a pay raise for our NCOs and our warrant officers, put it into a life insurance premium for our troops? And then take a little bit of it and deal with some problems in ballistic missile defense, which this budget, for all it does for BMD, does not do, for example to Patriot-3s. It took out a Tornado, it took out an F/A–18. We need to put more money into IFF, Identification Friend Or Foe.

□ 1200

Roadside bombs, IEDs, we need to put more money in that. Look at the Marine Corps' unfunded requirement list. You will find it at the top of their list.

These are the things that I, if I had the opportunity, would propose that we do with cuts that would not impede or in any way affect the progress of ballistic missile defense.

Give me that opportunity. Vote down the previous question. Vote down the rule. And let us have a full fair and serious debate on national defense.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON).

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule. Our country is at war, Mr. Speaker, and this rule and the underlying bill reflect the needs of a country at war.

We have addressed in this bill in particular the needs of the soldier. In fact, the bill is entitled The Year of the Soldier, and to support our soldiers we have addressed issues that have to do with technology. We have addressed issues that have to do with armor, both body and vehicle. We have addressed additional needs that our Special Operations Command has, and we have addressed the need to defend ourselves in terms of chemical and biological protection.

But one of the most important provisions of the bill, Mr. Speaker, is a provision that addresses a need in terms of our military's transformation. Our committee found during a hearing on April 21, 2004, that the DOD acquisition process would not respond in an expeditious manner to the urgent force protection equipment needs of our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan. This is something that the bill seeks to change.

At the hearing, the HASC found that it required 6 months from the time a combatant commander made his request to the time that the production for such equipment commenced, 6 months from the time the combatant commander said he needed a device and the time we began to produce it; not when it got to the field, but when we began to produce it.

This provision would authorize the Secretary of Defense to publish a streamlined acquisition process for use when combatant fatalities have occurred. The combatant commander has an urgent need for equipment and the delay would cause the continuation of combat fatalities. This rapid acquisition authority will allow a rapid response to emergency combat situations.

This rapid acquisition authority would allow a rapid response to emergency combat situations, would allow a rapid response to changes in our opponents' battlefield tactics and, most important, this provision would help minimize combat fatalities.

This is a process to be used as a quick-start bridge to the normal acquisition process. The provision is limited, however, limited to $100 million per fiscal year.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, when a country is at war, rule number one is that the sacrifice must be shared. Congress must support our citizen soldiers who answer the call of duty, but who face ongoing financial obligations in their civilian lives. Our Reserves and our National Guard are doing a superb job, but thousands of them are suffering significant hardships due to the discrepancy between their civilian and military pay.

Abandoning them financially is unacceptable. Yet, for the second time in 2 years, the Committee on Rules has rejected my amendment which would have immediately eliminated the pay gap for Federal employees and provided significant incentive for State and municipal governments to do the same. Instead of delaying financial assistance for 1 year, as the bill we are considering proposes, my amendment would have wiped out the pay gap for Reservists and National Guardsmen immediately.

Mr. Speaker, for the soldiers who suffer from the pay gap, the proposal in the legislation we are considering is too little and too late. In a time of war, it is unconscionable to impose all of the sacrifice on one segment of society. Yet, the administration and the Republicans in this House continue to back massive tax cuts for the wealthiest, placing financial burdens on other groups, including the Reservists and members of the National Guard who are already sacrificing so much for all of us.

It is an outrage that this body is not allowed to vote, not allowed to vote on providing members of our National Guard and our Reserves some financial relief. My amendment, which would provide immediate help to the tens of thousands of Reservists and members of the National Guard, was ruled out of order. Why? Because the Republican leadership is convinced that were we to debate my amendment freely on this floor, it would pass overwhelmingly.

It is an outrage to the Reservists and members of the National Guard that we are denied that opportunity. I urge all of my colleagues to oppose this unfair, unequitable and undemocratic rule.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I believe under the rules, procedures and etiquette of the House, that the press is to have access to the gallery here in the House. I am concerned that the doors may be locked. I see only one person in the press gallery today.

I think people all over the country have a right to know that the press has access to the Chamber to cover the travesty of democracy and the arrogance of power that is going on here today.

I would ask the Parliamentarian and the Sergeant at Arms to be sure that the press gallery doors are unlocked so that the press might have access to these terrible proceedings wrought on the House floor by the majority.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not stating a parliamentary inquiry. Accessibility to the House is being observed.

Mr. SNYDER. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Do the rules of the House provide for the press to have access to the gallery of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House is in open session. Anybody has access that meets the standards of security.

Mr. SNYDER. Thank you. And that was a correct parliamentary inquiry.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to note for clarification, there have been press people coming and going ever since we have been doing this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the distinguished chairman of this committee, who has done a phenomenal job in putting this bill together.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

I want to talk about this bill that was put together in the Committee on Armed Services, which was voted out with a 60 to zero vote, put together and shaped by Democrats and Republicans. I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), my partner on the committee, for all the great work that he has put into it, as well as the subcommittee chairmen, ranking members and all the folks who fill those seats in the Committee on Armed Services who really care about our troops.

In keeping with that, this is the Year of the Troops. We have endeavored to focus on those troops, and in doing that, we have got this 3.5 percent pay raise across the board. We have not increased money for hazardous duty pay. We have increased money for separation pay for folks that are away from their families. And beyond that we try to give our troops the tools that they need to get the job done.

The gentlewoman has mentioned armor, up-armoring of Humvees and trucks, and munitions and surveillance, in all the things that those folks need, those 135,000-plus folks in Iraq and thousands in the Afghanistan theater who are out there fighting right now, braving enemy fire, increasingly oppressive heat, difficult living conditions. And they are doing that for us. They are doing that all as volunteers, and it is our job to give them what they need to get the job done. That is what we do in this bill.

And appended to all of the great things that we have done, and I really applaud the gentleman who just spoke on this rapid acquisition initiative for a battlefield commander. When he is taking casualties, he can say, I want a system and I want it now. And you either have a system within contract of 15 days or you explain to the people in the field or to the Congress why that is not possible. That is very important.

Troops are important. And right now we have put into this bill an additional 10,000 Army troops each year for 3 years for a total of 30,000 troops. We have also put in an additional 3,000 Marines each year for a total of 9,000 additional Marines. And for everybody that hears from their Guard and Reserve and active forces, from the members of their family who say, you know, it looks like it is another Christmas that I will not be home, having more troops helps to alleviate that pressure because the more people you have, the less time an individual has to spend in theater, on duty, in rotation. So that takes a little bit of pressure off these troops.

Additionally, I think we looked at this thing as a committee and said, having additional forces available that are not obligated in the field, that are available for deployment, are insurance for our country. And we decided as a matter of policy that we wanted to have more insurance. So we have those additional forces.

Now, additional to the base bill this year, this $422 billion bill, we have got another thing, and that is this $25 billion authorization for a supplemental that we have bolted onto our bill. And we put that money in because we want to make sure we have plenty of money for operations in the closing months of this year, plenty of money for surveillance.

We have lots of surveillance platforms in here. We want to be able to see the bad guys when they are putting out those IEDs or putting up ambushes or other things. And we want to leverage our technology to do that so we have that additional surveillance money.

We have additional munitions money to put in so the troops have everything from the large rounds right down to M–16 ammunition, and we put in a lot of money for that.

Additionally, we have given the money to the Chief of Staff of the Army, to General Schumacher, to reshape his forces. And I would commend any Member of the House, and all of our members of the Committee on Armed Services have seen this, to have a sit-down with General Schumacher and listen to his blueprint for reshaping our force. He feels, under his blueprint, he can increase the Army from 33 active brigades to an additional three this year, three more next year and four more the next year. And we are helping him do that by putting in this supplemental for equipment for this reset.

I notice the ranking member had stood up to speak, and I just want to recognize him if he had anything to say. Then I know also the gentleman from South Carolina also had a position.

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

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just learned I can address the Chamber an additional 2 minutes a few minutes from now.

Let me, say on a positive side, I think it is a good thing we are doing, adding to the end strength of the troops. I am not sure if America fully knows, the understanding that we have some 4,000 coming out of Korea toward the Iraqi situation.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER).

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, every fair-minded Member of this House should be outraged at the rule we are being forced to debate under today. Two hours, a giant piece of legislation will be rammed through this House in 2 hours, less than 15 seconds per Member of this body; less than 15 seconds for each 700,000 group of constituents that we have the honor of representing; less than 15 seconds each to talk about over one-half of all the domestic discretionary spending of the United States of America; less than 15 seconds per Member to talk about the defense budget of the United States at a time of war; less than 15 seconds per Member to talk about a defense budget that is larger than every other defense budget in the world put together; less than 15 seconds per Member to talk about the needs of our troops in the field while they are fighting a war.

□ 1215

There will be no real debate allowed under this rule for properly funding our troops. It is true, thank goodness, that finally under pressure that the Republicans have put in $25 billion to fund our troops in kind of an emergency supplemental, but the truth is our troops need more money than that. They are running out of money now. Let me repeat, our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan are running out of money now.

The Pentagon is already having to raid every cookie jar in the building to try to fund their needs. We should do better by our troops. We should fully fund their needs. We should tell the truth to the American people about the real cost of this war, which is a lot

closer to $200 billion than any other number.

I had an amendment that we wanted to debate and discuss that would have put in $67 billion for our troops so that funding would not just start in October, as intended by the Republican majority and, as they put it, end in December and January. They are fully funding about 3 or 4 months of this war to disguise the true cost of it. We should fund the needs of our troops for an entire year, and we should be proud of it.

With all the life-threatening risks that our men and women face in uniform overseas, financial uncertainties should not be an additional risk; yet that is what is being imposed on them by this body with this simplistic rule which is 2 hours of debate, less than 15 seconds per Member to talk about the true needs of our troops.

The gentlewoman from North Carolina, unfortunately, was absent from the Committee on Rules when I testified. There were only two Members there. They are hurrying through this so quickly in a rubber-stamp fashion that we are not able to properly discuss one of the most important bills of the year and perhaps of the decade.

Mr. Speaker, our committee has been rated by CSIS, the Center For Strategic and International Studies, as one of the worst Committee on the Armed Services in decades. Why? This is one of the reasons, inability to do our job correctly.

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

I would just like to respond to the gentleman that I am not sure when he testified, but other than having a lunch appointment and voting on the floor, I was in that hearing the whole time; and I would also like to say, there is a total of 9½ hours of debate on this bill. It is not just 2 hours.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON).

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, the last speaker from the minority I think misrepresented the situation. This process started in January. We have been through the subcommittee process. The gentleman went through the subcommittee process, had ample time to make his arguments, went through the full committee process.

We forged a document through that process where everybody had ample time, including a debate that started at 10 o'clock in the morning last week and ended at midnight, to make our points; and following that debate, this bill was reported by a unanimous vote. So those who are crying foul today because of this rule are the same people who have worked since January to make their points, 12 hours last week to make their points, and a 9-hour debate today. It seems pretty fair to me.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the time remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) has 13 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) has 8¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON).

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, my friend from New Jersey makes reference to 9 hours of debate when, in truth, in fact, we have 2 hours of general debate on this issue.

I recommended to the Committee on Rules four major amendments. I stated the amendments from our committee, and I do not make recommendations lightly; and when I do, I hope the Committee on Rules would take them seriously. Most important is one that deals with quality of life for the soldiers and the troops and their families.

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) had a proposed amendment that would increase pay, increase quality of life. It targeted cuts towards the missile defense program which is being boosted up by well over $1 billion. What more can be said.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) had a proposed amendment to modify the Uniform Code of Military Justice, bringing this law into conformity with the Federal criminal sexual assault statutes. That was passed 18 years ago by this Congress. Now there are some 18 years of appellate history that can be used, and yet that was denied.

The gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) had an amendment authorizing a total of $67 billion for operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, when in truth and fact, the Committee on Rules set aside a reserve sum of some $50 billion meeting the Cooper/Ryan proposal by more than half.

The gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER), thank goodness they allowed an amendment that she has on the Department of Energy nuclear weapons policy.

These are important amendments, important not just to the future of our country, not just important to our policy, important to those who wear the uniform, important to their families, where we are going. It is important, I think, that we vote down this rule and come back with a better one.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the House Republican leadership has allowed more time to debate the renaming of post offices from the floor this year than time to debate the Defense authorization bill during a time of war. It is sad. It is sad that the muzzling of democracy continues here in the United States, even as American citizens die and try to bring democracy to Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is unfair. I would say that the bill itself has many positive things to it, and I do salute much of the bipartisan effort that went into shaping the Defense authorization bill itself. Let me discuss two specific parts of the bill, one positive and one of great concern to me.

On a positive note, the bill finally improves benefits for pensions for widows of servicemen and -women. This had been long overdue to change this unfair treatment of military widows. The sergeant's wife, for example, that served 20 years in the Army, only receiving a $7,000 a year pension. I salute the Republicans who supported it in committee, and I want to thank the veterans organizations and the 200 Democrats who joined in my petition to pressure a vote on this long overdue consideration.

Second, it is unfortunate that this bill does not take action to continue this next year the largest, most important housing improvement program in our Nation's military history; and it is really sad when we consider tomorrow the House Republican leadership will push a tax cut bill that will provide self-serving tax cuts for Members of Congress; but today, we are saying to 24,000 military families, we cannot afford to improve the housing that they live in, even if their loved one is someone serving in Iraq or Afghanistan. Self-serving tax cuts for Members of Congress being more important than improving military housing for those servicemen and -women sacrificing and serving our Nation in Iraq? It is wrong.

This rule is wrong. Vote ''no'' and let us reconsider this bill under new regulations and rules.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to just correct my friend because he may have missed it, but we did lift the housing cap for privatization of housing. That was done pursuant to the Miller amendment in the committee. So we did two things, both the survivor benefits and the housing cap.

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

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

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, if I can ask the gentleman a question, the staff of the committee has told me, and I have asked repeatedly, that it addresses the housing cap for fiscal year 2006, but does not solve the problem for 2005; and as a consequence, 24,000 military families will have their housing improvements put on hold.

Mr. HUNTER. I just say to the gentleman, it is permanent removal of the housing cap.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHN).

Mr. JOHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly oppose this rule.

Yesterday, in the Committee on Rules, I offered an amendment to the

defense authorization bill whose needs were proven and whose costs was fully offset, and it was sadly rejected.

The Air Force's Joint Surveillance Target Radar System, or the JSTARS, is a program vital to our Nation's security in a time of war and is crucial to the jobs of hard-working men in Louisiana. My amendment would have ensured the continuation of this program in order to build the number of planes that the military requested.

The next generation of JSTARS, the E–10A program, has been delayed twice and will not provide the needs of our military in sufficient time.

Without my amendment made in order, resources will be cut for our troops, plain and simple. Short-changing the military on their order for planes sells short this vital program and endangers valuable military support jobs in Louisiana.

The delay of the E–10A will disrupt our military industrial base and will affect our Nation's responsiveness to production needs.

The need is real, Mr. Speaker. The workforce is in place and our troops deserve the best we can provide. The JSTARS program merits funding and continuation. We will be continuing to discuss this, and it is a shame that we have not had this opportunity on the floor of the House to fully discuss this. The workers in my district deserve consideration to complete their mission, just as we have asked our troops to complete their mission.

I strongly oppose this rule.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), the chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina for her kindness in yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, in consideration of the fiscal year 2005 Defense Authorization Act, this comes at a benchmark moment for the United States of America, if not the world, in terms of our history.

Our Nation and our allies are engaged in a global war against terrorism, we all know that, a war that began long before September 11, 2001, and is obviously going to continue well into the future. It is a war fanatics declared on America and its friends. It is a war that we cannot avoid. It is a war that must be fought, and it is a war that will be won.

President Bush understood early on that this sustained conflict would be difficult, and he told us so; and the truth of his words becomes more evident as time goes by, and it is our job to step up and provide for the challenge.

Our Nation's brave men and women in uniform and out face danger every day, not only in countries like Iraq and Afghanistan but actually around the whole world. We have sustained casualties. The inevitability of losses in dangerous work has not deterred us, nor has it diminished, of course, our heartfelt gratitude for the sacrifices made by some of the best our Nation has to offer, some from my home State, Florida, some from my district, as they fought in service of our country, for ideals that we all believe in, ideals that will endure, will prosper, and will better the lives of fellow human beings everywhere.

These people bring credit and honor to us all. They must be remembered and cherished, and I have no doubt they will; and this legislation goes in that direction.

The legislation we consider today provides the resources needed to continue the fight that we are in. H.R. 4200 allows America's military to function at a superior level. It includes programs that look forward, anticipating needs so that they can be met quickly and with precision when and wherever future threats arise.

In addition, the Defense Authorization Act maintains the oversight ability of the Congress. The limited, but nonetheless damaging, instances of prisoner abuse at Abu Ghraib will be dealt with transparently and fairly to show the world that free societies respect civilized standards and enforce them.

As chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I appreciate that H.R. 4200 includes a strong intelligence component that ensures American war fighters on the ground or in whatever mode are provided with the best possible information; and I am most grateful to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, for understanding this and providing for it.

Timely, accurate information is a vital weapon in the war on terrorism, both for force protection, as the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) well knows, and for mission success. Yes, we can expect more violence in Iraq as the June 30 transfer of sovereignty approaches.

□ 1230

And, yes, unfortunately we can expect terrorists to target other events, including elections in free countries this year. But with the passage this year and maintaining levels of support for our military and intelligence capabilities, we can supply our soldiers and intelligence people with the resources and information they need to win.

This rule considered a lot of things. The committee got a good bill together, and I do not think there is any reason not to go forward with the debate. I urge support for the rule, I urge support for the bill, and I urge a vigorous debate on the information herein.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I want to clarify the record.

The committee dealt with the housing cap to allow improved military housing starting in fiscal year 2006, but it only adds $1 for the cap in 2005. So that means 24,452 military families will have their housing improvement plans put on hold even as their loved ones are fighting in Iraq or Afghanistan.

Thirteen military bases will have their housing programs basically frozen, even though tomorrow we are going to vote to provide a tax cut for Members of Congress.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

The gentleman concurs, as I think our common ground here is that we have permanently lifted this cap, with the lift starting in 2006. However, the housing program can continue under the current cap for the time being. And it is not a certain thing that we are definitely going to run out of money.

I would just say to the gentleman that I would be happy to work with the gentleman and the Committee on the Budget to attempt to accommodate 2005 and make sure there is not a seam between 2005 and 2006.

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

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

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I understand we will hit the cap as early as this November.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, that is not a certain thing. So telling all the families that they absolutely will not have housing is not a certain thing at this point.

I think the gentleman and I and others can work to make sure there is not a seam between 2005 and 2006.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), the ranking member on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in strong support of the defense authorization bill, but strong opposition to this rule.

Let me point out, Mr. Speaker, that the rule we are considering leaves out many important amendments which many on our side had hoped to offer. I had one which would have postponed additional expenditures for a ground-based missile system in Alaska which has not met operational testing requirements, and would have put those funds into port security. My amendment reflects the views of 49 Admirals and Generals whose letter to the President is dated March 26.

In my view, as ranking member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the potential

damage from a radiological device coming in through our ports is a much greater risk than the risk of a missile attack from North Korea.

There are, however, some good amendments put in order, one of which I strongly support. The Davis-Sanchez-Harman amendment, which we have offered every year for the last decade, would treat military servicewomen as women in America are treated, by allowing them their constitutional right to the full range of legal reproductive health care in foreign military hospitals, provided they pay for it. Current law prohibits this and requires servicewomen who put their lives on the line on austere fronts in the war on terror to seek approval from their commanding officer in order to travel elsewhere in order to obtain an abortion, as medical facilities may be inadequate or unavailable.

I view current law as unconstitutional. I think it is ridiculous at a time when military women are performing incredible service around the world that they still are treated differently from women in America. So I urge strong support of the Davis-Sanchez-Harman amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith for the RECORD the March 26, 2004 letter to President Bush from 49 Admirals and Generals:

49 GENERALS AND ADMIRALS CALL FOR MISSILE DEFENSE POSTPONEMENT

MARCH 26, 2004.

President GEORGE W. BUSH,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In December 2002, you ordered the deployment of a ground-based strategic mid-course ballistic missile defense (GMD) capability, now scheduled to become operational before the end of September 2004. You explained that its purpose is to defend our nation against rogue states that may attack us with a single or a limited number of ballistic missiles armed with weapons of mass destruction.

To meet this deployment deadline, the Pentagon has waived the operational testing requirements that are essential to determining whether or not this highly complex system of systems is effective and suitable. The Defense Department's Director of Operational Test and Evaluation stated on March 11, 2004, that operational testing is not in the plan ''for the foreseeable future.'' Moreover, the General Accounting Office pointed out in a recent report that only two of 10 critical technologies of the GMD system components have been verified as workable by adequate developmental testing.

Another important consideration is balancing the high costs of missile defense with funding allocated to other national security programs. Since President Reagan's strategic defense initiative speech in March 1983, a conservative estimate of about $130 billion, not adjusted upward for inflation, has been spent on missile defense, much of it on GMD. Your Fiscal Year 2005 budget for missile defense is $10.2 billion, with $3.7 billion allocated to GMD. Some $53 billion is programmed for missile defense over the next five years, with much more to follow. Deploying a highly complex weapons system prior to testing it adequately can increase costs significantly.

U.S. technology, already deployed, can pinpoint the source of a ballistic missile launch. It is, therefore, highly unlikely that any state would dare to attack the U.S. or allow a terrorist to do so from its territory with a missile armed with a weapon of mass destruction, thereby risking annihilation from a devastating U.S. retaliatory strike.

As you have said, Mr. President, our highest priority is to prevent terrorists from acquiring and employing weapons of mass destruction. We agree. We therefore recommend, as the militarily responsible course of action, that you postpone operational deployment of the expensive and untested GMD system and transfer the associated funding to accelerated programs to secure the multitude of facilities containing nuclear weapons and materials and to protect our ports and borders against terrorists who may attempt to smuggle weapons of mass destruction into the United States.

Signed:

Admiral William J. Crowe (USN, ret.), General Alfred G. Hansen (USAF, ret.), General Joseph P. Hoar (USMC, ret.).

Lt. General Henry E. Emerson (USA, ret.), Lt. General Robert G. Gard, Jr. (USA, ret.), Vice Admiral Carl T. Hanson (USN, ret.), Lt. General James F. Hollinsworth (USA, ret.), Lt. General Arlen D. Jameson (USAF, ret.), Lt. General Robert E. Kelley, (USAF, ret.), Lt. General John A. Kjellstrom (USA, ret.), Lt. General Dennis P. McAuliffe (USA, ret.), Lt. General Charles P. Otstott (USA, ret.), Lt. General Thomas M. Rienze (USA, ret.), Vice Admiral John J. Shanahan (USN, ret.), Lt. General Dewitt C. Smith, Jr. (USA, ret.), Lt. General Horace G. Taylor (USA, ret.), Lt. General James M. Thompson (USA, ret.), Lt. General Alexander M. Weyand (USA, ret.).

Major General Robert H. Appleby (AUS, ret.), Major General James G. Boatner (USA, ret.), Major General Jack O. Bradshaw (USA, ret.), Major General Morris J. Brady (USA, ret.), Major General William F. Burns (USA, ret.), Rear Admiral William D. Center (USN, ret.), Major General Albert B. Crawford (USA, ret.), Major General Maurice O. Edmonds (USA, ret.), Rear Admiral Robert C. Elliott, (USN, ret.), Major General John C. Faith (USA, ret.), Rear Admiral Robert H. Gormley (USN, ret.), Major General Richard B. Griffitts (USA, ret.), Rear Admiral Charles D. Grojean (USN, ret.), Major General Raymond E. Haddock (USA, ret.), Major General Jack R. Holbein, Jr. (USAF, ret.), Major General Stanley H. Hyman (USA, ret.), Major General Wayne P. Jackson (USA, ret.), Major General Frederick H. Lawson (AUS, ret.), Major General Vincent P. Luchsinger, Jr. (USAF, ret.), Major General James J. LeCleir (AUS, ret.), Major General William F. Willoughby (USAF, ret.).

Brig. General George C. Cannon, Jr. (USAF, ret.), Brig. General John J. Costa (USA, ret.), Brig. General Alvan E. Cowan (USA, ret.), Brig. General Lee Denson (USAF, ret.), Brig. General Evelyn P. Foote (USA, ret.), Brig. General Leslie R. Forney, Jr. (USA, ret.), Brig. General John H. Grubbs (USA, ret.), Brig. General James E. Hastings (USA, ret.), Brig. General John H. Johns (USA, ret.), Brig. General Maurice D. Roush (USA, ret.).

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON).

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because several worthy amendments to this bill were not ruled in order for consideration, including my own amendment that I offered, which was an amendment that was very simple. It said, if this country is going to resume the testing of nuclear weapons, it would first have to be authorized to do so by Congress.

I think Congress, the people's Representatives, ought to be involved in such a significant decision. This is not a partisan issue. It is an issue about having the people's Representatives involved.

The United States did conduct over 900 nuclear weapons tests at the Nevada test site from 1951 until 1992, and during most of this time, people who lived downwind of the test site were not warned about the adverse health effects associated with radiation exposure.

What is not widely known is that the fallout from weapons testing traveled across the entire country. Studies by the National Cancer Institute concluded that people in every single county in the lower 48 States were exposed to fallout.

A moratorium on nuclear weapons testing was instituted in 1992, but recent funding decisions in the appropriations process by Congress are leading us down the path to renewed nuclear testing and, therefore, as far as I am concerned, it is important that the people's Representatives, the United States Congress, ought to be asked to come up for a vote on whether or not we should resume nuclear testing.

This amendment was not ruled in order and, therefore, I encourage all my colleagues to oppose this rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on our side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) has 3¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I think it should be obvious to everybody that we have a huge agenda of meritorious issues that will not be brought to the well of the House. We will not have today a free market of ideas as we deal with and debate one of the most important bills we will bring up.

So when I emphasize to every Member that if you want to have a free and full and serious debate, then you should vote against this rule and you should vote first against the motion to move the previous question. That will open up the process so that we can offer amendments.

And before concluding, I would like to ask the gentlewoman, given the amendment I am proposing that would deal with the needs of our NCOs and an incipient problem, and that is retention and recruitment, will the gentlewoman allow me to make a unanimous consent request to put in order amendment No. 89, which would increase the targeted pay increase for senior enlisted personnel and warrant officers and use, as an offset, a partial reduction in the big increase in the ballistic missile program.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the approval of my amendment, amendment No. 89.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that his amendment, which is not proposed to be made in order by the Committee on Rules, be permitted to be in order. Does the gentlewoman from North Carolina object to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mrs. MYRICK. Yes, I do object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote ''no'' on the previous question and on the rule. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule that will make in order the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), which the Committee on Rules defeated on a straight party-line vote early this morning and for which unanimous consent was just denied.

Mr. Speaker, this is the second year in a row the Republican leadership has chosen to throw away the long-standing tradition of bipartisan cooperation in shaping our national defense policies. Nearly 100 amendments, most of them by Democratic Members, were shut out of the rule, including the Spratt amendment. It is a very sad day for the American people and particularly for those serving in the military.

Partisan politics have absolutely no place when it comes to protecting the brave American men and women who are serving in our military in harm's way. The Spratt amendment would provide $300 million additional dollars to give well-deserved pay raises to the sergeants and warrant officers who train and lead enlisted personnel. His amendment also guarantees military personnel serving in combat zones will have life insurance.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment and extraneous materials be inserted in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote on the previous question and a ''no'' vote on the rule.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule, which silenced all three of my amendments.

My first amendment called for the creation of an international commission, with Iraqi, U.S., and U.N. participation, to monitor prison conditions in Iraq. The Geneva Convention is neither quaint nor obsolete, and this amendment would have ensured compliance and help to restore badly damaged U.S. credibility.

My second amendment would have created a database of those who have been detained.

My third amendment prohibited the use of U.S. funds in the overthrow of democratically elected governments. Given the allegations of this government's involvement in the overthrow of President Aristide in Haiti, this amendment would have restored confidence in the protection of democracy.

Once again debate was stifled on many critical issues. The Republican majority continues to abuse its power.

Oppose this rule.

The material previously referred to by Mr. FROST is as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION FOR H. RES.—RULE ON H.R. 4200 NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 6. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendment printed in section 7 shall be in order as though printed as the first amendment in the report of the Committee on Rules if offered by Representative Spratt of South Carolina or a designee. That amendment shall be debatable for 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

SEC. 7. The amendment referred to in section 6 is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4200, AS REPORTED

OFFERED BY MR. SPRATT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

In section 421, add after the dollar amount (page 94, line 16) the following: ''(increased by $300,000,000)''.

At the end of subtitle A of title VI (page 209, after line 3), insert the following new section:

SEC. 6___. TARGETED PAY RAISE FOR SENIOR ENLISTED PERSONNEL AND JUNIOR WARRANT OFFICERS.

(a) INCREASE IN BASIC PAY.—The Secretary of Defense shall use $300,000,000 of the amount appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 421 to increase the rates of monthly basic pay for enlisted members of the Armed Forces in the pay grades E–5 through E–9 and warrant officers in the pay grades W–1, W–2, and W–3.

(b) RELATION TO OTHER PAY RAISE AUTHORITY.—Pay increases provided members of the Armed Forces pursuant to subsection (a) are in addition to the increase in the rates of monthly basic pay for members required by section 601.

At the end of subtitle B of title VI (page 230, after line 4), insert the following new section:

SEC. 6_____. INCREASE IN AMOUNT OF IMMINENT DANGER PAY TO COVER DEDUCTIONS FROM BASIC PAY FOR SERVICEMEMBERS' GROUP LIFE INSURANCE COVERAGE.

Section 310 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) ADDITIONAL INCREASE TO COVER DEDUCTIONS FOR SERVICEMEMBERS' GROUP LIFE INSURANCE COVERAGE.—(1) During the period specified in paragraph (3), in addition to the rate of pay authorized by subsection (a) or (e) for a month, a member who is eligible for special pay under this section for a month and who is insured during that month under Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance shall also receive an amount equal to the amount of the deduction from basic pay prescribed for the level of Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance coverage obtained by the member under section 1967 of title 38.

''(2) To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary concerned shall give members who will be assigned to duty under circumstances or in an area for which special pay is provided under this section notice, in advance of the deployment, of the following:

''(A) The availability of additional pay under this subsection for members insured under Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance.

''(B) The ability of members who elected not to be insured under Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance, or elected less than the authorized maximum coverage, to obtain additional coverage as provided in section 1967(c) of title 38.

''(3) Additional pay under paragraph (1) shall be available only during the period beginning October 1, 2004, and ending December 31, 2005. The total amount expended under such paragraph may not exceed $50,000,000.''.

At the end of subtitle A of title II (page 28, after line 14), insert the following new section:

SEC. 2___. ADDITIONAL MATTERS RELATING TO AMOUNTS FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION.

(a) INCREASE FOR NAVY RDT&E.—The amount in section 201(2) for research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy, is hereby increased by $14,700,000, of which—

(1) $6,400,000 shall be available for the Nonlethal Weapons program element (PE 0603851M); and

(2) $8,300,000 shall be available for the Marine Corps Communications System program element (PE 0206313M), of which—

(A) $3,800,000 shall be available within that element for the Communication Emitter Sensing and Attacking System project; and

(B) $4,500,000 shall be available within that element for the Marine Aviation Command and Control System Sustainment project.

(b) INCREASE FOR ARMY RDT&E.—The amount in section 201(1) for research, development, test, and evaluation, Army, is hereby increased by $49,700,000, to be available for the Patriot PAC–3 Theater Missile Defense program element (PE 0604865A).

(c) REDUCTION IN DEFENSE-WIDE RDT&E.—The amount in section 201(4) for research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense-wide, is hereby reduced by $414,400,000, of which—

(1) $77,000,000 shall be derived from the Ballistic Missile Defense System Interceptor program element (PE 0603886C);

(2) $289,400,000 shall be derived, within the Ballistic Missile Defense Midcourse Defense Segment program element (PE 0603882C), from the Ground-based Midcourse Defense Block 2006 program, to be derived by eliminating funding for—

(A) construction of silos;

(B) a second In-flight Interceptor Communications Systems Data Terminal at Fort Greely, Alaska; and

(C) construction of a second launch complex at Fort Greely, Alaska;

(3) $25,000,000 shall be derived from the Ballistic Missile Defense Technology program element (PE 0603175C); and

(4) $23,000,000 shall be derived from the Ballistic Missile Defense Products program element (PE 0603889C).

(d) PROHIBITION ON SPACE-BASED INTERCEPTOR.—None of the amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2005 or any prior fiscal year for the ballistic missile defense may be used to develop the space-based interceptor that is part of the Block 2012 element of the Ballistic Missile Defense System Interceptor program element (PE 0603886C).

(e) LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF SILOS.—None of the amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2005 or any prior fiscal year for the Ballistic Missile Defense Midcourse Defense Segment program element may be obligated for construction of a missile defense interceptor silo at Fort Greely, Alaska, if construction of that silo would result in the total number of such silos at Fort Greely being a number in excess of 16.

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

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later today.

HONORING PAST AND CURRENT MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES AND ENCOURAGING AMERICANS TO WEAR RED POPPIES ON MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. SCHROCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 424) honoring past and current members of the Armed Forces of the United States and encouraging Americans to wear red poppies on Memorial Day.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 424

Whereas the red poppy was the first living plant that sprouted in the battlefields devastated by fighting during World War I;

Whereas red poppies grew abundantly in the trenches and craters of the war-torn battlefields in Northern France and Belgium;

Whereas during World War I, the bloom of red poppies each year and the coming of the warm weather brought hope to those still fighting in the trenches of France and Belgium;

Whereas in 1915, the red poppy inspired Canadian Colonel John McCrae to write the poem ''In Flanders Fields'' in remembrance of the thousands of soldiers who perished during the three battles of Ypres in Belgium;

Whereas in 1918, John McCrae's poem inspired Moina Belle Michael of Athens, Georgia, to write her own poem entitled ''We Shall Keep the Faith'', in which she promised to wear a red poppy to memorialize American soldiers killed in World War I, and later to raise millions of dollars to support and employ disabled American veterans of all wars;

Whereas on November 11, 1921, the first Poppy Day was held in the United Kingdom and was a national success;

Whereas the red poppy is a symbol of sacrifice throughout the world;

Whereas the red poppy has been worn in the United States for more than 80 years as a way to remember those individuals who died fighting for freedom and democracy around the world and to raise money to help disabled veterans; and

Whereas in 2004, wearing a red poppy on Memorial Day is especially timely considering the sacrifices United States soldiers are making in Iraq and Afghanistan for freedom, democracy, and security: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress honors past and current members of the Armed Forces of the United States and their families by encouraging every American to wear a red poppy on Memorial Day as a sign of admiration and thanks to those individuals who died to preserve freedom and democracy in the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCHROCK) and the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCHROCK).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCHROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 424, the concurrent resolution currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHROCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 424.

Mr. Speaker, many of those watching today's proceedings may notice that many of us here on the floor are wearing the red poppy. It is, in fact, a symbol of Memorial Day and an acknowledgment of the sacrifice made by armed services personnel in fighting for our freedom throughout the world.

Next weekend, our Nation will celebrate Memorial Day. All too often we forget the purposes of those celebrations, but Memorial Day is a very important day set aside to honor and acknowledge the sacrifice of all of those who have served our Nation and died in their service to our Nation. It is a day, as we will hear during this debate, with a long and important history.

It is a day which began as Decoration Day, following the deaths during the Civil War of so many soldiers, a day, as we will hear in this debate, civilians went to the fields to decorate the graves of soldiers who had died in battle and decorated the graves of all soldiers, both Confederate and Union.

Mr. Speaker, it is most fitting that this year, in this resolution, we would call upon the American people to make a special point of wearing a red poppy and of acknowledging the ultimate sacrifice made by our troops. Because this year, on Memorial Day, we will have troops in the field in both Iraq and Afghanistan, and throughout the world, who are serving our Nation and who themselves have been joined by soldiers who have made the ultimate sacrifice.

This resolution acknowledges the importance of the red poppy, which has been adopted by the American Legion and by the Auxiliary of the American Legion as the official flower honoring the sacrifice of those who have died in our Nation's service.

□ 1245

It seems to me, as Members will hear in this debate, there was a time in our Nation when all Americans on Memorial Day wore a red poppy to acknowledge sacrifices made by our Armed Forces personnel. It has now become a worldwide tradition.

I commend the gentleman for offering the resolution, and I encourage my colleagues to join in this debate, and I thank them for wearing the red poppy today.

Some 535 red poppies were donated to Congress, and every Member of the House and Senate has a red poppy to wear today and on Memorial Day in recognition of this grand tradition and in recognition of the sacrifice paid by our soldiers, including those who have lost their lives in the recent battles in Afghanistan and Iraq, one of those soldiers being Pat Tillman from my State whose life was tragically lost within the last month.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this resolution.

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

I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 424, introduced by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG). This timely resolution honors the men and women who serve in uniform and calls on all Americans to recognize the sacrifices of those who have given their lives to protect our freedom by wearing a red poppy on Memorial Day, May 30.

In 2 weeks, our Nation will observe Memorial Day. Sadly, the true meaning of Memorial Day seems to have faded over the years, and for many young Americans, Memorial Day is often seen as just another holiday or the beginning of summer. This is sad and unfortunate as Memorial Day is a time to remember and honor those who have died in service, defending our Nation.

The resolution before us honors those who have given their lives in service to their country and encourages Americans to wear a red poppy on Memorial Day.

A number of people have asked, ''Why wear a red poppy?'' The red poppy grew abundantly in the battlefields of World War I, and it was the inspiration for several poems at the time, including such notable poems as ''Flanders Fields,'' written by John McCrae in May, 1915, and a poem by Moina Michael, entitled ''We Shall Keep the Faith,'' written in November, 1918.

The first Poppy Day was held in England on November 11, 1921, and since that time, the red poppy has been a

symbol of sacrifice. For over 80 years, the red poppy has been worn to honor those who have made the ultimate sacrifice for our country and to raise money to help our disabled veterans.

A poem attributed to Don Crawford entitled, ''Why Wear a Poppy'' captures the significance of this special flower, and I would like to read the poem for the RECORD.

WHY WEAR A POPPY

''Please wear a poppy,'' the lady said
And held one forth, but I shook my head.
Then I stopped and watched as she offered them there,
And her face was old and lined with care,
But beneath the scars the years had made
There remained a smile that refused to fade.
A boy came whistling down the street,
Bouncing along on care-free feet.
His smile was full of joy and fun,
''Lady,'' said he ''May I have one?''
When she pinned it on he turned to say,
''Why do we wear a poppy, today?''
The lady smiled in her wistful way,
And answered ''This is Remembrance Day,
And the poppy there is the symbol for
The gallant men and women who died in war,
And because they did, you and I are free,
That's why we wear a poppy, you see.
I had a boy about your size,
With golden hair and big blue eyes.
He loved to play and jump and shout,
Free as a bird he would race about.
As the years went by he learned and grew
And became a man—as you will too.
He was fine and strong with a boyish smile,
But he'd seemed with us such a little while
When war broke out and he went away.
I still remember his face that day.
When he smiled at me and said 'Good-bye,
I'll soon be back, Mom, so please don't cry.'
But the war went on and he had to stay,
All I could do was wait and pray.
His letters told of the awful fight,
(I can see it still in my dreams at night.)
With the tanks and guns and the cruel barbed wire,
And the mines and bullets, the bombs and fire.
Till at last, the war was won,
And that's why we wear a poppy, son.''
The small boy turned as if to go,
Then said, ''Thanks, lady, I'm glad to know.
That sure did sound like an awful fight.
But your son, did he come back all right?''
A tear rolled down each faded cheek,
She shook her head, but didn't speak.
I slunk away in a sort of shame,
And if you were me you'd have done the same,
For our thanks in giving, is oft delayed,
Though our freedom was bought, and thousands paid,
And so when we see a poppy worn,
Let us reflect on the burden borne
By those who gave their very all
And asked to answer their country's call,
That we at home in peace might live.
Then wear a poppy. Remember—and give!''

Mr. Speaker, this Memorial Day each hometown across America will pause to remember the heroes of this generation as well as those of the past. Let us honor and pay tribute to the over 900 American service members who have given their lives in Iraq and Afghanistan, along with all those who die in service to their Nation.

On Guam, we have lost three young men in Iraq: Specialist Christopher Wesley, Lieutenant Michael Vega, and Sergeant Eddie Chen. One officer, two enlisted men. Wesley, Vega and Chen, these three, are a microcosm of the American people, one Western name, one Hispanic name, and one Asian name.

In these troubled times, it is worth reflecting on Memorial Day who we are as a Nation and what values we stand for. We are a Nation of immigrants whose parents and grandparents have come to these shores seeking individual liberty, prosperity and human dignity. The Nation we call our own is a Nation of compassion and justice. It is a Nation worth dying for. It is a Nation of opportunity and freedom.

We on Guam know what freedom is all about because we also know what occupation is. We celebrate Liberation Day on Guam every year as the day of deliverance of enemy occupation and the return of freedom after 32 months of enemy subjugation. We know what it means to thank Marines, soldiers, airmen and sailors for their sacrifices because it was not all that long ago that we were an occupied land.

Tomorrow, I will be accompanying former Congressman General Ben Blaz, the veterans of the 5th Field Service Depot of the United States Marine Corps to Arlington National Cemetery. We will lay a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier to express our deep appreciation to all those who serve and have served our Nation in uniform. We thank them, honor them, and will never forget them.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) for introducing this resolution. I want to thank my very good friend of nearly 3 decades, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO), for that wonderful poem. I know the sacrifices the folks on Guam made. I was privileged to serve in Guam during my Navy career, and I know what a great place that is and what a wonderful woman the gentlewoman is.

Mr. Speaker, as our Nation struggles to answer threats to our security in this global war on terror, it is appropriate that we both remember and seek inspiration from the sacrifices of the generations that have gone before in defending our freedoms, our way of life and the ideals on which our Nation is founded. Their sacrifices changed the world in which we live and made possible the freedoms we enjoy in today's world. Ours is a continuation of their struggle.

The red poppy is a symbol that even on the tortured soil of a war-torn battlefield, our soldiers can be reminded that despite the death and violence which surrounds them, the world for which they are fighting is vibrant and future beautiful. This remains an important symbol for every American, both in and out of uniform, who may feel overwhelmed by the death and violence of today's world.

It is important that we stop and consider the sacrifices of our men and women in uniform. Their service is an honorable one, and our Nation owes them a debt we can never fully repay. That our Nation takes a day to contemplate and remember their sacrifice is an appropriate tribute to their efforts.

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

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL), but first thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCHROCK) for his very kind words.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, and we should wear poppies to honor the sacrifices of our troops, but we should express our support not only on our lapels, but in our budgets.

It is somewhat ironic to me that we would consider this bill, as important as it is, only a few moments after we had a rule on this floor on our defense budget, a rule that excluded an amendment that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and I advanced that would pay for our troops' life insurance.

I have lost four constituents from my district in Afghanistan and Iraq: Raheen Tyson Heighter, Michael Esposito, Jacob Fletcher, and Nate Bruckenthal.

Raheen Tyson Heighter was 19 years old when he joined the Army. And when he was told that he needed life insurance, this young man, being a fearless young man, chose the least expensive life insurance policy because the premium was all that he could afford, and the policy was all that he believed he needed because he believed he would be coming back home.

He did not come back home alive; he was killed on July 24, 2003. His casualty officer called his mother and said, Your son's life insurance policy was $10,000.

Mr. Speaker, $10,000 is not adequate. And what is even worse is while Mr. Heighter was taking bullets in Iraq, Uncle Sam was taking 80 cents a month from his gross monthly pay of $1,987, including hazard duty pay, for his life insurance.

Mr. Speaker, I know that we all agree, when we send troops into combat to protect our national security, they should not have to worry about their family's financial security in the event they do not return.

I know that all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle agree that we have an obligation to honor those who have made the eternal sacrifice every single day, that we must display our commitment and our reverence to them, display it; but also pay for what we owe them as well, not simply display, but pay to help their families.

That would be the true mark of how we honor our heroes, the men and women who have made such heroic sacrifices, with poppies, but also with dollars.

I, of course, will support and proudly vote for this bill, but I hope that my

colleagues in this Congress and that the President of the United States will understand that it is more than just poppies and it is more than just words, it is budgets that count ultimately.

Mr. SCHROCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) to refocus our attention on what this bill is really about.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, I can remember as a young boy, going to downtown Pontotoc, Mississippi, with my parents on Memorial Day to hand out poppies.

I thought Members might be interested in a little history lesson about the origin of Memorial Day which began as Decoration Day. The facts, as I have come to understand them, are that in 1866 a group of Columbus, Mississippi, women met to decide on a way to honor the Confederate war dead in the local Friendship Cemetery.

Once the ladies arrived at the cemetery, one of the women began placing flowers on the graves of Union soldiers, too, because they also had given their lives for their beliefs.

□ 1300

Other women followed suit and soon all of the graves, Confederate and Union, had flowers. This generous gesture was told and retold and finally made its way to the New York Tribune where the short article was seen by a young attorney named Francis Miles Finch. He was so moved by the generosity of the Southern ladies and their Decoration Day that he wrote the poem ''The Blue and the Gray'' and it was published in the Atlantic Monthly in September of 1867.

Mr. Speaker, other towns may claim Decoration Day or Memorial Day perhaps earlier than the one in Columbus, but Columbus, Mississippi, was the first to honor former enemies. Here is what the Library of Congress said:

''Columbus, Mississippi, thus can rightly claim to be not only one day ahead of Columbus, Georgia, in its observance of Memorial Day but more generous in its distribution of the tributes of honor and mourning.''

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent Columbus, Mississippi, in the Congress, the place where Memorial Day first began.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I humbly suggest that if we want to make the poppy in our lapels more than a mere gesture, we should vote ''no'' on the previous question on the rule that will make in order the defense authorization bill. Because by voting ''no,'' we will make in order the consideration of an amendment that I have offered which contains two key elements that go to the very heart of what it is we are discussing here right now.

We would take a little bit of money out of a huge increase in ballistic missile defense and put it in a place where it will do a lot of good, namely, in targeted pay increases to our enlisted personnel, particularly our NCOs and our junior warrant officers. It costs $300 million. It is not something I pulled out of the air. It was recommended 3 years ago by the last quadrennial review. For 2 fiscal years we have done it; this year we have not in the bill before us. We can rectify that by voting ''no'' and then voting for the amendment.

In addition, we do something else in the amendment that I would offer, that is, we say to every soldier, sailor, airman and Marine going into combat, into harm's way, Uncle Sam is going to see to it that you get the maximum in servicemen's life insurance, group life insurance, $250,000. The premium will be paid by an increase in your imminent danger pay, two things that will say volumes to our soldiers about how much we appreciate what they are doing for today, the risks they are taking; two things that we can say that will make more than just this mere gesture a sincere commitment to those who have gone in harm's way and laid their life on the line to make this the home of the free and the land of the brave.

Mr. SCHROCK. Mr. Speaker, we really have had time to debate what the last gentleman has discussed. It is too bad we are saddening the debate on this for that kind of discussion. There was certainly plenty of time for that.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES), one of the strongest advocates of the military that I have ever known.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia and the gentlewoman from Guam, and I want to thank my friend from Arizona for bringing this resolution to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, it is important, whether we agree or disagree on whether our troops should be in Iraq or not, the fact is they are there. They have families that live in my district, the home of Camp Lejeune, Cherry Point, Seymour Johnson Air Force Base; and I think that probably this year as much as ever if not even more than ever that on Memorial Day we the American people wear the red poppy to show our appreciation and our allegiance to the men and women in uniform and those who have given their sons and their daughters to die for freedom.

I brought with me today on the floor for my couple of minutes the faces of the real. To my left, Mr. Speaker, is a young man whose name is Tyler Jordan. Tyler's father was a gunny sergeant, Phillip Jordan, who was killed last year in Iraq. I bring this to the floor, Mr. Speaker, because this photograph speaks much better than I could ever speak. It shows a young man who is looking at the casket of his father. It is showing a young man who has a folded flag under his arm. These are the faces of the families who have given loved ones from the beginning of this great Nation through and including today.

The other poster, Mr. Speaker, I have outside of my office, 12 of these posters that say ''May We Never Forget.'' The reason for that is why we are here today speaking on behalf of this resolution. The red poppy is a reminder of past wars, of past gifts, of a husband, a wife, a son, or a daughter. This Nation does owe those who have worn the uniform and their families. We should never forget those who wore the uniform for this Nation. We should never forget those who gave their lives.

It so happens that this past Saturday night in my home district, a Reservist, Rodney Murray who died in Iraq 2 weeks ago, I went to visit and I had the chance to speak to the wife, a 24-year-old lady, whose husband, 28, died in Iraq 2 weeks ago. I said, Amanda, on behalf of the United States House of Representatives, I extend to you my deepest sympathy and my gratitude on behalf of my colleagues. Mr. Speaker, tears came to my eyes. I could not even complete the statement.

I close today by saying to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, please support this resolution, as we will do, and let us not forget as we begin to debate the needs of our retired military and those who have served and their families. God bless America and God bless our men and women in uniform.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to go on record to thank the gentleman from North Carolina. I pass those posters every day on my way to my office. I think it is a wonderful tribute that he is paying to the men and women in service who have lost their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and let me compliment my friend and colleague from Arizona for offering this resolution.

It was November 11, 1941. My father, another Ike Skelton, was the best known orator in Lafayette County, and he was invited to speak to the Odessa, Missouri, High School assembly on Armistice Day. By prearrangement with my teacher, he took me out of grade school and we drove to Odessa. I sat in the back of the Odessa student body while I watched the program. The students put on a skit in Army uniform with the leggings and the drill sergeant hat and bass drums simulating artillery, and then my father spoke.

Being a Navy veteran of the First World War, he spoke as a veteran. He said to that student body audience, November 11, 1941, that there are those in this audience that may well have to fight for our freedoms once again. How prophetic he was, because not long thereafter, less than a month, the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor, and Adolf

Hitler the following day declared war on our country. Two of the young men graduating from that high school class of May 1942 gave their lives in Germany on the battlefield.

In the closing part of my father's speech to those students that day, he recited the poem that came out of the Great War written by a Major John McCrae:

In Flanders fields the poppies blow
Between the crosses, row on row
That mark our place; and in the sky
The larks, still bravely singing, fly
Scarce heard amid the guns below.
We are the Dead. Short days ago
We lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow,
Loved and were loved, and now we lie
In Flanders fields.

Take up our quarrel with the foe:
To you from failing hands we throw
Our torch; be yours to hold it high.
If ye break faith with us who die
We shall not sleep, though poppies grow
In Flanders fields.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that we pass this resolution and that we pay honor to those in uniform of yesteryear and that we express appreciation and gratitude for those who defend the freedoms of our country today.

Mr. SCHROCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI).

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to grow up the son of Major General Gene Renzi out of Fort Huachuca, Arizona. I grew up in a home where our house was filled with veterans and troops who came back with great life stories of the sacrifices and the contributions that they made to our Nation.

And so it is a great honor for me to stand before you and pay tribute today to those who have given their full measure, who have contributed so much to our society and who have allowed me to breathe free and to stand in the halls of Congress and to try and serve and give a little back.

I am privileged to serve on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs where it is our obligation to hold and to care for the surviving families, the wives, the spouses, the husbands and the kids who have seen their moms and dads go off and who may have lost their loved ones in defense of our Nation.

We are at a time of patriotism in our country, a real crossroads where our resolve is being tested, with the rise of patriotism and the showing of American flags. The wearing of the poppy flower symbolizes a remembrance of past days where we loved our Nation. That time is welcomed.

Each year I have the great honor to walk in parades all around rural Arizona, small towns like Payson, Arizona. I love to stand behind and walk behind our veterans and our troops. It is so moving each year to see the moms and dads along the parade route rise up out of their lawn chairs and show great respect and deference to our flag by removing their hats, putting their hands over their hearts, and calling out to those veterans the great job, the love that they have for them. Again we breathe free because of the sacrifice our veterans have made.

On this Memorial Day, I ask that we raise the flag, that we wear the poppy, and I give thanks and ask God's grace for our troops and our veterans.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Guam for her leadership and also her eloquence. I have heard her often speak of the military personnel in her area, not only speak for them, but advocate for them; and I thank her for her leadership in this issue and many other issues. I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) for his leadership as well, bringing us together on this day, because I believe it is important to announce to the world that there is not one moment of divide amongst us as it relates to the honor and commemoration of those who honor us by giving the ultimate sacrifice, but also taking the oath to serve in the United States military.

Might I say to you that I come with a heavy heart, for I pay tribute today to a young private by the name of Sotelo. I visited with his family as they learned the tragic news just last year of this young, almost 21-year-old in my congressional district who lost his life on the front lines of Iraq.

□ 1315

His mother cried, his father cried, his family members cried, not because they did not recognize his willingness to give the ultimate sacrifice but because not only was it his sacrifice, but as the family looked into the future of his future, they knew that this bright light would be extinguished forever.

We funeralized him at his beloved high school, Reagan High School, the wishes of his parents, on a very hot, very hot and solemn day in June; and then we looked to honor him on this coming Memorial Day. But also we honored him as his mother was able to spend Mother's Day together with other mothers, the Gold Star Mothers, who lost young people in this terrible thing called war.

I was in Flanders Field, in the burial place of thousands of those from World War I, the graveyards near that area. And I simply want to say that death is a horrible experience for those families left longing, but it is for those brave souls who are willing to give their lives that we must stand together and fight for what is right.

This is a day of honor, and I hope on Memorial Day we will honor them by wearing poppies. But I do believe it is important to bring honor today.

I would have hoped that we would have had a bipartisan rule. I think we must also respect the living by keeping veterans' hospitals open and access to health care available, and by providing for the Spratt amendment to provide $414 million to be able to give an increase in salary. And, yes, I think it is important, even on this day as we raise this wonderful resolution up, to give honor to those who are in the armed services.

We must recognize that accountability is important. As our line officers today are being prosecuted, this does not taint the entire military, for we respect them, but it does say that we hold those responsible at the top, for they are responsible too.

Mr. SCHROCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding me this time.

What a fantastic way to recognize the veterans of all of our wars, but of course this, as we know, the wearing of the poppy, it all started after World War I, and it is talked about in the resolution.

But it was a physician from Canada, Dr. John McCrae, who had a friend who was killed in Belgium and was buried at Flanders Fields, and Dr. McCrae himself, later on, in that war to end all wars, died of pneumonia on the battlefield and never made it back to his practice in Canada. But before he died, of course, he wrote that great poem that we will know today "In Flanders Field," and the last stanza of that poem I think went something like:

"To you from failing hands we throw
The torch; be it yours to hold it high.
If ye break faith with us who die
We shall not sleep, though poppies grow
In Flanders fields."

And what Dr. McCrae was saying to us and to future generations and to all generations was, never forget, no matter what battle it was, whether it was the Civil War or Operation Iraqi Freedom today, these young men and women are dying for a cause; and whether one agrees with them or not, they had no choice.

In many cases, they were conscripted. Today, we have an all-volunteer military, but they are there defending our freedom, and many of them are paying the ultimate sacrifice.

So that is what this poppy says. And for me to have a little opportunity today just before Memorial Day to talk about this and to support H. Con. Res. 424, I am very proud to do that. What a wonderful way to honor our men and women in the military.

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

Mr. SCHROCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

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

I want to recognize two Fourth Congressional District members of our military, Wilfredo Perez, Jr., from Norwalk, Connecticut; and Tyanna Avery Felder from Bridgeport, Connecticut; both lost their lives in Iraq fighting for freedom and fighting for justice and fighting for the United States of America on behalf of a better world.

We have lost 773 in Iraq. We have lost 122 men and women in Afghanistan. And I think it is just absolutely essential we recognize all who have lost their lives by wearing this red poppy on Memorial Day and asking all Americans do that. I thank the sponsors of this legislation for advocating that kind of recognition.

I close by saluting one community, in the 4th Congressional District, Greenwich, Connecticut. In Old Greenwich the community rings a bell for every American who has lost his or her life fighting for America, and that goes back before the Revolutionary War.

We are a great Nation, with an extraordinary history. We must never forget those who served in battle and came home draped in an American flag.

Mr. SCHROCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution as we honor both the past and current members of the armed services, and also their families, as we encourage every member of the American public to wear the red poppy on Memorial Day.

To many people, especially the Nation's thousands of combat veterans on this day, history that goes back all the way to the Civil War, it is an important reminder of all those who died in service to their Nation, the brave, the proud, the strong who gave their lives so that so many of us today can have the freedoms that we have.

And it is proper that we honor this today in light of all those men and women who find themselves in harm's way as we speak, risking their lives over in the Middle East. And it is proper also that this House does all that we can do as we continue to work on this side to provide services for our veterans, services of better health care, enhanced housing access, job opportunities, and benefits for their loved ones at home.

So I encourage all Members and the constituency back in the district in the great State of New Jersey to wear a poppy on this day, and also to honor those men and women by going to the cemeteries, visiting memorials, and also by participating in the National Moment of Remembrance at 3 p.m. to pause and think on the true meaning of this day.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank all of my colleagues who spoke in support of this resolution. Each of us will have a chance to spend some time with veterans from our districts on Memorial Day.

We know we owe them more than words for their service, but the words spoken here today came from the heart. And I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to the liberators of Guam and all of our cherished veterans and outstanding servicemen and women in uniform.

I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG), the author; the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCHROCK); and I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Mr. SCHROCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG), who introduced this resolution.

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

I want to close by thanking all of those who participated in this debate and who discussed the issue of this resolution. The issue of this resolution is not legislation as we debated the last hour regarding the defense appropriation. The issue of this resolution is the honoring of those American armed services personnel who have died in our Nation's service and of the great tradition of Memorial Day.

We heard here today in this discussion that there is indeed a great tradition surrounding Memorial Day that all Americans should be reminded of and should remember; a tradition that, as the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) reminds us, began as far as back as 1866 where veterans who had died, soldiers who had died in the Civil War, both Union and Confederate, had their graves decorated by the wives of Confederate soldiers who had died; a tradition that carried itself forward all the way to this day, a tradition that inspired the poem ''In Flanders Fields,'' read so eloquently by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services.

There are indeed many poems that commemorate this great day in our history. One of them, ''We Shall Keep the Faith,'' written by Ms. Moina Michael of Athens, Georgia, the second city that supported and recognized Memorial Day, says:

We cherish too, the poppy red
That grows on fields where valor led,
It seems to signal to the skies
That blood of heroes never dies.

We have heard in this debate a discussion of the heroes who serve our Nation today, those who have tragically died in combat both in Afghanistan and in Iraq. I think it is indeed fitting that this year all Americans would acquire a red paper poppy and would acknowledge the sacrifice of those who have died.

As I indicated earlier, the red poppy is the national symbol of sacrifice all over the world, not just here in America. That was a tradition inspired by the fact that the red poppy was the first living plant to sprout from the devastation of the battlefields of northern France and Belgium during World War I; and its bright, vibrant color of red brought life and hope and reassurance to those still fighting and was the inspiration for the poem ''In Flanders Fields,'' which I would at this point like to insert in the RECORD, as well as the ''Poppy Poem'' by Doris Theiss, an American Legion member from Arizona, who brought this issue to my office.

It seems to me that it is fitting that this year with so many Americans still engaged in battle and the risk that today or tomorrow or the day after tomorrow or indeed when we celebrate Memorial Day next weekend itself, some American soldier may lose his or her life in the service of our country.

For our colleagues who are watching and for those around the Nation, this four-petaled crepe paper poppy became the official memorial flower of the American Legion and the American Legion Auxiliary in 1923; and in 1927, at the Paris Convention, it was decided that only veteran-made poppies would be distributed by the American Legion Auxiliary. All of the poppies we see here on the floor today, and I would assume through the balance of this week are handmade by veterans.

I think it is most fitting that we honor our veterans, most fitting in particular that we honor those who paid the ultimate sacrifice. And I would hope that by this debate and by this memorial, Americans across the Nation would remember once again the significance and the meaning of Memorial Day they would hopefully acquire from the American Legion or from the VFW, which also recognizes the red poppy, a red, four-petaled poppy like this one, and this coming Memorial Day weekend recognize and honor the tremendous sacrifice made by all those who have died in our Nation's service.

IN FLANDERS FIELDS

(By Lieutenant Colonel John McCrae, MD (1872–1918) Canadian Army)

IN FLANDERS FIELDS the poppies blow
Between the crosses, row on row,
That mark our place, and in the sky
The larks, still bravely singing, fly
Scarce heard amid the guns below.

We are the Dead. Short days ago
We lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow,
Loved and were loved, and now we lie
In Flanders fields.

Take up our quarrel with the foe:
To you from failing hands we throw
The torch; be yours to hold it high.
If ye break faith with us who die
We shall not sleep, though poppies grow
In Flanders fields.

POPPY POEM

A man walked down the street the other day.
The ladies of the Auxiliary came his way.
He took the poppy and gave them a dime.
He mumbled ''Why do they take up my time?''
He put the poppy in the bottom hole of his coat;
Next to some pencils and other notes.
When he went home, he placed the poppy on the table;
The red paper flower with the little white label.
As he looked at the flower, as if inspired;
He wondered ''Who put this flower in this wire?''
He's probably a man who once stood tall;
And for his country he gave his all.
Now gave his all just to walk with a cane.

His strong hand were a sense of power,
Now he makes this little red flower.
In our world, we are busy with money and power,
While this man's job is this little red flower,
He still takes pride in what he has to do;
Petal by petal he makes this flower for you.
Next year when it comes to Poppy Day,
I'll be glad to see the Auxiliary come my way.
I'll cheerfully give them generously;
For the veterans making this flower could have been me.

May God Bless You,
Doris Theiss.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, as this country will shortly celebrate Memorial Day, we pay tribute to the veterans who have honored us with their service, and their sacrifice.

As a Nation, we are united in honoring our war dead, we also need to be as united in honoring our living veterans.

In the last paragraph of his second inaugural address, Abraham Lincoln uttered the words that would ultimately comfort untold numbers of veterans and their families for generations to come. Lincoln challenged the divided nation to "Bind up the Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan."

Mr. Speaker, the promise of lifelong health care that this country made to our men and women in uniform is being threatened, not by the aggression of a foreign power, but by inadequate funding. As our veterans grow older, they require increased dependence on health care services.

Before elected for public office, I served as the chief psychiatric nurse at the Veterans Administration Hospital in Dallas during the 70's. I was privileged to serve in the day care and rehabilitation center of that facility for 15 years. I know firsthand that caring for America's veterans is the ongoing cost of war.

The Dallas Veterans Affairs Medical Center is an excellent example of how our nation can repay some of the debt it owes our brave veterans. The DVAMC operates 216 internal medicine beds, including a 28-bed pulmonary service. Moreover, a number of small VA hospitals and outlying community hospitals refer patients to the DVAMC for the diagnosis and treatment of complicated and unusual problems.

Mr. Speaker, I am worried that the proposed cuts will adversely affect over 70,000 Texas veterans. This number includes more than 18,000 veterans in the Dallas-Fort Worth area. It is estimated that 5,200 active patients in the Dallas-Fort Worth area will drop out of the VA Health Care System.

Mr. Speaker, how can Congress and this administration even consider slashing benefits at a time when our young men and women are still in harm's way in Iraq, Afghanistan and Southwest Asia.

Veterans should not be expected to wait in long lines, and travel farther for health care services at a diminished level. If we fail our obligation to veterans, how can we justify sending more and more young service into harm's way?

As we salute our veterans, we must also recognize the medical care provided by VA medical centers, clinics, and nursing home facilities. I applaud the efforts of the hundreds of compassionate men and women who have dedicated themselves professionally to our veterans. Let us say to them: We salute you and we thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCHROCK) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 424.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put each question on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the following order:

Previous question on H. Res. 649, by the yeas and nays; if ordered, adoption of H. Res. 649; previous question on H. Res. 648, by the yeas and nays; if ordered, adoption of H. Res. 648; and motion to suspend the rules on H. Con. Res. 424, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. CON. RES. 95, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 649 on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 204, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 191]

YEAS—220

Aderholt
Akin
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Collins
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Upton
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—204

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Ballance
Becerra
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Case
Chandler
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kleczka
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lynch

Majette
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—9

Davis (AL)
Deutsch
Hayworth
Johnson, Sam
Leach
Norwood
Simmons
Tauzin
Weldon (PA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington) (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1356

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Mr. HOEFFEL changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 220, noes 204, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 192]

AYES—220

Aderholt
Akin
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Collins
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Upton
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—204

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Ballance
Becerra
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Case
Chandler
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kleczka
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—9

Davis (AL)
Deutsch
Hayworth
Johnson, Sam
Leach
Norwood
Peterson (PA)
Tauzin
Weldon (PA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida) (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1406

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4200, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 648, on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 204, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 193]

YEAS—220

Aderholt
Akin
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Collins
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
English
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen

Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Upton
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—204

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Ballance
Becerra
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Case
Chandler
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kleczka
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—9

Davis (AL)
Deutsch
Emerson
Hayworth
Johnson, Sam
Leach
Norwood
Tauzin
Weldon (PA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1413

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 220, noes 205, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 194]

AYES—220

Aderholt
Akin
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Collins
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Upton
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—205

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Ballance
Becerra
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Case
Chandler
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kleczka
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak

Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—8

Davis (AL)
Deutsch
Hayworth
Johnson, Sam
Leach
Norwood
Tauzin
Weldon (PA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1425

Mrs. JONES of Ohio changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING PAST AND CURRENT MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES AND ENCOURAGING AMERICANS TO WEAR RED POPPIES ON MEMORIAL DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 424.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCHROCK) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 424, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 419, nays 0, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 195]

YEAS—419

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldwin
Ballance
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Becerra
Bell
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Collins
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gephardt
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—14

Baird
Conyers
Davis (AL)
Deutsch
Hayworth
Johnson, Sam
Kingston
Leach
Norwood
Nussle
Radanovich
Reynolds
Tauzin
Weldon (PA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1433

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 191, 192, 193, 194 and 195 I was speaking to 400 WWII veterans from my district. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on all 5 rollcalls.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). Under clause 7(c) of rule XXII, the filing of the conference report on S. Con. Res. 95 has vitiated the following two motions to instruct conferees on that measure:

1. The motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) which was debated yesterday and on which further proceedings were postponed under clause 8 of rule XX; and

2. The motion to instruct on which the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) provided notice yesterday.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE NANCY PELOSI, DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER,
Washington, DC, May 19, 2004.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 211 of the Older Americans Act Amendments of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 3001 note), I hereby appoint Barbara Kennelly of Connecticut and Robert B. Blancato of Virginia, to the Policy Committee of the White House Conference on Aging.

Best regards,

NANCY PELOSI.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4200.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 648 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4200.

□ 1433

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4200) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2005 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2005, and for other purposes, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) each will control 60 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this is a bill that was put together with the bipartisan work of all members of the House Committee on Armed Services, the defense bill for the United States. It was engaged in with a great deal of detail by Republicans and Democrats to try to do the very best we could for the people that wear the uniform of the United States.

Beyond that, Mr. Chairman, we have had enormous publicity the last number of days about the mess at Abu Ghraib. I estimated we have probably devoted as much media attention to that mess involving now, as identified, some seven personnel, as we did to the Normandy invasion, and that is an imbalance. It is time to refocus.

The subjects of the refocus should be the 135,000 great personnel doing their job in Iraq and the tens of thousands doing their job in Afghanistan and around the world in this war against terrorism. So I just thought I might start out, Mr. Chairman, by reminding my colleagues that while that much-publicized mess was taking place with just a few people at Abu Ghraib Prison, Master Sergeant Tony Prior was taking on an enemy position in Afghanistan and was single-handedly taking out four insurgents, the last one in hand-to-hand combat to win the Silver Star.

Jeffrey Bohr, Gunnery Sergeant Jeffrey Bohr was over in Iraq laying down a field of fire to protect his wounded Marines who otherwise would have been killed, and he laid down that field of fire until he himself was killed.

I have dozens of such citations, Mr. Chairman, on the leadership desk, and I would hope that Members walk down. And if their heads are filled with all of the publicity about a few bad apples at Abu Ghraib Prison, I want them to pick up those citations and read about the good apples, the great Americans who fill out this 2.5-million-person force that wear the uniform of the United States, active, Guard and Reserve.

This bill is a big bill, and my great partner, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking member, have worked on it along with all of the members of the committee. Almost all of our members have gone to Iraq now. A lot of them have also gone to Afghanistan, some of them multiple times. We have visited troops, held extensive hearings, and we put together a bill that we think supplies the wherewithal, the equipment for our troops to get the job done.

Let me go over a couple of those things, and then I want to listen to my colleagues on the Democrat side of the aisle who have been such great partners in this endeavor.

First, we have tried to focus on this theater in Iraq because our people need equipment, they need to have the very best equipment. They are over there in the heat and in enemy fire with oppressive living conditions. We have devoted and focused our dollars on that theater, so we pulled some money out of some areas that are not right now relevant, closely relevant, to that warfighting theater, more long-range things, things that are peripheral.

We focused that money on things like force protection, up-armored Humvees, steel for the trucks, the 5-ton trucks for the Army, 7-ton trucks for the Marine Corps, replenishment of ammunition, surveillance capability so we can see the bad guys and engage them before they can get in tight to our troops. All of the leverage we can give them with high technology, we give them in this bill.

We also look to their families. We have this 3.5 percent pay raise across the board, we have an expansion of the amount of money that our troops now get for hazardous duty and for separation from their family. We have also put in a survivor benefit for the widows of our military people and for the widowers of our military people so they will not have this offset against Social Security.

We have tried to do a lot of things on the people's side. We have a great bill with our military housing, our MILCON projects. We have privatization, the cap removed from 2006 on, and we are going to work to make sure there is no seam between 2005 and 2006.

Beyond that, the ranking member and I and a number of other folks have been working and looking at force levels. We now have 10 Army divisions; we used to have 18 in 1991. We have a relatively small Marine Corps, roughly 177,000. We realize we are going to need more people.

And for families who say, How come Joe is not here again for Christmas, whether he is Guard, Reserve, or active, one answer is, we have such a small force that the people have to go more often. And so we have increased in strength by some 10,000 this year, 10,000 next year and 10,000 the next year, and that coincides with Chief of Staff of the Army Schumacher's plan to increase the fighting strength of the U.S. Army by three brigades this year, three brigades next year, and four brigades the year after to add 10 new fighting brigades to the Army for a total of 43. We have also increased the U.S. Marines Corps by 3,000 personnel per year for the next 3 years.

To do that and to do a lot of the other things that we are flowing to the troops, we have also bolted onto this package a supplemental for $25 billion. That supplemental will handle the closing months of this year to make sure that our troops do not run thin on supplies or replenishment or new capabilities in the last few months of this year. It also helps General Schumacher to stand up this new modular force that he is putting into effect and reshaping the Army.

So we have that $25 billion bolted on, and that has lots of good stuff for the troops. It helps to sustain us through any tough things that we may see in the last several months of this year.

Now, we are going to need a new supplemental. We all know that. The chairman of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) talked about that and put a $50 billion wedge in the budget, acknowledging that fact; and we are going to have to come around at some point and have a new supplemental to get through 2005. It all depends on how far we can reasonably project. We think this $25 billion bolt-on that we are doing will do the right things for the troops.

We have gone right down through the unfunded requirements list, things that our Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and our Air Force sent to us, things that they said we need, Congress, we do not have the money for them. And we went in and paid for those things so we can pull them out and deliver them to the troops in this supplemental we have bolted on.

So this is a great bill. I want to commend the ranking member and all of the great members of the Armed Services Committee. We have great subcommittee chairmen who have worked some very tough issues; their ranking members have worked them hard, and we have brought this bill, in what is a

contentious political season, we brought this bill out on a 60–0 vote. It was a 60–0 vote because we have common ground, and that common ground is the Armed Forces of the United States and their well-being.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge my colleagues to support this national defense authorization bill. I will leave aside my disappointment on the rule. We are past that, and we are now discussing the bill in general debate.

This bill is a good bill. It is a solid bill, and I wish first to thank the chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) for his work, for his collegial markup, and for his leadership on the bill, as it was in the committee and reported to the House. We thank the gentleman for that.

This bill is an important one because it funds the military for a year, which is good news for the United States military. For those in uniform at the individual level, it makes a number of improvements on how our soldiers live. Most significantly, it raises the cap on family housing construction. Military service can weigh heavy on a family, and I believe it is much easier for a deployed soldier to know that the family back home is living in decent conditions.

The 3.5 percent larger paycheck, of course, helps. The bill also increases the end strength, that is, the troop strength of the Army and Marine Corps. Since 1995, I have been urging this and as a result in the supplemental part, the $25 billion part of this bill, which is something which should have been done and is done, we are increasing the Army in strength by 10,000, 30,000 over 3 years; and the Marine Corps by 3,000, 9,000 over 3 years.

More broadly, the bill provides funding for the next few months of operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. I was disappointed to receive a budget request that pretended we could not foresee at least some of the level of military activity. I recently wrote that, based on historical precedent, U.S. forces may be in Iraq for the next 50 years.

□ 1445

Whether that is true or not, we can be sure they will be there for more than 3 months.

We are in a war. Neither the country nor this Congress was united in initiating the conflict, but we stand now as one with the soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines fighting it. I expect that much of the debate over the next 2 days will concern Iraq, and rightly so. Let me mention two points, if I may.

First, events of recent weeks, from open questions relating to the transition of sovereignty, to real questions about the role of private military contractors providing security services, to the disturbing events at Abu Ghraib prison highlight the Congress's need to get better information and to take our oversight role more seriously. These are issues critical to our country's security and to our role in the world. This bill makes some steps in those directions.

Second, though, it is important that we not let a focus on the current conflict blind us to the needs of the future. This bill says fiscal year 2005; but the force structures, platforms and policies addressed in it will shape the military for 40 years or more. We have to be prepared for the full range of threats to our Nation and its interests.

We have learned lessons from the past. We have learned some real-life lessons from attempting to rapidly acquire equipment to protect our forces in Iraq. Those lessons have been incorporated into this bill where there is streamlining acquisition language to help protect those who are in harm's way.

I am disappointed in the bill's approach to nuclear weapons development and not going further to fund the foreseeable costs of our current operations. I was disappointed, too, that the amendment of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA SÁNCHEZ) to conform the Uniform Code of Military Justice was not allowed to be on this floor.

But, Mr. Chairman, we are at war. A few moments ago, we paid tribute to those who have served and do serve in uniform on a resolution involving the poppy, which we all wear. But the best thing we can do for those currently serving is to pass this bill to make sure they have the wherewithal to continue fighting and keeping the peace and stability in those far corners of the world. It is one way to say thank you, we support you, not just in words but by our votes today.

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY), chairman of the Subcommittee on Readiness, the subcommittee which oversees the biggest increment of the defense budget, all operations, maintenance and military construction.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, today the U.S. military is deployed around the world in support of the war against terrorism, the efforts to rebuild Afghanistan and Iraq, and defense of the American homeland and U.S. interests abroad. H.R. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act For Fiscal Year 2005, provides the resources necessary to keep the U.S. military ready to overcome any challenge.

H.R. 4200 includes operations and maintenance funds for training, peacetime operational tempo and depot maintenance, as well as resources to support the troops in Iraq and Afghanistan for the first months of fiscal year 2005. Of the $25 billion included in the bill for Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom, $16 billion is directly dedicated to maintaining or improving our military readiness.

H.R. 4200 fully funds the President's environmental programs, including $3.8 billion for pollution prevention, conservation, compliance, and cleanup activities of the Department of Defense. The bill also recognizes and rewards the civilian personnel who support the global war on terror by authorizing additional pay for civilians who are proficient in foreign languages and extending health benefits to government employees who are mobilized Reservists.

In keeping with the theme of this year's bill, The Year of the Soldier, H.R. 4200 contains additional funds for soldier equipment and protective gear, authorizes the Secretary of Defense to reimburse those soldiers who needed protective body armor, but had to buy it themselves, and provides $9.9 billion for military construction and family housing. The bill also contains a provision to eliminate the cap on military housing privatization program as of October 1, 2005, saving this successful program which has improved housing for tens of thousands of military families from termination.

Finally, H.R. 4200 contains a provision that would delay the next base closure round until 2007, pending DoD reports to Congress on a number of absolutely critical, yet still unresolved, infrastructure-related issues. This provision is neither an election-year stunt nor an effort to kill BRAC forever. To the contrary, it is reflective of deep bipartisan concern that the U.S. military is undergoing too much turbulence to allow the 2005 BRAC round to be a fully informed, effective process.

We are a Nation at war against terrorism. Our military is rebuilding Afghanistan and Iraq. The Department of Defense is contemplating the most significant overseas basing changes since World War II. The military requirements to defend the homeland continue to evolve and military transformation continues to change the basic training and operational requirements of our Nation's forces. Each of these issues is a significant factor in determining the domestic basing needs of our Nation's military, and each of these issues is not yet resolved. Until the Department resolves these issues and Congress has the opportunity to review and approve these decisions, a base closure round is premature and is sure to result in poor closure and realignment decisions. As a Nation, we simply cannot afford to close a military installation in the 2005 BRAC round only to discover in 2010 that the assets at that base were both irreplaceable and now lost forever.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. I encourage the support of everyone for this piece of legislation.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ), the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Readiness.

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

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Missouri for the fine work that they have done in putting this bill together; and, of course, as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Readiness, I am pleased to join the gentleman from Colorado in commending H.R. 4200 to my colleagues' attention and urge them to vote for this great bill because we have worked together as a nonpartisan group. We have every reason to be proud of this bill as a whole and the readiness-related portions in particular. It reflects fair and thoughtful leadership and a lot of hard, bipartisan work on the part of the committee. Again I thank the gentleman from Colorado for that. Also I want to say thank you to our staff because it is not easy when you are working on a $400 billion bill to be able to put everything together and bring it to the floor. So to the staff, thank you for a great job.

I would first like to say how proud I am of our military forces and of the thousands of civilian workers who work night and day to support our military. We owe them a debt of gratitude for their service.

Mr. Chairman, we are a Nation at war. This bill that we have put together is a prudent way to approach the difficult balancing of competing demands to assure that our troops have what they need for success. To that end, we have authorized nearly $120 billion for their peacetime operating and maintenance requirements. But, of course, we are not in a peacetime environment. For example, the Army testified that coming into this fiscal year it had $1.2 billion of unfunded maintenance requirements as it began bringing its equipment back from Iraq and Afghanistan.

Not only that, we are now depending a little too much on the Reserves and the National Guard. It has come to my attention that sometimes this equipment stays behind. They do not bring it back with them. The gentlemen who serve as National Guardsmen and Reserves are first responders in our communities. When they come back, they might not even have the equipment to train with because it is left behind. H.R. 4200 makes some progress on those concerns, but we know that we can expect a significant bill to come due when we begin to reset the force, repair the equipment as it returns from the war, and restock our prepositioned assets. That bill will be billions of dollars.

Today I ask my colleagues to support this bill. It is a good bill. It is a bipartisan bill. This is exactly what our troops need.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado and the gentleman from Texas for their great work.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), who chairs the Subcommittee on Terrorism which oversees all of our special operators and who has spent a ton of his time this last year going to some very inconvenient places to make sure that our troops get what they need.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, let me begin by thanking and congratulating the chairman and the ranking member for the great leadership that they have each shown in bringing us through this process beginning in January, working through February, March and April; and here we are on May 20 taking another step forward in this process of making sure that we provide the resources that are needed by our troops in this, The Year of the Troops, which is what this bill is named after.

I rise in strong support of the bill, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005. Last week the Committee on Armed Services approved this bill unanimously, continuing the committee's tradition of bipartisanship in addressing the defense needs for our Nation. The bill contains several initiatives that will aid the armed services and the Federal Government as a whole in the ongoing war against terrorism and contains several promising provisions that will help to transform the military services.

At the request of the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), we adopted the theme The Year of the Soldier and emphasized initiatives that would directly assist our deployed forces. We are aware of the challenges they face in Iraq and Afghanistan and want to do everything we can to make conditions safer for them and to make it possible for them to be ever so effective. An important element in the committee's Year of the Soldier theme is force protection, and that is a concern that influenced all we did this year.

We have taken a number of actions in this bill to provide the resources and direction to better equip our men and women who are serving selflessly in dangerous conditions overseas. In this bill, we provide for our valiant warriors in the Special Operations Command. We have authorized funds, for example, for several items in the SOCOM commander's unfunded requirements priority list and have authorized additional funding that would provide some necessary operational flexibility for special operations forces on the ground.

We continue to believe that the best way to fight terrorism is to keep terrorists far from our shores. I continue to believe that the Special Operations Command is one of our most effective weapons in this mission. This bill bolsters the command's capabilities in several ways.

Next, the bill provides increased funding to accelerate the development and fielding of advanced technologies for emerging critical operations needs, including projection of our forces against improvised explosive devices and rocket and mortar attack and to provide real-time surveillance of suspected enemy activities.

I could add here, Mr. Chairman, there is a very strong provision which we added late in the game because at a hearing on April 21 it became apparent that it took just too long to field new kinds of technologies. We have provided a special program to provide capabilities for the chief of staff of the Army and his staff to provide in a more quick fashion the capabilities that are needed by our soldiers.

In addition, this bill provides increased funding for combating terrorism in terms of technological support to accelerate the development and fielding of advanced technologies for the fight against terrorism.

Finally, we continue to expand our successful initiative of last year to develop chemical and biological defense countermeasures.

Mr. Chairman, I would be remiss if I did not say a word about something that we are doing for those who have fought in previous wars. We have found the resources this year to add $7 billion over a 10-year period to bolster and bring up to date the survivors benefit program that retired individuals and their spouses are able to avail themselves of.

□ 1500

We move the percentage of survivors benefits, that is, generally widows, from a 35 percent level to a 55 percent level.

This SBP program is an extremely important program because what happened was that in the past, when a member who served in the military passed away, his surviving spouse, usually, of course, his widow, would receive 55 percent of his retired pay up until she turned 62 and then that percentage would drop to 35 percent.

We have fixed that in providing $7 billion over 10 years to bring that 35 percent back up over a 4-year period to the 55 percent level. This is important. It is a way of saying thank you to those who have served our country and is a very important part of our bill.

In closing, I just want to express my appreciation to the members of the Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee, who contributed so mightily to this bill, and particularly thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN), the ranking member, with whom I have worked closely over the years.

This is an excellent bill. I congratulate the chairman for bringing it here. I urge all Members to vote ''yes'' on this bill.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New

York (Mr. ISRAEL), a member of the committee.

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

I rise in strong support of this authorization. And, of course, we have to give credit where credit is due, and that is to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), chairman, and to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), ranking member.

This bill includes funding for transformational weapons systems that will help our military meet the challenges of the 21st century, billions of dollars for new naval destroyers, Army combat systems, and fighter aircraft programs.

These programs may be worthwhile, but I remember back in January when I was on a C–130 traveling from Kuwait to Baghdad, a member of the 1st Armored Division looked at me and said, Congressman, you have got to do something about these improvised explosive devices, these roadside bombs. They are the biggest threat that we face.

There has been a lot of talk in Washington about countering these threats with hardware, with systems that are lighter and leaner and faster, more precise, more agile, more lethal; and I understand the need for that hardware transformation, but we also need a software transformation. Our committee had Major General Robert Scales before us, he is the former Commandant of the U.S. Army War College; and he talked about the fact that our troops have exquisite situational awareness, but we need to invest them with more cultural awareness.

They know where every tank is, their speed, their direction, their firepower, how they are arrayed. What we need to make sure of is that they know who is in the tank, what language they are speaking, not just their firepower but their willpower. And that is why I want to thank our chairman and ranking member for including in this authorization two amendments that I offered which will establish a Defense Language Office within the Department of Defense and require the Secretary of Defense to assess the military's foreign language and cultural awareness capabilities. Those skills are just essential to success in the future.

Mr. Chairman, it is indisputable to us that our current forces are doing an extraordinary job of adapting to challenges on the ground. They deserve defense budgets that anticipate 21st century changes, not Cold War challenges. They deserve defense budgets that value their minds as well as their arms. And I want to again thank the gentleman from California (Chairman HUNTER) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), ranking member, for including the amendments that I proposed in this authorization; and I urge the other body to accept those amendments.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER), who has great expertise in the area of defense.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005. I want to commend the gentleman from California (Chairman HUNTER); the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), ranking member; and the entire committee for bringing this bill to the House floor at this crucial time for America's Armed Forces. The committee had to balance many difficult needs and did a great job.

The last several months have been very difficult for our men and women serving in the United States military. The actions of a few at Abu Ghraib Prison in Iraq must not reflect badly on their fellow soldiers, sailors, Marines and airmen serving so bravely in the war on terrorism. The barbaric murder of an American civilian captured on videotape has reminded us of the true nature of our enemy and why we must win this war. Our troops are on the front lines fighting this war for each and every one of us, and they deserve our full support and gratitude.

By passing the defense authorization bill this week, the House of Representatives will send a strong message of support to our troops and a resolve to friends and enemies across the globe. We must stand firm and continue our fight against terrorism. There is no more important battle today.

The bill authorizes over $420 billion for the Department of Defense and the national security programs at the Department of Energy. It includes many important provisions for our troops, their families, and America's veterans.

The bill also authorizes an additional $25 billion in supplemental funding to ensure that our men and women fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan will have all the resources they need.

Finally, the bill funds many important weapons programs that will ensure our military strength for decades to come. I want to focus on some of those critical weapons programs: the F–34 Joint Strike Fighter, the F/A–22 Raptor, and the V–22 Osprey.

The F–35 Joint Strike Fighter, or JSF as we call it, will be the prime multirole fighter for the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps for the 21st century. The defense authorization bill fully funds the President's budget request for continued development of the JSF.

The basic JSF design, with several modifications to meet each service's needs, will be used for all three services. The aircraft will have the best next-generation avionics, weapons systems, and stealth capabilities. It will also have dramatically increased range over our current fighters. We simply must continue to develop the Joint Strike Fighter, and the underlying bill fully supports the program.

The F/A–22 Raptor is the Air Force's state-of-the-art, next-generation fighter aircraft. As with the JSF, the committee has fully funded the President's request for the F/A–22. Specifically, the bill includes funding to build 24 new F/A–22s over the next fiscal year.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), ranking member on the Strategic Forces Subcommittee.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding me this time, and I thank our chairman for always working together in a very strong bipartisan manner on this very important committee as it involves the national security of our country.

Mr. Chairman, the Strategic Forces Subcommittee has jurisdiction over some of the most contentious and controversial issues considered by the overall committee, including ballistic missile defense and nuclear weapon development programs. While we did not reach complete bipartisan accord on these two issues, the subcommittee and the committee generally had substantive and cordial debates on all of these matters.

I am somewhat disappointed, Mr. Chairman, that even though the bill contains $10 billion for various ballistic missile defense programs, no amendment was made in order to allow for legitimate debate and a vote on important policy issues related to those programs.

I am, however, pleased that we will have an opportunity to debate the wisdom of developing new nuclear weapons. The mark contains the President's budget request for both the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator and an initiative to study new nuclear weapons designs called Advanced Concepts. I will encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of the Tauscher amendment which would transfer these funds to a more realistic and conventional alternative to ''bunker busting.''

Our committee reached bipartisan agreement on the space programs within this mark. We reduced funding for the Transformational Satellite Communications program by $100 million and prevent the Air Force from downselecting a prime contractor on space-based radar until they provide a report to Congress. Members on both sides of the aisle are concerned about the affordability and the technological readiness of these programs.

Overall, the mark of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee is one that I support. I am especially pleased that we were able to reach a bipartisan agreement to add funding for THAAD, which is critical and important to better protecting our troops in the field of theater-range ballistic missiles. I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EVERETT), my partner and my chairman, for his leadership on this issue and our subcommittee in general. Even on those areas where we disagree, he has always been a straightforward and fair individual, and it has been a pleasure to work with him.

I also want to state today my concern about the number of troops in our armed services. I am pleased that the

bill increases the end-strength levels for the Army and Marine Corps over the next 3 years, but I remain concerned that this surely is not enough. Simply put, we do not have enough troops to sustain our commitments around the world, facing the current challenge. We are starting to crack around the end-strength issue, and this may be an indicator that we may have to reevaluate and reprioritize the various theaters.

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

I want to thank the gentleman for his hard work and the fact that he has been in Iraq and Afghanistan more than any other member, which is very important to this committee.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT), the very thoughtful chairman of the Projection Forces Subcommittee.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, before proceeding, as chairman of the Projection Forces Subcommittee, I believe it appropriate to first underscore the magnificent service rendered the Nation by the men and women serving in our Armed Forces around the world. We have called upon them and continue to call upon them to be ready to make the ultimate sacrifice in their service to the Nation. They continue to meet every challenge with true dedication and commitment. We thank each and every one of them for their service, and we thank all Americans for their unwavering support of our servicemen and women.

History has repeatedly taught us that peace is only achieved through strength. We have sought to apply the lessons learned from the ongoing war on terrorism and operations in Iraq and Afghanistan to the committee markup of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005, in order to strengthen our Armed Forces.

Oceans cover three-fourths of the Earth's surface. The vast majority of the world's population lives within 2 miles of a seacoast. Seventy percent of our trade moves by sea. Clearly, maintaining America's naval superiority is an imperative, not an option.

I am pleased to report that the National Defense Authorization Act that we will consider increases the requested authorization for Department of Defense programs within the jurisdiction of the Projection Forces Subcommittee by $890 million; $296 million of the additional authorization is for programs on the military service chiefs' unfunded requirements list.

Authorization is included for the administration's request of one Virginia Class submarine, three DDG–51 destroyers, one LPD–17 amphibious assault ship, and two cargo and ammunition ships.

We have also taken several initiatives to begin to address shortfalls in important requirements of the Department of Defense. All of these programs are viewed as critical enablers for operations in Iraq and Afghanistan.

These programs include $150 million additional authorization to begin development of the amphibious assault ship replacement; $96 million as the fiscal year 2005 increment to begin the regeneration process to restore 10 additional B–1s to combat-ready condition; $98 million to upgrade the fleet of B–2 bombers; $100 million to continue a next-generation bomber program to replace the now 42-year-old B–52 bomber fleet; $95 million to begin the recapitalization of the Air Force's aging aerial refueling tanker fleet; and $23 million to complete development and evaluation of the Affordable Weapon System, a low-cost cruise missile that is the successful result of an Office of Naval Research advanced technology initiative to demonstrate the ability to design, develop, and build a capable and affordable precision-guided weapons system at a cost that would be an order of magnitude cheaper than comparable weapons systems; and increased authorization for several procurement and research and development programs of the services.

In addition, the recommended mark includes important legislative proposals: to accelerate the DDG–51 Aegis guided missile destroyer modernization program; and to establish an independent body of manufacturing experts to find ways to again make the United States shipbuilding industry competitive. Ad hoc government policy and business management adjustments to reductions in the fleet from 600 to less than 300 are not adequate or acceptable to make the necessary short-term and long-term decisions to maintain the capacity and capability of this critical and complex industrial base. Once lost, that industrial base cannot be easily reconstituted.

This study will rigorously analyze all of the relevant factors and make recommendations to ensure the capability of America's shipyards to build the ships for our Navy and to be competitive against other shipyards in the global marketplace.

While there is much more to do, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 is an important step in making our country more secure. I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR), the ranking member of our subcommittee, for his extraordinary partnership, dedication, and support in completing this bill. I would like to thank all of my other colleagues on the subcommittee for their diligence, commitment, and hard work.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), our chairman, for his leadership; and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), our ranking member.

In conclusion, I would especially like to thank and recognize the contributions of the many staff members for their invaluable assistance in preparing H.R. 4200.

□ 1515

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), the ranking member of the Select Committee on Homeland Security and a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. TURNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services for their leadership on this bill today.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of our troops and in support of this defense authorization bill, but I urge my colleagues to be up front with the American people about the true cost of our operations in Iraq. The supplemental $25 billion included in this bill for operations is not enough. We all know that at the rate we are spending money in Iraq, this will only last a few more months.

Democrats on the Committee on Armed Services unanimously supported a $67 billion authorization to ensure we can do what is necessary to provide stability in Iraq, and we have been denied the opportunity to have a vote on this issue on the floor by the Committee on Rules.

To accomplish our goal in Iraq, we need additional troop strength; we must commit whatever is necessary to force protection; we need to increase recruiting and training for the Iraqi military and police forces; and, finally, we need a bold and urgent plan that gives the Iraqi people the opportunity to determine their own destiny.

We have set a June 30 deadline for the handover of political authority to the interim Iraqi Government. The President has correctly said we must keep this deadline. Deadlines are important motivators; they give purpose and direction and urgency to both planning and execution. The Iraqi people must also keep the deadline to adopt a permanent constitution on or before October 15, 2005.

It is equally clear that we should also establish a clear and unambiguous deadline of December 31, 2005, to turn over complete responsibility for peacekeeping to the Iraqi civilian police and the Iraqi military. Thereafter, we should commit, if invited by the new government to participate in an international advisory group, to assist the Iraqi people in a successful transition to stability and democracy.

The Iraqi people are capable, resourceful, and educated; and we know that stability can be achieved with hard work and strong commitment. We can and should encourage and support democracy in Iraq; but in the final analysis, the Iraqi people must choose democracy and a form of government fashioned by their own history, their own values, and their own initiatives.

Our brave soldiers and the American people have already and will continue to pay in blood and treasure to achieve this goal. A clear timetable will more likely achieve a successful outcome. Both the people of America and the people of Iraq deserve no less.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EVERETT), the chairman of our Subcommittee on Strategic Forces which oversees our nuclear component, space assets, and many critical aspects of national security.

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

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me say how much I enjoy being on this great committee. There is not a member of this committee that is not interested in serving the American fighting man and woman. We owe much of our attitude to our great leadership from our full committee chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), and our ranking member, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON). I would be remiss if I did not also note it is a pleasure for me to work with my ranking member and partner, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES). He has made great contributions to this markup.

Mr. Chairman, ongoing operations in Iraq and against terrorism at large call for a fresh look at military requirements. These lessons learned illustrate that today's defense forces must be powerful, versatile, and be able to deploy globally with great speed.

Moreover, our national security investment must continue the development of transformational capabilities of future systems. Given that, this bill supports the administration's objectives while making significant improvements to the budget request and incorporating the chairman's theme of supporting the war fighter.

Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces' effort continues to fund missile defense, military space and atomic energy programs. As we quickly approach the deployment of the Nation's first national missile defense capability later this summer, this bill fully funds the GMD system.

In the area of military space, the bill shifts funds from longer-term follow-on systems to more near-term capabilities, including the Operationally Responsive Satellite and the Advanced EHF Satellite. The bill adds funding for the SBIRS High program and ensures sufficient technological maturity for the Space Based Radar and the TSAT program.

Within Atomic Energy Defense Activities, the bill funds the National Nuclear Security Administration at the budget request. The bill includes modest reductions for directed stockpile work and campaigns while adding $50 million for infrastructure upgrades that are badly needed. The committee recommends $5.88 billion for defense site acceleration completion, an increase of $62 million over fiscal year 2004.

Mr. Chairman, the committee's recommendation addresses the administration's objectives, many of DoD's unfunded requirements, and Member priorities. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking member on the Committee on the Budget and also a distinguished member of the Committee on Armed Services.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I commend my good friend, the chairman. We do not agree about everything; nevertheless, I hope that is not a sign of what is about to come. He does a wonderful job of chairing the committee, and he has brought to the floor a good piece of legislation. We thought it could be better. I wish there were more amendments in order, but I do not want to diminish the significance of what is in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, with troops in the field being bombed and shot at, we cannot be stinting about what we provide our troops. We have got to give them the resources they need to do the tough tasks that they have taken on. But with the defense bill before us running at a level of $422 billion, that is an increase of $125 billion in 3 years, and with the costs of our operations in Iraq alone approaching $200 billion by the end of next year, military and economic reconstruction, Congress also cannot relax its oversight responsibilities and we should not rubber-stamp what the administration sends us.

That is why I thought more of the 100-odd amendments we offered should have been made in order. We could have a good, full debate on the House floor about priorities. That is why I wanted to take the ballistic missile defense account, which the administration wants to increase by $1.2 billion, to make it twice as big as any other program in the procurement and R&D accounts; why I wanted to take just a little bit, $400 million off the top of that, leaving an increase of $800 million; take a little off the top of that and then spread it to someplace else in the budget where I think it would do a lot more good, and that is in compensating the backbone of our military services, our NCOs and warrant officers, with a pay raise above the level provided other troops, at least in the rate of increase.

In addition, I wanted to provide $25 million to $50 million, that is all, so we could say to every troop we send into combat, Uncle Sam will pick up the premium and we will see to it that every one of you has $250,000 of group life insurance.

Now, there are some good things in this bill, as I said. I want to congratulate the chairman for leaning on DoD to send us a supplemental, because we were sailing into the next year under the artificial representation that we had enough money and we could move it around and we could get to the next calendar year. We cannot do it.

But I do not think we should give the administration a blank check, and, to a great extent, we have not done that; and I commend the chairman for that. We have provided some line item specificity in title 15 of this bill. We have also, in response to the administration's request for transfer authority, we said to them you can have transfer authority for $3 billion, but not for $25 billion. All of that is an improvement over the request.

But nobody should think that $25 billion is going to get us through the year. We will be lucky if it takes us to March. That is because we are spending $4 billion to $5 billion easily every month in Iraq; it is not likely to go down. We are spending $700 million to $900 million every month in Afghanistan; it is not likely to go down. We are spending $500 million a month for Noble Eagle, United States air defense and other things like that. It is close to $6 billion a month.

The arithmetic is easy, even on the back of an envelope. $6 billion times 12 months is $72 billion. We have only provided $25 billion of it. We could easily have another supplemental coming in 2005 of $50 billion.

That is why I want to remind everybody of the budget. It just so happens we are going to have the defense bill back to back with the budget; and let us keep in mind when the administration talks about runaway spending, the increase in spending in the budget, that much of it is occurring in the defense accounts. That is not to diminish or damn the amount of money that is being spent there; it is essential. But it also gets added into the calculation, and it is having an impact.

If you look at current services for everything in the discretionary budget and look at the spikes that are really standing out, what you will find is that 90 to 95 percent of the increase in discretionary spending over the last 4 fiscal years, every year has either been defense, homeland security, and our response to 9/11.

Quickly, let me show you a chart that is almost too much to read from this perspective. Basically, what we show here is the FYDP, the Future Years Defense Program, run out of 10 years, when Mr. Bush came to office was about $3.6 trillion in 2001. If you include what he has added, plus the costs just through this year of Iraq, it is about $4.6 trillion. If you go back and make some reasonable adjustments for policy changes in procurement and also add in the cost of Iraq and Afghanistan after 2005, you are easily up to a $1.5 trillion increase in spending.

Mr. Chairman, what I am saying is that we cannot forget the budget; we cannot forget the deficit. It has a huge impact on the economy. The economy is the first instrument of our national defense.

Secondly, sooner or later, if these costs keep running at this level, we have got to turn to the American people and ask more than our troops to share the sacrifice; we have to ask the American people to pick up some of the

costs that we are running here for our defense and homeland security. The bill has to be paid sooner or later, the day of reckoning is coming, and we are only postponing it with the budget we will take up after this bill is considered today.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), a very distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act For Fiscal Year 2005.

First, I would like to commend the gentleman from California (Chairman HUNTER) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), for their leadership in bringing this good bill to the floor. The gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) was referred to this morning in our conference as the troop's chairman, and I think that is exactly what he is; and he has brought a bill that is great for the troops.

Mr. Chairman, hundreds of thousands of brave American soldiers, including mothers, fathers, sisters and brothers, are fighting to protect our freedom and liberty throughout the world; and we owe it to them and to their families to pass this bill today.

The cornerstone of H.R. 4200 is the $2 billion plan to equip our troops with the latest and most state-of-the-art safety equipment, including body armor, armored Humvees, and armor add-on kits for thin-skinned vehicles.

Many times the best and most innovative of these technologies are developed by our Nation's small businesses who are able to produce cutting-edge military equipment at a lower cost. That is why we have included language in the bill to encourage the Department of Defense to provide greater consideration to the advantages and innovations offered by small business.

The bill also directs the Department to award more contracts to small businesses through broader utilization of phase 3 of the Small Business Innovative Research Program. I thank the gentleman from California (Chairman HUNTER), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman WELDON), and the committee staff for working with me to include this language in the bill.

I cannot overstate the strong impact that small businesses have on the Department of Defense. Our country's small businesses are the engines of American technological innovation, and they will significantly enhance the ability of the American war fighter and help save many lives.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4200 is a solid bill which focuses on protecting our troops on the battlefield and strengthening our support for them at home. It contains several other provisions that I support, including a solid pay raise for our troops, increases in their hardship pay, and elimination of their out-of-pocket expenses for housing, among other things.

□ 1530

This package is the least we could do for our brave men and women of the Armed Forces who risk their lives every day to protect America and our freedoms around the world. I urge all of my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 4200.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Projection Forces.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the young men and women who serve in our Nation's Armed Forces are not Democrats, they are not Republicans; they are Americans. And I am happy to say that I feel like the package that was put together was not put together by Democrats or Republicans, but by Americans who care about our Nation's defense. And I think it does some very good things.

First and foremost, I would like to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) for his efforts in working with us to delay the next round of base closures. As we have pointed out, we are growing the Army. Almost everyone in the Army is spoken for. They are either in Iraq, just got home from Iraq or getting ready to go to Iraq.

This is a time of great uncertainty, and we do not need to further complicate that uncertainty by closing bases with a number that was artificially picked prior to September 11.

It is my understanding that there will be efforts to put the next round of base closures back into the bill. I would encourage my colleagues to vote against that. We have come to a very fair compromise when people like me, who would just as soon do away with BRAC entirely, and a level head like the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) said, we should delay it. And I support that delay.

We should continue to work and we continue to work on programs that protect our troops. With things like up-armored Humvees, with things like jammers to prevent improvised explosive devices from unnecessarily taking the lives of young Americans. We have worked to provide hazardous duty pay for those people whose primary military mission is fire-fighting.

As my great colleague from Maryland has said, we have taken several significant steps to help our Nation's Navy and shipbuilding programs with three destroyers, a submarine, an amphibious cargo ship, an amphibious assault ship for the Marine Corps, and the LHD, which is also an amphibious assault ship for the Marine Corps.

We have taken steps to limit the amount of foreign flag vessels that can be leased by our Nation's Navy. Again, my chairman, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) is doing a great job of trying to revitalize American shipbuilding. We do not help that one bit when we go out and lease foreign-flag vessels. They should be made here in our country, instead of being built and leased from overseas.

We have worked, and again, I want to compliment all of my colleagues, I think this passed unanimously, to fix the problem with the survivor benefits program where the widows of the people who served in our Nation's military were not given what they were promised. Their retirement benefit was reduced by their Social Security. That should not be the case and I commend everyone who worked on that, in particular, my friend from Pensacola, Florida (Mr. MILLER), who is a sponsor of that amendment.

The last thing I would like to mention to my colleagues is, we are indeed at war. Over 700 young Americans have lost their lives in Iraq. More, including a great football player, have lost their lives in Afghanistan; and we are truly blessed by every single person who chooses to serve our Nation in its Armed Forces.

I would point out that in just a little while we will be having a vote on the conference report to our Nation's budget. And I would like to ask my colleagues, in addition to supporting this bill, to keep in mind that those who are fortunate enough not to have to fight in this war ought to, at the very least, be willing to pay for it now, not with borrowed money and not with sticking future generations of Americans with a bill that we are not willing to pay.

So I would encourage Members to vote for the defense authorization bill. I would encourage Members to vote against bringing BRAC back into this bill; and I would encourage Members to vote against the budget that does not pay for this bill with today's dollars, but pays for this bill with borrowed money that our children will have to pay.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman who just spoke for his hard work on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CHOCOLA).

Mr. CHOCOLA. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman for yielding me time and for his leadership on bringing this very important legislation to the floor.

This legislation supports our American men and women in uniform and it helps give them the tools to defend the freedoms that we all hold so dear and to keep our country safe. Specifically, I want to thank the chairman for his wisdom in investing $830 million approximately in Humvee production.

Humvees are manufactured in my district in Mishawaka, Indiana, by AM General. The men and women at AM General certainly do a tremendous job in manufacturing this very effective tool in the war on terror. And the investment in this production is certainly good for the 2,500 employees at AM General, it is good for our local economy, but most importantly, it provides a force protection tool for our soldiers that saves American lives.

As an example, about a year ago I went to Bethesda Naval Hospital and I met with a young Marine who had been injured in combat in Iraq. He told the story of the Navy corpsman, after he was hit, that dragged him to safety between two Humvees that were strategically placed in the battlefield.

Just 2 weeks ago I met another Marine that had lost his right arm in combat in Iraq. I flew to my district with the President, and as the President stepped off the plane, the Marine shook his hand and told him the story about how he owed his life to the fact that he was in an up-armored Humvee when he was injured.

It is because of thousands of stories like this that I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4200, because it does exactly what it should do. It provides our troops with the tools they need to win the war on terror and supports them in their efforts so they can be successful.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER), the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Total Force.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this good bill. This is a bill that will help the quality of life for both our service members and their families. It is a bill for the troops. It is a bill for their families.

I know that as a Nation and as a Congress we have ongoing disagreements and discussions about our national security policy, about Iraq, about issues all around the world; but while we are having that debate and in this discussion, this bill was put together that I think accounts for the unanimous support of the committee, 60 to zero, with people who are on different sides of these many issues, because it is a bill for the troops and their families.

I wish it could have been a better bill, and I think it could have been a better process had we, as a House, today voted to let more than 100 Members have amendments on the floor that were denied the right to be heard. But I do appreciate the work of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Total Force, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) as well as the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the chairman of the committee.

I know it is a good process when the chairman of the committee does not win all of his amendments during the committee process this year. I think we had a full and vigorous debate. Of course, I appreciate the work of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), our ranking member.

It is a bill for the troops. It will provide a 3.5 percent pay raise for the troops, which is a half percent more than the average private sector pay increase. It also eliminates out-of-pocket housing costs for service members and their families. It provides a permanent increase in imminent danger pay and family separation allowance, as well as increases the hardship duty pay from $300 to $750.

It includes providing active duty tuition assistance to Reservists who are mobilized, and it also makes permanent the TRICARE coverage for mobilized Reservists 90 days prior to activation and 180 days of transitional assistance following their separation from service.

I was also glad to see the great work done by the committee on the survivors benefits program. I would like to acknowledge two Members who are not members of our committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) who had the bill's sponsor to change the survivors benefit program, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), a former member of the committee, who also did good work on advocating on behalf of changing that program. I think that will help a lot of spouses of military retirees who have lost their mate. It is a very important issue.

Finally, I want to say in conclusion, I do support this bill; however, I think we should have allowed more time and had more amendments. It is particularly distressing on a committee in which we talk about our bipartisanship, that some of the most senior and experienced members, such as the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) and his recommendations for amendments were denied an opportunity.

We had a bipartisan amendment. The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), who had an amendment, both senior Members, not of the committee but of this Congress, were denied a right to be heard on the House floor today and tomorrow on their amendment. It would have been a better process and a better bill if that had gone forward.

But I do support the bill and urge other Members to do so also.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER) for his hard work on the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES), a gentleman with a real heart for our soldiers.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I want to recognize my good friend, the soldiers' chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) for everything he has done to bring this bill together that supports our troops.

I rise today in support of H.R. 4200, legislation we have crafted in the Committee on Armed Services that focuses on force protection and personnel benefits, designating 2005 as the Year of the Troops. For the soldiers and airmen in my district at Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base, the ability to adequately execute the mission for which they are called and care for their families are the two issues that are second to none.

I believe this legislation makes significant progress in these areas and will enable our men and women in uniform to continue successfully prosecuting the war on terrorism.

A trip to Iraq this past March, the second I have made, did nothing but reinforce my pride in our Nation's warfighters. These brave men and women served with honor and distinction as they liberated a nation. Troops from the 8th district of North Carolina have been at the very tip of the spear that ended the dark reign of Saddam Hussein and continued to lead the way in postconflict resolution in Iraq and Afghanistan.

This legislation, first and foremost, takes care of our most vital asset, our military, our people. It provides every service member an across-the-board 3.5 percent pay raise and increases the force structure of the Army and Marine Corps. It also boosts the maximum amount of hardship duty pay and eliminates out-of-pocket housing expenses. Furthermore, it closes the gap that some deployed Reservists and members of the National Guard face when their military pay is less than their civilian pay.

It is the first time in history that steps have been taken to replace income loss while Reservists are away from their civilian jobs. Currently, about 3,500 members of the North Carolina Guard are deployed in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom, the largest deployment in our State's history. It is vital that we take every measure to care for their families while they are away.

I am also happy the committee is urging the Department of Defense to consider programs being proposed at the University of North Carolina and others to help ease the hardship of these families and what they face.

Additionally, I would like to mention the direct effect this legislation will have for men and women at Fort Bragg and Pope. There is almost $200 million for infrastructure and housing improvements at these two installations. It includes $10 million more than was in the President's request for a barracks complex at Fort Bragg. I worked hard to secure this funding, along with others, because it will help improve the living conditions of the 16th MP brigade, the unit that spent many months in Iraq.

The National Defense Authorization Act addresses other critical issues, fortifying the defense industrial base, ensuring the Department of Defense purchases products that are made in America. My top two priorities are national security and economic security. There is seldom, if ever, a reason that these two goals should be considered mutually exclusive. I have vowed to always work to protect and promote the U.S. manufacturing industry, and we must develop transparency within the DOD procurement process.

Providing visibility on the Berry amendment, which stipulates domestic sourcing requirements, is crucial and is in this bill. This is vital to protect our workers and our soldiers and our national security, and it is just as important to protect our economic security here at home.

The gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) has worked so hard to provide this, and I thank him again.

Mr. Chairman, this is a great bill. It supports our wonderful men and women in uniform. I urge our most enthusiastic support.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ), a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Tailhook, Aberdeen, Air Force Academy rapes, rapes in the Pacific theater, rapes in the Iraqi theater.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to talk about what is not in this bill. A sensible, conservative legislative initiative that would have made it easier for the military to prosecute sexual assault offenses in the armed services.

The majority prohibited me from offering an amendment that would have made this vital change to the Uniform Code of Military Justice. It would have replaced a woefully outdated statute currently being used by the military to prosecute sexual assault with a version we use at the Federal level, title 18, used also in 37 other States, that was approved by this body 18 years ago.

The current military mechanism for prosecuting sexual assault was written in the 1950s, and it really does not reflect today's reality. My bill would have emphasized the acts of the perpetrator, rather than the reaction of the victim during an assault, which is an all-too-common complaint within the military justice system.

□ 1545

It would have expressly provided for cases involving voluntary and involuntary intoxication of the victim, which are common fact patterns in military sexual assault cases.

It would have expanded the definition of sexual abuse to include a broader scope of sex acts.

It would have also included a provision which specifically relates to the sexual abuse of a prisoner, unlike the current UCMJ. This provision is particularly timely given the tragic incidents which have occurred in Abu Ghraib prison.

We are facing a sexual assault crisis within our armed services. Our women and our men are being raped in Iraq. The Army currently has investigations of 110 counts of sexual abuse in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Some say this is combat-related stress. Well, in March of this year, the Air Force reported that it is investigating 92 reports of rape in the Pacific. Those troops are not in combat.

In a report released by the Department of Defense just this week, it was reported that across the Department of Defense there were 901 reported cases of rape in 2002 and over 1,000 in 2003. Now, I think that is a problem, and the Pentagon obviously thinks it is a problem, also.

So this would be an opportunity to make some positive changes on this issue because it is our job as Members of Congress to provide oversight of the executive departments of this Nation. It is our responsibility to provide assurances to men and women in uniform that they are safe and that when crimes are committed, our laws assure that justice will be served.

I am disappointed that my amendment is not being considered today. I think it is a disservice to the military men and women of our Nation.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER), the gentleman who is the author, the father of this great benefit package for military survivors that was embedded in this bill and is good news for hundreds of thousands of families.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank my chairman of the full committee for the time; and, Mr. Chairman, I proudly rise today in support of H.R. 4200, our National Defense Authorization Act of 2005.

As the chairman said, this legislation fully restores the survivor benefit plan annuity to what was promised to America's surviving spouses, and I applaud my Committee on Armed Services colleagues for bringing a quarter of a million military widows and widowers one step closer to seeing increases in their monthly checks next year. This is a Defense authorization measure which this entire body can be proud of.

Since coming to Congress, I have been working on this issue of particular interest, restoration of the minimum survivor benefit plan basic annuity to 55 percent for those survivors aged 62 years of age and older. Under present law, surviving spouses are subject to a reduction to 35 percent as part of the initial SBP law that was enacted in 1972, but this critical piece of information did not find its way into military retirement briefings and to the SBP election forms until many years later.

Here is a 1982 election form. Nowhere will my colleagues find in this form the offset mentioned. Survivors have felt betrayed by this bait-and-switch; and at 35 percent, SBP provides only a poverty-level or lower annuity to most survivors, even those of relatively senior officers.

For nearly 3 years, we have worked with members of the committee, my colleagues on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and numerous VSOs, to introduce SBP bills that will bring the needed equity. Both bills that I have introduced in Congress have received strong bipartisan support with over 300 Members sponsoring one or both measures, and I am proud that this committee has produced SBP reform that exceeds even my greatest expectation.

H.R. 4200 will fully eliminate the so-called ''widow's tax'' by April 1, 2008, in under 5 years. I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and the first rate Committee on Armed Services staff who literally worked round the clock to make this happen.

Once again, our Nation is calling upon the members of the U.S. Armed Forces to defend democracy and freedom. We have no doubt that these brave men and women will rise to the challenge. However, for those who have selected to make their career the U.S. military, they face an unknown risk.

This giant leap forward sends a clear message to the men and women who have provided our national defense. Today, we are a grateful Nation, and this Congress is making good on our promises to our Armed Forces. This battle has been hard fought, and its victory is shared by so many whose efforts have been tireless and unrelenting.

I thank my colleagues who have stood by me to realize this victory.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER), a member of our Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Missouri, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, we will not be allowed to debate the true cost of this war. That is ironic because I think most Americans, whether they are for or against the conflict, at least want honest answers from this body. They want to know what the real casualty rate is, something that, unfortunately, Secretary Wolfowitz could not recall in a hearing the other day. They also want to know about the dollars and cents.

In the first Iraq war, which I proudly supported, the American taxpayer really did not have to pay even $10 billion for that war. This cost is already approaching $200 billion. That is not necessarily a bad thing because I think most Americans not only support the war; they want us to win and bring our troops home safely.

Here with this bill, despite the many fine things that are in the legislation, most every Member of this House, Republican or Democrat, has already voted for a budget which contained $50 billion for our troops, $50 billion, five zero billion dollars. But what is in this bill? $25 billion dollars for the troops. Why the difference? Why the difference?

Actually, the $25 billion is a partial victory, and I congratulate the chairman because, before, the White House did not want any money in the bill for the troops in Iraq or Afghanistan. They wanted that to be handled entirely separately. So, finally, we have an acknowledgment of $25 billion.

But is Iraq safer than it was a few months ago? Is that why the number is less than the $50 billion that we have all already supported? No. Iraq is more dangerous than it was before.

I am worried a false impression is being created here. There are many good things in this legislation, but when it comes to funding Iraq and Afghanistan, we are pretending with this

bill, and we are allowing no amendments to this section, we are pretending that the cost is $25 billion.

This $25 billion is pretty curious because it really does not kick in until October 1 of this fall, the new fiscal year; and then it will last us a whopping 3 or 4 months, so that our men and women in uniform in Iraq and Afghanistan are going to have to start worrying about Christmastime whether the new Congress and a possible new White House is going to be as supportive of their efforts. We know our troops are going to be there. We know our troops are going to be there in large numbers. Why do we not go ahead and properly fund them?

The current policy in this bill is as silly as knowing you are running out of gas when you are on a long car trip, refusing to buy any new gas until way down the road somewhere, about October, and then when you finally get to the pump, you are buying $25 worth of gas when you should be filling up the tank.

Mr. Chairman, this bill refuses to fill up the tank. It refuses to fully fund our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan. It does fund them for 3 or 4 months; but that is a piecemeal, shortsighted funding scheme that does a disservice to our men and women in uniform.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the time remaining, please.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. CAMP). The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) has 27 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Let me just say in response to my colleague who has just spoken that we did something that was unprecedented in this bill, which was look into the future, into the last several months of this year, and decide that, even though we all agreed and the budget chairman announced on the floor and to the world that we were going to need supplementals of $50 billion this next year, we decided that we did not want to have any strain on the troops in the closing months of this year before Congress, after the election, could put together another supplemental.

So we provided this bridge, which even the gentleman will admit carries us well into the next year, into the next calendar year; and we did fully provide for the additional forces that we have in the field, the 1st Armored Division, which is going to be an additional $750,000. For all of the armor upgrades, we have got roughly $1 billion for armor upgrades in Humvees and trucks, for all of the modernization that the chief of staff of the Army needs for modularity, that is, building this new brigade centric force for the U.S. Army.

The reason we do not go off into the new year and say, okay, should it be $50 billion, should it be $75 billion is very simple. We cannot see the future. We do not know how much weight this new Iraqi military is going to be able to take on their shoulders, how fast we are going to be able to make this handoff; and all of those things drive the costs of operation. But this takes good care of the troops for a long period of time during this bridge period; and that is the reason we did it, to give the troops confidence.

It is above and beyond the $422 billion bill that we have. I think, Mr. Chairman, it does a good job in looking out for the troops.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces, whose subcommittee oversees the most massive part of modernization and our biggest programs for aircraft and land systems, who has done a great job working this issue.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank our chairman of the committee for an outstanding bill. I think it is one of the best Defense bills since I have been in Washington in 18 years, and I want to also thank the distinguished ranking member who is one of the finest gentlemen in this Congress and someone that both the chairman and I are proud to serve with.

I tell my colleagues that the chairman is correct. This bill is for the soldier. It directly deals with the issues that our soldiers are experiencing and the problems and challenges they are experiencing in the Iraq and Afghan theater, and it provides an aggressive and appropriate response.

In fact, we are proud of the fact that under our chairman's leadership we have had almost every member of the committee visit Iraq and Afghanistan to interact with our troops so that we did not base our own decisions in a vacuum on what was told to us by our military leaders; but rather, we went over and we talked to the troops. We interacted with them in a firsthand way and then came to terms with the President's budget request and what we thought was needed.

We increased funding just within my subcommittee's jurisdiction by $4.3 billion for additional programs and modernization. That includes $700 million of additional money for up-armored Humvees. It includes additional money for improvised explosive devices, for UAVs, for personal protection, for surveillance, for the Predator and the Shadow, for the Bradley fighting vehicle modernization, for Hellfire missiles; and across the board we provide the funding that we know our troops need.

The gentleman referred to a shortfall. I can tell my colleagues, after we got the President's budget, we asked the services, what are your unfunded priorities. The total amount of unfunded priorities, as given to us by the service chiefs, was $12 billion. We more than compensated for the unfunded priorities and look forward to what the costs are going to be to continue our presence in Iraq and Afghanistan, and we took care of that because of the vision of our chairman and our ranking member in working together.

Now, we are going to have to come back and ask for additional dollars, yes; but this bill does a more than adequate job to take care of the needs that we have identified and that our service chiefs have identified, but it goes beyond that.

We specify in this bill that any modernization must also be given to our Guard and Reserve units based on their being deployed in the theater. So the new equipment we buy will not just go to our active duty forces; but under this legislation, it will go to Guard and Reserve units who have been serving over there and who need the latest state-of-the-art equipment. But we even go further than this.

We deal with some tough issues. We deal with the issue of outsourcing. Under the chairman's leadership, starting last year, we put money into a fund to come up with innovative ways to have manufacturing components done here in the U.S. as opposed to overseas.

□ 1600

This year, we added $50 million of additional money to that pot. And we have challenged our companies to work with labor unions so that when they contemplate outsourcing 10 or more jobs, we have a financial mechanism in place to bring labor and management together to find common solutions that will allow that company to reduce costs and keep those potential outsourced jobs right here in America.

So this bill covers a lot of territory. It is good legislation, and I encourage my colleagues to accept it and vote for it.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the evidence of the unity of the Committee on Armed Services presents itself in unanimous support of this committee on this bill. I thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) and the chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), as well, for collaborating at that level. And I guess I rise today simply to be united behind our troops, but I do offer my concerns.

I had an amendment that would direct the Department of Defense to award a contract to an independent phone bank for tending to rape and sexual assault victims in a confidential manner within 3 months of enactment of this bill. It was needed and not made in order.

My second amendment would have directed the Department of Defense to conduct a full review into the situations women are placed in within the

Armed Forces. The review would specifically focus on the intimidation many women feel they may face in the Armed Forces in relation to higher-ranking male officers, who often place female subordinates in compromising situations. But, likewise, it would discuss, of course, some of the issues that we see in Iraq.

But today I rise to say singularly that my vote will be offered to provide the kind of funding that we see in this bill for the troops, the $705 million for up-armored Humvees, the $332 million for ballistic armor for other Humvees, and, yes, the over $104 billion for military personnel, in particular the dollars that we will have for Iraq and Afghanistan. There is a great need.

America, however, needs to be told the truth. And as I stand here, united with our troops, I demand and call for the accountability of those who are responsible for the incidents and the activities in the Iraqi prison and the other collapse of the Iraqi effort.

I want victory in Iraq and in Afghanistan as well. I want democracy and security in Afghanistan and Iraq. And I want our troops to be safe, I want other veterans to be safe, I want their widows and families to be safe. We are unified behind that.

But I see no reason to continue with the leadership of Secretary Rumsfeld. We must hold the higher ranking accountable.

Today, I stand with the troops in support of this legislation.

I rise today with grave concerns in regards to the deficiencies of this National Defense Authorization Act. It is truly unfortunate that the brave men and women of our Armed Forces are fighting around the world while the Department of Defense is in the current state it is in. Leadership must be accountable for the actions of the Armed Forces; the unfortunate events taking place in Iraq have caused our Nation irreparable harm.

CONGRESSWOMAN JACKSON-LEE'S AMENDMENTS

I am most disappointed with the decision of the Rules Committee not to make my amendments in order. I can find no real substantive or procedural reason why my two Amendments would be ruled out of order. Unfortunately, there is no substitute to this National Defense Authorization Act; therefore there is a greater need for appropriate amendments. My two amendments would have addressed two glaring issues that continue to trouble members of our Armed Forces.

My first amendment would direct the Department of Defense to award a contract to an independent phone bank for tending to rape and sexual assault victims in a confidential manner within 3 months of its enactment. That phone bank would be required to have the expertise and training programs in place to allow operators to cope with unique situations arising from sexual abuse in the military context. This phone bank would be open to members of the Armed Forces and their families. I hope we all understand the devastation caused by rape and sexual assault. However, what we fail to recognize is the fact that members of the Armed Forces and their families are in a unique situation that is not faced by other Americans. Because of this fact it is imperative members of the Armed Forces and their families have an outlet to receive counseling and advice for issues related to rape and sexual assault without the fear that their report might be sent to their superiors in the Armed Forces without their consent.

My second amendment would have directed the Department of Defense to conduct a full review into the situations women are placed in within the Armed Forces. This review would specifically focus on the intimidation many women in the Armed Forces may face in relation to higher ranking male officers who often place female subordinates in compromising situations. Also, to have been addressed specifically by the review are the delicate situations women in the Armed Forces are placed in when stationed abroad especially when in relation to direct contact with enemy combatants and prisoners. The Department of Defense would then report the full findings of this review and appropriate remedies to the problem within 6 months to the Senate and House Armed Services Committees. I feel strongly that such a review is necessary after the recent torture scandal that took place in Iraq. It has become obvious that women stationed abroad in Iraq were not placed in proper situations. Pfc. Lynndie England, who is accused of being involved in the torture and humiliation of Iraqi prisoners, says that her actions were forced by her superiors in the military. I will not pass judgment on Pfc. England until her court-martial has taken place, but what I do know is that it is entirely possible that she was intimidated. Furthermore, why were female soldiers guarding Iraqis in a prison when we know that it would be deeply offensive to the Iraqi public to do so? I am not saying that women should not be serving in Iraq, what I am stating is that women in Iraq shouldn't be placed in precarious situations which are not advantageous to them or to the mission we are hoping to accomplish in Iraq. The Department of Defense needs to conduct this review because no member of the Armed Forces should be intimidated into taking actions that they know to be wrong. It must be clear to everyone in this body that this review is necessary in light of recent events that have unfortunately placed women in the Armed Forces in a bad light.

IRAQ TORTURE SCANDAL

I have great consternation with the fact that this Defense Authorization does nothing to address the prison situation that led to the Iraq torture scandal. The court-martial of a few enlisted soldiers will not solve a problem that is endemic. There are many steps to be taken to make sure that our men and women of the Armed Forces are not being put in uncertain situations. It must be obvious to all Members of this body that we need a proper system of jails to hold Iraqi prisoners and appropriate training of our soldiers to guard these prisoners.

I was pleased to see that Representative ABERCROMBIE's language on independent contractors was added to this Authorization. It has become painstakingly clear that the Pentagon has no control on the number of activities of independent contractors in Iraq. Apart from their own safety, which we cannot guarantee, independent contractors have been involved in a number of dubious situations which have placed further undue burden on our Armed Forces.

The recent events in Iraq have made it even more painfully clear to me that this Administration has no real exit plan from Iraq. The truth is that this war was poorly planned from the start and the recent torture scandal has only furthered that thought. This authorization addresses a number of issues affecting our Armed Forces, but it does not properly address the needs of our Armed Forces who are still stationed in Iraq.

MISSILE DEFENSE

It is truly unfortunate to that this Defense Authorization continues this Administration's policy of having misplaced priorities. Instead of directing more money for proper planning in Iraq, or for greater protection equipment for our troops, or maybe for greater pay raises for our troops; this Administration has decided to budget $10.2 billion for missile defense next year—twice the request for any other weapons system. Missile defense systems are not new, in fact they have been discussed for decades. The truth is that missile defense systems have proven to be overly complex, unreliable, and often been little more than pipe dreams. Why in good conscience, in this time of budget constraints and increased need, would we allocate even more money for failed programs? There are more responsible ways to budget this money. Money from the Defense Authorization should go to our men and women in the Armed Forces who actually defend our Nation instead of into programs that just waste needed funds.

SPRATT AMENDMENT

It is sad to see that so many relevant and necessary amendments to this Defense Authorization were not ruled in order. Perhaps the most relevant amendment was that submitted by my distinguished colleague, Representative SPRATT. His amendment would have provided $414.4 million for targeted pay raises, reimbursement of life insurance premiums for service members that are in imminent danger, 3 Marine Corps' troop protection unfunded requirements, and improvements to the PAC–3 ballistic missile defense system. These necessary defense budget items would have been offset by targeted cuts to 4 ballistic missile defense program elements, the Ground-based Midcourse Defense system, BMD Products, BMD Technology, and the BMD Systems Interceptor. Representative SPRATT has found a very reasonable compromise that still results in Ballistic Missile Defense programs receiving an increase in funding over the 2004 level. It is truly unfortunate that such a pertinent amendment was not ruled in order and debated by this entire body. When the amendment process is compromised like it has been here then the legislative process suffers and unfortunately that means our Armed Forces will suffer as a result of this Defense Authorization.

I hope in the future that such significant legislation as this will involve the debate and full consideration of all necessary and relevant amendments. The men and women of our Armed Forces and indeed the American people as a whole deserve as much.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4200, AS REPORTED

OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

At the end of title V (page 200, after line 24), insert the following new section:

SEC. ___. CONTRACT FOR INDEPENDENT TELEPHONE BANK FOR TENDING TO RAPE AND SEXUAL ASSAULT VICTIMS IN THE MILITARY CONTEXT.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall award a contract for the establishment of a telephone bank, operated independently from the Department of Defense, for counseling of members of the Armed Forces, and family members of members of Armed Forces, who are victims of rape, sexual assault, or other forms of sexual abuse. The contract shall require that such counseling be provided on a confidential basis and that the entity awarded the contract have expertise and training programs in place to allow operators to cope with unique situations arising from sexual abuse in the military context.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4200, AS REPORTED

OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

At the end of title V (page 200, after line 24), insert the following new section:

SEC. ___. REVIEW OF SITUATIONS IN WHICH WOMEN IN THE ARMED FORCES ARE PLACED WHILE SERVING IN THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) REVIEW.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a full review into the situations women in the Armed Forces are placed in within the Armed Forces. The review shall specifically address—

(1) the intimidation many women in the Armed Forces face in relation to higher ranking male officers who often place female subordinates in compromising situations; and

(2) the delicate situations women in the Armed Forces are placed in when stationed abroad, especially in relation to direct contact with enemy combatants and prisoners.

(b) REPORT.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit a report on the review under subsection (a) to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. The report shall set forth the full findings of the review and appropriate remedies to problems identified in the review.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH), who chairs the Subcommittee on Total Force, which oversees the 2.5 million Americans in uniform.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, the distinguished chairman of the committee, for yielding me this time, and it is with great honor and pride that I rise today.

Mr. Chairman, as always, I express my deep appreciation to the chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), and of course to the ranking member, my dear friend for whom I hold so much respect, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), and also my partner on the Subcommittee on Total Force, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER), for their support, their great leadership in this effort.

As we have heard, Mr. Chairman, time and time again, the chairman of the full committee challenged all of us to make this the Year of the Soldier. Those of us on the Subcommittee on Total Force try to make every day the Year of the Soldier, but I think even by that normal standard this subcommittee has done an outstanding job on both sides of the aisle of bringing together a package of benefits and of responses to the challenges facing our men and women in uniform that go that extra step further, as they are for us.

The chairman spoke earlier about that 30,000 increase in total end strength for the Army and 9,000 for the Marines, placing valuable, much-needed troops on the ground in those places like Afghanistan, like Iraq, and, in turn, lessening the burden on the troops back home awaiting their next rotation or on the Reserve component.

We talked about the 3.5 percent pay increase. This is now the sixth consecutive year in which we have provided a pay increase. This particular 3.5 percent exceeds that of the private sector and reduces the gap that we have been struggling to close between the private sector and military from 5.5 to 5.1 percent. We increased the wartime pay, the imminent danger pay, and family separation allowances that our brave men and women in those theaters of war deserve. We added to those.

The Reserve component is not left behind either. It is very, very valuable. I heard my dear friend and colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), earlier speak about the need to ensure that those Reservists who find themselves financially stressed are in a position to have their incomes supplemented. In this bill, Mr. Chairman, for the first time in history, we propose and, in fact, do that, from $50,000 to $3,000 a month in added income to those Guards and Reservists who are deployed repeatedly and for extended periods of time. It is the right thing to do and the right time to do it.

I would like to address the comments of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ), and she has been a leader on this subcommittee and a leader in the House with respect to issues of sexual harassment, sexual abuse and rape; and I commend her for her leadership. But we want most of all to be sure that any change in the Uniform Code of Military Justice is done appropriately and done in a way that ensures better not fewer protections for the victim.

And in this bill we require a report from the Department of Defense. We are going to move on that issue. Yesterday, I met with the Deputy Secretary for Personnel, Dr. David Chu, on this very issue. I told him that this subcommittee, Democrat and Republican alike, is committed to reforming and updating the rules and regulations in the UCMJ with respect to sexual harassment and rape, and told him that we wanted him to be a partner.

But with him or without him, with or without the Department and the services, we were going to make the changes that the gentlewoman has discussed. This is far too important an issue to do in a hurried manner, and I certainly look forward to the gentlewoman's being a continued leader in that effort.

In short, Mr. Chairman, I would just say that this Subcommittee on Total Force has worked magnificently to respond to probably the greatest asset this Nation has today in the war on terror. And, without question, the greatest asset this Nation has ever had, since our founding back in 1776, is our men and women in uniform.

This is a great bill, and I urge all my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the ranking member for yielding me this time, and to commend him and the chairman for the hard work they have done on this legislation.

I fear, however, Mr. Chairman, that my brief contribution to this debate today must concern one of the bill's serious omissions. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and I drafted a bipartisan amendment that would have addressed the fact that, because of loopholes in current law, contractors in Iraq are operating in a legal fog where they are not accountable to Iraqi laws, to U.S. laws, or to laws governing our troops. The contractors working in Iraq are not comfortable with this, and we should not be comfortable with it either.

Our amendment would have fixed this problem by closing loopholes in the Military Extraterritorial Jurisdiction Act, MEJA, so that contractors and subcontractors in Iraq and elsewhere would be accountable under the law, and the Department of Defense would have a clear responsibility to place violators of the law before the appropriate bar of justice.

Our amendment had the support of the contractors themselves. The Parliamentarian had ruled it germane. It had strong bipartisan support and would have almost certainly passed, and yet we were not allowed to present this amendment before this body today for a vote.

Mr. Chairman, this issue is too important for this Congress to do nothing. The gentleman from Connecticut and I have just introduced our amendment as a stand-alone bill. We welcome the support of colleagues, and we hope that the House leadership will not pass up this second chance to do the right thing.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER).

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman for working with me in adding $100 million to add 10 additional B–1 bombers. As my colleagues know, the B–1 played a very major role in Iraq and Afghanistan, and the B–1s from Dyess Air Force Base were an integral part of that mission.

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

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his hard work and his urging that we try to retrieve an additional 10 B–1 bombers. We now have 67.

The Air Force was going to cut that down to 60. We moved it back up where we retrieved seven of the bombers that were going basically into the bone yard, and the gentleman worked hard with myself and other members of the committee to make sure we retrieved an additional 10 bombers. So we are taking the B–1 up to 77 bombers.

That B–1 has been a great asset for the projection of power for the United States. It has got great speed, it can hold a tremendous payload, and it can literally put a precision munition right through a goalpost. In fact, we went after Saddam Hussein early on in the war in Iraq with the B–1 bomber.

So the gentleman has been a champion of the B–1. I want to thank him for that, and I hope he is here with me when we roll out those additional 10 that we are bringing back from retirement.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I look forward to that day.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS), a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of this bill.

This bill contains important provisions for our troops, including a well-deserved pay raise and additional force protection equipment. I would like to thank my colleague from San Diego, the distinguished chairman of the committee, for resisting calls from the Defense Department to grant further relief from important environmental laws.

Despite the great provisions in this legislation, some serious questions remain, and I will address one.

If you ask the Defense Department today to tell you the number of contractor personnel serving in Iraq, you will get a shrug. That represents a fundamental area of concern. The events in Fallujah and the images of Abu Ghraib remind us of the role that contractor personnel play and how their actions can affect the military mission.

We must come to terms with contractor participation and performance on the battlefield. The questions that must be answered include: Why are so many contractors being used in Iraq and other places? Does anyone really know how many are present? Who is responsible for ensuring contractors are properly trained and qualified? And to whom are the various contractors accountable? Are they providing security for the military, or is it the other way around?

This bill authorizes an additional $25 billion for operations in fiscal year 2005, a figure that should have been included in the President's budget request. So before this Congress approves additional funding, we must come to terms with money being spent on contractor personnel.

Mr. Chairman, lives are at stake.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to thank the gentlewoman who just spoke, my seatmate in California, to say something about contractors.

God bless our contractors. The last figure I saw was that the contractors for Halliburton, who have to run Ambush Alley, bringing our convoys, bringing food to the troops up through the heart of the insurgency country in Iraq, have now lost 34 of their personnel, killed in action supplying American troops.

We have always had lots of contractors for the very simple reason that for every troop you have out there with a rifle, you need roughly 10 people to support him down the supply line; and a lot of those people have always been contractors. We have had them in all theaters of the war in this last century and, obviously, in Afghanistan and Iraq.

The four individuals who were killed in Fallujah were American heroes, and they were trying to advance the American cause with every bit as pure a heart and sense of honor, in fact, as mostly former military personnel, as any of our people in the United States Marine Corps or Army in that area of operation.

So I think that we should appreciate our contractors perhaps more than has been noted on the House floor.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), a very good member of the committee.

□ 1615

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from California for his leadership, and the ranking member, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), for his participation in crafting a wonderful bill, H.R. 4200.

I had an opportunity last fall to accompany the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) to Iraq, and I saw firsthand the courage of our troops and the difference they are making in winning the war against terror and protecting American families.

I also had an opportunity last year of concluding 31 years' service with the Army National Guard, and I now have two sons serving in the Army National Guard, including one son deployed in Iraq; so this bill has a great deal of meaning to me because of the improvements of the statutes providing for benefits for those who serve in the Guard and Reserves.

These benefits are going to be so meaningful for troops who are protecting our country and are mobilized at this time. First of all, there is the provision for new reenlistment and retention bonuses. As we face future crises, the Guard and Reserve will have that increased protection.

Income supplement is an issue I worked very hard on for 25 years, premobilization and legal counseling; and the greatest concern I saw were the sacrifices that many of our young people made where they had a reduction in income. This will be addressed in this bill. It will be so beneficial to families.

Finally, there is the provision for TRICARE health benefits to be provided for National Guard members and Reservists, and I also thank the chairman for including wording that will provide for the establishment of State defense forces. In South Carolina, we have the South Carolina State Guard. These are volunteers, unpaid like civil defense forces, who stand in to protect our people when there has been deployment of National Guard troops.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) for ensuring our troops have the resources needed to fight the war on terror to protect American families. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4200.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN), the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Terrorism and Unconventional Threats and Capabilities.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for his service on this committee. I also recognize the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) for his service and the way that he conducted the hearings on this mark in a very bipartisan way, affording an opportunity for all Members to speak out. In fact, my recollection is the chairman even came down on the shortened of a vote which I have not seen in quite some time. I am sure the gentleman will fix that in the other body. I thank the gentleman for his service.

As a ranking member of the Subcommittee on Terrorism and Unconventional Threats, I believe the product before us today is, on the whole, a solid proposal. This committee pledged to make this year the Year of the Soldier, and I think we made great strides in achieving that goal. We have a well-deserved pay raise for our troops. I am pleased that this legislation authorizes critical force protection resources, including $329 million for up-armoring Humvees, $358 million for add-on armor kits, and $421 million for interceptor body armor.

This fulfills all of the shortfalls, including on the Army's unfunded requirements list, which I am disappointed that the administration failed to request. The committee has also included language that I put forward requiring the Department of Defense to report to Congress on the lessons learned from its failure to expeditiously field protective equipment to our troops in Iraq. And we have expressed a sense of Congress urging the Department to release all appropriated

funds to armor thin-skinned Humvees as soon as possible.

We are a Nation at war, and we cannot shortchange our troops by leaving them defenseless in the theater. I am proud that this committee has stepped forward and authorized important resources to support our ongoing military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, despite the administration's failure to include much of this funding in its annual budget. But I also strongly support efforts to authorize $67 billion to take us through the end of fiscal year 2005 instead of the end of this calendar year.

Additionally, I am pleased that my colleagues recognized the need to address the gaping holes in the oversight of civilian contractors hired by the Department of Defense in the face of human rights abuses in Abu Ghraib prison.

Our committee approved an amendment offered by the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) to require the Department to report to Congress on the activities of contractors in Iraq. We also included my proposal on directing the Department to issue guidance for training contractors in the Geneva Conventions and international laws of war.

Finally, the bill makes important quality-of-life improvements for our troops and for our veterans. I applaud the committee for finally ending the survivors benefit penalty. I am also encouraged that the bill addresses many of the inequities in benefits for our Reserve component, from eliminating the $5,000 cap on reenlistment bonuses, to removing restrictions on Reservists from accessing tuition assistance, as included in an amendment which I offered.

With respect to the terrorism subcommittee's mark, several of the provisions in this portion of the bill deserve praise. First, I am pleased we included a number of recommendations to streamline and accelerate the development and acquisition of technologies to combat terrorism. Additional resources are provided in a number of areas, including chemical and biological research and important detection initiatives.

The committee also honored a request by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) and me to improve the manner in which we develop and acquire medical countermeasures against biological warfare agents.

Finally, I cannot say I support every provision in this authorization bill. I remain concerned about cuts to DARPA and several information technology programs, as well as the committee's failure to include several important nonproliferation provisions which I believe are key to winning the global war on terrorism.

I hope that we can at least have an honest debate on these issues another day. With that said, legislating is the art of compromise, and I believe the product before us will boost our troops and our war-fighting capabilities. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting its final approval.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and applaud the gentleman for all the good work he is doing for the United States.

Mr. Chairman, no Member in this body disagrees that so long as our troops remain in Iraq, they should have the resources they need in order to protect their lives. We have not done well in this area up to this point, and we must do better.

Further, in my judgment, the Bush administration has done a terrible job in keeping faith with our veterans. This bill makes a start in improving that situation, but we have a very long way to go in that area, especially with regard to veterans health care.

Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of good things in this bill, and there are in my view portions of this bill that are not good and that are very wasteful of taxpayer money.

Most importantly, however, is what is lacking in this legislation, and that is there is no demand in this bill for the President to provide us with an exit strategy from Iraq, a timetable as to how we can get out. Since the war in Iraq began, we have lost 790 men and women, over 4,500 have been wounded; and we are spending billions every month.

Meanwhile, anti-American feelings are growing throughout the Muslim world, breeding more potential terrorists, and we are becoming increasingly isolated from our long-term allies. Significantly, in a recent U.S. Government-sponsored poll, 82 percent of the Iraqi people indicated that they now disapprove of the U.S. and allied military being in their country; 82 percent disapprove. The war in Iraq, in my view, is not helping us in the very difficult struggle against international terrorism. In many ways, it is making a bad situation worse.

The time is long overdue for President Bush to develop an exit strategy as to when the Iraqi people will really be allowed to govern themselves. It is not good enough for the U.S. to install Iraqi figureheads who do not have the support or confidence of the Iraqi people. The President must also tell us when the U.N. and the international community will be helping rebuild Iraq. That should not only be the burden of our soldiers and our taxpayers. President Bush must do all that he can to internationalize the transition situation.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, and most importantly, the President must begin to tell us when American troops will begin coming home. We have lost 790 men and women already, 4,500 have been wounded, many thousands of Iraqi men, women and children are dead. We need an exit strategy to get our troops home as soon as feasible.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), who has worked so hard on the chem-bio protection issues.

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

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

To provide for the common defense is the first object of the Federal Government. I rise today in strong support of the National Defense Authorization Act because it meets that objective.

This legislation with its principal focus on the American soldier earns the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) the well-deserved title Soldier's Chairman, which I believe will stick.

American soldiers with the help of coalition forces have accomplished extraordinary things in recent days, liberated 50 million people in Iraq and Afghanistan, captured and imprisoned a brutal dictator, deposed an evil regime, and American soldiers have carried out hundreds of raids, seizing caches of enemy weapons and munitions, including ominously this week, weapons of mass destruction that were found in Iraq in the form of munitions containing mustard gas and sarin gas.

It is precisely this discovery, as the chairman attests, that concerns me and most Members of Congress most deeply, for the well-being of our men and women in uniform in the theater of operation in Iraq.

I am pleased to say that H.R. 4200 provides an extraordinary amount of resources in the form of force protection: $1.5 billion for chemical and biological defense programs, individual protection, decontamination equipment, chemical and biological protective shelters, just to name a few.

We have most certainly now found weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, and the nature of the munitions we have found suggest there are more stockpiles yet to be uncovered. And putting a primacy on achieving our objective of securing the peace in Iraq must remain our fervent goal; but beyond that, protecting our forces in that theater of operation from exposure to these weapons of mass destruction is key, and the new National Defense Authorization Act achieves that goal. I am grateful for the chairman; I am grateful for every member of the committee on both sides of the aisle for creating this extraordinary legislation.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, there are many good parts of this bill, such as those that relate to pay and benefits, particularly a quality for National Guard reenlistees and others. There are some necessary, long-overdue basics for the troops, armored Humvees among others. But I rise to raise another issue

which is of extraordinary importance, and hopefully I can get some agreement to resolve this problem.

□ 1630

We do not have a draft in the United States of America. We have a great all-volunteer military. Unfortunately, there are two aspects to that. One I tried to address with an amendment which was not allowed which is what are called ''stop-loss orders.'' Many people in the military today are being forced to serve beyond the terms of their contract under stop-loss orders with no compensation. I think minimally they should be compensated. But today in the Portland Oregonian, page one, we have a story which is now breaking that faulty orders were sent out by the Army last month which told people in the Individual Ready Reserve if they did not choose a branch and reenlist that the military would choose soon a branch and mandatorily reenlist them. They now admit that this order was a mistake. Here is a quote from one veteran: ''I started crying and said, 'I'm not doing this,' '' said Carissa Jenkins, 22, of Keizer who was discharged from active Army duty in January 2003. ''I have a baby, a husband. All my values have changed.'' She said she joined the National Guard last week to keep from going back into the regular Army. It is reported that in Oregon alone, enlistments were up by a factor of 1,000 percent for the month. Nothing else explains it except that these people were being told they were about to be drafted back into the military. And nationally, over 1,063 inactive Army Reservists signed up under these false pretenses.

I would ask that these reenlistments, which were done under color of faulty orders, be abrogated by the Secretary of Defense. I would hope that the two gentlemen on the floor here would join me. If these soldiers want to sign up of their own free will without a draft, without faulty orders, then certainly they should be allowed to do that. But this woman and a number of others are saying, no, they did not want to go back onto active duty, they did not want to go back into active guard status, but they did it because they were told if they did not do that that the Army was going to do it to them.

Is the chairman of the committee familiar with this situation?

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

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I would just say to the gentleman, no, I am not familiar with that situation.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Is the ranking member familiar? I understand he is trying to get some information on this.

Mr. SKELTON. If the gentleman will yield, I am familiar with the article and I have asked my staff to make official inquiry with the Reserve component of the United States Army to answer this.

Mr. DEFAZIO. If soldiers like this woman, Carissa Jenkins, were forced against their own better judgment and their own life circumstances to reup because they felt they were about to be compelled without their own volition back into active duty, would the gentleman agree that perhaps we could look at voiding these contracts and allowing them to decide without coercion whether or not they want to go back into active duty?

Mr. SKELTON. I think coercion is certainly absolutely wrong. I would say to the gentleman that we would do everything we could to correct the mistake. I am certainly positive that the military would stand behind a mistake that they made.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman, and I hope that we can get this rectified. As I said previously, there are many good parts to this bill. I believe in the all-volunteer military; I believe in the pay and benefits enhancements; and I believe in providing better equipment, which the bill does. I intend to support it.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I would just say to the gentleman that I will be happy to work with the gentleman from Missouri on this issue.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), chairman of that very important committee, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from California, chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. I want to thank the gentleman for his support and leadership on a significant matter affecting the security of our Nation's military installations. Last year scores of undocumented workers were arrested at several DoD installations across the country, including New Jersey. In the post-9/11 world, we simply cannot afford to allow our contractors to hire undocumented and unskilled workers to work on military bases.

As the gentleman knows, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO), and I have worked together with him to address this problem. Section 822 of H.R. 4200 authorizes a demonstration project intended to provide incentives to contractors who have a meaningful and comprehensive skilled worker staffing plan to ensure all workers are properly documented. The provision, however, does not state the size or the location of the demonstration project.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. The gentleman is correct. The size and location of the demonstration project have been left to the discretion of the Secretary of Defense. I will add, however, the whole point of doing a demonstration project is to test whether a legislative idea will produce the results that its proponents intend. The Secretary should conduct a thorough and complete demonstration program.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It is my hope and expectation that the Secretary performs at least part of the demonstration project with contractors in New Jersey. The legislative text of section 822 leaves this choice up to the discretion of the Department of Defense, but can we count on the chairman's support to help us persuade DoD to include New Jersey in the demonstration project based on the fact that an investigation by our own U.S. attorney, Christopher Christie, resulted in the discovery of security violations and the arrests of illegal aliens who had access to several of our New Jersey bases?

Mr. HUNTER. I would just say to my good friend that he and his colleagues from New Jersey and others can certainly count on my support.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman. I urge my colleagues to support this provision and to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 4200.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the work done by the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Missouri on this legislation. There are some important pieces to this bill, equipment for our troops and the like. There are matters of concern, for example, the new nuclear program that I have opposition to. But there is an obscure provision of the bill that I want to make sure Members know about and that is section 1404 which would require U.S. companies to get a license before they export any goods listed on the military critical technologies list. According to a copy of the list I found on the Department of Defense Technical Information Center Web site, that includes computers that exceed 1,500 MTOPS. That would be considered military critical. So under this bill, computers, laptops, Sony PlayStations that exceed 1,500 MTOPS would require an export license. That would be to export it anywhere. If you want to sell a Sony PlayStation to Europe, to England, you would need a Defense Department export license. I think that that is a problem.

The outdated metric of 190,000 MTOPS needs to be changed, but to go down to 1,500 MTOPS as a metric is literally the stone age of computing. I believe that if there are specific military critical technologies that are not sufficiently controlled under existing export regulations, say, night vision or surveillance devices, then let us draft something that controls those technologies. But to say that we cannot sell a laptop to somebody in London, that the Ipods cannot be exported to France, that the Sony PlayStations

cannot be sold to Japan, I think is a mistake. I know that this is about war. I did not know it was about war on the American economy.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FERGUSON).

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the full committee for his great work on this bill. I rise in support of H.R. 4200. Today we address the needs of a Nation at war on multiple fronts and sustain our commitment to our troops, providing them with the best technology and equipment in support of our ongoing mission in Iraq and in Afghanistan and in the war on terror all around the world. This bill will improve living and working conditions for U.S. military personnel and their families. It recognizes the critical contribution of our National Guard and Reserve and increases authorization for their modernization programs. It protects and supports our military retirees and their survivors. Most important, it gives our troops the resources and equipment that they need to keep themselves safe and America free.

The Committee on Armed Services has deemed this the Year of the Soldier. I can think of no better way to honor and serve those who are giving of themselves, making extraordinary sacrifices, putting their lives on the line in defense of this country than by supporting H.R. 4200, the national defense authorization bill. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their great work on this.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. CAMP). Without objection, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) may control the time of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON).

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY), who has done so much great work on this committee.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4200, and I would like to commend the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Missouri for their tireless efforts in support of our soldiers, our sailors, airmen and Marines who are bravely defending us at home and abroad.

Mr. Chairman, this is the Year of the Soldier. The bill before us clearly reflects that objective. The bill does a remarkable job of covering a wide scope of issues that are vitally important to our armed services. From survivor benefit improvements to the 3.5 percent across-the-board pay raise that H.R. 4200 authorizes, this bill addresses the most pressing needs of our troops in a very trying time for this country. For our Reservists who experience a reduction in their income while away from their civilian jobs, there are income replacement payments. For our deployed soldiers, H.R. 4200 contains almost $830 million for up-armored Humvees and $358 million for vehicle add-on armor kits.

I am also grateful for the work that the Committee on Armed Services has done to fully fund the F/A–22 program this year. In particular, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), my subcommittee chairman, for doing this and making sure that we got this vitally important program fully funded.

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

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, first, let me just say that this is a program that shares support on our committee among Democrats and Republicans. This aircraft capability is something that is very important to our country. We just did a briefing on the emerging aerospace industrial base in China, their new high-performance aircraft, which at some point may threaten American interests. This aircraft is vital, it is needed, and it is an important follow-on. We will keep working on it. I thank the gentleman for his hard work on it.

Mr. GINGREY. I thank the gentleman from California for the full funding for these 24 planes. It will go a long way toward providing stability for that program and ensuring that America maintains air dominance for the next 30 years.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Missouri for their hard work on this bill.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a fellow Texan.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentleman from my home city of El Paso, Texas, for yielding me this time and for his commitment to our young men and women in uniform. My father served many, many years at Fort Bliss, Texas.

I rise today to discuss the three amendments that I would have offered had the Republican leadership allowed genuine debate on our Nation's defense policy. Of course, instead we heard earlier a rule was crafted which silenced probably over 95 amendments.

Let me talk about my three amendments for a minute. The first amendment which I offered called for the creation of an international commission to monitor prison conditions in Iraq. This commission would be made up of representatives from the Iraqi Government and Iraqi civil society, the International Red Cross, the International Red Crescent, the United Nations, the United States and Coalition Armed Forces. Contrary to what the President's lawyers apparently think, the Geneva Conventions is neither quaint nor is it obsolete. This amendment would have ensured compliance to help restore badly damaged United States credibility. We have all seen the pictures. The whole world has seen the pictures. We need to take action to correct the situation and to convince the Iraqi people and the world that we are abiding by international law.

My second amendment would have created a database of those who have been detained. Family members should not have to wonder if their loved ones have simply disappeared. We have learned that over 70 percent of the detainees probably are individuals who should not be detained. We cannot condone the policy and practice of holding ghost prisoners who just vanish into United States custody. This is simply wrong. But this amendment also was rejected.

Finally, my third amendment prohibited the use of United States funds in the overthrow of democratically elected governments. That is a simple democratic principle that I thought we held. Given the allegations of this government's involvement in the overthrow of President Aristide's government in Haiti, this amendment would have restored confidence in the protection of democracy. It was born out of the Bush administration's alleged involvement in the recent coup in Haiti.

□ 1645

First of all, this is a similar amendment that was instituted under Representative Edward Boland, who prohibited the Reagan administration from using money to fund the Nicaraguan contras. It is shocking and totally shameful that we even need an amendment saying that our government is not in the business of overthrowing its democratically elected counterparts throughout the world; but history, including our very recent history, teaches us that we do.

This amendment also was rejected, along with many others offered by my colleagues. Some would have called for an exit strategy from Iraq; others would have reined in the uncontrolled and unmonitored use of private contractors, and that would have prevented the escalation, of course, of the arms race. These are, again, some other amendments that would have been allowed had we been allowed to debate them.

I say that the Republican majority continues to abuse its power.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), a very distinguished American from San Diego, the Navy Top Gun who was nominated for the Congressional Medal of Honor for actions over the skies of North Vietnam and who has a real heart for the servicemen.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) is a descendant of Daniel Boone. He is like a brother. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), or Silver, as we call him, would rather work in a bipartisan manner than anything and is a very close friend.

I heard this morning in our conference the words ''a soldier's chairman,'' and I cannot think of a better

fitting for this bill and the chairman that presents it. The gentleman from California's (Mr. HUNTER) dad, R.O. Hunter, was in the Marine Corps. The gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) served in Vietnam. His son is in the Marine Corps and a lieutenant today.

But I think even more important, the people in this Chamber who know the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), know he has given his life to this Nation, to our military, and our veterans.

We go out to Walter Reed and we see these kids that have lost a foot or an arm, and do the Members know what they ask me? I talked to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), and they talk to him the same way; they say, Do not let them kick us out of the service, let us go back to our units. These kids that are wounded multiple times and they fight to stay with their units because they believe in it.

And I think what a fitting bill that takes care of our families, that takes care of our troops, and is supported in such a bipartisan way. I think this Nation is proud, and I think this Nation supports not only this bill, but the actions of Members on both sides of the aisle.

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

May I respond to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), my friend. I am most appreciative of his kind words.

This is a very important bill, Mr. Chairman. We are at war. Needless to say, a lot of legislative work went into this bill, and of course there are some disappointments that go along with it. But the bottom line is, it is going to be very helpful in both the anti-guerrilla effort in Iraq and the antiterrorism effort in Afghanistan as well as supporting the troops all over the globe.

Cicero once said that gratitude is the greatest of all virtues, and through this legislation, in our own way, Mr. Chairman, we are expressing our gratitude to the young men and young women who wear the uniform of our country. We thank them for doing their duty, for understanding what their duty is, for being professionals at what they are, and bottom line, being patriotic.

So we thank them in so many ways, in the amendments and in the paragraphs and the figures, as well as in the speeches in this Chamber, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), my friend, our chairman, and Members on both sides of the aisle.

So, Mr. Chairman, I fully support the bill. And at the end of this debate, I say thank you to the troops and I thank the majority, especially our chairman, for the cooperation that we have had.

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

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

Having heard the eloquence of my great colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) and preceded by the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), my old compadre, I do not think I can add anything to what they said.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4200, Fiscal Year 2005 Defense Authorization. The House Armed Services Committee deserves recognition for producing a bill that addresses the critical needs of our Armed Forces at a time when we are engaged in major military campaigns in both Iraq and Afghanistan. The bill also makes provisions to ensure the long-term strength of our military readiness and improve the livelihood of our military families.

Specifically, I am pleased that this measure eliminates the Survivor Benefit Penalty to spouses of deceased members of the Armed Forces. Not only is this annuity essential to the livelihood of many surviving spouses, but it provides much-needed peace of mind to our dedicated military personnel.

Additionally, I am pleased that this bill contains $400 million for individual body armor. I have long been concerned about this issue since receiving several phone calls and heartfelt letters from parents in my district whose children serving in Iraq have no body armor. There is no excuse for us to send our soldiers into harm's way without this most basic protection. H.R. 4200 commits substantial resources to ensure that our troops have the body armor they need.

Next week, we will commemorate Memorial Day and remember the courageous men and women who made the ultimate sacrifice for our freedom. Regrettably, since the beginning of the campaign in Iraq, we have added 793 to their ranks. More troubling is that potentially one in four of these fatalities could have been avoided if our troops had had the armored equipment they needed.

This bill makes a commitment not only to the memory of the soldiers we have lost but also the ones that continue to be in harm's way in Iraq. We owe it to their memory and those who answer the call to service to do everything in our power to minimize the risk of loss of life.

I also want to rise in opposition to H. Res. 648, the rule for consideration of this bill. In Rules Committee, I offered three amendments that would have substantially improved the underlying bill. Regrettably, the Committee decided to deny this body the opportunity to consider two of my amendments.

My first amendment would have ensured that the Department of Defense had a steady stream of domestically produced electronic equipment. These components are vital to the maintenance of some of our most sophisticated weapons and communications systems.

My second amendment would have allowed individuals to apply for benefits under the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Act if they developed diseases from their work at facilities that had residual contamination, after the Manhattan Project had been completed. It is long overdue to do right by this aging and ill population.

Our men and women in uniform are bravely serving all over the world because their country has called on them. In return, we must ensure that we are doing everything within our power to provide them with what they need. This bill makes great progress toward meeting the needs of our soldiers and their families.

For this reason, Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support for H.R. 4200.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to S. Con. Res. 95, the "Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2005." In these times of economic uncertainty it is unthinkable to pass a budget that will leave this country over $8 trillion in debt at year's end.

I have often quoted my friend, Princeton economist Uwe Reinhardt, when talking about the Federal budget. He explains the budget as a Memo to God, outlining our highest priorities as a Nation. In tune with the Republicans' faith-based initiative, I give you this year's memo to God, and ask everyone to think if this is the message we really want to send to God and the American people.

To: God.

From: Republicans in Congress and the Bush Administration.

Re: FY 2005 Budget Priorities.

Date: May 19, 2004

God, it has been a really tough year. We are on track to have the worst jobs growth record since the great depression, we have lost nearly 800 of our bravest young men and women in Iraq, and 43.6 million Americans have no health insurance. With this in mind, we have proposed a budget that is both fiscally and compassionately conservative, which we have outlined below.

We feel it is absolutely necessary to have a $690 billion deficit in FY 2005, which will raise the national debt to over $8 trillion dollars. We are raising the debt limit under the Hastert rule, thereby precluding the House from ever debating whether the coming years' budget should be allowed to increase the Federal debt by such an alarming amount. Every man, woman, and child will have over $26,000 in national debt to call their very own by the end of FY 2005.

God, we know it's a sin, but we haven't been very good at telling the truth lately; first it was weapons of mass destructions, and now it is Medicare. Our own experts have told us that the Medicare prescription drug bill we passed last year will cost $534 billion dollars over 10 years. However, we didn't tell anybody before we voted, so there is no reason to pretend it is reality now. The budget resolution assumes this legislation will only cost $409 billion over ten years, meaning we have purposely underestimated the $609 billion deficit to further cover up previous mistakes.

Since we have been so dedicated to healthcare this year with Medicare, we have no choice but to make broad cuts in the Medicaid program. Over the next five years we promise to cut mandatory Medicaid spending by nearly $900 million dollars. We are aware that many low-income children and mothers may lose access to affordable healthcare services, but this is the price we have to pay for continuing huge tax cuts for corporations and wealthy Americans.

Racking up an over $600 billion deficit also requires large doses of fiscal irresponsibility. As the party of fiscal conservatism we are dedicated to paying for our increased spending—unless that spending is earmarked for the war on terrorism—but not the decreased revenues caused by our tax cuts. Pay-as-you-go rules worked to balance the budget during the Clinton Administration, so we cannot possibly use them to balance our budget. Yes, we did pretend to require new spending and tax cut offsets for one year, but that has no real effect on our agenda because we exempted three major tax cuts that we plan to enact this year that will cost $551 billion over the next ten years.

Finally, we have further endangered Social Security and Medicare by increasing the

debt, thereby increasing the amount that must be borrowed each year from the trust funds. With the baby boomers approaching retirement, we know we can't continue to pilfer these trust funds, but we do it anyway. In the end, the only plausible option will be to cut Social Security and Medicare to continue paying for our unjustified wars and irresponsible tax cuts for the upper class.

God, we know you will understand why it is necessary to continue tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans while we cut vital services for the elderly, people with disabilities and the poor. This memo is about our priorities, and upon close analysis of this budget I think you will see what true compassion and fiscal conservatism is really all about.

That is the message that House Republicans are sending to God and to the American public. It's not a message I agree with and that is why I urge my colleagues to join me in voting ''no'' on this misguided priority list for our Nation.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, throughout the last year there have been numerous reports, some issued by government agencies, others emanating from news organizations, that have detailed critical shortages of equipment needed to protect our young men and women serving in Iraq.

I visited Iraq last year and spoke with our troops serving there about the shortages of armored Humvees and body armor. I know that many of my colleagues who have visited Iraq have raised similar concerns. I have pressed this issue during consideration of the Iraq supplemental and on numerous other occasions. Many of our troops who have been killed in Iraq in the past months were riding in unarmored Humvees that were hit by small arms fire, rocket-propelled grenades, or improvised explosive devices. Doubtless, some were lost because they were not protected.

I was deeply disappointed by the length of time that it has taken to provide our soldiers with this life-saving equipment, and I am pleased that Chairman HUNTER and Ranking Member SKELTON wisely increased funding for these programs by several orders of magnitude. Because of these increases, I will add my voice of support for the bill.

I am also pleased that the Committee has increased the end strength of the Army and Marine Corps over the next three years. Our active duty forces, our Reserves, and our Guard have been overstretched by operations in the War on Terrorism and the war in Iraq. I have been strongly supportive of increasing the size of the military, and by authorizing additional forces, we will enable our troops to get the training and time for rest and re-fit that they need and deserve.

I am less pleased by the provisions relating to the rush to deploy a National Missile Defense system that I believe is not ready for deployment. I support additional research and testing of ballistic missile defense systems, but the imminent deployment of the first interceptors is premature and diverts taxpayer money that is more immediately needed to provide basic security for our troops.

I am most concerned by the ill-conceived decision to authorize more than $36 million for research into the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator, as well as a new generation of advanced nuclear weapons. At a time when we are asking other nations to forswear the development of nuclear weapons, when we invaded Iraq because we thought that Saddam was developing nuclear weapons, when Osama bin-Laden has exhorted his followers to use nuclear weapons against the United States, and when our own State Department has compiled a Top Secret list of sites around the world that contain unsecured fissile material, we should be focusing on non-proliferation, counter-proliferation, and cleanout activities. Funding for a new generation of nuclear weapons enhances neither our security, nor our credibility.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation to Chairman HUNTER and Ranking Member SKELTON for their leadership in bringing this bill before the House. I honor after dedication to our uniformed men and women, and their families and dependents.

I have often criticized our military budget. There is simply too much waste, too much duplication, too much fraud and abuse. We fund weapon systems that don't work, or contribute to a new arms race, or both. On these matters, I will support the amendment to be offered later today by Congresswoman TAUSCHER and my Massachusetts colleague Congressman MARKEY.

I believe, however, that this bill makes important contributions to protecting our troops in the field and to the welfare of their families.

H.R. 4200 fixes the long-standing problem of the Social Security offset for our military retirees and their survivors, which is a top priority for my constituents. The Survivor Benefit Plan currently penalizes over 225,000 aging survivors, mostly widows of our nation's veterans. These survivors are forced to give up more than one-third of their retirement benefit when they become eligible for Social Security. Mr. Chairman, this is simply wrong.

Bipartisan legislation to fix the Survivor Benefit Plan was introduced over a year ago by our colleague form Florida, Congressman MILLER, and despite having 336 cosponsors, was left to languish. So, I salute the Committee for ending this injustice by providing a five-year phase-out of the Social Security offset.

I strongly support the increased funding for Armored Humvees, to outfit currently deployed Humvees with ballistic armor, and for Interceptor body armor. This bill also reimburses military personnel who had to purchase their own body armor because the Pentagon failed to provide them with protection.

I also want to thank the Committee for including an initiative for income replacement payments to Reservists who experience a reduction to income from their civilian life. I believe this is an important step that should be extended to National Guard members, especially for those who have experienced extended deployments. The financial stress faced by the families of our active-duty Reserve and Guard is well-known to every Member of this House, and I believe we must respond in a far more comprehensive way if we expect to honor their service and sacrifice, retain current personnel, and attract future candidates for service. I am deeply disappointed that the Republican majority will not allow Congressman LANTOS to offer his amendment, which would help equalize the difference in income for federal workers who have been called to active-duty in the Reserves. I am an original cosponsor on Congressional LANTOS' legislation that would provide such funding, and I am very proud that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has already implemented such a program for state employees who have been activated. I simply do not see why we cannot do the same for federal employees nation-wide.

I also want to thank the Committee for its strong bipartisan support for keeping in place the limits on the number of U.S. military troops and contractors in Colombia, and I thank our colleagues from Mississippi, GENE TAYLOR, for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I want to be clear: Even though I support this bill I have serious concerns about U.S. Policy in Iraq and Afghanistan. This bill cannot be a blank check. Our policies are in serious trouble in both countries. The Bush Administration must, I believe, change course if we are to have any hope of brining security, stability and representative government to the region.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4200, ''The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005''.

I would like to start off by commending Chairman DUNCAN HUNTER and the entire Committee on Armed Services for all of the hard work on this legislation. A bill of this magnitude requires an enormous bi-partisan effort. The result here is legislation that will provide the resources necessary for U.S. military forces to protect and defend this country both at home and abroad.

I am concerned, however, with several provisions in this bill affecting the acquisition system. The first provisions interfere with the Department of Defense's competitive sourcing program. The second group of provisions represent an ill-considered attempt to protect domestic jobs. We can all agree that the Federal government should do as much as it can to support jobs in America. However, tacking on onerous provisions to the acquisition system to protect a handful of jobs is not the right approach. It costs money—taxpayers' money. The acquisition system's purpose is to procure the best value goods and services with taxpayers' dollars, not to protect jobs. Most important, we have learned time and time again that provisions restricting our ability to tap the resources of the global market in the name of saving jobs result in retaliation from our trading partners, costing us more jobs in the long run.

First, we have the provisions of the Langevin amendment included in the Committee mark. These provisions, if enacted, would require sweeping changes to the Administration's critical competitive sourcing program and hamstring the Defense Department's ability to manage its programs and workforce.

Our economy is based on a free market system where competition is essential to maintaining vibrancy and productivity. Who can argue with the idea that a little competition is needed to spur efficiency in Government? The problem is that, despite having considerable input into the revised OMB Circular A–76 that provides the procedural framework for the competitive sourcing program, its opponents have mounted an attack on competitive sourcing. They equate ''competitive sourcing'' with ''outsourcing'' or ''privatization,'' or at least they say they do. But words matter, and competitive sourcing is simply not the same as outsourcing or privatization. Outsourcing assumes up front that the private sector can perform activities better, cheaper, and/or faster

than a government organization. Competitive sourcing does not assume the private sector is the preferred provider. Its purpose is not to downsize the government workforce. It uses competition to decide. Opponents argue that competitive sourcing takes jobs away from Federal employees. This is simply untrue. In most cases, the Federal employees involved in the competition either retain their jobs if the agency team wins or are rehired if the private sector wins. In fact, according to agency data from a recent GAO report, in-house teams win most of the competitions, retaining almost 76 percent of the positions competed. The key point is, public-private competitions result in substantial savings in the activity competed, regardless of who wins the competition.

The Langevin language would cripple the competitive sourcing program at the Department of Defense. It would, for example, prevent the Department from making reasoned management decisions for the benefit of our Armed Forces and the American taxpayer by prohibiting the Defense Department from making any reorganization of a function so that it would be performed by 10 or fewer employees unless it conducts a public/private competition. Think about this: under this provision, the Secretary of Defense is prohibited from paring his office staff from 12 people to 9.

Further, the Langevin amendment unfairly tilts public-private competitions toward the Federal employees and introduces into private businesses' right to offer their employees a total compensation package by prohibiting the A–76 cost comparison from including any savings that could be attributable to a businesses' use of a worker health plan that is different than that provided to Federal government employees. This would establish a Federal mandate to private industry and cripple the ability of small businesses to participate in this program. That, Mr. Chairman, is not good government.

The Langevin provision also would require the Department of Defense to establish a pilot program to conduct an arbitrary number of public/private competitions for new work and work currently performed by contractors. This would mandate that the Department expend resources so that Federal workers can compete with the private sector to perform new commercial work. Don't our Federal workers have enough to do in fulfilling their current responsibilities? Interestingly, the requirements would not extend to any work to be performed by a contractor whose workers are represented by a private-sector labor union.

Finally, the Langevin amendment imposes a mass of reporting and tracking requirements, which in a number of cases duplicate requirements that are currently in chapter 146 of title 10. The only point of these is to gum up the competitive sourcing program. A number of these mandates would apply whenever a service contract is awarded by the agency, whether or not as the result of a competitive sourcing study. So not only are the Langevin supporters interested in hamstringing the competitive sourcing program but also in reversing the recently passed reforms in service contracting.

Secondly, section 811 of the bill, titled Defense Trade Reciprocity, would prohibit DoD from purchasing any defense article or service from any company in a country (including our NATO allies, our coalition partners, and Israel) that within one year does not have an offset policy toward U.S. companies that is comparable to U.S. offset policy. This provision is ill advised, would severly limit the ability of the Department of Defense to cooperate with our allies and operate overseas, and would undercut the ability of our defense industry to compete in selling to our allies.

Last fall, the Congress passed two provisions dealing with offsets. In the extension of the Defense Production Act, we asked the Commerce Department to complete a study by this August on the impact of offsets on the supplier base and required the Administration to discuss with our trading partners ways to reduce the ''adverse'' impacts of offsets. Congress is to receive periodic reports on how such discussions are progressing.

In last year's Defense Appropriations Act, we required the Department of Defense to prepare a report by March 1 on the impact of offsets on the defense industrial base and make any appropriate recommendations. We ought to at least wait for the results of the actions we demanded of the Executive Branch only a few months ago before taking premature actions on offsets.

In fact, while offsets distort international defense trade, concern about the impact of offsets is overblown. The annual Commerce Department review of offsets that is required by a provision of the Defense Production Act consistently concludes that defense sales that have associated offset provisions produce approximately 30,000 U.S. jobs, and the offsets reduce that figure by about 9,000 jobs, for a net gain to the U.S. of 21,000 jobs. Any actions that jeopardized those sales could result in a net loss of jobs and an erosion of the U.S. defense industrial base.

The U.S. currently enjoys a trade balance in defense exports of 6–1 in its favor with respect to Europe and around 12–1 with respect to the world. In a time when we worry about ballooning trade deficits, the U.S. aerospace industry delivers the largest export surplus of any sector in the economy with over a $25 billion trade surplus in 2003. Policies that restrict the ability of U.S. companies to continue making such sales will hinder interoperability with our allies, reduce U.S. jobs, and undercut the supplier base.

The simple fact is that restrictive provisions such as this are self-defeating, Cold War anachronisms that cripple our participation in the Global Market and jeopardize defense exports—one of the major sectors of our economy.

Finally, the Manzullo amendment, to be considered on the floor, would add the creation of jobs in the U.S. as one of the instances that the Secretary of Defense could use in a determination under 10 U.S.C. 2304(b)(1) to exclude a source to establish or maintain alternative sources of supply. The 10 U.S.C. 2304(b)(1) is seldom used and it is discretionary, but it could be used to justify a sole-source contract award under the guise that it created jobs.

Moreover, the amendment would add ''the creation of jobs'' to the list of required evaluation factors for all negotiated acquisitions under 10 U.S.C. 2305(a)(3)(A). This would mandate that the creation of jobs be a factor in the selection of the winning offeror in a competitive acquisition. The problem here is that we would be requiring the consideration of a factor that has nothing whatever to do with the merits or cost of the proposal. Again we are burdening our acquisition system with a requirement that is not related to the acquisition of best value goods and services for the government.

Additionally, I am concerned with Chairman HUNTER's amendment that adds money for the Patriot missile and uses a $48 million cut to the KEI program as one of the offsets. The KEI program will play a crucial role in our Nation's security by providing enemy ballistic missile defense. Any cut in funding will hinder this program's advances in the area of anti-ballistic missiles.

I also want to offer my support to the Wamp amendment, which makes improvements to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Act. The amendment addresses statutory problems that have created significant bottlenecks for thousands of claims being made under this important DOE program.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I want to again commend Chairman HUNTER for this bill in its entirety, despite my opposition to some of its specifics.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support for H.R. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2005.

As a Member of the Armed Services Committee, I wish to thank Chairman HUNTER and Ranking Member SKELTON, as well as our subcommittee chairmen and ranking members for their tireless work in crafting this fine piece of legislation.

These are not easy times for the Department of Defense. The brave men and women of the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marines are serving us proudly around the globe. They are daily putting their lives on the line to defend the liberties we take for granted. In the last 2 years these men and women have overthrown two terrorist regimes and liberated over 50 million people in Afghanistan and Iraq.

The least we can do for our troops is provide good wages, adequate armor and ammunition, and new aircraft, ships and fighting vehicles. This legislation meets and exceeds these goals. I am pleased that this bill will provide a 3.5 percent across-the-board pay raise, eliminating out-of-pocket housing expenses and increasing retention incentives and hazard duty pay.

Hearing of inadequacies in body armor and up-armored HMMWVs from family members of soldiers in the field, I made force protection my number one priority. Earlier this year I traveled to Ohio to see first-hand the manufacturing process and capabilities of up-armored HMMWVs.

I thank the chairman and ranking member for fulfilling their commitment by providing $704.7 million to increase and sustain production of the vehicles at a rate of 450 per month.

I also applaud their forward vision in providing $358.2 million for add-on armor kits for the Army's truck fleet. The add-on armor provides critical protection against anti-personnel projectiles and improvised explosive devices (IEDs).

Earlier this year the 1109th AVCRAD, a Connecticut National Guard aviation repair unit, returned from a year deployment in Kuwait and Iraq. Conversations with the CO made clear to me that the Blackhawk helicopters in theater are wearing out rapidly.

Therefore, I am pleased to see that many of the funds originally authorized in the Comanche program have been redirected to the procurement of much needed Blackhawk Helicopters. The eight helicopters added by the

committee brings the grand total in the bill to 63. Our soldiers specifically asked for more Blackhawks, a workhorse helicopter for our Army and Navy, and this is now provided in this bill.

For our sailors, this bill provides funding for the next Virginia Class submarine. Virginia Class will also be seeing critical research and development funding for both payloads and sensors and the critical Multi-Mission Modules.

Additionally, I am pleased that this legislation addresses the security needs of Naval Submarine Base New London, in Groton, Connecticut, by providing $4.42 million for security enhancements and upgrades to entry gates 3 and 5. These upgrades are necessary to protect the submariners stationed at Subase New London, as well as protecting our investment in the submarine fleet, including the new USS *Virginia* that will soon call the Subase home.

Mr. Chairman, in December 2003, Time magazine named their ''Person of the Year'' as the American Soldier. This year's defense authorization bill has been named ''The Year of the Troops.'' We praise the men and women of the Armed Forces for their service. I am pleased to support a piece of legislation that sends a clear message from this Congress that we support their service and sacrifice.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005. I'd like to thank Chairman HUNTER, Ranking Member SKELTON, and my Subcommittee leaders Chairman WELDON and Ranking Member ABERCROMBIE and Chairman HEFLEY and Ranking Member ORTIZ for all their hard work and efforts to put together a great and bipartisan bill.

The bill we are taking up on the floor today contains a number of very important provisions beyond its routine function of providing for the yearly defense budget.

Specifically, Section 304 includes language that provides authority to the Secretary of Defense to reimburse a member of the Armed Forces for the cost of protective body armor purchased between September 11, 2001 and December 31, 2003 by the member, or by another person on behalf of the member, for use by the member while deployed in connection with Operation Noble Eagle, Operation Enduring Freedom, or Operation Iraqi Freedom if the member was so deployed and was not issued protective body armor before the member became engaged in operations or situations described in 37USC310(a)(2), regarding ''Special pay: duty subject to hostile fire or imminent danger''.

This language is a direct result of both the effort and sacrifice of my constituent Pene Palifka of East Hartford, whose son, Bill, was serving in the Army National Guard's 248th Engineer Company in Iraq. On Monday night, October 13, 2003, I held a public forum about the FY04 Iraq supplemental appropriation request in my District where I first met Pene Palifka and heard her story. When her son Bill was deployed, he was deployed without the Army's new Interceptor body armor, because as it had been reported and as I heard directly from soldiers serving in Iraq when I visited there in August 2003, there was a shortage of roughly 40,000 of these vests at that time.

Out of concern for her son's safety, she came forward and provided the money herself, about $1,100, to purchase body armor for her son. Many other families and soldiers have had to do the same, and that is simply wrong.

Congress appropriated funding in the FY03 Emergency Wartime Supplemental that was signed into law in April 2003 to procure and distribute additional vests. But, as became evident by the time the Iraq Supplemental Appropriation bill was before Congress last October, there were various manufacturing and procurement issues preventing these vests from making it to the front, and this shortage continued to exist through the early part of this year, prompting many soldiers or their families to take matters into their own hands.

While the Congress and the Department of Defense have worked to address these shortfalls since then, this bill fulfills the government's responsibility to reimburse the people who stepped in and spent money out of their own pocket to equip the soldiers serving in the Global War on Terrorism with equipment that Congress intended the Department of Defense to provide.

The next issue I would like to point out and commend our Committee leaders for is working with all of us to find the resources to make eliminating the so-called ''widows tax'' possible. This bill eliminates the social security offset under the SBP by increasing the annuities paid to survivors of military retirees who are 62 or older from 35 percent of retired pay to 55 percent by March 2008. The surviving spouses of our military servicemen and women deserve their full benefits.

Finally, this bill includes a 2-year BRAC delay, an important pause at a time when we must all reassess the priorities of the military and its requirements to provide for the national security of this country in a post 9/11 environment.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I proudly rise today in wholehearted support of H.R. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act of 2005. This legislation fully restores the Survivor Benefit Plan annuity to what was promised America's surviving spouses. I applaud my Armed Services Committee colleagues for bringing a quarter of a million military widows and widowers one step closer to seeing increases in their monthly checks next year. This is a Defense Authorization measure of which this body can be proud.

Since coming to Congress, I have been working this issue of particular interest—restoration of the minimum Survivor Benefit Plan basic annuity to fifty-five percent (55%) for survivors age sixty-two (62) and older.

Under present law, surviving spouses are subject to a reduction to thirty-five percent (35%) as part of the initial SBP law enacted in 1972. But this critical piece of information didn't find its way into military retirement briefings and SBP election forms until many years later.

Here's a 1982 election form. Nowhere will you find the offset mentioned. Survivors feel betrayed by this bait and switch. And at 35 percent, SBP provides only a poverty-level-or lower-annuity for most survivors, even those of relatively senior officers.

For nearly three years, I have worked with members of this Committee, my colleagues on the Veterans Affairs Committee, and numerous service organizations to introduce SBP bills that will bring the needed equity. Both bills I have introduced in this Congress have received strong bipartisan support with over three hundred (300) Members sponsoring one or both. I am proud that this Committee has produced SBP reform that exceeds even my greatest expectations. H.R. 4200 will fully eliminate the so-called ''Widow's Tax'' by April 1, 2008—in under five years.

Again, what we're doing today exceeds all expectations. It's what we set our sights upon when I introduced H.R. 548. I thank Chairman DUNCAN HUNTER and the first-rate Armed Services Committee staff, who literally worked around the clock to make this work.

Mr. Chairman, I urge this entire body to support these provisions we have worked tirelessly hard fought, and its victory is shared by so many whose efforts have been tireless and unrelenting. I thank my colleagues who have stood by me to realize this victory.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, the export control amendments in H.R. 4200 will limit Presidential authority to effectively promote U.S. national security and will hobble the U.S. information technology industry by preventing it from selling commodity commercial products to our allies.

This bill requires an export license for all exports of goods and technologies on the Military Critical Technologies List to all countries.

This legislation would roll back export controls on computers below the levels implemented five years ago—thus preventing our technology industry from exporting computing products that are a few generations old.

This amendment is so broad that it would immediately require export licenses for exports of things such as laptop and desktop computers, which can't possibly serve any national security interest.

By passing this amendment, we are immediately cutting off American manufacturers from customers around the world, including key export markets such as Canada, Mexico, Europe, and Asia.

The amendment is so arbitrary, and the list so outdated, that it bears no rational relation to U.S. national security, and threatens to derail America's economic recovery.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to protect our critical technology industry and vote against H.R. 4200.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4200, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005.

This legislation supports our troops with $422 billion for national defense and an additional $25 billion for operations in Iraq. Funding for national missile defense and combat capability would increase. Special emphasis on protective equipment such as body armor and heavily-armored Humvees would also help our soldiers return safely to their families.

We must care for our soldiers' families here at home. I am proud to support the well-earned 3.5 percent pay raise and boost in hardship pay from $300 to $750. As a co-chair of the House Impact Aid Coalition, I also commend Chairman Hunter for including $50 million for the education of military children. This would send an additional $20 million to school districts across the country that serve military families. I thank the Chairman for his hard work and strong support of this critical funding.

While I appreciate the emphasis the Air Force has placed on quality of life improvements, I am deeply concerned that mission readiness be funded at adequate levels to support our troops. For example, Offutt Air Force Base in Nebraska has a mission critical runway repair requiring urgent attention. The

safety of airmen flying in and out of Offutt depends upon the condition of this runway, which the Air Force has labeled a critical safety hazard.

Although the repair is the top priority of the Air Combat Command that oversees 38 major installations, the Pentagon has given funding priority to dormitories and fitness centers. I thank Chairman Hunter for at least funding design of the needed runway, and urge him to reexamine the Air Force's priorities in conference. We must ensure mission critical repairs are completed for the safety of our airmen. Military bases that consistently and efficiently perform should also be rewarded for their success.

The War on Terror has been costly in both blood and treasure. More than 750 American soldiers have given the ultimate sacrifice of their lives. Our troops who patrol the streets of Iraq, scour the towns and mountains of Afghanistan, and root out terrorist cells worldwide, know the price of freedom. Their service to protect our nation honors their fallen comrades and dignifies the United States, and should not be demeaned by the cowardly actions of soldiers in the Abu Ghraib prison.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 4200 to aid our valiant troops.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my strong support for the passage of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005. This legislation will continue to ensure that our military services are provided with the personnel, equipment and capabilities that they need to protect our national security.

Section 815 of the pending National Defense Authorization Act will ensure that American freight-forwarding companies in Louisiana, Texas, California, Tennessee and other states are properly utilized in the efforts by the United States to provide cargo shipments for military operations, humanitarian relief aid, or postwar reconstruction in Iraq and Afghanistan. American freight forwarders should be used to the greatest extent possible to process, dispatch or otherwise handle government-sponsored cargoes for shipment overseas.

The Congress continues to see to it that American companies and their hard-working labor force benefit from the procurement of goods and services by the United States government. Specifically, the Congress has required that the American work force be provided with a fair opportunity to compete for federal government contracts. Similarly, cargo preference laws ensure that government-generated cargoes are shipped aboard United States-flag vessels. However, no such protections exist for American freight forwarders. As a result, significant government shipments of cargoes for military operations, international assistance and other purposes are handled today by foreign-owned and controlled freight forwarders without any consideration for the use of American companies to provide freight forwarding services.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation before us will provide appropriate protections for American freight forwarding companies and U.S. government-sponsored cargoes. The bill establishes a preference for the participation of U.S. freight forwarding companies as prime or subcontractors in the shipment of government-sponsored cargoes, provided that the freight forwarding services are offered at fair and reasonable rates. Furthermore, this initiative will further protect the chain-of-custody of critical and sensitive project and other U.S. government-sponsored cargoes destined for Iraq and Afghanistan.

Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman HUNTER, Congressman SKELTON and other members of the House Armed Services Committee for their support in this matter, and I look forward to working with them on the passage of this vital legislation.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the FY 2005 Defense Authorization bill. The bill continues to fund an ineffective and wasteful defense strategy based on the Cold War. The bill authorizes $422.2 billion for the Department of Defense and the nuclear weapons activities of the Department of Energy. However, the 2001 Defense Authorization bill was $310 billion, revealing that we have increased nominal defense spending 36 percent in just four short years.

The FY 2005 bill also authorizes $25 billion for combat operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. This increases the total funding to $447.2 billion. The running total for emergency supplementals has now reached $191 billion for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Unfortunately the Republican led Congress continues to refuse its Constitutional role of oversight.

The bill funds several weapons systems as well as a war in Iraq that will provide little additional security for Americans. For example, the Ballistic Missile Defense is slated to receive $9 billion for a system that does not work, but will be implemented this year as an election year boost for the President.

The F/A–22 ''Raptor'' Fighter is a cold war fighter plane without an enemy to fight. Yet, the bill will spend $4.5 billion to purchase 24 aircraft. The bill authorizes the purchase of 11 V–22 ''Osprey'' Tilt rotor for $1.6 billion, yet the plane is terribly unsafe. The bill also authorizes more research dollars for the DD(X) Destroyer, wasting $1.2 billion on a boat the Navy does not need. I also object to the Boeing airborne tankers lease/purchase program. This is a classic example of corporate welfare.

I am greatly disappointed that the Republicans have sought to block consideration of two amendments I would have offered. These amendments would have provided the House of Representatives the opportunity to help bring resolution to the ongoing crisis in Iraq.

My first amendment would require that the President develop criteria for troop withdrawal from Iraq.

The war that we are fighting in Iraq at this time is an unconventional war. We have already deposed the leader of the country, and now we now fight both an unknown enemy and a new enemy that was not there before we invaded. There is no exit strategy and every six months or so the American people are faced with a new bill. The leaders of our country have given them no indication that they even know how to get out of Iraq, much less an idea of when their sons and daughters will come home.

The amendment that I would have offered today would require the Administration to provide Congress with a list of criteria for the withdrawal of combat troops in Iraq.

This amendment is useful because it provides America and the world with the answers to the question: What are we still doing in Iraq and what must happen so that we can leave?

These questions are simple and they are necessary.

After all, what are the goals that this Administration hopes to achieve before the withdrawal of troops can commence?

At the very beginning of the war, the ultimate goal was to disarm Iraq from weapons of mass destruction. But there weren't any weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, and our troops are still there.

At another point, the goal was to remove Saddam Hussein from power. Well, that's been done too, and our troops are still there.

So now what? What are the next criteria?

Will troops come home after we've established the largest embassy in the world inside Iraq? Or will they come home after the oil starts flowing in to the right pockets? Or will it be when the defense contractors get billion more of American taxpayer dollars? Or when there are permanent military bases in Iraq so that we can extend an American empire to the Middle East?

Or is it when we've brought ''democracy'' to the people of Iraq? But what constitutes a democracy? An interim government was set up and a constitution was drafted, but we're still there. Will we pull out after an election, or two elections, or three? What happens if the Iraqis elect a leader that we don't like? Will we stay inside until the person of our choosing is running the country?

Is the criterion for leaving Iraq complete ''pacification'', in that we won't leave Iraq until all the fighting has stopped and the country is secure? What will that mean? Will it mean a slow down to one attack per day or week or month?

My amendment is a modest amendment because it requires the Administration to think about all these questions and then tell the American people what exactly it will take to bring the troops home.

And we should all want the answers to these questions. I know that my constituents elected me to ask these questions. After all, it's their money that we're committing.

My feelings about the war are known here. I have been against the war and the occupation. But since it appears as if the Administration does not care to volunteer the details of their objectives in Iraq, we should then ask them.

My second amendment would offer a sense of Congress that would disavow any intention for permanent United States military presence in Iraq. As we all know, many people across the globe have accused the United States of imperial thoughts and actions. To ensure the global community we have no such notions; we must publicly declare our intentions not to establish permanent military bases.

A month after the United States began military operations in Iraq, the New York Times (April, 21, 2003) printed a story indicating that the United States was considering the establishment of four permanent military installations in Iraq. The bases identified are the Baghdad international airport; the Talil airbase near Nasariyah; a base known as H–1 in the western desert near Syria; and Bashur airfield in the Kurdish region near the convergence of the borders of Turkey, Iran and Iraq. On the very next day the Secretary of Defense denied that the United States was seeking permanent military installations in Iraq.

But, neoconservatives are openly talking about the benefits of such permanent bases.

Given that the Turks had been truculent about access by ground before Operation

Iraqi Freedom, that the use of Saudi Arabia has been a delicate matter for the past decade, and that Iraq is ideally situated for operations throughout the region, there is a compelling case for siting U.S. bases in Iraq. (There's No Place Like Iraq . . . For U.S. military bases. Tom Donnelly Weekly Standard 05/05/2003)

More recently in the Inter Press Service News Agency:

But Qatar and even Kuwait, which has acted as a de facto military base for Washington since 1990, could not substitute for the kind of strategic depth and flexibility offered by the four bases identified by the Times as those to which the administration wants permanent access. (Jim Lobe, Nov. 28, 2003)

I believe the Arab world would take great comfort in hearing a declaration by the United States to disavow permanent military bases in Iraq. The United States must state without exception that it does not seek to maintain a long-term military presence in Iraq. Such a declaration will reduce anti-American sentiment in the region and, I believe reduce the attacks upon our troops.

So it is greatly unfortunate that the leadership of the House has not seen fit to debate these amendments.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this Member certainly is pleased that H.R. 4200 provides authorization for funding for a very important project in Nebraska's 1st Congressional District. The bill includes $614,000 for a national guard and reserve center headquarters building at Lincoln Airbase, Nebraska. This is the second year that this Member has requested this funding for this necessary project. This Member would like to thank the distinguished Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee (Mr. HUNTER), the distinguished Ranking Member (Mr. SKELTON), the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) who serves as Chairman of the Readiness Subcommittee, and the Ranking Member, the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ) for their assistance in this important matter.

These funds will be used to complete the design process associated with the construction of a new headquarters and emergency operating center for the Nebraska Army National Guard. The existing headquarters facility must be relocated due to the new Antelope Valley highway/flood control infrastructure project in the City of Lincoln, Nebraska.

While this project was included in the Department of Defense's (DoD) FY2009 Future Year Defense Plan (FYDP), it needs to be accelerated due to the unanticipatedly expeditious progress on the Antelope Valley Freeway and Flood Control project which will very soon necessitate the abandonment of the current headquarters. It appears that the National Guard Bureau agrees since initial design funding was allocated last year from existing funds, even though it was not authorized or appropriated.

The new facility will house the Joint Forces Headquarters, the Army National Guard Emergency Operating Center, the 24th Medical Company, the 105th Personnel Service Detachment, the Nebraska State Patrol dispatch and communications systems and the Nebraska Emergency Management Agency. Building a multipurpose facility on an existing military installation increases security for all of the components. Furthermore, housing several Federal, state and local agencies in one facility allows the Department of Defense to save scarce military construction funds. Also, bringing those various components within close proximity would facilitate better coordination among the agencies on issues of national and homeland security. Indeed, it is critically important to enhance these relationships in the current post-September 11th environment. The authorization included in H.R. 4200 will allow this important project to move forward.

In addition, this Member is pleased that $497,000 in design funds is authorized in H.R. 4200 for a critically important runway repair at Offutt Air Force Base which is immediately contiguous to the 1st Congressional District of Nebraska. This repair project has been championed by the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY), who represents Offutt, with this Member, and the two U.S. Senators from Nebraska.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, this Member urges his colleagues to support H.R. 4200.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. CAMP). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill is considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and is considered read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 4200

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005''.

SEC. 2. ORGANIZATION OF ACT INTO DIVISIONS; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) DIVISIONS.—This Act is organized into three divisions as follows:

(1) Division A—Department of Defense Authorizations.

(2) Division B—Military Construction Authorizations.

(3) Division C—Department of Energy National Security Authorizations and Other Authorizations.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; findings.
Sec. 2. Organization of Act into divisions; table of contents.
Sec. 3. Congressional defense committees.

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

Sec. 101. Army.
Sec. 102. Navy and Marine Corps.
Sec. 103. Air Force.
Sec. 104. Defense-wide activities.

Subtitle B—Program Matters

Sec. 111. Multiyear procurement authority for the light-weight 155-millimeter howitzer program.
Sec. 112. DDG–51 modernization program.
Sec. 113. Repeal of authority for pilot program for flexible funding of cruiser conversions and overhauls.
Sec. 114. Force protection for asymmetric threat environment.
Sec. 115. Allocation of equipment authorized by this title to be made on basis of units deployed or preparing to deploy.
Sec. 116. Multiyear procurement authority for KC–767 tanker aircraft acquisition program.
Sec. 117. Other matters relating to KC–767 tanker aircraft acquisition program.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

Sec. 201. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 202. Amount for defense science and technology.

Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations

Sec. 211. Future Combat Systems program strategy.
Sec. 212. Collaborative program for research and development of vacuum electronics technologies.
Sec. 213. Annual Comptroller General report on Joint Strike Fighter program.
Sec. 214. Amounts for United States Joint Forces Command to be derived only from Defense-wide amounts.
Sec. 215. Authority of Director of Defense Research and Engineering to award prizes for advanced technology achievements.
Sec. 216. Space Based Radar.
Sec. 217. Mark–54 Torpedo Product Improvement Program.

Subtitle C—Missile Defense

Sec. 221. Fielding of ballistic missile defense capabilities.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

Sec. 301. Operation and Maintenance funding.
Sec. 302. Working capital funds.
Sec. 303. Other Department of Defense programs.
Sec. 304. Reimbursement of members of the Armed Forces who purchased protective body armor during shortage of defense stocks of body armor.

Subtitle B—Environmental Provisions

Sec. 311. Report regarding encroachment issues affecting Utah Test and Training Range, Utah.

Subtitle C—Workplace and Depot Issues

Sec. 321. Simplification of annual reporting requirements concerning funds expended for depot maintenance and repair workloads.
Sec. 322. Repeal of annual reporting requirement concerning management of depot employees.
Sec. 323. Public-private competition for work performed by civilian employees of Department of Defense.
Sec. 324. Public-private competition pilot program.
Sec. 325. Sense of Congress on equitable legal standing for civilian employees.
Sec. 326. Competitive sourcing reporting requirement.

Subtitle D—Information Technology

Sec. 331. Preparation of Department of Defense plan for transition to Internet Protocol version 6.
Sec. 332. Defense business enterprise architecture, system accountability, and conditions for obligation of funds for defense business system modernization.
Sec. 333. Establishment of joint program office to improve interoperability of battlefield management command and control systems.

Subtitle E—Readiness Reporting Requirements

Sec. 341. Annual report on Department of Defense operation and financial support for military museums.
Sec. 342. Report on Department of Defense programs for prepositioning of material and equipment.

Subtitle F—Other Matters

Sec. 351. Extension of Arsenal Support Program Initiative.
Sec. 352. Limitation on preparation or implementation of Mid-Range Financial Improvement Plan.
Sec. 353. Procurement of follow-on contracts for the operation of five Champion-class T-5 tank vessels.
Sec. 354. Sense of Congress on America's National World War I Museum.

TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

Subtitle A—Active Forces

Sec. 401. End strengths for active forces.
Sec. 402. Revision in permanent active duty end strength minimum levels.
Sec. 403. Maximum number of reserve personnel authorized to be on active duty for operational support.
Sec. 404. Accounting and management of reserve component personnel performing active duty or full-time National Guard duty for operational support.

Subtitle B—Reserve Forces

Sec. 411. End strengths for Selected Reserve.
Sec. 412. End strengths for Reserves on active duty in support of the reserves.
Sec. 413. End strengths for military technicians (dual status).
Sec. 414. Fiscal year 2005 limitation on number of non-dual status technicians.

Subtitle C—Authorizations of Appropriations

Sec. 421. Military personnel.
Sec. 422. Armed Forces Retirement Home.

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

Subtitle A—General and Flag Officer Matters

Sec. 501. Length of service for service chiefs.
Sec. 502. Repeal of requirement that Deputy Chiefs and Assistant Chiefs of Naval Operations be selected from officers in the line of the Navy.
Sec. 503. Increase in age limit for deferral of mandatory retirement for up to 10 senior general and flag officers.
Sec. 504. Increased flexibility for voluntary retirement for military officers.
Sec. 505. Repeal of requirement that no more than 50 percent of active duty general and flag officers be in grades above brigadier general and rear admiral (lower half).
Sec. 506. Revision to terms for assistants to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for National Guard and Reserve matters.
Sec. 507. Succession for position of Chief, National Guard Bureau.
Sec. 508. Title of Vice Chief of the National Guard Bureau changed to Director of the Joint Staff of the National Guard Bureau.
Sec. 509. Two-year extension of authority to waive requirement that Reserve chiefs and National Guard Directors have significant joint duty experience.
Sec. 510. Repeal of distribution requirements for Naval Reserve flag officers.

Subtitle B—Other Officer Personnel Policy Matters

Sec. 511. Transition of active-duty list officer force to all regular status.
Sec. 512. Mandatory retention on active duty to qualify for retirement pay.
Sec. 513. Distribution in grade of Marine Corps Reserve officers in an active status in grades below brigadier general
Sec. 514. Tuition assistance for officers.

Subtitle C—Reserve Component Matters

Sec. 521. Revision to statutory purpose of the reserve components.
Sec. 522. Improved access to reserve component members for enhanced training.
Sec. 523. Status under disability retirement system for reserve members released from active duty due to inability to perform within 30 days of call to active duty.
Sec. 524. Federal civil service military leave for Reserve and National Guard civilian technicians.
Sec. 525. Expanded educational assistance authority for officers commissioned through ROTC program at military junior colleges.
Sec. 526. Effect of appointment or commission as officer on eligibility for Selected Reserve education loan repayment program for enlisted members.
Sec. 527. Number of Starbase academies in a State.
Sec. 528. Comptroller General assessment of integration of active and reserve components of the Navy.
Sec. 529. Operational activities conducted by the National Guard under authority of title 32.
Sec. 530. Army program for assignment of active component advisers to units of the Selected Reserve.

Subtitle D—Joint Officer Management

Sec. 531. Strategic plan to link joint officer development to overall missions and goals of Department of Defense.
Sec. 532. Joint requirements for promotion to flag or general officer grade.
Sec. 533. Clarification of tours of duty qualifying as a joint duty assignment.
Sec. 534. Reserve joint special officer qualification requirements.

Subtitle E—Professional Military Education

Sec. 541. Improvement to professional military education in the Department of Defense.
Sec. 542. Ribbons to recognize completion of joint professional military education.
Sec. 543. Increase in number of private-sector civilians who may be enrolled for instruction at National Defense University.
Sec. 544. Requirement for completion of Phase I joint professional military education before promotion to colonel or Navy captain.

Subtitle F—Other Education and Training Matters

Sec. 551. College First delayed enlistment program.
Sec. 552. Standardization of authority to confer degrees on graduates of Community College of the Air Force with authority for other schools of Air University.
Sec. 553. Change in titles of heads of the Naval Postgraduate School.
Sec. 554. Increase from two years to three years in period for which educational leave of absence may be authorized.
Sec. 555. Correction to disparate treatment of disabilities sustained during accession training.
Sec. 556. Prayer at military service academy activities.
Sec. 557. Revision to conditions on service of officers as service academy superintendents.
Sec. 558. Codification of prohibition on imposition of certain charges and fees at the service academies.
Sec. 559. Qualifications of the dean of the faculty of United States Air Force Academy.

Subtitle G—Medals and Decorations and Special Promotions and Appointments

Sec. 561. Separate military campaign medals to recognize service in Operation Enduring Freedom and service in Operation Iraqi Freedom.
Sec. 562. Eligibility of all uniformed services personnel for National Defense Service Medal.
Sec. 563. Authority to appoint Brigadier General Charles E. Yeager, United States Air Force (retired), to the grade of major general on the retired list.
Sec. 564. Posthumous commission of William Mitchell in the grade of major general in the Army.

Subtitle H—Military Justice Matters

Sec. 571. Review on how sexual offenses are covered by Uniform Code of Military Justice.
Sec. 572. Service time not lost when confined in connection with trial if confinement excused as unavoidable.
Sec. 573. Clarification of authority of military legal assistance counsel to provide military legal assistance without regard to licensing requirements.

Subtitle I—Administrative and Management Matters

Sec. 581. Three-year extension of limitation on reductions of personnel of agencies responsible for review and correction of military records.
Sec. 582. Staffing and funding for Defense Prisoner of War/Missing Personnel office (DPMO).
Sec. 583. Permanent ID cards for retiree dependents age 70 and older.
Sec. 584. Authority to provide civilian clothing to members traveling in connection with medical evacuation.
Sec. 585. Authority to accept donation of frequent traveler miles, credits, and tickets to facilitate rest and recuperation travel of deployed members of the Armed Forces and their families.
Sec. 586. Limitation on amendment or cancellation of Department of Defense directive relating to reasonable access to military installations for certain personal commercial solicitation.
Sec. 587. Annual identification of reasons for discharges from the Armed Forces during preceding fiscal year.
Sec. 588. Authority for Federal recognition of National Guard commissioned officers appointed from former Coast Guard personnel.
Sec. 589. Study of blended wing concept for the Air Force.
Sec. 590. Continuation of impact aid assistance on behalf of dependents of certain members despite change in status of member.

Subtitle J—Other Matters

Sec. 591. Employment preferences for spouses of certain Department of Defense civilian employees subject to relocation agreements.
Sec. 592. Repeal of requirement to conduct electronic voting demonstration project for the Federal election to be held in November 2004.
Sec. 593. Examination of sexual assault in the Armed Forces by the defense task force established to examine sexual harassment and violence at the military service academies.

Sec. 594. Renewal of pilot program for treating GED and home school diploma recipients as high school graduates for determinations of eligibility for enlistment.
Sec. 595. Assistance to local educational agencies that benefit dependents of members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense civilian employees.
Sec. 596. Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps and recruiter access at institutions of higher education.
Sec. 597. Reports on transformation milestones.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances

Sec. 601. Increase in basic pay for fiscal year 2005.
Sec. 602. Authority to provide family separation basic allowance for housing.
Sec. 603. Geographic basis for basic allowance for housing during short changes of station for professional military education or training.
Sec. 604. Immediate lump-sum reimbursement for unusual nonrecurring expenses incurred by members serving outside continental United States.
Sec. 605. Income replacement payments for Reserves experiencing extended and frequent mobilization for active duty service.
Sec. 606. Authority for certain members deployed in combat zones to receive limited advances on their future basic pay.

Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays

Sec. 611. One-year extension of bonus and special pay authorities.
Sec. 612. Reduction in required service commitment to receive accession bonus for registered nurses.
Sec. 613. Increase in maximum monthly rate authorized for hardship duty pay.
Sec. 614. Termination of assignment incentive pay for members placed on terminal leave.
Sec. 615. Consolidation of reenlistment and enlistment bonus authorities for regular and reserve components.
Sec. 616. Revision of authority to provide foreign language proficiency pay.
Sec. 617. Eligibility of reserve component members for critical skills retention bonus and expansion of authority to provide bonus.
Sec. 618. Eligibility of new reserve component officers for accession or affiliation bonus for officers in critical skills.
Sec. 619. Eligibility of reserve component members for incentive bonus for conversion to military occupational specialty to ease personnel shortage.
Sec. 620. Availability of hazardous duty incentive pay for military firefighters.

Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowances

Sec. 631. Expansion of travel and transportation allowances to assist survivors of a deceased member to attend burial ceremony of the member.
Sec. 632. Transportation of family members incident to the serious illness or injury of members of the uniformed services.
Sec. 633. Reimbursement of members for certain lodging costs incurred in connection with student dependent travel.

Subtitle D—Retired Pay and Survivor Benefits

Sec. 641. Computation of benefits under Survivor Benefit Plan for surviving spouses over age 62.
Sec. 642. Open enrollment period for Survivor Benefit Plan commencing October 1, 2005.
Sec. 643. Source of funds for Survivor Benefit Plan annuities for Department of Defense beneficiaries over age 62.

Subtitle E—Commissary and Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentality Benefits

Sec. 651. Consolidation and reorganization of legislative provisions regarding defense commissary system and exchanges and other morale, welfare, and recreation activities.
Sec. 652. Consistent State treatment of Department of Defense Nonappropriated Fund Health Benefits Program.
Sec. 653. Cooperation and assistance for qualified scouting organizations serving dependents of members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees overseas.

Subtitle F—Other Matters

Sec. 661. Repeal of requirement that members entitled to basic allowance for subsistence pay subsistence charges while hospitalized.
Sec. 662. Clarification of education loans qualifying for education loan repayment program for reserve component health professions officers.
Sec. 663. Survey and analysis of effect of extended and frequent mobilization of Reservists for active duty service on Reservist income.

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Enhanced Benefits for Reserves

Sec. 701. Demonstration project for TRICARE coverage for Ready Reserve members.
Sec. 702. Comptroller General report on the cost and feasibility of providing private health insurance stipends for members of the Ready Reserves.
Sec. 703. Improvement of medical services for activated members of the Ready Reserve and their families.
Sec. 704. Modification of waiver of certain deductibles under TRICARE program.
Sec. 705. Authority for payment by United States of additional amounts billed by health care providers to activated Reserve members.
Sec. 706. Extension of transitional health care benefits after separation from active duty.

Subtitle B—Other Benefits Improvements

Sec. 711. Coverage of certain young children under TRICARE dental program.
Sec. 712. Comptroller General report on provision of health and support services for exceptional family member program enrollees.
Sec. 713. Exceptional eligibility for TRICARE prime remote.
Sec. 714. Transition to home health care benefit under sub-acute care program.
Sec. 715. Requirement relating to prescription drug benefits for medicare-eligible enrollees under defense health care plans.
Sec. 716. Professional accreditation of military dentists.
Sec. 717. Addition of certain unremarried former spouses to persons eligible for dental insurance plan of retirees of the uniformed services.
Sec. 718. Waiver of collection of payments due from certain persons unaware of loss of CHAMPUS eligibility.

Subtitle C—Planning, Programming, and Management

Sec. 721. Pilot program for transformation of health care delivery.
Sec. 722. Study of provision of travel reimbursement to hospitals for certain military disability retirees.

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

Subtitle A—Amendments to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations

Sec. 801. Rapid acquisition authority to respond to combat emergencies.
Sec. 802. Defense acquisition workforce changes.
Sec. 803. Limitation on task and delivery order contracts.
Sec. 804. Funding for contract cancellation ceilings for certain multiyear procurement contracts.
Sec. 805. Increased threshold for requiring contractors to provide specified employee information to cooperative agreement holders.
Sec. 806. Extension of authority for use of simplified acquisition procedures.
Sec. 807. Authority to adjust acquisition-related dollar thresholds for inflation.

Subtitle B—United States Defense Industrial Base Provisions

Sec. 811. Defense trade reciprocity.
Sec. 812. Amendments to domestic source requirements.
Sec. 813. Three-year extension of restriction on acquisition of polyacrylonitrile (PAN) carbon fiber from foreign sources.
Sec. 814. Grant program for defense contractors to implement strategies to avoid outsourcing of jobs.
Sec. 815. Preference for domestic freight forwarding services.

Subtitle C—Other Acquisition Matters

Sec. 821. Sustainment and modernization plans for existing systems while replacement systems are under development.
Sec. 822. Review and demonstration project relating to contractor employees.
Sec. 823. Defense acquisition workforce limitation and reports.
Sec. 824. Provision of information to Congress to enhance transparency in contracting.

TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Sec. 901. Change in title of Secretary of the Navy to Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps.
Sec. 902. Transfer of Center for the Study of Chinese Military Affairs from National Defense University to United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission.
Sec. 903. Transfer to Secretary of the Army of responsibility for Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives Program.
Sec. 904. Modification of obligated service requirements under National Security Education Program.
Sec. 905. Change of membership of certain councils.
Sec. 906. Actions to prevent the abuse of detainees.
Sec. 907. Responses to congressional inquiries.

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Financial Matters

Sec. 1001. Transfer authority.
Sec. 1002. Budget justification documents for operation and maintenance.
Sec. 1003. Retention of fees from intellectual property licenses.

Sec. 1004. Authority to waive claims of the United States when amounts recoverable are less than costs of collection.
Sec. 1005. Repeal of funding restrictions concerning development of medical countermeasures against biological warfare threats.
Sec. 1006. Report on budgeting for exchange rates for foreign currency fluctuations.

Subtitle B—Naval Vessels and Shipyards

Sec. 1011. Authority for award of contracts for ship dismantling on net-cost basis.
Sec. 1012. Independent study to assess cost effectiveness of the Navy ship construction program.
Sec. 1013. Authority to transfer specified former naval vessels to certain foreign countries.
Sec. 1014. Limitation on leasing of foreign-built vessels.

Subtitle C—Sunken Military Craft

Sec. 1021. Preservation of title to sunken military craft and associated contents.
Sec. 1022. Prohibitions.
Sec. 1023. Permits.
Sec. 1024. Penalties.
Sec. 1025. Liability for damages.
Sec. 1026. Relationship to other laws.
Sec. 1027. Encouragement of agreements with foreign countries.
Sec. 1028. Definitions.

Subtitle D—Counter-Drug Activities

Sec. 1031. Continuation of authority to use Department of Defense funds for unified counterdrug and counterterrorism campaign in Colombia.
Sec. 1032. Limitation on number of United States military personnel in Colombia.

Subtitle E—Reports

Sec. 1041. Study of continued requirement for two-crew manning for ballistic missile submarines.
Sec. 1042. Study of effect on defense industrial base of elimination of United States domestic firearms manufacturing base.
Sec. 1043. Study of extent and quality of training provided to members of the Armed Services to prepare for post-conflict operations.

Subtitle F—Security Matters

Sec. 1051. Use of National Driver Register for personnel security investigations and determinations.
Sec. 1052. Standards for disqualification from eligibility for Department of Defense security clearance .

Subtitle G—Transportation-Related Matters

Sec. 1061. Use of military aircraft to transport mail to and from overseas locations.
Sec. 1062. Reorganization and clarification of certain provisions relating to control and supervision of transportation within the Department of Defense.
Sec. 1063. Determination of whether private air carriers are controlled by United States citizens for purposes of eligibility for Government contracts for transportation of passengers or supplies.
Sec. 1064. Evaluation of whether to prohibit certain offers for transportation of security-sensitive cargo.

Subtitle H—Other Matters

Sec. 1071. Two-year extension of authority of the Secretary of Defense to engage in commercial activities as security for intelligence collection activities abroad.
Sec. 1072. Assistance for study of feasibility of biennial international air trade show in the United States and for initial implementation.
Sec. 1073. Technical and clerical amendments.
Sec. 1074. Commission on the long-term implementation of the new strategic posture of the United States.
Sec. 1075. Liability protection for certain Department of Defense volunteers working in the maritime environment.
Sec. 1076. Transfer of historic F3A-1 Brewster Corsair aircraft.

TITLE XI—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

Sec. 1101. Payment of Federal employee health benefit premiums for mobilized Federal employees.
Sec. 1102. Foreign language proficiency pay.
Sec. 1103. Pay parity for civilian intelligence personnel.
Sec. 1104. Pay parity for senior executives in nonappropriated fund instrumentalities.
Sec. 1105. Prohibition of unauthorized wearing or use of civilian medals or decorations.

TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO OTHER NATIONS

Subtitle A—Matters Relating to Iraq, Afghanistan, and Global War on Terrorism

Sec. 1201. Documentation of conditions in Iraq under former dictatorial government as part of transition to post-dictatorial government.
Sec. 1202. Support of military operations to combat terrorism.
Sec. 1203. Commanders' Emergency Response Program.
Sec. 1204. Status of Iraqi security forces.
Sec. 1205. Guidance and report required on contractors supporting deployed forces in Iraq.
Sec. 1206. Findings and sense of Congress concerning Army Specialist Joseph Darby.

Subtitle B—Other Matters

Sec. 1211. Assignment of allied naval personnel to submarine safety programs.
Sec. 1212. Expansion of entities of the People's Republic of China subject to certain presidential authorities when operating in the United States.
Sec. 1213. Report by President on Global Peace Operations Initiative.
Sec. 1214. Procurement sanctions against foreign persons that transfer certain defense articles and services to the People's Republic of China.

TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION WITH STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION

Sec. 1301. Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction programs and funds.
Sec. 1302. Funding allocations.
Sec. 1303. Temporary authority to waive limitation on funding for chemical weapons destruction facility in Russia.

TITLE XIV—EXPORT CONTROL AND COUNTERPROLIFERATION MATTERS

Subtitle A—Export Controls

Sec. 1401. Definitions under Arms Export Control Act.
Sec. 1402. Exemption from licensing requirements for export of significant military equipment.
Sec. 1403. Cooperative projects with friendly foreign countries.
Sec. 1404. Licensing requirement for export of militarily critical technologies.
Sec. 1405. Control of exports of United States weapons technology to the People's Republic of China.
Sec. 1406. Strengthening international export controls.

Subtitle B—Counterproliferation Matters

Sec. 1411. Defense international counterproliferation programs.
Sec. 1412. Defense counterproliferation fellowship program.

Subtitle C—Initiatives Relating to Countries of Former Soviet Union

Sec. 1421. Silk Road initiative.
Sec. 1422. Teller-Kurchatov nonproliferation fellowships.
Sec. 1423. Collaboration to reduce the risks of a launch of Russian nuclear weapons.

TITLE XV—AUTHORIZATION FOR INCREASED COSTS DUE TO OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM

Sec. 1501. Purpose.

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

Sec. 1511. Army procurement.
Sec. 1512. Navy and Marine Corps procurement.
Sec. 1513. Air Force procurement.
Sec. 1514. Defense-wide activities procurement.
Sec. 1515. Operation and maintenance.
Sec. 1516. Defense health program.
Sec. 1517. Military personnel.
Sec. 1518. Treatment as additional authorizations.
Sec. 1519. Transfer authority.
Sec. 1520. Designation of emergency authorizations.

Subtitle B—Personnel Provisions

Sec. 1531. Three-year increase in active Army strength levels.
Sec. 1532. Three-year increase in active Marine Corps strength levels.
Sec. 1533. Extension of increased rates for imminent danger pay and family separation allowance.

Subtitle C—Financial Management Matters

Sec. 1541. Revised funding methodology for military retiree health care benefits.

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Sec. 2001. Short title.

TITLE XXI—ARMY

Sec. 2101. Authorized Army construction and land acquisition projects.
Sec. 2102. Family housing.
Sec. 2103. Improvements to military family housing units.
Sec. 2104. Authorization of appropriations, Army.
Sec. 2105. Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2004 projects.
Sec. 2106. Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2003 project.

TITLE XXII—NAVY

Sec. 2201. Authorized Navy construction and land acquisition projects.
Sec. 2202. Family housing.
Sec. 2203. Improvements to military family housing units.
Sec. 2204. Authorization of appropriations, Navy.

TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE

Sec. 2301. Authorized Air Force construction and land acquisition projects.
Sec. 2302. Family housing.
Sec. 2303. Improvements to military family housing units.
Sec. 2304. Authorization of appropriations, Air Force.

TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES

Sec. 2401. Authorized Defense Agencies construction and land acquisition projects.

Sec. 2402. Improvements to military family housing units.
Sec. 2403. Energy conservation projects.
Sec. 2404. Authorization of appropriations, Defense Agencies.

TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

Sec. 2501. Authorized NATO construction and land acquisition projects.
Sec. 2502. Authorization of appropriations, NATO.

TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

Sec. 2601. Authorized Guard and Reserve construction and land acquisition projects.

TITLE XXVII—EXPIRATION AND EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS

Sec. 2701. Expiration of authorizations and amounts required to be specified by law.
Sec. 2702. Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2002 projects.
Sec. 2703. Extension and renewal of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2001 projects.
Sec. 2704. Effective date.

TITLE XXVIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes

Sec. 2801. Increase in certain thresholds for carrying out unspecified minor military construction projects.
Sec. 2802. Assessment of vulnerability of military installations to terrorist attack and annual report on military construction requirements related to antiterrorism and force protection.
Sec. 2803. Change in threshold for congressional notification regarding use of operation and maintenance funds for facility repair.
Sec. 2804. Reporting requirements regarding military family housing requirements for general officers and flag officers.
Sec. 2805. Congressional notification of deviations from authorized cost variations for military construction projects and military family housing projects.
Sec. 2806. Repeal of limitation on use of alternative authority for acquisition and improvement of military family housing.
Sec. 2807. Temporary authority to accelerate design efforts for military construction projects carried out using design-build selection procedures.
Sec. 2808. Exchange or sale of reserve component facilities to acquire replacement facilities.
Sec. 2809. One-year extension of temporary, limited authority to use operation and maintenance funds for construction projects outside the United States.

Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration

Sec. 2811. Increase in certain thresholds for reporting real property transactions.
Sec. 2812. Reorganization of existing administrative provisions relating to real property transactions.
Sec. 2813. Treatment of money rentals from golf course at Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois.
Sec. 2814. Number of contracts authorized department-wide under demonstration program on reduction in long-term facility maintenance costs.
Sec. 2815. Repeal of Commission on Review of Overseas Military Facility Structure of the United States.
Sec. 2816. Designation of Airmen Leadership School at Luke Air Force Base, Arizona, in honor of John J. Rhodes, a former minority leader of the House of Representatives.
Sec. 2817. Elimination of reversionary interests clouding United States title to property used as Navy homeports.
Sec. 2818. Report on real property disposal at Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California.

Subtitle C—Base Closure and Realignment

Sec. 2821. Two-year postponement of 2005 base closure and realignment round and submission of reports regarding future infrastructure requirements for the armed forces.
Sec. 2822. Establishment of specific deadline for submission of revisions to force-structure plan and infrastructure inventory for next base closure round.
Sec. 2823. Specification of final selection criteria for next base closure round.
Sec. 2824. Requirement for unanimous vote of Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission to add to or otherwise expand closure and realignment recommendations made by Secretary of Defense.
Sec. 2825. Adherence to certain authorities on preservation of military depot capabilities during any subsequent round of base closures and realignments.

Subtitle D—Land Conveyances

PART I—ARMY CONVEYANCES

Sec. 2831. Transfer of administrative jurisdiction, Defense Supply Center, Columbus, Ohio.
Sec. 2832. Land conveyance, Fort Hood, Texas.
Sec. 2833. Land conveyance, Army National Guard Facility, Seattle, Washington.

PART II—NAVY CONVEYANCES

Sec. 2841. Transfer of jurisdiction, Nebraska Avenue Naval Complex, District of Columbia.
Sec. 2842. Land conveyance, Navy property, former Fort Sheridan, Illinois.
Sec. 2843. Land exchange, Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Maryland.

PART III—AIR FORCE CONVEYANCES

Sec. 2851. Land exchange, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama.

DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorizations

Sec. 3101. National Nuclear Security Administration.
Sec. 3102. Defense environmental management.
Sec. 3103. Other defense activities.
Sec. 3104. Defense nuclear waste disposal.

Subtitle B—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations

Sec. 3111. Extension of authority for appointment of certain scientific, engineering, and technical personnel.
Sec. 3112. Requirements for baseline of projects under Facilities and Infrastructure Recapitalization Program.

Subtitle C—Other Matters

Sec. 3131. Transfers and reprogrammings of National Nuclear Security Administration funds.
Sec. 3132. National Academy of Sciences study on management by Department of Energy of high-level radioactive waste.
Sec. 3133. Contract to review Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, New Mexico.

TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

Sec. 3201. Authorization.

TITLE XXXIII—NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE

Sec. 3301. Authorized uses of National Defense Stockpile funds.
Sec. 3302. Relaxation of quantity restrictions on disposal of manganese ferro in National Defense Stockpile.
Sec. 3303. Revision of earlier authority to dispose of certain materials in National Defense Stockpile.

TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

Sec. 3401. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

Sec. 3501. Authorization of appropriations for Maritime Administration.
Sec. 3502. Extension of authority to provide war risk insurance for merchant marine vessels.

SEC. 3. CONGRESSIONAL DEFENSE COMMITTEES.

For purposes of this Act, the term ''congressional defense committees'' has the meaning given that term in section 101(a)(16) of title 10, United States Code.

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

SEC. 101. ARMY.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2005 for procurement for the Army as follows:

(1) For aircraft, $2,805,941,000.
(2) For missiles, $1,414,321,000.
(3) For weapons and tracked combat vehicles, $1,739,695,000.
(4) For ammunition, $1,729,402,000.
(5) For other procurement, $4,313,640,000.

SEC. 102. NAVY AND MARINE CORPS.

(a) NAVY.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2005 for procurement for the Navy as follows:

(1) For aircraft, $8,912,667,000.
(2) For weapons, including missiles and torpedoes, $2,253,454,000.
(3) For ammunition, $870,840,000.
(4) For shipbuilding and conversion, $10,120,027,000.
(5) For other procurement, $4,876,725,000.

(b) MARINE CORPS.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2005 for procurement for the Marine Corps in the amount of $1,315,103,000.

SEC. 103. AIR FORCE.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2005 for procurement for the Air Force as follows:

(1) For aircraft, $13,649,174,000.
(2) For ammunition, $1,396,457,000.
(3) For missiles, $4,638,313,000.
(4) For other procurement, $13,229,257,000.

SEC. 104. DEFENSE-WIDE ACTIVITIES.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2005 for Defense-wide procurement in the amount of $2,950,702,000.

Subtitle B—Program Matters

SEC. 111. MULTIYEAR PROCUREMENT AUTHORITY FOR THE LIGHT-WEIGHT 155–MILLIMETER HOWITZER PROGRAM.

The Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy may, in accordance with section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, jointly enter into a multiyear contract, beginning with the fiscal year 2005 program year, for procurement of the light-weight 155-millimeter howitzer.

SEC. 112. DDG–51 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM.

(a) ACCELERATION OF MODERNIZATION PROGRAM.—The Secretary of the Navy shall accelerate the program for in-service modernization

of the DDG–51 class of destroyers. As part of that modernization program, the Secretary shall include additional emphasis on determining a means to reduce crew size from approximately 300 to about 200.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than March 31, 2005, the Secretary of the Navy shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the steps taken as of that date to carry out subsection (a).

SEC. 113. REPEAL OF AUTHORITY FOR PILOT PROGRAM FOR FLEXIBLE FUNDING OF CRUISER CONVERSIONS AND OVERHAULS.

Section 126 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136; 117 Stat. 1410; 10 U.S.C. 7291 note) is repealed.

SEC. 114. FORCE PROTECTION FOR ASYMMETRIC THREAT ENVIRONMENT.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR ASYMMETRIC THREAT ASSESSMENT.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall require the Secretary of each military department to perform an assessment of the survivability and suitability against asymmetrical threats of each of the following military systems under the jurisdiction of that Secretary:

(A) Each manned ground system or war-fighter survivability system that may be required to deploy in an asymmetrical threat environment.

(B) Each manned airborne system that may be required to deploy in an asymmetrical threat environment.

(2) For each system covered by paragraph (1), the Secretary concerned shall establish the key performance parameters for survivability and suitability against asymmetric threats.

(3) The assessments under paragraph (1) shall be completed not later than July 1, 2005.

(4) The Secretary of each military department shall review annually the assessments under paragraph (1) conducted by that Secretary to ensure that the assessments remains relevant to the asymmetric threat environment.

(b) REQUIREMENT FOR FORCE PROTECTION.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall require the Secretary of each military department, for each system covered by subsection (a)(1) under that Secretary's jurisdiction, either to—

(A) take each of the force protection or survivability steps specified in paragraph (2); or

(B) restrict the system from deployment to an asymmetrical threat environment.

(2) The force protection or survivability steps for a system covered by subsection (a)(1) are the following:

(A) Development of force protection or survivability enhancements for the system that meet the key performance parameters established for that system under subsection (a)(2).

(B) Budgeting for in-service modification programs for the system to provide force protection and survivability enhancements developed under subparagraph (A).

(C) Development of tactics, techniques, and procedures for the system to maximize force protection and survivability.

(c) WAIVER.—The Secretary of Defense may waive the applicability of subsection (b) to a system covered by subsection (a)(1) if the Secretary determines that, but for such a waiver, the Department would be unable to meet national security objectives. Whenever the Secretary makes such a determination and authorizes such a waiver, the Secretary shall submit notice of such waiver and of the Secretary's determination and the reasons therefor in writing to the congressional defense committees.

(d) REQUIREMENT FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT MILITARY ACQUISITION PROGRAMS.—The Secretary of Defense shall require the Secretary of each military department, for each military acquisition program that has not entered low-rate initial production as of the date of the enactment of this Act, to include in the development of that program—

(1) as part of the system requirements development, assessments of war-fighter survivability and of system suitability against asymmetrical threats; and

(2) as part of the documentation of system requirements, requirements for key performance parameters for force protection and survivability.

(e) ASYMMETRICAL THREAT ENVIRONMENT.—For purposes of this section, the term ''asymmetrical threat environment'', with respect to a manned system, means a security, stability, or peacekeeping operation in which the system is deployed or any other such environment in which an asymmetrical threat may exist (or, in the case of a manned airborne system, another such environment in which airborne operations would subject the system to a ground-based asymmetrical threat).

SEC. 115. ALLOCATION OF EQUIPMENT AUTHORIZED BY THIS TITLE TO BE MADE ON BASIS OF UNITS DEPLOYED OR PREPARING TO DEPLOY.

The Secretary of Defense shall provide that, in the allocation to operational units of equipment acquired using funds authorized to be appropriated by this title, priority shall be given to units that are deployed to, or preparing to deploy to, Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom, regardless of the status of those units as active, Guard, or reserve component units.

SEC. 116. MULTIYEAR PROCUREMENT AUTHORITY FOR KC–767 TANKER AIRCRAFT ACQUISITION PROGRAM.

(a) MULTIYEAR PROCUREMENT AUTHORITY.—(1) The Secretary of the Air Force may, in accordance with section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, enter into a multiyear contract, beginning with the fiscal year 2005 program year, for procurement of 80 KC–767 tanker aircraft.

(2) Notwithstanding subsection (k) of section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, a contract under this subsection may be for any period not in excess of eight program years.

(b) LIMITATION.—Subsection (b) of section 135 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136; 117 Stat. 1413; 10 U.S.C. 2401a note) is repealed.

(c) RELATIONSHIP TO PREVIOUS LAW.—The multiyear procurement authority in subsection (a) may not be executed under section 135 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136; 117 Stat. 1413; 10 U.S.C. 2401a note) or under section 8159 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2002 (division A of Public Law 107–117).

SEC. 117. OTHER MATTERS RELATING TO KC–767 TANKER AIRCRAFT ACQUISITION PROGRAM.

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

(1) aerial refueling capability for the Armed Forces is a critical combat force multiplier;

(2) the Nation must expeditiously proceed with a program to replace the Air Force's aging fleet of aerial refueling tankers;

(3) in pursuing an aerial refueling tanker program, the Department of Defense should take full advantage of the United States commercial aircraft production base; and

(4) anyone suspected of involvement in improper or illegal activities associated with such a program should be investigated and, if warranted, prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

(b) REQUIREMENT FOR RENEGOTIATION OF CONTRACT.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall enter into one or more contracts for the Air Force multiyear tanker aircraft program, provided that any such contract is negotiated after June 1, 2004.

(c) REVIEW BY OUTSIDE PANEL.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall establish a panel of experts from outside the Department of Defense to review any proposed contract for the multiyear tanker aircraft program. The panel shall be comprised of individuals who, by reason of education, training, or experience, have expertise relevant to the evaluation of a proposed contract for the lease or procurement of aircraft under that program.

(2) The panel shall review any proposed contract for the multiyear tanker aircraft program to assess, and assist the Secretary of the Air Force in determining, whether the Air Force would under that contract obtain the best value for funds expended. The panel shall serve in whatever manner the Secretary of Defense determines is appropriate to provide an independent review of any such proposed contract. The Secretary shall provide for the panel to make a determination of, and to advise the Secretary of the Air Force on, what would constitute a fair and reasonable contract for that program.

(d) REPORT.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide for the panel established under subsection (c) to submit a report providing the results of its review to the Secretary of the Air Force and the congressional defense committees.

(e) MULTIYEAR TANKER AIRCRAFT PROGRAM DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''multiyear tanker aircraft program'' means the program for—

(1) lease of no more than 20 aerial refueling aircraft for the Air Force authorized under section 8159 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2002 (division A of Public Law 107–117; 115 Stat. 2284), subject to section 135(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136; 117 Stat. 1413); and

(2) procurement of no more than 80 KC–767 tanker aircraft for which a multiyear procurement contract is authorized by section 116(a) of this Act.

(f) INTERPRETATION.—Section 134 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136; 117 Stat. 1412) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) INTERPRETATION.—Nothing in subsection (b) or section 1111 of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense and for the Reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan, 2004 (Public Law 108–106; 117 Stat. 1215) is intended to prohibit the Secretary of the Air Force from executing the program described in section 135(a) of this Act and section 116 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005.''.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

SEC. 201. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2005 for the use of the Department of Defense for research, development, test, and evaluation as follows:

(1) For the Army, $9,478,164,000.

(2) For the Navy, $16,047,841,000.

(3) For the Air Force, $21,527,967,000.

(4) For Defense-wide activities, $21,074,389,000, of which $305,135,000 is authorized for the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation.

SEC. 202. AMOUNT FOR DEFENSE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY.

(a) FISCAL YEAR 2005.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated by section 201, $11,067,698,000 shall be available for the Defense Science and Technology Program, including basic research, applied research, and advanced technology development projects.

(b) BASIC RESEARCH, APPLIED RESEARCH, AND ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term ''basic research, applied research, and advanced technology development'' means work funded in program elements for defense research and development under Department of Defense category 6.1, 6.2, or 6.3.

Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations

SEC. 211. FUTURE COMBAT SYSTEMS PROGRAM STRATEGY.

(a) PROGRAM STRATEGY REQUIRED.—The Secretary of the Army shall establish and implement a program strategy for the Future Combat Systems acquisition program of the Army. The purpose of the program strategy shall be to provide an effective, affordable, producible, and supportable military capability with a realistic schedule and a robust cost estimate.

(b) ELEMENTS OF PROGRAM STRATEGY.—The program strategy shall—

(1) require the release, at the design readiness review, of not less than 90 percent of engineering drawings for the building of prototypes;

(2) require, before facilitating production or contracting for items with long lead times, that an acceptable demonstration be carried out of the performance of the information network, including the performance of the Joint Tactical Radio System and the Warfighter Information Network-Tactical; and

(3) require, before the initial production decision, that an acceptable demonstration be carried out of the collective capability of each system to meet system-of-systems requirements when integrated with the information network.

(c) REQUIRED SUBMISSIONS TO CONGRESS.—Before convening the Milestone B update for the Future Combat Systems acquisition program required by the Future Combat Systems acquisition decision memorandum, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics shall submit to Congress each of the following documents:

(1) The independent cost estimate with respect to the program prepared by the cost analysis improvement group of the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

(2) A report, prepared by an independent panel, on the maturity levels of the critical technologies with respect to the program, including an assessment of those technologies that are likely to require a decision to use an alternative approach.

(3) A report, prepared by the chief information officer of the Army, describing—

(A) the status of the development and integration of the network and the command, control, computers, communications, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance components; and

(B) the progress made toward meeting the requirements for network-centric capabilities as set forth by such officer.

(4) A report identifying the key performance parameters with respect to the program, with all objectives and thresholds quantified, together with the supporting analytical rationale.

(d) LIMITATION ON FUNDING.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary of the Army may not obligate, from amounts made available for fiscal year 2005, more than $2,200,000,000 for the Future Combat Systems acquisition program.

(2) The limitation in paragraph (1) shall not apply after the Secretary of the Army submits to Congress the Secretary's certification that the Secretary has established and implemented the program strategy required by subsection (a).

SEC. 212. COLLABORATIVE PROGRAM FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT OF VACUUM ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGIES.

(a) PROGRAM REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish a program for research and development in advanced vacuum electronics to meet the requirements of the Department of Defense electromagnetic systems.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM.—The program under subsection (a) shall be carried out collaboratively by the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Secretary of the Army, and other appropriate elements of the Department of Defense. The program shall include the following activities:

(1) Activities needed for development and maturation of advanced vacuum electronics technologies needed to meet the requirements of the Department of Defense.

(2) Identification of legacy and developmental electromagnetic systems for use of advanced vacuum electronics under the program.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than January 31, 2005, the Director of Defense Research and Engineering shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the implementation of the program under subsection (a). The report shall include the following:

(1) Identification of the officer to have lead responsibility for carrying out the program.

(2) A description of the management plan for the program and any agreements relating to that plan.

(3) A schedule for the program.

(4) Identification of the funding required for fiscal year 2006 and for the future-years defense program to carry out the program.

(5) A list of program capability goals and objectives.

(d) FUNDING.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated in section 201—

(1) $13,500,000 shall be available in program element 62771N for applied research in vacuum electronics; and

(2) $5,000,000 shall be available in program element 63771N for advanced technology development in vacuum electronics.

SEC. 213. ANNUAL COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT ON JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER PROGRAM.

(a) ANNUAL GAO REVIEW.—The Comptroller General shall conduct an annual review of the Joint Strike Fighter aircraft program and shall, not later than March 15 of each year, submit to Congress a report on the results of the most recent review. With each such report, the Comptroller General shall submit a certification as to whether the Comptroller General has had access to sufficient information to enable the Comptroller General to make informed judgments on the matters covered by the report.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—Each report on the Joint Strike Fighter aircraft program under subsection (a) shall include the following with respect to system development and demonstration under the program:

(1) The extent to which such system development and demonstration is meeting established goals, including the goals established for performance, cost, and schedule.

(2) The plan for such system development and demonstration (leading to production) for the fiscal year that begins in the year in which the report is submitted.

(3) The Comptroller General's conclusion regarding whether such system development and demonstration (leading to production) is likely to be completed at a total cost not in excess of the amount specified (or to be specified) for such purpose in the Selected Acquisition report for the Joint Strike Fighter aircraft program under section 2432 of title 10, United States Code, for the first quarter of the fiscal year during which the report of the Comptroller General is submitted.

(c) REQUIREMENT TO SUPPORT ANNUAL GAO REVIEW.—The Secretary of Defense and the prime contractor for the Joint Strike Fighter aircraft program shall provide to the Comptroller General such information on that program as the Comptroller General considers necessary to carry out the responsibilities of the Comptroller General under this section, including such information as is necessary for the purposes of subsection (b)(3).

(d) TERMINATION.—No report is required under this section after the report that, under subsection (a), is required to be submitted not later than March 15, 2009.

SEC. 214. AMOUNTS FOR UNITED STATES JOINT FORCES COMMAND TO BE DERIVED ONLY FROM DEFENSE-WIDE AMOUNTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 9 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 232. United States Joint Forces Command: amounts for research, development, test, and evaluation to be derived only from Defense-wide amounts

''(a) REQUIREMENT.—Amounts for research, development, test, and evaluation for the United States Joint Forces Command shall be derived only from amounts made available to the Department of Defense for Defense-wide research, development, test, and evaluation.

''(b) SEPARATE DISPLAY IN BUDGET.—Any amount in the budget submitted to Congress under section 1105 of title 31 for any fiscal year for research, development, test, and evaluation for the United States Joint Forces Command shall be set forth under the account of the Department of Defense for Defense-wide research, development, test, and evaluation.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''232. United States Joint Forces Command: amounts for research, development, test, and evaluation to be derived only from Defense-wide amounts.''.

SEC. 215. AUTHORITY OF DIRECTOR OF DEFENSE RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING TO AWARD PRIZES FOR ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY ACHIEVEMENTS.

Section 2374a(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''acting through the Director of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency'' and inserting ''acting through the Director of Defense Research and Engineering''.

SEC. 216. SPACE BASED RADAR.

(a) LIMITATION.—In carrying out the Space Based Radar program, the Secretary of Defense may not authorize that program to proceed into the system development and procurement phase referred to as Milestone B until the Secretary—

(1) submits to the congressional defense committees, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate a report described in subsection (b); and

(2) a period of 30 days has elapsed after the date on which such report is submitted.

(b) REPORT.—A report under this subsection is a report on the Space Based Radar program in which the Secretary of Defense sets forth the following with respect to that program:

(1) A description of the technical system concept selected.

(2) A description of the concept of operations associated with the technical system concept selected.

(3) An independent cost estimate for development and procurement under the program.

(4) The acquisition strategy for the program.

SEC. 217. MARK–54 TORPEDO PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

Of the amount provided in section 201 for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Navy, $2,000,000 within the budget line designated as line 120 shall be available for the Mark-54 Torpedo Product Improvement Program.

Subtitle C—Ballistic Missile Defense

SEC. 221. FIELDING OF BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE CAPABILITIES.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Funds described in subsection (b) may, upon approval by the Secretary of Defense, be used for the development and fielding of ballistic missile defense capabilities.

(b) COVERED FUNDS.—Subsection (a) applies to funds appropriated for fiscal year 2005 or fiscal year 2006 for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Missile Defense Agency.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

SECTION 301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FUNDING.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2005 for the use of the Armed Forces and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for operation and maintenance, in amounts as follows:

(1) For the Army, $25,838,611,000.

(2) For the Navy, $29,523,490,000.

(3) For the Marine Corps, $3,637,615,000.

(4) For the Air Force, $27,143,566,000.

(5) For Defense-wide activities, $17,317,406,000.

(6) For the Army Reserve, $2,003,728,000.

(7) For the Naval Reserve, $1,240,038,000.

(8) For the Marine Corps Reserve, $188,696,000

(9) For the Air Force Reserve, $2,226,790,000

(10) For the Army National Guard, $4,425,686,000.

(11) For the Air National Guard, $4,448,938,000.

(12) For the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, $10,825,000.

(13) For Environmental Restoration, Army, $400,948,000.

(14) For Environmental Restoration, Navy, $266,820,000.

(15) For Environmental Restoration, Air Force, $397,368,000.

(16) For Environmental Restoration, Defense-wide, $23,684,000

(17) For Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites, $216,516,000.

(18) For Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid programs, $59,000,000.

(19) For Cooperative Threat Reduction programs, $409,200,000.

(20) For the Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund, $5,000,000.

(21) For the Defense Industrial Base Capabilities Fund, $50,000,000

SEC. 302. WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2005 for the use of the Armed Forces and other activities and agencies of the Department of Defense for providing capital for working capital and revolving funds in amounts as follows:

(1) For the Defense Working Capital Funds, $372,886,000.

(2) For the National Defense Sealift Fund, $1,219,252,000.

(3) For the Defense Working Capital Fund, Defense Commissary, $1,175,000,000

SEC. 303. OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS.

(a) DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2005 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for the Defense Health Program, $17,811,586,000, of which—

(1) $17,374,544,000 is for Operation and Maintenance;

(2) $72,407,000 is for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation; and

(3) $364,635,000 is for Procurement.

(b) CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, DEFENSE.—(1) Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2005 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense, $1,371,990,000, of which—

(A) $1,138,801,000 is for Operation and Maintenance;

(B) $154,209,000 is for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation; and

(C) $78,980,000 is for Procurement.

(2) Amounts authorized to be appropriated under paragraph (1) are authorized for—

(A) the destruction of lethal chemical agents and munitions in accordance with section 1412 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (50 U.S.C. 1521); and

(B) the destruction of chemical warfare materiel of the United States that is not covered by section 1412 of such Act.

(c) DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE-WIDE.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2005 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-wide, $852,697,000.

(d) DEFENSE INSPECTOR GENERAL.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2005 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, $193,562,000, of which—

(1) $191,362,000 is for Operation and Maintenance;

(2) $2,100,000 is for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation; and

(3) $100,000 is for Procurement.

SEC. 304. REIMBURSEMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO PURCHASED PROTECTIVE BODY ARMOR DURING SHORTAGE OF DEFENSE STOCKS OF BODY ARMOR.

(a) REIMBURSEMENT AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of Defense may reimburse a member of the Armed Forces for the cost of protective body armor purchased by the member, or by another person on behalf of the member, for use by the member while deployed in connection with Operation Noble Eagle, Operation Enduring Freedom, or Operation Iraqi Freedom if the member was not issued protective body armor before the member became engaged in operations in areas or situations described in section 310(a)(2) of title 37, United States Code.

(b) DURATION OF AUTHORITY.—Reimbursement may be provided under subsection (a) for protective body armor purchased during the period beginning on September 11, 2001, and ending on December 31, 2003. Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall implement regulations to expedite the provision of such reimbursement.

Subtitle B—Environmental Provisions

SEC. 311. REPORT REGARDING ENCROACHMENT ISSUES AFFECTING UTAH TEST AND TRAINING RANGE, UTAH.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall prepare a report that outlines current and anticipated encroachments on the use and utility of the special use airspace of the Utah Test and Training Range in the State of Utah, including encroachments brought about through actions of other Federal agencies. The Secretary shall include such recommendations as the Secretary considers appropriate regarding any legislative initiatives necessary to address encroachment problems identified by the Secretary in the report.

(b) SUBMISSION OF REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit the report to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

Subtitle C—Workplace and Depot Issues

SEC. 321. SIMPLIFICATION OF ANNUAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS CONCERNING FUNDS EXPENDED FOR DEPOT MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR WORKLOADS.

Subsection (d) of section 2466 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(d) ANNUAL REPORT AND REVIEW.—(1) Not later than April 1 of each year, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report identifying, for each of the armed forces (other than the Coast Guard) and each Defense Agency, the percentage of the funds referred to in subsection (a) that was expended during the preceding fiscal year, and are projected to be expended in the current fiscal year and next fiscal year, for performance of depot-level maintenance and repair workloads by the public and private sectors.

''(2) Not later than 60 days after the date on which the Secretary submits a report under paragraph (1), the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress the Comptroller General's views on whether—

''(A) the Department of Defense has complied with the requirements of subsection (a) during the preceding fiscal year covered by the report; and

''(B) the expenditure projections for the current fiscal year and next fiscal year are reasonable.''.

SEC. 322. REPEAL OF ANNUAL REPORTING REQUIREMENT CONCERNING MANAGEMENT OF DEPOT EMPLOYEES.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 2472 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''(a) PROHIBITION ON MANAGEMENT BY END STRENGTH.—''; and

(2) by striking subsection (b).

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—(1) The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

''§2472. Prohibition on management of depot employees by end strength''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 146 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 2472 and inserting the following new item:

''2472. Prohibition on management of depot employees by end strength.''.

SEC. 323. PUBLIC-PRIVATE COMPETITION FOR WORK PERFORMED BY CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2461(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5)(A) A function of the Department of Defense performed by 10 or more civilian employees may not be converted, in whole or in part, to performance by a contractor unless, the conversion is based on the results of a public-private competition process that—

''(i) formally compares the cost of civilian employee performance of the function with the costs of performance by a contractor;

''(ii) creates an agency tender, including a most efficient organization plan, in accordance with Office of Management and Budget Circular A–76, as implemented on May 29, 2003;

''(iii) determines whether the submitted offers meet the needs of the Department of Defense with respect to factors other than cost, including quality and reliability;

''(iv) requires continued performance of the function by civilian employees if the cost of performance of the function by a contractor would, over all performance periods required by the solicitation, cost less than—

''(I) 10 percent of the personnel-related costs for performance of that activity or function in the agency tender; or

''(II) $10,000,000; and

''(v) provides no advantage to an offeror for a proposal to reduce costs for the Department of Defense by—

''(I) not making an employer-sponsored health insurance plan available to the workers who are to be employed in the performance of such function under a contract; or

''(II) offering to such workers an employer-sponsored health benefits plan that requires the employer to contribute less towards the premium or subscription share than that which is paid by the Department of Defense for health benefits for civilian employees under chapter 89 of title 5.

''(B) Any modification, reorganization, division, or other change in the organization of a function of the Department of Defense so that is performed by less than 10 civilian employees of the Department of Defense and, therefore, excluded from subparagraph (A), is prohibited.

''(C) Any function that is performed by civilian employees of the Department of Defense and is proposed to be reengineered, reorganized, modernized, upgraded, expanded, or changed in order to become more efficient, but the civilian

employees would still provide essentially the same service, is subject to the competition requirement in subparagraph (A).

''(D) The cost savings requirement specified in subparagraph (A) does not apply to any contracts for special studies and analyses, construction services, architectural services, medical services, scientific and technical services related to (but not in support of) research and development, and depot-level maintenance and repair services.

''(E) The Secretary of Defense may waive the competition requirement in specific instances if—

''(i) the written waiver is prepared by the Secretary of Defense, or the relevant Assistant Secretary or agency head;

''(ii) the written waiver is accompanied by a detailed determination that national security interests are so compelling as to preclude compliance with the requirement for a public-private competition; and

''(iii) a copy of the waiver is published in the Federal Register within 10 working days after the date on which the waiver is invoked, although use of the waiver need not be delayed until its publication.''.

(b) RELATION TO PILOT PROGRAM.—Paragraph (5) of section 2461(b) of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to the pilot program for best-value source selection for performance of information technology services authorized by section 336 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136; 117 Stat. 1444; 10 U.S.C. 2461 note).

SEC. 324. PUBLIC-PRIVATE COMPETITION PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) PURPOSE.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish a pilot program to examine the use of the public-private competition process of Office of Management and Budget Circular A–76 on new requirements, as defined by such Circular, and functions currently being performed by contractors that could be performed by civilian employees.

(b) DURATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall carry out the pilot program during fiscal years 2005 and 2006.

(c) REQUIREMENT FOR PUBLIC-PRIVATE COMPETITION FOR NEW WORK.—(1) By the end of the pilot project, the Secretary of Defense shall have allowed civilian employees to compete through the standard competition process of Office of Management and Budget Circular A–76 for new requirements, as defined by such Circular, that are approximately one-tenth in value of the funds spent by the Department of Defense during the two fiscal years of the pilot project on all functions that are considered new requirements, as defined by such Circular.

(2) The Department of Defense shall not receive credit towards compliance with the pilot program for subjecting to public-private competition—

(A) any contract to be awarded to small business concerns that meet the requirements under section 3(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(a)) and regulations under that section;

(B) any contract to be performed by contractor employees who are represented by a private sector labor union; or

(C) any contract related to special studies and analyses, construction services, architectural services, medical services, scientific and technical services related to (but not in support of) research and development, and depot-level maintenance and repair services.

(d) FUNCTIONS PERFORMED BY CONTRACTORS.—(1) By the end of the pilot project, the Secretary of Defense shall have subjected a number of contractor employees to public-private competition through the standard competition process of Office of Management and Budget Circular A–76 that is approximately one-tenth of the number of civilian employees subject to public-private competition during the two fiscal years of the pilot project.

(2) The Department of Defense shall, to the extent possible, subject to public-private competition those positions held by contractor employees that are associated with functions that are or have been performed at least in part by Federal employees at any time on or after October 1, 1980; and

(3) Subsection (c)(2) shall also apply to this subsection.

(e) WAIVER.—The implementation of the pilot project may be waived if—

(1) the written waiver is prepared by the Secretary of Defense;

(2) the written waiver is accompanied by a detailed determination that national security interests are so compelling as to preclude compliance with the competition requirement; and

(3) a copy of the waiver is published in the Federal Register within 10 working days after the date on which the waiver is invoked, although use of the waiver need not be delayed until its publication.

(f) REPORT.—At the end of each fiscal year of the pilot program, the Inspector General of the Department of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the pilot program, including the extent to which the Department of Defense complied with the requirements of this section.

SEC. 325. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON EQUITABLE LEGAL STANDING FOR CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES.

It is the sense of Congress that, in order to ensure that, when public-private competitions are held, they are conducted as fairly, effectively, and efficiently as possible, competing parties, both Department of Defense civilian employees (or their representatives) and contractors (or their representatives) should receive comparable treatment throughout the competition regarding access to relevant information and legal standing to challenge the way a competition has been conducted at all appropriate forums, including the General Accounting Office and the United States Court of Federal Claims.

SEC. 326. COMPETITIVE SOURCING REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than February 1, 2005, the Inspector General of the Department of Defense shall submit to Congress a report addressing whether the Department of Defense—

(1) employs a sufficient number of adequately trained civilian employees to conduct satisfactorily, taking into account equity, efficiency and expeditiousness, all of the public-private competitions that are scheduled to be undertaken by the Department of Defense during the next fiscal year (including a sufficient number of employees to formulate satisfactorily the performance work statements and most efficient organization plans for the purposes of such competitions) and to administer any resulting contracts; and

(2) has implemented a comprehensive and reliable system to track and assess the cost and quality of the performance of functions of the Department of Defense by service contractors, to update the records of such costs and the assessments each fiscal quarter, and to make such information available in reports to Congress and the public, including through the use of electronic means, except that proprietary information and information to which section 552(b)(1) of title 5, United States Code, applies shall be excised from information published or reports made available.

(b) ELEMENTS OF TRACKING SYSTEM.—The system of the Department of Defense for tracking cost and quality of performance of a function under a service contract shall include at least the following data elements:

(1) The contract number and the applicable Federal supply class or service code.

(2) The name, business address, and business telephone of the agency official who supervises the service contract.

(3) The statutory, regulatory, or other authority for entering into the service contract and, if a public-private competition was not used in the determination of whether to provide for performance of the activity or function by a contractor, an explanation of the reasons for not doing so.

(4) The cost to the Department of Defense of conducting the public-private competition under Office of Management and Budget Circular A–76, if one was undertaken, including the cost of consultants as well as civilian employees.

(5) In the case of a function formerly performed by civilian employees, the actual cost of the performance by such employees.

(6) The cost to the Department of Defense of civilian employee performance of the function under the most efficient organization plan.

(7) The anticipated cost of contractor performance, based on the award.

(8) The cost to the Department of Defense for performance of the function by the contractor.

(9) A description of the quality control process used by the agency in connection with monitoring the contract performance (including the applicable quality control standards and the frequency of the quality control reports), together with an assessment of whether the contractor achieved, exceeded, or failed to achieve the quality control standards.

(c) ASSESSMENT OF TRACKING SYSTEM.—The Inspector General of the Department of Defense shall include in the report required by subsection (a) an assessment of the comprehensiveness and reliability of the Department of Defense system for tracking cost and quality of performance of a function under a service contract, including compliance with each of the requirements specified in subsection (b). The Inspector General shall base the assessment on an audit of a representative sample of service contracts. The report shall also include recommendations by the Inspector General regarding how weaknesses identified in the Department of Defense infrastructure for competitive sourcing can be rectified, whether through the use of different processes or the availability of additional employees, additional training, or additional resources.

Subtitle D—Information Technology

SEC. 331. PREPARATION OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PLAN FOR TRANSITION TO INTERNET PROTOCOL VERSION 6.

(a) TRANSITION PLAN.—The Secretary of Defense shall prepare a plan to provide for the transition of Department of Defense information technology systems to Internet Protocol version 6 from the present use of Internet Protocol version 4 and other network protocols. The plan shall outline the networking and security system equipment that will need to be replaced, including the timing and costs of such replacement, address how the current and new networks and security systems will be managed, and assess the potential impact of the transition, include any proposed measures to alleviate any adverse affects. In preparing the transition plan, the Secretary shall compare private industry plans for the transition to Internet Protocol version 6.

(b) TESTING AND EVALUATION FOR INTERNET PROTOCOL.—To determine whether a change to the use of Internet Protocol version 6 will support Department of Defense requirements, the Secretary of Defense shall provide for a rigorous, real-world end-to-end testing of Internet Protocol version 6, as proposed for use by the Department, to evaluate the following:

(1) The ability of Internet Protocol version 6, with its ''best effort'' quality of service, to satisfactory support the Department's multiple applications and other information technology systems, including the use of Internet Protocol version 6 over bandwidth-constrained tactical circuits.

(2) The ability of the Department's networks using Internet Protocol version 6 to respond to, and perform under, heavy loading of the core networks.

(c) SUBMISSION OF PLAN AND RESULTS.—Not later than March 31, 2005, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense

committees a report containing the transition plan prepared under subsection (a) and the results of the tests conducted under subsection (b).

SEC. 332. DEFENSE BUSINESS ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE, SYSTEM ACCOUNTABILITY, AND CONDITIONS FOR OBLIGATION OF FUNDS FOR DEFENSE BUSINESS SYSTEM MODERNIZATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Chapter 131 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting before section 2223 the following new section:

"§ 2222. Defense business systems: architecture, accountability, and modernization

''(a) CONDITIONS FOR OBLIGATION OF FUNDS FOR DEFENSE BUSINESS SYSTEM MODERNIZATION.—Effective January 1, 2005, funds appropriated to the Department of Defense may not be obligated for a defense business system modernization that will have a total cost in excess of $1,000,000 unless—

''(1) the approval authority designated for the defense business system certifies to the Defense Business Systems Management Committee established by section 186 of this title that the defense business system modernization—

''(A) is in compliance with the enterprise architecture developed under subsection (b), or such compliance is waived in writing by the approval authority as a result of the investment review process conducted under subsection (d) for the defense business system modernization; and

''(B) will be acquired or developed in a manner consistent with the system acquisition regulations and instructions of the Department of Defense; and

''(2) the Defense Business Systems Management Committee approves the certification by the approval authority.

''(b) ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE FOR DEFENSE BUSINESS SYSTEMS.—Not later than September 30, 2005, the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Defense Business Systems Management Committee, shall develop—

''(1) an enterprise architecture to cover all defense business systems, and the functions and activities supported by defense business systems, which shall be sufficiently defined to effectively guide, constrain, and permit implementation of interoperable defense business system solutions and consistent with the policies and procedures established by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and

''(2) a transition plan for implementing the enterprise architecture for defense business systems.

''(c) APPROVAL AUTHORITIES AND ACCOUNTABILITY FOR DEFENSE BUSINESS SYSTEMS.—The Secretary of Defense shall delegate responsibility for the planning, design, acquisition, deployment, operation, maintenance, modernization, and oversight of defense business systems as follows:

''(1) The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics shall be responsible and accountable for any defense business system the primary purpose of which is to support acquisition activities, logistics activities, or installations and environment activities of the Department of Defense.

''(2) The Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) shall be responsible and accountable for any defense business system the primary purpose of which is to support financial management activities or strategic planning and budgeting activities of the Department of Defense.

''(3) The Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness shall be responsible and accountable for any defense business system the primary purpose of which is to support human resource management activities of the Department of Defense.

''(4) The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Networks and Information Integration and the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense shall be responsible and accountable for any defense business system the primary purpose of which is to support information technology infrastructure or information assurance activities of the Department of Defense.

''(5) The Deputy Secretary of Defense or an Under Secretary of Defense, as designated by the Secretary of Defense, shall be responsible for any defense business system the primary purpose of which is to support any activity of the Department of Defense not covered by paragraphs (1) through (4).

''(d) DEFENSE BUSINESS SYSTEM INVESTMENT REVIEW.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall require each approval authority designated under subsection (c) to establish, not later than March 15, 2005, an investment review process, consistent with section 11312 of title 40, to review the planning, design, acquisition, development, deployment, operation, maintenance, modernization, and project cost benefits and risks of all defense business systems for which the approval authority is responsible. The investment review process so established shall specifically address the responsibilities of approval authorities under subsection (a).

''(2) The review of defense business systems under the investment review process shall include the following:

''(A) Review and approval by an investment review board of each defense business system as an investment before the obligation of funds on the system.

''(B) Periodic review, but not less than annually, of every defense business system investment.

''(C) Representation on each investment review board by appropriate officials from among the armed forces, combatant commands, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Defense Agencies.

''(D) Use of threshold criteria to ensure an appropriate level of review within the Department of Defense of, and accountability for, defense business system investments depending on scope, complexity, and cost.

''(e) BUDGET INFORMATION.—In the materials that the Secretary submits to Congress in support of the budget submitted by the President to Congress under section 1105 of title 31 for fiscal year 2006 and fiscal years thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall—

''(1) identify the approval authority for each defense business system; and

''(2) for each defense business system for which funding is proposed in the budget—

''(A) certify that the defense business system complies with the defense business enterprise architecture; or

''(B) explain why funds for such system are necessary to maintain a mission critical or mission essential system of the Department of Defense, notwithstanding its noncompliance with the defense business enterprise architecture.

''(f) CONGRESSIONAL REPORTS.—Not later than March 15 of each year from 2005 through 2009, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on Department of Defense compliance with the requirements of this section. The first report shall define plans and commitments for meeting the requirements of subsection (a), including specific milestones and performance measures. Subsequent reports shall—

''(1) describe actions taken and planned for meeting the requirements of subsection (a), including—

''(A) specific milestones and actual performance against specified performance measures, and any revision of such milestones and performance measures; and

''(B) specific actions on the defense business system modernizations submitted for certification under such subsection;

''(2) identify the number of defense business system modernizations so certified;

''(3) identify any defense business system modernization with an obligation in excess of $1,000,000 during the preceding fiscal year that was not certified under subsection (a), and the reasons for the waiver; and

''(4) discuss specific improvements in business operations and cost savings resulting from successful defense business systems modernization efforts.

''(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) The term 'approval authority', with respect to a defense business system, means the Department of Defense official responsible for the defense business system, as designated by subsection (c).

''(2) The term 'defense business system' means an information system, other than a national security system, operated by, for, or on behalf of the Department of Defense, including financial systems, mixed systems, financial data feeder systems, and information technology and information assurance infrastructure, used to support business activities, such as acquisition, financial management, logistics, strategic planning and budgeting, installations and environment, and human resource management.

''(3) The term 'defense business system modernization' means—

''(A) the acquisition or development of a new defense business system; or

''(B) any significant modification or enhancement of an existing defense business system (other than necessary to maintain current services).

''(4) The term 'enterprise architecture' has the meaning given that term in section 3601(4) of title 44.

''(5) The terms 'information system' and 'information technology' have the meanings given those terms in section 11101 of title 40.

''(6) The term 'national security system' has the meaning given that term in section 2315 of this title.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting before the item relating to section 2223 the following new item:

''2222. Defense business systems: architecture, accountability, and modernization.''.

(b) DEFENSE BUSINESS SYSTEM MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE.—Chapter 7 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 186. Defense business system management Committee

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish a Defense Business Systems Management Committee, to be composed of the following persons:

''(1) The Deputy Secretary of Defense, who shall serve as the chairman of the Committee.

''(2) The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology.

''(3) The Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness.

''(4) The Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller).

''(5) The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Networks and Information Integration.

''(6) The Secretaries of the military departments and the heads of the Defense Agencies.

''(7) Such additional personnel of the Department of Defense (including personnel assigned to the Joint Chiefs of Staff and combatant commands) as are designated by the Secretary of Defense.

''(b) DUTIES.—(1) In addition to any other matters assigned to the Committee by the Secretary of Defense, the Committee shall—

''(A) recommend to the Secretary of Defense policies and procedures necessary to effectively integrate the requirements of section 2222 of this title into all business activities and any transformation, reform, reorganization, or process improvement initiatives undertaken within the Department of Defense; and

''(B) review and approve any major update of the defense business enterprise architecture developed under subsection (b) of section 2222 of this title, including evolving the architecture, and of defense business systems modernization plans.

''(2) The Committee shall be responsible for coordinating defense business system modernization initiatives to maximize benefits and minimize costs for the Department of Defense and periodically report to the Secretary on the status of defense business system modernization efforts.

''(3) The Committee shall ensure that funds are obligated for defense business system modernization in a manner consistent with section 2222 of this title.

''(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms 'defense business system' and 'defense business system modernization' have the meanings given such terms in section 2222 of this title.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''186. Defense Business System Management Committee.''.

(c) DELEGATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITY.—The delegation of responsibility for the planning, design, acquisition, deployment, operation, maintenance, modernization, and oversight of defense business systems required by subsection (c) of section 2222 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a)(1), shall be completed not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) RELATION TO ANNUAL REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS.—Nothing in sections 186 and 2222 of title 10, United States Code, as added by this section, shall be construed to alter the requirements of section 8084 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108–87; 117 Stat. 1091), with regard to information technology systems (as defined in subsection (d) of such section).

(e) REPEAL OF OBSOLETE FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT ENTERPRISE ARCHITECTURE REQUIREMENTS.—Section 1004 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314; 10 U.S.C. 113 note) is repealed.

SEC. 333. ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT PROGRAM OFFICE TO IMPROVE INTEROPERABILITY OF BATTLEFIELD MANAGEMENT COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS.

(a) OFFICE FOR FAMILY OF INTEROPERABLE PICTURES.—The Secretary of Defense shall designate a single joint program office in the Department of Defense for the management of battlefield management command and control systems of the Armed Forces, known as the ''Family of Interoperable Pictures'', to improve the interoperability of such systems so that members of the Armed Forces may access a common operational picture of the battlefield. The office shall include at a minimum the Single Integrated Air Picture, the Single Integrated Ground Picture, the Single Integrated Maritime Picture, the Special Operations Forces Picture, and the Single Integrated Space Picture. The Secretary shall provide for the head of the office to be selected on a rotating basis among related offices of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps.

(b) COMMON SYSTEMS ARCHITECTURE.—The Secretary of Defense shall develop, implement, and maintain a common systems architecture for all battlefield management command and control systems included in the Family of Interoperable Pictures.

(c) CONSOLIDATED PROGRAM ELEMENTS.—All funds for development and procurement related to the Family of Interoperable Pictures shall be consolidated under the office designated under subsection (a).

(d) PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT.—The head of the office designated under subsection (a), subject to the authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of Defense, shall—

(1) establish and control the performance specifications for the battlefield management command and control systems included in the Family of Interoperable Pictures;

(2) establish and control the standards for development of the software and equipment for the Family of Interoperable Pictures;

(3) establish and control the standards for operation of the Family of Interoperable Pictures; and

(4) develop a single, unified concept of operations for all users of the Family of Interoperable Pictures.

Subtitle E—Readiness Reporting Requirements

SEC. 341. ANNUAL REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OPERATION AND FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR MILITARY MUSEUMS.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Chapter 23 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§489. Annual report on Department of Defense operation and financial support for military museums

''(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—As part of the budget materials submitted to Congress in connection with the submission of the budget for a fiscal year pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, but in no case later than March 15 of each year, the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report identifying all museums that, during the preceding fiscal year—

''(1) were operated by the Department of Defense or a military department; or

''(2) were otherwise supported using funds appropriated to the Department of Defense.

''(b) CONTENT OF REPORT.—For each museum identified in a report under this section, the Secretary of Defense shall include in the report the following:

''(1) The purpose and functions of the museum and the justification for the museum

''(2) A description of the facilities dedicated to the museum.

''(3) An itemized listing of the funds appropriated to the Department of Defense that were obligated to support the museum during the fiscal year covered by the report, as well as any other Federal funds, funds from a non-appropriated fund instrumentality account of the Department of Defense, and non-Federal funds obligated to support the museum.

''(4) The number of civilian employees of the Department of Defense who serve full-time or part-time at the museum.

''(5) The number of members of the armed forces who serve full-time or part-time at the museum.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''489. Annual report on Department of Defense operation and financial support for military museums.''.

SEC. 342. REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS FOR PREPOSITIONING OF MATERIAL AND EQUIPMENT.

(a) SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ASSESSMENT AND REPORT.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall conduct an assessment of the programs of the Department of Defense for the prepositioning of material and equipment. Such assessment shall particularly focus on how those programs will be incorporated into achievement of the goals of the Secretary of Defense (referred to as the ''10–30–30'' goals) for the Armed Forces to have the capability, from the onset of a contingency situation, of deploying forces to a distant theater within 10 days, defeating an enemy within 30 days, and being ready for an additional conflict within another 30 days.

(2) The Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on such assessment not later than October 1, 2005.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The assessment under subsection (a) shall include the prepositioning programs of each of the Armed Forces and of the United States Special Operations Command as well as assessment of each of the following:

(1) Use of prepositioned equipment as part of Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom and potential solutions to identified challenges.

(2) Changes to doctrine, strategy, and transportation plans to support the goals of the Secretary described in subsection (a) and referred to as the 10–30–30 goals in light of the current lift constraints facing both land and sea components of lift as well as the emerging mobility requirements.

(3) Modifications of the prepositioning programs of the Armed Forces in order to adapt to pending modularity concepts, future force structure changes, and new sea basing concepts in relation to current and potential areas of instability.

(4) Joint operations and training that include theater opening requirements at potential aerial and sea ports of debarkation, joint force reception capabilities, joint theater distribution operations, and use of joint prepositioned stocks and systems.

Subtitle F—Other Matters

SEC. 351. EXTENSION OF ARSENAL SUPPORT PROGRAM INITIATIVE.

(a) DURATION OF PROGRAM.—Subsection (a) of section 343 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (as enacted into law by Public Law 106–398; 10 U.S.C. 4551 note) is amended by striking ''2004'' and inserting ''2008''.

(b) ADDITIONAL REPORT REQUIRED.—Subsection (g) of such section is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''2004'' and inserting ''2008''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''2003'' and inserting ''2007''.

SEC. 352. LIMITATION ON PREPARATION OR IMPLEMENTATION OF MID-RANGE FINANCIAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN.

Amounts appropriated to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2005 for operation and maintenance may not be obligated for the purpose of preparing or implementing the Mid-Range Financial Improvement Plan until the Secretary of Defense submits a report to the congressional defense committees containing, for each of the military departments and the Defense Agencies—

(1) an explanation of the manner in which funds will be used for such purpose during that fiscal year; and

(2) an estimate of the costs for future fiscal years to prepare and implement the plan.

SEC. 353. PROCUREMENT OF FOLLOW-ON CONTRACTS FOR THE OPERATION OF FIVE CHAMPION-CLASS T–5 TANK VESSELS.

The Secretary of the Navy may consider bids or proposals for the follow-on contracts for the Department of the Navy contracts for the operation of five Champion-class T–5 tank vessels only from an entity that is a citizen under section 2 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (46 App. U.S.C. 802).

SEC. 354. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON AMERICA'S NATIONAL WORLD WAR I MUSEUM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds as follows:

(1) The Liberty Memorial Museum in Kansas City, Missouri, was built in 1926 in honor of those individuals who served in World War I in defense of liberty and the Nation.

(2) The Liberty Memorial Association, a nonprofit organization which originally built the Liberty Memorial Museum, is responsible for the finances, operations, and collections management of the Liberty Memorial Museum.

(3) The Liberty Memorial Museum is the only public museum in the Nation that exists for the exclusive purpose of interpreting the experiences of the United States and its allies in the World War I years (1914–1918), both on the battlefield and on the home front.

(4) The Liberty Memorial Museum project began after the 1918 Armistice through the efforts of a large-scale, grass-roots civic and fundraising effort by the citizens and veterans of the

Kansas City metropolitan area. After the conclusion of a national architectural design competition, ground was broken in 1921, construction began in 1923, and the Liberty Memorial Museum was opened to the public in 1926.

(5) In 1994, the Liberty Memorial Museum closed for a massive restoration and expansion project. The restored museum reopened to the public on Memorial Day, 2002, during a gala rededication ceremony.

(6) Exhibits prepared for the original museum buildings presaged the dramatic, underground expansion of core exhibition gallery space, with over 30,000 square feet of new interpretive and educational exhibits currently in development. The new exhibits, along with an expanded research library and archives, will more fully utilize the many thousands of historical objects, books, maps, posters, photographs, diaries, letters, and reminiscences of World War I participants that are preserved for posterity in the Liberty Memorial Museum's collections. The new core exhibition is scheduled to open on Veterans Day, 2006.

(7) The City of Kansas City, the State of Missouri, and thousands of private donors and philanthropic foundations have contributed millions of dollars to build and later to restore this national treasure. The Liberty Memorial Museum continues to receive the strong support of residents from the States of Missouri and Kansas and across the Nation.

(8) Since the restoration and rededication of 2002, the Liberty Memorial Museum has attracted thousands of visitors from across the United States and many foreign countries.

(9) There remains a need to preserve in a museum setting evidence of the honor, courage, patriotism, and sacrifice of those Americans who offered their services and who gave their lives in defense of liberty during World War I, evidence of the roles of women and African Americans during World War I, and evidence of other relevant subjects.

(10) The Liberty Memorial Museum seeks to educate a diverse group of audiences through its comprehensive collection of historical materials, emphasizing eyewitness accounts of the participants on the battlefield and the home front and the impact of World War I on individuals, then and now. The Liberty Memorial Museum continues to actively acquire and preserve such materials.

(11) A great opportunity exists to use the invaluable resources of the Liberty Memorial Museum to teach the ''Lessons of Liberty'' to the Nation's schoolchildren through on-site visits, classroom curriculum development, distance learning, and other educational initiatives.

(12) The Liberty Memorial Museum should always be the Nation's museum of the national experience in the World War I years (1914–1918), where people go to learn about this critical period and where the Nation's history of this monumental struggle will be preserved so that generations of the 21st century may understand the role played by the United States in the preservation and advancement of democracy, freedom, and liberty in the early 20th century.

(13) This initiative to recognize and preserve the history of the Nation's sacrifices in World War I will take on added significance as the Nation approaches the centennial observance of this event.

(14) It is fitting and proper to refer to the Liberty Memorial Museum as ''America's National World War I Museum''.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—The Congress—

(1) recognizes the Liberty Memorial Museum in Kansas City, Missouri, including the museum's future and expanded exhibits, collections, library, archives, and educational programs, as ''America's National World War I Museum'';

(2) recognizes that the continuing collection, preservation, and interpretation of the historical objects and other historical materials held by the Liberty Memorial Museum enhance the knowledge and understanding of the Nation's people of the American and allied experience during the World War I years (1914–1918), both on the battlefield and on the home front;

(3) commends the ongoing development and visibility of ''Lessons of Liberty'' educational outreach programs for teachers and students throughout the Nation; and

(4) encourages the need for present generations to understand the magnitude of World War I, how it shaped the Nation, other countries, and later world events, and how the sacrifices made then helped preserve liberty, democracy, and other founding principles for generations to come.

TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

Subtitle A—Active Forces

SEC. 401. END STRENGTHS FOR ACTIVE FORCES.

The Armed Forces are authorized strengths for active duty personnel as of September 30, 2005, as follows:

(1) The Army, 482,400.

(2) The Navy, 365,900.

(3) The Marine Corps, 175,000.

(4) The Air Force, 359,700.

SEC. 402. REVISION IN PERMANENT ACTIVE DUTY END STRENGTH MINIMUM LEVELS.

Effective October 1, 2004, section 691(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) NAVY.—Paragraph (2) is amended by striking ''373,800'' and inserting ''365,900''.

(2) AIR FORCE.—Paragraph (4) is amended by striking ''359,300'' and inserting ''359,700''.

SEC. 403. MAXIMUM NUMBER OF RESERVE PERSONNEL AUTHORIZED TO BE ON ACTIVE DUTY FOR OPERATIONAL SUPPORT.

During fiscal year 2005, the maximum number of members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who may be serving at any time on full-time operational support duty under section 115(b) of title 10, United States Code, is the following:

(1) The Army National Guard of the United States, 10,300.

(2) The Army Reserve, 5,000.

(3) The Naval Reserve, 6,200.

(4) The Marine Corps Reserve, 2,500.

(5) The Air National Guard of the United States, 10,100.

(6) The Air Force Reserve, 3,600.

SEC. 404. ACCOUNTING AND MANAGEMENT OF RESERVE COMPONENT PERSONNEL PERFORMING ACTIVE DUTY OR FULL-TIME NATIONAL GUARD DUTY FOR OPERATIONAL SUPPORT.

(a) STRENGTH AUTHORIZATIONS.—Section 115 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)(A), by inserting ''unless on active duty pursuant to subsection (b)'' after ''active-duty personnel'';

(2) in subsection (a)(1)(B), by inserting ''unless on active duty or full-time National Guard duty pursuant to subsection (b)'' after ''reserve personnel'';

(3) by redesignating subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g) and (h) as subsections (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h) and (i), respectively; and

(4) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection (b):

''(b) CERTAIN RESERVES ON ACTIVE DUTY TO BE AUTHORIZED BY LAW.—(1) Congress shall annually authorize the maximum number of members of a reserve component permitted to be on active duty or full-time National Guard duty at any given time who are called or ordered to—

''(A) active duty under section 12301(d) of this title for the purpose of providing operational support, as prescribed in regulation issued by the Secretary of Defense;

''(B) full-time National Guard duty under section 502(f)(2) of title 32 for the purpose of providing operational support when authorized by the Secretary of Defense;

''(C) active duty under section 12301(d) of this title or full-time National Guard duty under section 502(f) of title 32 for the purpose of preparing for and performing funeral honors functions for funerals of veterans under section 1491 of this title;

''(D) active duty or retained on active duty under sections 12301(g) of this title while in a captive status; or

''(E) active duty or retained on active duty under 12301(h) or 12322 of this title for the purpose of medical evaluation or treatment.

''(2) A member of a reserve component who exceeds either of the following limits shall be included in the strength authorized under subparagraph (A) or subparagraph (B), as appropriate, of subsection (a)(1):

''(A) A call or order to active duty or full-time National Guard duty that specifies a period greater than three years.

''(B) The cumulative periods of active duty and full-time National Guard duty performed by the member exceed 1095 days in the previous 1460 days.

''(3) In determining the period of active service under paragraph (2), the following periods of active service performed by a member shall not be included:

''(A) All periods of active duty performed by a member who has not previously served in the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve.

''(B) All periods of active duty or full-time National Guard duty for which the member is exempt from strength accounting under paragraphs (1) through (7) of subsection (i).''.

(b) LIMITATION ON APPROPRIATIONS.—Subsection (c) of such section (as redesignated by subsection (a)(3)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''or'' at the end of paragraph (1);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

''(3) the use of reserve component personnel to perform active duty or full-time National Guard duty under subsection (b) unless the strength for such personnel for that reserve component for that fiscal year has been authorized by law.''.

(c) AUTHORITY FOR SECRETARY OF DEFENSE VARIANCES IN MAXIMUM STRENGTHS.—Subsection (f) of such section (as redesignated by subsection (a)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''END'' in the heading;

(2) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (2);

(3) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting ''; and''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) increase the maximum strength authorized pursuant to subsection (b)(1) for a fiscal year for certain reserves on active duty for any of the reserve components by a number equal to not more than 10 percent of that strength.''.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 115.— Such section is further amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (e) (as redesignated by subsection (a)(3)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''subsection (a) or (c)'' and inserting ''subsection (a) or (d)''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''subsections (a) and (c)''; and inserting ''subsections (a) and (d)'';

(ii) by striking ''pursuant to subsection (e)) and subsection (c)'' and inserting ''pursuant to subsection (f)) and subsection (d)'' each place it appears.

(2) Subsection (g) (as redesignated by subsection (a)(3)) is amended by striking ''subsection (e)(1)'' in paragraph (2) and inserting ''subsection (f)(1)''.

(3) Subsection (i) (as redesignated by subsection (a)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

''(i) CERTAIN PERSONNEL EXCLUDED FROM COUNTING FOR ACTIVE-DUTY END STRENGTHS.— In counting personnel for the purpose of the end strengths authorized pursuant to subsection

(a)(1), persons in the following categories shall be excluded:

''(1) Members of a reserve component ordered to active duty under section 12301(a) of this title.

''(2) Members of a reserve component in an active status ordered to active duty under section 12301(b) of this title.

''(3) Members of the Ready Reserve ordered to active duty under section 12302 of this title.

''(4) Members of the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve or members of the Individual Ready Reserve mobilization category described in section 10144(b) of this title ordered to active duty under section 12304 of this title.

''(5) Members of the National Guard called into Federal service under section 12406 of this title.

''(6) Members of the militia called into Federal service under chapter 15 of this title.

''(7) Members of reserve components on active duty for training.

''(8) Members of the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve on active duty to support programs described in section 1203(b) of the Cooperative Threat Reduction Act of 1993 (22 U.S.C. 5952(b)).

''(9) Members of the National Guard on active duty or full-time National Guard duty for the purpose of carrying out drug interdiction and counter-drug activities under section 112 of title 32.

''(10) Members of a reserve component on active duty under section 10(b)(2) of the Military Selective Service Act (50 U.S.C. App. 460(b)(2)) for the administration of the Selective Service System.

''(11) Members of the National Guard on full-time National Guard duty for the purpose of providing command, administrative, training, or support services for the National Guard Challenge Program authorized by section 509 of title 32.''.

(e) MILITARY TO MILITARY CONTACT STRENGTH ACCOUNTING.—Subsection (f) of section 168 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''(f) ACTIVE DUTY END STRENGTHS.—A member of a reserve component who is engaged in activities authorized under this section shall not be counted for purposes of the following personnel strength limitations:

''(1) The end strength for active-duty personnel authorized pursuant to section 115(a)(1) of this title for the fiscal year in which the member carries out the activities referred to under this section.

''(2) The authorized daily average for members in pay grades E–8 and E–9 under section 517 of this title for the calendar year in which the member carries out such activities.

(3) The authorized strengths for commissioned officers under section 523 of this title for the fiscal year in which the member carries out such activities.

(f) E–8 AND E–9 STRENGTH ACCOUNTING.—Subsection (a) of section 517 of such title is amended by striking ''(other than for training) in connection with organizing, administering, recruiting, instructing, or training the reserve component of an armed force.'' and inserting ''as authorized under section 115(a)(1)(B) or 115(b) of this title, or excluded from counting for active duty end strengths under section 115(i) of this title.''.

(g) FIELD GRADE OFFICER STRENGTH ACCOUNTING.—(1) Paragraph (1) of section 523(b) of such title is amended to read as follows:

''(A) on active duty as authorized under section 115(a)(1)(B) or 115(b)(1) of this title, or excluded from counting for active duty end strengths under section 115(i) of this title;

''(B) on active duty under section 10211, 10302 through 10305, or 12402 of this title or under section 708 of title 32; or

''(C) on full-time National Guard duty.''; and

(2) Paragraph (7) of section 523(b) is amended by striking ''Reserve or retired officers'' and inserting ''Retired officers''.

(h) ACTIVE GUARD AND RESERVE FIELD GRADE OFFICER STRENGTH ACCOUNTING.—Paragraph (2) of section 12011(e) of such title is amended to read as follows:

''(2) Full-time National Guard duty (other than for training) under section 502(f) of title 32, except for duty under section 115(b)(1)(B) and (C) of this title and section 115(i)(9) of this title.''.

(i) WARRANT OFFICER ACTIVE-DUTY LIST EXCLUSION.—Paragraph (1) of section 582 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''(1) Reserve warrant officers—

''(A) on active duty as authorized under section 115(a)(1)(B) or 115(b)(1) of this title, or excluded from counting for active duty end strengths under section 115(i) of this title; or

''(B) on full-time National Guard duty.''.

(j) OFFICER ACTIVE-DUTY LIST, APPLICABILITY OF CHAPTER.—Paragraph (1) of section 641 of such is amended to read as follows:

''(1) Reserve officers—

''(A) on active duty authorized under section 115(a)(1)(B) or 115(b)(1) of this title, or excluded from counting for active duty end strengths under section 115(i) of this title;

''(B) on active duty under section 3038, 5143, 5144, 8038, 10211, 10301 through 10305, 10502, 10505, 10506(a), 10506(b), 10507, or 12402 of this title or section 708 of title 32; or

''(C) on full-time National Guard duty.''.

(k) STRENGTH ACCOUNTING FOR MEMBERS PERFORMING DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES.—Section 112 of title 32, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (e);

(2) by redesignating subsections (f), (g), (h) and (i) as subsections (e), (f), (g) and (h) respectively; and

(3) in paragraph (1) of subsection (e), as redesignated by paragraph (2), by striking ''for a period of more than 180 days'' each place it appears.

(l) REPORT.—Not later than June 1, 2005, the Secretary of Defense shall report to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives the Secretary's recommendations regarding the exemptions provided in paragraphs (8) through (11) by section 115(i) of title 10, United States Code, as amended by this section. The recommendations shall address the manner in personnel covered by those exemptions shall be accounted for in authorizations provided by section 115 of such title. The objective of the analysis should be to terminate the need for such exemptions after September 30, 2006.

(m) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe by regulation the meaning of the term ''operational support'' for purposes of paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of section 115 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a).

Subtitle B—Reserve Forces

SEC. 411. END STRENGTHS FOR SELECTED RESERVE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Armed Forces are authorized strengths for Selected Reserve personnel of the reserve components as of September 30, 2005, as follows:

(1) The Army National Guard of the United States, 350,000.

(2) The Army Reserve, 205,000.

(3) The Naval Reserve, 83,400.

(4) The Marine Corps Reserve, 39,600.

(5) The Air National Guard of the United States, 106,800.

(6) The Air Force Reserve, 76,100.

(7) The Coast Guard Reserve, 10,000.

(b) ADJUSTMENTS.—The end strengths prescribed by subsection (a) for the Selected Reserve of any reserve component shall be proportionately reduced by—

(1) the total authorized strength of units organized to serve as units of the Selected Reserve of such component which are on active duty (other than for training) at the end of the fiscal year; and

(2) the total number of individual members not in units organized to serve as units of the Selected Reserve of such component who are on active duty (other than for training or for unsatisfactory participation in training) without their consent at the end of the fiscal year.

Whenever such units or such individual members are released from active duty during any fiscal year, the end strength prescribed for such fiscal year for the Selected Reserve of such reserve component shall be increased proportionately by the total authorized strengths of such units and by the total number of such individual members.

SEC. 412. END STRENGTHS FOR RESERVES ON ACTIVE DUTY IN SUPPORT OF THE RESERVES.

Within the end strengths prescribed in section 411(a), the reserve components of the Armed Forces are authorized, as of September 30, 2005, the following number of Reserves to be serving on full-time active duty or full-time duty, in the case of members of the National Guard, for the purpose of organizing, administering, recruiting, instructing, or training the reserve components:

(1) The Army National Guard of the United States, 26,476.

(2) The Army Reserve, 14,970.

(3) The Naval Reserve, 14,152.

(4) The Marine Corps Reserve, 2,261.

(5) The Air National Guard of the United States, 12,225.

(6) The Air Force Reserve, 1,900.

SEC. 413. END STRENGTHS FOR MILITARY TECHNICIANS (DUAL STATUS).

The minimum number of military technicians (dual status) as of the last day of fiscal year 2005 for the reserve components of the Army and the Air Force (notwithstanding section 129 of title 10, United States Code) shall be the following:

(1) For the Army Reserve, 7,299.

(2) For the Army National Guard of the United States, 25,076.

(3) For the Air Force Reserve, 9,954.

(4) For the Air National Guard of the United States, 22,956.

SEC. 414. FISCAL YEAR 2005 LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF NON-DUAL STATUS TECHNICIANS.

(a) LIMITATIONS.—(1) Within the limitation provided in section 10217(c)(2) of title 10, United States Code, the number of non-dual status technicians employed by the National Guard as of September 30, 2005, may not exceed the following:

(A) For the Army National Guard of the United States, 1,600.

(B) For the Air National Guard of the United States, 350.

(2) The number of non-dual status technicians employed by the Army Reserve as of September 30, 2005, may not exceed 795.

(3) The number of non-dual status technicians employed by the Air Force Reserve as of September 30, 2005, may not exceed 90.

(b) NON-DUAL STATUS TECHNICIANS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''non-dual status technician'' has the meaning given that term in section 10217(a) of title 10, United States Code.

Subtitle C—Authorizations of Appropriations

SEC. 421. MILITARY PERSONNEL.

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for military personnel for fiscal year 2005 a total of $104,647,558,000. The authorization in the preceding sentence supersedes any other authorization of appropriations (definite or indefinite) for such purpose for fiscal year 2005.

SEC. 422. ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT HOME.

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2005 from the Armed Forces Retirement Home Trust Fund the sum of

$61,195,000 for the operation of the Armed Forces Retirement Home.

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

Subtitle A—General and Flag Officer Matters

SEC. 501. LENGTH OF SERVICE FOR SERVICE CHIEFS.

(a) CHIEF OF STAFF OF THE ARMY.—Paragraph (1) of section 3033(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''for a period of four years'' in the first sentence; and

(2) by striking the second and third sentences and inserting the following: ''The Chief of Staff serves at the pleasure of the President for a term of four years. The President may extend the service of an officer as Chief of Staff for an additional period of not to exceed two years. In time of war or during a national emergency declared by Congress, the President may extend the service of an officer as Chief of Staff for such additional periods as the President determines necessary, except that the total period of an officer's service as Chief of Staff may not exceed eight years.''.

(b) CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS.—Paragraph (1) of section 5033(a) of such title is amended by striking the third and fourth sentences and inserting the following: ''The Chief of Naval Operations serves at the pleasure of the President. The President may extend the service of an officer as Chief of Naval Operations for an additional period of not to exceed two years. In time of war or during a national emergency declared by Congress, the President may extend the service of an officer as Chief of Naval Operations for such additional periods as the President determines necessary, except that the total period of an officer's service as Chief of Naval Operations may not exceed eight years.''.

(c) COMMANDANT OF THE MARINE CORPS.—Paragraph (1) of section 5043(a) of such title is amended by striking the third and fourth sentences and inserting the following: ''The Commandant serves at the pleasure of the President. The President may extend the service of an officer as Commandant for an additional period of not to exceed two years. In time of war or during a national emergency declared by Congress, the President may extend the service of an officer as Commandant for such additional periods as the President determines necessary, except that the total period of an officer's service as Commandant may not exceed eight years.''.

(d) CHIEF OF STAFF OF THE AIR FORCE.—Paragraph (1) of section 8033(a) of such title is amended to read as follows:

(1) by striking ''for a period of four years'' in the first sentence; and

(2) by striking the second and third sentences and inserting the following: ''The Chief of Staff serves at the pleasure of the President for a period of four years. The President may extend the service of an officer as Chief of Staff for an additional period of not to exceed two years. In time of war or during a national emergency declared by Congress, the President may extend the service of an officer as Chief of Staff for such additional periods as the President determines necessary, except that the total period of an officer's service as Chief of Staff may not exceed eight years.''.

SEC. 502. REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT THAT DEPUTY CHIEFS AND ASSISTANT CHIEFS OF NAVAL OPERATIONS BE SELECTED FROM OFFICERS IN THE LINE OF THE NAVY.

(a) DEPUTY CHIEFS OF NAVAL OPERATIONS.—Section 5036(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''in the line''.

(b) ASSISTANT CHIEFS OF NAVAL OPERATIONS.—Section 5037(a) of such title is amended by striking ''in the line''.

SEC. 503. INCREASE IN AGE LIMIT FOR DEFERRAL OF MANDATORY RETIREMENT FOR UP TO 10 SENIOR GENERAL AND FLAG OFFICERS.

Section 1251(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''64 years of age'' and inserting ''66 years of age''.

SEC. 504. INCREASED FLEXIBILITY FOR VOLUNTARY RETIREMENT FOR MILITARY OFFICERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1370 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''except as provided in paragraph (2)'' and inserting ''subject to paragraphs (2) and (3)''; and

(ii) by striking '', for not less than six months'';

(B) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(C) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) In order to be eligible for voluntary retirement under this title in a grade below the grade of lieutenant colonel or commander, a commissioned officer of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps covered by paragraph (1) must have served on active duty in that grade for not less than six months.

''(3)(A) In order to be eligible for voluntary retirement in a grade above major or lieutenant commander and below brigadier general or rear admiral (lower half), a commissioned officer of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps covered by paragraph (1) must have served on active duty in that grade for not less than three years, except that the Secretary of Defense may authorize the Secretary of the military department concerned to reduce such period to a period not less than two years.

''(B) In order to be eligible for voluntary retirement in a grade above colonel or captain, in the case of the Navy, a commissioned officer of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps covered by paragraph (1) must have served on active duty in that grade for not less than one year.

''(C) An officer in a grade above major general or rear admiral may be retired in the highest grade in which the officer served on active duty satisfactorily for not less than one year, upon approval by the Secretary of the military department concerned and concurrence by the Secretary of Defense. The function of the Secretary of Defense under the preceding sentence may only be delegated to a civilian official in the Office of the Secretary of Defense appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

''(D) The President may waive subparagraph (A), (B) or (C) in individual cases involving extreme hardship or exceptional or unusual circumstances. The authority of the President under the preceding sentence may not be delegated.'';

(2) in subsection (b), by inserting ''or whose service on active duty in that grade was not determined to be satisfactory by the Secretary of the military department concerned'' after ''specified in subsection (a)'';

(3) by striking subsection (c); and

(4) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c) and in that subsection—

(A) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by inserting ''(i)'' after ''(3)(A)'';

(II) by inserting ''and below brigadier general or rear admiral (lower half)'' after ''lieutenant commander'';

(III) by inserting '', except that the Secretary of Defense may authorize the Secretary of the military department concerned to reduce such period to a period not less than two years'' after ''three years''; and

(IV) by adding at the end the following new clauses:

''(ii) In order to be credited with satisfactory service in a grade above colonel or captain, in the case of the Navy, a person covered by paragraph (1) must have served satisfactorily in that grade (as determined by the Secretary of the military department concerned) as a reserve commissioned officer in active status, or in a retired status on active duty, for not less than one year.

''(iii) An officer covered by paragraph (1) who is in a grade above the grade of major general or rear admiral may be retired in the highest grade in which the officer served satisfactorily for not less than one year, upon approval by the Secretary of the military department concerned and concurrence by the Secretary of Defense. The function of the Secretary of Defense under the preceding sentence may only be delegated to a civilian official in the Office of the Secretary of Defense appointed by the president, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.'';

(ii) in subparagraphs (D) and (E), by striking subparagraph (A)'' and inserting ''subparagraph (A)(i)''; and

(iii) by striking subparagraph (F); and

(B) by striking paragraphs (5) and (6); and

(5) by striking subsection (e).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 1406(i)(2) of such title is amended—

(1) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''MEMBERS'' and all that follows through ''SATISFACTORILY'' and inserting ''ENLISTED MEMBERS REDUCED IN GRADE'';

(2) by striking ''a member'' and inserting ''an enlisted member'';

(3) by striking ''1998—'' and all that follows through ''is reduced in'' and inserting ''1998, is reduced in'';

(4) by striking ''; or'' and inserting a period; and

(5) by striking subparagraph (B).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to the determination of the retired grade of members of the Armed Forces retiring on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 505. REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT THAT NO MORE THAN 50 PERCENT OF ACTIVE DUTY GENERAL AND FLAG OFFICERS BE IN GRADES ABOVE BRIGADIER GENERAL AND REAR ADMIRAL (LOWER HALF).

(a) REPEAL OF DISTRIBUTION REQUIREMENT.—Subsection (a) of section 525 of title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

(b) REORGANIZATION OF SECTION.—Such section is further amended—

(1) by striking ''(b)(1) No appointment'' and inserting ''(a) LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF GENERAL AND FLAG OFFICERS IN SENIOR GRADES.—(1) No appointment''; and

(2) by striking ''(3) An officer'' and inserting ''(b) SPECIAL RULES AND EXCEPTIONS.—(1) An officer''; and

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (4), (5), (6), (7), and (8) as paragraphs (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6), respectively.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Subsection (b) of such section (as designated by subsection (a)(2)) is amended as follows:

(A) Paragraph (1) (as redesignated by subsection (a)(2)), paragraph (2)(A) (as redesignated by subsection (a)(3)), and paragraph (6) (as redesignated by subsection (a)(3)) are amended by striking ''paragraph (1) or (2)'' and inserting ''subsection (a)''.

(B) Paragraph (3)(A) (as so redesignated) is amended by striking ''under the first sentence of paragraph (1) or (2), as applicable'' and inserting ''under subsection (a)''.

(C) Paragraph (4) (as so redesignated) and the first and third sentences of paragraph (5) (as so redesignated) are amended by striking ''paragraph (1)'' and inserting ''subsection (a)(1)''.

(D) The second sentence of paragraph (5) (as so redesignated) is amended by striking ''paragraph (1) or (2)'' and inserting ''subsection (a)(2)''.

(2) Subsection (c) of such section is amended—

(A) by striking ''(c)(1)'' and inserting '(c) 'REALLOCATION AUTHORITY.—(1)'';

(B) in paragraph (1)(A), by striking ''subsection (b)(1)'' and inserting ''subsection (a)(1)'';

(C) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking ''subsection (b)(2)'' and inserting ''subsection (a)(2)''; and

(D) in paragraph (3)(A), by striking ''subsection (b)'' and inserting ''subsections (a) and (b)''.

(3) Subsection (d) of such section is amended by inserting ''SPECIAL RULE FOR OFFICERS FORMERLY ON JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF.—'' after ''(d)''.

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—(1) The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

''§ 525. Distribution in grade: general and flag officers on active duty''.

(2) The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 32 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''525. Distribution in grade: general and flag officers on active duty.''.

SEC. 506. REVISION TO TERMS FOR ASSISTANTS TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF FOR NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE MATTERS.

(a) CODIFICATION AND REVISION.—Chapter 5 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end a new section 156 consisting of—

(1) the following section heading:

''§ 156. Assistants to the Chairman for National Guard matters and for Reserve matters'';

and

(2) a text consisting of the text of subsections (a) through (f)(1) of section 901 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (10 U.S.C. 155 note), revised—

(A) in subsection (c), by deleting ''two years'' and inserting ''four years''; and

(B) in subsection (f), by deleting ''(1)''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''156. Assistants to the Chairman for National Guard members and for Reserve matters.''.

(c) CONFORMING REPEAL.—Section 901 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (10 U.S.C. 155 note) is repealed.

SEC. 507. SUCCESSION FOR POSITION OF CHIEF, NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU.

(a) DESIGNATION OF SENIOR OFFICER IN NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU.—Section 10502 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) SUCCESSION.—(1) Unless otherwise directed by the President or Secretary of Defense, when there is a vacancy in the office of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau or in the event the Chief of the National Guard Bureau is unable to perform the duties of that office, the senior of the officers specified in paragraph (2) shall serve as the acting Chief until a successor is appointed or the Chief once again is able to perform the duties of that office.

''(2) The officers specified in this paragraph are the following:

''(A) The senior officer of the Army National Guard of the United States on duty with the National Guard Bureau.

''(B) The senior officer of the Air National Guard of the United States on duty with the National Guard Bureau.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—(1) The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

''§ 10502. Chief of the National Guard Bureau: appointment; adviser on National Guard matters; grade; succession''.

(2) The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 1011 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''10502. Chief of the National Guard Bureau: appointment; adviser on National Guard matters; grade; succession.''.

(c) REPEALER.—Subsections (d) and (e) of section 10505 of such title are repealed.

SEC. 508. TITLE OF VICE CHIEF OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU CHANGED TO DIRECTOR OF THE JOINT STAFF OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 10505 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by section 507(c), is amended by striking ''Vice Chief of the National Guard Bureau'' each place it appears in subsections (a), (b), and (c) and inserting ''Director of the Joint Staff of the National Guard Bureau''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—(1) The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

''§ 10505. Director of the Joint Staff of the National Guard Bureau''.

(2) The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 1011 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''10505. Director of the Joint Staff of the National Guard Bureau.''.

SEC. 509. TWO-YEAR EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO WAIVE REQUIREMENT THAT RESERVE CHIEFS AND NATIONAL GUARD DIRECTORS HAVE SIGNIFICANT JOINT DUTY EXPERIENCE.

(a) EXTENSION.—Sections 3038(b)(4), 5143(b)(4), 5144(b)(4), 8038(b)(4), and 10506(a)(3)(D) of title 10, United States Code, are amended by striking ''December 31, 2004,'' and inserting ''December 31, 2006,''.

(b) FUTURE COMPLIANCE.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate a plan for ensuring that all officers selected after December 31, 2006, for recommendation for appointment as a Reserve chief or National Guard director have significant joint duty experience, as required by law, and may be so recommended without requirement for a wavier of such requirement. Such plan shall be developed in coordination with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

SEC. 510. REPEAL OF DISTRIBUTION REQUIREMENTS FOR NAVAL RESERVE FLAG OFFICERS.

Subsection (c) of 12004 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''(1)'' after ''(c)''; and

(2) by striking the second sentence and all that follows through the end of the subsection.

Subtitle B—Other Officer Personnel Policy Matters

SEC. 511. TRANSITION OF ACTIVE-DUTY LIST OFFICER FORCE TO ALL REGULAR STATUS.

(a) REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT THAT ACTIVE-DUTY OFFICERS SERVE IN A RESERVE COMPONENT FOR AT LEAST ONE YEAR BEFORE RECEIVING A REGULAR COMMISSION.—Section 532 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (e).

(b) REVISION TO QUALIFICATIONS FOR ORIGINAL APPOINTMENT AS A COMMISSIONED OFFICER.—(1) Section 532 of such title is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) The Secretary of Defense may waive the requirement of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) with respect to a person who has been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence when the Secretary determines that the national security so requires, but only for an original appointment in a grade below the grade of major or lieutenant commander.''.

(2) Section 619(d) of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) An officer of the Army, Air Force, or Marine Corps in the grade of captain, or of the Navy in the grade of lieutenant, who is not a citizen of the United States.''.

(c) REPEAL OF LIMITATIONS ON TOTAL STRENGTH OF REGULAR COMMISSIONED OFFICERS ON ACTIVE-DUTY.—Section 522 of such title is repealed. The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 31 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to that section.

(d) AUTHORITY FOR ORIGINAL APPOINTMENT OF REGULAR OFFICERS IN JUNIOR GRADES TO BE MADE BY PRESIDENT ALONE.—Section 531(a) of such title is amended to read as follows:

''(a)(1) Original appointments in the grades of second lieutenant, first lieutenant, and captain in the Regular Army, Regular Air Force, and Regular Marine Corps and in the grades of ensign, lieutenant (junior grade), and lieutenant in the Regular Navy shall be made by the President alone.

''(2) Original appointments in the grades of major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel in the Regular Army, Regular Air Force, and Regular Marine Corps and in the grades of lieutenant commander, commander, and captain in the Regular Navy shall be made by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.''.

(e) TERMINATION OF REQUIREMENT OF 6 YEARS SERVICE IN A RESERVE COMPONENT FOR NONREGULAR SERVICE RETIREMENT ELIGIBILITY.—(1) Section 12731(a)(3) of such title is amended by inserting after ''(3)'' the following: ''in the case of a person who completed the service requirements of paragraph (2) before the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005,''.

(f) ALL REGULAR OFFICER APPOINTMENTS FOR STUDENTS ATTENDING UNIVERSITY OF HEALTH SCIENCES.—Section 2114(b) of such title is amended by striking the first two sentences and inserting the following: ''They shall be appointed in a regular component of the uniformed services and shall serve on active duty as a second lieutenant or ensign (or the equivalent).''.

SEC. 512. MANDATORY RETENTION ON ACTIVE DUTY TO QUALIFY FOR RETIREMENT PAY.

Section 12686(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''(other than the retirement system under chapter 1223 of this title)'' after ''retirement system''.

SEC. 513. DISTRIBUTION IN GRADE OF MARINE CORPS RESERVE OFFICERS IN AN ACTIVE STATUS IN GRADES BELOW BRIGADIER GENERAL

The table in section 12005(c)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''Colonel	*2 percent*
Lieutenant colonel	*8 percent*
Major	*16 percent*
Captain	*39 percent*
First lieutenant and second lieutenant (when combined with the number authorized for general officer grades under section 12004 of this title)	*35 percent.''.*

SEC. 514. TUITION ASSISTANCE FOR OFFICERS.

(a) AUTHORITY TO REDUCE OR WAIVE ACTIVE DUTY SERVICE OBLIGATION.—Subsection (b) of section 2007 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(b)'';

(2) by inserting ''or full-time National Guard duty'' after ''active duty'' each place it appears; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the Secretary of the military department may reduce or waive the active duty service obligation—

''(A) in the case of a commissioned officer who is subject to mandatory separation;

''(B) in the case of a commissioned officer who has completed the period of active duty service in support of a contingency operation; or

''(C) in other exigent circumstances as determined by the Secretary.'.

(b). INCREASE IN TUITION ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZED FOR ARMY OFFICERS IN THE SELECTED RESERVE.—Paragraph (1) of section 2007(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(1) Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), the Secretary of the Army may pay the charges of an educational institution for the tuition or expenses of an officer in the Selected Reserve of the Army National Guard or the Army Reserve for education or training of such officer.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) may, at the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be applied to a service obligation incurred by an officer serving on active duty as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

Subtitle C—Reserve Component Matters

SEC. 521. REVISION TO STATUTORY PURPOSE OF THE RESERVE COMPONENTS.

Subsection 10102 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking '', during'' and all that follows through ''planned mobilization,''.

SEC. 522. IMPROVED ACCESS TO RESERVE COMPONENT MEMBERS FOR ENHANCED TRAINING.

(a) RESERVE COMPONENTS GENERALLY.— Section 12301 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''(other than for training)'';

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking ''(other than for training)'' and inserting ''as provided in subsection (a)''; and

(B) in the second sentence, by striking ''ordered to active duty (other than for training)'' and inserting ''so ordered to active duty''; and

(3) in subsection (e), by striking ''(other than for training)'' and inserting ''as provided in subsection (a)''.

(b) READY RESERVE.—Section 12302 of such title is amended by striking ''(other than for training)'' in subsections (a) and (c).

(c) ORDER TO ACTIVE DUTY OTHER THAN DURING WAR OR NATIONAL EMERGENCY.—Section 12304(a) of such title is amended by striking ''(other than for training)''.

(d) STANDBY RESERVE.—Section 12306 of such title is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''(other than for training) only''; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''(other than for training)'' in paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting ''as provided in section 12301(a) of this title''.

(d) STANDBY RESERVE.—Section 12306 of such title is amended by striking ''(other than for training)'' each place it appears and inserting ''as provided in section 12301(a)''.

SEC. 523. STATUS UNDER DISABILITY RETIREMENT SYSTEM FOR RESERVE MEMBERS RELEASED FROM ACTIVE DUTY DUE TO INABILITY TO PERFORM WITHIN 30 DAYS OF CALL TO ACTIVE DUTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 61 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1206 the following new section:

''§ 1206a. Reserve component members unable to perform duties when ordered to active duty: disability system processing

''(a) MEMBERS RELEASED FROM ACTIVE DUTY WITHIN 30 DAYS.—A member of a reserve component who is ordered to active duty for a period of more than 30 days and is released from active duty within 30 days of commencing such period of active duty for a reason stated in subsection (b) shall be considered for all purposes under this chapter to have been serving under an order to active duty for a period of 30 days or less.

''(b) APPLICABLE REASONS FOR RELEASE.—Subsection (a) applies in the case of a member released from active duty because of a failure to meet—

''(1) physical standards for retention; or

''(2) medical or dental standards for deployment due to a preexisting condition not aggravated during the period of active duty.

''(c) SAVINGS PROVISION FOR MEDICAL CARE PROVIDED WHILE ON ACTIVE DUTY.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), any benefit under chapter 55 of this title received by a member described in subsection (a) or a dependent of such member before or during the period of active duty shall not be subject to recoupment or otherwise affected.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1206 the following new item:

''1206a. Reserve component members unable to perform duties when ordered to active duty: disability system processing.''.

SEC. 524. FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE MILITARY LEAVE FOR RESERVE AND NATIONAL GUARD CIVILIAN TECHNICIANS.

Section 6323(d)(1) of title 5, United States Code is amended by striking ''(other than active duty during a war or national emergency declared by the President or Congress)''.

SEC. 525. EXPANDED EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE AUTHORITY FOR OFFICERS COMMISSIONED THROUGH ROTC PROGRAM AT MILITARY JUNIOR COLLEGES.

(a) FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR SERVICE ON ACTIVE DUTY.—Section 2107(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(5)(A) The Secretary of the Army may provide an individual who received a commission as a Reserve officer in the Army from a military junior college through a program under this chapter and who does not have a baccalaureate degree with financial assistance for pursuit of a baccalaureate degree.

''(B) Such assistance is in addition to any financial assistance provided under paragraph (1), (3), or (4).

''(C) The agreement and reimbursement requirements established in section 2005 of this title are applicable to financial assistance under this paragraph.

''(D) An officer receiving financial assistance under this paragraph shall be attached to the unit of the Army at the educational institution at which the officer is pursuing a baccalaureate degree and shall be considered to be a member of the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps on inactive duty for training, as defined in section 101(23) of title 38.

''(E) A qualified officer who did not previously receive financial assistance under this section is eligible to receive educational assistance under this paragraph.

''(F) A Reserve officer may not be called or ordered to active duty for a deployment while participating in the program under this paragraph.

''(G) Any service obligation incurred by an officer under an agreement entered into under this paragraph shall be in addition to any service obligation incurred by that officer under any other provision of law or agreement.

''(H) The amount obligated during any fiscal year under this paragraph and paragraph (4) of section 2107a(c) of this title may not exceed a total of $1,500,000.''.

(b) FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR SERVICE IN TROOP PROGRAM UNITS.—Section 2107a(c) of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(4)(A) The Secretary of the Army may provide an individual who received a commission as a Reserve officer in the Army from a military junior college through a program under this chapter and who does not have a baccalaureate degree with financial assistance for pursuit of a baccalaureate degree.

''(B) Such assistance is in addition to any provided under paragraph (1) or (2).

''(C) The agreement and reimbursement requirements established in section 2005 of this title are applicable to financial assistance under this paragraph.

''(D) An officer receiving financial assistance under this paragraph shall be attached to the unit of the Army at the educational institution at which the officer is pursuing a baccalaureate degree and shall be considered to be a member of the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps on inactive duty for training, as defined in section 101(23) of title 38.

''(E) A qualified officer who did not previously receive financial assistance under this section is eligible to receive educational assistance under this paragraph.

''(F) A Reserve officer may not be called or ordered to active duty for a deployment while participating in the program under this paragraph.

''(G) Any service obligation incurred by an officer under an agreement entered into under this paragraph shall be in addition to any service obligation incurred by that officer under any other provision of law or agreement.

''(H) As provided in subparagraph (H) of section 2107(c)(5) of this title, the amount obligated during any fiscal year under this paragraph and paragraph (5) of section 2107(c) of this title may not exceed a total of $1,500,000.''.

(c) REPEAL OF SUNSET PROVISION FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR STUDENTS NOT ELIGIBLE FOR ADVANCED TRAINING.—Section 2103a of such title is amended by striking subsection (d).

(d) ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION REPORT.—The Secretary of the Army shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives an annual report, for each of the next six years after the enactment of this Act, providing information on the experience of the Department of Defense during the preceding year under paragraph (5) of section 2107(c) of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), and under paragraph (4) of section 2107a(c) of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (b). The report for with respect to any year shall be submitted not later March 31 of the following year.

SEC. 526. EFFECT OF APPOINTMENT OR COMMISSION AS OFFICER ON ELIGIBILITY FOR SELECTED RESERVE EDUCATION LOAN REPAYMENT PROGRAM FOR ENLISTED MEMBERS.

(a) CONTINUATION OF LOAN REPAYMENT.—Section 16301(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''The Secretary'' in the first sentence and inserting ''Except as provided in paragraph (3), the Secretary of Defense''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) In the case of a commitment made by the Secretary of Defense after the date of the enactment of this paragraph to repay a loan under paragraph (1) conditioned upon the performance by the borrower of service as an enlisted member under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall repay the loan for service performed by the borrower as an officer (rather than as an enlisted member) in the case of a borrower who, after such commitment is entered into and while performing service as an enlisted member, accepts an appointment or commission as a warrant officer or commissioned officer of the Selected Reserve.''.

(b) LIMITATION ON FISCAL YEAR 2005 OBLIGATIONS.—During fiscal year 2005, obligations incurred under section 16301 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a), to make loan repayments on behalf of members of the reserve components who accept an appointment or commission as a warrant officer or commissioned officer of the Selected Reserve may not exceed $1,000,000.

SEC. 527. NUMBER OF STARBASE ACADEMIES IN A STATE.

Paragraph (3) of section 2193b(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(3)(A) Subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary may not support the establishment in any State of more than two academies.

''(B) The Secretary may waive the limitation in subparagraph (A). Any such waiver shall be made under criteria to be prescribed by the Secretary.''.

SEC. 528. COMPTROLLER GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF INTEGRATION OF ACTIVE AND RESERVE COMPONENTS OF THE NAVY.

(a) ASSESSMENT.—The Comptroller General shall review the plan of the Secretary of the Navy for, and implementation by the Secretary of, initiatives undertaken within the Navy to improve the integration of the active and reserve components of the Navy in peacetime and wartime operations resulting from—

(1) the Naval Reserve Redesign Study carried out by the Navy: and

(2) the zero-based review of reserve component force structure undertaken by the commander of the Fleet Forces Command of the Navy during fiscal year 2004.

(b) REPORT.—No later than March 31, 2005, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report on the results of the review under subsection (a). The Comptroller General shall include in the report recommendations for improved active and reserve component integration in the Navy.

(c) LIMITATION.—No funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be obligated or expended to decommission a Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve aviation squadron until 90 days after the date on which the report required by subsection (b) is submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives.

(d) MATTERS TO BE EXAMINED.—In conducting the review, the Comptroller General shall examine the following:

(1) The criteria the Navy used to determine the following with respect to integration of the active and reserve components of the Navy:

(A) The future mix of active and reserve component force structure.

(B) Organization of command and control elements.

(C) Manpower levels.

(D) Basing changes.

(2) The extent to which the plans of the Navy for improving the integration of the active and reserve components of the Navy considered each of the following:

(A) The new Fleet Response Plan of the Navy.

(B) The flexible deployment concept.

(C) Global operations.

(D) Emerging mission requirements.

(E) Other evolving initiatives.

(3) The manner in which the timing of the execution of planned active and reserve integration initiatives will correlate with the funding of those initiatives, including consideration of an evaluation of the adequacy of the funding allocated to those integration initiatives.

(4) For naval aviation forces, the extent to which the active and reserve component integration plans of the Navy will affect factors such as—

(A) common training and readiness standards for active and reserve forces;

(B) reserve component access to the same equipment as the active component;

(C) relationships between command and headquarters elements of active and reserve forces; and

(D) trends in the use by the Navy of units referred to as ''associate'' units or ''blended'' units.

(E) Basing of future aviation forces.

(F) Employment of Naval Reserve aviation forces and personnel in peacetime and wartime operations.

SEC. 529. OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED BY THE NATIONAL GUARD UNDER AUTHORITY OF TITLE 32.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title 32, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new chapter:

''CHAPTER 9—OPERATIONS OF A NATIONAL OR FEDERAL INTEREST

''Sec.
''901. Operational activities.
''902. Operational duty.
''903. Funding assistance.
''904. Operations requests.

''§ 901. Operational activities

''The Secretary of Defense may provide funds in advance or on a reimbursable basis to a Governor to employ National Guard units and individuals to conduct operational activities that the Secretary determines to be in the national interest. The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations to implement this chapter.

''§ 902. Operational duty

''All duty performed under this chapter shall be considered to be full-time National Guard duty under section 502(f) of this title. Members of the National Guard performing full-time National Guard duty in the Active Guard and Reserve Program may support or execute operational activities performed by the National Guard under this chapter.

''§ 903. Funding assistance

''When the Secretary of Defense determines that certain operational activities of the National Guard are in the national interest under section 901 of this title, the Secretary shall provide funds to a State in an amount that the Secretary determines is appropriate for the following costs of the operational activities from funds available to the Department for related purposes:

''(1) The pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses of personnel of the National Guard of that State.

''(2) The operation and maintenance of the equipment and facilities of the National Guard of that State.

''(3) The procurement of services and equipment, and the leasing of equipment, for the National Guard of that State.

''§ 904. Operations requests

''(a) REQUESTS.—A Governor of a State may request funding assistance for the operational activities of the National Guard of that State from the Secretary of Defense. Any such request shall include the following:

''(1) The specific intended operational activities of the National Guard of that State.

''(2) An explanation of why the operational activities are in the national interest.

''(3) A certification that operational activities are to be conducted at a time when the personnel involved are not in Federal service.

''(4) A certification that participation by National Guard personnel in the operational activities is service in addition to training required under section 502 of this title.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters at the beginning of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''9. Operations of a National or Federal Interest ..... 901''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 115(h) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(i) CERTAIN FULL-TIME NATIONAL GUARD DUTY PERSONNEL EXCLUDED FROM COUNTING FOR FULL-TIME NATIONAL GUARD DUTY END STRENGTHS.—In counting full-time National Guard duty personnel for the purpose of end-strengths authorized pursuant to subsection (a)(1), persons involuntarily performing operational activities under chapter 9 of title 32 shall be excluded.''.

SEC. 530. ARMY PROGRAM FOR ASSIGNMENT OF ACTIVE COMPONENT ADVISERS TO UNITS OF THE SELECTED RESERVE.

(a) CHANGE IN MINIMUM NUMBER REQUIRED TO BE ASSIGNED.—Section 414(c)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107; 10 U.S.C. 12001 note) is amended by striking ''5,000'' and inserting ''3,500''.

(b) LIMITATION ON REDUCTIONS.—Notwithstanding the amendment made by subsection (a), the Secretary of the Army may not reduce the number of active component Reserve support personnel below the number of such personnel as of the date of the enactment of this Act until the report required by subsection (c) has been submitted.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than March 31, 2005, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report on the support by active components of the Army for training and readiness of the Army National Guard and Army Reserve. The report shall include an evaluation and determination of each of the following:

(1) The effect on the ability of the Army to improve such training and readiness resulting from the reduction under the amendment made by subsection (a) in the minimum number of active component Reserve support personnel.

(2) The adequacy of having 3,500 members of the Army (the minimum number required under the law as so amended) assigned as active component Reserve support personnel in order to meet emerging training requirements in the Army reserve components in connection with unit and force structure conversions and preparations for wartime deployment

(3) The nature and effectiveness of efforts by the Army to reallocate the 3,500 personnel assigned as active component Reserve support personnel to higher priority requirements and to expand the use of reservists on active duty to meet reserve component training needs.

(4) Whether the Army is planning further reductions in the number of active component Reserve support personnel and, if so, the scope and rationale for those reductions.

(5) Whether an increase in Army reserve component full-time support personnel will be required to replace the loss of active component Reserve support personnel.

(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''active component Reserve support personnel'' means the active component Army personnel assigned as advisers to units of the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve of the Army pursuant to section 414 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107; 10 U.S.C. 12001 note).

Subtitle D—Joint Officer Management

SEC. 531. STRATEGIC PLAN TO LINK JOINT OFFICER DEVELOPMENT TO OVERALL MISSIONS AND GOALS OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) PLAN REQUIRED.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall develop a strategic plan for joint officer management and joint professional military education that links joint officer development to the accomplishment of the overall missions and goals of the Department of Defense, as set forth in the most recent national military strategy under section 153(d) of title 10, United States Code. Such plan shall be developed for the purpose of ensuring that sufficient numbers of qualified officers are available as necessary to meet the needs of the Department for qualified officers who are operationally effective in the joint environment.

(2) The Secretary shall develop the strategic plan with the advice of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—As part of the strategic plan under subsection (a), the Secretary shall include the following:

(1) A statement of the levels of joint officer resources needed to be available to properly support the overall missions of the Department of Defense, with such resources to be specified by the number of officers with the joint specialty, the number of officers required for service in joint duty assignment positions, and the training and education resources required.

(2) An assessment of the available and projected joint officer development resources (including officers, educational and training resources, and availability of joint duty assignment positions and tours of duty) necessary to achieve the levels specified under paragraph (1).

(3) Identification of any problems or issues arising from linking resources for joint officer development to accomplishment of the objective of meeting the levels specified under paragraph (1) to resolve those problems and issues and plans.

(4) A description of the process for identification of the requirement for joint specialty officers.

(5) A description of the career development and management of joint specialty officers and of any changes to be made to facilitate achievement of the levels of resources specified in paragraph (1), including additional education requirements, promotion opportunities, and assignments to fill joint assignments.

(c) INCLUSION OF RESERVE COMPONENT OFFICERS.—In developing the strategic plan required by subsection (a), the Secretary shall include joint officer development for officers on the reserve active-status list in the plan.

(d) REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit the plan developed under this section to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives not later than January 15, 2006.

(e) ADDITIONAL ASSESSMENT.—Not later than January 15, 2007, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, as a follow-on to the report under subsection (d), a report providing an assessment of, and initiatives to improve, the performance in joint matters of the following:

(1) Senior civilian officers and employees in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Defense Agencies, and the military departments.

(2) Senior noncommissioned officers.

(3) Senior leadership in the reserve components.

SEC. 532. JOINT REQUIREMENTS FOR PROMOTION TO FLAG OR GENERAL OFFICER GRADE.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE FOR JOINT SPECIALTY OFFICER REQUIREMENT.—Subsection (a)(2) of section 619a of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''September 30, 2007'' and inserting ''September 30, 2008''.

(b) EXCEPTION TO JOINT DUTY REQUIREMENT FOR OFFICERS SERVING IN JOINT DUTY ASSIGNMENT WHEN CONSIDERED FOR PROMOTION.—Subsection (b)(4) of such section is amended by striking ''if—'' and all that follows through ''(B) the officer's'' and inserting ''if the officer's''.

SEC. 533. CLARIFICATION OF TOURS OF DUTY QUALIFYING AS A JOINT DUTY ASSIGNMENT.

(a) CONSECUTIVE TOURS OF DUTY IN JOINT DUTY ASSIGNMENTS.—Section 668(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''within the same organization''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall not apply in the case of a joint duty assignment completed by an officer before the date of the enactment of this Act, except in the case of an officer has continued in joint duty assignments, without a break in service in such assignments, between the end of such assignment and the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 534. AUTHORITY FOR RESERVE OFFICERS TO QUALIFY AS JOINT SPECIAL OFFICERS.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Subsection (a) of section 661 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''on the active-duty list''.

(b) NOMINATIONS FOR SELECTION.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended in the second sentence—

(1) by striking ''and'' after ''military department,''; and

(2) by inserting after ''such date,'' the following: '', and each reserve component officer in an active status who is not on the active-duty list,''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Section 662 of such title is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by inserting ''on the active-duty list'' after ''qualifications of officers'' in the matter preceding paragraph (1); and

(B) in subsection (b), by inserting ''on the active-duty list'' after ''preceding fiscal year of officers'' in the first sentence.

(2)(A) The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

''§ 662. Promotion policy objectives for joint officers on the active-duty list''.

(B) The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 38 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''662. Promotion policy objectives for joint officers on the active-duty list.''.

(d) ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.—(1) Section 667 of such title is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (18) as paragraph (19); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (17) the following new paragraph (18):

''(18) The implementation of authority under section 661 of this title to certify reserve component officers as joint specialty officers, together with the number of reserve component officers who were so certified during the reporting period.''.

(2) The Secretary of Defense shall include in the annual report of the Secretary to Congress for fiscal year 2005, as part of the material included in that report pursuant to paragraph (18) of section 667 of title 10, United States Code, a summary of the joint officer management policies adopted for reserve component officers pursuant to the amendments made by subsections (a) and (b).

Subtitle E—Professional Military Education

SEC. 541. IMPROVEMENT TO PROFESSIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part III of subtitle A of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating chapter 107 as chapter 106A; and

(2) by inserting before chapter 108 the following new chapter:

''CHAPTER 107—PROFESSIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION

''Sec.
''2151. Definitions
''2152. Professional military education: general requirements.
''2153. Capstone course: newly selected general and flag officers.
''2154. Joint professional military education: three-phase approach.
''2155. Intermediate level service colleges: written examination for selection for attendance.
''2156. Joint professional military education phase II program of instruction.
''2157. Intermediate and senior level service colleges; Joint Forces Staff College: duration of principle course of instruction.
''2158. Annual report to Congress.

''§ 2151. Definitions

(a) JOINT PROFESSIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION.—Joint professional military education consists of the rigorous and thorough instruction and examination of officers of the armed forces in an environment designed to promote a theoretical and practical in-depth understanding of joint matters and, specifically, of the subject matter covered. The subject matter to be covered by joint professional military education shall include at least the following:

''(1) Integrated employment of land, sea, and air forces.

''(2) National military strategy.

''(3) Strategic planning.

''(4) Contingency planning.

''(5) Command and control of combat operations under unified command.

''(6) Joint and combined operations.

''(7) Joint doctrine.

''(8) Joint logistics.

''(9) Joint communications.

''(10) Joint intelligence.

''(11) Campaign planning.

''(12) Joint military command and control systems and the interface of those systems with national command systems.

''(13) Joint force development, including mobilization.

''(14) Joint requirements development.

''(15) Military history.

''(16) Awareness of cultures in areas outside of the United States where United States forces may operate or of forces of foreign countries with whom United States forces may operate.

''(b) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—In this chapter:

''(1) The term 'senior level service school' means any of the following:

''(A) The Army War College.

''(B) The College of Naval Warfare.

''(C) The Air War College.

''(D) The Marine Corps University.

''(2) The term 'intermediate level service school' means any of the following:

''(A) The United States Army Command and General Staff College.

''(B) The College of Naval Command and Staff.

''(C) The Air Command and Staff College.

''(D) The Marine Corps Command and Staff College.

''§ 2152. Joint professional military education: general requirements

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall implement a coherent and comprehensive framework for the joint professional military education of officers, including officers nominated under section 661 of this title for the joint specialty.

''§ 2153. Capstone course: newly selected general and flag officers

''(a) REQUIREMENT.—Each officer selected for promotion to the grade of brigadier general or, in the case of the Navy, rear admiral (lower half) shall be required, after such selection, to attend a military education course designed specifically to prepare new general and flag officers to work with the other armed forces.

''(b) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary of Defense may waive subsection (a)—

''(A) in the case of an officer whose immediately previous assignment was in a joint duty assignment and who is thoroughly familiar with joint matters;

''(B) when necessary for the good of the service;

''(C) in the case of an officer whose proposed selection for promotion is based primarily upon scientific and technical qualifications for which joint requirements do not exist (as determined under regulations prescribed under section 619(e)(4) of this title); and

''(D) in the case of a medical officer, dental officer, veterinary officer, medical service officer, nurse, biomedical science officer, or chaplain.

''(2) The authority of the Secretary of Defense to grant a waiver under paragraph (1) may only be delegated to the Deputy Secretary of Defense, an Under Secretary of Defense, or an Assistant Secretary of Defense. Such a waiver may be granted only on a case-by-case basis in the case of an individual officer.

''§ 2154. Joint professional military education: three-phase approach

''(a) THREE-PHASE APPROACH.—The Secretary of Defense shall implement a three-phase approach to joint professional military education, as follows:

''(1) There shall be a course of instruction, designated and certified by the Secretary of Defense as Phase I instruction, consisting all the elements of a joint professional military education (as specified in section 2151(a) of this

title), in addition to the principal curriculum taught to all officers at an intermediate level service school.

''(2) There shall be a course of instruction, designated and certified by the Secretary of Defense as Phase II instruction, consisting of a joint professional military education curriculum taught in residence at—

''(A) the Joint Forces Staff College; or

''(B) a senior level service school that has been designated and certified by the Secretary of Defense as a joint professional military education institution.

''(3) There shall be a course of instruction, designated and certified by the Secretary of Defense as the Capstone course, for officers selected for promotion to the grade of brigadier general or, in the case of the Navy, rear admiral (lower half) and offered in accordance with section 2153 of this title.

''(b) SEQUENCED APPROACH.—The Secretary shall require the sequencing of joint professional military education so that the standard sequence of assignments for such education requires an officer to complete Phase I instruction before proceeding to Phase II instruction, as provided in section 2156(a) of this title.

''§ 2155. Intermediate level service school: written examination for selection for attendance

''(a) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of each military department shall require that performance on a comprehensive written examination shall constitute not less than 20 percent of the evaluation criteria for selection of any officer for full-time attendance at an intermediate level service school under the jurisdiction of the Secretary. Such an examination shall be designed so as to require substantive knowledge of military history, national military strategy, service and joint doctrine, and such other subjects as the Secretary may require. Such an examination shall be required for each class entering an intermediate level service school after September 30, 2007.

''(b) SELECTION FROM DIFFERENT SERVICE.—The Secretary of a military department, in considering candidates for full-time attendance at an intermediate level service school under the jurisdiction of the Secretary who are officers of an armed force other than the armed force that administers that service school, shall consider such an officer to be qualified for selection for such attendance if the officer has met all the requirements for attendance at the equivalent intermediate level service school of that officer's own armed force.

''§ 2156. Joint professional military education phase II program of instruction

''(a) PREREQUISITE OF COMPLETION OF JOINT PROFESSIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION I PROGRAM OF INSTRUCTION.—(1) After September 30, 2009, an officer of the armed forces may not be accepted for, or assigned to, a program of instruction designated by the Secretary of Defense as joint professional military education Phase II unless the officer has successfully completed a program of instruction designated by the Secretary of Defense as joint professional military education Phase I.

''(2) The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff may grant exceptions to the requirement under paragraph (1). Such an exception may be granted only on a case-by-case basis for compelling cause, as determined by the Chairman. An officer selected to receive such an exception shall be required to demonstrate a knowledge of joint matters and other aspects of the Phase I curriculum that, to the satisfaction of the Chairman, qualifies the officer to meet the minimum requirements established for entry into Phase II instruction without first completing Phase I instruction. The number of officers selected to attend an offering of the principal course of instruction at the Joint Forces Staff College or a senior level service school designated by the Secretary of Defense as a joint professional military education institution who have not completed Phase I instruction should comprise no more than 10 percent of the total number of officers selected.

''(b) PHASE II REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall require that the curriculum for Phase II joint professional military education at any school—

''(1) focus on developing joint attitudes and perspectives and honing joint warfighting skills; and

''(2) be structured —

''(A) so as to adequately prepare students to perform effectively in an assignment to a joint, multiservice organization; and

''(B) so that students progress from a basic knowledge of joint matters learned in Phase I instruction to the level of expertise necessary for successful performance in the joint arena.

''(c) CURRICULUM CONTENT.—In addition to the subjects specified in section 2151(a) of this title, the curriculum for Phase II joint professional military education shall include the following:

''(1) National security strategy.

''(2) Theater strategy and campaigning.

''(3) Joint planning processes and systems.

''(4) Joint, interagency, and multinational capabilities and the integration of those capabilities.

''(d) STUDENT RATIO; FACULTY RATIO.—(1) For courses of instruction in a Phase II program of instruction that is offered at senior level service school that has been designated by the Secretary of Defense as a joint professional military education institution—

''(1) the percentage of students enrolled in any such course who are officers of the armed force that administers the school may not exceed 60 percent, with the remaining services proportionally represented; and

''(2) of the faculty at the school who are active-duty officers who provide instruction in such courses, the percentage who are officers of the armed force that administers the school may not exceed 60 percent, with the remaining services proportionally represented.

''§ 2157. Intermediate and senior level service schools; Joint Forces Staff College: duration of principle course of instruction

''(a) SERVICE SCHOOLS.—The duration of the principal course of instruction offered at each intermediate level service school and each senior level service school may not be less than 10 months of resident instruction. The Secretary of Defense may waive the requirement in the preceding sentence during a period of war or during a national emergency declared by the President or the Congress.

''(b) JOINT FORCES STAFF COLLEGE.—(1) The duration of the principal course of instruction offered at the Joint Forces Staff College may not be less than 10 weeks of resident instruction.

''(2) In this subsection, the term 'principal course of instruction' means any course of instruction offered at the Joint Forces Staff College as Phase II joint professional military education.

''§ 2158. Annual report to Congress

''The Secretary of Defense shall include in the annual report of the Secretary to Congress under section 113(c) of this title, for the period covered by the report, the following information (which shall be shown for the Department of Defense as a whole and separately for the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps and each reserve component):

''(1) The number of officers who successfully completed a joint professional military education phase II course and were not selected for promotion.

''(2) The number of officer students and faculty members assigned by each service to the professional military schools of the other services and to the joint schools.''.

(b) TRANSFER OF OTHER PROVISIONS.—Subsections (b) and (c) of section 663 of title 10, United States Code, are transferred to section 2151 of such title, as added by subsection (a), and added at the end thereof.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Section 663 of such title, as amended by subsection (b), is further amended—

(A) by striking subsections (a) and (e); and

(B) by striking ''(d) POST-EDUCATION JOINT DUTY ASSIGNMENTS.—(1) The'' and inserting ''(a) JOINT SPECIALTY OFFICERS.—The'';

(C) by striking ''(2)(A) The Secretary'' and inserting ''(b) OTHER OFFICERS.—(1) The Secretary'';

(D) by striking ''in subparagraph (B)' and inserting ''in paragraph (2)'';

(E) by striking ''(B) The Secretary'' and inserting ''(2) The Secretary''; and

(F) by striking ''in subparagraph (B)' and inserting ''in paragraph (1)''.

(2)(A) The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

''§ 633. Joint duty assignments after completion of joint professional military education''.

(B) The item relating to that section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 38 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''633. Joint duty assignments after completion of joint professional military education.''.

(d) CONFORMING REPEAL.—Section 1123(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101–189; 103 Stat. 1556) is repealed.

(e) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The tables of chapters at the beginning of subtitle A, and at the beginning of part III of subtitle A, of title 10, United States Code, are amended by striking the item relating to chapter 107 and inserting the following:

''106A. Educational Assistance for Persons Enlisting for Active Duty 2141

''107. Professional Military Education ..... 2151''.

SEC. 542. RIBBONS TO RECOGNIZE COMPLETION OF JOINT PROFESSIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Chapter 57 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 1134. Joint professional military education ribbon: award

''(a) JPME I.—The Secretary of Defense may award a ribbon, of appropriate design, as approved by the Secretary, to any person who successfully completes a program of instruction approved by the Secretary as qualifying for credit as the Joint Professional Military Education Phase I program of instruction.

''(b) JPME II.—The Secretary of Defense may award a device, of appropriate design, as approved by the Secretary, for wear with the ribbon awarded under subsection (a), to any person who successfully completes a program of instruction approved by the Secretary as qualifying for credit as the Joint Professional Military Education Phase II course of instruction.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''1134. Joint professional military education ribbon: award.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 1134 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to the successful completion of a joint professional military education program of instruction after November 29, 1989.

SEC. 543. INCREASE IN NUMBER OF PRIVATE-SECTOR CIVILIANS WHO MAY BE ENROLLED FOR INSTRUCTION AT NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY.

Section 2167(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''10'' and inserting ''20''.

SEC. 544. REQUIREMENT FOR COMPLETION OF PHASE I JOINT PROFESSIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION BEFORE PROMOTION TO COLONEL OR NAVY CAPTAIN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 36 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 619a the following new section:

"§ 619b. Eligibility for consideration for promotion: joint professional military education required before promotion to colonel or Navy captain; exceptions

''(a) GENERAL RULE.—After September 30, 2007, an officer on the active-duty list of the Army, Air Force, or Marine Corps may not be appointed to the grade of colonel, and an officer on the active-duty list of the Navy may not be appointed to the grade of captain, unless the officer has successfully completed a program of instruction approved by the Secretary as qualifying for credit as the Joint Professional Military Education Phase I or Phase II program of instruction.

''(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Subject to subsection (c), the Secretary of Defense may waive subsection (a) in the following circumstances:

''(1) When necessary for the good of the service.

''(2) In the case of an officer whose proposed selection for promotion is based primarily upon scientific and technical qualifications for which joint requirements do not exist.

''(3) In the case of—

''(A) a medical officer, dental officer, veterinary officer, medical service officer, nurse, or biomedical science officer;

''(B) a chaplain; or

''(C) a judge advocate.

''(c) WAIVER TO BE INDIVIDUAL.—A waiver may be granted under subsection (b) only on a case-by-case basis in the case of an individual officer.

''(d) SPECIAL RULE FOR GOOD-OF-THE-SERVICE WAIVER.—In the case of a waiver under subsection (b)(1), the Secretary shall provide that the first duty assignment as a colonel or Navy captain of the officer for whom the waiver is granted shall be to a program of joint professional military education.

''(e) LIMITATION ON DELEGATION OF WAIVER AUTHORITY.—The authority of the Secretary of Defense to grant a waiver under subsection (b) (other than under paragraph (1) of that subsection) may be delegated only to the Deputy Secretary of Defense, an Under Secretary of Defense, or an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

''(f) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations to carry out this section. The regulations shall specifically identify for purposes of subsection (b)(2) those categories of officers for which selection for promotion to colonel or, in the case of the Navy, captain is based primarily upon scientific and technical qualifications for which joint requirements do not exist.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''619b. Eligibility for consideration for promotion: joint professional military education required before promotion to colonel or Navy captain; exceptions.''.

Subtitle F—Other Education and Training Matters

SEC. 551. COLLEGE FIRST DELAYED ENLISTMENT PROGRAM.

(a) CODIFICATION AND EXTENSION OF ARMY PROGRAM.—(1) Chapter 31 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 510 the following new section:

"§ 511. College First Program

''(a) PROGRAM AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of each military department may establish a program to increase the number of, and the level of the qualifications of, persons entering the armed forces as enlisted members by encouraging recruits to pursue higher education or vocational or technical training before entry into active service.

''(b) DELAYED ENTRY WITH ALLOWANCE FOR HIGHER EDUCATION.—The Secretary concerned may—

''(1) exercise the authority under section 513 of this title—

''(A) to accept the enlistment of a person as a Reserve for service in the Selected Reserve or Individual Ready Reserve of a reserve component, notwithstanding the scope of the authority under subsection (a) of that section, in the case of the Army National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States; and

''(B) to authorize, notwithstanding the period limitation in subsection (b) of that section, a delay of the enlistment of any such person in a regular component under that subsection for the period during which the person is enrolled in, and pursuing a program of education at, an institution of higher education, or a program of vocational or technical training, on a full-time basis that is to be completed within the maximum period of delay determined for that person under subsection (c); and

''(2) subject to paragraph (2) of subsection (d) and except as provided in paragraph (3) of that subsection, pay an allowance to a person accepted for enlistment under paragraph (1)(A) for each month of the period during which that person is enrolled in and pursuing a program described in paragraph (1)(B).

''(c) MAXIMUM PERIOD OF DELAY.—The period of delay authorized a person under paragraph (1)(B) of subsection (b) may not exceed the 30-month period beginning on the date of the person's enlistment accepted under paragraph (1)(A) of such subsection.

''(d) ALLOWANCE.—(1) The monthly allowance paid under subsection (b)(2) shall be equal to the amount of the subsistence allowance provided for certain members of the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps with the corresponding number of years of participation under section 209(a) of title 37. The Secretary concerned may supplement that stipend by an amount not to exceed $225 per month.

''(2) An allowance may not be paid to a person under this section for more than 24 months.

''(3) A member of the Selected Reserve of a reserve component may be paid an allowance under this section only for months during which the member performs satisfactorily as a member of a unit of the reserve component that trains as prescribed in section 10147(a)(1) of this title or section 502(a) of title 32. Satisfactory performance shall be determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned.

''(4) An allowance under this section is in addition to any other pay or allowance to which a member of a reserve component is entitled by reason of participation in the Ready Reserve of that component.

''(e) RECOUPMENT OF ALLOWANCE.—(1) A person who, after receiving an allowance under this section, fails to complete the total period of service required of that person in connection with delayed entry authorized for the person under section 513 shall repay the United States the amount which bears the same ratio to the total amount of that allowance paid to the person as the unserved part of the total required period of service bears to the total period.

''(2) An obligation to repay the United States imposed under paragraph (1) is for all purposes a debt owed to the United States.

''(3) A discharge of a person in bankruptcy under title 11 that is entered less than five years after the date on which the person was, or was to be, enlisted in the regular Army pursuant to the delayed entry authority under section 513 does not discharge that person from a debt arising under paragraph (1).

''(4) The Secretary concerned may waive, in whole or in part, a debt arising under paragraph (1) in any case for which the Secretary determines that recovery would be against equity and good conscience or would be contrary to the best interests of the United States.

''(f) SPECIAL PAY AND BONUSES.—Upon enlisting in the regular component of the member's armed force, a person who initially enlisted as a Reserve under this section may, at the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be eligible for all regular special pays, bonuses, education benefits, and loan repayment programs.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 510 the following new item:

''511. College First Program''.

(b) REPEAL OF ARMY COLLEGE FIRST PROGRAM.—Section 573 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (10 U.S.C. 513 note) is repealed. The Secretary of the Army shall treat the program under section 511 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), as a continuation of the program under the section repealed by the preceding sentence.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 511 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), and the repeal made by subsection (b) shall take effect on October 1, 2004.

(d) LIMITATION ON FISCAL YEAR 2005 OBLIGATIONS.—During fiscal year 2005, obligations incurred under section 511 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), to pay allowances to persons accepted for enlistment as a Reserve for service in the Selected Reserve or Individual Ready Reserve of a reserve component using the expanded authority provided by the amendment made by subsection (a) may not exceed $5,000,000. The authority to pay allowances under such section shall not be considered to be an expanded authority to the extent that the authority to pay such allowances was available under section 573 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (10 U.S.C. 513 note), before the repeal of such section by subsection (b).

SEC. 552. STANDARDIZATION OF AUTHORITY TO CONFER DEGREES ON GRADUATES OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE OF THE AIR FORCE WITH AUTHORITY FOR OTHER SCHOOLS OF AIR UNIVERSITY.

(a) CHANGE IN DEGREE CONFERRING AUTHORITY.—Section 9315(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''Air Education and Training Command of the Air Force'' and inserting ''Air University''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''Air Education and Training Command of the Air Force'' and inserting ''Air University''.

(b) CONFORMING AND STYLISTIC AMENDMENTS.—(1) Subsection (a) of section 9317 of such title is amended—

(1) by striking ''may confer—'' and inserting ''may confer degrees as follows:'';

(2) by striking ''the'' in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) after the paragraph designation and inserting ''The'';

(3) by striking the semicolon at the end of paragraph (1) and inserting a period;

(4) by striking ''; and'' at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting a period; and

(5) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) An associate level degree upon graduates of the Community College of the Air Force.''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—The heading for such section, and the item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 901 of such title, are amended by striking the matter between the colon and the last word.

SEC. 553. CHANGE IN TITLES OF HEADS OF THE NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL.

(a) PRESIDENT OF THE SCHOOL.—(1)(A) Section 7042 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Superintendent'' each place it appears in the text and inserting ''President''.

(B) The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

"§ 7042. President; assistants".

(2)(A) Section 7044 of such title is amended by striking ''Superintendent'' and inserting ''President of the school'';

(B) Sections 7048(a) and 7049(e) of such title are amended by striking ''Superintendent'' and inserting ''President'';

(b) PROVOST AND ACADEMIC DEAN.—(1)(A) Subsection (a) of section 7043 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(a) There is at the Naval Postgraduate School the civilian position of Provost and Academic Dean. The Provost and Academic Dean shall be appointed, to serve for periods of not more than five years, by the Secretary of the Navy after consultation with the Naval Postgraduate School Board of Advisors and consideration of the recommendation of the leadership and faculty of the Naval Postgraduate School.''.

(B) Subsection (b) of such section is amended by striking ''Academic Dean'' and inserting ''Provost and Academic Dean''.

(C) The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

"§ 7043. Provost and Academic Dean".

(2) Section 5102(c)(10) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Academic Dean'' and inserting ''Provost and Academic Dean''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 605 of such title is amended by striking the items related to sections 7042 and 7043 and inserting the following new items:

''7042. President; assistants.

''7043. Provost and Academic Dean.''.

SEC. 554. INCREASE FROM TWO YEARS TO THREE YEARS IN PERIOD FOR WHICH EDUCATIONAL LEAVE OF ABSENCE MAY BE AUTHORIZED.

Section 708(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''two years'' and inserting ''three years''.

SEC. 555. CORRECTION TO DISPARATE TREATMENT OF DISABILITIES SUSTAINED DURING ACCESSION TRAINING.

(a) ELIGIBILITY OF ACADEMY CADETS AND MIDSHIPMEN FOR DISABILITY RETIRED PAY.—(1) Section 1217 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1217. Cadets, midshipmen, and aviation cadets: applicability of chapter

''(a) This chapter applies to cadets at the United States Military Academy, the United States Air Force Academy, and the United States Coast Guard Academy and midshipmen of the Navy, but only with respect to physical disabilities incurred after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005.

''(b) Monthly cadet pay and monthly midshipman pay under section 203(c) of title 37 shall be considered to be basic pay for purposes of this chapter and the computation of retired pay and severance and separation pay to which entitlement is established under this chapter.''.

(2) The item related to section 1217 in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 61 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''1217. Cadets, midshipmen, and aviation cadets: applicability of chapter.''.

(b) MEDICAL AND DENTAL CARE FOR SENIOR ROTC MEMBERS AND APPLICANTS.—(1) Chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1074a the following new section:

"§ 1074b. Medical and dental care: members of, and designated applicants for membership in, Senior ROTC

''(a) Under joint regulations prescribed by the administering Secretaries, the following persons are entitled to the benefits described in subsection (b):

''(1) A member of, and a designated applicant for membership in, Senior ROTC who incurs or aggravates an injury, illness, or disease in the line of duty while performing duties pursuant to section 2109 of this title.

''(2) A member of, and a designated applicant for membership in, Senior ROTC who incurs or aggravates an injury, illness, or disease while traveling directly to or from the place at which that member or applicant is to perform or has performed duties pursuant to section 2109 of this title.

''(3) Each member of, and each designated applicant for membership in, Senior ROTC who incurs or aggravates an injury, illness, or disease in the line of duty while remaining overnight immediately before the commencement of duties performed pursuant to section 2109 of this title or, while remaining overnight, between successive periods of performing duties pursuant to section 2109 of this title, at or in the vicinity of the site of the duties performed pursuant to section 2109 of this title, if the site is outside reasonable commuting distance from the residence of the member or designated applicant.

''(b) A person described in subsection (a) is entitled to—

''(1) the medical and dental care appropriate for the treatment of the injury, illness, or disease of that person until the resulting disability cannot be materially improved by further hospitalization or treatment; and

''(2) subsistence during hospitalization.

''(c) A member of, and each designated applicant for membership in, Senior ROTC is not entitled to benefits under subsection (b) if the injury, illness, or disease or aggravation of an injury, illness, or disease of that person described in subsection (a)(2) is the result of the gross negligence or the misconduct of the member or applicant for membership in Senior ROTC.

''(d) In this section, the term 'Senior ROTC' means a program under chapter 103 of this title.''.

(2) Section 1074b of title 10, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1), shall apply with respect to injuries, illnesses, and diseases incurred or aggravated on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 55 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1074a the following new item:

''1074b. Medical and dental care: members of, and designated applicants for membership in, Senior ROTC.''.

SEC. 556. PRAYER AT MILITARY SERVICE ACADEMY ACTIVITIES.

(a) AUTHORITY OF SUPERINTENDENT.—The Superintendent of a service academy may have in effect such policy as the Superintendent considers appropriate with respect to the offering of a voluntary, nondenominational prayer at an otherwise authorized activity of the academy, subject to such limitations as the President may prescribe.

(b) SERVICE ACADEMIES.—For purposes of this section, the term ''service academy'' means any of the following:

(1) The United States Military Academy.

(2) The United States Naval Academy.

(3) The United States Air Force Academy.

SEC. 557. REVISION TO CONDITIONS ON SERVICE OF OFFICERS AS SERVICE ACADEMY SUPERINTENDENTS.

(a) REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT THAT OFFICERS RETIRE AFTER SERVICE AS SUPERINTENDENT.—Sections 3921, 6371, and 8921 of title 10, United States Code, are repealed.

(b) MINIMUM THREE-YEAR TOUR OF DUTY AS SUPERINTENDENT.—

(1) MILITARY ACADEMY.—Section 4333a of such title is amended to read as follows:

"§ 4333a. Superintendent: length of assignment

''An officer who is detailed to the position of Superintendent of the Academy shall be so detailed for a period of not less than three years. In any case in which an officer serving as Superintendent is reassigned or retires before having completed three years service as Superintendent, or otherwise leaves that position (other than due to death) without having completed three years service in that position, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to Congress notice that such officer left the position of Superintendent without having completed three years service in that position, together with a statement of the reasons why that officer did not complete three years service in that position.''.

(2) NAVAL ACADEMY.—Section 6951a of such title is amended—

(A) by striking the second sentence of subsection (b); and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) An officer who is detailed to the position of Superintendent shall be so detailed for a period of not less than three years. In any case in which an officer serving as Superintendent is reassigned or retires before having completed three years service as Superintendent, or otherwise leaves that position (other than due to death) without having completed three years service in that position, the Secretary of the Navy shall submit to Congress notice that such officer left the position of Superintendent without having completed three years service in that position, together with a statement of the reasons why that officer did not complete three years service in that position.''.

(3) AIR FORCE ACADEMY.—Section 9333a of such title is amended to read as follows:

"§ 9333a. Superintendent: length of assignment

''An officer who is detailed to the position of Superintendent of the Academy shall be so detailed for a period of not less than three years. In any case in which an officer serving as Superintendent is reassigned or retires before having completed three years service as Superintendent, or otherwise leaves that position (other than due to death) without having completed three years service in that position, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to Congress notice that such officer left the position of Superintendent without having completed three years service in that position, together with a statement of the reasons why that officer did not complete three years service in that position.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 367 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 3921.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 403 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''4333a. Superintendent: length of assignment.''

(3) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 573 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 6371.

(4) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 867 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 8921.

(5) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 903 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''9333a. Superintendent: length of assignment.''

SEC. 558. CODIFICATION OF PROHIBITION ON IMPOSITION OF CERTAIN CHARGES AND FEES AT THE SERVICE ACADEMIES.

(a) UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY.—(1) Chapter 403 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 4359. Cadets: charges and fees for attendance; limitation

''(a) PROHIBITION.—Except as provided in subsection (b), no charge or fee for tuition, room, or board for attendance at the Academy may be imposed unless the charge or fee is specifically authorized by a law enacted after October 5, 1994.

''(b) EXCEPTION.—The prohibition specified in subsection (a) does not apply with respect to any item or service provided to cadets for which a charge or fee is imposed as of October 5, 1994. The Secretary of Defense shall notify Congress of any change made by the Academy in the amount of a charge or fee authorized under this subsection.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''4359. Cadets: charges and fees for attendance; limitation.''.

(b) UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY.—(1) Chapter 603 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 6978. Midshipmen: charges and fees for attendance; limitation

''(a) PROHIBITION.—Except as provided in subsection (b), no charge or fee for tuition, room, or board for attendance at the Naval Academy may be imposed unless the charge or fee is specifically authorized by a law enacted after October 5, 1994.

''(b) EXCEPTION.—The prohibition specified in subsection (a) does not apply with respect to any item or service provided to midshipmen for which a charge or fee is imposed as of October 5, 1994. The Secretary of Defense shall notify Congress of any change made by the Naval Academy in the amount of a charge or fee authorized under this subsection.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''4359. Midshipmen: charges and fees for attendance; limitation.''.

(c) UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY.—(1) Chapter 903 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 9359. Cadets: charges and fees for attendance; limitation

''(a) PROHIBITION.—Except as provided in subsection (b), no charge or fee for tuition, room, or board for attendance at the Academy may be imposed unless the charge or fee is specifically authorized by a law enacted after October 5, 1994.

''(b) EXCEPTION.—The prohibition specified in subsection (a) does not apply with respect to any item or service provided to cadets for which a charge or fee is imposed as of October 5, 1994. The Secretary of Defense shall notify Congress of any change made by the Academy in the amount of a charge or fee authorized under this subsection.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''9359. Cadets: charges and fees for attendance; limitation.''.

(d) UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY.—(1) Chapter 9 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 197. Cadets: charges and fees for attendance; limitation

''(a) PROHIBITION.—Except as provided in subsection (b), no charge or fee for tuition, room, or board for attendance at the Academy may be imposed unless the charge or fee is specifically authorized by a law enacted after October 5, 1994.

''(b) EXCEPTION.—The prohibition specified in subsection (a) does not apply with respect to any item or service provided to cadets for which a charge or fee is imposed as of October 5, 1994. The Secretary of Homeland Security shall notify Congress of any change made by the Academy in the amount of a charge or fee authorized under this subsection.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''197. Cadets: charges and fees for attendance; limitation.''.

(e) UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY.—Section 1303 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. App. 1295b), is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(j) LIMITATION ON CHARGES AND FEES FOR ATTENDANCE.—

''(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), no charge or fee for tuition, room, or board for attendance at the Academy may be imposed unless the charge or fee is specifically authorized by a law enacted after October 5, 1994.

''(2)The prohibition specified in paragraph (1) does not apply with respect to any item or service provided to cadets for which a charge or fee is imposed as of October 5, 1994. The Secretary of Transportation shall notify Congress of any change made by the Academy in the amount of a charge or fee authorized under this paragraph.''.

(f) REPEAL OF CODIFIED PROVISION.—Section 553 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103–337; 10 U.S.C. 4331 note) is repealed.

SEC. 559. QUALIFICATIONS OF THE DEAN OF THE FACULTY OF UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY.

Section 9335(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the second sentence the following: '', except that, if the Dean is not an officer on active duty, the Dean shall be a retired officer or former officer, and a person may not be appointed or assigned as Dean unless that person holds the highest academic degree in that person's academic field''.

Subtitle G—Medals and Decorations and Special Promotions and Appointments

SEC. 561. SEPARATE MILITARY CAMPAIGN MEDALS TO RECOGNIZE SERVICE IN OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM AND SERVICE IN OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—The President shall establish a campaign medal specifically to recognize service by members of the uniformed services in Operation Enduring Freedom and a separate campaign medal specifically to recognize service by members of the uniformed services in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

(b) ELIGIBILITY.—Subject to such limitations as may be prescribed by the President, eligibility for a campaign medal established pursuant to subsection (a) shall be set forth in regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary concerned (as defined in section 101 of title 10, United States Code). In the case of regulations prescribed by the Secretaries of the military departments, the regulations shall be subject to approval by the Secretary of Defense and shall be uniform throughout the Department of Defense.

SEC. 562. ELIGIBILITY OF ALL UNIFORMED SERVICES PERSONNEL FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE SERVICE MEDAL.

The President shall revise the criteria for eligibility for the decoration known as the National Defense Service Medal so as to extend such eligibility, with respect to service on or after September 11, 2001, to members of all of the uniformed services.

SEC. 563. AUTHORITY TO APPOINT BRIGADIER GENERAL CHARLES E. YEAGER, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE (RETIRED), TO THE GRADE OF MAJOR GENERAL ON THE RETIRED LIST.

The President is authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, Brigadier General Charles E. Yeager, United States Air Force (retired), to the grade of major general on the retired list of the Air Force. Any such appointment shall not affect the retired pay or other benefits of Charles E. Yeager or any benefits to which any other person is or may become entitled based upon his service.

SEC. 564. POSTHUMOUS COMMISSION OF WILLIAM MITCHELL IN THE GRADE OF MAJOR GENERAL IN THE ARMY.

(a) AUTHORITY.—The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, may issue posthumously a commission as major general, United States Army, in the name of the late William Mitchell, formerly a colonel, United States Army, who resigned his commission on February 1, 1926.

(b) DATE OF COMMISSION.—A commission issued under subsection (a) shall issue as of the date of the death of William Mitchell on February 19, 1936.

(c) PROHIBITION OF BENEFITS.—No person is entitled to receive any bonus, gratuity, pay, allowance, or other financial benefit by reason of the enactment of this section.

Subtitle H—Military Justice Matters

SEC. 571. REVIEW ON HOW SEXUAL OFFENSES ARE COVERED BY UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE.

(a) REVIEW REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall review the Uniform Code of Military Justice and the Manual for Courts-Martial with the objective of determining what changes are required to improve the ability of the military justice system to address issues relating to sexual assault and to conform the Uniform Code of Military Justice and the Manual for Courts-Martial more closely to other Federal laws and regulations that address such issues.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than March 1, 2005, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a report on the review carried out under subsection (a). The report shall include the recommendations of the Secretary for revisions to the Uniform Code of Military Justice and, for each such revision, the rationale behind that revision.

SEC. 572. SERVICE TIME NOT LOST WHEN CONFINED IN CONNECTION WITH TRIAL IF CONFINEMENT EXCUSED AS UNAVOIDABLE.

Section 972 of title 10, United States Code, is amended in each of subsections (a)(3) and (b)(3) by inserting after ''the trial'' the following: '', unless such confinement is excused as unavoidable''.

SEC. 573. CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY OF MILITARY LEGAL ASSISTANCE COUNSEL TO PROVIDE MILITARY LEGAL ASSISTANCE WITHOUT REGARD TO LICENSING REQUIREMENTS.

Section 1044 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e)(1) Notwithstanding any law regarding the licensure of attorneys, a judge advocate or civilian attorney who is authorized to provide military legal assistance is authorized to provide that assistance in any jurisdiction, subject to such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary concerned.

''(2) In this subsection, the term 'military legal assistance' includes—

''(A) legal assistance provided under this section; and

''(B) legal assistance contemplated by sections 1044a, 1044b, 1044c, and 1044d of this title.''.

Subtitle I—Management and Administrative Matters

SEC. 581. THREE-YEAR EXTENSION OF LIMITATION ON REDUCTIONS OF PERSONNEL OF AGENCIES RESPONSIBLE FOR REVIEW AND CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS.

Section 1559(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''During fiscal years 2003, 2004, and 2005,'' and inserting ''Before October 1, 2008,''.

SEC. 582. STAFFING AND FUNDING FOR DEFENSE PRISONER OF WAR/MISSING PERSONNEL OFFICE (DPMO).

(a) MINIMUM LEVEL OF STAFFING.—Subparagraph (B) of section 1501(a)(5) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(B)(i) For any fiscal year—

''(I) the number of full-time Department of Defense personnel permanently assigned or detailed to the office shall be not less than 46 members of the armed forces and not less than 69 civilian employees of the Department of Defense; and

''(II) the number of permanent positions authorized for the office shall be not less than 46 positions for members of the armed forces and not less than 69 positions for civilian employees.

''(ii) No reductions below the numbers assigned or authorized under clause (i) may be made unless expressly authorized by law.

''(iii) If for any reason the number of military or civilian personnel assigned to the office should fall below the required level under clause (i)(I), the Secretary of Defense shall promptly notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives of the number of personnel so assigned and of the Secretary's plan to restore the staffing levels of the office to at least the required minimums under clause (i). The Secretary shall publish such notice and plan in the Federal Register.''.

(b) MINIMUM LEVEL OF FUNDING.—Subparagraph (C) of such section is amended to read as follows:

''(C) For any fiscal year, the level of funding allocated to the office shall be not less than $16,000,000 unless a lower level of funding is expressly required by law.''.

SEC. 583. PERMANENT ID CARDS FOR RETIREE DEPENDENTS AGE 70 AND OLDER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Chapter 53 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 1060b. Military ID cards: dependents and survivors of retirees; issuance of permanent ID card after attaining 70 years of age

''(a) PERMANENT ID CARD AFTER AGE 70.—In issuing military ID cards to retiree dependents, the Secretary concerned shall issue a permanent ID card (not subject to renewal) to any such retiree dependent who has attained 70 years of age. Such a permanent ID card shall be issued upon the expiration, after the retiree dependent attains 70 years of age, of any earlier, renewable military ID card or, if earlier, upon the request of such a retiree dependent after attaining age 70.

''(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) The term 'military ID card' means a card or other form of identification used for purposes of demonstrating eligibility for any benefit from the Department of Defense.

''(2) The term ''retiree dependent'' means a person who is a dependent of a retired member of the uniformed services, or a survivor of a deceased retired member of the uniformed services, who is eligible for any benefit from the Department of Defense.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''1060b. Military ID cards: dependents and survivors of retirees; issuance of permanent ID card after attaining 70 years of age.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 1060b of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall take effect on October 1, 2004.

SEC. 584. AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE CIVILIAN CLOTHING TO MEMBERS TRAVELING IN CONNECTION WITH MEDICAL EVACUATION.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Section 1047 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(b) CERTAIN ENLISTED MEMBERS.—'' before ''The Secretary''; and

(2) by inserting after the section heading the following:

''(a) MEMBERS TRAVELING IN CONNECTION WITH MEDICAL EVACUATION.—The Secretary of the military department concerned may furnish civilian clothing to a member at a cost not to exceed $250, or reimburse a member for the purchase of civilian clothing in an amount not to exceed $250, in the case of a member who—

''(1) is medically evacuated for treatment in a medical facility by reason of an illness or injury incurred or aggravated while on active duty; or

''(2) after being medically evacuated as described in paragraph (1), is in an authorized travel status from a medical facility to another location approved by the Secretary.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (a) of section 1047 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 2004.

SEC. 585. AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT DONATION OF FREQUENT TRAVELER MILES, CREDITS, AND TICKETS TO FACILITATE REST AND RECUPERATION TRAVEL OF DEPLOYED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND THEIR FAMILIES.

(a) OPERATION HERO MILES.—Chapter 155 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 2613. Acceptance of frequent traveler miles, credits, and tickets; use to facilitate rest and recuperation travel of deployed members and their families

''(a) AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT DONATION OF TRAVEL BENEFITS.—Subject to subsection (c), the Secretary of Defense may accept from any person or government agency the donation of travel benefits for the purposes of use under subsection (d).

''(b) TRAVEL BENEFIT DEFINED.—In the section, the term ''travel benefit'' means frequent traveler miles, credits for tickets, or tickets for air or surface transportation issued by an air carrier or a surface carrier, respectively, that serves the public.

''(c) CONDITION ON AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT DONATION.—The Secretary may accept a donation of a travel benefit under this section only if the air or surface carrier that is the source of the benefit consents to such donation. Any such donation shall be under such terms and conditions as the surface carrier may specify, and the travel benefit so donated may be used only in accordance with the rules established by the carrier.

''(d) USE OF DONATED TRAVEL BENEFITS.—A travel benefit accepted under this section may be used only for the purpose of—

''(1) facilitating the travel of a member of the armed forces who—

''(A) is deployed on active duty away from the permanent duty station of the member; and

''(B) is granted, during such deployment, rest and recuperative leave, emergency leave, convalescent leave, or another form of leave authorized for the member; or

''(2) facilitating the travel of family members of a member described in paragraph (1) in order to be reunited with the member.

''(e) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary shall designate a single office in the Department of Defense to carry out this section. That office shall be responsible for developing rules and procedures to facilitate the acceptance and distribution of travel benefit under this section.

''(f) STATUS OF BENEFITS RECEIVED.—A member of the armed forces, or a family member of a member of the armed forces, who receives a travel benefit under this section is deemed to recognize no income from the receipt or use of such benefit. A donors of a travel benefit under this section is deemed to obtain no tax benefit from such donation.

''(g) FAMILY MEMBER DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'family member' has the meaning given that term in section 411h(b)(1) of title 37.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''2613. Acceptance of frequent traveler miles, credits, and tickets; use to facilitate rest and recuperation travel of deployed members and their families.''.

SEC. 586. LIMITATION ON AMENDMENT OR CANCELLATION OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DIRECTIVE RELATING TO REASONABLE ACCESS TO MILITARY INSTALLATIONS FOR CERTAIN PERSONAL COMMERCIAL SOLICITATION.

An amendment to Department of Defense Directive 1344.7, ''Personal Commercial Solicitation on DoD Installations'', or cancellation of that directive, shall not take effect until after the end of the one-year period beginning on the date on which a report containing the results of the investigation regarding insurance premium allotment processing, which is underway as of the date of the enactment of this Act, is submitted to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate.

SEC. 587. ANNUAL IDENTIFICATION OF REASONS FOR DISCHARGES FROM THE ARMED FORCES DURING PRECEDING FISCAL YEAR.

Not later than January 1 each year, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report on discharges from the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps during the preceding fiscal year. Each such report shall show, in the aggregate and for each of those Armed Forces, the following:

(1) The total number of persons discharged during the preceding fiscal year.

(2) For each separation code, and for each reenlistment eligibility code, used by the Armed Forces, the number of those discharged persons assigned that code.

(3) For the persons assigned each such separation code, classification of discharges by age, by sex, by race, by military rank or grade, by time in service, by unit (shown at the small unit level), by military occupational specialty (or the equivalent), and by reenlistment eligibility code.

SEC. 588. AUTHORITY FOR FEDERAL RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL GUARD COMMISSIONED OFFICERS APPOINTED FROM FORMER COAST GUARD PERSONNEL.

Section 305(a) of title 32, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps'' in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) and inserting ''armed forces''; and

(2) by striking ''or the United States Air Force Academy'' in paragraph (5) and inserting ''the United States Air Force Academy, or the United States Coast Guard Academy''.

SEC. 589. STUDY OF BLENDED WING CONCEPT FOR THE AIR FORCE.

(a) STUDY REQUIRED.—Not later than March 1, 2005, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to Congress a report on the blended wing concept for the Air Force. The report shall include the Secretary's findings as to the characteristics and locations that are considered favorable for a blended wing, a description of the manner in which current blended wings are functioning, and a statement of the current and future plans of the Air Force to implement the blended wing concept.

(b) SELECTION CRITERIA.—The report shall include a description of the criteria and attributes that the Secretary requires when choosing units to become blended wings.

SEC. 590. CONTINUATION OF IMPACT AID ASSISTANCE ON BEHALF OF DEPENDENTS OF CERTAIN MEMBERS DESPITE CHANGE IN STATUS OF MEMBER.

(a) SPECIAL RULE.—For purposes of computing the amount of a payment for an eligible local educational agency under subsection (a) of section 8003 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (20 U.S.C. 7703) for school year 2004–2005, the Secretary of Education shall continue to count as a child enrolled in a school of such agency under such subsection any child who—

(1) would be counted under paragraph (1)(B) of such subsection to determine the number of

children who were in average daily attendance in the school; but

(2) due to the deployment of both parents or legal guardians of the child, the deployment of a parent or legal guardian having sole custody of the child, or the death of a military parent or legal guardian while on active duty (so long as the child resides on Federal property (as defined in section 8013(5) of such Act (7 U.S.C. 7713(5))), is not eligible to be so counted.

(b) TERMINATION.—The special rule provided under subsection (a) applies only so long as the children covered by such subsection remain in average daily attendance at a school in the same local educational agency they attended before their change in eligibility status.

Subtitle J—Other Matters

SEC. 591. EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES FOR SPOUSES OF CERTAIN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES SUBJECT TO RELOCATION AGREEMENTS.

(a) SPOUSES OF CERTAIN CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES.—(1) Section 1784 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h) INCLUSION OF SPOUSES OF CERTAIN DOD CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES SUBJECT TO RELOCATION AGREEMENTS.—(1) For the purposes of this section, the spouse of a civilian employee described in paragraph (2) shall be considered to be the spouse of a member of the armed forces.

''(2) An employee described in this paragraph is a Department of Defense employee who, pursuant to a mandatory mobility agreement executed as a condition of employment or pursuant to another civilian mobility program of the Department of Defense, has had a change of permanent duty assignment (A) that was based on the needs of the Government, and (B) that required a relocation of the employee's residence.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—(1) The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

''§ 1784. Employment opportunities: military spouses; certain Department of Defense civilian spouses subject to relocation agreements''.

(2) The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of subchapter I of chapter 88 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''1784. Employment opportunities: military spouses; certain Department of Defense civilian spouses subject to relocation agreements.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (h) of section 1784 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply only with respect to spouses of employees described in paragraph (2) of that subsection who relocate their residence as a result of a permanent duty assignment specified in that paragraph that is effective on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 592. REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT TO CONDUCT ELECTRONIC VOTING DEMONSTRATION PROJECT FOR THE FEDERAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN NOVEMBER 2004.

Section 1604 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107-107; 115 Stat. 1277; 42 U.S.C. 1977ff note) is repealed.

SEC. 593. EXAMINATION OF SEXUAL ASSAULT IN THE ARMED FORCES BY THE DEFENSE TASK FORCE ESTABLISHED TO EXAMINE SEXUAL HARASSMENT AND VIOLENCE AT THE MILITARY SERVICE ACADEMIES.

(a) EXTENSION OF TASK FORCE.—(1) The task force in the Department of Defense established by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to section 526 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136; 117 Stat. 1466) to examine matters relating to sexual harassment and violence at the United States Military Academy and United States Naval Academy shall continue in existence for a period of at least 18 months after the date as of which the task force would otherwise be terminated pursuant to subsection (i) of that section.

(2) Upon the completion of the functions of the task force referred to in paragraph (1) pursuant to section 526 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004, the name of the task force shall be changed to the Defense Task Force on Sexual Assault in the Military Services, and the task force shall then carry out the functions specified in this section. The task force shall not begin to carry out the functions specified in this section until it has completed its functions under such section 526.

(b) EXAMINATION OF MATTERS RELATING TO SEXUAL ASSAULT IN THE ARMED FORCES.—The task force shall conduct an examination of matters relating to sexual assault in cases in which members of the Armed Forces are either victims or commit acts of sexual assault.

(c) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Task Force shall include in its report under subsection (e) recommendations of ways by which civilian officials within the Department of Defense and leadership within the Armed Forces may more effectively address matters relating to sexual assault. That report shall include an assessment of, and recommendations (including any recommendations for changes in law) for measures to improve, with respect to sexual assault, the following:

(1) Victim care and advocacy programs.

(2) Effective prevention.

(3) Collaboration among military investigative organizations with responsibility or jurisdiction.

(4) Coordination between military and civilian communities, including local support organizations.

(5) Reporting procedures, data collection, and tracking.

(6) Oversight of sexual assault programs.

(7) Military justice issues.

(8) Other issues identified by the task force relating to sexual assault.

(d) METHODOLOGY.—In carrying out its examination under subsection (b) and in formulating its recommendations under subsection (c), the task force shall consider the findings and recommendations of previous reviews and investigations of sexual assault conducted by the Department of Defense and the Armed Forces.

(e) REPORT.—(1) Not later than one year after the initiation of its examination under subsection (b), the task force shall submit to the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force a report on the activities of the task force and on the activities of the Department of Defense and the Armed Forces to respond to sexual assault.

(2) The report shall include the following:

(A) A description of any barrier to implementation of improvements as a result of previous efforts to address sexual assault.

(B) Other areas of concern not previously addressed in prior reports

(C) The findings and conclusions of the task force.

(D) Any recommendations for changes to policy and law that the task force considers appropriate.

(3) Within 90 days after receipt of the report under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Defense shall submit the report, together with the Secretary's evaluation of the report, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives.

(f) TERMINATION.—The task force shall terminate 90 days after the date on which the report of the task force is submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives pursuant to subsection (e)(3).

SEC. 594. RENEWAL OF PILOT PROGRAM FOR TREATING GED AND HOME SCHOOL DIPLOMA RECIPIENTS AS HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES FOR DETERMINATIONS OF ELIGIBILITY FOR ENLISTMENT.

Section 571(e) of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (10 U.S.C. 520 note) is amended to read as follows:

''(e) DURATION OF PILOT PROGRAM.—The pilot program shall be in effect during the period beginning on October 1, 2004, and ending on September 30, 2005.''.

SEC. 595. ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES THAT BENEFIT DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES.

(a) CONTINUATION OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAM FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated pursuant to section 301(5) for operation and maintenance for Defense-wide activities, $50,000,000 shall be available only for the purpose of providing educational agencies assistance to local educational agencies.

(b) NOTIFICATION.—Not later than June 30, 2005, the Secretary of Defense shall notify each local educational agency that is eligible for educational agencies assistance for fiscal year 2005 of—

(1) that agency's eligibility for the assistance; and

(2) the amount of the assistance for which that agency is eligible.

(c) DISBURSEMENT OF FUNDS.—The Secretary of Defense shall disburse funds made available under subsection (a) not later than 30 days after the date on which notification to the eligible local educational agencies is provided pursuant to subsection (b).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''educational agencies assistance'' means assistance authorized under section 386(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102–484; 20 U.S.C. 7703 note).

(2) The term ''local educational agency'' has the meaning given that term in section 8013(9) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7713(9)).

SEC. 596. SENIOR RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS AND RECRUITER ACCESS AT INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

(a) CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE WITH ROTC ACCESS PROVISIONS.—Subsection (a) of section 983 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(1)'' before ''No funds'';

(2) by striking ''prevents—'' and inserting ''prevents, either (or both) of the following:'';

(3) by striking ''(1) the'' and inserting ''(A) The'';

(4) by striking ''; or'' and inserting a period;

(5) by striking ''(2) a'' and inserting ''(B) A''; and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

''(2)(A) Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall request from each institution of higher education that has students participating in a Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps program during the then-current academic year of that institution a certification that such institution, during the next academic year of the institution, will—

''(i) permit the Secretary of each military department to maintain a unit of the Senior Officer Training Corps (in accordance with subsection (a)) at that institution (or any subelement of that institution), should such Secretary elect to maintain such a unit; and

''(ii) if the Secretary of the military department concerned elects not to establish or maintain a unit of the Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps at that institution, permit a student of

that institution (or any subelement of that institution) to enroll in a unit of the Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps at another institution of higher education.

''(B) Any certification under subparagraph (A) shall be made by the president of the institution (or equivalent highest ranking administrative official) and shall be submitted to the Secretary of Defense no later than 90 days after receipt of the request from the Secretary.

''(C) In the case of any institution from which a certification is requested under subparagraph (A), if the Secretary of Defense does not receive a certification in accordance with subparagraph (B), or if the certification does not state that the university will comply with both clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A) during its next academic year, the Secretary shall make a determination under paragraph (1) as to whether the institution has a policy or practice described in that paragraph.''.

(b) EQUAL TREATMENT OF MILITARY RECRUITERS WITH OTHER RECRUITERS.—Subsection (b)(1) of such section is amended—

(1) by striking ''entry to campuses'' and inserting ''access to campuses''; and

(2) by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: ''in a manner that is at least equal in quality and scope to the access to campuses and to students that is provided to any other employer''.

(c) PROHIBITION OF FUNDING FOR POST-SECONDARY SCHOOLS THAT PREVENT ROTC ACCESS OR MILITARY RECRUITING.—(1) Subsection (d) of such section is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''limitation established in subsection (a) applies'' and inserting ''limitations established in subsections (a) and (b) apply'';

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by inserting ''for any department or agency for which regular appropriations are made'' after ''made available''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

''(C) Any funds made available for the Department of Homeland Security.

''(D) Any funds made available for the National Nuclear Security Administration of the Department of Energy.

''(E) Any funds made available for the Department of Transportation.

''(F) Any funds made available for the Central Intelligence Agency.''; and

(B) by striking paragraph (2).

(2)(A) Subsection (b) of such section is amended by striking ''subsection (d)(2)'' and inserting ''subsection (d)(1)''.

(B) Subsection (e) of such section is amended by inserting '', to the head of each other department and agency the funds of which are subject to the determination,'' after ''Secretary of Education''.

(d) CODIFICATION AND EXTENSION OF EXCLUSION OF AMOUNTS TO COVER INDIVIDUAL PAYMENTS.—Subsection (d) of such section, as amended by subsection (c)(1), is further amended—

(1) by striking ''The'' after ''(1)'' and inserting ''Except as provided in paragraph (2), the''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) Any Federal funding specified in paragraph (1) that is provided to an institution of higher education, or to an individual, to be available solely for student financial assistance, related administrative costs, or costs associated with attendance, may be used for the purpose for which the funding is provided.''.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Subsections (a) and (b) of such section are amended by striking ''(including a grant of funds to be available for student aid)''.

(f) CONFORMING REPEAL OF CODIFIED PROVISION.—Section 8120 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000 (Public Law 106–79; 10 U.S.C. 983 note), is repealed

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to funds appropriated for fiscal year 2005 and thereafter.

SEC. 597. REPORTS ON TRANSFORMATION MILESTONES.

(a) MILITARY TO CIVILIAN CONVERSIONS.—Not later than January 31, 2005, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report providing information as to the number of positions in the Department of Defense converted during the previous fiscal year from performance by military personnel to performance by civilian personnel. The report shall include—

(1) a description of the skill set of the positions converted;

(2) specification of the total cost of such conversions and how that cost is being paid for; and

(3) the number of positions in the Department of Defense projected for such conversion during the period from March 1, 2005, to January 31, 2006.

(b) CIVILIAN SKILLS CORPS FEASIBILITY STUDY.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall conduct an Armed Forces-wide study of how a system to embed certain civilian expertise skill sets within the military on a temporary basis could be implemented. The study shall include consideration of all skills sets in which, as determined by the Secretary of Defense, there is a significant shortfall within the Armed Forces or which are high value, but of uncertain need. The study shall examine the feasibility of implementing a personnel system that expands the capability of the Armed Forces to rapidly access civilian volunteers with needed expertise outside of the reserve components.

(2) The Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the results of the study under paragraph (1) not later than March 31, 2005.

(c) MILITARY-TO-MILITARY CONVERSIONS.—Not later than March 31 of each of 2005, 2006, and 2007, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the milestones within the multiyear transformation for internal military-to-military transitions. Each such report shall include—

(1) the number of units and personnel transferred and retrained within the previous fiscal year and what their new unit designations are; and

(2) a description of the transformation goals for the upcoming fiscal year and whether the previous years goals were met and why or why not.

(d) TRANSFORMATION TO BRIGADE STRUCTURE FOR THE ARMY.—No later than March 31 of each year, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the status of the internal transformation of the Army from a division-orientated system to a brigade-orientated one. Such a report shall be submitted for each year until the Secretary of the Army certifies to those committees that the transformation of the Army to brigade level units has been completed.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances

SECTION 601. INCREASE IN BASIC PAY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005.

(a) WAIVER OF SECTION 1009 ADJUSTMENT.—The adjustment to become effective during fiscal year 2005 required by section 1009 of title 37, United States Code, in the rates of monthly basic pay authorized members of the uniformed services shall not be made.

(b) INCREASE IN BASIC PAY.—Effective on January 1, 2005, the rates of monthly basic pay for members of the uniformed services are increased by 3.5 percent.

SEC. 602. AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE FAMILY SEPARATION BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING.

Section 403(d) of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''is entitled to'' and inserting ''may be paid''; and

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking the first sentence and inserting the following new sentence: ''A family separation basic allowance for housing paid to a member under this subsection is in addition to any other allowance or per diem that the member receives under this title.''

SEC. 603. GEOGRAPHIC BASIS FOR BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING DURING SHORT CHANGES OF STATION FOR PROFESSIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION OR TRAINING.

Section 403(d)(3) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) If the member is reassigned for a permanent change of station or permanent change of assignment from a duty station in the continental United States to another duty station in the continental United States for a period of not more than one year for the purpose of participating in professional military education or training classes, the Secretary concerned may base the amount of the basic allowance for housing for the member on the duty station to which the member is reassigned or the area in which the dependents reside, whichever the Secretary concerned determines to be most equitable.''.

SEC. 604. IMMEDIATE LUMP-SUM REIMBURSEMENT FOR UNUSUAL NONRECURRING EXPENSES INCURRED BY MEMBERS SERVING OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES.

(a) ELIGIBILITY FOR REIMBURSEMENT.—Section 405 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) LUMP-SUM REIMBURSEMENT FOR NONRECURRING EXPENSES.—In addition to providing a per diem under this section, the Secretary concerned may reimburse a member for actual expenses of a nonrecurring nature that the member incurs incident to serving on duty outside of the continental United States. The types of expenses for which reimbursement may be provided under this paragraph shall be limited to those expenses directly related to the conditions or location of the duty outside of the continental United States and either of a nature or a magnitude not normally incurred by members assigned to duty inside the continental United States. In determining the per diem to be paid under this section, the Secretary concerned shall not consider expenses for which reimbursement is provided under this paragraph.''.

(b) USE OF DEFINED TERM CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES.—(1) Subsection (a) of such section is amended by striking ''outside of the United States or in Hawaii or Alaska'' and inserting ''outside of the continental United States''.

(2) The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

''§ 405. Travel and transportation allowances: per diem while on duty outside the continental United States''.

(3) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 7 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 405 and inserting the following new item:

''405. Travel and transportation allowances: per diem while on duty outside the continental United States.''.

SEC. 605. INCOME REPLACEMENT PAYMENTS FOR RESERVES EXPERIENCING EXTENDED AND FREQUENT MOBILIZATION FOR ACTIVE DUTY SERVICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Chapter 19 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 910. Replacement of lost income: involuntarily mobilized reserve component members subject to extended and frequent active duty service

''(a) PAYMENT REQUIRED.—The Secretary concerned shall pay to an eligible member of a reserve component of the armed forces an amount

equal to the monthly active-duty income differential of the member, as determined by the Secretary. The payments shall be made on a monthly basis.

''(b) ELIGIBILITY.—Subject to subsection (c), a reserve component member is entitled to a payment under this section for any full month of active duty of the member, while on active duty under an involuntary mobilization order, following the date on which the member—

''(1) completes 12 continuous months of service on active duty under such an order;

''(2) completes 18 months on active duty during the previous 60 months under such an order; or

''(3) is involuntarily mobilized for service on active duty six months or less following the member's separation from the member's previous period of active duty.

''(c) MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM PAYMENT AMOUNTS.—(1) A payment under this section shall be made to a member for a month only if the amount of the monthly active-duty income differential for the month is greater than $50.

''(2) Notwithstanding the amount determined under subsection (d) for a member for a month, the monthly payment to a member under this section may not exceed $3,000.

''(d) MONTHLY ACTIVE-DUTY INCOME DIFFERENTIAL.—For purposes of this section, the monthly active-duty income differential of a member is the difference between—

''(1) the average monthly civilian income of the member; and

''(2) the member's total monthly military compensation.

''(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) The term 'average monthly civilian income', with respect to a member of a reserve component, means the amount, determined by the Secretary concerned, of the earned income of the member for either the 12 months preceding the member's mobilization or the 12 months covered by the member's most recent Federal income tax filing, divided by 12.

''(2) The term 'total monthly military compensation' means the amount, computed on a monthly basis, of the sum of—

''(A) the amount of the regular military compensation (RMC) of the member; and

''(B) any amount of special pay or incentive pay and any allowance (other than an allowance included in regular military compensation) that is paid to the member on a monthly basis.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''910. Replacement of lost income: involuntarily mobilized reserve component members subject to extended and frequent active duty service.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 910 of title 37, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply for months after December 2004.

SEC. 606. AUTHORITY FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS DEPLOYED IN COMBAT ZONES TO RECEIVE LIMITED ADVANCES ON THEIR FUTURE BASIC PAY.

(a) ADVANCEMENT OF BASIC PAY.—(1) Chapter 3 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 212. Advancement of basic pay: members deployed in combat zones for more than one year

''(a) ELIGIBILITY; AMOUNT ADVANCED.—(1) If a member of the armed forces is assigned to duty in an area for which special pay under section 310 of this title is available and the assignment is pursuant to orders specifying an assignment of one year or more (or the assignment is otherwise extended beyond one year), the member may request, during the period of the assignment, the advanced payment of not more than three months of the basic pay of the member.

''(2) A request by a member described in paragraph (1) for the advanced payment of a single month of basic pay shall be granted. The Secretary concerned may grant a request for a second or third month of advanced basic pay during the assignment for the member upon a showing of financial hardship.

''(b) RECOUPMENT OF ADVANCED PAY.—The Secretary concerned shall recoup an advance made on the basic pay of a member under this section in equal installments over a one-year period beginning as provided in subsection (c). If the member is serving on active duty for any month during the recoupment period, the amount of the installment for the month shall be deducted from the basic pay of the member for that month. The estate of a deceased member shall not be required to repay an advance made to the member under this section.

''(c) COMMENCEMENT OF RECOUPMENT.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the recoupment of basic pay advanced to a member under this section shall commence beginning with the first month that begins after the end of the assignment of the member to duty in an area for which special pay under section 310 of this title is available

''(2) A member of a reserve component who receives an advancement of basic pay under this section shall commence repayment of the advance beginning with the first month that begins after the the advanced pay is received.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''212. Advancement of basic pay: members deployed in combat zones for more than one year.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 212 of title 37, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall take effect October 1, 2004.

Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays

SEC. 611. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF BONUS AND SPECIAL PAY AUTHORITIES.

(a) NURSE OFFICER CANDIDATE ACCESSION PROGRAM.—Section 2130a(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''December 31, 2004'' and inserting ''December 31, 2005''.

(b) REPAYMENT OF EDUCATION LOANS FOR CERTAIN HEALTH PROFESSIONALS WHO SERVE IN THE SELECTED RESERVE.—Section 16302(d) of such title is amended by striking ''January 1, 2005'' and inserting ''January 1, 2006''.

(c) AVIATION OFFICER RETENTION BONUS.—Section 301b(a) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking ''December 31, 2004'' and inserting ''December 31, 2005''.

(d) ACCESSION BONUS FOR REGISTERED NURSES.—Section 302d(a)(1) of such title is amended by striking ''December 31, 2004'' and inserting ''December 31, 2005''.

(e) INCENTIVE SPECIAL PAY FOR NURSE ANESTHETISTS.—Section 302e(a)(1) of such title is amended by striking ''December 31, 2004'' and inserting ''December 31, 2005''.

(f) ACCESSION BONUS FOR DENTAL OFFICERS.—Section 302h(a)(1) of such title is amended by striking ''December 31, 2004'' and inserting ''December 31, 2005''.

(g) ACCESSION BONUS FOR PHARMACY OFFICERS.—Section 302j(a) of such title is amended by striking ''the date of the enactment of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 and ending on September 30, 2004'' and inserting ''October 30, 2000, and ending on December 31, 2005''.

(h) REENLISTMENT BONUS FOR ACTIVE AND RESERVE MEMBERS.—Section 308(g) of such title is amended by striking ''December 31, 2004'' and inserting ''December 31, 2005''.

(i) ENLISTMENT BONUS FOR ACTIVE AND RESERVE MEMBERS.—Section 309(e) of such title is amended by striking ''December 31, 2004'' and inserting ''December 31, 2005''.

(j) SPECIAL PAY FOR NUCLEAR-QUALIFIED OFFICERS EXTENDING PERIOD OF ACTIVE SERVICE.—Section 312(e) of such title is amended by striking ''December 31, 2004'' and inserting ''December 31, 2005''.

(k) NUCLEAR CAREER ACCESSION BONUS.—Section 312b(c) of such title is amended by striking ''December 31, 2004'' and inserting ''December 31, 2005''.

(l) NUCLEAR CAREER ANNUAL INCENTIVE BONUS.—Section 312c(d) of such title is amended by striking ''December 31, 2004'' and inserting ''December 31, 2005''.

(m) RETENTION BONUS FOR MEMBERS WHO HAVE CRITICAL MILITARY SKILLS OR MEET OTHER CRITERIA.—Section 323(i) of such title is amended by striking ''December 31, 2004'' and inserting ''December 31, 2005''.

(n) ACCESSION OR AFFILIATION BONUS FOR NEW OFFICERS IN CRITICAL SKILLS.—Section 324(g) of such title is amended by striking ''December 31, 2004'' and inserting ''December 31, 2005''.

SEC. 612. REDUCTION IN REQUIRED SERVICE COMMITMENT TO RECEIVE ACCESSION BONUS FOR REGISTERED NURSES.

(a) REDUCTION.—Section 302d(a)(1) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking ''four years'' and inserting ''three years''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect October 1, 2004, and apply with respect to written agreements referred to in section 302d(a)(1) of title 37, United States Code, entered into on or after that date.

SEC. 613. INCREASE IN MAXIMUM MONTHLY RATE AUTHORIZED FOR HARDSHIP DUTY PAY.

(a) INCREASE.—Section 305(a) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking ''$300'' and inserting ''$750''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect October 1, 2004.

SEC. 614. TERMINATION OF ASSIGNMENT INCENTIVE PAY FOR MEMBERS PLACED ON TERMINAL LEAVE.

(a) TERMINATION.—Subsection (e) of section 307a of title 37, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(e) STATUS NOT AFFECTED BY TEMPORARY DUTY OR LEAVE.—The service of a member in an assignment referred to in subsection (a) shall not be considered discontinued during any period that the member is not performing service in the assignment by reason of—

''(1) the performance by the member of temporary duty pursuant to orders; or

''(2) the absence of the member for authorized leave, unless the member is placed on terminal leave and will not be returning to the assignment.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to agreements under section 307a(b) of title 37, United States Code, entered into on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 615. CONSOLIDATION OF REENLISTMENT AND ENLISTMENT BONUS AUTHORITIES FOR REGULAR AND RESERVE COMPONENTS.

(a) CONSOLIDATED REENLISTMENT BONUS AUTHORITY; ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA.—(1) Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 308 of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking the matter preceding subparagraph (A) and inserting ''The Secretary concerned may pay a bonus under paragraph (2) to a member of the armed forces serving in a regular component or reserve component of the armed force if the member—'';

(B) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

''(A) has completed at least 17 months of service in a regular or reserve component of the armed forces, but not more than 18 years of total military service;''; and

(C) by striking subparagraph (D) and all that follows through the period at the end of such paragraph and inserting the following:

''(D) reenlists or voluntarily extends the member's enlistment for a period of at least three

years in a regular component or reserve component of the armed forces.''.

(2) Paragraph (3) of such subsection is amended by striking ''16 years'' and inserting ''20 years''.

(3) Paragraph (5) of such subsection is amended to read as follows:

''(5) The Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of Homeland Security with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy, may waive all or part of the eligibility requirements specified in paragraph (1) in time of war or national emergency.''.

(4) Subsection (b) of such section is amended—

(A) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(b)''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) Notwithstanding the schedule established for making partial bonus payments under paragraph (1), a member of a reserve component entitled to a bonus under this section who is called or ordered to active duty shall be paid, during that period of active duty, any amount of the bonus that becomes payable to the member during that period of active duty.''.

(5) Subsection (g) of such section is amended by striking ''an active-duty reenlistment'' and inserting ''a reenlistment''.

(b) CONSOLIDATED ENLISTMENT BONUS AUTHORITY.—Section 309(a) of such title is amended—

(1) by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: ''(1) The Secretary concerned may pay a bonus this section to a person who enlists in a regular component or reserve component of the armed forces for a period of at least two years.''; and

(2) by inserting after the first sentence, as so amended, the following new paragraph:

''(2) The amount of a bonus under this section may not exceed $20,000.''.

(c) REPEAL OF SEPARATE REENLISTMENT AND ENLISTMENT BONUS AUTHORITY FOR RESERVE COMPONENTS.—(1) Sections 308b, 308c, 308g, 308h, and 308i of such title are repealed.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 5 of such title is amended by striking the items relating to sections 308b, 308c, 308h, and 308i.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—(1) Except as provided by paragraphs (2) and (3), the amendments made by this section shall take effect October 1, 2004, and the amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply to reenlistments, the voluntary extension of enlistments, and enlistments referred to in section 308(a)(1) or 309(a) of title 37, United States Code, entered into on or after that date.

(2) The amendments made by subsection (c) shall take effect December 31, 2004, except that the repeal of section 308g of title 37, United States Code, shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) In the case of a member of the Armed Forces who, on or before December 31, 2004, reenlisted, voluntarily extended the enlistment of the member, or enlisted in a reserve component of the Armed Forces, section 308b, 308c, 308h, or 308i of title 37, United States Code, whichever applies to the member, and as in effect on December 31, 2004, shall continue to apply with respect to the payment of a bonus under such section to the member.

(e) LIMITATION ON FISCAL YEAR 2005 OBLIGATIONS.—During fiscal year 2005, obligations incurred under sections 308 and 309 of title 37, United States Code, to provide reenlistment and enlistment bonuses to members of the uniformed services using the expanded authority provided by the amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) may not exceed $20,000,000. The bonus authority available under such sections shall not be considered to be an expanded authority to the extent that the authority was available under a provision of law specified in subsection (c), before the repeal of the provision by such subsection.

SEC. 616. REVISION OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY PAY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Section 316 of title 37, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§316. Special pay: bonus for members with foreign language proficiency

''(a) BONUS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary concerned may pay an annual bonus under this section to a member of the uniformed services who—

''(1) is qualified in a uniformed services specialty requiring proficiency in a foreign language identified by the Secretary concerned as a foreign language in which it is necessary to have personnel proficient because of national defense or public health considerations;

''(2) received training, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned, designed to develop a proficiency in such a foreign language;

''(3) is assigned to duties requiring a proficiency in such a foreign language; or

''(4) is proficient in a foreign language for which the uniformed service may have a critical need, as determined by the Secretary concerned.

''(b) CERTIFICATION OF PROFICIENCY.—Except as provided in subsection (e), for a member described in subsection (a) to be eligible to receive or retain a bonus under this section, the Secretary concerned shall certify the member as being proficient in the foreign language for which bonus is offered.

''(c) DURATION OF CERTIFICATION.—Except as provided in subsection (e), the certification of a member as being proficient in a foreign language for purposes of receipt of a bonus under this section shall expire at the end of the 12-month period beginning on the first day of the first month beginning on or after the certification date.

''(d) BONUS AMOUNT; PAYMENT METHOD.—The maximum amount of the bonus paid under this section to a member may not exceed $12,000 for the 12-month period covered by the certification of the member. The Secretary concerned may pay the bonus in a single lump sum at the beginning of the certification period or in installments.

''(e) CERTIFICATION INTERRUPTED BY CONTINGENCY OPERATION.—(1) The Secretary concerned may waive the certification requirement under subsection (b) and pay a bonus under this section to a member described in subsection (a) who was previously certified in a foreign language, but whose certification expired under subsection (c), if—

''(A) the member is assigned to duty in connection with a contingency operation; and

''(B) the Secretary concerned determines that the member is unable to schedule or complete the certification required by subsection (b) because of that assignment.

''(2) For purposes of determining the amount of a bonus to be paid to a member under the authority of this subsection, the Secretary concerned shall treat the date on which the member was assigned to duty in connection with the contingency operation as equivalent to a certification date. In the case of a member whose certification expires during such duty assignment, the Secretary shall commence the next 12-month period effective as of the date on which the prior certification period expired.

''(3) A member who receives a bonus under the authority of this subsection shall complete the certification required by subsection (b) for the foreign language for which the bonus was paid not later than the end of the 180-day period beginning on the date on which the member is released from the assignment in connection with the contingency operation. The Secretary concerned may extend that period for a member in accordance with regulations prescribed under subsection (h). If the member fails to obtain the required certification before the end of the authorized period, the Secretary concerned may require the member to repay all or a portion of the bonus, in the manner provided in subsection (g).

''(f) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PAY OR ALLOWANCE.—A bonus under this section is in addition to any other pay or allowance payable to a member under any other provision of law.

''(g) REPAYMENT OF BONUS.—(1) The Secretary concerned may require a member who receives a bonus under this section, but who does not satisfy an eligibility requirement specified in subsection (a) for the entire certification period, to repay to the United States an amount which bears the same ratio to the total amount of the bonus paid to the member as the unsatisfied portion of the certification period bears to the entire certification period.

''(2) An obligation to repay the United States imposed under paragraph (1) is for all purposes a debt owed to the United States. A discharge in bankruptcy under title 11 that is entered for the member less than five years after the expiration of the certification period does not discharge the member from a debt arising under this paragraph. This paragraph applies to any case commenced under title 11 after the date of the enactment of this section.

''(h) REGULATIONS.—This section shall be administered under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense for the armed forces under the jurisdiction of the Secretary, by the Secretary of Homeland Security for the Coast Guard when the Coast Guard is not operating as a service in the Navy, by the Secretary of Health and Human Services for the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service, and by the Secretary of Commerce for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 5 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 316 and inserting the following new item:

''316. Special pay: bonus for members with foreign language proficiency.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Section 316a of title 37, United States Code, is repealed.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 5 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 316a.

SEC. 617. ELIGIBILITY OF RESERVE COMPONENT MEMBERS FOR CRITICAL SKILLS RETENTION BONUS AND EXPANSION OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE BONUS.

(a) INCLUSION OF RESERVE COMPONENT MEMBERS.—Section 323 of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''who is serving on active duty and'' by inserting ''who is serving on active duty in a regular component or in an active status in a reserve component and who''; and

(B) in paragraph (1), by inserting '', or remain in an active status in a reserve component,'' after ''remain on active duty'';

(2) in subsection (e)(2), by inserting ''or service in a reserve component'' after ''period of active duty''; and

(3) in subsection (g), by striking ''active duty'' and inserting ''service''.

(b) INCLUSION OF MEMBERS SERVING PURSUANT TO INDEFINITE REENLISTMENT.—Subsection (a) of such section is further amended—

(1) by striking ''or'' at the end of paragraph (1);

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting ''other than an enlisted member referred to in paragraph (3),'' after ''enlisted member,''; and

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) in the case of an enlisted member serving pursuant to an indefinite reenlistment, the member executes a written agreement to remain on active duty, or remain in an active status in a reserve component, for a period of at least one year.''.

(c) ADDITIONAL CRITERIA FOR BONUS.—Such section is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''designated critical military skill'' and inserting ''critical military skill designated under subsection (b) or satisfies such other criteria for the bonus established under such subsection'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''DESIGNATION OF CRITICAL SKILLS.—'' and inserting ''BASIS FOR BONUS.—(1)''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) The Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of Homeland Security with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy, may establish such other criteria as the Secretary considers appropriate under which a retention bonus will be provided to an officer or enlisted member of the armed forces under subsection (a).''; and

(3) in subsection (h)(1), by striking ''qualified in the critical military skills for which the bonuses were offered'' and inserting ''who were offered the bonuses''.

(d) REPEAL OF SEPARATE SPECIAL AND INCENTIVE PAY AUTHORITIES FOR RESERVE COMPONENTS.—(1) Sections 302g, 308d, and 308e of such title are repealed.

(2) In the case of a member of the Armed Forces who, on or before December 31, 2004, entered into a written agreement under section 302g or 308e of title 37, United States Code, such section 302g or 308e, whichever applies to the member, and as in effect on December 31, 2004, shall continue to apply after that date with respect to the payment of special pay under such section to the member during the term of the agreement.

(e) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—(1) The heading of section 323 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''§ 323 Special pay: retention incentives for members qualified in a critical military skill or who satisfy other eligibility criteria''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 5 of such title is amended—

(A) by striking the items relating to sections 302g, 308d, and 308e; and

(B) by striking the item relating to section 323 and inserting the following new item:

''323. Special pay: retention incentives for members qualified in a critical military skill or who satisfy other eligibility criteria.''.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—(1) Except as provided by paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall take effect October 1, 2004, and the amendments made by subsections (a), (b), and (c) shall apply to agreements, reenlistments, and the voluntary extension of enlistments referred to in section 323(a) of title 37, United States Code, entered into on or after that date.

(2) The amendments made by subsections (d)(1) and (e)(2)(A) shall take effect December 31, 2004.

(g) LIMITATION ON FISCAL YEAR 2005 OBLIGATIONS.—During fiscal year 2005, obligations incurred under section 323 of title 37, United States Code, to provide retention bonuses to members of the uniformed services using the expanded authority provided by the amendments made by subsections (a), (b), and (c) may not exceed $10,000,000. The bonus authority available under such section shall not be considered to be an expanded authority to the extent that the authority was available under a provision of law specified in subsection (d), before the repeal of the provision by such subsection.

SEC. 618. ELIGIBILITY OF NEW RESERVE COMPONENT OFFICERS FOR ACCESSION OR AFFILIATION BONUS FOR OFFICERS IN CRITICAL SKILLS.

(a) ELIGIBILITY.—Subsection (a) of section 324 of title 37, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(a) BONUS AUTHORIZED.—(1) The Secretary concerned may pay a bonus under this section—

''(A) to a person who executes a written agreement to accept a commission or an appointment as an officer of armed forces and serve on active duty in a designated critical officer skill or serve in a reserve component of an armed force in a designated critical officer skill; or

''(B) to an officer of an armed force, including a warrant officer, but excluding an officer who has previously served in the Selected Reserve or an officer who is entitled to retired pay, who executes a written agreement to serve in a reserve component of an armed force in a designated critical officer skill after being discharged or released from active duty under honorable conditions, once the officer affiliates with a unit or position in the reserve component.

''(2) The written agreement under paragraph (1) between the Secretary concerned and a person or officer shall specify the period during which the person or officer will be required to serve in a designated critical officer skill to maintain entitlement to the bonus payment.''.

(b) AMOUNT OF BONUS.—Subsection (c) of such section is amended to read as follows:

''(c) AMOUNT OF BONUS.—The Secretary concerned shall determine the amount of a bonus to be paid under subsection (a), except that a person may not receive a total of more than $60,000 in payments under this section''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Such section is further amended—

(1) in subsection (d), by striking ''accession'' both places it appears;

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking ''ACCESSION''; and

(B) by striking ''an accession bonus'' and inserting ''a bonus''; and

(3) in subsection (f), by striking ''active duty'' and ''accession'' each place it appears.

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—(1) The heading of section 324 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''§ 324. Special pay: accession or affiliation bonus for officers in designated critical skills''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 5 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 324 and inserting the following new item:

''324. Special pay: accession or affiliation bonus for officers in designated critical skills.''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect October 1, 2004, and apply to agreements referred to in section 324(a) of title 37, United States Code entered into on or after that date.

(f) LIMITATION ON FISCAL YEAR 2005 OBLIGATIONS.—During fiscal year 2005, obligations incurred under section 324 of title 37, United States Code, as amended by subsections (a) and (b), to provide accession and affilliation bonuses to members of the Armed Forces not previously eligible for such a bonus under such section may not exceed $5,000,000.

SEC. 619. ELIGIBILITY OF RESERVE COMPONENT MEMBERS FOR INCENTIVE BONUS FOR CONVERSION TO MILITARY OCCUPATIONAL SPECIALTY TO EASE PERSONNEL SHORTAGE.

(a) ELIGIBILITY.—Section 326 of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting ''of a regular or reserve component'' after ''an eligible member'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''if—'' and all that follows through ''at the time'' and inserting ''if, at the time''; and

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively; and

(3) in subsection (c)(2), by inserting ''regular or reserve component of the'' after ''chief personnel officer of the''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect October 1, 2004, and apply to agreements referred to in section 326(a) of title 37, United States Code, entered into on or after that date.

(c) LIMITATION ON FISCAL YEAR 2005 OBLIGATIONS.—During fiscal year 2005, obligations incurred under section 326 of title 37, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a), to provide incentive bonuses to members of a reserve component of the Armed Forces may not exceed $3,000,000.

SEC. 620. AVAILABILITY OF HAZARDOUS DUTY INCENTIVE PAY FOR MILITARY FIREFIGHTERS.

(a) ADDITIONAL TYPE OF DUTY ENTITLED TO PAY.—Subsection (a) of section 301 of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''or'' at the end of paragraph (12);

(2) by redesignating paragraph (13) as paragraph (14); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (12) the following new paragraph:

''(13) involving regular participating as a firefighting crew member, as determined by the Secretary concerned; or''.''.

(b) MONTHLY AMOUNT OF PAY.—Subsection (c) of such section is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''(12)'' and inserting ''(13)''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking ''(13)'' and inserting ''(14)''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) and (b) shall take effect October 1, 2004.

Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowances

SEC. 631. EXPANSION OF TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCES TO ASSIST SURVIVORS OF A DECEASED MEMBER TO ATTEND BURIAL CEREMONY OF THE MEMBER.

(a) AUTHORIZED TRAVEL LOCATIONS.—Subsection (b) of section 411f of title 37, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(b) AUTHORIZED LOCATIONS FOR TRAVEL; DURATION AND RATES.—(1) The allowances under subsection (a) may be provided for travel and transportation by eligible relatives of the deceased member to the place selected pursuant to section 1482(a)(8) of title 10 for disposition of the remains of the deceased member.

''(2) The allowances may not exceed the rates for two days and the time necessary for the travel.''.

(b) ELIGIBLE RELATIVES.—Subsection (c)(1)(C) of such section is amended by striking ''If no person described in subparagraph (A) or (B) is provided travel and transportation allowances under subsection (a)(1), the'' and inserting ''The''.

(c) LIMITATION ON FISCAL YEAR 2005 OBLIGATIONS.—During fiscal year 2005, obligations incurred under section 411f of title 37, United States Code, as amended by subsections (a) and (b), to provide travel and transportation allowances, not previously available under such section, to survivors of deceased members of the uniformed services, and to provide such allowances to persons not previously eligible for such allowances, may not exceed $2,000,000.

SEC. 632. TRANSPORTATION OF FAMILY MEMBERS INCIDENT TO THE SERIOUS ILLNESS OR INJURY OF MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES.

(a) REMOVAL OF LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF FAMILY MEMBERS.—Subsection (a)(1) of section 411h of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking ''not more than two family members'' and inserting ''a family member''.

(b) FAMILY MEMBERS DESCRIBED.—Subsection (b)(1) of such section is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (C);

(2) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (D) and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) other persons approved by the Secretary concerned.''.

(c) AVAILABILITY OF PER DIEM.—Such section is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by inserting ''travel and'' before ''transportation''; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(c)'' ; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) In addition to the transportation authorized by subsection (a), the Secretary concerned may provide a per diem allowance or reimbursement for the actual and necessary expenses of the travel, or a combination thereof, but not to exceed the rates established under section 404(d) of this title.''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2004, and apply to transportation described in section 411h of title 37, United States Code, provided on or after that date.

(e) LIMITATION ON FISCAL YEAR 2005 OBLIGATIONS.—During fiscal year 2005, obligations incurred under section 411h of title 37, United States Code, as amended by subsections (a) and (b), to provide travel and transportation allowances, not previously available under such section, to family members of seriously ill or injured members of the uniformed services, and to provide such allowances to persons not previously eligible for such allowances, may not exceed $3,000,000.

SEC. 633. REIMBURSEMENT OF MEMBERS FOR CERTAIN LODGING COSTS INCURRED IN CONNECTION WITH STUDENT DEPENDENT TRAVEL.

Section 430(b) of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph (2):

''(2) The transportation allowance paid to a member under paragraph (1) may include reimbursement, at a rate prescribed by the Secretaries concerned, for lodging costs incurred during the annual trip for which the allowance is paid when, for reasons beyond the control of the dependent child of the member, the child is required to procure accommodations while en route between the child's school and the member's duty station.''.

Subtitle D—Retired Pay and Survivor Benefits

SEC. 641. COMPUTATION OF BENEFITS UNDER SURVIVOR BENEFIT PLAN FOR SURVIVING SPOUSES OVER AGE 62.

(a) PHASED INCREASE IN BASIC ANNUITY.—

(1) STANDARD ANNUITY.—

(A) INCREASE TO 55 PERCENT.—Clause (i) of subsection (a)(1)(B) of section 1451 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''35 percent of the base amount.'' and inserting ''the product of the base amount and the percent applicable to the month, as follows:

''(I) For a month before October 2005, the applicable percent is 35 percent.

''(II) For months after September 2005 and before April 2006, the applicable percent is 40 percent.

''(III) For months after March 2006 and before April 2007, the applicable percent is 45 percent.

''(IV) For months after March 2007 and before April 2008, the applicable percent is 50 percent.

''(V) For months after March 2008, the applicable percent is 55 percent.''.

(B) COORDINATION WITH SAVINGS PROVISION UNDER PRIOR LAW.—Clause (ii) of such subsection is amended by striking '', at the time the beneficiary becomes entitled to the annuity,''.

(2) RESERVE-COMPONENT ANNUITY.—Subsection (a)(2)(B)(i)(I) of such section is amended by striking ''35 percent'' and inserting ''the percent specified under subsection (a)(1)(B)(i) as being applicable for the month''.

(3) SURVIVORS OF ELIGIBLE PERSONS DYING ON ACTIVE DUTY, ETC.—

(A) INCREASE TO 55 PERCENT.—Clause (i) of subsection (c)(1)(B) of such section is amended—

(i) by striking ''35 percent'' and inserting ''the applicable percent''; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following: ''The percent applicable for a month under the preceding sentence is the percent specified under subsection (a)(1)(B)(i) as being applicable for that month.''.

(B) COORDINATION WITH SAVINGS PROVISION UNDER PRIOR LAW.—Clause (ii) of such subsection is amended by striking '', at the time the beneficiary becomes entitled to the annuity,''.

(4) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The heading for subsection (d)(2)(A) of such section is amended to read as follows: ''COMPUTATION OF ANNUITY.—''.

(b) CORRESPONDING PHASED ELIMINATION OF SUPPLEMENTAL ANNUITY.—

(1) PHASED REDUCTION OF SUPPLEMENTAL ANNUITY.—Section 1457(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking ''5, 10, 15, or 20 percent'' and inserting ''the applicable percent''; and

(B) by inserting after the first sentence the following: ''The percent used for the computation shall be an even multiple of 5 percent and, whatever the percent specified in the election, may not exceed 20 percent for months before October 2005, 15 percent for months after September 2005 and before April 2006, 10 percent for months after March 2006 and before April 2007, and 5 percent for months after March 2007 and before April 2008.''.

(2) REPEAL UPON IMPLEMENTATION OF 55 PERCENT SBP ANNUITY.—Effective on April 1, 2008, chapter 73 of such title is amended—

(A) by striking subchapter III; and

(B) by striking the item relating to subchapter III in the table of subchapters at the beginning of that chapter.

(c) RECOMPUTATION OF ANNUITIES.—

(1) PERIODIC RECOMPUTATION REQUIRED.—Effective on the first day of each month specified in paragraph (2)—

(A) each annuity under section 1450 of title 10, United States Code, that commenced before that month, is computed under a provision of section 1451 of that title amended by subsection (a), and is payable for that month shall be recomputed so as to be equal to the amount that would be in effect if the percent applicable for that month under that provision, as so amended, had been used for the initial computation of the annuity; and

(B) each supplemental survivor annuity under section 1457 of such title that commenced before that month and is payable for that month shall be recomputed so as to be equal to the amount that would be in effect if the percent applicable for that month under that section, as amended by this section, had been used for the initial computation of the supplemental survivor annuity.

(2) TIME FOR RECOMPUTATION.—The requirement under paragraph (1) for recomputation of certain annuities applies with respect to the following months:

(A) October 2005.

(B) April 2006.

(C) April 2007.

(D) April 2008.

(d) RECOMPUTATION OF RETIRED PAY REDUCTIONS FOR SUPPLEMENTAL SURVIVOR ANNUITIES.—The Secretary of Defense shall take such actions as are necessitated by the amendments made by subsection (b) and the requirements of subsection (c)(1)(B) to ensure that the reductions in retired pay under section 1460 of title 10, United States Code, are adjusted to achieve the objectives set forth in subsection (b) of that section.

SEC. 642. OPEN ENROLLMENT PERIOD FOR SURVIVOR BENEFIT PLAN COMMENCING OCTOBER 1, 2005.

(a) PERSONS NOT CURRENTLY PARTICIPATING IN SURVIVOR BENEFIT PLAN.—

(1) ELECTION OF SBP COVERAGE.—An eligible retired or former member may elect to participate in the Survivor Benefit Plan under subchapter II of chapter 73 of title 10, United States Code, during the open enrollment period specified in subsection (f).

(2) ELECTION OF SUPPLEMENTAL ANNUITY COVERAGE.—An eligible retired or former member who elects under paragraph (1) to participate in the Survivor Benefit Plan at the maximum level may also elect during the open enrollment period to participate in the Supplemental Survivor Benefit Plan established under subchapter III of chapter 73 of title 10, United States Code.

(3) ELIGIBLE RETIRED OR FORMER MEMBER.—For purposes of paragraphs (1) and (2), an eligible retired or former member is a member or former member of the uniformed services who on the day before the first day of the open enrollment period is not a participant in the Survivor Benefit Plan and—

(A) is entitled to retired pay; or

(B) would be entitled to retired pay under chapter 1223 of title 10, United States Code, but for the fact that such member or former member is under 60 years of age.

(4) STATUS UNDER SBP OF PERSONS MAKING ELECTIONS.—

(A) STANDARD ANNUITY.—A person making an election under paragraph (1) by reason of eligibility under paragraph (3)(A) shall be treated for all purposes as providing a standard annuity under the Survivor Benefit Plan.

(B) RESERVE-COMPONENT ANNUITY.—A person making an election under paragraph (1) by reason of eligibility under paragraph (3)(B) shall be treated for all purposes as providing a reserve-component annuity under the Survivor Benefit Plan.

(b) ELECTION TO INCREASE COVERAGE UNDER SBP.—A person who on the day before the first day of the open enrollment period is a participant in the Survivor Benefit Plan but is not participating at the maximum base amount or is providing coverage under the Plan for a dependent child and not for the person's spouse or former spouse may, during the open enrollment period, elect to—

(1) participate in the Plan at a higher base amount (not in excess of the participant's retired pay); or

(2) provide annuity coverage under the Plan for the person's spouse or former spouse at a base amount not less than the base amount provided for the dependent child.

(c) ELECTION FOR CURRENT SBP PARTICIPANTS TO PARTICIPATE IN SUPPLEMENTAL SBP.—

(1) ELECTION.—A person who is eligible to make an election under this paragraph may elect during the open enrollment period to participate in the Supplemental Survivor Benefit Plan established under subchapter III of chapter 73 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) PERSONS ELIGIBLE.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), a person is eligible to make an election under paragraph (1) if on the day before the first day of the open enrollment period the person is a participant in the Survivor Benefit Plan at the maximum level, or during the open enrollment period the person increases the level of such participation to the maximum level under subsection (b) of this section, and under that Plan is providing annuity coverage for the person's spouse or a former spouse.

(3) LIMITATION ON ELIGIBILITY FOR CERTAIN SBP PARTICIPANTS NOT AFFECTED BY TWO-TIER ANNUITY COMPUTATION.—A person is not eligible to make an election under paragraph (1) if (as determined by the Secretary concerned) the annuity of a spouse or former spouse beneficiary of that person under the Survivor Benefit Plan will be computed under section 1451(e) of title 10, United States Code. However, such a person may during the open enrollment period waive the right to have that annuity computed under such section. Any such election is irrevocable. A person making such a waiver may make an election under paragraph (1) as in the case of any other participant in the Survivor Benefit Plan.

(d) MANNER OF MAKING ELECTIONS.—An election under this section must be made in writing,

signed by the person making the election, and received by the Secretary concerned before the end of the open enrollment period. Any such election shall be made subject to the same conditions, and with the same opportunities for designation of beneficiaries and specification of base amount, that apply under the Survivor Benefit Plan or the Supplemental Survivor Benefit Plan, as the case may be. A person making an election under subsection (a) to provide a reserve-component annuity shall make a designation described in section 1448(e) of title 10, United States Code.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE FOR ELECTIONS.—Any such election shall be effective as of the first day of the first calendar month following the month in which the election is received by the Secretary concerned.

(f) OPEN ENROLLMENT PERIOD DEFINED.—The open enrollment period is the two-year period beginning on October 1, 2005.

(g) EFFECT OF DEATH OF PERSON MAKING ELECTION WITHIN TWO YEARS OF MAKING ELECTION.—If a person making an election under this section dies before the end of the two-year period beginning on the effective date of the election, the election is void and the amount of any reduction in retired pay of the person that is attributable to the election shall be paid in a lump sum to the person who would have been the deceased person's beneficiary under the voided election if the deceased person had died after the end of such two-year period.

(h) APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF LAW.—The provisions of sections 1449, 1453, and 1454 of title 10, United States Code, are applicable to a person making an election, and to an election, under this section in the same manner as if the election were made under the Survivor Benefit Plan or the Supplemental Survivor Benefit Plan, as the case may be.

(i) ADDITIONAL PREMIUM.—The Secretary of Defense may require that the premium for a person making an election under subsection (a)(1) or (b) include, in addition to the amount required under section 1452(a) of title 10, United States Code, an amount determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense for the purposes of this subsection. Any such amount shall be stated as a percentage of the base amount of the person making the election and shall reflect the number of years that have elapsed since the person retired, but may not exceed 4.5 percent of that person's base amount.

(j) REPORT CONCERNING OPEN SEASON.—Not later than July 1, 2005, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a report on the open season authorized by this section for the Survivor Benefit Plan. The report shall include the following:

(1) A description of the Secretary's plans for implementation of the open season.

(2) The Secretary's estimates of the costs associated with the open season, including any anticipated effect of the open season on the actuarial status of the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund.

(3) Any recommendation by the Secretary for further legislative action.

SEC. 643. SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR SURVIVOR BENEFIT PLAN ANNUITIES FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BENEFICIARIES OVER AGE 62.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 74 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 1465(b) of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) At the same time that the Secretary of Defense makes the determination required by paragraph (1) for any fiscal year, the Secretary shall determine the amount of the Treasury contribution to be made to the Fund for the next fiscal year under section 1466(b)(2)(E) of this title. That amount shall be determined in the same manner as the determination under paragraph (1) of the total amount of Department of Defense contributions to be made to the Fund during that fiscal year under section 1466(a) of this title, except that for purposes of this paragraph the Secretary, in making the calculations required by subparagraphs (A) and (B) of that paragraph, shall use the single level percentages determined under subsection (c)(5), rather than those determined under subsection (c)(1).''.

(4) Section 1465(c) of such title is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: ''and as if benefits under subchpater II of chapter 73 of this title for beneficiaries 62 years of age and older were computed for any fiscal year on the basis of the percentage of 35 percent, rather than any percentage otherwise applicable for that computation for that fiscal year''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''and as if benefits under subchapter II of chapter 73 of this title for beneficiaries 62 years of age and older were computed for any fiscal year on the basis of the percentage of 35 percent, rather than any percentage otherwise applicable for that computation for that fiscal year'';

(B) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (6); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph (5):

''(5) Whenever the Secretary carries out an actuarial valuation under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall include as part of such valuation the following:

''(A) A determination of a single level percentage determined in the same manner as applies under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1), but determined as if benefits under subchapter II of chapter 73 of this title for beneficiaries 62 years of age and older were computed for any fiscal year on the basis of the percentage of 35 percent, rather than any percentage otherwise applicable for that computation for that fiscal year.

''(B) A determination of a single level percentage determined in the same manner as applies under subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1), but determined as if benefits under subchapter II of chapter 73 of this title for beneficiaries 62 years of age and older were computed for any fiscal year on the basis of the percentage of 35 percent, rather than any percentage otherwise applicable for that computation for that fiscal year.

Such single level percentages shall be used for the purposes of subsection (b)(4).''.

(5) Section 1466(b) of such title is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''1465(b)(4),'' after ''1465(b)(3),''; and

(B) by adding at the end of paragraph (2) the following new subparagraph:

''(E) The amount for that year determined by the Secretary of Defense under section 1465(b)(4) of this title for the cost to the Fund arising from increased amounts payable from the Fund by reason of benefits under subchapter II of chapter 73 of this title for beneficiaries 62 years of age and older being computed for any fiscal year on the basis of the percentage greater than 35 percent.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect as of October 1, 2004. If this Act is enacted after that date, the Secretary of Defense shall provide for such administrative adjustments as necessary to provide for payments made for any period during fiscal year 2005 before the date of the enactment of this Act to be treated as having been made in accordance with such amendments and for the provisions of those amendments to be implemented as if enacted as of September 30, 2004.

Subtitle E—Commissary and Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentality Benefits

SEC. 651. CONSOLIDATION AND REORGANIZATION OF LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS REGARDING DEFENSE COMMISSARY SYSTEM AND EXCHANGES AND OTHER MORALE, WELFARE, AND RECREATION ACTIVITIES.

(a) PROVISIONS RELATED TO COMMISSARY STORES.—Chapter 147 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking the table of sections at the beginning of the chapter and sections 2481, 2483, 2485, and 2487;

(2) by redesignating sections 2482, 2484, and 2486 as sections 2485, 2483 and 2484, respectively;

(3) by inserting after the chapter heading the following:

''Subchapter	*Sec.*
''I. Defense Commissary System	*2481*
''II. Relationship, Continuation, and Common Policies of Defense Commissary and Exchange Systems	*2487*
''III. Morale, Welfare, and Recreation Programs and Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentalities	*2491*

''SUBCHAPTER I—DEFENSE COMMISSARY SYSTEM

''Sec.
''2481. Existence and purpose of defense commissary system.
''2482. Commissary stores: criteria for establishment or closure; store size.
''2483. Commissary stores: use of appropriated funds to cover operating expenses.
''2484. Commissary stores: merchandise that may be sold; uniform surcharges and pricing.
''2485. Commissary stores: operation.

''§ 2481. Existence and purpose of defense commissary system

''(a) EXISTENCE OF SYSTEM.—The Secretary of the Defense shall operate, using funds appropriated to the Department of Defense, a worldwide system of commissary stores that sell, at reduced prices, food and other merchandise consistent with societal norms for product selection in commercial large-scale grocery stores in the United States to members of the uniformed services on active duty, members of the uniformed services entitled to retired pay, dependents of such members, and patrons authorized to use the system under chapter 54 of this title.

''(b) PURPOSE OF SYSTEM.—The purpose of the defense commissary system is to enhance the quality of life of members of the uniformed services, retired members, dependents of such members, and other authorized patrons and to provide such members with an additional nonmonetary compensation in recognition of their service to the United States.

''(c) REDUCED PRICES DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'reduced prices' means prices for food and other merchandise determined using the price setting process specified in section 2484 of this title.

''§ 2482. Commissary stores: criteria for establishment or closure; store size

''(a) PRIMARY CONSIDERATION FOR ESTABLISHMENT.—The needs of members of the uniformed services on active duty and their dependents shall be the primary consideration whenever the Secretary of Defense—

''(1) assesses the need to establish a commissary store; and

''(2) selects the actual location for the store.

''(b) STORE SIZE.—In determining the size of a commissary store, the Secretary of Defense shall take into consideration the number of all authorized patrons of the defense commissary system who are likely to use the store.

''(c) CLOSURE CONSIDERATIONS.—(1) Whenever assessing whether to close a commissary store, the effect of the closure on the quality of life of members of the uniformed services and their dependents using the store and on the welfare and

security of the military community in which the commissary is located shall be the primary consideration. In all cases, the quality of life for military patrons shall take priority over any consideration of economic criteria relative to store financial performance.

''(2) The Secretary of Defense shall give the quality of life for members of a reserve component the same priority as the quality of life for active duty members whenever assessing whether to close a commissary store, including when the assessment is undertaken as a result of the closure or realignment of a military installation under a base closure law.

''(d) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—The closure of a commissary store shall not take effect until the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date on which the Secretary of Defense submits to Congress written notice of the reasons supporting the closure. The written notice shall include an assessment of the impact closure will have on the quality of life for military patrons and the welfare and security of the military community in which the commissary is located.'';

(4) by inserting sections 2483 and 2484, as redesignated by paragraph (2), after section 2482, as added by paragraph (3);

(5) in section 2484, as redesignated by paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking subsections (a), (b), (c), and (g);

(B) by redesignating subsections (d), (e), and (f) as subsections (f), (g), and (h), respectively;

(C) by inserting before subsection (f), as so redesignated, the following new subsections:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—As provided in section 2481(a) of this title, commissary stores are intended to be similar to commercial grocery stores and may sell merchandise similar to that sold in commercial grocery stores. The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the design and format of commissary stores are consistent with modern grocery store stockage and format.

''(b) REQUIRED COMMISSARY MERCHANDISE CATEGORIES.—Merchandise sold in, at, or by commissary stores shall include items in the following categories:

''(1) Meat, poultry, and seafood.

''(2) Nonalcoholic beverages.

''(3) Produce.

''(4) Grocery food, whether stored chilled, frozen, or at room temperature.

''(5) Dairy products.

''(6) Bakery and delicatessen items.

''(7) Nonfood grocery items.

''(8) Health and beauty aids.

''(9) Magazines and periodicals.

''(10) Telephone cards, greeting cards, and film and one-time use cameras.

''(c) INCLUSION OF GENERAL MERCHANDISE ITEMS.—(1) Among the various defense retail systems—

''(A) commissary stores shall be the primary Department of Defense-operated store for the sale of items described in paragraphs (1) through (7) of subsection (b); and

''(B) exchange stores shall continue to maintain the exclusive right to operate convenience stores, shopettes, and troop stores, including such stores established to support contingency operations.

''(2) Merchandise sold in commissary stores may include such general merchandise items as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, except that the Secretary may not exclude seasonal items, tobacco products, pet supplies, batteries, potted plants and floral bouquets, women's hosiery, and school supplies, to the extent such products have been available in commissary stores before June 1, 2004, unless the Secretary determines that space or other considerations preclude the sale of all or some of the specified items. The Secretary shall provide notice to Congress of any reduction in the availability of such items at least 30 days before the reduction takes effect.

''(3) A military exchange may be considered as the vendor for the purchase of tobacco products, greeting cards, and film and one-time use cameras and shall serve as the vendor for telephone cards. Subsections (e) and (f) shall not apply to the pricing of such an item when a military exchange serves as the vendor of the item. Commissary store and exchange prices shall be comparable for such an item.

''(4) During the two-year period ending March 31, 2007, the Secretary shall maintain sales data for commissary stores and exchange stores regarding the items identified in subsection (b)(10). Not later than August 1, 2007, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report containing such sales data.

''(d) EXCLUDED GOODS OR SERVICES.—Commissary stores shall not offer film development services.

''(e) UNIFORM SALES PRICE SURCHARGE.—The Secretary of Defense shall apply a uniform surcharge equal to not more than five percent on the sales prices established under subsection (f) for each item of merchandise sold in, at, or by commissary stores.'';

(D) in subsection (f), as so redesignated, by striking ''(consistent with this section and section 2685 of this title)'' in paragraph (1);

(E) in subsection (h), as so redesignated, by striking ''Subsections (c) and (d)'' and inserting ''Subsections (e) and (f)''; and

(F) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(i) USE OF SURCHARGE FOR CONSTRUCTION, REPAIR, IMPROVEMENT, AND MAINTENANCE.—(1)(A) The Secretary of Defense may use the proceeds from the surcharges imposed under subsection (e) only—

''(i) to acquire (including acquisition by lease), construct, convert, expand, improve, repair, maintain, and equip the physical infrastructure of commissary stores and central product processing facilities of the defense commissary system; and

''(ii) to cover environmental evaluation and construction costs related to activities described in clause (i), including costs for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and design.

''(B) In subparagraph (A), the term 'physical infrastructure' includes real property, utilities, and equipment (installed and free standing and including computer equipment), necessary to provide a complete and usable commissary store or central product processing facility.

''(2)(A) The Secretary of Defense may authorize a nonappropriated fund instrumentality of the United States to enter into a contract for construction of a shopping mall or similar facility for a commissary store and one or more nonappropriated fund instrumentality activities. The Secretary may use the proceeds of surcharges under subsection (e) to reimburse the nonappropriated fund instrumentality for the portion of the cost of the contract that is attributable to construction of the commissary store or to pay the contractor directly for that portion of such cost.

''(B) In subparagraph (A), the term 'construction', with respect to a facility, includes acquisition, conversion, expansion, installation, or other improvement of the facility.

''(3) The Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, may obligate anticipated proceeds from the surcharges under subsection (e) for any use specified in paragraph (1) or (2), without regard to fiscal year limitations, if the Secretary determines that such obligation is necessary to carry out any use of such adjustments or surcharges specified in such paragraph.

''(4) Revenues received by the Secretary of Defense from the following sources or activities of commissary store facilities shall be available for the purposes set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3):

''(A) Sale of recyclable materials.

''(B) Sale of excess and surplus property.

''(C) License fees.

''(D) Royalties.

''(E) Fees paid by sources of products in order to obtain favorable display of the products for resale, known as business related management fees.'';

(6) by inserting section 2485, as redesignated by paragraph (2), after section 2484, as amended by paragraph (5); and

(7) in section 2485, as redesignated by paragraph (2)—

(A) in subsection (a)(2), by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''Until December 31, 2009, the Defense Commissary Agency is not required to conduct any cost-comparison study under the policies and procedures of Office of Management and Budget Circular A–76 relating to the possible contracting out of commissary store functions.'';

(B) in subsection (b)(2), by striking ''section 2484'' and inserting ''section 2483'';

(C) in subsection (c)(2), by adding at the end the following new sentences: ''The chairman of the governing board shall be a commissioned officer or member of the senior executive service who has demonstrated experience or knowledge relevant to the management of the defense commissary system. In selecting other members of the governing board, the Secretary shall give priority to persons with experience related to logistics, military personnel, military entitlements or other experiences of value of management of commissaries.''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(d) ASSIGNMENT OF ACTIVE DUTY MEMBERS.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), members of the armed forces on active duty may not be assigned to the operation of a commissary store.

''(2)(A) The Secretary of Defense may assign an officer on the active-duty list to serve as the Director of the Defense Commissary Agency.

''(B) Not more than 18 members (in addition to the officer referred to in subparagraph (A)) of the armed forces on active duty may be assigned to the Defense Commissary Agency. Members who may be assigned under this subparagraph to regional headquarters of the agency shall be limited to enlisted members assigned to duty as advisers in the regional headquarters responsible for overseas commissaries and to veterinary specialists.

''(e) REIMBURSEMENT FOR USE OF COMMISSARY FACILITIES BY MILITARY DEPARTMENTS.—(1) The Secretary of a military department shall pay the Defense Commissary Agency the amount determined under paragraph (2) for any use of a commissary facility by the military department for a purpose other than commissary sales or operations in support of commissary sales.

''(2) The amount payable under paragraph (1) for use of a commissary facility by a military department shall be equal to the share of depreciation of the facility that is attributable to that use, as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

''(3) The Director of the Defense Commissary Agency shall credit amounts paid under paragraph (1) for use of a facility to an appropriate account to which proceeds of a surcharge applied under section 2484(e) of this title are credited.

''(4) This subsection applies with respect to a commissary facility that is acquired, constructed, converted, expanded, installed, or otherwise improved (in whole or in part) with the proceeds of a surcharge applied under section 2484(e) of this title.

''(f) DONATION OF UNUSABLE FOOD.—(1) The Secretary of Defense may donate food described in paragraph (2) to any of the following entities:

''(A) A charitable nonprofit food bank that is designated by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of Health and Human Services as authorized to receive such donations.

''(B) A State or local agency that is designated by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of Health and Human Services as authorized to receive such donations.

''(C) A chapter or other local unit of a recognized national veterans organization that provides services to persons without adequate shelter and is designated by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs as authorized to receive such donations.

''(D) A not-for-profit organization that provides care for homeless veterans and is designated by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs as authorized to receive such donations.

''(2) Food that may be donated under this subsection is commissary store food, mess food, meals ready-to-eat (MREs), rations known as humanitarian daily rations (HDRs), and other food available to the Secretary of Defense that—

''(A) is certified as edible by appropriate food inspection technicians;

''(B) would otherwise be destroyed as unusable; and

''(C) in the case of commissary store food, is unmarketable and unsaleable.

''(3) In the case of commissary store food, a donation under this subsection shall take place at the site of the commissary store that is donating the food.

''(4) This subsection does not authorize any service (including transportation) to be provided in connection with a donation under this subsection.

''(g) COLLECTION OF DISHONORED CHECKS.—(1) The Secretary of Defense may impose a charge for the collection of a check accepted at a commissary store that is not honored by the financial institution on which the check is drawn. The imposition and amounts of charges shall be consistent with practices of commercial grocery stores regarding dishonored checks.

''(2)(A) The following persons are liable to the United States for the amount of a check referred to in paragraph (1) that is returned unpaid to the United States, together with any charge imposed under that paragraph:

''(i) The person who presented the check.

''(ii) Any person whose status and relationship to the person who presented the check provide the basis for that person's eligibility to make purchases at a commissary store.

''(B) Any amount for which a person is liable under subparagraph (A) may be collected by deducting and withholding such amount from any amounts payable to that person by the United States.

''(3) Amounts collected as charges imposed under paragraph (1) shall be credited to the commissary trust revolving fund.

''(4) Appropriated funds may be used to pay any costs incurred in the collection of checks and charges referred to in paragraph (1). An appropriation account charged a cost under the preceding sentence shall be reimbursed the amount of that cost out of funds in the commissary trust revolving fund.

''(5) In this subsection, the term 'commissary trust revolving fund' means the trust revolving fund maintained by the Department of Defense for surcharge collections and proceeds of sales of commissary stores.

''(h) RELEASE OF CERTAIN COMMERCIALLY VALUABLE INFORMATION TO PUBLIC.—(1) The Secretary of Defense may limit the release to the public of any information described in paragraph (2) if the Secretary determines that it is in the best interest of the Department of Defense to limit the release of such information. If the Secretary determines to limit the release of any such information, the Secretary may provide for limited release of such information in accordance with paragraph (3).

''(2) Paragraph (1) applies to the following:

''(A) Information contained in the computerized business systems of commissary stores or the Defense Commissary Agency that is collected through or in connection with the use of electronic scanners in commissary stores, including the following information:

''(i) Data relating to sales of goods or services.

''(ii) Demographic information on customers.

''(iii) Any other information pertaining to commissary transactions and operations.

''(B) Business programs, systems, and applications (including software) relating to commissary operations that were developed with funding derived from commissary surcharges.

''(3)(A) The Secretary of Defense may, using competitive procedures, enter into a contract to sell information described in paragraph (2).

''(B) The Secretary of Defense may release, without charge, information on an item sold in commissary stores to the manufacturer or producer of that item or an agent of the manufacturer or producer.

''(C) The Secretary of Defense may, by contract entered into with a business, grant to the business a license to use business programs referred to in paragraph (2)(B), including software used in or comprising any such program. The fee charged for the license shall be based on the costs of similar programs developed and marketed by businesses in the private sector, determined by means of surveys.

''(D) Each contract entered into under this paragraph shall specify the amount to be paid for information released or a license granted under the contract, as the case may be.

''(4) Information described in paragraph (2) may not be released, under paragraph (3) or otherwise, in a form that identifies any customer or that provides information making it possible to identify any customer.

''(5) Amounts received by the Secretary under this section shall be credited to funds derived from commissary surcharges applied under section 2484(e) of this title, shall be merged with those funds, and shall be available for the same purposes as the funds with which merged.''.

(b) RELATION BETWEEN DEFENSE COMMISSARY AND EXCHANGE SYSTEMS.—Chapter 147 of title 10, United States Code, is further amended—

(1) by inserting after section 2485, as amended by subsection (a)(7), the following:

''SUBCHAPTER II—RELATIONSHIP, CONTINUATION, AND COMMON POLICIES OF DEFENSE COMMISSARY AND EXCHANGE SYSTEMS

''Sec.
''2487. Existence and purpose of defense commissary system.
''2488. Combined exchange and commissary stores.
''2489. Overseas commissary and exchange stores: access and purchase restrictions.

''§2487. Relationship between defense commissary system and exchange stores system

''(a) SEPARATE SYSTEMS.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the defense commissary system and the exchange stores system shall be operated as separate systems of the Department of Defense.

''(2) Paragraph (1) does not apply to the following:

''(A) Combined exchange and commissary stores operated under the authority provided by section 2489 of this title.

''(B) NEXMART stores of the Navy Exchange Service Command established before October 1, 2003.

''(b) CONSOLIDATION OR OTHER ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGES OF DEFENSE RETAIL SYSTEMS.—(1) The operation and administration of the defense retail systems may not be consolidated or otherwise merged unless the consolidation or merger is specifically authorized by an Act of Congress.

''(2) In this subsection, the term 'defense retail systems' means the defense commissary system and exchange stores system and other revenue-generating facilities operated by nonappropriated fund instrumentalities of the Department of Defense for the morale, welfare, and recreation of members of the armed forces'';

(2) by redesignating sections 2488, 2489, 2489a as sections 2495, 2495a, and 2495b, respectively; and

(3) by redesignating sections 2490a and 2492 as sections 2488 and 2489, respectively, and inserting such sections after section 2487, as added by paragraph (1).

(c) MWR PROGRAMS AND NONAPPROPRIATED FUND INSTRUMENTALITIES.—Chapter 147 of title 10, United States Code, is further amended—

(1) by inserting after section 2489, as redesignated and moved by subsection (b)(3), the following:

''SUBCHAPTER III—MORALE, WELFARE, AND RECREATION PROGRAMS AND NONAPPROPRIATED FUND INSTRUMENTALITIES

''Sec.
''2491. Uniform funding and management of morale, welfare, and recreation programs.
''2491a. Department of Defense golf courses: limitation on use of appropriated funds.
''2491b. Use of appropriated funds for operation of Armed Forces Recreation Center, Europe: limitation.
''2491c. Retention of morale, welfare, and recreation funds by military installations: limitation.
''2492. Nonappropriated fund instrumentalities: contracts with other agencies and instrumentalities to provide and obtain goods and services.
''2493. Fisher Houses: administration as nonappropriated fund instrumentality.
''2494. Nonappropriated fund instrumentalities: furnishing utility services for morale, welfare, and recreation purposes.
''2495. Nonappropriated fund instrumentalities: purchase of alcoholic beverages.
''2495a. Overseas package stores: treatment of United States wines.
''2495b. Sale or rental of sexually explicit material prohibited.'';

(2) by redesignating section 2494 as section 2491 and inserting such section after the table of sections at the beginning of subchapter III, as added by paragraph (1);

(3) by redesignating section 2482a as section 2492 and inserting such section before section 2493;

(4) by inserting after section 2493 the following new section:

''§2494. Nonappropriated fund instrumentalities: furnishing utility services for morale, welfare, and recreation purposes

''Appropriations for the Department of Defense may be used to provide utility services for—

''(1) buildings on military installations authorized by regulation to be used for morale, welfare, and recreation purposes; and

''(2) other morale, welfare, and recreation activities for members of the armed forces.''; and

(5) by inserting sections 2495, 2495a, and 2495b, as redesignated by subsection (b)(2), after section 2494, as added by paragraph (4).

(d) INCLUSION OF OTHER TITLE 10 PROVISIONS.—Sections 2246, 2247, and 2219 of title 10, United States Code, are—

(1) transferred to chapter 147 of such title;

(2) inserted after section 2491, as redesignated and moved by subsection (c)(2); and

(3) redesignated as sections 2491a, 2491b, and 2491c, respectively.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Section 977 of title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

(2) Section 2868 of such title is amended by striking ''for—'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''for buildings constructed at private cost, as authorized by law.''.

(3) Section 367 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261; 112 Stat. 1987; 10 U.S.C. 2482 note) is repealed.

(f) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—(1) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 49 of title

10, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 977.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 132 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 2219.

(3) The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter I of chapter 134 of such title is amended by striking the items relating to sections 2246 and 2247.

SEC. 652. CONSISTENT STATE TREATMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE NONAPPROPRIATED FUND HEALTH BENEFITS PROGRAM.

Section 349 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103–337; 108 Stat. 2727) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) TREATMENT OF PROGRAM AS FEDERAL HEALTH BENEFIT PROGRAM.—(1) No State tax, fee, other monetary payment, or State health plan requirement, may be imposed, directly or indirectly, on the Nonappropriated Fund Uniform Health Benefits Program of the Department of Defense, or on a carrier or an underwriting or plan administration contractor of the Program, to the same extent as such prohibition applies to the health insurance program authorized by chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, under section 8909(f) of such title.

''(2) Paragraph (1) shall not be construed to exempt the Nonappropriated Fund Uniform Health Benefits Program of the Department of Defense, or any carrier or underwriting or plan administration contractor of the Program from the imposition, payment, or collection of a tax, fee, or other monetary payment on the net income or profit accruing to, or realized by, the Program or by such carrier or contractor from business conducted under the Program, so long as the tax, fee, or payment is applicable to a broad range of business activity.

''(3) In this section, the term 'State' means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and any political subdivision or other non-Federal authority thereof.''.

SEC. 653. COOPERATION AND ASSISTANCE FOR QUALIFIED SCOUTING ORGANIZATIONS SERVING DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OVERSEAS.

(a) AUTHORITY TO COOPERATE AND PROVIDE ASSISTANCE.—Subsection (a) of section 2606 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''Subject to subsection (b)'' and inserting ''In the interest of promoting the recognized morale, welfare, and recreation of members of the armed forces''; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''and may'' and all that follows through ''armed forces''.

(b) TREATMENT OF ORGANIZATIONS AND EMPLOYEES.—Such section is further amended—

(1) by striking subsections (e) and (f);

(2) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsections:

''(c) TREATMENT AS NONAPPROPRIATED FUND INSTRUMENTALITIES.—(1) Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), to the extent a qualified scouting organization is providing services for members of the armed forces and their dependents, or civilian employees of the Department of Defense and their dependents, at a location outside the United States consistent with the regulations prescribed under subsection (b), the qualified scouting organization shall be a nonappropriated fund instrumentality of the Department of Defense.

''(2) Notwithstanding treatment as a nonappropriated fund instrumentality of the Department of Defense, personnel of the qualified scouting organization who are performing duties in connection with cooperation and assistance provided under subsection (a) may continue such policies and procedures related to personnel management and such other policies or procedures established by the qualified scouting organization as the personnel consider appropriate, subject to the approval of the qualified scouting organization.

''(3) A qualified scouting organization operating outside the United States may operate as a private association overseas for the purpose of raising funds. Any funds so raised may not be commingled with amounts retained in a nonappropriated morale, welfare, and recreation account of the Department of Defense.

''(d) TREATMENT AS NONAPPROPRIATED FUND INSTRUMENTALITY EMPLOYEES.—(1) Personnel of a qualified scouting organization who are performing duties in connection with cooperation and assistance provided under subsection (a) for members of the armed forces and their dependents, or civilian employees of the Department of Defense and their dependents, shall be nonappropriated fund instrumentality employees of the United States for any period during which the personnel perform such duties.

''(2) Such personnel of a qualified scouting organization shall receive the same benefits, entitlements, and logistical support as other nonappropriated fund instrumentality employees, except that such personnel—

''(A) shall be allowed to decline to participate in retirement programs or other personnel management policies or procedures available to other nonappropriated fund instrumentality employees and elect to continue the programs, policies or procedures made available by the qualified scouting organization; and

''(B) shall not receive nonappropriated fund instrumentality employment credit nor rehire priority.

''(3) In the regulations prescribed under subsection (b), the Secretary of Defense may authorize the use of funds appropriated to the Department of Defense to pay costs of such personnel of a qualified scouting organization, including reimbursement of the personnel or the qualified scouting organization, in the case of those retirement, personnel management, and other compensation programs regarding which the personnel have elected to continue the programs made available to them by the qualified scouting organization.''.

(c) CONFORMING AND CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—Such section is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting ''AUTHORITY TO COOPERATE AND PROVIDE ASSISTANCE.—'' after ''(a)'';

(2) in subsection (c), by inserting ''BASIS FOR COOPERATION AND ASSISTANCE.—'';

(3) in subsection (e), as redesignated by subsection (b)(2)—

(A) by inserting ''PROVISION OF TRANSPORTATION, SPACE, AND SERVICES.—'' after ''(e)''; and

(B) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting '', using the authority of subsection (d)(3)'' after ''furnished'';

(4) in subsection (f), as redesignated by subsection (b)(2), by inserting ''TRANSPORTATION OF SUPPLIES.—'' after ''(f)''; and

(5) in subsection (g), by inserting ''DEFINITION.—'' after ''(g)''.

Subtitle F—Other Matters

SEC. 661. REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT THAT MEMBERS ENTITLED TO BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE PAY SUBSISTENCE CHARGES WHILE HOSPITALIZED.

(a) REPEAL.—(1) Section 1075 of title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 55 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 1075.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT REGARDING MILITARY-CIVILIAN HEALTH SERVICES PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.—Section 1096(c) of such title is amended—

(1) by inserting ''who is a dependent'' after ''covered beneficiary''; and

(2) by striking ''shall pay'' and all that follows through the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting ''shall pay the charges prescribed by section 1078 of this title.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 662. CLARIFICATION OF EDUCATION LOANS QUALIFYING FOR EDUCATION LOAN REPAYMENT PROGRAM FOR RESERVE COMPONENT HEALTH PROFESSIONS OFFICERS.

Section 16302(a)(5) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''a basic professional qualifying degree (as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense) or graduate education in'' after ''regarding''.

SEC. 663. SURVEY AND ANALYSIS OF EFFECT OF EXTENDED AND FREQUENT MOBILIZATION OF RESERVISTS FOR ACTIVE DUTY SERVICE ON RESERVIST INCOME.

(a) SURVEY OF MOBILIZED RESERVISTS TO DETERMINE DIFFERENTIAL BETWEEN PRIVATE SECTOR INCOME AND MILITARY COMPENSATION.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a survey involving members of the reserve components who serve, or have served, on active duty in support of a contingency operation at any time during the period beginning on September 11, 2001, and ending on September 30, 2005, to determine the extent to which such members sustained a reduction in monthly income during the period of the active duty service compared to the average monthly civilian income of the members during the 12 months preceding their mobilization.

(2) At least 50 percent of the total number of members of the reserve components who have served on active duty in support of a contingency operation at any time during the period specified in paragraph (1) shall be included in the survey.

(b) CALCULATION OF INCOME DIFFERENTIAL.—For each member surveyed under subsection (a) who reports that total monthly military compensation during the active duty service of the member was less, or appeared to be less, than the average monthly civilian income of the member, the Secretary of Defense, in cooperation with the member, shall calculate the monthly active-duty income differential for the member.

(c) DEFINITIONS USED IN CONDUCTING SURVEY AND CALCULATIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''monthly active-duty income differential'', with respect to a member of a reserve component surveyed under subsection (a), means the difference between—

(A) the average monthly civilian income of the member; and

(B) the total monthly military compensation of the member.

(2) The term ''average monthly civilian income'', with respect to a member of a reserve component surveyed under subsection (a), means the amount, determined by the Secretary of Defense, of the earned income of the member for the 12 months preceding the first mobilization of the member during the period specified in subsection (a)(1), divided by 12.

(3) The term ''total monthly military compensation'', with respect to a member of a reserve component surveyed under subsection (a), means the amount, computed on a monthly basis, of the sum of—

(A) the amount of the regular military compensation (RMC), as defined in section 101(25) of title 37, United States Code, of the member during the period specified in subsection (a)(1); and

(B) any amount of special pay or incentive pay and any allowance (other than an allowance included in regular military compensation) that is paid to the member on a monthly basis during the period specified in subsection (a)(1).

(d) COLLECTION OF DEMOGRAPHIC DATA.—The Secretary of Defense shall collect demographic

data regarding each member of a reserve component surveyed under subsection (a), including, at a minimum, data on the following:

(1) Reserve component.

(2) Unit of assignment.

(3) Grade.

(4) Age.

(5) Years of service.

(6) Sex.

(7) Marital status.

(8) Number of dependents.

(9) General category of private-sector employment, as determined by the Secretary, but to include an employment category to cover members who are self-employed.

(10) Military occupational specialty, including specifying all surveyed members who are serving in a critical wartime specialty.

(11) Length of service on active duty during the most recent mobilization.

(12) Number of times mobilized since September 11, 2001.

(e) EFFECT OF INCOME LOSS ON RETENTION.—The Secretary of Defense shall include in the survey a question to solicit information from each member of a reserve component surveyed under subsection (a) regarding the likely effect of a reoccurring monthly active-duty income differential for the member while serving on active duty on the decision of the member to remain in the reserve component.

(f) ANALYSIS OF SURVEY DATA.—(1) At a minimum, the Secretary of Defense shall determine, for each variable listed in paragraphs (2) through (12) of subsection (d), the number of members of the reserve components surveyed under subsection (a) who sustained a monthly active-duty income differential for any month during their active duty service and compare and contrast that number with the number of members who did not experience a monthly active-duty income differential.

(2) The Secretary shall also determine the average amount of the active-duty income differential by reserve component for each variable within the characteristics listed in paragraphs (2) through (12) of subsection (d).

(g) SUBMISSION OF SURVEY RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than January 31, 2006, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress and the Comptroller General a report containing the results of the surveys conducted under subsection (a), including the results of the analysis of survey data required by subsection (e). The Secretary shall include such recommendations as the Secretary considers appropriate regarding alternatives for restoring income lost by members of the reserve components who sustained a monthly active-duty income differential during their active duty service.

(h) COMPTROLLER GENERAL EVALUATION.—Not later than March 31, 2006, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress an assessment of the findings and recommendations contained in the report of the Secretary of Defense submitted under subsection (g).

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Enhanced Benefits for Reserves

SEC. 701. DEMONSTRATION PROJECT FOR TRICARE COVERAGE FOR READY RESERVE MEMBERS.

(a) DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—Section 1076b of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1076b. TRICARE demonstration project: coverage for members of the Ready Reserve

''(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a demonstration project beginning in fiscal year 2005 to test whether TRICARE coverage for certain Ready Reserve members and their families enhances medical readiness and retention of such members.

''(2) Under the demonstration project required by paragraph (1), within the scope of the project, as established by the Secretary, members of the Ready Reserve may be allowed to enroll for coverage under the TRICARE Standard option of the TRICARE program and receive benefits under such enrollment for any period that the member—

''(A) is not eligible for health care benefits under an employer-sponsored health benefits plan; and

''(B) either—

''(i) is not on active duty; or

''(ii) is on active duty but under a call or order to active duty for a period of 30 days or less.

''(3) A member allowed to enroll in TRICARE Standard under the demonstration project may enroll for self-only coverage or self and family coverage.

''(b) SCOPE OF COVERAGE .—A member and the dependents of a member enrolled in TRICARE Standard under this section shall be entitled to the same benefits and shall pay the same charges as are provided under section 1079 of this title.

''(c) PREMIUMS.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall charge premiums for coverage pursuant to enrollments under this section. The Secretary shall prescribe a premium for self only coverage and a premium for self and family coverage.

''(2) The monthly amount of the premium in effect for a month for a type of coverage under this section shall be the amount equal to 28 percent of the total amount determined by the Secretary on an appropriate actuarial basis as being reasonable for the coverage.

''(3) The premiums payable by a member under this subsection may be deducted and withheld from basic pay payable to the member under section 204 of title 37 or from compensation payable to the member under section 206 of such title. The Secretary shall prescribe the requirements and procedures applicable to the payment of premiums by members not entitled to such basic pay or compensation.

''(4) Amounts collected as premiums under this subsection shall be credited to the appropriation available for the Defense Health Program Account under section 1100 of this title, shall be merged with sums in such Account that are available for the fiscal year in which collected, and shall be available under subparagraph (B) of such section for such fiscal year.

''(d) CONDITIONS OF ELIGIBILITY.—(1) The Secretary of Defense may establish other conditions of eligibility, including requiring a member to submit any certification that the Secretary considers appropriate to substantiate the member's assertion that the member is not eligible for health care benefits under any other health benefits plan.

''(2) In the case of any member who is self-employed and not eligible for coverage under any other employer-sponsored health benefits plan, the member shall not be considered eligible to enroll under this section if the member's income in the prior calendar year exceeded $40,000.

''(e) SCOPE AND TERMS OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—The geographic scope and priorities for enrollment under the demonstration program, if any, shall be established by the Secretary of Defense. The Secretary may establish such other terms and conditions for the demonstration project required by subsection (a) as the Secretary determines appropriate to accomplish its purposes.

''(f) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—An enrollment in TRICARE under this section may not continue after December 31, 2007.

''(g) EVALUATION OF DEMONSTRATION AND REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than March 1, 2007, the Secretary shall provide to Congress a report on the results of the demonstration project required by this section. Such report shall include an analysis of the impact of the demonstration on medical readiness and retention of the members who enrolled, an assessment of the costs and benefits of any improvements in medical readiness or retention, and recommendations concerning TRICARE Standard coverage for Ready Reserve members.

''(h) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'TRICARE Standard' means the option of the TRICARE program that is also known as the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services, as defined in section 1072(4) of this title.''.

(b) TERMINATION OF COVERAGE UNDER SUPERSEDED PROVISION OF LAW.—An enrollment in TRICARE under section 1076b of title 10, United States Code, as in effect before the date of the enactment of this Act may not continue after such date.

(c) SITE IDENTIFICATION.—(1) Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, shall identify not less than 10 sites that meet the criteria specified in paragraph (2) for the conduct of the demonstration project required under section 1076b of title 10, United States Code, as amended by this section.

(2) For purposes of paragraph (1), the sites selected for the conduct of the demonstration project shall be areas of the United States that include a substantial number of personnel expected to be ordered to active duty for a period of more than 30 days.

(d) INDEPENDENT EVALUATION AND REPORTS.—(1) The Comptroller General shall conduct an evaluation of the demonstration project required under section 1076b of title 10, United States Code (as amended by this section) The evaluation shall include an assessment of the following:

(A) Compliance by the Department of Defense with the requirements under section 1076b of title 10, United States Code (as amended by this section).

(B) A description of the effects of the demonstration project on medical readiness and retention of the participants compared to nonparticipants.

(C) The number of Ready Reserve members and their dependents opting to participate in the demonstration project.

(D) An analysis of how the demonstration project affects the overall accessibility of care in the direct and purchased care systems and a description of the unintended effects (if any) upon the normal treatment priority system.

(E) A description of the difficulties (if any) experienced by the Department of Defense in managing the demonstration project.

(F) Any impact of the demonstration project on employers, including causing them to discontinue health care insurance benefits for employees who are members of the reserves.

(G) A recommendation whether to extend the demonstration project or make the project permanent.

(H) A determination of whether the terms and conditions of the demonstration project should be continued or modified if the project is extended or expanded.

(I) Implications on cost, medical readiness, recruitment, and retention if the demonstration project was made available to all reservists meeting the enrollment criteria throughout the United States and its territories.

(J) Any additional elements that the Comptroller General determines are appropriate to assess the demonstration project.

(2) The Comptroller General shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives—

(A) an interim report on the evaluation under this section not later than 12 months after the date on which the demonstration project begins operation; and

(B) a final report on the evaluation under this section not later than March 1, 2007.

SEC. 702. COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT ON THE COST AND FEASIBILITY OF PROVIDING PRIVATE HEALTH INSURANCE STIPENDS FOR MEMBERS OF THE READY RESERVES.

(a) STUDY REQUIRED.—The Comptroller General shall conduct a study on the cost and feasibility of providing a stipend to members of the

Ready Reserves to offset the cost of continuing private health insurance coverage for the member's dependents when the member is on active duty for a period of more than 30 days, with the dependents being ineligible to enroll in the TRICARE program and payment of the stipend ending when the member is no longer on active duty.

(b) MATTERS COVERED.—The study shall include the following matters:

(1) Recommendation for a benefit amount and cost to the Department of Defense.

(2) Potential effects on medical readiness, recruitment, and retention.

(3) The extent to which the Reserves and members of their families might participate under the stipend program.

(4) Administrative and management considerations for the Department of Defense.

(5) Impact of pre-existing conditions on continuity of care for dependents.

(6) Possible implications for employers.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than March 31, 2005, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a report containing the results of the study under this section.

SEC. 703. IMPROVEMENT OF MEDICAL SERVICES FOR ACTIVATED MEMBERS OF THE READY RESERVE AND THEIR FAMILIES.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR TRICARE COVERAGE FOR DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF RESERVE COMPONENTS CALLED TO ACTIVE DUTY.—Paragraph (1) of section 1074(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''a dependent of'' after ''chapter,'';

(2) by inserting ''a dependent of a member'' after ''treated as being''; and

(3) by striking ''the later of'' and all that follows through the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting ''the date described in paragraph (3).''.

(b) AUTHORITY FOR TRICARE COVERAGE FOR MEMBERS OF RESERVE COMPONENTS CALLED TO ACTIVE DUTY.—Section 1074(d) of such title is further amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (3);

(2) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (4); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraphs:

''(2) The Secretary of Defense may, beginning on the date described in paragraph (3), provide a member of a reserve component of the armed forces who is issued a delayed-effective-date active-duty order, or is covered by such an order, such medical and dental care (in addition to care for which the member is eligible under section 1074a(f) of this title or other provisions of law) the Secretary determines appropriate.

''(3) The date referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) with respect to a member is the later of the date that is—

''(A) the date of the issuance of the delayed-effective-date active-duty order; or

''(B) 90 days before the date on which the period of active duty is to commence under such order for that member.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on January 1, 2005.

SEC. 704. MODIFICATION OF WAIVER OF CERTAIN DEDUCTIBLES UNDER TRICARE PROGRAM.

Section 1095d(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended in paragraphs (1) and (2) by striking ''less than one year'' each place it appears and inserting ''more than 30 days''.

SEC. 705. AUTHORITY FOR PAYMENT BY UNITED STATES OF ADDITIONAL AMOUNTS BILLED BY HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS TO ACTIVATED RESERVE MEMBERS.

Section 1079(h) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of paragraph (4) the following new subparagraph:

''(C) In the case of services billed to a dependent referred to in subsection (a) of a member of a reserve component who is ordered to active duty for a period of more than 30 days in support of a contingency operation under a provision of law referred to in section 101(a)(13)(B) of this title, the regulations shall provide that, in addition to amounts otherwise payable by the United States, the Secretary may pay the amount referred to in subparagraph (B)(i) for the services.''.

SEC. 706. EXTENSION OF TRANSITIONAL HEALTH CARE BENEFITS AFTER SEPARATION FROM ACTIVE DUTY.

(a) EXTENSION OF TRANSITIONAL HEALTH CARE BENEFITS.—Paragraph (3) of section 1145(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(3) Transitional health care shall be available under this subsection for a period beginning on the date on which the member is separated from active duty and ending on the earlier of—

''(A) 180 days after the date on which the member is separated from active duty; or

''(B) the date on which the member and dependents of the member are covered by a health plan sponsored by an employer.''.

(b) LIMITATION.—During the period beginning on January 1, 2005, and ending on September 30, 2005, not more than $170,000,000 of the amount appropriated pursuant to the authorization for operations and maintenance for the Defense Health Program in section 303(a) may be used for transitional health care under section 1145(a) of title 10, United States Code, as amended by this section.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to separations from active duty that take effect on or after January 1, 2005.

Subtitle B—Other Benefits Improvements

SEC. 711. COVERAGE OF CERTAIN YOUNG CHILDREN UNDER TRICARE DENTAL PROGRAM.

(a) COVERAGE OF CERTAIN YOUNG CHILDREN.—Section 1076a(k)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after ''by reason of'' the following: ''the dependent's young age on the date of death of the member of''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 712. COMPTROLLER GENERAL REPORT ON PROVISION OF HEALTH AND SUPPORT SERVICES FOR EXCEPTIONAL FAMILY MEMBER PROGRAM ENROLLEES.

(a) EVALUATION REQUIREMENT.—The Comptroller General shall evaluate the effect of the Exceptional Family Member Program (in this section referred to as ''EFMP'') on health and support services in selected civilian communities near military installations with a high concentration of EFMP enrollees.

(b) MATTERS COVERED.—The evaluation under subsection (a) shall include a discussion of the following:

(1) Communities that have high concentrations of EFMP enrollees that use State and local health and support services.

(2) Needs of EFMP enrollees, if any, that are not met by State and local health and support services.

(3) The burdens, financial and otherwise, placed on State and local health and support services by EFMP enrollees and their families.

(4) The ability of the TRICARE program to meet the needs of EFMP enrollees and their families.

(5) Reasons for any limitations of the TRICARE program, the EFMP, and State and local health and support services in providing assistance to EFMP enrollees and their families.

(6) Recommendations for more effectively meeting the needs of EFMP enrollees and their families.

(c) COMMUNITIES COVERED.—The evaluation under subsection (a) shall examine no fewer than four civilian communities, as determined by the Comptroller General, that have high concentrations of EFMP enrollees and that are near several military installations, including at least two military installations with tenants from more than one of the Armed Forces.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''health and support services'' means services provided to children and other dependents with special needs, including specialized day care, mental health day treatment services, respite services, counseling, and other such services provided for children and other dependents with special needs.

(2) The term ''TRICARE program'' has the meaning given that term in section 1072(7) of title 10, United States Code.

(e) REPORT.—Not later than March 31, 2005, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the results of the evaluation required under subsection (a), with findings and recommendations.

SEC. 713. EXCEPTIONAL ELIGIBILITY FOR TRICARE PRIME REMOTE.

Section 1079(p) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

''(4) The Secretary of Defense may provide for coverage of a dependent referred to in subsection (a) who is not described in paragraph (3) if the Secretary determines that exceptional circumstances warrant such coverage.''.

SEC. 714. TRANSITION TO HOME HEALTH CARE BENEFIT UNDER SUB-ACUTE CARE PROGRAM.

Section 1074j of title 10, United States Code, is amended in subsection (b)(3)—

(1) by inserting ''(A)'' after ''(3)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) The Secretary of Defense shall establish procedures for the transition to and implementation of the home health care benefit required by subparagraph (A). The Secretary may provide in such procedures that covered beneficiaries who, before the implementation of such benefit, received home health care under this chapter in excess of such benefit, may continue to receive such care for such time as the Secretary considers appropriate.''.

SEC. 715. REQUIREMENT RELATING TO PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFITS FOR MEDICARE-ELIGIBLE ENROLLEES UNDER DEFENSE HEALTH CARE PLANS.

Section 1074g(a)(6) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(A)'' after ''(6)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) For a medicare-eligible beneficiary, the cost-sharing requirements may not be in excess of the cost-sharing requirements applicable to all other beneficiaries covered by section 1086 of this title. For purposes of the preceding sentence, a medicare-eligible beneficiary is a beneficiary eligible for health benefits under section 1086 of this title pursuant to subsection (d)(2) of such section.''.

SEC. 716. PROFESSIONAL ACCREDITATION OF MILITARY DENTISTS.

Section 1077(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''A'' and inserting ''(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), a''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2)(A) Dependents who have not attained age 13 and who are participating under a dental plan established under section 1076a of this title may be treated by post-graduate dental students in eligible dental treatment facilities if—

''(i)(I) treatment of pediatric dental patients is required to comply with American Dental Association accreditation standards; or

''(II) pediatric dental training is required to enable post-graduate dental students to provide dental care for such dependents outside the United States; and

''(ii) there are insufficient numbers of children eligible to be provided dental care under section 1076(a) of this title to meet such standards or training requirements.

''(B) The total number of dependents who may be treated under this paragraph may not exceed 2,000 in any fiscal year.

''(C) In this paragraph, an eligible dental treatment facility is a dental treatment facility with a post-graduate dental education program accredited by the American Dental Association.''.

SEC. 717. ADDITION OF CERTAIN UNREMARRIED FORMER SPOUSES TO PERSONS ELIGIBLE FOR DENTAL INSURANCE PLAN OF RETIREES OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES.

(a) ELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN FORMER SPOUSES FOR DENTAL COVERAGE.—(1) Section 1076c(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) A person who—

''(i) is an unremarried former spouse of a member described in paragraph (1) or (2);

''(i) is described in section 1072(2)(F)(i) of this title; and

''(ii) does not have dental coverage under an employer-sponsored health plan.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 1076c(b)(6) of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 718. WAIVER OF COLLECTION OF PAYMENTS DUE FROM CERTAIN PERSONS UNAWARE OF LOSS OF CHAMPUS ELIGIBILITY.

(a) AUTHORITY TO WAIVE COLLECTION.—The Secretary of Defense may waive (in whole or in part) the collection of payments otherwise due from a person described in subsection (b) as a result of the receipt by the person of health benefits under section 1086 of title 10, United States Code, after the termination of the person's eligibility for such benefits and may also authorize continued coverage of benefits under section 1086 of such title for such person for the period described in subsection (c).

(b) PERSONS ELIGIBLE.—A person shall be eligible for relief under subsection (a) if the person—

(1) is a person described in paragraph (1) of subsection (d) of section 1086, of title 10, United States Code;

(2) in the absence of such paragraph, would have been eligible for health benefits under such section;

(3) at the time of the receipt of such benefits, satisfies the criteria specified in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (2) of such subsection; and

(4) was unaware of the loss of eligibility to receive health benefits at the time they were received.

(c) EXTENT OF AUTHORITY.—The authority to waive the collection of payments and to continue coverage of benefits under this section shall apply during the period beginning on July 1, 1999, and ending on December 31, 2004, under terms established by the Secretary of Defense.

(d) QUARTERLY REPORTS.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall provide quarterly reports to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives regarding—

(A) efforts by the Department of Defense to identify persons who satisfy the criteria specified in subparagraph (B) of subsection (d)(2) of section 1086 of title 10, United States Code, and would be eligible for health benefits under such section if the criteria specified in subparagrpah (A) were also satisfied; and

(B) actions taken by the Department with respect to persons identified under subparagraph (B) of this paragraph.

(2) The first report under paragraph (1) shall be submitted not later than 30 days after the end of the first quarter of fiscal year 2005.

Subtitle C—Planning, Programming, and Management

SEC. 721. PILOT PROGRAM FOR TRANSFORMATION OF HEALTH CARE DELIVERY.

(a) FINDINGS.—(1) Congress finds the following:

(A) Historically, providing military health care to military beneficiaries has centered on building a military medical treatment facility and providing a full range of services on a military installation.

(B) Traditionally, in many locations the majority of military personnel and their dependents who are eligible beneficiaries of the military health care system do not live on military installations.

(C) As the cost of repairing, replacing, recapitalizing, or expanding aging military treatment facilities and maintaining adequate health care services on military installations increases, the Department of Defense will be challenged to find new, more cost-effective ways of providing enhanced health care for military and civilian beneficiaries of the Department of Defense health care system.

(2) In view of these findings, the Secretary of Defense is directed to examine feasible and cost-effective methods for leveraging and expanding non-military health care resources to provide health care to military beneficiaries. Furthermore, the Secretary of Defense shall conduct a pilot program in accordance with this section.

(b) PILOT PROGRAM PURPOSES.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a pilot program at one or more military installations for purposes of testing—

(1) the feasibility and cost effectiveness of expanding use of non-military health care resources, particularly in cases in which such use would reduce or eliminate the need for military medical construction projects;

(2) initiatives that build cooperative health care arrangements and agreements between military installations and local and regional non-military health care systems; and

(3) development of an integrated, long range business plan for the delivery of health care services for military beneficiaries, incorporating present and potential future capabilities in the non-military health care sector.

(c) REQUIREMENTS OF PILOT PROGRAM.—In conducting the pilot program, the Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) identify and analyze health care delivery options that range from outsourcing all health care delivery services to the private sector to providing some health care services in military facilities located on the installation;

(2) determine the cost avoidance or savings resulting from innovative partnerships between the Department of Defense and the private sector and limiting recapitalization costs in military facilities;

(3) study the potential, viability, cost efficiency, and health care effectiveness of Department of Defense health care providers delivering health care in civilian community hospitals;

(4) determine the opportunities for and barriers to coordinating and leveraging the use of existing health care resources, including Federal, State, local, and contractor assets; and

(5) develop recommendations for a model health care delivery system that may be used at other military installations.

(d) CONSULTATION REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary of Defense shall develop the pilot program in consultation with the Secretaries of the military departments, representatives from the military installation selected for the pilot program, Federal, State, and local entities, and the TRICARE managed care support contractor with responsibility for that installation.

(e) SELECTION OF MILITARY INSTALLATION.—The pilot program shall be implemented at one or more military installations selected by the Secretary of Defense. At least one of the selected military installations shall meet the following criteria:

(1) The military installation is an Army installation located in a rural area.

(2) The military installation has members of the Armed Forces on active duty and members of reserve components of the Armed Forces that use the installation as a training and operational base, with members routinely deploying in support of the global war on terrorism.

(3) The number of members of the Armed Forces on active duty permanently assigned to the military installation is expected to increase over the next five years.

(4) One or more partnerships exist at the military installation with civilian health care entities in the form of limited specialty care services in the military medical treatment facility on the installation.

(5) There is a military treatment facility on the installation that does not have inpatient or trauma center care capabilities.

(6) There is a civilian community hospital within 15 miles of the military installation with limited capability to expand inpatient care beds, intensive care, and specialty services.

(7) There is no civilian hospital with a trauma center within 50 miles from the military installation.

(f) DURATION OF PILOT PROGRAM.—Implementation of the pilot program developed under this subsection shall begin not later than May 1, 2005, and shall be conducted during fiscal years 2005, 2006, and 2007.

(g) FUNDS.—For fiscal year 2005, not more than $5,000,000 of the amount appropriated pursuant to the authorization for operations and maintenance for the Defense Health Program in section 303(a) may be used to conduct the pilot program under this section.

(h) REPORTS.—Not later than July 1, 2005, the Secretary of Defense shall submit an interim report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives describing the details of the pilot program. Not later than July 1, 2007, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to such committees a final report describing the results of the pilot program with recommendations for a model health care delivery system for other military installations.

SEC. 722. STUDY OF PROVISION OF TRAVEL REIMBURSEMENT TO HOSPITALS FOR CERTAIN MILITARY DISABILITY RETIREES.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a study of the feasibility, and of the desirability, of providing that a member of the uniformed services retired under chapter 61 of title 10, United States Code, for a combat-related disability (as defined in section 1413a(e) of that title) shall be provided reimbursement for the travel expenses of such member for travel, during the two-year period beginning on the date of the retirement of the member, to a military treatment facility for medical care. The Secretary shall include in that study consideration of whether reimbursement under such a plan should, as nearly as practicable, be under the same terms and conditions, and at the same rate, as apply to beneficiary travel reimbursement provided by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs under section 111 of title 38, United States Code.

(b) REPORT.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report providing the results of the study under subsection (a). Such report shall be submitted not later than March 1, 2005.

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

Subtitle A—Amendments to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations

SEC. 801. RAPID ACQUISITION AUTHORITY TO RESPOND TO COMBAT EMERGENCIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 141 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 2410p. Rapid acquisition authority to respond to combat emergencies

''(a) RAPID ACQUISITION AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Defense may rapidly acquire, in accordance with this section, equipment needed by a combatant commander to eliminate a combat capability deficiency that has resulted in combat fatalities.

''(b) PROCESS FOR RAPID ACQUISITION.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary of Defense shall develop a process for the rapid acquisition authority provided by subsection (a) and submit to Congress a detailed explanation of the process, including procedures to be followed in carrying out the process. The process shall provide for the following:

''(1) A requirement that the process may be used only to acquire the minimum amount of equipment needed until the needs of the combatant commander can be fulfilled under existing acquisition statutes, policies, directives, and regulations.

''(2) A goal of awarding a contract for the equipment within 15 days after receipt of a request from a commander.

''(3) In a case in which the equipment cannot be acquired without an extensive delay, a requirement for an interim solution to minimize the combat capability deficiency and combat fatalities until the equipment can be acquired.

''(4) Waiver of the applicability of all policies, directives, and regulations related to—

''(A) the establishment of the requirement for the equipment;

''(B) the research, development, test, and evaluation of the equipment; and

''(C) the solicitation and selection of sources, and the award of the contract, for procurement of the equipment.

''(5) Such other procedures or requirements as the Secretary considers appropriate.

''(c) WAIVER OF CERTAIN STATUTES.—For purposes of exercising the authority provided by subsection (a) with respect to equipment, laws relating to the following shall not apply:

''(A) The establishment of the requirement for the equipment.

''(B) The research, development, test, and evaluation of the equipment.

''(C) The solicitation and selection of sources, and the award of the contract, for procurement of the equipment.

''(d) LIMITATIONS.—The rapid acquisition authority provided by subsection (a) may be used only—

''(1) after the Secretary of Defense, without delegation, determines in writing that there exists a combat capability deficiency that has resulted in combat fatalities; and

''(2) to acquire equipment in an amount aggregating not more than $100,000,000 during a fiscal year.

''(e) SOURCE OF FUNDS.—For acquisitions under this section to be made during any fiscal year, the Secretary may use any funds made available to the Department of Defense for that fiscal year.

''(f) NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS AFTER EACH USE OF AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Defense shall notify the congressional defense committees within 15 days after each use of the authority provided by subsection (a). Each such notice shall identify the equipment to be acquired, the amount to be expended for such acquisition, and the source of funds for such acquisition.

''(g) COMBATANT COMMANDER.—In this section, the term 'combatant commander' means the commander of a unified combatant command with authority for the conduct of operations in a specific area of responsibility or who otherwise has authority to conduct operations at the direction of the President or Secretary of Defense.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''2410p. Rapid acquisition authority to respond to combat emergencies.''.

SEC. 802. DEFENSE ACQUISITION WORKFORCE CHANGES.

(a) SELECTION CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES.—Section 1732(b)(1)(A) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''within grade GS–13 or above of the General Schedule'' and inserting ''in any position designated by the Secretary of Defense''.

(b) CRITICAL ACQUISITION POSITIONS.—Section 1733 of such title is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

''(b) DESIGNATION OF CRITICAL ACQUISITION.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall designate the acquisition positions in the Department of Defense that are critical acquisition positions. Such positions shall include the following:

''(A) Program executive officer.

''(B) Program manager of a major defense acquisition program (as defined in section 2430 of this title) or of a significant nonmajor defense acquisition program (as defined in section 1737(a)(3) of this title).

''(C) Deputy program manager of a major defense acquisition program.

''(D) Any other acquisition position of significant responsibility determined by the Secretary to be critical.

''(2) The Secretary shall annually publish a list of the positions designated under this subsection.''.

(c) SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMS.—Section 1742 of such title is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(a) PROGRAMS.—'' at the beginning of the text; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(b) SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.—With respect to any scholarship program conducted under this section, the Secretary of Defense and the participant shall agree in writing to the terms of the scholarship. The agreement shall include the obligations of the Secretary and the participant, as well as actions available for either party to take if there is a failure to meet the obligations under the agreement.''.

SEC. 803. LIMITATION ON TASK AND DELIVERY ORDER CONTRACTS.

Subsection 2304a(f) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(f) CONTRACT PERIOD.—The head of an agency entering into a task or delivery order contract under this section may provide for the contract to cover any base period up to five years and may extend the contract period for one or more successive periods pursuant to an option provided in the contract or a modification to the contract.''.

SEC. 804. FUNDING FOR CONTRACT CEILINGS FOR CERTAIN MULTIYEAR PROCUREMENT CONTRACTS.

(a) MULTIYEAR CONTRACTS RELATING TO PROPERTY.—Section 2306b(g) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(1)'' before ''Before any'';

(2) by striking ''Committee'' through ''House of Representatives'' and inserting ''congressional defense committees''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) In the case of a contract described in subsection (a) with a cancellation ceiling described in paragraph (1), if the budget for the contract does not include proposed funding for the costs of contract cancellation up to the cancellation ceiling established in the contract, the head of the agency concerned shall, as part of the certification required by subsection (i)(1)(A), give written notification to the congressional defense committees of—

''(A) the cancellation ceiling amounts planned for each program year in the proposed multiyear procurement contract, together with the reasons for the amounts planned;

''(B) the extent to which costs of contract cancellation are not included in the budget for the contract; and

''(C) a financial risk assessment of not including budgeting for costs of contract cancellation, including proposed funding sources to meet such cancellation costs if the contract is canceled.''.

(b) MULTIYEAR CONTRACTS RELATING TO SERVICES.—Section 2306c(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraphs (1), (3), and (4), by striking ''committees of Congress named in paragraph (5)'' and inserting ''congressional defense committees'' each place it appears; and

(2) by amending paragraph (5) to read as follows:

''(5) In the case of a contract described in subsection (a) with a cancellation ceiling described in paragraph (4), if the budget for the contract does not include proposed funding for the costs of contract cancellation up to the cancellation ceiling established in the contract, the head of the agency concerned shall give written notification to the congressional defense committees of—

''(A) the cancellation ceiling amounts planned for each program year in the proposed multiyear procurement contract, together with the reasons for the amounts planned;

''(B) the extent to which costs of contract cancellation are not included in the budget for the contract; and

''(C) a financial risk assessment of not including budgeting for costs of contract cancellation, including proposed funding sources to meet such cancellation costs if the contract is canceled.''

SEC. 805. INCREASED THRESHOLD FOR REQUIRING CONTRACTORS TO PROVIDE SPECIFIED EMPLOYEE INFORMATION TO COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT HOLDERS.

Section 2416(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''$500,000'' and inserting ''$1,000,000''.

SEC. 806. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR USE OF SIMPLIFIED ACQUISITION PROCEDURES.

Section 4202(e) of the Clinger-Cohen Act (division D of Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat. 652; 10 U.S.C. 2304 note) is amended by striking ''January 1, 2006'' and inserting ''October 1, 2009''.

SEC. 807. AUTHORITY TO ADJUST ACQUISITION-RELATED DOLLAR THRESHOLDS FOR INFLATION.

(a) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY.—The FAR Council and the heads of executive agencies may adjust the dollar thresholds in procurement laws in order to maintain the constant dollar value of the threshold, taking into account the effect of inflation on the threshold.

(b) LIMITATION ON EXERCISE OF AUTHORITY.—Adjustments of dollar thresholds under subsection (a) may be carried out—

(1) by the FAR Council only with respect to procurement laws that apply to executive agencies generally; and

(2) by the head of an executive agency only with respect to procurement laws that apply to that agency exclusively.

(c) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—In adjusting a threshold under subsection (a), the FAR Council and the head of an agency shall—

(2) consult with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget;

(3) round the threshold, to facilitate implementation; and

(4) publish the adjusted threshold in the Federal Register.

(d) EXCLUSIONS.—This section does not apply to—

(1) dollar thresholds in sections 3141 through 3144, 3146, and 3147 of title 40, United States Code;

(2) dollar thresholds in the Service Contract Act of 1965 (41 U.S.C. 351, et seq.); or

(3) dollar thresholds established by the United States Trade Representative pursuant to title III of the Trade Agreements Act of 1979 (19 U.S.C. 2511 et seq.).

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''procurement law'' means any provision of law that sets forth policies, procedures, requirements, or restrictions for the procurement of property or services by the Federal Government.

(2) The terms ''executive agency'' and ''procurement'' have the meanings provided by section 4(1) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(1))

(3) The term ''FAR Council'' means the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council established under section 25 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 421)).

Subtitle B—United States Defense Industrial Base Provisions

SEC. 811. DEFENSE TRADE RECIPROCITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 148 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2532 the following new section:

''§2532a. Defense trade reciprocity

''(a) POLICY.—(1) It is the policy of Congress that procurement regulations used in the conduct of trade in defense articles and defense services shall be based on the principle of fair trade and reciprocity consistent with United States national security, including the need to ensure comprehensive manufacturing capability in the United States defense industrial base for military system essential items.

''(2) The Secretary of Defense shall make every effort to ensure that the policies and practices of the Department of Defense reflect the goal of establishing an equitable trading relationship between the United States and its foreign defense trade partners, including ensuring that United States firms and United States employment in the defense sector are not disadvantaged by unilateral procurement practices by foreign governments, such as the imposition of offset agreements or similar requirements in defense procurements by those governments. In pursuing this goal, the Secretary shall—

''(A) develop a comprehensive defense acquisition trade policy that provides the necessary guidance and incentives for the elimination of offset agreements as an accepted practice in defense trade; and

''(B) review and make necessary modifications to existing acquisition policies and strategies, and review and seek to make necessary modifications to existing memoranda of understanding, cooperative project agreements, or related agreements with foreign defense trade partners, to reflect this goal.

''(b) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of Defense may not enter into a contract, or approve or permit any subcontract under a contract entered into by the Department of Defense, for the procurement of any defense article or defense service from a foreign firm unless the country in which the foreign firm performs substantially all of its manufacturing, production, and research and development activities in the performance of the contract (or subcontract) agrees to apply offset agreements to the procurement of defense articles and defense services from the United States firms in the same manner and to the same degree as such agreements are applied by the Department of Defense to the procurement of defense articles and defense services from that country.

''(c) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (b) does not apply to a contract or subcontract for the procurement of a defense article or defense service from a foreign firm if the Secretary of Defense determines in writing, with respect to the specific contract or subcontract, that an exception to subsection (b) is necessary for the Department to be able to meet national security objectives.

''(d) NOTIFICATION REQUIRED WHEN EXCEPTION APPLIED.—The Secretary of Defense may not apply an exception under subsection (c) until—

''(1) a notification of the intent to apply such exception is submitted to the congressional defense committees and published in the Federal Register; and

''(2) a period of 30 days has expired after the date on which such notification is so submitted and published.

''(e) AUTHORITY TO APPLY EXCEPTION NOT DELEGABLE.—The authority of the Secretary to apply the exception under subsection (c) may not be delegated to any officer or employee in a position at a level lower than the position of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics.–

''(f) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe regulations to implement this section in the Department of Defense supplement to the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

''(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the regulations prescribed under this section shall apply to contracts and subcontracts entered into on and after the date occurring one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

''(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) The term 'foreign firm' means a business entity that performs substantially all of its manufacturing, production, and research and development activities outside of the United States.

''(2) The term 'United States firm' means a business entity that performs substantially all of its manufacturing, production, and research and development activities in the United States.

''(3) The term 'foreign defense trade partner' means a foreign country with respect to which there is—

''(A) a memorandum of understanding or related agreement described in section 2531(a) of title 10, United States Code; or

''(B) a cooperative project agreement described in section 27 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2767).

''(4) The term 'offset agreement' has the meaning provided that term by section 36(e) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(e)).

''(5) The terms 'defense article' and 'defense service' have the meanings provided those terms by section 47(7) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2794(7)).

''(6) The term 'military system essential item' means an item on the military system essential item breakout list produced pursuant to section 813(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (P.L. 108–136; 117 Stat. 1544).''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''2532a. Defense trade reciprocity.''.

SEC. 812. AMENDMENTS TO DOMESTIC SOURCE REQUIREMENTS.

(a) NOTICE.—Section 2533a of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(k) NOTIFICATION REQUIRED WHEN CERTAIN EXCEPTIONS APPLIED.—(1) Funds appropriated or otherwise available to the Department of Defense may not be used to enter into a contract to procure an item described in subsection (b) pursuant to an exception set forth in subsection (c) or (e) until—

''(A) a notification of the intent to apply such exception is submitted to Congress and posted on the website maintained by the General Services Administration known as FedBizOpps.gov (or any successor site); and

''(B) a period of 15 days has expired after the date on which such notification is so submitted and published.

''(2) In any case in which the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the military department concerned intends to apply or applies the exception set forth in subsection (d)(1), the Secretary concerned shall submit to Congress a notification of such intent or such application during the period beginning six months before the date of application of such exception and ending six months after the date of application of such exception.''.

(b) CLOTHING MATERIALS AND COMPONENTS COVERED.—Subsection (b) of section 2533a of title 10, United States Code, is amended in paragraph (1)(B) by inserting before the semicolon the following: ''and the materials and components thereof, other than sensors, electronics, or other items added to, and not normally associated with, clothing (and the materials and components thereof)''.

SEC. 813. THREE-YEAR EXTENSION OF RESTRICTION ON ACQUISITION OF POLYACRYLONITRILE (PAN) CARBON FIBER FROM FOREIGN SOURCES.

The Secretary of Defense shall delay by three years the phase-out of the restriction on acquisition of polyacrylonitrile (PAN) carbon fiber from foreign sources (described in subpart 225.7103 of the Department of Defense supplement to the Federal Acquisition Regulation). In implementing such delay, the Secretary shall revise the appplicable regulations to ensure that such restriction applies to—

(1) solicitations and contracts issued on or before May 31, 2006, for major systems that are not yet in production; and

(2) solicitations and contracts issued during the period beginning June 1, 2006, and ending May 31, 2008, for major systems that are not yet in engineering and manufacturing development.

SEC. 814. GRANT PROGRAM FOR DEFENSE CONTRACTORS TO IMPLEMENT STRATEGIES TO AVOID OUTSOURCING OF JOBS.

(a) GRANT PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of Defense may make grants under this section for fiscal year 2005 to qualified defense contractor groups for the purposes described in subsection (b).

(b) GRANT PURPOSES.—A grant may be made under this section for the purpose of implementing a strategy to avoid the outsourcing of jobs by a defense contractor, including the following strategies:

(1) Cost-cutting measures.

(2) Retraining programs.

(3) Technology development.

(4) Plant upgrades.

(c) APPLICATION.—A grant may not be awarded under this section unless an application is submitted to, and approved by, the Secretary. Such an application—

(1) shall be submitted by a qualified defense contractor group in such form and manner as the Secretary may require; and

(2) shall contain—

(A) a description of the strategy proposed for avoiding the outsourcing of at least 10 jobs in the performance of a defense contract by the defense contractor concerned; and

(B) such other information as the Secretary may require.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''qualified defense contractor group'', with respect to a defense contractor, is a group or person representing—

(A) management of the contractor;

(B) a labor organization that represents employees of the contractor; or

(C) employees of the contractor.

(2) The term ''outsourcing'', with respect to a defense contract, includes the performance outside the United States of work under the contract.

(e) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the costs of the strategy carried out with a grant under this section may not exceed 50 percent.

(f) USE OF DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL CAPABILITIES FUND FOR GRANTS.—(1) Notwithstanding section 814(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (P.L. 108–136; 117 Stat. 1545), amounts in the Defense Industrial Base Capabilities Fund may be used for grants under this section.

(2) For fiscal year 2005, up to $50,000,000 of amounts available in such Fund may be used to carry out this section.

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Defense Industrial Base Capabilities Fund $50,000,000 for purposes of providing grants under this section.

SEC. 815. PREFERENCE FOR DOMESTIC FREIGHT FORWARDING SERVICES.

(a) PREFERENCE.—In the procurement of transportation services described in subsection (b), the Secretary of Defense shall give preference to any freight forwarder that—

(1) certifies to the Department of Defense that it is owned and controlled by citizens of the United States; and

(2) offers services at fair and reasonable rates.

(b) SERVICES COVERED.—Subsection (a) applies to transportation services to, from, or within Iraq or Afghanistan, and warehousing, logistics, or other similar services performed within Iraq or Afghanistan.

Subtitle C—Other Acquisition Matters

SEC. 821. SUSTAINMENT AND MODERNIZATION PLANS FOR EXISTING SYSTEMS WHILE REPLACEMENT SYSTEMS ARE UNDER DEVELOPMENT.

(a) EXISTING SYSTEMS TO BE MAINTAINED WHILE REPLACEMENT SYSTEMS ARE UNDER DEVELOPMENT.—(1) Chapter 144 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2436 the following new section:

"§ 2437. Development of major defense acquisition programs: sustainment and modernization of system to be replaced

''(a) REQUIREMENT FOR SUSTAINING AND MODERNIZING EXISTING FORCES.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall require that, whenever a new major defense acquisition program begins development, the defense acquisition authority responsible for that program shall develop a plan (to be known as a sustainment and modernization plan) for the existing system that the system under development is intended to replace. Any such sustainment and modernization plan shall provide for budgeting, sustaining, and modernizing the existing system until the replacement system to be developed under the major defense acquisition program is fielded and assumes the majority responsibility for the mission of the existing system. This section does not apply to a major defense acquisition that reaches initial operational capability before October 1, 2008.

''(2) In this section, the term ''defense acquisition authority'' means the Secretary of a military department or the commander of the United States Special Operations Command.

''(b) SUSTAINMENT AND MODERNIZATION PLAN.—The Secretary of Defense shall require that each sustainment and modernization plan under this section include, at a minimum, the following:

''(1) The milestone schedule for the development of the major defense acquisition program, including low-rate initial production, initial operational capability, full-rate production, full operational capability, and the date when the replacement system assumes the majority responsibility for the mission of the existing system.

''(2) An analysis of the existing system to determine the following:

''(A) A sustainment plan and budget requirements necessary to provide service life extension to the existing system at acceptable reliability and availability rates.

''(B) A modernization plan and budget requirements necessary to maintain mission capability against the relevant threats.

''(C) A modernization plan and budget requirements necessary—

''(i) to transfer mature technologies from the new system or other systems so that the mission capability of the existing system is enhanced against relevant threats; and

''(ii) to provide interoperability with the new system during the period from initial fielding until the new system assumes the majority of responsibility for the mission of the existing system.

''(c) ANNUAL REVIEW.—Each fiscal year, before the submission to Congress of the President's budget for the next fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense shall review the schedule performance of each replacement major defense acquisition program for which a sustainment and modernization plan has been developed under this section to compare that performance with the schedule set forth under subsection (b)(1). If the schedule for the program has changed, then the Secretary shall notify the congressional defense committees of such change.

''(d) EXCEPTIONS.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to a major defense acquisition program if the Secretary of Defense determines that—

''(1) the existing system is no longer relevant to the mission;

''(2) the mission has been eliminated;

''(3) the mission has been consolidated with another mission in such a manner that another existing system can adequately meet the mission requirements; or

''(4) the duration of time until the new system assumes the majority of responsibility for the existing system's mission is sufficiently short so that mission availability, capability, interoperability, and force protection requirements are maintained.

''(e) WAIVER.—The Secretary of Defense may waive the applicability of subsection (a) to a major defense acquisition program if the Secretary determines that, but for such a waiver, the Department would be unable to meet national security objectives. Whenever the Secretary makes such a determination and authorizes such a waiver, the Secretary shall submit notice of such waiver and of the Secretary's determination and the reasons therefor in writing to the congressional defense committees.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2436 the following new item:

''2437. Development of major defense acquisition programs: sustainment and modernization of system to be replaced .''.

(b) APPLICATION TO EXISTING PROGRAMS IN DEVELOPMENT.—Section 2437 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to a major defense acquisition program that is under development as of the date of the enactment of this Act and is not expected to reach initial operational capability before October 1, 2008. The Secretary of Defense shall require that a sustainment and modernization plan under that section be developed not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act for the existing system that the system under development is intended to replace.

SEC. 822. REVIEW AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECT RELATING TO CONTRACTOR EMPLOYEES.

(a) GENERAL REVIEW.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a review of policies, procedures, practices, and penalties of the Department of Defense relating to employees of defense contractors for purposes of ensuring that the Department of Defense is in compliance with Executive Order No. 12989 (relating to a prohibition on entering into contracts with contractors that are not in compliance with the Immigration and Nationality Act).

(2) In conducting the review, the Secretary shall—

(A) identify potential weaknesses and areas for improvement in existing policies, procedures, practices, and penalties;

(B) develop and implement reforms to strengthen, upgrade, and improve policies, procedures, practices, and penalties of the Department of Defense and its contractors; and

(C) review and analyze reforms developed pursuant to this paragraph to identify for purposes of national implementation those which are most efficient and effective.

(3) The review under this subsection shall be completed not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a demonstration project in accordance with this section, in one or more regions selected by the Secretary, for purposes of promoting greater contracting opportunities for contractors offering effective, reliable staffing plans to perform defense contracts that ensure all contract personnel employed for such projects, including management employees, professional employees, craft labor personnel, and administrative personnel, are lawful residents or persons properly authorized to be employed in the United States and properly qualified to perform services required under the contract. The demonstration project shall focus on contracts for construction, renovation, maintenance, and repair services for military installations.

(c) DEMONSTRATION PROJECT PROCUREMENT PROCEDURES.—As part of the demonstration project under subsection (b), the Secretary of Defense shall conduct a competition in which there is a provision in contract solicitations and request for proposal documents to require significant weight or credit be allocated to—

(1) reliable, effective workforce programs offered by prospective contractors that provide background checks and other measures to ensure the contractor is in compliance with the Immigration and Nationality Act; and

(2) reliable, effective project staffing plans offered by prospective contractors that specify for all contract employees (including management employees, professionals, and craft labor personnel) the skills, training, and qualifications of such persons and the labor supply sources and hiring plans or procedures used for employing such persons.

(d) IMPLEMENTATION OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—The Secretary of Defense shall begin operation of the demonstration project required under this section after completion of the review under subsection (a), but in no event later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(e) REPORT ON DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—Not later than six months after award of a contract under the demonstration project, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report setting forth a review of the demonstration project and recommendations on the actions, if any, that can be implemented to ensure compliance by the Department of Defense with Executive Order No. 12989.

(f) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''military installation'' means a base, camp, post, station, yard, center, homeport facility for any ship, or other activity under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense, including any leased facility, which is located within any of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, or Guam. Such term does not include any facility used primarily for civil works, rivers and harbors projects, or flood control projects.

SEC. 823. DEFENSE ACQUISITION WORKFORCE LIMITATION AND REPORTS.

(a) DEFENSE ACQUISITION AND SUPPORT PERSONNEL LIMITATION.—(1) Effective October 1, 2005, the number of defense acquisition and support personnel in the Department of Defense may not exceed 95 percent of the baseline number.

(2) For purposes of paragraph (1), the baseline number is the number of defense acquisition and support personnel as of October 1, 2004.

(3) All determinations of personnel strengths for purposes of this section shall be on the basis of full-time equivalent positions.

(b) GAO STUDY AND REPORT ON DEFENSE ACQUISITION AND SUPPORT PERSONNEL.—(1) The Comptroller General shall conduct a study of Department of Defense management of defense acquisition and support personnel. The study shall include—

(A) an analysis of the number and structure of defense acquisition and support personnel; and

(B) an assessment of the size, mission, composition, and projected workload requirements of defense acquisition and support personnel.

(2) The Comptroller General shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the results of the study conducted under this subsection not later than March 1, 2005.

(c) DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY STUDY AND REPORT ON DEFENSE ACQUISITION AND SUPPORT PERSONNEL.—(1) The Defense Acquisition University shall conduct a study of all the training programs offered to defense acquisition and support personnel.

(2) The Defense Acquisition University shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the results of the study conducted under this subsection not later than March 1, 2005. The report shall include—

(A) the number of individuals currently certified within the field they are working in; and

(B) recommendations on how to improve education and productivity for defense acquisition and support personnel, including recommendations for additional training program requirements.

(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''defense acquisition and support personnel'' means members of the Armed Forces and civilian personnel (other than civilian personnel who are employed at a maintenance depot) who are assigned to, or employed in, acquisition organizations of the Department of Defense (as specified in Department of Defense Instruction numbered 5000.58, dated January 14, 1992), and any other organization that, as determined by the Secretary, has acquisition as its predominant mission.

SEC. 824. PROVISION OF INFORMATION TO CONGRESS TO ENHANCE TRANSPARENCY IN CONTRACTING.

Upon request of the chairman or ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate or House of Representatives, the Secretary of Defense shall provide, with respect to any contract or task or delivery order under a task or delivery order contract entered into by the Department of Defense, within 14 days after receipt of the request, unredacted copies of any documents required to be maintained in the contracting office contract file, the contract administration office contract file, and the paying office contract file pursuant to subpart 4.8 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation, including—

(1) copies of the contract and all modifications;

(2) orders issued under the contract;

(3) justifications and approvals;

(4) any government estimate of contract price;

(5) source selection documentation;

(6) cost or price analysis;

(7) audit reports;

(8) justification for type of contract;

(9) authority for deviations from regulations, statutory requirements, or other restrictions;

(10) bills, invoices, vouchers, and supporting documents; and

(11) records of payments or receipts.

TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

SEC. 901. CHANGE IN TITLE OF SECRETARY OF THE NAVY TO SECRETARY OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS.

(a) CHANGE IN TITLE.—The position of the Secretary of the Navy is hereby redesignated as the Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference to the Secretary of the Navy in any law, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States shall be considered to be a reference to the Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps.

SEC. 902. TRANSFER OF CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF CHINESE MILITARY AFFAIRS FROM NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY TO UNITED STATES-CHINA ECONOMIC AND SECURITY REVIEW COMMISSION.

(a) TRANSFER.—The Center for the Study of Chinese Military Affairs established by section 914 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (10 U.S.C. 2165 note) is transferred from the National Defense University of the Department of Defense to the United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (a) of section 914 of the National Defense Authorization Act for 2000 (10 U.S.C. 2165 note) is amended to read as follows:

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There shall be a Center for the Study of Chinese Military Affairs organized under the United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission established by section 1238 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (22 U.S.C. 7002).''.

(c) REPEAL OF OBSOLETE PROVISIONS.—Such section is further amended by striking subsections (d) and (e).

(d) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO COMMISSION CHARTER.—(1) Section 1238(c) of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (22 U.S.C. 7002) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''(beginning in 2002)''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''The report shall include a full discussion of the activities of the Commission under each of the subparagraphs of paragraph (2).''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking the matter preceding subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(2) AREAS OF FOCUS.—The Commission shall focus, in lieu of any other area of work or study, on the following:''; and

(B) by replacing subparagraphs (A) through (J) with the text of subparagraphs (A) through (I) of section 2(c)(2) of division P of Public Law 108–7 (22 U.S.C. 7002 note).

(2) Section 2(c)(2) of division P of Public Law 108–7 (22 U.S.C. 7002 note) is repealed.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (a) and the amendment made by subsection (b) shall take effect at the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 903. TRANSFER TO SECRETARY OF THE ARMY OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR ASSEMBLED CHEMICAL WEAPONS ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM.

Effective January 1, 2005, the text of section 142 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261; 50 U.S.C. 1521 note) is amended to read as follows:

''(a) PROGRAM MANAGEMENT.—(1) The program manager for the Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives program shall report to the Secretary of the Army.

''(2) The Secretary of the Army shall provide for that program to be managed as part of the management organization within the Department of the Army specified in section 1412(e) of Public Law 99–145 (50 U.S.C. 1521(e)).

''(b) CONTINUED IMPLEMENTATION OF PREVIOUSLY SELECTED ALTERNATIVE TECHNOLOGIES.—(1) In carrying out the destruction of lethal chemical munitions at Pueblo Chemical Depot, Colorado, the Secretary of the Army shall continue to implement fully the alternative technology for such destruction at that depot selected by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics on July 16, 2002.

''(2) In carrying out the destruction of lethal chemical munitions at Blue Grass Army Depot, Kentucky, the Secretary of the Army shall continue to implement fully the alternative technology for such destruction at that depot selected by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics on February 3, 2003.''.

SEC. 904. MODIFICATION OF OBLIGATED SERVICE REQUIREMENTS UNDER NATIONAL SECURITY EDUCATION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b)(2) of section 802 of the David L. Boren National Security Education Act of 1991 (50 U.S.C. 1902) is amended by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B), as added by section 925(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136; 117 Stat. 1578), and inserting the following:

''(A) in the case of a recipient of a scholarship, as soon as practicable but in no case later than three years after the completion by the recipient of the study for which scholarship assistance was provided under the program, the recipient shall work for a period of one year—

''(i) in a national security position that the Secretary certifies is appropriate to use the unique language and region expertise acquired by the recipient pursuant to such study in the Department of Defense, in any element of the intelligence community, in the Department of Homeland Security, or in the Department of State; or

''(ii) in such a position in any other Federal department or agency not referred to in clause (i) if the recipient demonstrates to the Secretary that no position is available in a Federal department or agency specified in clause (i); or

''(B) in the case of a recipient of a fellowship, as soon as practicable but in no case later than two years after the completion by the recipient of the study for which fellowship assistance was provided under the program, the recipient shall work for a period equal to the duration of assistance provided under the program, but in no case less than one year—

''(i) in a position described in subparagraph (A)(i) that the Secretary certifies is appropriate to use the unique language and region expertise acquired by the recipient pursuant to such study; or

''(ii) in such a position in any other Federal department or agency not referred to in clause (i) if the recipient demonstrates to the Secretary that no position is available in a Federal department or agency specified in clause (i); and''.

(b) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations to carry out the amendment made by subsection (a). In prescribing such regulations, the Secretary shall establish standards that recipients of scholarship and fellowship assistance under the program under such section 802 are required to demonstrate to satisfy the requirement of a good faith effort to gain employment as required under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (b)(2) of such section.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—(1) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to service agreements entered into under the David L. Boren National Security Education Act of 1991 on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall not affect the force, validity, or terms of any service agreement entered into under the David L. Boren National Security Education Act of 1991 before the date of the enactment of this Act that is in force as of that date.

SEC. 905. CHANGE OF MEMBERSHIP OF CERTAIN COUNCILS.

(a) MEMBERSHIP OF ARMED FORCES POLICY COUNCIL.—Section 171(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(14) The Commandant of the Coast Guard, for discussion of matters pertaining to the Coast Guard.''.

(b) MEMBERSHIP OF COUNCIL UNDER SECTION 179.—Subsection (a) of section 179 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) The Under Secretary of Defense for Policy.''.

(b) CONFORMING AND CLARIFYING AMENDMENTS.—Such subsection is further amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(1) by striking ''Joint''; and

(2) by striking ''composed of three members as follows:'' and inserting ''operated as a joint activity of the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy. The membership of the Council is comprised of the following officers of those departments:''.

(c) OTHER TECHNICAL AND CLARIFYING AMENDMENTS.—Such section is further amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (c)(3)(B) is amended by striking ''appointed'' and inserting ''designated''.

(2) Subsection (e) is amended by striking ''In addition'' and all that follows through ''also'' and inserting ''The Council shall''.

(3) Subsection (f) is amended by striking ''Committee on'' the first place it appears and all that follows through ''Representatives'' and inserting ''congressional defense committees''.

(d) STYLISTIC AMENDMENTS.—Such section is further amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended by inserting ''ESTABLISHMENT; MEMBERSHIP.—'' after ''(a)''.

(2) Subsection (b) is amended by inserting ''CHAIRMAN; MEETINGS.—'' after ''(b)''.

(3) Subsection (c) is amended by inserting ''STAFF AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES; STAFF DIRECTOR.—'' after ''(c)''.

(4) Subsection (d) is amended by inserting ''RESPONSIBILITIES.—'' after ''(d)''.

(5) Subsection (e) is amended by inserting ''REPORT ON DIFFICULTIES RELATING TO SAFETY OR RELIABILITY.—'' after ''(e)''.

(6) Subsection (f) is amended by inserting ''ANNUAL REPORT.—'' after ''(f)''.

(e) FURTHER CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3212(e) of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C. 2402(e)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''JOINT'' in the subsection heading; and

(2) by striking ''Joint''.

SEC. 906. ACTIONS TO PREVENT THE ABUSE OF DETAINEES.

(a) POLICIES REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe policies regarding procedures for the Armed Forces and other elements of the Department of Defense and contractor personnel of the Department of Defense intended to prevent the conditions leading to acts of abuse of detainees who are held by the United States as part of the Global War on Terrorism. Policies under this subsection shall be prescribed not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—In order to achieve the objective stated in subsection (a), the policies on the prevention of abuse of detainees under that subsection shall specify, at a minimum, procedures for the following:

(1) Ensuring that commanders of detention facilities and commanders of interrogation facilities provide all assigned personnel (including contractor personnel) with training, and documented acknowledgement of receiving training, regarding the Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War and established Standing Operating Procedures for the treatment of detainees. Training provided under this paragraph to contractor personnel shall be at least comparable in degree to that provided to members of the Armed Forces.

(2) Providing all detainees with information, in their own language, of the protections afforded under the Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War.

(3) Conducting periodic unannounced and announced inspections of prisons and other areas where detainees are held in order to provide continued oversight of interrogation and detention operations.

(4) Prohibiting contact between male guards and female detainees and between female guards and male detainees, except under exigent circumstances.

(c) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives—

(1) a copy of the policies prescribed pursuant to subsection (a), immediately after those policies are prescribed; and

(2) a report on the implementation of those policies, not later than one year after the date on which those policies are prescribed.

SEC. 907. RESPONSES TO CONGRESSIONAL INQUIRIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Chapter 3 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 113a the following new section:

''§ 113b. Response to congressional inquiries

''Whenever the Secretary of Defense or any other official of the Department of Defense is requested by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate or the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives to respond to a question or inquiry submitted by the chairman or another member of that committee pursuant to a committee hearing or other activity, the Secretary (or other official) shall respond to the request, in writing, within 21 days of the date on which the request is transmitted to the Secretary (or other official).''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 113a the following new item:

''113b. Response to congressional inquiries.''.

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Financial Matters

SEC. 1001. TRANSFER AUTHORITY.

(a) AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER AUTHORIZATIONS.—(1) Upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, the Secretary may transfer amounts of authorizations made available to the Department of Defense in this division for fiscal year 2005 between any such authorizations for that fiscal year (or any subdivisions thereof). Amounts of authorizations so transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes as the authorization to which transferred.

(2) The total amount of authorizations that the Secretary may transfer under the authority of this section may not exceed $3,000,000,000. Of such amount, $500,000,000 may be used only for a transfer from an account for an active component to an account for a reserve component, or from an account of a reserve component to an account of an active component, of the same Armed Force.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—The authority provided by this section to transfer authorizations—

(1) may only be used to provide authority for items that have a higher priority than the items from which authority is transferred;

(2) may not be used to provide authority for an item that has been denied authorization by Congress; and

(3) may not be combined with the authority provided under section 1522.

(c) EFFECT ON AUTHORIZATION AMOUNTS.—A transfer made from one account to another under the authority of this section shall be deemed to increase the amount authorized for the account to which the amount is transferred by an amount equal to the amount transferred.

(d) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall promptly notify Congress of each transfer made under subsection (a).

SEC. 1002. BUDGET JUSTIFICATION DOCUMENTS FOR OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Chapter 9 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 232. Operations and maintenance budget presentation

''(a) IN GENERAL.—In this section

''(1) The term 'O&M justification documents' means Department of Defense budget justification documents with respect to accounts for operation and maintenance submitted to the congressional defense committees in support of the Department of Defense component of the President's budget for any fiscal year.

''(2) The term 'President's budget' means the budget of the President submitted to Congress under section 1105 of title 31 for any fiscal year.

''(3) The term 'current year' means the fiscal year during which the President's budget is submitted in any year.

''(b) IDENTIFICATION OF BASELINE AMOUNTS IN O&M JUSTIFICATION DOCUMENTS.—In any case in which the amount requested in the President's budget for a fiscal year for a Department of Defense operations and maintenance program, project, or activity is different from the amount appropriated for that program, project, or activity for the current year, the O&M justification documents supporting that budget shall identify that appropriated amount and the difference between that amount and the amount requested in the budget, stated as an amount and as a percentage.

''(c) PERSONAL SERVICE CONTRACTS.—In the O&M justification documents for any fiscal year, costs programmed in the budget for that fiscal year for Department of Defense for personal service contracts, and the number of personal service contractors to be used by the Department of Defense during that fiscal year who will be compensated at an annual rate in excess of the annual rate of salary of the Vice President under section 104 of title 3, shall be separately set forth and identified.

''(d) NAVY SUBACTIVITIES FOR SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE AND FOR INTERMEDIATE SHIP MAINTENANCE.—In the O&M justification documents for the Navy for any fiscal year, amounts requested for ship depot maintenance and amounts requested for intermediate ship maintenance shall be set forth as separate budget subactivity groups.

''(e) CIVILIAN AVERAGE SALARY COSTS.—In the O&M justification documents for any fiscal year, average civilian salary costs, shown by subactivity group, shall be set forth as a component of the personnel summary exhibit.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''232. Operations and maintenance budget presentation.''.

(b) COMPONENTS OF LINE ITEMS FOR OTHER COSTS AND OTHER CONTRACTS.—Not later than March 1, 2005, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth the component elements of the line items identified as ''Other Costs'' and ''Other Contracts'' in the exhibit identified as ''Summary of Price and Program Changes'' in the budget justification materials submitted to those committees in support of the budget for fiscal year 2006.

SEC. 1003. RETENTION OF FEES FROM INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LICENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 165 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 2788. Licensing of intellectual property of the military departments; authority to charge and retain fees

''(a) AUTHORITY TO RETAIN FEES.—(1) Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary concerned may license trademarks, service marks, certification marks, and collective marks owned by a military department and may retain and expend fees received from such licensing in accordance with subsection (b).

''(2) In this section, the terms 'trademark', 'service mark', 'certification mark', 'collective mark', and 'mark' have the meanings given those terms in section 45 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1127).

''(b) USE OF LICENSING FEES.—(1) Funds received by a military department from licensing under subsection (a)(1) shall be used for the expenses incurred by the department in securing the registration of marks owned by the department and in licensing those marks.

''(2) If the amount of fees received by a military department during any fiscal year from the licensing of marks exceeds the anticipated expenses under paragraph (1) during that year, the Secretary concerned may designate those funds as excess and expend them as provided in paragraph (3).

''(3) Not more than 50 percent of any such excess funds shall be available for military personnel recruiting and retention activities of the department. The remainder of such funds shall be available for morale, welfare, and recreation activities of the department.

''(4) Funds received pursuant to subsection (a)(1) shall remain available for two years after the end of the fiscal year during which the funds are received.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''2788. Licensing of intellectual property of the military departments; authority to charge and retain fees.''.

SEC. 1004. AUTHORITY TO WAIVE CLAIMS OF THE UNITED STATES WHEN AMOUNTS RECOVERABLE ARE LESS THAN COSTS OF COLLECTION.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Chapter 165 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2780 the following new section:

''§ 2780a. Debt collection: general waiver authority for small amounts owed the United States

''(a) AUTHORITY.—In the case of an indebtedness to the United States described in subsection (b) that is for an amount that is less than the threshold amount specified in subsection (c), the Secretary of Defense may, under regulations prescribed under this section, cancel the indebtedness and waive recovery of the amount owed. Such authority may be used only when, based on a cost-benefit analysis, the Secretary determines that the costs of collection are expected to exceed the amount recoverable.

''(b) COVERED DEBTS.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), this section applies with respect to amounts owed to the United States that arise out of the activities of, or that are referred to, the Department of Defense (including amounts owed by members of the armed forces and Department of Defense civilian personnel).

''(2) The authority under this section does not apply to amounts owed to the United States arising out of activities of the Department of Defense that have been referred to another executive agency for collection action or that are otherwise within the purview of another executive agency.

''(c) MAXIMUM AMOUNT WAIVABLE.—The threshold amount referred to in subsection (a) is the micropurchase threshold amount in effect under section 32 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 428).

''(d) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations for the purposes of this section.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2780 the following new item:

''2780a. Debt collection: general waiver authority for small amounts owed the United States.''.

SEC. 1005. REPEAL OF FUNDING RESTRICTIONS CONCERNING DEVELOPMENT OF MEDICAL COUNTERMEASURES AGAINST BIOLOGICAL WARFARE THREATS.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 2370a of title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 139 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to that section.

SEC. 1006. REPORT ON BUDGETING FOR EXCHANGE RATES FOR FOREIGN CURRENCY FLUCTUATIONS.

(a) SECRETARY OF DEFENSE REPORT.—(1) Not later than December 1, 2004, the Secretary Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report on the foreign currency exchange rate projection used in annual Department of Defense budget presentations.

(2) In the report under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) identify alternative approaches for selecting foreign currency exchange rates that would produce more realistic estimates of amounts required to be appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense to accommodate foreign currency exchange rate fluctuations;

(B) address the advantages and disadvantages of each approach identified pursuant to subparagraph (A);

(C) identify the Secretary's preferred approach among the alternatives identified pursuant to subparagraph (A) and provide the Secretary's rationale for preferring that approach.

(3) In identifying alternative approaches pursuant to paragraph (2)(A), the Secretary shall examine—

(A) approaches used by other Federal departments and agencies; and

(B) the feasibility of using private economic forecasting.

(b) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REVIEW AND REPORT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall review the report under subsection (a), including the basis for the Secretary's conclusions stated in the report, and shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report containing the Comptroller General's conclusions with respect to that report. Such report shall be submitted not later than January 15, 2005.

Subtitle B—Naval Vessels and Shipyards

SEC. 1011. AUTHORITY FOR AWARD OF CONTRACTS FOR SHIP DISMANTLING ON NET-COST BASIS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 633 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 7305 the following new section:

''§ 7305a. Vessels stricken from Naval Vessel Register: contracts for dismantling on net-cost basis

''(a) AUTHORITY FOR NET-COST BASIS CONTRACTS.—When the Secretary of the Navy awards a contract for the dismantling of a vessel stricken from the Naval Vessel Register, the Secretary may award the contract on a net-cost basis.

''(b) RETENTION BY CONTRACTOR OF PROCEEDS OF SALE OF SCRAP AND REUSABLE ITEMS.—When the Secretary awards a contract on a net-cost basis under subsection (a), the Secretary shall provide in the contract that the contractor may retain the proceeds from the sale of scrap and reusable items removed from the vessel dismantled under the contract.

''(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) The term 'net-cost basis', with respect to a contract for the dismantling of a vessel, means that the amount to be paid to the contractor under the contract for dismantling and for removal and disposal of hazardous waste material is discounted by the offeror's estimate of the value of scrap and reusable items that the contractor will remove from the vessel during performance of the contract.

''(2) The term 'scrap' means personal property that has no value except for its basic material content.

''(3) The term 'reusable item' means a demilitarized component or a removable portion of a vessel or equipment that the Secretary of the Navy has identified as excess to the needs of the Navy but which has potential resale value on the open market.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 7305 the following new item:

''7305a. Vessels stricken from Naval Vessel Register: contracts for dismantling on net-cost basis.''.

SEC. 1012. INDEPENDENT STUDY TO ASSESS COST EFFECTIVENESS OF THE NAVY SHIP CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide for a study, to be conducted by an entity independent of the Department of Defense, of the cost effectiveness of the ship construction program of the Navy. The purpose of the study shall be to examine both—

(1) a variety of approaches by which the Navy ship construction program could be made more efficient in the near term; and

(2) a variety of approaches by which, with a nationally integrated effort over the next decade, the United States shipbuilding industry might be made competitive globally.

(b) NEAR TERM IMPROVEMENTS IN EFFICIENCY.—With respect to the examination under subsection (a)(1) of approaches by which the Navy ship construction program could be made more efficient in the near term, the Secretary shall provide for the entity conducting the study—

(1) to determine, with respect to each approach so examined, the cost savings that could result from implementation of that approach over each of the next 10 years;

(2) to recommend one or more of the approaches examined under subsection (a)(1) for implementation; and

(3) for each approach recommended under paragraph (2) for implementation, to develop a concept and implementation plan by which the recommended improvements could best be phased into the naval ship construction program.

(c) GLOBAL COMPETITIVENESS OF UNITED STATES SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRY.—With respect to the examination under subsection (a)(2) of approaches by which, with a nationally integrated effort over the next decade, the United States shipbuilding industry might be made competitive globally, the Secretary shall provide for the entity conducting the study—

(1) to develop a plan to modernize the United States shipbuilding infrastructure within the next decade in order to make the United States shipbuilding industry more competitive globally; and

(2) to estimate the resources required to carry out a modernization plan developed under paragraph (1).

(d) REPORT.—Not later than June 1, 2005, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report providing the results of the study under subsection (a). The report shall include the matters specified in subsections (b) and (c).

SEC. 1013. AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER SPECIFIED FORMER NAVAL VESSELS TO CERTAIN FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

(a) AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER BY GRANT.—The Prsident is authorized to transfer vessels to foreign countries on a grant basis under section 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j), as follows:

(1) CHILE.—The ''SPRUANCE'' class destroyer O'BANNON (DD–987) to the Government of Chile.

(2) PORTUGAL.—The ''OLIVER HAZARD PERRY'' class guided missile frigate GEORGE PHILIP (FFG–12) to the Government of Portugal.

(b) AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER BY SALE.—The President is authorized to transfer on a sale basis under section 21 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2761) the ''ANCHORAGE'' class dock landing ship ANCHORAGE (LSD–36) to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States (which is the

Taiwan instrumentality designated pursuant to section 10(a) of the Taiwan Relations Act).

(c) GRANTS NOT COUNTED IN ANNUAL TOTAL OF TRANSFERRED EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES.—The value of a vessel transferred to another country on a grant basis under section 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j) pursuant to authority provided by subsection (a) shall not be counted for the purposes of subsection (g) of that section in the aggregate value of excess defense articles transferred to countries under that section in any fiscal year.

(d) COSTS OF TRANSFERS.—Any expense incurred by the United States in connection with a transfer authorized by this section shall be charged to the recipient (notwithstanding section 516(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j (e)) in the case of a transfer authorized to be made on a grant basis under subsection (a)).

(e) REPAIR AND REFURBISHMENT IN UNITED STATES SHIPYARDS.—To the maximum extent practicable, the President shall require, as a condition of the transfer of a vessel under this section, that the country to which the vessel is transferred have such repair or refurbishment of the vessel as is needed, before the vessel joins the naval forces of that country, performed at a shipyard located in the United States, including a United States Navy shipyard.

(f) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority to transfer a vessel under this section shall expire at the end of the two-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1014. LIMITATION ON LEASING OF FOREIGN-BUILT VESSELS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Chapter 141 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2401a the following new section:

"§2401b. Limitation on lease of foreign-built vessels

''(a) LIMITATION.—The Secretary of a military department may not make a contract for a lease or charter of a vessel for a term of more than 12 months (including all options to renew or extend the contract) if the hull, a major component of the hull, or superstructure of the vessel is constructed in a foreign shipyard.

''(b) PRESIDENTIAL WAIVER FOR NATIONAL SECURITY INTEREST.—(1) The President may authorize exceptions to the limitation in subsection (a) when the President determines that it is in the national security interest of the United States to do so.

''(2) The President shall transmit notice to Congress of any such determination, and no contract may be made pursuant to the exception authorized until the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date on which the notice of the determination is received by Congress.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2401a the following new item:

''2401b. Limitation on lease of foreign-built vessels.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 2401b of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to contracts entered into after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Subtitle C—Sunken Military Craft

SEC. 1021. PRESERVATION OF TITLE TO SUNKEN MILITARY CRAFT AND ASSOCIATED CONTENTS.

Right, title, and interest of the United States in and to any United States sunken military craft shall not be extinguished by the passage of time, regardless of when the sunken military craft sank.

SEC. 1022. PROHIBITIONS.

(a) UNAUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES DIRECTED AT SUNKEN MILITARY CRAFT.—No person shall engage in or attempt to engage in any activity directed at a sunken military craft that disturbs, removes, or injures any sunken military craft, except—

(1) as authorized by a permit under this subtitle;

(2) as authorized by regulations issued under this subtitle; or

(3) as otherwise authorized by law.

(b) POSSESSION OF SUNKEN MILITARY CRAFT.—No person may possess, disturb, remove, or injure any sunken military craft in violation of—

(1) this section; or

(2) any prohibition, rule, regulation, ordinance, or permit that applies under any other applicable Federal, foreign, or other law.

(c) LIMITATIONS ON APPLICATION.—

(1) ACTIONS BY UNITED STATES.—This section shall not apply to actions taken by, or at the direction of, the United States.

(2) FOREIGN PERSONS.—This section shall not apply to any action by a person who is not a citizen, national, or resident alien of the United States, except in accordance with—

(A) generally recognized principles of international law;

(B) an agreement between the United States and the foreign country of which the person is a citizen; or

(C) in the case of an individual who is a crew member or other individual on a foreign vessel or foreign aircraft, an agreement between the United States and the flag State of the foreign vessel or aircraft that applies to the individual.

(3) LOAN OF SUNKEN MILITARY CRAFT.—This section does not prohibit the loan of United States sunken military craft in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary concerned.

SEC. 1023. PERMITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary concerned may issue a permit authorizing a person to engage in an activity otherwise prohibited by section 1022 with respect to a United States military craft, for archaeological, historical, or educational purposes, in accordance with regulations issued by such Secretary that implement this section.

(b) CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER LAWS.—The Secretary concerned shall require that any activity carried out under a permit issued by such Secretary under this section must be consistent with all requirements and restrictions that apply under any other provision of Federal law.

(c) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out this section (including the issuance after the date of the enactment of this Act of regulations implementing this section), the Secretary concerned shall consult with the head of each Federal agency having authority under Federal law with respect to activities directed at sunken military craft or the locations of such craft.

SEC. 1024. PENALTIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Any person who violates this subtitle, or any regulation or permit issued under this subtitle, shall be liable to the United States for a civil penalty under this section.

(b) ASSESSMENT AND AMOUNT.—The Secretary concerned may assess a civil penalty under this section, after notice and an opportunity for a hearing, of not more than $100,000 for each violation.

(c) CONTINUING VIOLATIONS.—Each day of a continued violation of this subtitle or a regulation or permit issued under this subtitle shall constitute a separate violation for purposes of this section.

SEC. 1025. LIABILITY FOR DAMAGES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Any person who engages in an activity in violation of section 1022 or any regulation or permit issued under this subtitle that disturbs, removes, or injures any United States sunken military craft shall pay the United States enforcement costs and damages resulting from such disturbance, removal, or injury.

(b) INCLUDED DAMAGES.—Damages referred to in subsection (a) may include—

(1) the reasonable costs incurred in storage, restoration, care, maintenance, conservation, and curation of any sunken military craft that is disturbed, removed, or injured in violation of section 1022 or any regulation or permit issued under this subtitle; and

(2) the cost of retrieving, from the site where the sunken military craft was disturbed, removed, or injured, any information of an archaeological, historical, or cultural nature.

SEC. 1026. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAWS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except to the extent that an activity is undertaken as a subterfuge for activities prohibited by this subtitle, nothing in this subtitle is intended to affect—

(1) any activity that is not directed at a sunken military craft; or

(2) the traditional high seas freedoms of navigation, including—

(A) the laying of submarine cables and pipelines;

(B) operation of vessels;

(C) fishing; or

(D) other internationally lawful uses of the sea related to such freedoms.

(b) INTERNATIONAL LAW.—This subtitle and any regulations implementing this subtitle shall be applied in accordance with generally recognized principles of international law and in accordance with the treaties, conventions, and other agreements to which the United States is a party.

(c) LAW OF FINDS.—The law of finds shall not apply to any United States sunken military craft, wherever located.

(d) LAW OF SALVAGE.—No salvage rights or awards shall be granted with respect to any sunken military craft without the express permission of the United States.

(e) LAW OF CAPTURE OR PRIZE.—Nothing in this subtitle is intended to alter the international law of capture or prize with respect to sunken military craft.

(f) LIMITATION OF LIABILITY.—Nothing in sections 4281 through 4287 and 4289 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. App. 181 et seq.) or section 3 of the Act of February 13, 1893 (chapter 105; 27 Stat. 445; 46 U.S.C. App. 192), shall limit the liability of any person under this section.

(g) AUTHORITIES OF THE COMMANDANT OF THE COAST GUARD.—Nothing in this subtitle is intended to preclude or limit the application of any other law enforcement authorities of the Commandant of the Coast Guard.

(h) PRIOR DELEGATIONS, AUTHORIZATIONS, AND RELATED REGULATIONS.—Nothing in this subtitle shall invalidate any prior delegation, authorization, or related regulation that is consistent with this subtitle.

(i) CRIMINAL LAW.—Nothing in this subtitle is intended to prevent the United States from pursuing criminal sanctions for plundering of wrecks, larceny of Government property, or violation of any applicable criminal law.

SEC. 1027. ENCOURAGEMENT OF AGREEMENTS WITH FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

The Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, is encouraged to negotiate and conclude bilateral and multilateral agreements with foreign countries with regard to sunken military craft consistent with this subtitle.

SEC. 1028. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) ASSOCIATED CONTENTS.—The term ''associated contents'' means—

(A) the equipment, cargo, and contents of a sunken military craft that are within its debris field; and

(B) the remains and personal effects of the crew and passengers of a sunken military craft that are within its debris field.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of a military department.

(3) SUNKEN MILITARY AIRCRAFT.—The term ''sunken military aircraft'' means any sunken military aircraft that was owned or operated by the United States when it sank.

(4) SUNKEN MILITARY CRAFT.—The term ''sunken military craft'' means any sunken military vessel, sunken military aircraft, or associated contents, or any portion thereof, the title to

which has not been abandoned or transferred in a manner prescribed by the United States.

(5) SUNKEN MILITARY VESSEL.—The term ''sunken military vessel'' means any sunken warship or naval auxiliary of the United States that is a public vessel as that term is used in the Act of March 3, 1925 (chapter 428; 46 U.S.C. App. 781 et seq.), popularly known as the Public Vessels Act.

(6) UNITED STATES CONTIGUOUS ZONE.—The term ''United States contiguous zone'' means the contiguous zone of the United States under Presidential Proclamation 7219, dated September 2, 1999.

(7) UNITED STATES INTERNAL WATERS.—The term ''United States internal waters'' means all waters of the United States on the landward side of the baseline from which the breadth of the United States territorial sea is measured.

(8) UNITED STATES TERRITORIAL SEA.—The term ''United States territorial sea'' means the waters of the United States territorial sea under Presidential Proclamation 5928, dated December 27, 1988.

(9) UNITED STATES WATERS.—The term ''United States waters'' means United States internal waters, the United States territorial sea, and the United States contiguous zone.

Subtitle D—Counter-Drug Activities

SEC. 1031. CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY TO USE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FUNDS FOR UNIFIED COUNTERDRUG AND COUNTERTERRORISM CAMPAIGN IN COLOMBIA.

(a) AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE.—During fiscal years 2005 and 2006, the Secretary of Defense may use funds made available to the Department of Defense for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities to provide assistance to the Government of Colombia—

(1) to support a unified campaign against narcotics trafficking in Colombia;

(2) to support a unified campaign against activities by designated terrorist organizations, such as the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), the National Liberation Army (ELN), and the United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia (AUC); and

(3) to take actions to protect human health and welfare in emergency circumstances, including undertaking rescue operations.

(b) RELATION TO OTHER ASSISTANCE AUTHORITY.—The authority provided by subsection (a) is in addition to other provisions of law authorizing the provision of assistance to the Government of Colombia.

SEC. 1032. LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF UNITED STATES MILITARY PERSONNEL IN COLOMBIA.

(a) LIMITATION.—None of the funds available to the Department of Defense for any fiscal year may be used to support or maintain more than 500 members of the Armed Forces on duty in the Republic of Colombia at any time.

(b) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN MEMBERS.—For purposes of determining compliance with the limitation in subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense may exclude the following military personnel:

(1) A member of the Armed Forces in the Republic of Colombia for the purpose of rescuing or retrieving United States military or civilian Government personnel, except that the period for which such a member may be so excluded may not exceed 30 days unless expressly authorized by law.

(2) A member of the Armed Forces assigned to the United States Embassy in Colombia as an attaché, as a member of the security assistance office, or as a member of the Marine Corps security contingent.

(3) A member of the Armed Forces in Colombia to participate in relief efforts in responding to a natural disaster.

(4) Nonoperational transient military personnel.

(5) A member of the Armed Forces making a port call from a military vessel in Colombia.

Subtitle E—Reports

SEC. 1041. STUDY OF CONTINUED REQUIREMENT FOR TWO-CREW MANNING FOR BALLISTIC MISSILE SUBMARINES.

(a) STUDY AND DETERMINATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a study of whether the practice of using two alternating crews (referred to as the ''Gold Crew'' and the ''Blue Crew'') for manning of ballistic missile submarines (SSBNs) continues to be justified under the changed circumstances since the end of the Cold War and, based on that study, shall make a determination of whether that two-crew manning practice should be continued or should be modified or terminated.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report providing notice of the Secretary's determination under subsection (a) and the reasons for that determination.

SEC. 1042. STUDY OF EFFECT ON DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL BASE OF ELIMINATION OF UNITED STATES DOMESTIC FIREARMS MANUFACTURING BASE.

Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report describing in detail the effect on both military readiness and the defense industrial base that would result from the elimination of the United States domestic firearms manufacturing base.

SEC. 1043. STUDY OF EXTENT AND QUALITY OF TRAINING PROVIDED TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED SERVICES TO PREPARE FOR POST-CONFLICT OPERATIONS.

(a) STUDY REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a study to determine the extent to which members of the Armed Forces assigned to duty in support of contingency operations receive training in preparation for post-conflict operations and to evaluate the quality of such training

(b) MATTERS INCLUDED IN STUDY.—As part of the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall specifically evaluate the following:

(1) The doctrine, training, and leader-development system necessary to enable members of the Armed Forces to successfully operate in post-conflict operations.

(2) The adequacy of curricula at military educational facilities to ensure that the Armed Forces has a cadre of members skilled in post-conflict duties, foreign languages, and foreign cultures.

(3) The training time and resources available to members and units to develop cultural awareness about ethnic backgrounds, religious beliefs, and political loyalties of the people living in areas in which the Armed Forces operate.

(4) The organization of the combatant commands to conduct post-conflict operations.

(c) SUBMISSION OF STUDY RESULTS.—Not later than March 15, 2005, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a report containing the results of the study conducted under this section.

Subtitle F—Security Matters

SEC. 1051. USE OF NATIONAL DRIVER REGISTER FOR PERSONNEL SECURITY INVESTIGATIONS AND DETERMINATIONS.

Section 30305(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (9) through (11) as paragraphs (10) through (12), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (8) the following new paragraph:

''(9) An individual who has or is seeking access to national security information for purposes of Executive Order 12968, or any successor Executive order, or an individual who is being investigated for Federal employment under authority of Executive Order 10450, or any successor Executive order, may request the chief driver licensing official of a State to provide information about the individual pursuant to subsection (a) of this section to a Federal department or agency that is authorized to investigate the individual for the purpose of assisting in the determination of the eligibility of the individual for access to national security information or for Federal employment. A Federal department or agency that receives such information about an individual may use it in accordance with applicable law.''.

SEC. 1052. STANDARDS FOR DISQUALIFICATION FROM ELIGIBILITY FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SECURITY CLEARANCE .

(a) DISQUALIFIED PERSONS.—Subsection (c)(1) of section 986 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' and inserting '', was''; and

(2) and inserting before the period at the end the following: '', and was incarcerated as a result of that sentence for not less than one year''.

(b) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—Subsection (d) of such section is amended to read as follows:

''(d) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—In a meritorious case, an exception to the prohibition in subsection (a) may be authorized for a person described in paragraph (1) or (4) of subsection (c) if there are mitigating factors. Any such waiver may be authorized only in accordance with standards and procedures prescribed by, or under the authority of, an Executive order or other guidance issued by the President.''.

Subtitle G—Transportation-Related Matters

SEC. 1061. USE OF MILITARY AIRCRAFT TO TRANSPORT MAIL TO AND FROM OVERSEAS LOCATIONS.

(a) AUTHORITY FOR USE OF MILITARY AIRCRAFT.—Section 3401 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)(A), by striking ''title 49,'' and inserting ''title 49, or on military aircraft at rates not to exceed those so fixed and determined for scheduled United States air carriers,''; and

(B) in the sentence following paragraph (3), by striking ''carriers'' each place it appears and inserting ''carriers and military aircraft''; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking ''title 49,'' and inserting ''title 49, or on military aircraft at rates not to exceed those so fixed and determined for scheduled United States air carriers,''; and

(B) in the second sentence—

(i) by inserting ''and military aircraft'' after ''carriers'' the first place it appears; and

(ii) by striking ''by air carriers other than scheduled United States air carriers'' and inserting ''by other than scheduled United States air carriers and military aircraft''.

(b) DEFINITION.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) In this section, the term 'military aircraft' means an aircraft owned, operated, or chartered by the Department of Defense.''.

SEC. 1062. REORGANIZATION AND CLARIFICATION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS RELATING TO CONTROL AND SUPERVISION OF TRANSPORTATION WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) TRANSFER OF CERTAIN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITIES.—Sections 4744, 4745, 4746, and 4747 of title 10, United States Code, are transferred to chapter 157 of such title, inserted (in that order) at the end of such chapter, and redesignated as sections 2648, 2649, 2650, and 2651, respectively.

(b) CLARIFICATION OF APPLICABILITY OF TRANSFERRED AUTHORITIES THROUGHOUT THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—(1) Section 2648 of such title, as transferred and redesignated by subsection (a), is amended—

(A) by striking ''Secretary of the Army'' in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and inserting ''Secretary of Defense'';

(B) by striking ''Army transport agencies'' in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and all that follows through ''military transport agency of''; and

(C) by striking paragraphs (1), (2), and (3);

(D) by redesignating paragraph (4), (5), (6), and (7) as paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4), respectively;

(E) by redesignating paragraph (8) as paragraph (5) and in that paragraph striking ''persons described in clauses (1), (2), (4), (5), and (7)'' and inserting ''members of the armed forces, officers and employees of the Department of Defense or the Coast Guard, and persons described i paragraphs (1), (2), and (4)''; and

(F) by striking ''clause (7) or (8)'' in the last sentence and inserting ''paragraph (4) or (5)''.

(2) Section 2649 of such title, as transferred and redesignated by subsection (a), is amended—

(A) by striking the section heading and inserting the following:

''§ 2649. Civilian passengers and commercial cargoes: transportation on Department of Defense vessels'';

(B) by striking ''(1) on vessels'' and all that follows through ''Department of the Army'';

(C) by striking ''any transport agency of''; and

(D) by striking ''Secretary of the Army'' and all that follows through ''be transported'' and inserting ''Secretary of Defense, be transported''.

(3) Section 2650 of such title, as transferred and redesignated by subsection (a), is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''Army transport agencies'' and all that follows through ''military transport agency of'';

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking ''Secretary of the Army'' and inserting ''Secretary of Defense''; and

(C) in paragraph (4), by striking ''by air—'' and all that follows through ''the transportation cannot'' and inserting ''by air, the transportation cannot''.

(4) Section 2651 of such title, as transferred and redesignated by subsection (a), is amended by striking ''Army transport agencies'' and all that follows and inserting ''the Department of Defense, under regulations and at rates to be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.''.

(c) REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED AND OBSOLETE PROVISIONS.—The following sections of such title are repealed: sections 4741, 4743, 9741, 9743, and 9746.

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 157 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new items:

''2648. Persons and supplies: sea transportation.
''2649. Civilian passengers and commercial cargoes: transportation on Department of Defense vessels.
''2650. Civilian personnel in Alaska.
''2651. Passengers and merchandise to Guam: sea transport.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 447 of such title is amended by striking the items relating to sections 4741, 4743, 4744, 4745, 4746, and 4747.

(3) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 947 of such title is amended by striking the items relating to sections 9741, 9743, and 9746.

SEC. 1063. DETERMINATION OF WHETHER PRIVATE AIR CARRIERS ARE CONTROLLED BY UNITED STATES CITIZENS FOR PURPOSES OF ELIGIBILITY FOR GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS FOR TRANSPORTATION OF PASSENGERS OR SUPPLIES.

Section 2710 of the Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2003 (Public Law 108–11; 117 Stat. 601), is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''Any determination for purposes of this section of whether (in accordance with the first proviso of this section) an air carrier is effectively controlled by citizens of the United States shall be made by, or shall be based on determinations made by, the Secretary of Transportation.''.

SEC. 1064. EVALUATION OF WHETHER TO PROHIBIT CERTAIN OFFERS FOR TRANSPORTATION OF SECURITY-SENSITIVE CARGO.

(a) EVALUATION REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall evaluate whether, and under what circumstances, in the award of service contracts for domestic freight transportation for security-sensitive cargo (such as arms, ammunitions, explosive, and classified material), the Secretary should not consider an offer or tender from more than one motor carrier that is part of a group of motor carriers under common financial or administrative control. In conducting the evaluation, the Secretary shall seek industry comment.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than January 1, 2005, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report on the results of the evaluation conducted under subsection (a).

Subtitle H—Other Matters

SEC. 1071. TWO-YEAR EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE TO ENGAGE IN COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES AS SECURITY FOR INTELLIGENCE COLLECTION ACTIVITIES ABROAD.

Section 431(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''December 31, 2004'' and inserting ''December 31, 2006''.

SEC. 1072. ASSISTANCE FOR STUDY OF FEASIBILITY OF BIENNIAL INTERNATIONAL AIR TRADE SHOW IN THE UNITED STATES AND FOR INITIAL IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) ASSISTANCE FOR COMMUNITY FEASIBILITY STUDY.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall provide assistance to a community selected under subsection (d) for expenses of a study by that community of the feasibility of the establishment and operation of a biennial international air trade show in the area of that community.

(2) The Secretary shall provide for the community to submit to the Secretary a report containing the results of the study not later than September 30, 2005. The Secretary shall promptly submit the report to Congress, together with such comments on the report as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(b) ASSISTANCE FOR IMPLEMENTATION.—If the community conducting the study under subsection (a) determines that the establishment and operation of such an air show is feasible and should be implemented, the Secretary shall provide assistance to the community for the initial expenses of implementing such an air show in the selected community.

(c) AMOUNT OF ASSISTANCE.—The amount of assistance provided by the Secretary under subsections (a) and (b)—

(1) may not exceed a total of $1,000,000, to be derived from amounts available for operation and maintenance for the Air Force for fiscal year 2005 or later fiscal years; and

(2) may not exceed one-half of the cost of the study and may not exceed one-half the cost of such initial implementation.

(d) SELECTION OF COMMUNITY.—The Secretary shall select a community for purposes of subsection (a) through the use of competitive procedures. In making such selection, the Secretary shall give preference to those communities that already sponsor an air show, have demonstrated a history of supporting air shows with local resources, and have a significant role in the aerospace community. The community shall be selected not later than March 1, 2005.

SEC. 1073. TECHNICAL AND CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) CLARIFICATION OF DEFINITION OF ''OPERATIONAL RANGE''.—Section 101(e)(3) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Secretary of Defense'' and inserting ''Secretary of a military department''.

(b) AMENDMENTS RELATING TO DEFINITION OF CONGRESSIONAL DEFENSE COMMITTEES.—

(1) Chapter 169 of such title is amended as follows:

(A) Paragraph (4) of section 2801(c) is amended to read as follows:

''(4) The term 'congressional defense committees' includes, with respect to any project to be carried out by, or for the use of, an intelligence component of the Department of Defense—

''(A) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

''(B) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.''.

(B) The following sections are amended by striking ''appropriate committees of Congress'' each place it appears and inserting ''congressional defense committees'': sections 2803(b), 2804(b), 2805(b)(2), 2806(c)(2), 2807(b), 2807(c), 2808(b), 2809(f)(1), 2811(d), 2812(c)(1)(A), 2813(c), 2814(a)(2)(A), 2814(g)(1), 2825(b)(1), 2827(b), 2828(f), 2835(g), 2836(f), 2837(c)(2), 2853(c)(2), 2854(b), 2854a(c)(1), 2865(e)(2), 2866(c)(2), 2875(e), 2881a(d)(2), 2881a(e), 2883(f), and 2884(a).

(2) Section 2215 is amended—

(A) by striking ''(a) CERTIFICATION REQUIRED.—'';

(B) by striking ''congressional committees specified in subsection (b)'' and inserting ''congressional defense committees''; and

(C) by striking subsection (b).

(3) Section 2306b(g) is amended by striking ''Committee on'' the first place it appears and all that follows through ''House of Representatives'' and inserting ''congressional defense committees''.

(4) Section 2515(d) is amended—

(A) by striking ''(1)'' before ''The Secretary'';

(B) by striking ''congressional committees specified in paragraph (2)'' and inserting ''congressional defense committees''; and

(C) by striking paragraph (2).

(5) Section 2676(d) is amended by striking ''appropriate committees of Congress'' at the end of the first sentence and inserting ''congressional defense committees''.

(6) Section 2694a is amended by striking ''appropriate committees of Congress'' in subsections (e) and (i)(1) and inserting ''congressional defense committees''.

(c) AMENDMENTS RELATING TO DEFINITION OF BASE CLOSURE LAWS.—

(1) Section 2694a(i) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (2).

(2) Paragraph (1) of section 1333(i) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103–160; 10 U.S.C. 2701 note) is amended to read as follows:

''(1) BASE CLOSURE LAW.—The term 'base closure law' has the meaning given such term in section 101(a)(17) of title 10, United States Code.''.

(3) Subsection (b) of section 2814 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (division B of Public Law 103–337; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) BASE CLOSURE LAW DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'base closure law' has the meaning given such term in section 101(a)(17) of title 10, United States Code.''.

(4) Subsection (c) of section 3341 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(c) For purposes of this section, the term 'base closure law' has the meaning given such term in section 101(a)(17) of title 10.''.

(5)(A) Paragraph (1) of section 554(a) of title 40, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(1) BASE CLOSURE LAW.—The term 'base closure law' has the meaning given that term in section 101(a)(17) of title 10.''.

(B) Subparagraph (B) of section 572(b)(1) of title 40 is amended to read as follows:

''(B) BASE CLOSURE LAW.—The term 'base closure law' has the meaning given that term in section 101(a)(17) of title 10.''.

(d) DEFINITION OF STATE FOR PURPOSES OF SECTION 2694A.—Subsection (i) of section 2694a of title 10, United States Code, as amended by subsections (b)(6) and (c)(1), is further amended—

(1) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph (2):

''(2) The term 'State' includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa.''; and

(2) by striking paragraph (4).

(e) MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.—Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) The tables of chapters at the beginning of subtitle A, and at the beginning of part I of subtitle A, are amended by striking ''481'' in the item relating to chapter 23 and inserting ''480''.

(2) Section 130a is amended—

(A) by striking ''Effective October 1, 2002, the'' in subsection (a) and inserting ''The'';

(B) by striking ''baseline number'' in subsection (a) and all that follows through ''means the'' in subsection (c);

(C) by transferring subsection (e) so as to appear before subsection (d) and redesignating that subsection as subsection (b);

(D) by redesignating subsections (d) and (f) as subsection (c) and (d), respectively; and

(E) by striking subsection (g).

(3) Section 437(c) is amended by inserting ''(50 U.S.C. 415b)'' after ''National Security Act of 1947''.

(4) Section 487(d) is amended by striking ''OTHER DEFINITIONS'' and inserting ''INAPPLICABILITY TO COAST GUARD''.

(5) Section 503(c)(1)(B) is amended by striking ''education'' in the second sentence and inserting ''educational''.

(6) Section 632(c)(1) is amended—

(A) by striking ''paragraph (2)'' and inserting ''paragraph (3)''; and

(B) by striking ''under that paragraph'' and inserting ''under that subsection''.

(7) The item relating to section 1076b in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 55 is amended to read as follows:

''1076b. TRICARE program: coverage for members of the Ready Reserve.''.

(8) Section 1108(e) is amended by striking ''heath'' and inserting ''health''.

(9) Section 1406(g) is amended—

(A) by striking ''section 305'' and inserting ''section 245''; and

(B) by inserting ''(33 U.S.C. 3045)'' after ''of 2002''.

(10) Sections 1448(b)(1)(F), 1448(d)(2)(B), 1448(d)(6)(A), and 1458(j) are amended by striking ''on or after the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004'' and inserting ''after November 23, 2003,''.

(11) Sections 1463(a), 1465(c)(1)(A), 1465(c)(1)(B), 1465(c)(4)(A), 1465(c)(4)(B), and 1466(b)(2)(D) are amended by striking ''1413, 1413a,'' and inserting ''1413a''.

(12) Section 1557(b) is amended ''Effective October 1, 2002, final'' and inserting ''Final''.

(13) Section 1566 is amended—

(A) in subsection (g)(2), by striking ''the date that is 6 months after the date of the enactment of the Help America Vote Act of 2002'' in the last sentence and inserting ''April 29, 2003''; and

(B) in subsections (h), (i)(1), and (i)(3), by striking ''Armed Forces'' and inserting ''armed forces''.

(14) Sections 1724(d) and 1732(d)(1) are amended by striking ''its decision'' in the second sentence and inserting ''the decision of the Secretary''.

(15) Section 1761(b) is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''provide for—'' and inserting ''provide for the following:'';

(B) in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), by capitalizing the first letter of the first word;

(C) at the end of paragraphs (1) and (2), by striking the semicolon and inserting a period;

(D) at the end of paragraph (3), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period; and

(E) by striking paragraph (4).

(16) Section 2193b(c)(2) is amended by striking ''the date of the enactment of this section'' and inserting ''October 5, 1999''.

(17) Section 2224(c) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking ''subtitle II of chapter 35'' and inserting ''subchapter II of chapter 35''.

(18) Section 2349(d) is amended by striking ''section 2350a(i)(3)'' and inserting ''section 2350a(i)(2)''.

(19) Section 2350b(g) is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting ''the Secretary of Defense'' after ''authorizing''; and

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking ''the Secretary of Defense''.

(20) Section 2540(b)(2) is amended by inserting '', as in effect on that date'' before the period at the end.

(21) Section 2662(a)(2) is amended—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking ''must include a summarization'' and inserting ''shall include a summary''; and

(B) in the second sentence, by inserting ''of paragraph (1)'' after ''in subparagraph (E)''.

(22) Section 2672a(a) is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting ''in any case in which the Secretary determines'' after ''in land'';

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking ''the Secretary determines'' and inserting ''the acquisition''; and

(C) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''the acquisition'' after ''(2)''.

(23) Section 2701 is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(2), by inserting ''(42 U.S.C. 9620)'' before the period at the end;

(B) in subsection (c)(2), by striking ''of CERCLA (relating to settlements)'' and inserting ''(relating to settlements) of CERCLA (42 U.S.C. 9622)'';

(C) in subsection (e), by inserting ''(42 U.S.C. 9619)'' after ''CERCLA''; and

(D) in subsection (j)(2), by striking ''the Comprehensive'' and all the follows through ''of 1980'' and inserting ''CERCLA''.

(24) Section 2702 is amended by inserting ''(42 U.S.C. 9660(a)(5))'' in the second sentence of subsection (a) before the period at the end.

(25) Section 2703(b) is amended by striking ''The terms'' at the beginning of the second sentence and inserting ''For purposes of the preceding sentence, the terms''.

(26) Section 2704 is amended by inserting ''(42 U.S.C. 9604(i))'' in subsections (c), (e), and (f) after ''CERCLA''.

(27) The second section 3755, added by section 543(b)(1) of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314; 116 Stat. 2549), is redesignated as section 3756, and the item relating to that section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 357 is revised to reflect such redesignation.

(28) Section 4689 is amended by striking ''Building'' after ''Capitol''.

(29) The second section 6257, added by section 543(c)(1) of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314; 116 Stat. 2549), is redesignated as section 6258, and the item relating to that section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 567 is revised to reflect such redesignation.

(30) Section 7102 is amended—

(A) by striking ''AUTHORITY'' at the beginning of subsection (a) and inserting ''MASTER OF MILITARY STUDIES'';

(B) by striking ''MARINE CORPS WAR COLLEGE'' at the beginning of subsection (b) and inserting ''MASTER OF STRATEGIC STUDIES'';

(C) by striking ''COMMAND AND STAFF COLLEGE OF THE MARINE CORPS UNIVERSITY'' at the beginning of subsection (c) and inserting ''MASTER OF OPERATIONAL STUDIES''; and

(D) by striking ''subsections (a) and (b)'' in subsection (d) and inserting ''this section''.

(31) Section 8084 is amended by striking ''capabilty'' and inserting ''capability''.

(32) The second section 8755, added by section 543(d)(1) of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314; 116 Stat. 2550), is redesignated as section 8756, and the item relating to that section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 857 is revised to reflect such redesignation.

(33) The table in section 12012(a) is amended by inserting a colon after ''Air National Guard''.

(f) TITLE 37, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 323(h) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Secretary of Transportation'' and inserting ''Secretary of Homeland Security''.

(g) PUBLIC LAW 108–136.—Effective as of November 24, 2003, and as if included therein as enacted, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) is amended as follows:

(1) Sections 832(a) and 834(a) (117 Stat. 1550) are each amended by striking ''such title'' and inserting ''title 10, United States Code,''

(2) Section 931(a)(1) (117 Stat. 1580) is amended by striking ''and donations'' in the first quoted matter and inserting ''or donations''.

(3) Section 2204(b) (117 Stat. 1706) is amended by striking ''section 2101(a)'' each place it appears and inserting ''section 2201(a)''.

(h) PUBLIC LAW 107–314.—Effective as of December 2, 2002, and as if included therein as enacted, section 1064(a)(2) of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314; 116 Stat. 2654) is amended by inserting ''the item relating to'' after ''is amended by inserting after''.

(i) PUBLIC LAW 101–510.—Section 2902(e)(2)(B) 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) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking ''Subcommittee on Readiness, Sustainability, and Support'' and inserting ''Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support''; and

(2) in clause (ii), by striking ''Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities'' and inserting ''Subcommittee on Readiness''.

(j) NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 1947.—Sections 702(a)(6)(B)(iv)(I), 703(a)(6)(B)(iv)(I), and 704(f)(2)(D)(i) of the National Security Act of 1947 are amended by striking ''responsible records'' and inserting ''responsive records''.

(k) CODIFICATION RELATING TO LEAVE FOR ATTENDANCE AT CERTAIN HEARINGS.—Subsection (b) of section 363 of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (10 U.S.C. 704 note) is—

(1) transferred to section 704 of title 10, United States Code;

(2) inserted at the end of that section;

(3) redesignated as subsection (c); and

(4) amended—

(A) by striking ''Armed Forces'' each place it appears and inserting ''armed forces'';

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''Secretary of each'' and all that follows through ''in the Navy,'' and inserting ''Secretary concerned''; and

(ii) by striking ''(as defined in section 101 of title 10, United States Code)''; and

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking ''For purposes of this subsection—'' and inserting ''In this subsection:'';

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''title 10, United States Code'' and inserting ''this title''; and

(iii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''such term'' and inserting ''that term''.

SEC. 1074. COMMISSION ON THE LONG-TERM IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NEW STRATEGIC POSTURE OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established a commission to be known as the ''Commission on the Long-Term Implementation of the New Strategic Posture of the United States''. The Secretary of Defense shall enter into a contract with a federally funded research and development center to provide for the organization, management, and support of the Commission. Such contract shall be entered into in consultation with the Secretary of Energy.

(2) COMPOSITION.—(A) The Commission shall be composed of 12 members who shall be appointed by the Secretary of Defense. In selecting individuals for appointment to the Commission, the Secretary of Defense shall consult with the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

(B) Members of the Commission shall be appointed from among private United States citizens with knowledge and expertise in the political, military, operational, and technical aspects of nuclear strategy.

(3) CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMISSION.—The Secretary of Defense shall designate one of the members of the Commission to serve as chairman of the Commission.

(4) PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT; VACANCIES.—Members shall be appointed for the life of the Commission. Any vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(5) SECURITY CLEARANCES.—All members of the Commission shall hold appropriate security clearances.

(b) DUTIES OF COMMISSION.—

(1) REVIEW OF LONG-TERM IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NUCLEAR POSTURE REVIEW.—The Commission shall examine long-term programmatic requirements to achieve the goals set forth in the report of the Secretary of Defense submitted to Congress on December 31, 2001, providing the results of the Nuclear Posture Review conducted pursuant to section 1041 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (as enacted into law by Public Law 106–398; 114 Stat. 1654, 1654A–262) and results of periodic assessments of the Nuclear Posture Review. Matters examined by the Commission shall include the following:

(A) The process of establishing requirements for strategic forces and how that process accommodates employment of nonnuclear strike platforms and munitions in a strategic role.

(B) How strategic intelligence, reconnaissance, and surveillance requirements differ from nuclear intelligence, reconnaissance, and surveillance requirements.

(C) The ability of a limited number of strategic platforms to carry out a growing range of nonnuclear strategic strike missions.

(D) The limits of tactical systems to perform nonnuclear global strategic missions in a prompt manner.

(E) An assessment of the ability of the current nuclear stockpile to address the evolving strategic threat environment through 2025.

(2) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Commission shall include in its report recommendations with respect to the following:

(A) Changes to the requirements process to employ nonnuclear strike platforms and munitions in a strategic role.

(B) Changes to the nuclear stockpile and infrastructure required to preserve a nuclear capability commensurate with the changes to the strategic threat environment through 2025.

(C) Actions the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy can take to preserve flexibility of the defense nuclear comples while reducing the cost of a Cold War strategic infrastructure.

(D) Identify shortfalls in the strategic modernization programs of the United States that would undermine the ability of the United States to develop new nonnuclear strategic strike capabilities.

(3) COOPERATION FROM GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS.—(A) In carrying out its duties, the Commission shall receive the full and timely cooperation of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Energy, and any other United States Government official in providing the Commission with analyses, briefings, and other information necessary for the fulfillment of its responsibilities.

(B) The Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Defense shall each designate at least one officer or employee of the Department of Energy and the Department of Defense, respectively, to serve as a liaison officer between the department and the Commission.

(c) REPORTS.—

(1) COMMISSION REPORT.—The Commission shall submit to the Secretary of Defense and the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report on the Commission's findings and conclusions. Such report shall be submitted not later that 28 months after the date of the first meeting of the Commission.

(2) SECRETARY OF DEFENSE RESPONSE.—Not later than one year after the date on which the Commission submits its report under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report—

(A) commenting on the Commission's findings and conclusions; and

(B) explaining what actions, if any, the Secretary intends to take to implement the recommendations of the Commission and, with respect to each such recommendation, the Secretary's reasons for implementing, or not implementing, the recommendation.

(d) HEARINGS AND PROCEDURES.—

(1) HEARINGS.—The Commission may, for the purpose of carrying out the purposes of this section, hold hearings and take testimony.

(2) PROCEDURES.—The federally funded research and development center with which a contract is entered into under subsection (a)(1) shall be responsible for establishing appropriate procedures for the Commission.

(3) DETAIL OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.—Upon request of the chairman of the Commission, the head of any Federal department or agency may detail, on a nonreimbursable basis, personnel of that department or agency to the Commission to assist it in carrying out its duties.

(e) FUNDING.—Funds for activities of the Commission shall be provided from amounts appropriated for the Department of Defense.

(f) TERMINATION OF COMMISSION.—The Commission shall terminate 60 days after the date of the submission of its report under subsection (c)(1).

(g) IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) FFRDC CONTRACT.—The Secretary of Defense shall enter into the contract required under subsection (a)(1) not later that 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) FIRST MEETING.—The Commission shall convene its first meeting not later than 60 days after the date as of which all members of the Commission have been appointed.

SEC. 1075. LIABILITY PROTECTION FOR CERTAIN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE VOLUNTEERS WORKING IN THE MARITIME ENVIRONMENT.

(a) AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT CERTAIN VOLUNTEER SERVICES.—Subsection (a) of section 1588 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(8) Voluntary services provided to the United States Military Academy, United States Naval Academy, and United States Air Force Academy for the training of cadets and midshipmen.''.

(b) LIABILITY PROTECTION FOR VOLUNTEERS IN MARITIME ENVIRONMENT.—Subparagraph (D) of subsection (d)(1) of such section is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' after ''this title'' and inserting a comma; and

(2) by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', and chapters 20 and 22 of title 46 (relating to claims for damages or loss on navigable waters)''.

SEC. 1076. TRANSFER OF HISTORIC F3A-1 BREWSTER CORSAIR AIRCRAFT.

(a) AUTHORITY TO CONVEY.—The Secretary of the Navy may convey, without consideration, to Lex Cralley, of Princeton Minnesota (in this section referred to as ''transferee''), all right, title and interest of the United States in and to a F3A-1 Brewster Corsair aircraft (Bureau Number 04634). The conveyance shall be made by means of a deed of gift.

(b) CONDITION OF AIRCRAFT.—The aircraft shall be conveyed under subsection (a) in its current unflyable, ''as is'' condition. The Secretary is not required to repair or alter the condition of the aircraft before conveying ownership of the aircraft.

(c) CONVEYANCE AT NO COST TO THE UNITED STATES.—The conveyance of the aircraft under subsection (a) shall be made at no cost to the United States. Any costs associated with the conveyance and costs of operation and maintenance of the aircraft conveyed shall be borne by the transferee.

(d) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with a conveyance under this section as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

TITLE XI—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

SEC. 1101. PAYMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEE HEALTH BENEFIT PREMIUMS FOR MOBILIZED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.

(a) AUTHORITY TO CONTINUE BENEFIT COVERAGE.—Section 8905a of title 5, United States Code is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''paragraph (1) or (2) of'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (2)(C), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) any employee who—

''(A) is enrolled in a health benefits plan under this chapter;

''(B) is a member of a Reserve component of the armed forces;

''(C) is called or ordered to active duty in support of a contingency operation (as defined in section 101(a)(13) of title 10);

''(D) is placed on leave without pay or separated from service to perform active duty; and

''(E) serves on active duty for a period of more than 30 consecutive days.''; and

(4) in subsection (e)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) in the case of an employee described in subsection (b)(3), the date which is 24 months after the employee is placed on leave without pay or separated from service to perform active duty.''.

(b) AUTHORITY FOR AGENCIES TO PAY PREMIUMS.—Subparagraph (C) of section 8906(e)(3) of such title is amended by striking ''18 months'' and inserting ''24 months''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to Federal employees called or ordered to active duty on or after September 14, 2001.

SEC. 1102. FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY PAY.

Section 1596a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2), by striking ''during a contingency operation supported by the armed forces''; and

(2) in subsection (c), by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''and shall not be considered base pay for any purpose''.

SEC. 1103. PAY PARITY FOR CIVILIAN INTELLIGENCE PERSONNEL.

Section 1602 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''in relation to the rates of pay provided in subpart D of part III of title 5 for positions subject to that subpart which have corresponding levels of duties and responsibilities'' and inserting ''in relation to the rates of pay provided for Department of Defense Senior Executive, Senior Level, and other comparable positions''; and

(2) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

''(b) PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEM.—The positions referred to in subsection (a) shall be subject to a performance appraisal system which, as designed and applied, is certified by the Secretary of Defense as making meaningful distinctions based on relative performance and may be the same performance appraisal system established and implemented within the Department for members of the Senior Executive Service.''.

SEC. 1104. PAY PARITY FOR SENIOR EXECUTIVES IN NONAPPROPRIATED FUND INSTRUMENTALITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 81 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 1599e. Senior executive compensation for nonappropriated fund instrumentalities

''Notwithstanding any provisions of title 5, the Secretary of Defense may regulate the amount of total compensation, including the rate of basic pay, of senior executives employed by Department of Defense nonappropriated fund instrumentalities, to provide for parity with the total compensation, including basic pay, of Department of Defense employees in the Senior Executive Service and other similar senior executive positions.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1599d the following new item:

''1599e. Senior executive compensation for nonappropriated fund instrumentalities.''.

SEC. 1105. PROHIBITION OF UNAUTHORIZED WEARING OR USE OF CIVILIAN MEDALS OR DECORATIONS.

Chapter 57 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 1134. Civilian medals or decorations of the Department of Defense

''(a) PROHIBITION.—Except with the written permission of the Secretary of Defense or when authorized by regulations, no person may knowingly—

''(1) wear; or

''(2) use, in connection with any merchandise, retail product, impersonation, solicitation, or commercial activity;

medals, decorations, or other insignia awarded by the Secretary of Defense to recognize Department of Defense civilian employees and other individuals who render service to the Department of Defense.

''(b) AUTHORITY TO ENJOIN VIOLATIONS.—Whenever it appears to the Attorney General that any person is engaged or is about to engage in an act or practice which constitutes or will constitute conduct prohibited by subsection (a), the Attorney General may initiate a civil proceeding in a district court of the United States to enjoin such act or practice. Such court shall proceed as soon as practicable to the hearing and determination of such action and may, at any time before final determination, enter such restraining orders or prohibitions, or take such other actions as is warranted, including imposing a civil penalty not to exceed $25,000 for each violation, to prevent injury to the United States or to any person or class of persons for whose protection the action is brought.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''1134. Civilian medals or decorations of the Department of Defense.''

TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO OTHER NATIONS

Subtitle A—Matters Relating to Iraq, Afghanistan, and Global War on Terrorism

SEC. 1201. DOCUMENTATION OF CONDITIONS IN IRAQ UNDER FORMER DICTATORIAL GOVERNMENT AS PART OF TRANSITION TO POST-DICTATORIAL GOVERNMENT.

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

(1) The regime of Saddam Hussein in Iraq was a dictatorial regime prone to secrecy in the maintenance of its hold on power.

(2) The people of Iraq all suffered as a result of Saddam Hussein's dictatorial control.

(3) Efforts in other post-dictatorial states to document the crimes and abuses of their predecessor dictatorial governments have contributed to the process of national reconciliation and have served as a reminder about the importance of protecting individual rights.

(b) TRANSFER OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS AND RECORDS.—The Secretary of Defense shall, to the extent practicable, establish a process for expeditiously transferring to indigenous Iraqi entities committed to documenting publicly the nature of the Saddam Hussein regime any documents and records described in subsection (c) that are obtained by United States military forces in Iraq.

(c) COVERED DOCUMENTS AND RECORDS.—The documents and records referred to in subsection (b) are documents and records—

(1) that were created by—

(A) the Government of Iraq between 1968 and May 1, 2003; or

(B) the Ba'ath Socialist Party in Iraq after 1968; and

(2) that provide insight into—

(A) the functioning of the Government of Iraq or the Ba'ath Socialist Party in Iraq; or

(B) the crimes, atrocities, and brutal practices of the Iraqi government towards the people of Iraq during the period between 1968 and May 1, 2003.

SEC. 1202. SUPPORT OF MILITARY OPERATIONS TO COMBAT TERRORISM.

(a) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Defense may expend up to $25,000,000 during any fiscal year during which this subsection is in effect to provide support to foreign forces, irregular forces, groups, or individuals engaged in supporting or facilitating ongoing military operations by United States special operations forces to combat terrorism.

(b) INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.—This section does not constitute authority to conduct a covert action, as such term is defined in section 503(e) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 413b(e)).

(c) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after the close of each fiscal year during which subsection (a) is in effect, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on support provided under this section during that fiscal year. Each such report shall describe the support provided, including a statement of the recipient of the support and the amount obligated to provide the support.

(d) FISCAL YEAR 2005 LIMITATION.—Support may be provided under subsection (a) during fiscal year 2005 only from funds made available for operations and maintenance pursuant to title XV of this Act.

(e) PERIOD OF AUTHORITY.—The authority under subsection (a) is in effect during each of fiscal years 2005 through 2007.

SEC. 1203. COMMANDERS' EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROGRAM.

(a) FISCAL YEAR 2005 AUTHORITY.—During fiscal year 2005, from funds made available to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance pursuant to title XV of this Act, not to exceed $300,000,000 may be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to provide funds for the Commanders' Emergency Response Program, established by the Administrator of the Coalition Provisional Authority for the purpose of enabling military commanders in Iraq to respond to urgent humanitarian relief and reconstruction requirements within their areas of responsibility by carrying out programs that will immediately assist the Iraqi people, and to provide funds for a similar program to assist the people of Afghanistan.

(b) QUARTERLY REPORTS.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a quarterly report, beginning on January 15, 2005, regarding the source of funds and the allocation and use of funds made available pursuant to the authorityprovided in this section.

SEC. 1204. STATUS OF IRAQI SECURITY FORCES.

(a) STRATEGIC PLAN.—No later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a strategic plan setting forth the manner in which the United States will achieve the goal of establishing viable and professional Iraqi security forces able to provide for the long-term security of the Iraqi people.

(b) COMPONENTS.—The strategic plan established under subsection (a) shall include at least the following:

(1) Recruiting and retention goals, shown for each service of the Iraqi security forces.

(2) Training plans for each service of the Iraqi security forces.

(3) A description of metrics by which progress toward the goal of Iraqi provision for its own security can be measured.

(4) A description of equipment needs, shown for each service of the Iraqi security forces.

(5) A resourcing plan for achieving the goals of the strategic plan.

(6) Personnel plans in terms of United States military and contractor personnel to be used in training each such service.

(7) A description of challenges faced and opportunities presented in particular regions of Iraq and a plan for addressing those challenges.

(8) A discussion of training and deployment successes and failures to the date of the report and how lessons from those successes and failures will be incorporated into the strategic plan.

(c) SUBSEQUENT REPORTS.—Ninety days following the submission of the strategic plan to Congress under subsection (a) and every 90 days thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report on progress toward meeting the goals established in the strategic plan. Each such report shall address the following:

(1) The number of forces recruited, currently serving, and that have left (along with a breakdown of the reasons for leaving) by service over the period in question.

(2) Progress in meeting training goals.

(3) Progress in achieving other metrics as identified in the strategic plan.

(4) A description and analysis of any training incidents and deployment successes and failures, with a discussion of how those incidents and successes will affect future efforts to achieve the goals of the strategic plan.

(d) IRAQI SECURITY FORCES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''Iraqi security forces'' means the Iraqi Armed Forces (IAF), the Iraqi Civil Defense Corps (ICDC), the Iraqi Police Service

(IPS), the Department of Border Enforcement (DBE), and the Facilities Protection Services (FCS).

SEC. 1205. GUIDANCE AND REPORT REQUIRED ON CONTRACTORS SUPPORTING DEPLOYED FORCES IN IRAQ.

(a) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall issue guidance on how to manage contractors that support deployed forces and shall direct the Secretaries of the military departments to develop procedures to ensure implementation of the guidance. The guidance shall—

(1) establish policies for the use of contractors to support deployed forces;

(2) delineate the roles and responsibilities of commanders regarding the management and oversight of contractors that support deployed forces; and

(3) integrate into a single document other guidance and doctrine that may affect Department of Defense responsibilities to contractors in locations where members of the Armed Forces are deployed.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after issuing the guidance required under subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report containing a discussion of the following:

(1) A description of the process used by the Department of Defense for deciding which security functions in Iraq will be performed by military personnel and which by private security companies.

(2) A discussion of the overall chain of command and oversight mechanisms that are in place to ensure adequate command and supervision of contractor personnel in critical security roles.

(3) An explanation of the rules of engagement for private security personnel throughout Iraq, along with how training in these rules of engagement is being carried out.

(4) A description of mechanisms that exist or that are under consideration to share intelligence and standardize communications procedures among private security companies.

(5) Casualty and fatality figures for each contractor in Iraq supporting deployed forces over the period beginning on May 1, 2003, and ending on the date of the issuance of the guidance.

(6) Disciplinary or criminal actions brought against such contractors during the period covered by the report.

(7) Any incidents of note in Iraq regarding such contractors during the period covered by the report.

(8) A plan for establishing and implementing a process for collecting data on individual contractors, the value of the contracts, and the number of personnel in Iraq performing the following services:

(A) Personal security details.

(B) Non-military site security.

(C) Non-military convoy security.

(D) Interrogation services at interrogation centers operated by the Department of Defense.

SEC. 1206. FINDINGS AND SENSE OF CONGRESS CONCERNING ARMY SPECIALIST JOSEPH DARBY.

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

(1) The need to act in accord with one's conscience, risking one's career and even the esteem of one's colleagues by pursuing what is right is especially important today.

(2) While the Department of Defense investigate the horrific abuses in American detention facilities in Iraq, the Nation should bear in mind that the abuses were only brought to light because of the courage of an American soldier.

(3) By alerting his superiors to abuses at Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq, Army Specialist Joseph Darby demonstrated the courage to speak out and do what is right for his country.

(4) Such an action is especially important in light of the many challenges facing the country.

(5) Specialist Darby deserves the Nation's thanks for speaking up and for standing up for what is right.

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

(1) the Secretary of Defense should make every protection available to Army Specialist Joseph Darby and others who demonstrate such courage; and

(2) Specialist Darby should be commended appropriately by the Secretary of the Army.

Subtitle B—Other Matters

SEC. 1211. ASSIGNMENT OF ALLIED NAVAL PERSONNEL TO SUBMARINE SAFETY PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 631 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 7234. Submarine safety programs: participation of allied naval personnel

''(a) ACCEPTANCE OF ASSIGNMENT OF FOREIGN NAVAL PERSONNEL.—In order to facilitate the development, standardization, and interoperability of submarine vessel safety and rescue systems and procedures, the Secretary of the Navy may conduct a program under which members of the naval service of any of the member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and Australia, Japan, the Republic of Korea, and Sweden may be assigned to United States commands to work on such systems and procedures.

''(b) COSTS FOR FOREIGN PERSONNEL.—(1) The United States may not pay the following costs for a member of a foreign naval service sent to the United States under the program authorized by this section:

''(A) Salary.

''(B) Per diem.

''(C) Cost of living.

''(D) Travel costs.

''(E) Cost of language or other training.

''(F) Other costs.

''(2) Paragraph (1) does not apply to the following costs, which may be paid by the United States:

''(A) The cost of temporary duty directed by the United States Navy.

''(B) The cost of training programs conducted to familiarize, orient, or certify members of foreign naval services regarding unique aspects of their assignments.

''(C) Costs incident to the use of the facilities of the United States Navy in the performance of assigned duties.

''(d) APPLICABILITY TO AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO AGREEMENTS.—The requirements of this section shall apply in the exercise of any authority of the Secretary of the Navy to enter into an agreement with the government of a foreign country, subject to the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to provide for the assignment of members of the naval service of the foreign country to a United States Navy submarine safety program.

''(e) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of the Navy may prescribe regulations for the application of this section in the exercise of authority referred to in subsection (d).''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''7234. Submarine safety programs: participation of allied naval personnel.''.

SEC. 1212. EXPANSION OF ENTITIES OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA SUBJECT TO CERTAIN PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITIES WHEN OPERATING IN THE UNITED STATES.

Section 1237(b)(4)(B)(i) of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended by inserting after ''the People's Liberation Army'' the following: '', by a ministry of the government of the People's Republic of China, or by an entity affiliated with the defense industrial base of the People's Republic of China''.

SEC. 1213. REPORT BY PRESIDENT ON GLOBAL PEACE OPERATIONS INITIATIVE.

Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the Congress a report on the Global Peace Operations Initiative. The report shall include the following elements:

(1) A summary of the goals of the Global Peace Operations Initiative and the timetable for achieving those goals.

(2) An examination of the mechanisms by which the United States will ensure that foreign countries acquiring new capabilities as a result of that Initiative will use those capabilities to the national security benefit of the United States.

(3) An examination of the mechanisms by which the United States will ensure that training and equipment provided under that Initiative are used solely for the purposes of peacekeeping and peace enforcement operations.

(4) An examination of the human rights practices of potential recipients under that Initiative, to include a discussion of each potential recipient's commitment to representative government.

(5) As assessment of the financial resources required to carry out that Initiative during fiscal years 2005 through 2009.

(6) An assessment of the effectiveness of the program of the Department of State referred to as the African Contingency Operations and Training Assistance program and the capacity of that program to be expanded.

(7) A review that compares and contrasts the basic military skills required of warfighters and the skills needed for peacekeeping and peace enforcement operations.

(8) An assessment of the ability of military forces in the developing world to absorb, retain, and use the advanced skills and capabilities needed for effective peacekeeping and peace enforcement operations.

(9) A proposal for providing sufficient resources to the Department of State to conduct the Global Peace Operations Initiative without significant financial contributions from the Department of Defense.

(10) An explanation of the reasons of the Administration for proposing to exempt the Global Peace Operations Initiative from existing law related to the type of military and police training the United States may provide to foreign countries.

(11) An examination of the costs and benefits of transferring responsibility for the training and equipping of foreign military and security forces from the Department of State to the Department of Defense, including an identification of any increased resources that will be provided to the Department of Defense should the Department of Defense become responsible for that activity.

SEC. 1214. PROCUREMENT SANCTIONS AGAINST FOREIGN PERSONS THAT TRANSFER CERTAIN DEFENSE ARTICLES AND SERVICES TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

(a) DECLARATION OF POLICY.—Congress declares that it is the policy of the United States to deny the People's Republic of China such defense goods and defense technology that could be used to threaten the United States or undermine the security of Taiwan or the stability of the Western Pacific region.

(b) PROCUREMENT SANCTION.—(1) The Secretary of Defense may not procure, by contract or otherwise, any goods or services from—

(A) any foreign person the Secretary of Defense determines has, with actual knowledge, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, exported, transferred, or otherwise provided to governmental or nongovernmental entities of the People's Republic of China any item or class of items on the United States Munitions List (or any item or class of items that are identical, substantially identical, or directly competitive to an item or class of items on the United States Munitions List); and

(B) any foreign person the Secretary of Defense determines—

(i) is a successor entity to a person referred to in paragraph (1);

(ii) is a parent or subsidiary of a person referred to in paragraph (1); or

(iii) is an affiliate of a person referred to in paragraph (1) if that affiliate is controlled in fact by such person.

(2) The prohibition under paragraph (1) with respect to a foreign person shall last for a period of five years after a determination is made by the Secretary of Defense with respect to that person under paragraph (1)(A).

(c) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF LIST OF SANCTIONED PERSONS.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall annually publish in the Federal Register a current list of any foreign persons sanctioned under subsection (b). The removal of foreign persons from, and the addition of foreign persons to, the list shall also be so published.

(2) The Secretary shall maintain the list published under paragraph (1) on the Internet website of the Department of Defense.

(d) REMOVAL FROM LIST OF SANCTIONED PERSONS.—The Secretary of Defense may remove a person from the list of sanctioned persons referred to in subsection (c) only after the five-year prohibition period imposed under subsection (b) with respect to the person has expired.

(e) EXCEPTIONS.—(1) Subsection (b) shall not apply—

(A) to contracts, or subcontracts under such contracts, in existence on the date of the enactment of this Act, including options under such contracts;

(B) if the Secretary of Defense determines in writing that the person to which the sanctions would otherwise be applied is a sole source supplier of the goods or services being procured, that the goods or services are essential, and that alternative sources are not readily or reasonably available;

(C) in the case of a contract for routine servicing and maintenance, if the Secretary of Defense determines in writing alternative sources for performing the contract are not readily or reasonably available; or

(D) if the Secretary of Defense determines in writing that goods or services proposed to be procured under the contract are essential to the national security of the United States.

(2) Determinations under paragraph (1) shall be published in the Federal Register.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''foreign person'' has the meaning given the term in section 14 of the Iran and Libya Sanctions Act of 1996 (50 U.S.C. 1701).

(2) The term ''United States Munitions List'' means the list referred to in section 38(a)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(a)(1)).

TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION WITH STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION

SEC. 1301. SPECIFICATION OF COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION PROGRAMS AND FUNDS.

(a) SPECIFICATION OF CTR PROGRAMS.—For purposes of section 301 and other provisions of this Act, Cooperative Threat Reduction programs are the programs specified in section 1501(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201; 110 Stat. 2731; 50 U.S.C. 2362 note).

(b) FISCAL YEAR 2005 COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION FUNDS DEFINED.—As used in this title, the term ''fiscal year 2005 Cooperative Threat Reduction funds'' means the funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 301 for Cooperative Threat Reduction programs.

(c) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 301 for Cooperative Threat Reduction programs shall be available for obligation for three fiscal years.

SEC. 1302. FUNDING ALLOCATIONS.

(a) FUNDING FOR SPECIFIC PURPOSES.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2005 in section 301(19) for Cooperative Threat Reduction programs, the following amounts may be obligated for the purposes specified:

(1) For strategic offensive arms elimination in Russia, $58,522,000.

(2) For nuclear weapons transportation security in Russia, $26,284,000.

(3) For nuclear weapons storage security in Russia, $48,720,000.

(4) For activities designated as Other Assessments/Administrative Support, $14,267,000.

(5) For defense and military contacts, $8,000,000.

(6) For chemical weapons destruction in Russia, $158,400,000.

(7) For biological weapons proliferation prevention in the former Soviet Union, $55,013,000.

(8) For weapons of mass destruction proliferation prevention in the states of the former Soviet Union, $40,030,000.

(b) REPORT ON OBLIGATION OR EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR OTHER PURPOSES.—No fiscal year 2005 Cooperative Threat Reduction funds may be obligated or expended for a purpose other than a purpose listed in paragraphs (1) through (8) of subsection (a) until 30 days after the date that the Secretary of Defense submits to Congress a report on the purpose for which the funds will be obligated or expended and the amount of funds to be obligated or expended. Nothing in the preceding sentence shall be construed as authorizing the obligation or expenditure of fiscal year 2005 Cooperative Threat Reduction funds for a purpose for which the obligation or expenditure of such funds is specifically prohibited under this title or any other provision of law.

(c) LIMITED AUTHORITY TO VARY INDIVIDUAL AMOUNTS.—(1) Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), in any case in which the Secretary of Defense determines that it is necessary to do so in the national interest, the Secretary may obligate amounts appropriated for fiscal year 2005 for a purpose listed in any of the paragraphs in subsection (a) in excess of the specific amount authorized for that purpose.

(2) An obligation of funds for a purpose stated in any of the paragraphs in subsection (a) in excess of the specific amount authorized for such purpose may be made using the authority provided in paragraph (1) only after—

(A) the Secretary submits to Congress notification of the intent to do so together with a complete discussion of the justification for doing so; and

(B) 15 days have elapsed following the date of the notification.

(3) The Secretary may not, under the authority provided in paragraph (1), obligate amounts for a purpose stated in any of paragraphs (5) through (8) of subsection (a) in excess of 125 percent of the specific amount authorized for such purpose.

SEC. 1303. TEMPORARY AUTHORITY TO WAIVE LIMITATION ON FUNDING FOR CHEMICAL WEAPONS DESTRUCTION FACILITY IN RUSSIA.

(a) TEMPORARY AUTHORITY.—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 if the President submits to Congress a written certification that includes—

(1) a statement as to why a waiver of the conditions described in such section 1305 is important to the national security interests of the United States;

(2) a full and complete justification for the waiver of the conditions; 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.—The authority in subsection (a) shall expire on September 30, 2005.

TITLE XIV—EXPORT CONTROLS AND COUNTERPROLIFERATION MATTERS

Subtitle A—Export Control Matters

SEC. 1401. DEFINITIONS UNDER ARMS EXPORT CONTROL ACT.

Section 47 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2794) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (10)—

(A) by moving the margin two ems to the left; and

(B) by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (11)—

(A) by moving the margin two ems to the left; and

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(12) 'license' means a document bearing the word license issued by the United States Government agency charged with implementing section 38 of this Act, which permits the export or import of a defense article or defense service;

''(13) 'agent' means a representative or emissary of a government other than an officer or employee of the government; and

''(14) 'exporting agent' means a freight forwarder or other consignee designated on a license application who is authorized to act on behalf of and the control of the license applicant.''.

SEC. 1402. EXEMPTION FROM LICENSING REQUIREMENTS FOR EXPORT OF SIGNIFICANT MILITARY EQUIPMENT.

Section 38(b)(2) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(2) Except'' and inserting ''(2)(A) Except'';

(2) by striking ''(A) for official'' and inserting ''(i) for official'' and further by striking ''(B) for carrying out'' and inserting ''(ii) for carrying out''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) The President may not establish an exemption in regulation or otherwise from the license requirements of this section for the export of a defense article that is significant military equipment (other than a firearm that is intended for personal use).''.

SEC. 1403. COOPERATIVE PROJECTS WITH FRIENDLY FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

Section 27 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2767) is amended—

(1) in subsection (g) to read as follows:

''(g) Unless the President states in his certification that an emergency exists which requires the immediate approval of the cooperative agreement in the national security interests of the United States (in which case the President shall set forth in the certification a justification for this determination), an agreement shall not be signed if, within the 30-day period specified in subsection (f), a joint resolution prohibiting the agreement is enacted into law.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(k) A license shall be required for the export of defense articles or defense services relating to a cooperative project by any person required to be registered under section 38(b)(1)(A)(i) whenever such export is made pursuant to, or in furtherance of, a private contract, purchase order, or similar commercial arrangement with a foreign corporation.''.

SEC. 1404. LICENSING REQUIREMENT FOR EXPORT OF MILITARILY CRITICAL TECHNOLOGIES.

(a) LICENSING REQUIREMENT.—The President shall require a license under the Export Administration Regulations of the Department of Commerce (15 C.F.R. part 730 et seq.) or the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (22 C.F.R. part 120 et seq.), as the case may be, for the export of goods or technologies included on the Militarily Critical Technologies List.

(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''Militarily Critical Technologies List'' means the list required to be developed by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to section 5(d)(2) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App.

2404(d)(2)), as such list was effect on January 20, 2004, and includes any goods or technologies that have been added to the list after that date.

SEC. 1405. CONTROL OF EXPORTS OF UNITED STATES WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

A dual use good or technology subject to the jurisdiction of the Export Administration Regulations of the Department of Commerce (15 C.F.R. part 730 et seq.) and a defense article or defense service subject to the jurisdiction of the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (22 C.F.R. part 120 et seq.) may be exported to a foreign person or a foreign country that has previously exported any such item to the military, intelligence, police, or internal security services of the Government of the People's Republic of China that would be prohibited for export to China if subject to United States export control laws only if—

(1) a license for such export is approved under the Export Administration Regulations or the International Traffic in Arms Regulations and the Secretary of Defense concurs in the approval of such license; and

(2) the foreign person or foreign country agrees in writing not to transfer title to or possession of, or otherwise provide access to, the licensed items, unless the President provides written consent thereto.

SEC. 1406. STRENGTHENING INTERNATIONAL EXPORT CONTROLS.

(a) FINDING.—The Congress recognizes that the international export control system, as currently constituted, is insufficient to achieve the national security interests of the United States.

(b) NATIONAL EXPORT CONTROL POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States to seek continued negotiations of a strengthened international export control system for the control of arms and militarily-sensitive goods and technology to countries of concern.

(c) PRESIDENTIAL REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—(1) Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every six months thereafter, the President shall submit to the committees referred to in subsection (d) a report setting forth the President's plan for effecting a strengthened international export control system capable of achieving the national security interests of the United States.

(2) The report shall include—

(A) an evaluation of the effectiveness of the current international export control system;

(B) a plan for negotiating and implementing a strengthened international export control system capable of achieving the national security interests of the United States; and

(C) challenges to and progress in negotiating and implementing that plan.

(d) COMMITTEES; CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT.—(1) The report required by subsection (c) shall be submitted to—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on International Relations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(2) The report shall be submitted in unclassified form and, as necessary, in classified form.

Subtitle B—Counterproliferation Matters

SEC. 1411. DEFENSE INTERNATIONAL COUNTERPROLIFERATION PROGRAMS.

(a) INTERNATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAM TO PREVENT UNAUTHORIZED TRANSFER AND TRANSPORTATION OF WMDS.—Subsection (b) of section 1424 of the Defense Against Weapons of Mass Destruction Act of 1996 (50 U.S.C. 2333) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) OTHER COUNTRIES.—The Secretary of Defense may carry out programs under subsection (a) in a country other than a country specified in that subsection if the Secretary determines that there exists in that country a significant threat of the unauthorized transfer and transportation of nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons or related materials.''.

(b) INTERNATIONAL TRAINING PROGRAM TO DETER WMD PROLIFERATION.—Section 1504(e)(3)(A) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103–337; 108 Stat. 2918) is amended—

(1) by striking ''The training program referred to in paragraph (1)(B) is a'' and inserting 'The Secretary of Defense may participate in a'';

(2) by inserting ''of'' after ''acquisition'';

(3) by striking ''and'' after ''countries''; and

(4) by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', and in other countries in which, as determined by the Secretary of Defense, there exists a significant threat of such proliferation and acquisition''.

SEC. 1412. DEFENSE COUNTERPROLIFERATION FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—Chapter 101 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 2015. Defense counterproliferation fellowship program

''(a) PROGRAM AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Defense may carry out a program under which foreign military defense personnel are selected to attend Department of Defense courses and programs in counterproliferation and nonproliferation matters in order to improve the ability of the foreign military defense personnel to contribute to halting the illicit acquisition or transportation of weapons of mass destruction or of materials that support the development or use of such weapons.

''(b) AUTHORITY TO PAY FOR COSTS OF PARTICIPANTS.—The Secretary of Defense may pay for all costs (including transportation, travel, and subsistence costs) associated with the attendance by a participant at courses and programs in the program under this section.

''(c) PARTICIPANTS.—(1) The following persons may be selected for participation in the program under this section:

''(A) Foreign military officers.

''(B) Foreign ministry of defense officials.

''(2) Participants in the program shall be selected by the Secretary of Defense based upon recommendations made by the commanders of the regional unified combatant commands.

''(d) AUTHORIZED PROGRAM ACTIVITIES.—Participants in the program may be selected for attendance at, and may be authorize to attend, any of the following:

''(1) Department of Defense professional military educational institutions.

''(2) Regional centers for security studies of the Department of Defense.

''(e) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations for the administration of the program under this section.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''2015. Defense counterproliferation fellowship program.''.

Subtitle C—Initiatives Relating to Countries of Former Soviet Union

SEC. 1421. SILK ROAD INITIATIVE.

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

(1) A number of independent states of the former Soviet Union have been helpful to the United States in the war on terrorism.

(2) Such states are new and struggling democracies and would benefit considerably from assistance to create sustainable jobs for their underemployed or unemployed scientists, engineers, and technicians who were formerly engaged in activities to develop and produce weapons of mass destruction for the Russian Federation or other such state.

(b) POLICIES.—(1) It is the policy of the United States to seek to establish and promote programs to prevent the proliferation, from scientists, engineers, and technicians of the Russian Federation and other independent states of the former Soviet Union to countries of proliferation concern, of expertise to develop and produce weapons of mass destruction.

(2) It is also the policy of the United States to seek to assist independent states of the former Soviet Union that have been helpful to the United States in the war on terrorism so as to promote the creation of jobs that foster economic stability and democracy.

(c) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—(1) The Secretary of Energy may carry out a program, to be known as the Silk Road Initiative, to promote non-weapons-related employment opportunities in the United States and in Silk Road nations for scientists, engineers, and technicians formerly engaged in activities to develop and produce weapons of mass destruction in Silk Road nations. The program should—

(A) incorporate best practices under the former Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention program; and

(B) facilitate commercial partnerships between private entities in the United States and scientists, engineers, and technicians in the Silk Road nations.

(2) Before implementing the program with respect to multiple Silk Road nations, the Secretary of Energy shall carry out a pilot program with respect to one Silk Road nation selected by the Secretary. It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary should select the Republic of Georgia.

(d) SILK ROAD NATIONS DEFINED.—In this section, the Silk Road nations are Armenia, Azerbaijan, the Republic of Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan.

(e) FUNDING.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for nonproliferation and international security for fiscal year 2005, $10,000,000 may be used to carry out this section.

SEC. 1422. TELLER-KURCHATOV NONPROLIFERATION FELLOWSHIPS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) From amounts made available to carry out this section, the Administrator for Nuclear Security may carry out a program under which the Administrator awards, to scientists employed at the Kurchatov Institute of the Russian Federation and scientists employed at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, international exchange fellowships, to be known as Teller-Kurchatov Nonproliferation Fellowships, in the nuclear nonproliferation sciences.

(2) The purpose of the program shall be to provide opportunities for advancement in the field of nuclear nonproliferation to scientists who, as demonstrated by their academic or professional achievements, show particular promise of making significant contributions in that field.

(3) A fellowship awarded to a scientist under the program shall be for study and training at (and, where appropriate, at an institution of higher education in the vicinity of)—

(A) the Kurchatov Institute, in the case of a scientist employed at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory; and

(B) Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, in the case of a scientist employed at the Kurchatov Institute.

(4) The duration of a fellowship under the program may not exceed two years, except that the Administrator may provide for a longer duration in an individual case to the extent warranted by extraordinary circumstances, as determined by the Administrator.

(5) In a calendar year, the Administrator may not award more than—

(A) one fellowship to a scientist employed at the Kurchatov Institute; and

(B) one fellowship to a scientist employed at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.

(6) A fellowship under the program shall include—

(A) travel expenses;

(B) any tuition and fees at an institution of higher education for study or training under the fellowship; and

(C) any other expenses that the Administrator considers appropriate, such as room and board.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''institution of higher education'' means a college, university, or other educational institution that is empowered by an appropriate authority, as determined by the Administrator, to award degrees higher than the baccalaureate level.

(2) The term ''nuclear nonproliferation sciences'' means bodies of scientific knowledge relevant to developing or advancing the means to prevent or impede the proliferation of nuclear weaponry.

(3) The term ''scientist'' means an individual who has a degree from an institution of higher education in a science that has practical application in the field of nuclear nonproliferation.

(c) FUNDING.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for nonproliferation and international security for fiscal year 2005, $10,000,000 may be used to carry out this section.

SEC. 1423. COLLABORATION TO REDUCE THE RISKS OF A LAUNCH OF RUSSIAN NUCLEAR WEAPONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that, despite the ending of the Cold War more than a decade ago, the nuclear postures and strategic command and control systems of the Russian Federation pose risks that a nuclear ballistic missile could be launched as the result of an accident, misinformation, miscalculation, or unauthorized use. Such risks are posed as a result of factors including the following:

(1) The high state of readiness of the Russian Federation's nuclear forces.

(2) The remote locations of much of the Russian Federation's nuclear forces.

(3) The inadequacy of the Russian Federation's early-warning information.

(4) The very short time that would be available to the President of the Russian Federation if the President were informed that a nuclear ballistic missile attack was or might be underway.

(5) The possibility that the Russian Federation, because of concerns that much of its nuclear forces would not survive a nuclear attack, may have a nuclear deterrence posture reliant upon launching a retaliatory nuclear strike when it believes a nuclear ballistic missile attack against it is or might be underway.

(6) Deficiencies in the security and control of the nuclear forces of the Russian Federation that could result in unauthorized personnel gaining control of a nuclear-armed missile or warhead.

(7) The susceptibility of nuclear strategic command and control systems and early-warning systems to an intrusion or accident that could create the false appearance that a nuclear ballistic missile attack is or might be underway.

(b) REPORT.—(1) Not later than November 1, 2005, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the collaborative measures that the United States and the Russian Federation could take to reduce the risks that a nuclear ballistic missile could be launched as the result of an accident, misinformation, miscalculation, or unauthorized use. For each such measure, the report shall provide—

(A) specific comments on the advisability of the measure in terms of the potential contribution of the measure to the national security interests of the United States, including the potential contribution of the measure in improving relations between the United States and the Russian Federation; and

(B) a description of the obstacles and opportunities associated with pursuing the measure.

(2) In addition to any other measure that the Secretary considers appropriate, the report required by paragraph (1) shall cover the following measures:

(A) The future of the Joint Data Exchange Center.

(B) Potential topics for discussion between high-level military leaders of the United States and of the Russian Federation on reducing the risk that a nuclear ballistic missile could be launched as the result of an accident, misinformation, miscalculation, or unauthorized use.

TITLE XV—AUTHORIZATION FOR INCREASED COSTS DUE TO OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM

SEC. 1501. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this title is to authorize appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2005, in addition to amounts otherwise authorized by this Act, to provide funds for additional costs due to Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom.

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

SEC. 1511. ARMY PROCUREMENT.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2005 for procurement accounts of the Army in amounts as follows:

(1) For aircraft, $498,300,000.

(2) For missiles, $42,800,000.

(3) For weapons and tracked combat vehicles, $201,900,000.

(4) For ammunition, $78,750,000.

(5) For other procurement, $1,567,410,000.

(6) For National Guard and Reserve equipment, $50,000,000.

SEC. 1512. NAVY AND MARINE CORPS PROCUREMENT.

(a) MARINE CORPS.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2005 for the procurement account for the Marine Corps in the amount of $98,190,000.

(b) NAVY AND MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2005 for the procurement account for ammunition for the Navy and the Marine Corps in the amount of $38,402,000.

SEC. 1513. AIR FORCE PROCUREMENT.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2005 for the procurement account for aircraft for the Air Force in amount of $99,000,000.

SEC. 1514. DEFENSE-WIDE ACTIVITIES PROCUREMENT.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2005 for the procurement account for Defense-wide procurement in the amount of $720,000,000.

SEC. 1515. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2005 for the use of the Armed Forces for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for operation and maintenance, in amounts as follows:

(1) For the Army, $9,607,113,000.

(2) For the Navy, $256,500,000.

(3) For the Marine Corps, $2,398,735,000.

(4) For the Air Force, $1,635,000,000.

(5) For Defense-wide, $2,327,900,000.

SEC. 1516. DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2005 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for the Defense Health Program, in the amount of $75,000,000, for Operation and Maintenance.

SEC. 1517. MILITARY PERSONNEL.

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for military personnel accounts for fiscal year 2005 a total of $5,305,000,000.

SEC. 1518. TREATMENT AS ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATIONS.

The amounts authorized to be appropriated by this title are in addition to amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated by this Act.

SEC. 1519. TRANSFER AUTHORITY.

(a) AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER AUTHORIZATIONS.—(1) Upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, the Secretary may transfer amounts of authorizations made available to the Department of Defense in this title for fiscal year 2005 between any such authorizations for that fiscal year (or any subdivisions thereof). Amounts of authorizations so transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes as the authorization to which transferred.

(2) The total amount of authorizations that the Secretary may transfer under the authority of this section may not exceed $2,500,000,000. The transfer authority provided in this section is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Secretary of Defense.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—The authority provided by this section to transfer authorizations—

(1) may only be used to provide authority for items that have a higher priority than the items from which authority is transferred;

(2) may not be used to provide authority for an item that has been denied authorization by Congress; and

(3) may not be combined with the authority under section 1001.

(c) EFFECT ON AUTHORIZATION AMOUNTS.—A transfer made from one account to another under the authority of this section shall be deemed to increase the amount authorized for the account to which the amount is transferred by an amount equal to the amount transferred.

(d) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall promptly notify Congress of each transfer made under subsection (a).

SEC. 1520. DESIGNATION OF EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATIONS.

The amounts authorized to be appropriated by this title are designated for emergency contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism.

Subtitle B—Personnel Provisions

SEC. 1531. THREE-YEAR INCREASE IN ACTIVE ARMY STRENGTH LEVELS.

(a) AUTHORIZED END STRENGTHS.—(1) The end strength level authorized for the Army for fiscal year 2005 under section 401 is hereby increased by 10,000.

(2) For fiscal years 2006 and 2007, the Army is authorized strengths for active duty personnel as follows:

(A) As of September 30, 2006, 502,400.

(B) As of September 30, 2007, 512,400.

(b) STATUTORY MINIMUM ACTIVE STRENGTH LEVEL.—The minimum strength for the Army under section 691(b) of title 10, United States Code (notwithstanding the number specified in paragraph (1) of that section)—

(1) for the period beginning on October 1, 2004, and ending on September 30, 2005, shall be the number specified in section 401(1) of this Act, increased by 10,000;

(2) for the period beginning on October 1, 2005, and ending on September 30, 2006, shall be 502,400; and

(3) for the period beginning on October 1, 2006, and ending on September 30, 2007, shall be 512,400.

(c) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—If the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of the Army, determines that adjustments are necessary to the minimum end-strength level for the Army in effect at any time pursuant to subsection (b), the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report providing the Secretary's recommendations and rationale for such an adjustment. Such a report must be submitted before the submission of the budget request for the fiscal year for which the change would be effective.

SEC. 1532. THREE-YEAR INCREASE IN ACTIVE MARINE CORPS STRENGTH LEVELS.

(a) AUTHORIZED END STRENGTHS.—(1) The end strength level authorized for the Marine Corps for fiscal year 2005 under section 401 is hereby increased by 3,000.

(2) For fiscal years 2006 and 2007, the Marine Corps is authorized strengths for active duty personnel as follows:

(A) As of September 30, 2006, 181,000.

(B) As of September 30, 2007, 184,000.

(b) STATUTORY MINIMUM ACTIVE STRENGTH LEVEL.—The minimum strength for the Marine Corps under section 691(b) of title 10, United States Code (notwithstanding the number specified in paragraph (3) of that section)—

(1) for the period beginning on October 1, 2004, and ending on September 30, 2005, shall be the number specified in section 401(3) of this Act, increased by 3,000;

(2) for the period beginning on October 1, 2005, and ending on September 30, 2006, shall be 181,000; and

(3) for the period beginning on October 1, 2006, and ending on September 30, 2007, shall be 184,000.

(c) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—If the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of the Navy, determines that adjustments are necessary to the minimum end-strength level for the Marine Corps in effect at any time pursuant to subsection (b), the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report providing the Secretary's recommendations and rationale for such an adjustment. Such a report must be submitted before the submission of the budget request for the fiscal year for which the change would be effective.

SEC. 1533. EXTENSION OF INCREASED RATES FOR IMMINENT DANGER PAY AND FAMILY SEPARATION ALLOWANCE.

(a) IMMINENT DANGER PAY.—(1) Subsection (e) of section 310 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking ''December 31, 2004'' and inserting ''December 31, 2005''.

(2) Effective January 1, 2006, such section is further amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''$150'' and inserting ''$225''; and

(B) by striking subsection (e).

(b) FAMILY SEPARATION ALLOWANCE.—(1) Subsection (e) of section 427 of such title is amended by striking ''December 31, 2004'' and inserting ''December 31, 2005''.

(2) Effective January 1, 2006, such section is further amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1), by striking ''$100'' and inserting ''$250''; and

(B) by striking subsection (e).

Subtitle C—Financial Management Matters

SEC. 1541. REVISED FUNDING METHODOLOGY FOR MILITARY RETIREE HEALTH CARE BENEFITS.

(a) REVISION.—Section 1116 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 1116. Payments into the Fund

''(a) At the beginning of each fiscal year after September 30, 2005, the Secretary of the Treasury shall promptly pay into the Fund from the General Fund of the Treasury—

''(1) the amount certified to the Secretary by the Secretary of Defense under subsection (c), which shall be the contribution to the Fund for that fiscal year required by section 1115; and

''(2) the amount determined by each administering Secretary under section 1111(c) as the contribution to the Fund on behalf of the members of the uniformed services under the jurisdiction of that Secretary.

''(b) At the beginning of each fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense shall determine the sum of the following:

''(1) The amount of the payment for that year under the amortization schedule determined by the Board of Actuaries under section 1115(a) of this title for the amortization of the original unfunded liability of the Fund.

''(2) The amount (including any negative amount) of the Department of Defense contribution for that year as determined by the Secretary of Defense under section 1115(b) of this title.

''(3) The amount (including any negative amount) for that year under the most recent amortization schedule determined by the Secretary of Defense under section 1115(c)(2) of this title for the amortization of any cumulative unfunded liability (or any gain) to the Fund resulting from changes in benefits.

''(4) The amount (including any negative amount) for that year under the most recent amortization schedule determined by the Secretary of Defense under section 1115(c)(3) of this title for the amortization of any cumulative actuarial gain or loss to the Fund resulting from actuarial assumption changes.

''(5) The amount (including any negative amount) for that year under the most recent amortization schedule determined by the Secretary of Defense under section 1115(c)(4) of this title for the amortization of any cumulative actuarial gain or loss to the Fund resulting from actuarial experience.

''(c) The Secretary of Defense shall promptly certify the amount determined under subsection (b) each year to the Secretary of the Treasury.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Section 1111(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended in the last sentence by striking ''1116'' and all that follows through the end of the sentence and inserting ''1115(b) of this title, and such contributions shall be paid into the Fund as provided in section 1116(a).''.

(2) Section 1115(a) of such title is amended by striking ''1116(c)'' and inserting ''1116''.

(3) Section 1115(b) of such title is amended—

(A) by striking ''(1) The Secretary of Defense'' and all that follows through ''of this title.'' and inserting ''The Secretary of Defense shall determine, before the beginning of each fiscal year after September 30, 2005, the total amount of the Department of Defense contribution to be made to the Fund for that fiscal year for purposes of section 1116(b)(2).'';

(B) by striking paragraph (2);

(C) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively;

(D) in each of paragraphs (1) and (2), as so redesignated, by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively; and

(E) in paragraph (2)(B), as so redesignated, by striking ''subparagraph (A)(ii)'' and inserting ''paragraph (1)(B)''.

(4) Section 1115(c)(1) of such title is amended by striking ''and section 1116(a) of this title''.

(5) Section 1115(c)(5) of such title is amended by striking ''1116(c)'' and inserting ''1116''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2005.

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

SECTION 2001. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the ''Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005''.

TITLE XXI—ARMY

SEC. 2101. AUTHORIZED ARMY CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

(a) INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2104(a)(1), the Secretary of the Army may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installations or locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Army: Inside the United States

State	Installation or Location	Amount
Alabama	Anniston Army Depot	$23,690,000
Alaska	Fort Richardson	$24,300,000
	Fort Wainwright	$92,459,000
California	Fort Irwin	$38,100,000
Colorado	Fort Carson	$59,508,000
Georgia	Fort Benning	$73,627,000
	Fort Gillem	$5,800,000
	Fort McPherson	$4,900,000
	Fort Stewart/Hunter Army Air Field	$65,495,000
Hawaii	Helemano Military Reservation	$75,300,000
	Hickam Air Force	$11,200,000
	Schofield Barracks	$241,792,000
Kansas	Fort Riley	$44,050,000
Kentucky	Fort Campbell	$89,600,000
	Fort Knox	$73,850,000
Louisiana	Fort Polk	$70,953,000
Maryland	Fort Detrick	$4,000,000
Missouri	Fort Leonard Wood	$21,450,000
New Jersey	Picatinny Arsenal	$9,900,000
New Mexico	White Sands Missile Range	$33,000,000
New York	Fort Drum	$13,650,000
	Fort Hamilton	$7,600,000
	Hancock Field	$6,000,000
	Military Entrance Processing Station, Buffalo	$6,200,000
	United States Military Academy, West Point	$60,000,000
North Carolina	Fort Bragg	$111,687,000
Oklahoma	Fort Sill	$17,800,000
Texas	Camp Bullis	$5,300,000
	Fort Bliss	$19,400,000
	Fort Hood	$88,888,000
Virginia	Fort A.P. Hill	$3,975,000
	Fort Lee	$4,250,000
	Fort Myer	$49,526,000
Washington	Fort Lewis	$48,000,000
	Total	$1,505,250,000

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2104(a)(2), the Secretary of the Army may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installations or locations outside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Army: Outside the United States

Country	Installation or Location	Amount
Germany	Grafenwoehr	$77,200,000
Italy	Livorno	$26,000,000
Korea	Camp Humphreys	$12,000,000
	Total	$115,200,000

SEC. 2102. FAMILY HOUSING.

(a) CONSTRUCTION AND ACQUISITION.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2104(a)(5)(A), the Secretary of the Army may construct or acquire family housing units (including land acquisition and supporting facilities) at the installations or locations, for the purposes and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Army: Family Housing

State	Installation or Location	Purpose	Amount
Alaska	Fort Richardson	92 Units	$42,000,000
	Fort Wainwright	246 Units	$124,000,000
Arizona	Fort Huachuca	205 Units	$41,000,000
	Yuma Proving Ground	55 Units	$14,900,000
Kansas	Fort Riley	126 Units	$33,000,000
New Mexico	White Sands Missile Range	156 Units	$31,000,000
Oklahoma	Fort Sill	247 Units	$47,000,000
Virginia	Fort Lee	218 Units	$46,000,000
	Fort Monroe	68 Units	$16,000,000
	Total		$394,900,000

(b) PLANNING AND DESIGN.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2104(a)(5)(A), the Secretary of the Army may carry out architectural and engineering services and construction design activities with respect to the construction or improvement of family housing units in an amount not to exceed $29,209,000.

SEC. 2103. IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS.

Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, and using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2104(a)(5)(A), the Secretary of the Army may improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $211,990,000.

SEC. 2104. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, ARMY.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2004, for military construction, land acquisition and military family housing functions of the Department of the Army in the total amount of $3,428,815,000 as follows:

(1) For military construction projects inside the United States authorized by section 2101(a), $1,335,750,000.

(2) For military construction projects outside the United States authorized by section 2101(b), $115,200,000.

(3) For unspecified minor military construction projects authorized by section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, $20,000,000.

(4) For architectural and engineering services and construction design under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, $161,209,000.

(5) For military family housing functions:

(A) For construction and acquisition, planning and design, and improvement of military family housing and facilities, $636,099,000.

(B) For support of military family housing (including the functions described in section 2833 of title 10, United States Code), $926,507,000.

(6) For the construction of phase 2 of a barracks complex, 5th & 16th Street, at Fort Stewart/Hunter Army Air Field, Georgia, authorized by section 2101(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (division B of Public Law 108–136; 117 Stat. 1697), $32,950,000.

(7) For the construction of phase 3 of a barracks complex renewal, Capron Road, at Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, authorized by section 2101(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (division B of Public Law 107–107; 115 Stat. 1283) and as amended by section 2105 of the Military Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (division B of Public Law 108–136; 117 Stat. 1697), $48,000,000.

(8) For the construction of phase 2 of the Lewis & Clark instructional facility at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, authorized by section 2101(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (division B of Public Law 107–314; 116 Stat. 2681), $44,000,000.

(9) For the construction of phase 2 of a barracks complex at Wheeler Sack Army Air Field at Fort Drum, New York, authorized by section 2101(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (division B of Public Law 108–136; 117 Stat. 1697), $48,000,000.

(10) For the construction of phase 2 of a barracks complex, Bastogne Drive, Fort Bragg, North Carolina, authorized by section 2101(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (division B of Public Law 108–136; 117 Stat. 1697), $48,000,000.

(11) For the construction of phase 3 of a maintenance complex at Fort Sill, Oklahoma, authorized by section 2101(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (division B of Public Law 107–314; 116 Stat. 2681), $13,100,000.

(b) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 2101 of this Act may not exceed the sum of the following:

(1) The total amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a).

(2) $41,000,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2101(a) to upgrade Drum Road, Helemano Military Reservation, Hawaii).

(3) $25,000,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2101(a) for construction of a vehicle maintenance facility, Schofield Barracks, Hawaii).

(3) $25,000,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2101(a) for construction of a barracks complex, Fort Campbell, Kentucky).

(4) $22,000,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2101(a) for construction of trainee barracks, Basic Training Complex 1, Fort Knox, Kentucky).

(5) $25,500,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2101(a) for construction of a library and learning facility, United States Military Academy, West Point, New York).

(6) $31,000,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2101(a) for a barracks complex renewal project, Fort Bragg, North Carolina).

SEC. 2105. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2004 PROJECTS.

(a) MODIFICATION OF INSIDE THE UNITED STATES PROJECTS.—The table in section 2101(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (division B of Public Law 108–136; 117 Stat. 1697) is amended—

(1) in the item relating to Fort Stewart/Hunter Army Air Field, Georgia, by striking ''$113,500,000'' in the amount column and inserting ''$114,450,000'';

(2) in the item relating to Fort Drum, New York, by striking ''$130,700,000'' in the amount column and inserting ''$135,700,000''; and

(3) by striking the amount identified as the total in the amount column and inserting ''$1,043,150,000''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 2104(b) of that Act (117 Stat. 1700) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''$32,000,000'' and inserting ''$32,950,000''; and

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking ''$43,000,000'' and inserting ''$48,000,000''.

SEC. 2106. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2003 PROJECT.

(a) MODIFICATION OF INSIDE THE UNITED STATES PROJECT.—The table in section 2101(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (division B of Public Law 107–314; 116 Stat. 2681), as amended by section 2105(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (division B of Public Law 108–136; 117 Stat. 1700), is further amended—

(1) in the item relating to Fort Sill, Oklahoma, by striking ''$39,652,000'' in the amount column and inserting ''$40,752,000''; and

(2) by striking the amount identified as the total in the amount column and inserting ''$1,157,267,000''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 2104(b)(6) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (division B of Public Law 107–314; 116 Stat. 2684) is amended by striking ''$25,000,000'' and inserting ''$26,100,000''.

TITLE XXII—NAVY

SEC. 2201. AUTHORIZED NAVY CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

(a) INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2204(a)(1), the Secretary of the Navy may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installations or locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Navy: Inside the United States

State	Installation or Location	Amount
Arizona	Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma	$26,670,000
California	Marine Corps Air-Ground Task Force Training Center, Twentynine Palms	$15,700,000
	Marine Corps Air Station, Camp Pendleton	$11,540,000
	Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton	$26,915,000
	Marine Corps Logistics Base, Barstow	$4,930,000
	Naval Air Facility, El Centro	$54,331,000
	Naval Air Station, North Island	$10,180,000
	Naval Surface Warfare Center, Division Corona	$9,850,000
Connecticut	Naval Submarine Base, New London	$50,302,000
District of Columbia	Naval Observatory, Washington	$3,239,000
Florida	Eglin Air Force Base	$2,060,000
	Naval Station, Mayport	$6,200,000
Georgia	Strategic Weapons Facility Atlantic, Kings Bay	$16,000,000
Hawaii	Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor	$5,100,000
Illinois	Naval Training Center, Great Lakes	$74,781,000
Indiana	Naval Surface Warfare Center, Crane	$10,580,000
Louisiana	Joint Reserve Base/Naval Air Station, New Orleans	$6,030,000
Maryland	Naval Surface Warfare Center, Indian Head	$23,000,000
North Carolina	Marine Corps Air Station, New River	$35,140,000
	Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune	$11,030,000
Nevada	Naval Air Station, Fallon	$4,980,000
South Carolina	Marine Corps Air Station, Beaufort	$5,480,000
Virginia	Camp Elmore Marine Corps Detachment	$13,500,000
	Marine Corps Air Facility, Quantico	$21,180,000
	Marine Corps Combat Development Command, Quantico	$24,140,000
	Naval Air Station, Oceana	$2,770,000
	Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek	$9,550,000
	Naval Station, Norfolk	$4,330,000
	Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown	$9,870,000
Washington	Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island	$1,990,000
	Naval Shipyard, Puget Sound	$23,455,000
	Naval Station, Bremerton	$74,125,000
	Strategic Weapons Facility Pacific, Bangor	$131,090,000
	Total	$730,038,000

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2204(a)(2), the Secretary of the Navy may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installations or locations outside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Navy: Outside the United States

Country	Installation or Location	Amount
Bahamas	Naval Undersea Warfare Center, Andros Islands	$20,750,000
Diego Garcia	Naval Support Facility, Diego Garcia	$17,500,000
Guam	Naval Public Works Center, Guam	$20,700,000
	Naval Station, Guam	$12,500,000
Italy	Sigonella	$22,550,000
Spain	Naval Station, Rota	$32,700,000
	Total	$126,700,000

(c) UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE.—Using the amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2204(a)(3), the Secretary of the Navy may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installations or locations and in the amount, set forth in the following table:

Navy: Unspecified Worldwide

Location	Installation or Location	Amount
	Unspecified Worldwide	$148,640,000
	Total	$148,640,000

SEC. 2202. FAMILY HOUSING.

Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2204(a)(6)(A), the Secretary of the Navy may construct or acquire family housing units (including land acquisition and supporting facilities) at the installations or locations, for the purposes and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Navy: Family Housing

State	Installation or Location	Purpose	Amount
North Carolina	Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point	198 Units	$27,002,000
	Total		$27,002,000

SEC. 2203. IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS.

Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, and using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2204(a)(6)(A), the Secretary of the Navy may improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $112,105,000.

SEC. 2204. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, NAVY.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2004, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Navy in the total amount of $1,913,273,000, as follows:

(1) For military construction projects inside the United States authorized by section 2201(a), $631,908,000.

(2) For military construction projects outside the United States authorized by section 2201(b), $126,700,000.

(3) For the military construction projects at unspecified worldwide locations authorized by section 2201(c), $98,560,000.

(4) For unspecified minor military construction projects authorized by section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, $12,000,000.

(5) For architectural and engineering services and construction design under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, $93,804,000.

(6) For military family housing functions:

(A) For construction and acquisition, planning and design, and improvement of military family housing and facilities, $139,107,000.

(B) For support of military family housing (including functions described in section 2833 of title 10, United States Code), $696,304,000.

(7) For the construction of increment 2 of the tertiary sewage treatment plant at Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, authorized by section 2201(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (division B of Public Law 108–136; 117 Stat. 1703), $25,690,000.

(8) For the construction of increment 2 of the general purpose berthing pier at Naval Weapons Station, Earle, New Jersey, authorized by section 2201(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2004 (division B of Public Law 108–136; 117 Stat. 1704), $49,200,000.

(9) For the construction of increment 2 of pier 11 replacement at Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia, authorized by section 2201(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2004 (division B of Public Law 108–136; 117 Stat. 1704), $40,000,000.

(b) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 2201 of this Act may not exceed the sum of the following:

(1) The total amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraphs (1), (2) and (3) of subsection (a).

(2) $21,000,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2201(a) for apron and hangar recapitalization, Naval Air Facility, El Centro, California).

(3) $40,000,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2201(a) for construction of bachelor enlisted quarters, Naval Station, Bremerton, Washington).

(4) $95,320,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2201(a) for construction of a limited area processing and storage complex, Strategic Weapons Facility Pacific, Bangor, Washington).

(5) $34,098,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2201(c) for construction of a White Side complex at an unspecified location worldwide).

(6) $15,982,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2201(c) for construction of a presidential helicopter programs support facility at an unspecified location).

TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE

SEC. 2301. AUTHORIZED AIR FORCE CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

(a) INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2304(a)(1), the Secretary of the Air Force may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installations or locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Air Force: Inside the United States

State	Installation or Location	Amount
Alaska	Elmendorf Air Force Base	$26,057,000
Arizona	Davis-Monthan Air Force Base	$17,029,000
	Luke Air Force Base	$17,900,000
Arkansas	Little Rock Air Force Base	$8,931,000
California	Beale Air Force Base	$10,186,000
	Edwards Air Force Base	$9,965,000
	Travis Air Force Base	$18,894,000
Colorado	Buckley Air Force Base	$12,247,000
Florida	Tyndall Air Force Base	$29,162,000
Georgia	Moody Air Force Base	$9,600,000
	Robins Air Force Base	$15,000,000
Hawaii	Hickam Air Force Base	$25,900,000
Louisiana	Barksdale Air Force Base	$13,800,000
Maryland	Andrews Air Force Base	$17,100,000
Mississippi	Columbus Air Force Base	$7,700,000
Missouri	Whiteman Air Force Base	$7,600,000
New Mexico	Kirtland Air Force Base	$9,200,000
North Carolina	Pope Air Force Base	$15,150,000
Ohio	Wright-Patterson Air Force Base	$9,200,000
South Carolina	Shaw Air Force Base	$7,000,000
Tennessee	Arnold Air Force Base	$24,500,000
Texas	Dyess Air Force Base	$3,300,000
	Lackland Air Force Base	$2,596,000
	Laughlin Air Force Base	$6,900,000
	Sheppard Air Force Base	$50,284,000
Utah	Hill Air Force Base	$18,013,000
Wyoming	F.E. Warren Air Force Base	$5,500,000
	Total	$398,714,000

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2304(a)(2), the Secretary of the Air Force may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installations or locations outside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Air Force: Outside the United States

Country	Installation or Location	Amount
Germany	Ramstein Air Base	$25,404,000
Greenland	Thule Air Base	$19,800,000
Guam	Andersen Air Force Base	$19,593,000
Italy	Aviano Air Base	$6,760,000
Japan	Misawa Air Base	$6,700,000
Korea	Kunsan Air Base	$37,100,000
	Osan Air Base	$18,600,000
Portugal	Lajes Field, Azores	$5,689,000
Spain	Naval Station, Rota	$14,153,000
United Kingdom	Royal Air Force Lakenheath	$5,500,000
	Total	$159,299,000

(c) UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE.—Using the amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2304(a)(3), the Secretary of the Air Force may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installations or locations, and in the amount, set forth in the following table:

Air Force: Unspecified Worldwide

Location	Installation or Location	Amount
	Classified Locations	$26,121,000
	Unspecified Worldwide	$28,794,000
	Total	$54,915,000

SEC. 2302. FAMILY HOUSING.

(a) CONSTRUCTION AND ACQUISITION.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2304(a)(6)(A), the Secretary of the Air Force may construct or acquire family housing units (including land acquisition and supporting facilities) at the installations or locations, for the purposes and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Air Force: Family Housing

State	Installation or Location	Purpose	Amount
Arizona	Davis-Monthan Air Force Base	250 Units	$48,500,000
California	Edwards Air Force Base	218 Units	$41,202,000
	Vandenberg Air Force Base	120 Units	$30,906,000
Florida	MacDill Air Force Base	61 Units	$21,723,000
	MacDill Air Force Base	Housing Maintenance Facility	$1,250,000
Idaho	Mountain Home Air Force Base	147 Units	$39,333,000
Mississippi	Columbus Air Force Base	Housing Management Facility	$711,000
Missouri	Whiteman Air Force Base	160 Units	$37,087,000
Montana	Malmstrom Air Force Base	115 Units	$29,910,000
North Carolina	Seymour Johnson Air Force Base	167 Units	$32,693,000
North Dakota	Grand Forks Air Force Base	90 Units	$26,169,000
	Minot Air Force Base	142 Units	$37,087,000
South Carolina	Charleston Air Force Base	Fire Station	$1,976,000
South Dakota	Ellsworth Air Force Base	75 Units	$21,482,000
Texas	Dyess Air Force Base	127 Units	$28,664,000
	Goodfellow Air Force Base	127 Units	$20,604,000
Germany	Ramstein Air Base	144 Units	$57,691,000
Italy	Aviano Air Base	Housing Office	$2,542,000
Korea	Osan Air Base	117 Units	$46,834,000
United Kingdom	Royal Air Force Lakenheath	154 Units	$43,976,000
	Total		$570,340,000

(b) PLANNING AND DESIGN.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2304(a)(6)(A), the Secretary of the Air Force may carry out architectural and engineering services and construction design activities with respect to the construction or improvement of military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $38,266,000.

SEC. 2303. IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS.

Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, and using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2304(a)(6)(A), the Secretary of the Air Force may improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $238,353,000.

SEC. 2304. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, AIR FORCE.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2004, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Air Force in the total amount of $2,493,679,000, as follows:

(1) For military construction projects inside the United States authorized by section 2301(a), $398,714,000.

(2) For military construction projects outside the United States authorized by section 2301(b), $159,299,000.

(3) For the military construction projects at unspecified worldwide locations authorized by section 2301(c), $54,915,000.

(4) For unspecified minor military construction projects authorized by section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, $13,000,000.

(5) For architectural and engineering services and construction design, under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, $166,126,000.

(6) For military family housing functions:

(A) For construction and acquisition, planning and design and improvement of military family housing and facilities, $846,959,000.

(B) For support of military family housing (including functions described in section 2833 of title 10, United States Code), $854,666,000.

(b) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 2301 of this Act may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a).

TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES

SEC. 2401. AUTHORIZED DEFENSE AGENCIES CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

(a) INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2404(a)(1), the Secretary of Defense may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installations or locations inside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Defense Agencies: Inside the United States

Agency	Installation or Location	Amount
Defense Intelligence Agency	Bolling Air Force Base, District of Columbia	$6,000,000
Defense Logistics Agency	Defense Distribution Depot, New Cumberland, Pennsylvania	$22,300,000
	Defense Distribution Depot, Richmond, Virginia	$10,100,000
	Defense Fuel Support Point, Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia	$3,589,000
	Defense Supply Center, Columbus, Ohio	$5,500,000
	Marina Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina	$22,700,000
	Naval Air Station, Kingsville, Texas	$3,900,000
	Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii	$3,500,000
	Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma	$5,400,000
	Travis Air Force Base, California	$15,100,000
Missile Defense Agency	Huntsville, Alabama	$19,560,000
National Security Agency	Fort Meade, Maryland	$15,007,000
Special Operations Command	Corona, California	$13,600,000
	Fleet Combat Training Center, Dam Neck, Virginia	$5,700,000
	Fort A.P. Hill, Virginia	$1,500,000
	Fort Bragg, North Carolina	$42,888,000
	Fort Stewart/Hunter Army Air Field, Georgia	$17,600,000
	Hurlburt Field, Florida	$2,500,000
	Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Virginia	$33,200,000
	Naval Air Station, North Island, California	$1,000,000
TRICARE Management Activity	Buckley Air Force Base, Colorado	$2,100,000
	Defense Language Institute, Presidio, Monterey	$6,700,000
	Fort Belvoir, Virginia	$100,000,000
	Fort Benning, Georgia	$7,100,000
	Langley Air Force Base, Virginia	$50,800,000
	Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Carolina	$25,000,000
	Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida	$28,438,000
	Total	$470,782,000

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2404(a)(2), the Secretary of Defense may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installations or locations outside the United States, and in the amounts, set forth in the following table:

Defense Agencies: Outside the United States

Agency	Installation or Location	Amount
Defense Education Activity	Grafenwoehr, Germany	$36,247,000

Defense Agencies: Outside the United States—Continued

Agency	Installation or Location	Amount
Defense Logistics Agency	Naval Station, Guam	$26,964,000
	Vilseck, Germany	$9,011,000
	Defense Fuel Support Point, Lajes Field, Portugal	$19,113,000
Special Operations Command	Misawa Air Base, Japan	$19,900,000
	Naval Station, Guam, Marianas Islands	$2,200,000
TRICARE Management Activity	Royal Air Force Mildenhall, United Kingdom	$10,200,000
	Diego Garcia	$3,800,000
	Grafenwoehr, Germany	$13,000,000
	Total	$140,435,000

(c) UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE.—Using the amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2404(a)(3), the Secretary of Defense may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installations or locations, and in the amount, set forth in the following table:

Defense Agencies: Unspecified Worldwide

Location	Installation or Location	Amount
Special Operations Command	Classified Locations	$7,400,000
	Unspecified Worldwide	$2,900,000
	Total	$10,300,000

SEC. 2402. IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS.

Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, and using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2404(a)(9)(A), the Secretary of Defense may improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $49,000.

SEC. 2403. ENERGY CONSERVATION PROJECTS.

Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2404(a)(7), the Secretary of Defense may carry out energy conservation projects under section 2865 of title 10, United States Code, in the amount of $50,000,000.

SEC. 2404. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, DEFENSE AGENCIES.

(a) MODIFICATION OF INSIDE THE UNITED STATES PROJECTS.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2004, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) in the total amount of $1,089,063,000, as follows:

(1) For military construction projects inside the United States authorized by section 2401(a), $413,782,000.

(2) For military construction projects outside the United States authorized by section 2401(b), $140,435,000.

(3) For the military construction projects at unspecified worldwide locations authorized by section 2401(c), $10,300,000.

(4) For unspecified minor military construction projects under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, $20,938,000.

(5) For contingency construction projects of the Secretary of Defense under section 2804 of title 10, United States Code, $10,000,000.

(6) For architectural and engineering services and construction design under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, $63,482,000.

(7) For Energy Conservation projects authorized by section 2404 of this Act, $50,000,000.

(8) For base closure and realignment activities as authorized by 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), $246,116,000.

(9) For military family housing functions:

(A) For improvement of military family housing and facilities, $49,000.

(B) For support of military family housing (including functions described in section 2833 of title 10, United States Code), $49,575,000.

(C) For credit to the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund established by section 2883(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, $2,500,000.

(10) For the construction of phase 6 of an ammunition demilitarization facility at Pueblo Depot Activity, Colorado, authorized by section 2401(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (division B of Public Law 104–201; 110 Stat. 2775), as amended by section 2406 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (division B of Public Law 106–65; 113 Stat. 839), and section 2407 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (division B of Public Law 107–314; 116 Stat. 2698), $44,792,000.

(11) For the construction of phase 5 of an ammunition demilitarization facility at Blue Grass Army Depot, Kentucky, authorized by section 2401(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (division B of Public Law 106–65; 113 Stat. 835), as amended by section 2405 of the Military Construction Authorization Act of 2002 (division B of Public Law 107–107; 115 Stat. 1298), and section 2405 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (division B of Public Law 107–314; 116 Stat. 2698), $37,094,000.

(b) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 2401 of this Act may not exceed the sum of the following:

(1) The total amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraphs (1), (2) and (3) of subsection (a).

(2) $57,000,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2401(a) for hospital replacement, Fort Belvoir, Virginia).

TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

SEC. 2501. AUTHORIZED NATO CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

The Secretary of Defense may make contributions for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program as provided in section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, in an amount not to exceed the sum of the amount authorized to be appropriated for this purpose in section 2502 and the amount collected from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as a result of construction previously financed by the United States.

SEC. 2502. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, NATO.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2004, for contributions by the Secretary of Defense under section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, for the share of the United States of the cost of projects for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program authorized by section 2501, in the amount of $165,800,000.

TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

SEC. 2601. AUTHORIZED GUARD AND RESERVE CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2004, for the costs of acquisition, architectural and engineering services, and construction of facilities for the Guard and Reserve Forces, and for contributions therefor, under chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code (including the cost of acquisition of land for those facilities), the following amounts:

(1) For the Department of the Army—

(A) for the Army National Guard of the United States, $393,225,000; and

(B) for the Army Reserve, $116,955,000.

(2) For the Department of the Navy, for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, $30,955,000.

(3) For the Department of the Air Force—

(A) for the Air National Guard of the United States, $184,620,000; and

(B) for the Air Force Reserve, $114,090,000.

TITLE XXVII—EXPIRATION AND EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 2701. EXPIRATION OF AUTHORIZATIONS AND AMOUNTS REQUIRED TO BE SPECIFIED BY LAW.

(a) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORIZATIONS AFTER THREE YEARS.—Except as provided in subsection (b), all authorizations contained in titles XXI through XXVI for military construction projects, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, and contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program (and authorizations of appropriations therefor) shall expire on the later of—

(1) October 1, 2007; or

(2) the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2008.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to authorizations for military construction projects, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, and contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment program (and authorizations of appropriations therefor), for which appropriated funds have been obligated before the later of—

(1) October 1, 2007; or

(2) the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for fiscal year 2008 for military construction projects, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, or contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment program.

SEC. 2702. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2002 PROJECTS.

(a) EXTENSION.—Notwithstanding section 2701 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (division B of Public Law 107–107; 115 Stat. 1301), authorizations set forth in the tables in subsection (b), as provided in section 2101 or 2302 of that Act, shall remain in effect until October 1, 2005, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2006, whichever is later.

(b) TABLES.—The tables referred to in subsection (a) are as follows:

Army: Extension of 2002 Project Authorizations

State	Installation or Location	Project	Amount
Alaska	Fort Wainwright	Power plant cooling tower	$23,000,000
Hawaii	Pohakuloa Training Area	Parker Ranch land acquisition	$1,500,000

Air Force: Extension of 2002 Project Authorizations

State	Installation or Location	Project	Amount
Colorado	Buckley Air Force Base	Family housing (55 Units)	$11,400,000
Louisiana	Barksdale Air Force Base	Family housing (56 Units)	$7,300,000

SEC. 2703. EXTENSION AND RENEWAL OF AUTHORIZATIONS OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2001 PROJECTS.

(a) EXTENSION AND RENEWAL.—Notwithstanding section 2701 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (division B 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–407)), authorizations set forth in the tables in subsection (b), as provided in section 2102 or 2401 of that Act and, in the case of the authorization set forth in the first table in subsection (b), extended by section 2702 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (division B of Public Law 108–136; 117 Stat. 1716), shall remain in effect until October 1, 2005, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2006, whichever is later.

(b) TABLES.—The tables referred to in subsection (a) are as follows:

Army: Extension of 2001 Project Authorization

State	Installation or Location	Project	Amount
South Carolina	Fort Jackson	Family housing (1 unit)	$250,000

Defense Agencies: Extension of 2001 Project Authorizations

Agency	Installation or Location	Project	Amount
Defense Finance and Accounting Service	Kleber Kaserne, Germany	Building renovation	$7,400,000
Defense Education Activity	Osan Air Base, Korea	Osan Elementary School addition	$843,000

SEC. 2704. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Titles XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXV, and XXVI of this Act shall take effect on the later of—

(1) October 1, 2004; or

(2) the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE XXVIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes

SECTION 2801. INCREASE IN CERTAIN THRESHOLDS FOR CARRYING OUT UNSPECIFIED MINOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.

(a) ADVANCE APPROVAL AND CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION THRESHOLD.—Subsection (b)(1) of section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''$750,000'' and inserting ''$1,000,000''.

(b) USE OF OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FUNDS THRESHOLD.—Subsection (c) of such section is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(1) Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), the Secretary concerned may spend from appropriations available for operation and maintenance amounts necessary to carry out an unspecified minor military construction project costing not more than $1,500,000.''; and

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking ''limitations'' and inserting ''limitation''.

SEC. 2802. ASSESSMENT OF VULNERABILITY OF MILITARY INSTALLATIONS TO TERRORIST ATTACK AND ANNUAL REPORT ON MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO ANTITERRORISM AND FORCE PROTECTION.

(a) ANNUAL ASSESSMENT AND REPORT.—Section 2808 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) ANTITERRORISM AND FORCE PROTECTION ASSESSMENTS AND MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUIREMENTS.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall develop common guidance and criteria to be used by the Secretary concerned—

''(A) to assess the vulnerability of military installations located inside and outside of the United States to terrorist attack;

''(B) to develop construction standards designed to reduce the vulnerability of structures to terrorist attack and improve the security of the occupants of such structures;

''(C) to prepare and carry out military construction projects, such as gate and fenceline construction, to improve the physical security of military installations; and

''(D) to assist in prioritizing such projects within the military construction budget of each of the armed forces.

''(2) The Secretary of Defense shall require vulnerability assessments of military installations to be conducted, at regular intervals, using the criteria developed under paragraph (1).

''(3) As part of the budget materials submitted to Congress in connection with the submission of the budget for a fiscal year pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, but in no case later than March 15 of each year, the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report describing—

''(A) the location and results of the vulnerability assessments conducted during the preceding fiscal year;

''(B) the military construction requirements anticipated to be necessary during the next three fiscal years to improve the physical security of military installations; and

''(C) the extent to which funds are not requested in the Department of Defense budget for the next fiscal year to meet those requirements.

''(4) In the case of the report required under paragraph (3) to be submitted in 2006, the Secretary of Defense shall include a certification by the Secretary that since September 11, 2001, vulnerability assessments have been undertaken at all major military installations. The Secretary shall indicate the basis by which the Secretary

differentiated between major and nonmajor military installations for purposes of making the certification.''.

(b) STYLISTIC AND CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—(1) The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

''§ 2808. Construction authority related to declaration of war or national emergency; construction requirements related to antiterrorism and force protection''.

(2) Such section is further amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by inserting ''CONSTRUCTION AUTHORITY; LIMITATION.—'' after ''(a)'';

(B) in subsection (b), by inserting ''CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—'' after ''(b)''; and

(C) in subsection (c), by inserting ''TERMINATION.—'' after ''(c)''.

(3) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 169 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 2808 and inserting the following new item:

''2808. Construction authority related to declaration of war or national emergency; construction requirements related to antiterrorism and force protection.''.

SEC. 2803. CHANGE IN THRESHOLD FOR CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION REGARDING USE OF OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FUNDS FOR FACILITY REPAIR.

Section 2811(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''$10,000,000'' and inserting ''$7,500,000''.

SEC. 2804. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS REGARDING MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING REQUIREMENTS FOR GENERAL OFFICERS AND FLAG OFFICERS.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT ON COST OF GENERAL AND FLAG OFFICERS QUARTERS.—Section 2831 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) ANNUAL REPORT OF COST OF GENERAL OFFICERS AND FLAG OFFICERS QUARTERS.—As part of the budget materials submitted to Congress in connection with the submission of the budget for a fiscal year pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, but in no case later than March 30 of each year, the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report—

''(1) identifying family housing units used, or intended for use, as quarters for general officers or flag officers for which the total operation and maintenance costs, utility costs, and repair costs are anticipated to exceed $20,000 in the next fiscal year; and

''(2) specifying the total of such costs for each unit of family housing identified under paragraph (1).''.

(b) REPORT ON NEED FOR SUCH QUARTERS IN NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION.—The Secretary of Defense shall prepare a report analyzing anticipated needs in the National Capital Region for family housing units for general officers and flag officers. In conducting the analysis, the Secretary shall consider the extent of available housing in the National Capital Region and the necessity of providing housing for general officers and flag officers in secure locations.

(c) REPORT ON WORLD-WIDE INVENTORY OF SUCH QUARTERS.—The Secretary of Defense shall prepare a report containing a worldwide inventory of family housing units for general officers and flag officers and identifying annual expenditures for each such unit for operation and maintenance, utilities, and repair for each for the fiscal years 2000 through 2004.

(d) SUBMISSION OF REPORTS.—The reports required by subsections (b) and (c) shall be submitted to the congressional defense committees not later than March 30, 2005.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The terms ''general officer'' and ''flag officer'' have the meanings given such terms in section 101(b) of title 10, United States Code.

(2) The term ''National Capital Region'' has the meaning given such term in section 2674(f) of such title.

SEC. 2805. CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION OF DEVIATIONS FROM AUTHORIZED COST VARIATIONS FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING PROJECTS.

Section 2853(c)(3) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''or, if over sooner, a period of 14 days has elapsed after the date on which a copy of the notification is provided in an electronic medium pursuant to section 480 of this title''.

SEC. 2806. REPEAL OF LIMITATION ON USE OF ALTERNATIVE AUTHORITY FOR ACQUISITION AND IMPROVEMENT OF MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING.

Effective October 1, 2005, subsection (g) of section 2883 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(g) LIMITATION ON USE OF AUTHORITY TO ACQUIRE OR CONSTRUCT MILITARY UNACCOMPANIED HOUSING.—The total value in budget authority of all contracts and investments undertaken using the authorities provided in this subchapter for the acquisition or construction of military unaccompanied housing shall not exceed $150,000,000.''.

SEC. 2807. TEMPORARY AUTHORITY TO ACCELERATE DESIGN EFFORTS FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS CARRIED OUT USING DESIGN-BUILD SELECTION PROCEDURES.

Section 2305a of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) SPECIAL AUTHORITY FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.—(1) The Secretary of a military department, and the Secretary of Defense with respect to matters concerning the Defense Agencies, may use funds available to the Secretary under section 2807(a) or 18233(e) of this title to accelerate the design effort in connection with a military construction project for which the two-phase selection procedures described in subsection (c) are used to select the contractor for both the design and construction portion of the project before the project is specifically authorized by law and before funds are appropriated for the construction portion of the project. Notwithstanding the limitations contained in such sections, use of such funds for the design portion of a military construction project may continue despite the subsequent authorization of the project. The advance notice requirement of section 2807(b) of this title shall continue to apply whenever the estimated cost of the design portion of the project exceeds the amount specified in such section.

''(2) Any military construction contract that provides for an accelerated design effort, as authorized by paragraph (1), shall include as a condition of the contract that the liability of the United States in a termination for convenience may not exceed costs above the costs attributable to the final design of the project.

''(3) Not more than 36 military construction projects containing the accelerated design effort authorized by paragraph (1) may be carried out.

''(4) Not later than March 1, 2007, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report evaluating the usefulness of the authority provided by this subsection in expediting the design and construction of military construction projects. The authority provided by this subsection expires September 30, 2008, except that, if the report required by this paragraph is not submitted by March 1, 2007, the authority shall expire on that date.''.

SEC. 2808. EXCHANGE OR SALE OF RESERVE COMPONENT FACILITIES TO ACQUIRE REPLACEMENT FACILITIES.

Section 18233 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g)(1) The Secretary of Defense may convey, by exchange or sale, an existing facility of a reserve component of the armed forces for the purpose of acquiring a replacement facility under this section or using the proceeds from the sale to acquire a replacement facility under this section, if the Secretary determines it is in the best interests of the United States to acquire the replacement facility by such exchange or sale. The United States shall receive funds or a replacement facility, or a combination of both, having a total value at least equal to the fair market value of the conveyed facility.

''(2) Acquisition of a replacement facility under this subsection may be accomplished by construction, expansion, rehabilitation, or conversion and must result in a fully equipped and operational replacement facility. Nothing in this subsection prohibits the Secretary of Defense from contributing additional funds, in accordance with this section, to obtain a fully equipped and operational replacement facility.

''(3) Funds received under this subsection shall be deposited in a separate account and remain available to the Secretary of Defense, without appropriation, for use in accordance with this subsection. Any funds received under this subsection in connection with a conveyance in excess of the funds required to obtain a fully equipped and operational replacement facility for the conveyed facility may be used by the Secretary for the purposes of subsection (a).''.

SEC. 2809. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF TEMPORARY, LIMITED AUTHORITY TO USE OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FUNDS FOR CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.

Section 2808 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (division B of Public Law 108–136; 117 Stat. 1723) is amended—

(1) in subsections (a) and (d), by striking ''fiscal year 2004'' both places it appears and inserting ''fiscal years 2004 and 2005''; and

(2) in subsection (c)(1), by striking ''in fiscal year 2004'' and inserting ''in a fiscal year''.

Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration

SEC. 2811. INCREASE IN CERTAIN THRESHOLDS FOR REPORTING REAL PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS.

(a) GENERAL NOTICE AND WAIT THRESHOLD.—Subsection (a) of section 2662 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''$750,000'' each place it appears and inserting ''$1,500,000''.

(b) ANNUAL REPORT ON MINOR TRANSACTIONS THRESHOLD.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended by striking ''subsection (a) that involve an estimated value of more than $250,000, but not more than $750,000'' and inserting ''such subsection that involve an estimated value of more than $500,000, but not more than the amount specified in such subsection''.

(c) NOTICE AND WAIT THRESHOLD FOR CERTAIN GSA LEASES.—Subsection (e) of such section is amended by striking ''$750,000'' and inserting ''$1,500,000''.

(d) THRESHOLD FOR ACQUISITION OF LOW-COST INTERESTS IN LAND.—Subsection (a) of section 2672 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''(a) ACQUISITION AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of a military department may acquire any interest in land that—

''(1) the Secretary determines is needed in the interest of national defense; and

''(2) does not cost more than $1,500,000, exclusive of administrative costs and the amounts of any deficiency judgments.''.

(e) TREATMENT MULTIPLE PARCELS UNDER LOW-COST ACQUISITION AUTHORITY.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended to read as follows:

''(b) TREATMENT OF MULTIPLE PARCELS.—This section does not authorize the acquisition, as a part of the same project, of more than one parcel of land unless—

''(1) the parcels are noncontiguous; or

''(2) if contiguous, the total cost for the acquisition of all of the contiguous parcels does not cost more than the amount specified in subsection (a)(2).''.

SEC. 2812. REORGANIZATION OF EXISTING ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS RELATING TO REAL PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS.

(a) LIMITATION ON COMMISSIONS.—(1) Section 2661 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) COMMISSIONS ON LAND PURCHASE CONTRACTS.—The maximum amount payable as a commission on a contract for the purchase of land from funds appropriated for the Department of Defense is two percent of the purchase price.''.

(2) Section 2666 of such title is repealed.

(b) REPEAL OF OBSOLETE AUTHORITY TO ACQUIRE LAND FOR TIMBER PRODUCTION.—Section 2664 of such title is repealed.

(c) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN INTERESTS IN REAL PROPERTY.—(1) Section 2672 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Appropriations available to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance or construction may be used for the acquisition of land or interests in land under this section.''.

(2) Section 2673 of such title is repealed.

(3) Section 2675 of such title is amended—

(A) by inserting before ''The Secretary'' the following ''(a) LEASE AUTHORITY; DURATION.—''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(b) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Appropriations available to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance or construction may be used for the acquisition of interests in land under this section.''.

(d) STYLISTIC AND CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—(1) Section 2661 of such title is further amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by inserting ''AVAILABILITY OF OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FUNDS.—'' after ''(a)'' ; and

(B) in subsection (b), by inserting ''LEASING AND ROAD MAINTENANCE AUTHORITY.—'' after ''(b)''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 159 of such title is amended by striking the items relating to sections 2664, 2666, and 2673.

SEC. 2813. TREATMENT OF MONEY RENTALS FROM GOLF COURSE AT ROCK ISLAND ARSENAL, ILLINOIS.

(a) SUPPORT OF MWR ACTIVITIES.—Section 2667(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B)—

(A) by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii); and

(B) by inserting after clause (i) the following new clause:

''(ii) Money rentals deposited in a nonappropriated morale, welfare, and recreation account under paragraph (3).''; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

''(3) The Secretary of the Army may deposit up to 50 percent of the money rentals received by the United States from a lease involving the golf course at Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois, in the nonappropriated morale, welfare, and recreation account for that installation, to be used for quality-of-life programs at that installation.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Paragraph (3) of section 2667(d) of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply to money rentals referred to in such paragraph received by the United States after September 30, 2004.

SEC. 2814. NUMBER OF CONTRACTS AUTHORIZED DEPARTMENT-WIDE UNDER DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM ON REDUCTION IN LONG-TERM FACILITY MAINTENANCE COSTS.

Section 2814 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107; 10 U.S.C. 2809 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''or the Secretary of a military department'' and inserting ''and the Secretaries of the military departments'';

(2) in subsection (b)(1), by striking ''12 contracts per military department'' and inserting ''36 contracts''; and

(3) in subsection (b)(2), by striking ''the date of the enactment of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003'' and inserting ''December 2, 2002''.

SEC. 2815. REPEAL OF COMMISSION ON REVIEW OF OVERSEAS MILITARY FACILITY STRUCTURE OF THE UNITED STATES.

Section 128 of the Military Construction Appropriations Act, 2004 (Public Law 108–132; 117 Stat. 1382; 10 U.S.C. 111 note), is repealed.

SEC. 2816. DESIGNATION OF AIRMEN LEADERSHIP SCHOOL AT LUKE AIR FORCE BASE, ARIZONA, IN HONOR OF JOHN J. RHODES, A FORMER MINORITY LEADER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

The Airmen Leadership School at Luke Air Force Base, Arizona, building 156, shall be known and designated as the ''John J. Rhodes Airmen Leadership School''. Any reference to such facility in any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States shall be considered to be a reference to the John J. Rhodes Airmen Leadership School.

SEC. 2817. ELIMINATION OF REVERSIONARY INTERESTS CLOUDING UNITED STATES TITLE TO PROPERTY USED AS NAVY HOMEPORTS.

(a) AUTHORITY TO ACQUIRE COMPLETE TITLE.—If real property owned by the United States and used as a Navy homeport is subject to a reversionary interest of any kind, the Secretary of the Navy may enter into an agreement with the holder of the reversionary interest to acquire the reversionary interest and thereby secure for the United States all right, title, and interest in and to the property.

(b) CONSIDERATION.—(1) As consideration for the acquisition of a reversionary interest under subsection (a), the Secretary shall provide the holder of the reversionary interest with in-kind consideration, to be determined pursuant to negotiations between the Secretary and the holder of the reversionary interest. In determining the type and value of any in-kind consideration to be provided for the acquisition of a reversionary interest under subsection (a), the Secretary shall take into account the nature of the reversionary interest, including whether it would require the holder of the reversionary interest to pay for any improvements acquired by the holder as part of the reversion of the real property, and the long-term use and ultimate disposition of the real property if the United States were to acquire all right, title, and interest in and to the real property subject to the reversionary interest.

(2) Cash payments are not authorized as consideration for the acquisition of reversionary interests under subsection (a).

SEC. 2818. REPORT ON REAL PROPERTY DISPOSAL AT MARINE CORPS AIR STATION, EL TORO, CALIFORNIA.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy shall submit to Congress a report describing—

(1) the progress being made with regard to the disposal of real property at Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California, including any challenges arising from plans to dispose of property at the installation by auction;

(2) the anticipated future uses of the property; and

(3) the requests received from other Federal agencies (including other military departments) for property at the installation.

Subtitle C—Base Closure and Realignment

SEC. 2821. TWO-YEAR POSTPONEMENT OF 2005 BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT ROUND AND SUBMISSION OF REPORTS REGARDING FUTURE INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) TWO-YEAR POSTPONEMENT IN SUBMITTAL OF BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT RECOMMENDATIONS.—Section 2914 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), as added by section 3003 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107; 115 Stat. 1345), is amended—

*(1) in the section heading, by striking ''**2005**'' and inserting ''**2007**''; and*

(2) in subsection (a), by striking ''May 16, 2005,'' and inserting ''May 16, 2007,''.

(b) COMMISSION REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—Subsection (d) of section 2914 of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 is amended—

(1) in paragraphs (1) and (2), by striking ''September 8, 2005'' both places it appears and inserting ''September 8, 2007''; and

(2) in paragraph (6)—

(A) by striking ''in 2005'' and inserting ''under this section''; and

(B) by striking ''July 1, 2005'' and inserting ''July 1, 2007''.

(c) REVIEW BY PRESIDENT AND TRANSMITTAL TO CONGRESS.—Subsection (e) of section 2914 of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''in 2005'' and inserting ''under this section''; and

(B) by striking ''September 23, 2005'' and inserting ''September 23, 2007'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''October 20, 2005'' and inserting ''October 20, 2007''; and

(3) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking ''November 7, 2005'' and inserting ''November 7, 2007''; and

(B) by striking ''in 2005'' and inserting ''in 2007''.

(d) NEW FORCE STRUCTURE PLAN AND INFRASTRUCTURE INVENTORY; RECERTIFICATION OF NEED FOR ADDITIONAL ROUND.—Section 2912 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), as added by section 3001 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107; 115 Stat. 1342), is amended—

*(1) in the section heading, by striking ''**2005**'' and inserting ''**2007**'';*

(2) by striking ''fiscal year 2005'' each place it appears and inserting ''fiscal year 2007'';

(3) in subsection (b)(1), by inserting ''for fiscal year 2007'' after ''subsection (a)'';

(4) in subsections (b)(2) and (d), by striking ''in 2005'' each place it appears and inserting ''under section 2914'';

(5) in subsection (d), by striking ''March 15, 2005'' both places it appears and inserting ''March 15, 2007'';

(6) in subsection (d)(4), by striking ''calendar year 2005 and shall terminate on April 15, 2006'' and inserting ''calendar year 2007 and shall terminate on April 15, 2008''; and

(7) in subsection (d)(5), by striking ''second session of the 108th Congress for the activities of the Commission in 2005'' and inserting ''second session of the 109th Congress for the activities of the Commission under section 2914''.

(e) INFRASTRUCTURE-RELATED REPORTING REQUIREMENTS; TERMINATION OF BASE CLOSURE ROUND.—Section 2912 of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) INFRASTRUCTURE-RELATED REPORTS.—

''(1) REQUIRED REPORTS.—The Secretary shall prepare the following reports related to infrastructure requirements for the Armed Forces:

''(A) A report containing the Integrated Global Presence and Basing Strategy of the Department of Defense, including the location of long-term overseas installations, installations to be used for rotational purposes, and forward operating locations, anticipated rotational plans and policies, and domestic and overseas infrastructure requirements associated with the strategy.

''(B) A report describing the anticipated infrastructure requirements associated with the probable end-strength levels and major military force units (including land force divisions, carrier and other major combatant vessels, air wings, and other comparable units) for each of the Armed Forces resulting from force transformation.

''(C) A report describing the anticipated infrastructure requirements related to expected changes in the active component versus reserve component personnel mix of the Armed Forces.

''(D) A report describing the anticipated infrastructure requirements associated with the so-called '10–30–30 objective' of the Secretary to ensure that military forces are capable of deployment overseas within 10 days in sufficient strength to defeat an enemy within 30 days and be ready for redeployment within 30 days after the end of combat operations.

''(E) A report containing the results of a complete reassessment of the infrastructure necessary to support the force structure described in the force-structure plan prepared under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) and describing any resulting excess infrastructure and infrastructure capacity, which were previously required by paragraph (2) of such subsection. The reassessment shall be based on actual infrastructure, facility, and space requirements for the Armed Forces rather than a comparative study between 1989 and 2003.

''(F) A report describing the anticipated infrastructure requirements associated with the assessment prepared by the Secretary pursuant to section 2822 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136; 117 Stat. 1726), in which Congress required the Secretary to assess the probable threats to national security and determine the potential, prudent, surge requirements for the Armed Forces and military installations to meet those threats.

''(2) TIME FOR SUBMISSION OF REPORTS.—The reports required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted to the congressional defense committees only during the period beginning on January 1, 2006, and ending on March 15, 2006.

''(3) TERMINATION OF ROUND FOR FAILURE TO SUBMIT REPORTS AS REQUIRED.—If the reports required by paragraph (1) are not submitted during the period specified in paragraph (2), the process for the making of recommendations to the Congress for the closure or realignment of military installations and the selection of installations for closure or realignment under this part in 2007 shall be terminated.''.

(f) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Section 2904(a)(3) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 is amended by striking ''in the 2005 report'' and inserting ''in a report submitted after 2001''.

(2) Section 2906(e) of such Act is amended by striking ''2005'' and inserting ''2007''.

(3) Section 2906A of such Act is amended—

(A) in the section heading, by striking ''**2005**'' and inserting ''**2007**''; and

(B) by striking ''2005'' each place it appears and inserting ''2007''.

(4) Section 2909(a) of such Act is amended by striking ''2006'' and inserting ''2008''.

SEC. 2822. ESTABLISHMENT OF SPECIFIC DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION OF REVISIONS TO FORCE-STRUCTURE PLAN AND INFRASTRUCTURE INVENTORY FOR NEXT BASE CLOSURE ROUND.

Section 2912(a)(4) 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) is amended by striking ''as part of the budget justification document submitted to Congress for fiscal year 2006.'' and inserting ''not later than March 15 of the year in which the Secretary will submit, consistent with subsection (e) of this section, the list of the military installations inside the United States that the Secretary recommends for closure or realignment. No revision of the force-structure plan or infrastructure inventory is authorized after that March 15 date.''.

SEC. 2823. SPECIFICATION OF FINAL SELECTION CRITERIA FOR NEXT BASE CLOSURE ROUND.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Title XXX of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107; 115 Stat. 1342) amended 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) to authorize the Secretary of Defense to conduct an additional round of base realignments and closures.

(2) In section 2822 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136; 117 Stat. 1726), approved November 24, 2003, Congress required the Secretary of Defense to assess the probable threats to national security and determine the potential, prudent, surge requirements for the Armed Forces and military installations to meet those threats. Such section specifically requires the Secretary of Defense to use the determination of surge requirements in exercising the authority of the Secretary to conduct the next round of base realignments and closures.

(3) Section 2913 of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, as added by title XXX of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002, specified the process by which the Secretary of Defense was to prepare the criteria to be used by the Secretary in making recommendations for the next round of base realignments and closures and listed certain requirements the Secretary had to comply with as part of the process, including the advance publication of the proposed criteria and the solicitation and consideration of public comments.

(4) In subsection (e) of such section, Congress required the Secretary of Defense to publish in the Federal Register and transmit to Congress not later than February 16, 2004, the final criteria intended to be used by the Secretary in making recommendations for the next round of base realignments and closures. Pursuant to such subsection, the Secretary of Defense published the final selection criteria in the Federal Register on February 12, 2004 (69 Fed. Reg. 6948).

(5) In addition to specifically reserving its right to disapprove the final selection criteria, Congress may modify or otherwise amend the criteria by Act of Congress.

(b) CONGRESSIONAL SPECIFICATION OF FINAL BRAC SELECTION CRITERIA.—Section 2913 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), as added by section 3002 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107; 115 Stat. 1344), is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 2913. FINAL SELECTION CRITERIA FOR ADDITIONAL ROUND OF BASE CLOSURES AND REALIGNMENTS.

''(a) FINAL SELECTION CRITERIA.—The final criteria to be used by the Secretary in making recommendations for the closure or realignment of military installations inside the United States under this part in any additional round of base closures and realignments are as follows:

''(1) The current and future mission requirements and the impact on operational readiness of the total force of the Department of Defense, including the impact on joint warfighting, training, readiness, and research, development, test, and evaluation of weapons systems and equipment.

''(2) The availability and condition of land, facilities, infrastructure, and associated air and water space (including preservation of training areas suitable for maneuver by ground, naval, or air forces throughout a diversity of climate and terrain areas, the preservation of testing ranges able to accommodate current or future military weapons systems and equipment, and the preservation of staging areas for the use of the Armed Forces in homeland defense missions) at both existing and potential receiving locations.

''(3) The ability to accommodate contingency, mobilization, and future total force requirements at both existing and potential receiving locations to support operations, training, maintenance, and repair.

''(4) Preservation of land, air, and water space, facilities, and infrastructure necessary to support training and operations of military forces determined to be surge requirements by the Secretary of Defense, as required by section 2822 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136; 117 Stat. 1726).

''(5) The extent and timing of potential costs and savings of base realignment and closure actions on the entire Federal budget, as well as the Department of Defense, including the number of years, beginning with the date of completion of the closure or realignment, for the savings to exceed the costs. Costs shall include those costs related to potential environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities.

''(6) The economic impact on existing communities in the vicinity of military installations.

''(7) The ability of the infrastructure of both the existing and potential receiving communities to support forces, missions, and personnel, including quality of living standards for members of the Armed Forces and their dependents.

''(8) The environmental impact on receiving locations.

''(b) PRIORITY GIVEN TO MILITARY VALUE.—In recommending military installations for closure or realignment, the Secretary shall give priority consideration to the first four criteria specified in subsection (a).

''(c) RELATION TO OTHER MATERIALS.—The final selection criteria specified in subsection (a) shall be the only criteria to be used, along with the force-structure plan and infrastructure inventory referred to in section 2912, in making recommendations for the closure or realignment of military installations inside the United States under this part after December 31, 2003.

''(d) RELATION TO CRITERIA FOR EARLIER ROUNDS.—Section 2903(b), and the selection criteria prepared under such section, shall not apply with respect to the process of making recommendations for the closure or realignment of military installations after December 31, 2003.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 is amended—

(1) in section 2912(c)(1)(A), by striking ''criteria prepared under section 2913'' and inserting ''criteria specified in section 2913''; and

(2) in section 2914(a), by striking ''criteria prepared by the Secretary under section 2913'' and inserting ''criteria specified in section 2913''.

SEC. 2824. REQUIREMENT FOR UNANIMOUS VOTE OF DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION TO ADD TO OR OTHERWISE EXPAND CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.

Section 2914(d) 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), as added by section 3003 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (division B of Public Law 107–107; 155 Stat, 1346) and amended by section 2854 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314; 116 Stat. 2728), is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking ''TO ADD'' and inserting ''TO CONSIDER ADDITIONS''; and

(2) by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(5) REQUIREMENTS TO EXPAND CLOSURE OR REALIGNMENT RECOMMENDATIONS.—In the report required under section 2903(d)(2)(A) that is to be transmitted under paragraph (1), the Commission may not make a change in the recommendations of the Secretary that would close a military installation not recommended for closure by the Secretary, would realign a military installation not recommended for closure or realignment by the Secretary, or would expand the extent of the realignment of a military installation recommended for realignment by the Secretary unless—

''(A) at least two members of the Commission visit the military installation before the date of the transmittal of the report; and

''(B) the decision of the Commission to make the change to recommend the closure of the military installation, the realignment of the installation, or the expanded realignment of the installation is unanimous.''.

SEC. 2825. ADHERENCE TO CERTAIN AUTHORITIES ON PRESERVATION OF MILITARY DEPOT CAPABILITIES DURING ANY SUBSEQUENT ROUND OF BASE CLOSURES AND REALIGNMENTS.

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) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 2915. ADHERENCE TO CERTAIN AUTHORITIES ON PRESERVATION OF MILITARY DEPOT CAPABILITIES DURING ANY SUBSEQUENT ROUND OF BASE CLOSURES AND REALIGNMENTS.

''(a) ADHERENCE REQUIRED.—(1) Any base closure and realignment actions under section 2914 or subsequent round of base closure and realignment, and any actions to carry out the closure or realignment of military installations as a result of such actions, shall reflect a strict adherence to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, for the maintenance of government-owned, government-operated depot-level maintenance, repair, and logistics capabilities within the Department of Defense, including the provisions of chapter 146 of such title and other applicable provisions.

''(2) No action to carry out the closure or realignment of military installations in any base closures and realignments under this part after the date of the enactment of this section may include a waiver authorized by paragraph (2) or (3) of section 2464(b) or section 2466(b) of title 10, United States Code.

''(b) BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT ACTIONS DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'base closure and realignment actions' means the following:

''(1) The preparation by the Secretary of Defense of recommendations on installations for closure or realignment under this part or any subsequent base closure law.

''(2) The review by the Commission of the recommendations referred to in paragraph (1).

''(3) The review by the President of the recommendations referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2).''.

Subtitle D—Land Conveyances

PART I—ARMY CONVEYANCES

SEC. 2831. TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION, DEFENSE SUPPLY CENTER, COLUMBUS, OHIO.

(a) TRANSFER REQUIRED.—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army shall transfer, without reimbursement, to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs a parcel of real property consisting of approximately 20 acres and comprising a portion of the Defense Supply Center in Columbus, Ohio, for the purpose of permitting the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to use the property as the site for an outpatient clinic.

(b) PAYMENT OF COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—(1) The Secretary of the Army shall require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to cover costs to be incurred by the Secretary of the Army, or to reimburse the Secretary of the Army for costs incurred by the Secretary of the Army, to carry out the conveyance under subsection (a), including survey costs, costs related to environmental documentation, and other administrative costs related to the conveyance. If amounts are collected from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs in advance of the Secretary of the Army incurring the actual costs, and the amount collected exceeds the costs actually incurred by the Secretary of the Army to carry out the conveyance, the Secretary of the Army shall refund the excess amount to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

(2) Amounts received as reimbursement under paragraph (1) shall be credited to the fund or account that was used to cover the costs incurred by the Secretary of the Army in carrying out the conveyance. Amounts so credited shall be merged with amounts in such fund or account, and shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same conditions and limitations, as amounts in such fund or account.

(c) DESCRIPTION OF REAL PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the real property to be transferred under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary of the Army.

SEC. 2832. LAND CONVEYANCE, FORT HOOD, TEXAS.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of the Army may convey to the Texas A&M University System of the State of Texas (in this section referred to as the ''University System''), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property, including improvements thereon, consisting of approximately 662 acres at Fort Hood, Texas, for the sole purpose of permitting the University System to establish on the property an upper level (junior, senior and graduate) university that will be State-supported, separate from other universities of the University System, and designated as Texas A&M University, Central Texas.

(b) CONSIDERATION.—(1) As consideration for the conveyance under subsection (a), the University System shall pay to the United States an amount equal to the fair market value of the conveyed property, as determined pursuant to an appraisal acceptable to the Secretary.

(2) In lieu of all or a portion of the cash consideration required by paragraph (1), the Secretary may accept in-kind consideration, including the conveyance by the University System of real property acceptable to the Secretary.

(c) CONDITION OF CONVEYANCE.—The conveyance under subsection (a) shall be subject to the condition that the Secretary determine that the conveyance of the property and the establishment of a university on the property will not adversely impact the operation of Robert Grey Army Airfield, which is located on Fort Hood approximately one mile from the property authorized for conveyance.

(d) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the real property to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary. The cost of the survey shall be borne by the University System.

(e) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 2833. LAND CONVEYANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD FACILITY, SEATTLE, WASHINGTON.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of the Army may convey, without consideration, to the State of Washington (in this section referred to as the ''State'') all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property, including any improvements thereon, consisting of approximately 9.747 acres in Seattle, Washington, and comprising a portion of the National Guard Facility, Pier 91, for the purpose of permitting the State to convey the facility unencumbered for economic development purposes.

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—(1) The State shall reimburse the Secretary for the administrative expenses incurred by the Secretary in carrying out the conveyance under subsection (a), including expenses related to surveys and legal descriptions, boundary monumentation, environmental surveys, necessary documentation, travel, and deed preparation.

(2) Section 2695(c) of title 10, United States Code, shall apply to any amounts received by the Secretary as reimbursement under this subsection.

(c) EXEMPTION FROM FEDERAL SCREENING.—The conveyance authorized by subsection (a) is exempt from the requirement to screen the property for other Federal use pursuant to sections 2693 and 2696 of title 10, United States Code.

(d) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the property to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary. The cost of the survey shall be borne by the United States, subject to the requirement for reimbursement under subsection (b).

(e) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

PART II—NAVY CONVEYANCES

SEC. 2841. TRANSFER OF JURISDICTION, NEBRASKA AVENUE NAVAL COMPLEX, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

(a) TRANSFER REQUIRED.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the Secretary of the Navy shall transfer to the administrative jurisdiction of the Administrator of General Services the parcel of Department of the Navy real property in the District of Columbia known as the Nebraska Avenue Complex for the purpose of permitting the Administrator to use the Complex to accommodate the Department of Homeland Security. The Complex shall be transferred in its existing condition.

(b) AUTHORITY TO RETAIN MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING.—At the option of the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary may retain administrative jurisdiction over that portion of the Complex that, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, is being used to provide Navy family housing.

(c) TIME FOR TRANSFER.—Not later than January 1, 2005, the Secretary of the Navy shall complete the transfer of administrative jurisdiction over the portion of the Complex required to be transferred under subsection (a).

(d) RELOCATION OF NAVY ACTIVITIES.—As part of the transfer of the Complex under subsection (a), the Secretary of the Navy shall relocate Department of the Navy activities at the Complex to other locations.

(e) PAYMENT OF INITIAL RELOCATION COSTS.—Subject to the availability of appropriations for this purpose, the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security shall be responsible for the payment of—

(1) all reasonable costs, including costs to move furnishings and equipment, related to the initial relocation of Department of the Navy activities from the Complex under subsection (d); and

(2) all reasonable costs incident to the initial occupancy by such activities of interim leased space, including rental costs for the first year.

(f) PAYMENT OF LONG-TERM RELOCATION COSTS.—

(1) SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING PAYMENT.—It is the sense of the Congress that the Secretary of the Navy should receive, from Federal agencies other than the Department of Defense, funds authorized and appropriated for the purpose of covering all reasonable costs, not paid

under subsection (e), that are incurred or will be incurred by the Secretary to permanently relocate Department of the Navy activities from the Complex under subsection (d).

(2) SUBMISSION OF COST ESTIMATES.—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act , the Secretary of the Navy shall submit to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Congress an initial estimate of the amounts that will be necessary to cover the costs to permanently relocate Department of the Navy activities from the portion of the Complex to be transferred under subsection (a). The Secretary shall include in the estimate anticipated land acquisition and construction costs. The Secretary shall revise the estimate as necessary whenever information regarding the actual costs for the relocation is obtained.

(g) TREATMENT OF FUNDS.—(1) Funds received by the Secretary of the Navy, from sources outside the Department of Defense, to relocate Department of the Navy activities from the Complex shall be used to pay the costs incurred by the Secretary to permanently relocate Department of the Navy activities from the Complex. A military construction project carried out using such funds is deemed to be an authorized military construction project for purposes of section 2802 of title 10, United States Code. Section 2822 of such title shall continue to apply to any military family housing unit proposed to be constructed or acquired using such funds.

(2) When a decision is made to carry out a military construction project using such funds, the Secretary of the Navy shall notify Congress in writing of that decision, including the justification for the project and the current estimate of the cost of the project. The project may then be carried out only after the end of the 21-day period beginning on the date the notification is received by Congress or, if earlier, the end of the 14-day period beginning on the date on which a copy of the notification is provided in an electronic medium pursuant to section 480 of title 10, United States Code.

(h) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO RECEIVE SUFFICIENT FUNDS FOR RELOCATION COSTS.—

(1) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—At the end of the three-year period beginning on the date of the transfer of the Complex under subsection (a), the Secretary of the Navy shall submit to Congress a report—

(A) specifying the total amount needed to cover both the initial and permanent costs of relocating Department of the Navy activities from the portion of the Complex transferred under subsection (a);

(B) specifying the total amount of the initial relocation costs paid by the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security under subsection (e); and

(C) specifying the total amount of appropriated funds received by the Secretary of the Navy, from sources outside the Department of Defense, to cover the permanent relocation costs.

(2) ROLE OF OMB.—The Secretary of the Navy shall obtain the assistance and concurrence of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget in determining the total amount needed to cover both the initial and permanent costs of relocating Department of the Navy activities from the portion of the Complex transferred under subsection (a), as required by paragraph (1)(A).

(3) CERTIFICATION REGARDING RELOCATION COSTS.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the report under paragraph (1) is required to be submitted to Congress, the President shall certify to Congress whether the amounts specified in the report pursuant to subparagraphs (B) and (C) of such paragraph are sufficient to cover both the initial and permanent costs of relocating Department of the Navy activities from the portion of the Complex transferred under subsection (a). The President shall make this certification only after consultation with the Chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

(4) RESTORATION OF COMPLEX TO NAVY.—If the President certifies under paragraph (3) that amounts referred to in subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (1) are insufficient to cover Navy relocation costs, the Administrator of General Services, at the request of the Secretary of the Navy, shall restore the Complex to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Navy.

(5) NAVY SALE OF COMPLEX.—If administrative jurisdiction over the Complex is restored to the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary shall convey the Complex by competitive sale. Amounts received by the United States as consideration from any sale under this paragraph shall be deposited in the special account in the Treasury established pursuant to section 572(b) of title 40, United States Code.

SEC. 2842. LAND CONVEYANCE, NAVY PROPERTY, FORMER FORT SHERIDAN, ILLINOIS.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of the Navy may convey, without consideration, to the State of Illinois, a political subdivision of the State, or a nonprofit land conservation organization (in this section collectively referred to as the ''grantee''), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain environmentally sensitive land at the former Fort Sheridan, Illinois, consisting of mostly bluffs and ravines, for the purpose of ensuring the permanent protection of the lands.

(b) REVERSIONARY INTEREST.—If the Secretary determines at any time that the real property conveyed under subsection (a) is not being used or maintained in accordance with the purpose of the conveyance specified in such subsection, all right, title, and interest in and to all or any portion of the property shall revert, at the option of the Secretary, to the United States, and the United States shall have the right of immediate entry onto the property. Any determination of the Secretary under this subsection shall be made on the record after an opportunity for a hearing.

(c) RECONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary may permit the grantee to convey the real property conveyed under subsection (a) to another eligible entity described in such subsection, subject to the same covenants and terms and conditions as provided in the deed from the United States.

(d) PAYMENT OF COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—(1) The Secretary shall require the grantee to cover costs to be incurred by the Secretary, or to reimburse the Secretary for costs incurred by the Secretary, to carry out the conveyance under subsection (a), including survey costs, costs related to environmental documentation, and other administrative costs related to the conveyance. If amounts are collected from the grantee in advance of the Secretary incurring the actual costs, and the amount collected exceeds the costs actually incurred by the Secretary to carry out the conveyance, the Secretary shall refund the excess amount to the grantee.

(2) Amounts received as reimbursement under paragraph (1) shall be credited to the fund or account that was used to cover the costs incurred by the Secretary in carrying out the conveyance. Amounts so credited shall be merged with amounts in such fund or account, and shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same conditions and limitations, as amounts in such fund or account.

(e) EXEMPTION FROM FEDERAL SCREENING.—The conveyance authorized by subsection (a) is exempt from the requirement to screen the property for other Federal use pursuant to sections 2693 and 2696 of title 10, United States Code.

(f) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the real property to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary.

(g) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(h) USE OF ALTERNATE CONVEYANCE AUTHORITY.—In lieu of using the authority provided by this section to convey the real property described in subsection (a), the Secretary may elect to include the property in a conveyance authorized by section 2878 of title 10, United States Code, subject to such terms, reservations, restrictions, and conditions as may be necessary to ensure the permanent protection of the property, if the Secretary determines that a conveyance under such section is advantageous to the interests of the United States.

SEC. 2843. LAND EXCHANGE, NAVAL AIR STATION, PATUXENT RIVER, MARYLAND.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of the Navy may convey to the State of Maryland (in this section referred to as ''State''), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property, including improvements thereon, consisting of approximately five acres at Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Maryland, and containing the Point Lookout Lighthouse, other structures related to the lighthouse, and an archaeological site pertaining to the military hospital that was located on the property during the Civil War. The conveyance shall include artifacts pertaining to the military hospital recovered by the Navy and held at the installation.

(b) PROPERTY RECEIVED IN EXCHANGE.—As consideration for the conveyance of the real property under subsection (a), the State shall convey to the United States a parcel of real property consisting of approximately five acres located in Point Lookout State Park, St. Mary's County, Maryland.

(c) PAYMENT OF COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—(1) The Secretary may require the State to cover costs to be incurred by the Secretary, or to reimburse the Secretary for costs incurred by the Secretary, to carry out the conveyance under subsection (a), including survey costs, costs related to environmental documentation, relocation expenses incurred under subsection (b), and other administrative costs related to the conveyance. If amounts are collected from the State in advance of the Secretary incurring the actual costs, and the amount collected exceeds the costs actually incurred by the Secretary to carry out the conveyance, the Secretary shall refund the excess amount to State.

(2) Amounts received as reimbursement under paragraph (1) shall be credited to the fund or account that was used to cover the costs incurred by the Secretary in carrying out the conveyance. Amounts so credited shall be merged with amounts in such fund or account, and shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same conditions and limitations, as amounts in such fund or account.

(d) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the properties to be conveyed under this section shall be determined by surveys satisfactory to the Secretary.

(e) EXEMPTION FROM FEDERAL SCREENING.—The conveyance authorized by subsection (a) is exempt from the requirement to screen the property for other Federal use pursuant to sections 2693 and 2696 of title 10, United States Code.

(f) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyances under this section as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

PART III—AIR FORCE CONVEYANCES

SEC. 2851. LAND EXCHANGE, MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, ALABAMA.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of the Air Force may convey to the City of

Montgomery, Alabama (in this section referred to as the ''City''), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property, including improvements thereon, consisting of all of the Maxwell Heights Housing site at Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama.

(b) CONSIDERATION.—(1) As consideration for the conveyance of the real property under subsection (a), the City shall convey to the United States a parcel of real property, including improvements thereon, consisting of approximately 35 acres designated as project AL 6–4 that is owned by the City and is contiguous to Maxwell Air Force Base. The Secretary shall have jurisdiction over the real property received under this paragraph.

(2) If the fair market value of the real property received under paragraph (1) is less than the fair market value of the real property conveyed under subsection (a), the Secretary may require the City to make up the difference through the payment of cash, the provision of in-kind consideration, or a combination thereof, to be determined pursuant to negotiations between the Secretary and the City.

(3) The fair market values of the real property to be exchanged under this section shall be determined by appraisals acceptable to the Secretary and the City.

(c) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the property to be conveyed under this section shall be determined by surveys satisfactory to the Secretary.

(d) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyances under this section as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorizations

SEC. 3101. NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2005 for the activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration in carrying out programs necessary for national security in the amount of $9,047,700,000, to be allocated as follows:

(1) For weapons activities, $6,577,953,000.

(2) For defense nuclear nonproliferation activities, $1,338,147,000.

(3) For naval reactors, $797,900,000.

(4) For the Office of the Administrator for Nuclear Security, $333,700,000.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF NEW PLANT PROJECTS.—From funds referred to in subsection (a) that are available for carrying out plant projects, the Secretary of Energy may carry out, for weapons activities, the following new plant projects:

Project 05–D–140, project engineering and design, various locations, $11,600,000.

Project 05–D–160, facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program, project engineering and design, various locations, $8,700,000.

Project 05–D–170, project engineering and design, safeguards and security, various locations, $17,000,000.

Project 05–D–401, production bays upgrade, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, Texas, $25,100,000.

Project 05–D–402, beryllium capability project, Y–12 national security complex, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, $3,627,000.

Project 05–D–601, compressed air upgrades project, Y–12 national security complex, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, $4,400,000.

Project 05–D–602, power grid infrastructure upgrade, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico, $10,000,000.

Project 05–D–603, new master substation, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, New Mexico, $600,000.

Project 05–D–701, security perimeter, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico, $20,000,000.

SEC. 3102. DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2005 for environmental management activities in carrying out programs necessary for national security in the amount of $6,863,307,000, to be allocated as follows:

(1) For defense site acceleration completion, $5,876,837,000.

(2) For defense environmental services, $986,470,000.

SEC. 3103. OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2005 for other defense activities in carrying out programs necessary for national security in the amount of $658,618,000.

SEC. 3104. DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2005 for defense nuclear waste disposal for payment to the Nuclear Waste Fund established in section 302(c) of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10222(c)) in the amount of $131,000,000.

Subtitle B—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations

SEC. 3111. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR APPOINTMENT OF CERTAIN SCIENTIFIC, ENGINEERING, AND TECHNICAL PERSONNEL.

Section 4601 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2701) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2004'' and inserting ''September 30, 2006''.

SEC. 3112. REQUIREMENTS FOR BASELINE OF PROJECTS UNDER FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE RECAPITALIZATION PROGRAM.

Subsection (a) of section 3114 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108-136; 117 Stat. 1744; 50 U.S.C. 2453 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by inserting ''of a baseline'' after ''selection''; and

(2) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

''(2)(A) After December 31, 2004, a project may be added to or removed from the Facilities and Infrastructure Recapitalization Program only after the Administrator submits to the congressional defense committees a notice that the Administrator has identified such project for addition or removal and has approved such addition or removal as a modification to the baseline for that program.

''(B) The Administrator may not obligate funds for any project added under subparagraph (A) until a period of 60 days has elapsed after the date on which such committees receive the notice under subparagraph (A) with respect to that project.

''(C) The authority of the Administrator to identify and approve under subparagraph (A) may not be delegated.''.

Subtitle C—Other Matters

SEC. 3131. TRANSFERS AND REPROGRAMMINGS OF NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION FUNDS.

Section 3252 of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C. 2452) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) TRANSFER AND REPROGRAMMING PROCESS.—(1) The Administrator shall have sole jurisdiction within the Department of Energy to submit to Congress or the appropriate congressional committees a notice of, or request for, a transfer or reprogramming of funds of the Administration.

''(2) The functions of the Chief Financial Officer of the Department of Energy shall not apply to a notice or request described in paragraph (1), except to certify whether the funds covered by such notice or request are available.''.

SEC. 3132. NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES STUDY ON MANAGEMENT BY DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY OF HIGH-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE.

(a) REVIEW REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Energy shall enter into an arrangement with the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences to carry out a study of the plans of the Department of Energy to manage the waste streams specified in subsection (b) that are not currently planned for disposal in a high-level repository.

(b) COVERED WASTE STREAMS.—The waste streams referred to in subsection (a) are the streams of high-level radioactive waste at—

(1) the Savannah River Site, South Carolina;

(2) the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho; and

(3) the Hanford Reservation, Washington.

(c) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The study required by subsection (a) shall evaluate—

(1) the physical, chemical, and radiological characteristics of the waste referred to in subsection (b), including specifically the waste proposed to be left indefinitely in storage tanks;

(2) the probability that such waste, if left indefinitely in storage tanks, will leak into the environment and the range of potential dangers such leakage would represent;

(3) the plans of the Department for the disposal of the high-level radioactive waste that the Department had planned, before certain litigation in Federal district court in 2003 on ''Waste Incidental to Reprocessing'', to reclassify as low-level waste;

(4) treatment and disposal alternatives to the plans referred to in paragraph (3), including, for each such alternative, assessments of the technology approaches and of the implications with respect to cost, worker safety, and long-term environmental and human health;

(5) the adequacy of the plans referred to in subsection (a), including Department of Energy Order No. 435.1, to protect, for the long term, the environment and population surrounding each site referred to in subsection (b); and

(6) any other matters that the National Research Council considers appropriate and directly related to the subject matter of the study.

(d) RECOMMENDATIONS REQUIRED.—In carrying out the study, the National Research Council shall develop recommendations relating to the subject matter of the study. The recommendations shall include—

(1) recommendations for improving the scientific basis for managing the waste covered by the study, including alternative criteria for determining what waste should be managed as ''Waste Incidental to Reprocessing''; and

(2) any other recommendations that the National Research Council considers appropriate and directly related to the subject matter of the study.

(e) REPORTS.—The National Research Council shall submit to the Secretary of Energy and the congressional defense committees—

(1) not later than six months after entering into the arrangement required by subsection (a), an interim report on the study with respect to the waste proposed to be left indefinitely in storage tanks, including the tentative findings, conclusions, and recommendations with respect to such waste; and

(2) not later than one year after entering into the arrangement required by subsection (a), a final report on the study, including all findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

(f) PROVISION OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall make available to the National Research Council all information that the National Research Council considers necessary to carry out, in a timely manner, its responsibilities under this section.

(g) FUNDING.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy by

section 3102, $1,500,000 shall be available only for carrying out the study required by this section.

SEC. 3133. CONTRACT TO REVIEW WASTE ISOLATION PILOT PLANT, NEW MEXICO.

The Secretary of Energy shall enter into a contract to conduct independent reviews and evaluations of the design, construction, and operations of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in New Mexico as they relate to the protection of the public health and safety and the environment. The contract shall be for a period of one year and shall be renewable for four additional one-year periods, subject to the authorization and appropriation of funds for such purpose.

TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

SEC. 3201. AUTHORIZATION.

There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2005, $21,268,000 for the operation of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board under chapter 21 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2286 et seq.).

TITLE XXXIII—NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE

SEC. 3301. AUTHORIZED USES OF NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE FUNDS.

(a) OBLIGATION OF STOCKPILE FUNDS.—During fiscal year 2005, the National Defense Stockpile Manager may obligate up to $59,700,000 of the funds in the National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund established under subsection (a) of section 9 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98h) for the authorized uses of such funds under subsection (b)(2) of such section, including the disposal of hazardous materials that are environmentally sensitive.

(b) ADDITIONAL OBLIGATIONS.—The National Defense Stockpile Manager may obligate amounts in excess of the amount specified in subsection (a) if the National Defense Stockpile Manager notifies Congress that extraordinary or emergency conditions necessitate the additional obligations. The National Defense Stockpile Manager may make the additional obligations described in the notification after the end of the 45-day period beginning on the date on which Congress receives the notification.

(c) LIMITATIONS.—The authorities provided by this section shall be subject to such limitations as may be provided in appropriations Acts.

SEC. 3302. RELAXATION OF QUANTITY RESTRICTIONS ON DISPOSAL OF MANGANESE FERRO IN NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE.

Section 3306(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107; 115 Stat. 1391; 50 U.S.C. 98d note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking ''each of the fiscal years 2004 and 2005'' and inserting ''fiscal year 2004''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) During fiscal year 2005, 100,000 short tons of high carbon manganese ferro of the highest grade.

SEC. 3303. REVISION OF EARLIER AUTHORITY TO DISPOSE OF CERTAIN MATERIALS IN NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE.

Section 3303(a) of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261; 50 U.S.C. 98d note) is amended by striking paragraphs (4) and (5) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

''(4) $785,000,000 by the end of fiscal year 2005; and

''(5) $870,000,000 by the end of fiscal year 2009.''.

TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

SEC. 3401. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Energy $20,000,000 for fiscal year 2005 for the purpose of carrying out activities under chapter 641 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the naval petroleum reserves.

(b) PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY.—Funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in subsection (a) shall remain available until expended.

TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 3501. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR MARITIME ADMINISTRATION.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Transportation for the Maritime Administration for fiscal year 2005 (in lieu of amounts authorized for the same purposes by section 3511 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004)—

(1) for expenses necessary for operations and training activities, $109,300,000;

(2) for administrative expenses under the loan guarantee program authorized by title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. App. 1271 et seq.), $4,764,000; and

(3) for ship disposal, $35,000,000, of which $2,000,000 shall be for decommissioning, removal, and disposal of the nuclear reactor and hazardous materials on board the vessel SAVANNAH.

SEC. 3502. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE WAR RISK INSURANCE FOR MERCHANT MARINE VESSELS.

(a) EXTENSION.— Section 1214 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. App. 1294), is amended by striking ''June 30, 2005'' and inserting ''December 31, 2010''.

(b) INVESTMENT OF ASSETS IN INSURANCE FUND.—Section 1208(a) of such Act (46 U.S.C. App. 1288), is amended by striking the third sentence and inserting the following: ''The Secretary of Transportation may request the Secretary of the Treasury to invest such portion of the Fund as is not, in the judgment of the Secretary of Transportation, required to meet the current needs of the fund. Such investments shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury in public debt securities of the United States, with maturities suitable to the needs of the fund, and bearing interest rates determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration current market yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturity.''.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 108–499 and amendments en bloc described in Section 3 of House Resolution 648.

Each amendment printed in the report shall be offered only in the order printed, except as specified in Section 4 of the resolution, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. Each amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes, unless otherwise specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment, except that the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services each may offer one pro forma amendment for the purpose of further debate on any pending amendment.

It shall be in order at any time for the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in the report not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc shall be considered read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

The original proponent of an amendment included in amendments en bloc may insert a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately before disposition of the amendments en bloc.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may recognize for consideration any amendment printed in the report out of the order printed, but not sooner than 1 hour after the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services or a designee announces from the floor a request to that effect.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 108–499.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GOODE

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. GOODE:

At the end of title X, insert the following new section:

SEC. ___. ASSIGNMENT OF MEMBERS TO ASSIST BUREAU OF BORDER SECURITY AND BUREAU OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

(a) ASSIGNMENT AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—Chapter 18 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 374 the following new section:

''§ 374a. Assignment of members to assist border patrol and control

''(a) ASSIGNMENT AUTHORIZED.—Upon submission of a request consistent with subsection (b), the Secretary of Defense may assign members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps to assist—

''(1) the Bureau of Border Security of the Department of Homeland Security in preventing the entry of terrorists, drug traffickers, and illegal aliens into the United States; and

''(2) the United States Customs Service of the Department of Homeland Security in the inspection of cargo, vehicles, and aircraft at points of entry into the United States to prevent the entry of weapons of mass destruction, components of weapons of mass destruction, prohibited narcotics or drugs, or other terrorist or drug trafficking items.

''(b) REQUEST FOR ASSIGNMENT.—The assignment of members under subsection (a) may occur only if—

''(1) the assignment is at the request of the Secretary of Homeland Security; and

''(2) the request is accompanied by a certification by the Secretary of Homeland Security that the assignment of members pursuant to the request is necessary to respond to a threat to national security posed by the entry into the United States of terrorists, drug traffickers, or illegal aliens.

''(c) TRAINING PROGRAM REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Defense, shall establish a training program to ensure that members receive general instruction regarding issues affecting law enforcement in the border areas in which the members may perform duties

under an assignment under subsection (a). A member may not be deployed at a border location pursuant to an assignment under subsection (a) until the member has successfully completed the training program.

''(d) CONDITIONS OF USE.—(1) Whenever a member who is assigned under subsection (a) to assist the Bureau of Border Security or the United States Customs Service is performing duties at a border location pursuant to the assignment, a civilian law enforcement officer from the agency concerned shall accompany the member.

''(2) Nothing in this section shall be construed to—

''(A) authorize a member assigned under subsection (a) to conduct a search, seizure, or other similar law enforcement activity or to make an arrest; and

''(B) supersede section 1385 of title 18 (popularly known as the 'Posse Comitatus Act').

''(e) ESTABLISHMENT OF ONGOING JOINT TASK FORCES.—(1) The Secretary of Homeland Security may establish ongoing joint task forces if the Secretary of Homeland Security determines that the joint task force, and the assignment of members to the joint task force, is necessary to respond to a threat to national security posed by the entry into the United States of terrorists, drug traffickers, or illegal aliens.

''(2) If established, the joint task force shall fully comply with the standards as set forth in this section.

''(f) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide to the Governor of the State in which members are to be deployed pursuant to an assignment under subsection (a) and to local governments in the deployment area notification of the deployment of the members to assist the Department of Homeland Security under this section and the types of tasks to be performed by the members.

''(g) REIMBURSEMENT REQUIREMENT.—Section 377 of this title shall apply in the case of members assigned under subsection (a).

''(h) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—No assignment may be made or continued under subsection (a) after September 30, 2006.''.

(b) COMMENCEMENT OF TRAINING PROGRAM.—The training program required by subsection (c) of section 374a of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall be established as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 374 the following new item:

''374a. Assignment of members to assist border patrol and control.''.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 648, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. This amendment is a very simple amendment that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to assign members of our Armed Forces to assist the Department of Homeland Security in controlling and patrolling our borders. If troops were needed, they could be of significant assistance to prevent the infiltration of terrorists, drug traffickers, and illegal aliens, and could prevent the entry of weapons of mass destruction into our country.

I emphasize that this is optional, but it would be available with this amendment and would put to rest any case law or any arguments to the contrary about the ability of the executive branch to utilize troops on our border.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) is recognized for 10 minutes.

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

I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE), my good friend and colleague. In fact, we came to Congress together, and as my colleague knows, I spent more than 26 years in Federal law enforcement on the border between the United States and Mexico.

I was on the front lines of our Nation's war on drugs and against terrorism. I know how difficult it is to patrol and to secure our Nation's borders. And I know the need for additional resources and I surely understand the realities of the gentleman from Virginia's (Mr. GOODE) concerns.

As a combat veteran and as a member of the Committee on Armed Services and as an experienced Border Patrol agent, I understand and I appreciate the concerns of the gentleman from Virginia. However, I rise in opposition to this amendment because it is simply the wrong solution to our current problems along the border.

This amendment will send our military personnel to our borders at a time when they are already stretched thin in places like Iraq, Afghanistan, Korea, Kosovo, Bosnia, and over 100 other countries around the world. We cannot and we should not ask our military personnel to patrol our borders.

If this Congress wants to secure our borders, then let us deploy additional law enforcement officers to the border, but let us do it the right way. Let us make a commitment to hire and train 20,000 Border Patrol agents or 1,000 agents a year to be deployed along our borders until we fully staff our ports of entry and in between our ports of entry with Border Patrol agents and Customs personnel.

We should not use military personnel for these kinds of jobs. We need our military to be at their best. Patrolling our borders against illegal immigration and against drug trafficking has very minimal military value and detracts from the training with our warfighting equipment for our warfighting missions. It will also lead to decreased military training, which reduces unit readiness and overall combat effectiveness of our armed services.

We in Congress are very concerned about protecting our men and women in uniform from threats such as the improvised explosive devices. I submit that this amendment is an improvised explosive device except that instead of an IED, it is ill-advised, expensive, and detrimental to border communities in particular.

The Department of Defense, as we all know, is opposed to this amendment, has been opposed to this amendment year after year, every time it comes on this floor. Currently, requests for DOD support can be made to the Secretary of Defense either directly by a Cabinet member or through the President. The Department of Defense already plays a significant role in supporting the defense of our border, if not through armed personnel, then through activities in technology.

UAVs supporting border security are based at Fort Wachuka, Arizona. Other support comes from essential units such as the Joint Task Force 6 headquarters based in my district. It provides critical training to law enforcement personnel along the border, including engineering, barrier fencing, and lighting.

And while today, Mr. Chairman, I may not agree with the gentleman from Virginia, I do know that what he wants to do is the right thing for our country. I would, therefore, ask him now to join with me and find a way to place additional professional law enforcement personnel on the border and not military personnel that are already stretched so thin throughout the world.

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

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES), a fighter for veterans and soldiers.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's amendment. And to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), and he is a friend of mine, I just happen to disagree on this issue because as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE) explained, this amendment would not require the use of the troops on the border. It would just give an option to the Department of Defense and Homeland Security.

So this is not mandating that troops be on the border. It is just saying that this is an option.

And in fairness to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE), I must say that this is of great concern to the people of this country. In fact, 85 percent of Americans think illegal immigration is a serious problem.

□ 1700

That is why the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE) has offered this amendment. We only have, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) spoke to this, about 11,000 Border Patrol that patrol the Mexican border and the Canadian border, the 1,100 agents on the Canadian border and 9,900 agents on the Mexican border. There are a total of 7,000 miles, about 2,000 Mexican miles and 5,000 Canadian miles.

This, again, is not an amendment that people should see as an amendment that is trying to do anything but

help the national security of this Nation. This has nothing to do with people that want to come to this country legally. They will be welcome, as always. This has to do with people that want to come, either through the Canadian or Mexican border, to this country illegally.

I must say that this is a time when we are at war with terrorists over in Afghanistan, Iraq and other parts of the world. We know that there is a presence of terrorists down in Central and South America. We know this for a fact.

So I think, if anything, this amendment should be seen as it is: it is an option for the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security, should they come together and decide it is necessary to help secure the boarders, so we can protect the American people from possible threats from terrorists or narco-terrorists or anyone that might want to come to this country illegally.

Again, as I close, I want to say that this is an amendment that gives an option, it does not mandate, it gives an option to those who are required to help protect the national security of the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will look at this amendment for what it is.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), our distinguished ranking member from the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, all one has to do is listen to the debate that we have had on this floor today. We are short of troops in the United States Army. We help correct that in this bill by authorizing, through the supplemental, 10,000 additional Army troops, 3,000 additional Marine troops; and, hopefully, this will continue for the next 3 years.

We are short of troops. Go anywhere you can and talk to our soldiers, whether it be here within the continental United States, Fort Leonard Wood, or wherever, Fort Jackson, you pick it, or go somewhere overseas; go to Iraq, Afghanistan, and talk to those young folks in uniform. They are stretched, and they are strained. As a matter of fact, we brought it up on the floor earlier today; 4,000 Army soldiers are being transferred out of South Korea, a brigade, into Iraq.

This is exhibit A. It is not a good idea to do this. This is for Border Patrol and police work.

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL).

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

Mr. Chairman, for almost the past 3 years, this Congress and this Nation have been intent on what do we do to protect our homeland. In that same period of time, we have sent military forces to protect the boarders of Kuwait, Afghanistan, Iraq, the Balkans and you name it. And the great irony that persists in the minds of the American people is, why can we not secure our own borders?

I have been to JADF–6 with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), and what the military told me there was that some of the most valuable training that the helicopter pilots and others had was when they worked in cooperation at JADF–6, because the terrain and the training they received in trying to patrol the borders, in cooperation with the Border Patrol and other civilian police, was the most valuable training they had.

Right now, when we train our military forces, we divide them up into those who are going to be the aggressors to see if they can penetrate the lines in a training exercise. Every day we have thousands of aggressors who penetrate our border. Every year we have hundreds of thousands who penetrate our border. The American people want to know why are we allowing that to happen.

The greatest training we could give to our Reserve and National Guard, and even our active duty forces in some instances, would be to work in cooperation with our civilian law enforcement to try to make sure that our borders are secure.

Now, what is wrong with that? That is the question the American people are asking. We have a chance to answer it by saying we are going to do something about it by passing this amendment.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), who knows and understands the issues that border communities have to face.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I come from a border area, San Diego, California; and we have thousands come across our border, not just from Mexico, from other places as well.

I used to think this was a good amendment, until you start thinking about it. You just do not send a Marine or someone in the Army to the border. You have to provide bivouacs, food, transportation, hospitals, training; and by the time you look at the cost, we are much better off to put additional money into trained Border Patrol, in my opinion.

There is a need for border security. That is real, and that is why my friends, I am sure out of frustration, are offering this amendment, and it is a good-intentioned amendment. But when you take a look at what it actually does, with our military so thin today and so drawn out, it would be disastrous, I think, for our men and women in the service itself.

I have heard people say that people coming across the border illegally do not have rights. They do. And you need people that are trained in that manner to know what those rights are, to be able to say ''alto'' when necessary, and to understand the people that are coming across.

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to relate an incident that I think is very helpful in understanding this situation and also the effectiveness of an amendment of this nature. A little over a year and a half ago, I had the opportunity to observe an exercise on the northern border, our northern border with Canada. It was in a place about 10 miles north of a place called Bonner's Ferry, Idaho.

This exercise was 2 weeks in duration, and it was trying to determine to what extent we could use the military, in this case 100 Marines, for the purpose of trying to defend about 100 miles of border. They were not just 100 Marines. There were three UAVs, three unmanned aerial vehicles they used, and also two radar stations.

While I was there, I observed the UAVs picking up four people coming across on all-terrain vehicles carrying 400 pounds of drugs. A little bit later they caught a plane trying to come in under the radar; but it could not, and we interdicted it.

Let me explain what this meant. The Marines themselves did no interdictions. They had nothing to do with stopping the actual people who were coming across. But they were working in concert with the Forest Service and the Border Patrol. So when they identified the problem, they simply radioed for help from the Border Patrol, the Border Patrol got in a helicopter, came down where they were supposed to, and interdicted the people. That is the way it worked.

At the end of the 2 weeks, I have the distinct feeling, and I guess you have to believe what I observed there, that nothing came across that 100 miles of border without us knowing about it.

At the end of the 2 weeks, as we were leaving, the commandant of that Marine detachment of 100 Marines said to me, this is the best exercise we have ever, ever had. This is the best training we have ever done, because, he said, number one, it is real-time; number two, we are trying to stop real bad guys from coming into our country; and, he said, number three, it is in the most difficult terrain in the world.

If you have been close to Bonner's Ferry, Idaho, it is beautiful; but it is absolutely the most difficult terrain you can imagine. No roads.

So we can do it. The question is whether or not we have the will to do it. That is what a vote on this amendment will establish.

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

It appears to me, Mr. Chairman, we are talking on one level, and my colleagues are talking on another level. We are saying that we do not have the military resources and do not have the

luxury of doing exactly what my colleague from Colorado just talked about.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ), a former sheriff who knows and understands and lives in a border community.

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Chairman, with all my respect to my good friend from Virginia, I understand about our borders; but there is a right way to do it and a wrong way to do it.

To begin with, I think that my ranking member just stated that we are moving 3,600 troops from Korea to Iraq because we do not have enough troops. Can you imagine what kind of signal this is sending to our friends in South Korea, what kind of signal it is sending to our friends in the Pacific Ring, that we are removing those troops because we do not have enough now?

I have been on both sides. I have been a law enforcement official, and I have been in the military. The Border Patrol has an extensive training school to deal with human beings. As a military guy, when I was in the military, they trained me how to kill people, especially the enemy.

So I do not think this is the way to do it, with all due respect. If we think we need to protect our borders more, the answer is hire more Border Patrol personnel or immigration.

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment being offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE).

Mr. Chairman, during the 1980s, and during the 1990s, there were many of us who warned that some day terrorism would be an issue that we would have to deal with in this country. Today, reports indicate that terrorist groups are functioning in parts of South America, as well as Mexico, in an effort to cross through the U.S.-Mexican border. It is clear that all possible steps must be taken in order to prevent this.

I would point out that both in Colombia and in the tri-border area, which is an area where the borders of Argentina, Paraguay and Brazil meet, there are large numbers of people who offer the potential to become a serious problem in our country. If anyone doubts that, there are two books that have recently been published by the Rand Corporation: ''Arms Trafficking and Colombia,'' and ''Colombian Labyrinth: The Synergy of Drugs and Insurgency and Its Implications for Regional Stability.''

These are serious issues. This amendment will accomplish the desired goal by providing the Department of Defense and our Commander in Chief the option of using military force to secure the border if it becomes necessary.

This amendment does not require the use of troops on the border, and will, most importantly, not affect force-readiness or overburden our military. Instead, it will enable the Secretary of Defense to respond to a request by the Secretary of Homeland Security to allow the use of military personnel to defend against this national security threat.

Just as many people did not want to hear it in the 1980s and people did not want to hear it in the 1990s, and then 2001 occurred, this is a new area of concern which must be dealt with.

The Secretary will also have the ability to authorize assistance for the U.S. Customs Service to prevent entry of weapons of mass destruction, drugs and other terrorist items.

Finally, this amendment is a commonsense approach which will give the highest levels of our government an important tool necessary to combat threats against our national security here at home.

□ 1715

I commend the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE) for bringing it forward, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I would just say to my colleague, the argument is made here that the effort in Iraq is part of homeland security and extending protection of our homeland there. Now we are hearing comments that this proposal retracts that to the homeland security border. We cannot have it both ways.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Houston, Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), who has made repeated trips to the border and knows and understands what these issues mean to border communities.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman.

We have spent a number of hours, days, months and years focusing on the border issues, both north and south. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) for his leadership.

Let me say what the issues are to the American public and to my colleagues. We already have the authority for the civilian government to call in the United States military in times of danger or in need.

Secondarily, we are undermining the very fine Border Patrol agents and law enforcement agents who are prepared to defend our borders with the necessary resources and the necessary equipment.

Listening to the deputy chief of Border Patrol in our testimony yesterday in the Committee on the Judiciary, in a hearing, he is prepared and equipped. We just need the resources.

Lastly, this is not a Nation that wants to have a standing military at our border and to jeopardize both the lives of our military and others at these borders. We are able to handle this matter with the civilian forces we have, adding more resources. And I would frankly say, this is both bad policy and bad judgment, and it is frankly un-American.

I would ask my colleagues to vote against this amendment and I appreciate the interest that is given to this particular topic.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY). The gentleman is recognized for a 1½ minutes.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, who has the right to close?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The other side has closed. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) has the right to close.

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

Mr. Chairman, this bill before us provides for cooperation between our Armed Forces and Federal law enforcement agencies to combat terrorism, drug trafficking, and illegal immigration.

Recent history shows us that there is no impediment to cooperation between the Department of Defense, that is opposed to this amendment, and our border law enforcement agencies.

It is also worth remembering and reiterating that in the event of a crisis, the President already has the authority. Let me repeat, the President today already has the authority to place our military assets or whatever assets he deems necessary and move them to protect the homeland. It is for these reasons that the Department of Defense has always opposed this amendment whenever it has been presented here on the House floor.

Essentially, the amendment grants the Secretary of Defense any authority that he already has under title 10 of the U.S. Code.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, it is imperative that we understand that we cannot continue to debate an issue that further stresses and further puts military personnel in a situation that compounds and exacerbates the already evident pressure of our armed services. It is important that our colleagues understand that a vote for this amendment is a vote that may feel good, that may seem right, that may be politically expedient, but it is not the right thing to do.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote against the Goode amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time has expired on this amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered

by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. DAVIS of california

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Chairman pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mrs. DAVIS of California:

Add at the end of title VII the following new section:

SEC. 723. LIMITING RESTRICTION OF USE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MEDICAL FACILITIES TO PERFORM ABORTIONS TO FACILITIES IN THE UNITED STATES.

Section 1093(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''in the United States'' after ''Defense''.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 648, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment allows military personnel and their family members serving overseas to use their own funds to obtain safe, legal abortion service in overseas U.S. military hospitals.

As a former military spouse who lived overseas, I understand what this amendment means for the more than 100,000 women who presently reside on overseas military bases.

Current law leaves our servicewomen with two grim options. They can go home after they receive authorization and find space on a military transport or they can seek an abortion in an unsafe, unsanitary foreign hospital. Any way you look at it, both options force them to gamble their health.

These women, who have already sacrificed so much, must also forfeit their privacy, their health and the very liberties they are fighting to protect. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that they deserve better.

So let me clarify a few points about this amendment. No Federal funds would be used. This amendment affects only U.S. military facilities overseas and it does not violate host country laws. It does not compel any doctor who opposes abortion on principle to perform one. It will, however, open up reproductive services at bases in countries where abortion is legal.

I hope Members will support our servicewomen by supporting the Davis-Sanchez-Harmon amendment.

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

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I stand in strong opposition to the Davis amendment. This amendment would simply turn our military hospitals overseas into abortion clinics by allowing self-funded abortions. Currently, self-funded abortions are already available in these institutions when the life of the mother is in danger and when the pregnancy is as a result of rape or incest.

There is no demonstrated need for expanding abortion access. This amendment does not seek to address an operational requirement or ensure access to an entitlement. It is simply aimed at introducing this very contentious and divisive issue into the defense authorization process.

Proponents of this amendment often claim that female service members and dependents overseas are denied equal access to health care, effectively putting their life and health in harm's way. Simply wrong. If a woman chooses to have an abortion at an abortion clinic, they are accessible overseas. If a woman prefers to have an abortion in the United States, that is available to her under current law.

Although this amendment is presented by the other side as providing for solely self-funded abortions, the fact is the American taxpayer will be forced to pay for the use of the military facility, the procurement of additional equipment needed to perform abortions, and the use of military personnel to perform abortions.

Military doctors did not sign up to end a baby's life. They joined up to save the lives of servicemen and women. It would be wrong for Congress to force these doctors to perform a procedure that many may feel morally objectionable.

I ask my colleagues to vote against the turning of our military hospitals into abortion clinics and to vote against the Davis amendment.

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ), who has championed this issue for many years.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) for introducing this important and very necessary amendment.

Members of the Armed Forces are entitled to a quality of life equal to that of the Nation they are pledged to defend. Whether you are prochoice or prolife, agree or disagree with the merits of reproductive freedom, the fact remains, women of the United States have a constitutional right to these services.

I want to read a little excerpt from a letter I received from a general in the Army who goes on to say, ''One day, a noncommissioned officer, an NCO, who was one of the battalion's senior women, came into my office and asked for permission to take a day off later in the week and to have the same take-off for a young soldier in the battalion. She said the soldier was pregnant and wanted an abortion and yet had no way to get an abortion at the U.S. Army medical facility in Germany where they were stationed.

''She had got information about a German clinic in another city, and they were going there for the procedure. The soldier did not have enough money to return to the U.S., saved for the abortion, nor did she want to talk to her chain of command about this issue. I told the NCO to go with her and to let me know what happened.

''Later, the NCO told me that the experience had been both mortifying and painful. No painkiller of any sort was administered for the procedure. The modesty of this soldier and the other women at the clinic had been violated due to cultural differences, and neither she nor the soldier understood German.''

It was a problem. It was a bad experience for all that, at a very vulnerable time, this American who was serving her country overseas could not count on the Army to give her the care that she needed.

What makes the situation of a soldier different from that of a civilian woman? She is subject to the orders of the officers appointed over here. Every hour of the day belongs to the U.S. Army and she must have her seniors' permission to leave her place of duty. She makes very low pay and so relies on the help of friends and family to pay for travel for medical care that is not given by the Army.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN).

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Chairman, once again, we come to the floor of this body to debate the issue of abortion in overseas military hospitals, and once again, we must do honor to the consciences of military caregivers and to the taxpayers who fund these facilities. Young men and women entering the medical divisions of the armed services are dedicated to protecting life. To ask them to take the lives of unborn children is simply wrong.

In fact, when the Clinton administration overturned the DOD policy against abortion in military facilities between 1993 and 1996, military physicians refused to perform or assist in elective abortions, thus forcing the administration to spend additional tax dollars on recruiting and hiring civilians who were willing to do the abortions.

In a country where 56 percent of Americans oppose abortion and where military physicians have refused to do elective abortions, it is unconscionable for our government to condone abortion by turning military hospitals into abortion clinics.

The language before us today has been debated and rejected year after year since 1996. I urge my colleagues again to defeat the Davis amendment.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER).

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my support for the Davis amendment. This amendment would provide fairness and equity to women in the military who are serving overseas.

Currently, women who have volunteered to serve our country and female military dependents are barred from exercising their legally guaranteed right to choose simply because they are stationed overseas.

Military women should be able to depend on their base hospitals for all of their health care needs. A repeal of the current ban on privately funded abortions would allow military women and dependents based overseas the same range and quality of medical care available to women in the United States. No Federal funds would be used to perform these procedures and no undue burden is placed on military physicians overseas.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply repeals the statutory prohibition on abortions in overseas military hospitals.

I hope we can all support this amendment and ensure that American women overseas are afforded access to quality reproductive services, as they would be if they were home in the United States.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains on both sides and who has the right to close?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN) has 7 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) has 5 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Kansas has the right to close.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI).

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment that would turn overseas military hospitals into abortion clinics.

The amendment corrupts the mission of our military hospitals which are dedicated to healing and nurturing life by turning military hospitals and doctors and nurses into on-demand abortion providers.

□ 1730

Again, when President Clinton allowed abortions in military facilities during the mid-1990s, military physicians, nurses and other health care professionals refused to perform these abortions. They were clear in their message. They serve America to save lives, not take unborn American lives.

This amendment, which the House has rejected every year since 1996, is a misguided attempt by abortion activists to insert a harmful provision into this vital legislation designed to authorize funds for the defense of our Nation.

I urge my colleagues to reject this attempt to alter the purpose of our overseas military hospitals, which provide life-saving care to the men and women in our military and their families.

Reject this amendment and allow our military doctors and nurses to continue to save lives, rather than abort them.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership on this issue.

This commonsense amendment would simply allow military women and their dependents that are stationed overseas to exercise the same rights as women in this country, the right to comprehensive family planning, including access to a safe, legal abortion.

It is important to point out that this amendment would not allow one cent of taxpayer money to fund these procedures. It simply allows women to use their own money, mind you, their own money to pay for this procedure in an overseas military facility.

It makes no sense that we have asked these soldiers to serve our country, and yet we cannot serve them with basic, comprehensive health care.

Let us reject this administration's ongoing, politically motivated war on women; and let us start by adopting this important, commonsense amendment. Let us stop discriminating against women in the military. I urge a ''yes'' vote.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS), my colleague on the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, for the last 8 years, without fail, this body has voted against funding abortions in DoD medical treatment facilities, and I trust today that we will make that 9.

Mr. Chairman, American taxpayer dollars should not be used to pay for abortions directly or indirectly, wherever they occur. Supporters of this amendment claim that taxpayer dollars would not actually pay for abortions. However, I want to point out that this is simply not true. Taxpayers would be paying for these abortions by subsidizing the cost of the physician services and the abortion equipment. Our current law protects against this, and I urge my colleagues to keep this commonsense policy intact.

As a member of the House Committee on Armed Services, I am strongly committed to our national defense. I am also strongly committed to preserving life in all its stages.

I urge my colleagues to choose life and oppose the Davis amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the amendment offered by my colleague from California. For the last 8 years, without fail, this body has voted against funding abortions in DOD medical treatment facilities. I trust that today we will make that 9.

Military physicians and personnel are tasked to provide life saving and nurturing care to our men and women of the armed services. By requiring them to conduct elective abortions, we are asking them to facilitate in the exact opposite of their mission.

Particularly at a time when their resources are devoted to addressing the needs of service members suffering from wounds and trauma sustained in Operations Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom, we must continue to support the doctors and nurses of the military in their effort to save and sustain life.

Mr. Chairman, American taxpayer dollars should not be used to pay for abortions, directly or indirectly, wherever they occur. Supporters of this amendment claim that taxpayer dollars would not actually pay for abortions, however I would point out that this is simply not true. Taxpayers would be paying for these abortions by subsidizing the costs of the physician services and the abortion equipment. Our current law protects against this, and I urge my colleagues to keep this common sense policy intact.

As a member of the House Committee on Armed Services, I am strongly committed to our national defense. I am also strongly committed to preserving life in all its stages. I urge my colleagues to choose life and oppose the Davis amendment.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Davis amendment authored by the distinguished gentlewoman from San Diego, the Pacific home of the United States Navy.

When I put on the uniform, I did it to defend the Constitution and the rights it protects for Americans. I must say that I have an emotional attachment to the rights of Americans in uniform. Our current law denies reproductive rights for women in uniform, just when they need it most, when they are deployed overseas.

I was stationed at Incirlik Air Base in Turkey for part of Operation Northern Watch against Iraq. The thought of forcing my fellow women in uniform to seek care in some Turkish clinic when we have a perfectly good U.S. military hospital on base is a tragedy. Imagine when you need care most being forced to communicate in Turkish or Korean or Arabic to get care guaranteed to you by the United States Supreme Court.

Women in uniform should have equal rights. No, no. Women in uniform should have more than equal rights, especially when they are on the frontier of freedom.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. Chairman, recently, Dr. Alveda King, niece of the late Dr. Martin Luther King, said about abortion, ''How can the dream survive if we murder the children?''

Dr. King, who has had an abortion herself but is now pro-life and bravely

speaks out, went on to say, ''We can no longer sit idly by and allow this horrible spirit of murder to cut down, yes cut out and away our unborn. This is the day to choose life,'' she went on to say. ''We must live and allow our babies to live. If the dream of Dr. Martin Luther King is to live,'' Dr. King went on to say, ''our babies must live.''

Mr. Chairman, the Davis amendment turns Dr. Alveda King's dream, our babies must live, into a nightmare. The Davis amendment will force pro-life Americans to facilitate abortion and subsidize the slaughter of innocent children. Women deserve better than abortion, Mr. Chairman. The Davis amendment turns overseas military hospitals into abortion mills.

This amendment comes on the heels of a new Zogby poll, I would just point out to my colleagues, that clearly shows a significant majority of Americans now reject abortion in most circumstances including women, 56 percent; African Americans, 62 percent; Hispanics, 79 percent; and young adults, 61 percent. Americans, Mr. Chairman, in ever growing numbers are finally, at long last coming to understand that abortion is violence against children and that abortion exploits and harms women.

Americans, at long last, are shocked to learn that abortion methods dismember, mutilate, decapitate, and chemically poison the child. The debate on the violence of the partial-birth abortion has exposed the truth that abortion is child abuse in the extreme.

Mr. Chairman, faced with the numbing reality of an abortionist jamming scissors into the brain of a partially born child so the brains could be sucked out, Americans have begun to connect the dots. They are now seeing that all abortion methods, not just partial-birth abortion, are cruel and all-too-common punishment against helpless and innocent babies.

Mr. Chairman, reject this amendment, the Davis amendment, so that babies and their mothers will live.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I just hope that none of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle ever are faced with a daughter or a granddaughter or a daughter-in-law or a niece serving overseas or as a military wife that needs an abortion and finds themselves in a hospital in Turkey.

Over the last 2 years, we have all stood here and voiced our support for our troops over and over again. We cast resolutions of support. We are demanding that our troops have adequate training and equipment, and there is no better way to show them how we support them than finally giving women in our Armed Forces and the wives and daughters of the men in our military the ability to exercise their constitutional right to obtain a free, no, not a free, a paid-for by-the-person out-of-their-own-pocket safe abortion using the money that they have, but in a military hospital.

We routinely ask our servicewomen to put their lives on the line in defense of our country and our country's ideals. That is why we must continue to require that this country provide them with what could save their lives, and that would be an abortion in a military hospital.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from the great State of Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

I rise in opposition to this amendment. I was on active duty in the Army medical corps when this policy was put in place by the Reagan administration, and it was very well received by the medical personnel in the corps.

The reason it was very well received is because most medical professionals do not want to have anything to do with abortion procedures. They recognize them for what they are. They are very brutal acts. Even those who are pro-choice will say, I am pro-choice, but I would never do an abortion.

When I was on active duty, this was very well received by the troops in the medical department, and I think it would be a mistake to overturn this policy. Vote against the amendment.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield for a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS)

(Mr. HASTINGS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the measure offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

A woman's right to choose what happens to her body has been reaffirmed as constitutional time after time by the Supreme Court. The Majority's decision to insert an anti-choice provision into a bill funding our Armed Services is troubling, and quite frankly, offensive.

If a servicewoman or female dependent of someone in our military chooses to have a procedure done to her body with her own funds, regardless of her occupation or where she is stationed, then she ought to be permitted to do so. And she ought to be able to have it done by a U.S. military doctor. It's her body. It's her money. It's just that simple.

It's unfortunate that Representative DAVIS' amendment is even needed. It's just shameful that the conservative wing of the Republican Caucus is trying to invoke controversy into a bill that all of us want to support. I cannot stand idly by while some attempt to demagogue those of us who believe in a woman's right to choose. No one is going to tell me what I can or cannot do with my body, so I certainly am not going to start telling women what they can do with theirs.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for the time.

There are currently over 20,000 women serving overseas. Each one of these women deserves the best available health care services; but under current law, women serving overseas effectively lose their constitutional right to choose at U.S. military bases where they literally cannot even pay for this medical procedure with their own money.

This amendment reverses a discriminatory policy against women. While women are bravely serving this country overseas, some Members of this body, many of whom have never served in the military, are voting to take away the constitutional rights that they enjoy in this country. It is wrong to take away their rights merely because they are in the military service.

Let us put this vote in perspective. It is one of over 200 anti-choice, anti-woman votes that have passed this Congress since the Republican majority took control in 1994.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY). The gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN) has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from Kansas has the right to close.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HART).

Ms. HART. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. In fact, the House has rejected this same amendment for the last, oh, I do not know, about 8 years or 9 years, 2003 back to 1996.

The Committee on Armed Services rejected this amendment over and over again. In fact, it was not even offered in committee this year.

President Clinton signed the current provision into law on February 10, 1996. The National Defense Authorization Act was signed into law to prevent the DoD medical treatment facilities from being used to perform abortions except where the life of the mother is endangered or in cases of rape or incest.

The Davis amendment would repeal that provision. It reopens the issue and attempts to turn DoD facilities into abortion clinics. These facilities are not abortion clinics; they are for healing the sick and the wounded.

Supporters of this amendment act as those pregnancy is a disease. That is certainly not the case. Ask any mother.

Support of this amendment would change the nature of our medical facilities. Our military is overseas for a reason, to support and defend people's lives. Our military treatment centers should do the same, and we should retain this life provision for our military treatment centers and forbid them from taking innocent human life.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, how often in the last year have we heard the phrase in this country saying we support our troops? I have heard it a lot on this floor, but those who oppose this amendment have a new slogan. We support our troops except for their constitutional rights.

The women of this country are in the streets of Baghdad and Nasiriyah and Fallujah today trying to install the concept of individual liberty and individually, constitutionally protected rights in Iraq while their Members of the U.S. Congress are trying to deny it back here in Washington, D.C.

Do not deny this amendment. Do not send the proud women in our armed services to the back streets of Baghdad. They are serving to establish liberty in Baghdad, not back-street abortions. Do not go back to those old days while we fight new battles trying to establish liberties overseas. Pass this amendment.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN) has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Davis amendment would force military medical personnel to be complicit in the taking of innocent human life. It would divert precious medical resources such as staff, time, equipment, and facilities away from the front lines of battle.

Let us not forget, abortion is violence. It is the most violent form of death known to mankind. It is violence against women and children. We should not be subsidizing it.

The American working family should not be forced to fund the extremists' health care agenda of this amendment. Our military should not sacrifice what it needs on the front lines.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the Davis amendment.

□ 1745

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time, and in conclusion, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. Our military installations should be there to save lives. Doctors have signed up to save lives, not take lives, and I urge a ''no'' vote on the Davis amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, thousand of brave women are serving overseas, fighting to protect and defend the liberties Americans enjoy every day. These brave women should not be denied their fundamental rights simply because they are serving abroad.

This Amendment allows military women and military dependents stationed overseas to exercise the same rights as women in this country to access a safe, legal abortion.

This Amendment ensures equal access to comprehensive reproductive health care for all U.S. servicewomen and dependents, regardless of where they are stationed.

Current law limits the range of reproductive-health services provided to servicewomen and military dependents serving overseas, even when they pay for these services with their own money.

This amendment does not require the Department of Defense to pay for abortion services; it would simply repeal the current ban on privately funded abortion care at overseas U.S. military facilities.

Women serving in the military overseas need to be able to depend on their base hospitals for medical care, especially when stationed in areas where local health care facilities are inadequate. The current ban may cause a woman seeking abortion services to delay the procedure while she looks for a safe provider, or may force a woman to seek an illegal, unsafe procedure locally.

Women would use their own money to pay for an abortion in an overseas military facility. No taxpayer dollars would pay for an abortion under this amendment.

The current language in the Department of Defense Authorization language degrades women serving our country overseas. It also jeopardizes servicewomen and dependents health by forcing them to wait until they can return to the U.S.—which can often be medically dangerous—or to seek an abortion in an unsafe, unsanitary foreign hospital.

DOD language penalizes service women and military dependents service abroad by prohibiting them from exercising their constitutional right to choose.

Roe v. Wade eliminated back alley abortions in this country. This amendment ensures our service women are not forced into the same dangerous procedures as they serve overseas.

This is not a debate about whether abortion is right or wrong. Abortion is legal. If it is legal for a woman here in America to exercise her right to choose, then it should be legal for an American woman serving her country overseas.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the Davis Amendment and our servicewomen stationed around the world. These brave soldiers, sailors, and air women have dedicated themselves to serving our country, and the least we should do is give them access to the highest quality healthcare available. Currently, servicewomen and female military dependents are prohibited from using their own funds for abortions at overseas military hospitals. Military women should be able to depend on their base hospitals for all their health-care services, but instead they are forced to compromise their medical privacy and wait for space on a military transport, or to seek an abortion in a foreign hospital. It is unacceptable to endanger the health of our servicewomen by denying them safe and timely medical care.

The Davis amendment would allow military women and military dependents stationed overseas to exercise the reproductive rights they are entitled to as Americans. This amendment would not require the government to pay for abortions, and it would not force medical providers to perform abortions. All branches of the military have provisions that permit medical personnel who have moral, religious, or ethical objections to abortion not to participate in the procedure; this amendment would not change this.

We can't violate the rights and liberties of our troops who are fighting to protect our rights and liberties. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Chairman, today on rollcall No. 197 Davis of California amendment to the defense authorization bill for fiscal year 2005, I was inadvertently recorded as having voted aye and should have been recorded as voted nay. I respectfully request the record reflect that I have voted in the negative on such amendments in previous years. I ask unanimous consent that this statement appear in the RECORD immediately following the vote.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to state my strong opposition to the Davis Amendment to H.R. 4200, which would allow abortions to be performed at our overseas military hospitals.

Throughout my years in Congress, I have consistently opposed efforts to allow abortions to take place in taxpayer funded military hospitals, and a majority in Congress has consistently opposed these efforts as well. The Davis amendment would repeal the current ban on abortions in our military hospitals, which was signed into law in 1996, and would seek to turn our military medical facilities into abortion clinics. If the Davis amendment is adopted, not only could taxpayer funded facilities be used to support abortion on demand, but resources could be used to search for, hire, and transport new personnel simply so that abortions could be performed. These facilities which are dedicated to the save the lives of the men and women in our Armed Forces should not be used to take the lives of innocent, unborn children.

I urge all of my colleagues in the House to vote to support life and to oppose the Davis amendment.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support Representative SUSAN DAVIS' amendment to the Defense Authorization bill to repeal the complete abortion ban for women in the military. This amendment is a reasonable compromise. It would not require the U.S. Government to fund abortions at military facilities around the world. It would simply allow U.S. servicewomen, or military dependents, to use their own funds for abortion care at overseas military hospitals.

Our brave servicewomen enroll in the military to protect the civil liberties of American citizens. Unfortunately, under existing law the very liberties they are trying to protect are being taken away from them through this draconian policy.

As a result, our servicewomen must sometimes resort to illegal, unsafe procedures to get an abortion. In the military, pregnancy is often cited as an attribute that makes women less desirable as soldiers, but at the same time the military institution denies women safe and reasonable access to terminate a pregnancy if she chooses.

Servicewomen should have comprehensive reproductive healthcare regardless of where they reside. I urge my colleagues to show support for our servicewomen, and vote yes to repeal this overreaching abortion ban for women in the military.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Davis amendment, which would allow military women and dependents stationed overseas to obtain abortion services

with their own money. I want to thank my colleague SUSAN DAVIS for her fine work on this important issue.

More than 100,000 women live on American military bases abroad. These women risk their lives and security to protect our great and powerful Nation and deserve the freedoms of our country. And yet, these women—for the past 8 years—have been denied the very Constitutional rights they fight to protect.

My colleagues, this restriction is un-American, undemocratic, and would be unconstitutional on U.S. soil. How can this body deny constitutional liberties to the very women who toil to preserve them? Mr. Speaker, as we work to promote and ensure democracy worldwide we have an obligation to ensure that our own citizens are free while serving abroad. Our military bases should serve as models of democracy at work, rather than examples of freedom suppressed.

This amendment is not about taxpayer dollars funding abortions because no Federal funds would be used for these services. This amendment is not about health care professionals performing procedures to which they are opposed because they are protected by a broad exemption. This amendment is about ensuring that all American women have the ability to exercise their Constitutional right to privacy and access safe and legal abortion services.

As our Nation works to preserve our freedom and democracy, now is not the time to put barriers in the path of our troops overseas. We know that the restriction on abortion does nothing to make abortion less necessary—it simply makes abortion more difficult and dangerous.

It is time to lift this ban, and ensure the fair treatment of our military personnel. I urge passage of the Davis amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 108–499.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. HUNTER:

At the end of subtitle A of title XII (page 424, after line 12), insert the following new section:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF CONGRESS CONCERNING THE ABUSE OF PERSONS IN CUSTODY IN IRAQ.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the abuses inflicted upon detainees at the Abu Ghraib prison in Baghdad, Iraq, are offensive to the principles and values of the American people and the United States military, are incompatible with the professionalism, dedication, standards and training required of individuals who serve in the United States military, and contradict the policies, orders, and laws of the United States and the United States military and undermine the ability of the United States military to achieve its mission in Iraq.

(2) the vast majority of members of the Armed Forces have upheld the highest possible standards of professionalism and morality in the face of illegal tactics and terrorist attacks and attempts on their lives.

(3) the abuse of persons in United States custody in Iraq is appropriately condemned and deplored by the American people;

(4) the Armed Forces are moving swiftly and decisively to identify, try, and punish persons who were responsible or culpable for such abuse;

(5) the Secretary of the Army must continue to conduct a full and thorough investigation into any and all allegations of mistreatment or abuse of detainees in Iraq;

(6) the Secretary of the Army and appropriate military authorities must continue to undertake corrective action to address chain of command deficiencies and the systemic deficiencies identified in the incidents in question;

(7) the American principle and tradition of affording proper and humane treatment to persons under the custody of the United States Armed Forces must be reaffirmed;

(8) the alleged crimes of a handful of individuals should not detract from the commendable sacrifices of over 300,000 members of the United States Armed Forces who have served, or who are serving, in Operation Iraqi Freedom; and

(9) the United States expresses its continuing solidarity and support for its partnership with the Iraqi people in building a viable Iraqi government and a secure nation.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 648, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this is an attempt to once more state the strong position of this House against the abuses at Abu Ghraib. I have noticed that the first conviction under the court-martial system has taken place today.

This is also an attempt to say good things about the hundreds of thousands of men and women who are serving in uniform, the 141,000 or so in Iraq who are serving honorably, and to put us solidly on record in support of the prosecution of wrongdoers and the continuing strong support, Mr. Chairman, of our forces who are locked in combat in the Iraq theater, in the Afghanistan theater, and let them know we do not support them any less because of the publicity of the last several weeks.

I think it is pretty consistent with what my great friend and colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) and I have said over and over in the full committee hearings that we have had on this issue and the briefings that we had, and I would hope that all Members could support this amendment.

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I claim time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is the gentleman in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. SKELTON. I will support the amendment, but I claim the time to speak.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) is recognized for 10 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I do support the amendment; however, if I may, I wish to point out a couple of things.

The Hunter-Meehan language that is in the base bill takes a major step towards this whole matter of the Abu Ghraib Prison situation, which of course is deplorable, and I think it is a good provision that is already in the bill.

I wish, however, that four Democratic amendments had been made in order on the prisoner abuse situation: one by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) that specifically lists prohibited interrogation techniques, which makes them very clear; one by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL) that requires very detailed reporting on the role of contractors as interrogators; one by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) that would close loopholes in existing law on how contractors who commit crimes can be prosecuted; and one by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), which would make a database of detainee names available to families and create an international commission to monitor detainee treatment.

Each one of those, individually and collectively, I think, would have made this bill all the better.

But I must express my position in support of this amendment, because we do know that there are major steps to be taken, and we further know that there are so many young men and young women doing positive work in Iraq and Afghanistan; and we hope that the terrible and deplorable situation in that prison that has dominated the news now for a good number of days does not detract from their excellent work.

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to thank the gentleman for his important work in this area, and also mention that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) and I worked up a provision that is in the base bill also, that I think, after reading the Taguba report, very much follows the Taguba report in terms of clarifying policy.

Let me go over a couple of things that we require to be done.

Ensuring that commanders of detention facilities and commanders of interrogation facilities provide all assigned personnel, including contractor

personnel, with training, and documented acknowledgment of receiving training, regarding the Geneva Convention relative to the treatment of prisoners; and establish SOPs, standard operating procedures, for the treatment of detainees.

We also provide that periodic unannounced and announced inspections be made by officers, something that was sadly lacking in the research and investigation that we have done and the review of the Taguba report. Also prohibiting contact between male guards and female detainees and between female guards and male detainees, except in exigent circumstances.

Clearly, there are many dimensions of a prison that are akin, in ways, to locker rooms, and it makes no sense to have substantial contact between male guards and female detainees or female guards and male detainees. So we have spelled that out.

So we have put in, working this in a bipartisan way, we have put in a number of new clarifications, which, while they are manifested into standard operating procedure, represent the emphasis that we would like to place on them in light of the Taguba report and the hearings and briefings that we have received in this matter.

Having said that, I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from Massachusetts for working on this language also, and all the Members that worked on it.

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), as the ranking member of the Committee on Government Reform.

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

Mr. Chairman, I agree that the appalling abuse and torture of Iraqi detainees by U.S. military personnel at the Abu Ghraib Prison is completely unacceptable. Congress should condemn this illegal and inhumane misconduct in the strongest possible terms. But condemnation alone is not enough. Congress also has the responsibility to fully investigate this terrible episode.

Unfortunately, this amendment ignores the constitutional role of Congress to provide oversight over the activities of the administration and military. Without a thorough congressional investigation, the amendment simply assumes that only a handful of individuals were involved in the abuse. Despite General Taguba's conclusion that civilian contractors were either directly or indirectly responsible for the abuse, this amendment is silent on the role of private contractors in interrogating and abusing Iraqis at Abu Ghraib.

I do not understand how the House of Representatives can express its sense of the facts when it has made no meaningful effort to determine what the facts are. This amendment fails to acknowledge that Congress has a fundamental responsibility to investigate the allegations and to conduct oversight over the military campaign in Iraq. We cannot, as this amendment assumes, ignore our responsibility and rely on the administration to oversee itself. This amendment should call for House investigations into the abuse at Abu Ghraib.

The Committee on Government Reform, for example, should examine the role of private contractors in interrogations and prisoner abuse. Congress should be asking whether it is appropriate for the Defense Department to turn to private contractors to assist in the interrogation of prisoners. We should also determine what sanctions apply when private contractors operating in Iraq engage in outrageous abuse.

Time and time again the majority has demonstrated that it has no interest in performing any serious oversight of this administration. The majority has refused to investigate the alleged White House's outing of a CIA agent, Valerie Plame. The majority has declined to investigate allegations that administration officials threatened to fire the Health and Human Services chief actuary if he disclosed unfavorable cost projections for the Medicare prescription drug benefit in his presentation to Congress.

Now, the House majority wants to do as little oversight as possible when it comes to the abuse of detainees. One Republican leader objected to ''jerking these battlefield commanders'' out of Iraq for hearings. Another suggested that congressional investigations would inflame hatred of the U.S. ''by providing fodder and sound bites for our enemies.'' The majority seems to think it is unpatriotic to ask tough questions and demand answers.

Mr. Chairman, oversight is not unpatriotic. Oversight is our constitutional duty. Congress must not abdicate its responsibility for holding the administration accountable. We owe it to the Iraqi people, we owe it to the American people and especially to the U.S. troops that have served with honor to learn the whole story and to take steps to ensure that this kind of abuse never again occurs.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to reclaim the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and let me just say something briefly in response to my colleague who just spoke.

We are not abdicating any oversight on this issue. In fact, we have had as much congressional hearing time as we have had in the past going to war, sending the entire Nation to war. We have had massive hearings on this issue. We have had briefings.

In fact, we finished a briefing yesterday, with the majority of the House, with the Secretary of Defense and experts on this issue that carried well until after 6:30. The majority of the House Members, by my count, appeared. The Secretary did not leave until the last question was answered.

In my estimation, we have given as much publicity to this as we did to the invasion of Normandy, looking over the old stacks of publicity that attended that fairly important event.

Now, I would say this to my dear colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN). We have 141,000 people whose lives are in danger. They need their leadership. Their battlefield leadership is now back here rehashing this issue. The first conviction was made today on this issue. Does the gentleman think we need to have congressional oversight overlooking the court-martial that just concluded in a conviction and a punishment being meted out?

And I would say to my friend that the punishments in the military system are meted out much swifter and much more surely than they are on the domestic side. We have already had a conviction. So your statement to the effect that there is no oversight, your implication there is no oversight is not true. It is false. There is massive oversight.

And in looking at the Taguba report and embedding many of those recommendations in this law, we have actually made changes that are a function or have arisen from that oversight. So the question is one of balance.

We have 141,000 people who need leadership in their operations. We need to make sure they have all the equipment that they need. We need to make sure they have their operational leadership.

So does the gentleman want another 15 hearings? Maybe we should cancel every piece of congressional business for the entire year so that the issue at Abu Ghraib can be milked until the election. I do not think that is good for either side of the aisle.

We have given an enormous amount of publicity to those seven people. I have a stack of Bronze Stars on my desk. Those people will never get any publicity. They certainly will not hear the gentleman from California talking about them, and probably not me, because we will not have a chance to get to them because we will be concentrating on those seven bad apples ad infinitum.

Judgment and balance are important in this business. And for that reason, I think after massive hearings on both sides of the Capitol, after enormous publicity, with six full investigations now attending these seven people, separate investigations, and prosecutions and court-martials going forward, I think we need to lead our troops and we need to provide them what they need; and that means we need to refocus on this war, and we need to win this war.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON).

□ 1800

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I take some exception to the polite assertion of the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) that the Congress of the United States perhaps in his view has not done enough or is not on a track to do enough; but at some point we have to decide to come to a conclusion that a few people committed some very horrendous, bad acts.

The events that have occurred since then, and I would remind Members this occurred in late December or January, or became evident in January, and immediate actions were taken by our trusted military leaders, and I am not talking about our civilian leaders necessarily, I am talking about our military leaders, people who swore to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States while carrying out their military duties. Since then, General Taguba and his staff have carried out a very extensive investigation.

I saw a copy of the report. It was that high with a 50-page executive summary. While it is classified, somehow or another it happened to appear on the Internet so anyone that wants to know what is in it can click on the Internet and look at it, and you will have to fairly conclude that there was nothing in that report that would suggest that we need a broader investigation.

But in spite of that, there are currently seven ongoing investigations being carried out by our military leadership, trying to find out if there is anything else that ought to be looked at, any other criminal investigations that ought to be entered into, any other processes to clean this mess up.

Now, we have 140,000 people doing good work, protecting the national security of our country while trying to put that country back together, positive work supporting the Provisional Coalition Authority, positive work working with Iraqi families, positive work monitoring caucuses where Iraqis are electing their own local leaders, controlling traffic, positive work securing ammo dumps that are sometimes miles square.

Our Special Forces are there operating, 140,000 people doing good works; and we are asked by the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) to concentrate on the bad acts, throw Congress into an oversight overdrive, concentrating on the bad acts of a handful of people.

I do not buy into the notion that we should do this, and I think the chairman's amendment is exactly what we need to do. I would hope the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) would rethink his position.

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

In line with my responsibility for oversight, I made a request a good number of days ago in a letter to the President asking when the White House, when the Defense Department, when the State Department received the International Red Cross report that was provided to me just recently, but dated back in February of this year.

In line with that, I am expecting to hear from the White House day by day, and I call them day by day. That is part of my oversight responsibility, to find out these matters as to when they received that International Red Cross document concerning the prison abuse.

Hopefully, they will get an answer to me to help me fulfill my oversight responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, we have had several gentlemen on the other side of the aisle take a great deal of time attacking the idea that they should hold public hearings. They act as if they held a public oversight hearing, we could not support our troops in the war.

Let me say, having private briefings and having classified meetings is not enough when our country's credibility and our reputation for human rights and democracy has been tarnished all around the world and our troops are in greater danger because of it. We need to know the facts.

We have heard people say a couple of times, seven bad apples. We do not know if it is only seven bad apples. I hope that is true. But we do not know how far up the chain of command some of these ideas were put forward in terms of how to treat the detainment of Iraqi prisoners.

The gentleman's Committee on Armed Services has had one public hearing with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense. What about others to testify? I attended the classified briefing with Secretary Rumsfeld and other military people yesterday. I do not think I am violating any rules to tell Members that when the question of the Abu Ghraib prisoners came up, the Secretary said, We will find out the answers when we find out the answers. That is not a direct quote, but that is pretty much what I got out of that meeting.

I think we need to do more, and the best example of somebody doing more in a responsible way is Senator WARNER as the chairman of the committee on the other side of this building who has held hearings. Have we had any hearings for the public to hear on the House side? Have we heard from General Taguba in a public hearing?

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

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California for an answer to that one question.

Mr. HUNTER. No, the gentleman has not heard from every single officer in the U.S. Army on this subject.

Mr. WAXMAN. Have we heard from General Taguba who prepared the report?

Mr. HUNTER. We have heard from the Secretary of Defense, who is responsible for delivering the Taguba report to us.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, my point is that what we are hearing from the Republican leadership in this House over and over again is, We will trust the administration to investigate themselves.

We heard that when it came to the outing of the CIA agent, endangering our national security, from somebody at the White House who leaked the information.

We have heard it when it came from the Medicare estimates being withheld from the Congress.

And we are hearing it now on this issue of how Iraqi prisoners were treated.

I think we have more of a responsibility than just to say we trust this administration because, after all, we have a war going on. I would hope the House of Representatives could chew gum and walk at the same time, and that means support our troops, but also support America's standing in the world by doing our own investigation and hearing from other people than the Secretary of Defense in public meetings and in private meetings not tell us much of anything because they are still investigating it.

My argument to Members is, I will support anything that says we want to do something about the abuse, but we are not doing something about the abuse unless we exercise our oversight responsibilities and hold public hearings.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY). The Chair would advise Members that the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) has the right to close, and has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) has 30 seconds remaining.

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

I have made my statement regarding my request to the White House for the information, and I hope I do not have to make another phone call tomorrow to receive the letter.

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

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

Apparently, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) did not understand. Let me be clear: We had a major public hearing on this issue. It was a full-blown hearing, and the briefing that the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) attended is one that the gentleman attends perhaps on an infrequent basis, but one that we have on a regular basis, and have ever since the operation in Iraq started, to let Members of the House know what is happening. That is why the gentleman was invited.

And I am not going to yield to the gentleman because I have a point to make. I have listened to the gentleman's point, and I am going to close. I

am going to talk about some things that are important to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Let me tell Members why it is important to have General Sanchez back leading his troops and not here when you have massive operations and you have conflict and you have people being taken, casualties being killed and wounded in that theater.

General Sanchez, who is in charge of that theater, who is a combat leader in that theater, has issues stacking up on his desk, and he has challenges; and a lot of those challenges affect our constituents.

I presume that the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) has young men and women in the Armed Forces in the gentleman's constituency, who are stationed in Iraq, whose very safety depends on General Sanchez making good decisions. He has to be there to make those decisions. He has to make convoy decisions, IED decisions, operational decisions, and that is why we need him back there leading his troops, not being pulled back here for political theater.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

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

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

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

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order: Amendment No. 1 by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE); and amendment No. 2 by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GOODE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 231, noes 191, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 196]

AYES—231

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burns
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Collins
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Doolittle
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
English
Etheridge
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Jones (NC)
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Manzullo
Marshall
Matheson
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Spratt
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Udall (CO)
Upton
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wicker
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—191

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Ballance
Becerra
Bell
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Brown, Corrine
Burgess
Burr
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Chandler
Clay
Conyers
Cooper
Crowley
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Tom
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Filner
Flake
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Price (NC)
Putnam
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Simmons
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tierney
Towns
Turner (TX)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (NM)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—11

Delahunt
Fattah
Ford
Hayworth
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kingston
Leach
Norwood
Portman
Tauzin

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY) (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes are remaining in this vote.

□ 1837

Messrs. TERRY, FARR, BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Ms. MAJETTE changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. UDALL of Colorado, LIPINSKI, SMITH of Michigan, LATHAM, and Ms. HART changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. DAVIS OF CALIFORNIA

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 202, noes 221, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 197]

AYES—202

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Ballance
Bass
Becerra
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Case
Castle
Chandler
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Dunn
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Filner
Foley
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Greenwood
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Houghton
Hoyer
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kirk
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kucinich
Lampson
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Majette
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Obey
Olver
Ose
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Simmons
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Tanner
Tauscher
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—221

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Beauprez
Bereuter
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Boozman
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Collins
Costello
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
John
Johnson (IL)
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Keller
Kennedy (MN)
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kline
Knollenberg
LaHood
Langevin
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Manzullo
Marshall
McCotter
McCrery
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Porter
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Stenholm
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Upton
Vitter
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Delahunt
Fattah
Ford
Hayworth
Johnson, Sam
Kingston
Leach
Norwood
Portman
Tauzin

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY) (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1853

Mr. ORTIZ changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. BASS changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to section 4 of House Resolution 648, I hereby request that the following amendment be considered out of the order printed in House Report 108–499: amendment No. 14.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. SWEENEY, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4200) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2005 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2005, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. CON. RES. 95, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 649, I call up the conference report on the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 95) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2005 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2006 through 2009.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 649, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Tuesday, May 18, 2004.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on S. Con. Res. 95.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, first I would like to thank members of the Committee on the Budget on both sides of the aisle that have worked throughout the process this year. I wish to thank my ranking member and friend, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

We will embark today on a vigorous debate. I have a feeling that we will differ quite a lot on the policy and the issues before us faced in the budget, but we do so in a cheerful manner, one that is with full respect; and I have enormous respect for my very able friend and colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

I also want to thank our staff. Rich Meade and the entire Committee on the Budget staff, they have worked very, very diligently on the majority side; and Tom Kahn and the minority staff have also done that. They prepare Members, not only on the committee but throughout our conferences and caucuses, so we are prepared for this debate today and throughout the year, and they deserve our support as we move forward and our appreciation.

As we started crafting the budget this year, there was certainly really no lack of naysayers who said that getting a budget passed this year would probably be next to impossible. There were way too many challenges, people said, facing our country, too many conflicting interests, too much pressure because of the upcoming elections.

All of those things are certainly true. It is true we are dealing with a number of other challenging issues, such as the ongoing conflicts in Afghanistan and Iraq, and the war against terrorism in general on a global basis.

But we will prevail as a Nation. Regardless of the debate that we have today on budgets and taxes and pay-as-you-go and the national debt, we will prevail as a Nation, because it is not about budgets in the end. It is not about taxes in the end. It is about an American spirit that will not die, because we believe in freedom, and that is freedom that is given to us as a little seed planted in our hearts when we are born and something that blossoms throughout our lives. We want to share that with the world, and we believe that by sharing it with the world, we will have a safer place in which to live.

I am also happy to report that we have prevailed, despite a myriad of critics who said it could not be done, that we would not even get a conference report agreement between the House and the Senate. We were able to do that. So today in the House we will complete the first step of what are some of our most fundamental duties.

I am extremely proud of this budget and what it stands for. I would like to particularly thank our leadership, our Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT); our majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY); our deputy whip, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR); and our whip, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT); as well as the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE). All of the leadership team worked hard, standing our ground for the budget principles that we knew must be done.

And what was that must-do list for this year's budget? Clearly, this budget had to provide for the defense and homeland security of our Nation. That is job one. There is no excuse not to complete the most important job that this country requires of a Nation in order for it to be free, and that is the defense of our country.

Second, this budget had to continue to support a program of economic growth for our country, as well as continue our commitment to a host of critical domestic programs, such as veterans benefits, education, health care, and prescription drugs for seniors. And we had to do all of this while reining in our spending and working to reduce the deficits we incurred while responding to extraordinary circumstances over the past few years.

Getting a consensus on what was exactly right or correct was not easy. It has been very difficult. Every single person has their own idea of what a perfect budget would look like. This is not a perfect budget, and I dare say my friends on the other side will remind me of that time and time again today; but it is what is doable at a time of extreme circumstances in our Nation's history.

I have heard people say at time of war we ought to do this; at time of economic challenge we ought to do that; we ought to fund priorities. All of those are true. But we have never faced all of them at the exact same time: to have a downturn in the economy, be faced with two wars, a global response to terrorism, the most unbelievable tragic event of terrorism facing our Nation. All of this happening at the exact same time is something that has never happened to our Nation.

□ 1900

So these are extraordinary circumstances and we will respond. Let me tell you the guiding principles of this budget of how we are going to respond.

First is strength. We are free as a Nation as long as we are able to defend our freedom at home and abroad. And so the first principle is strength.

Second is growth. We must continue to grow. Our policies are helping to boost the economy. We do not want to grow government. We want to grow the earning capacity of people. We want to grow the ability to create jobs. We want to grow the entrepreneurial spirit in our country. That is what we want to grow. And we have already seen, the last 6 months have been the fastest growth in 20 years as a result of the policies put forward by our President and by this Congress. And we believe that must continue.

Business investment is up. Unemployment is falling, and it is lower now than it was on average for the 1970s, the 1980s or the 1990s. And most important, we are seeing jobs being created.

More Americans are working today than at any time in American history; 1.1 million jobs have been created over the last 8 months alone. So to remain the most prosperous superpower, our economy must be able to continue to grow.

Finally, opportunity. Strength, growth and, finally, opportunity. America's continued greatness comes from the unlimited opportunities that our American freedom provides. We are all for that. And we must continue to encourage those opportunities for a better life for every American citizen. Government certainly has a role in that.

Those were the guiding principles of our budget that we passed here in the House, and they remain the guiding principles as we work through this conference agreement.

I also want to talk to you about a few principles with regard to this budget that were included in the final conference agreement. First, there will be no tax increase. And let me be clear: If you vote ''yes'' on this budget, you are saying we do not need a tax increase. We do not want an automatic tax increase to happen, and we do not believe that this is a time for Americans to dig deeper in their pockets in order to deal with challenges we should be facing here in Washington.

Tax increases should not be the solution. And so if you vote ''no'' on this budget, be aware you are voting to automatically allow tax increases to occur this year.

That is what this budget will do. It will prevent an automatic tax increase. So by voting against it, an automatic tax increase will occur.

Second, on spending, our constituents have told us time and time again that we have got to rein in spending. We have got to control the waste, fraud and abuse in Washington. And certainly that is often in the eye of the beholder; but we believe that it is time to go through our departments, through our categories and look at ways to rein in spending. We cannot begin to address reducing the budget deficit without holding the current rate of spending growth.

This is what our spending growth has looked like in the past few years, a lot of growth. Most of that from necessary demands, but we cannot sustain that spending growth. So we have looked for ways to control spending throughout the budget. This budget calls for holding the line on nondefense, nonhomeland security discretionary spending. For the first time, this Congress, certainly in my tenure here and I daresay in the tenure of all Members of this body, this will be the first opportunity for you to vote to freeze or hold the line on nonsecurity spending in Congress.

Let us talk about the war. The President did not, when he submitted his budget back in February, contemplate the true cost of war because they were unknown at that time. Our budget has taken that into account.

We know, without question, that there will be costs for the ongoing war and that this budget will have an effect as a result. Do we know the exact amount? No. That is not known right now to the Congress, to the Defense Department, to the President.

We can speculate, and we have put into this budget a placeholder that says $50 billion, based on the estimate that we have for this year, is an appropriate figure to begin planning for the 2005 costs of the war.

And thank goodness we did that, because right after we passed our budget, we found out that at least $25 billion will be necessary to fund the ongoing conflict during 2005. So it is not with precision that we know this amount, but it is something we need to plan for in this, and this budget accomplishes that.

This budget does all of this, if we follow it, to get us back to balanced budgets and fiscal responsibility. We have to start somewhere.

There will be people who come to the floor today who say, you know, this is only a 1-year budget. Well, yeah, that is what we always pass. Last year we passed a budget; it had a lot of years on it, but we only followed it for a year. Then we renegotiated it this year. We will to the same next year and the year after. In fact, every year I have been here we have gone year to year to year with regard to taxes, spending, rules, appropriations, all of the different issues that face us today.

And so we are coming forward to present to you today a 1-year budget. It complies with the Budget Act. You will see 5 years' worth of projections for the amounts of money, but this is a 1-year budget. And we believe if we can get this right and if we can hold the House and the other body and the President to this plan, it puts us on a path to not only controlling the deficit, but getting us back to a balanced budget.

This budget is the first step in accomplishing that but it only works if we stick to it. This is our next major challenge, I daresay, to begin to get past all of the excuses of the last few years, although they are appropriate, certainly important rationale for how we have gotten here.

But we need to move forward. This allows us to do that today. So we need to vote ''yes'' in order to move this plan forward. But let me be clear: If you vote no, as I said before, you vote for an automatic tax increase, you vote to cut veterans' spending because we increased veterans' spending here over the President's amount by $1.2 billion; you are not supporting the troops to the tune of $50 billion contemplating the war costs.

Sure, you can say we will vote for the appropriations bill, but this plans for it in a budget. And I also suggest, you are not doing what you need to do to plan for defense and homeland security of our Nation.

This puts us on a track to fiscal responsibility. It meet our needs and the strengths of our country and growth for the economy and opportunity for the future. And I ask my colleagues to support the conference report.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker I yield myself 4½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) and I work together well, and I have the greatest regard for him, but let me put it the way it is. He is trying to put the best face on a bad situation.

What we have got here is a new high for the budget deficit and a new low for the budget process. For the first time in 20 years, for the first time since the 1980s we have a budget that only goes out 1 year. Ever since the Budget Act was adopted, the principle has been that you will run out your numbers 5 years so that we can see the implications of tax cuts and tax increases, spending cuts and spending increases, spread over a reasonable period of time. Not in this budget: 1 year for the first time in 20 years.

Now, what does that allow you to do? It allows you to dodge the deficit. It keeps you from having to show on a multiyear basis how you will get from a $300–$400 billion deficit to something that is half that size to a respectable, sustainable number.

If you only take it out 1 year, there is no way in the world that we will ever get our arms around the deficit in that period of time. So it exonerates you from presenting any kind of process or plan to get where we all know where we have got to go, and that is to a much lower deficit.

Another thing: When you do not put real numbers in the outyears, in 2006, 2007, 2008, it allows you to reduce the President's request and not acknowledge what you are actually doing. By our calculations, when we look at the numbers that are on the chart contained in this budget resolution, this budget resolution provides $122 billion less for defense than the President requests or projects for himself over that same period of time.

This much is clear: Vote for this and you are voting for a huge deficit by the acknowledgment of the drastic $367 billion. And while they have included $50 billion for supplemental spending in Iraq and Afghanistan next year, I think that is at least $25 billion short of where we will really be. Add that 25 to the 367; you get to 392. Take out the Social Security surplus because it should not be included, and the deficit in the basic budget is $552 billion.

That is what you are voting for if you vote for this budget resolution, a deficit of $552 billion.

Now, when you run a deficit like that, you stack up debt, and once again we will have to raise the debt ceiling; and one of the key provisions of this bill buried beneath all of the line items is a provision which would automatically spin off an increase in the debt ceiling of $690 million—$690 billion. It will take the debt of the United States up to $8.1 trillion.

It is hard to get my tongue around those numbers.

When Mr. Bush came to office, the statutory debt ceiling of the United States was $5.9 trillion. Adopt this budget resolution and we will raise that ceiling by $2.2 trillion to $8.1 trillion. That is how much we have had to increase the debt ceiling, $2 trillion in order to accommodate the fiscal policies of the Bush administration.

Now, we have got record deficits. We have record debt. That is bad enough, but even worse, even worse in this budget resolution, there is no plan, no process and no prospect, not even a PAYGO rule for balancing the budget or anyone issuing the deficit over a period of time. All we have here, after a lot of huffing and puffing, is a puny version of the PAYGO rule that House Democrats and House Republican on two occasions in the 1990s adopted to apply to both tax cuts and spending increases on the entitlement side. All we have got here is a 1-year extension that applies only in the Senate, no application whatsoever in the House. That is all we have got.

The gentleman says if you do not vote for this, it could impair the recovery. Well, let me say, Mr. Greenspan warned us only a week or two ago that this recovery we are beginning to enjoy may be short lived unless we come to grips with this critical problem, and that is mounting, never-ending deficits that these budgets are producing.

So the thing that is incumbent upon us now is not to kick the can down the road, is not just to pass something for the sake of saying we passed the budget resolution, we fixed the 302(a) number. We can go ahead with our appropriation bills. We need a plan; we need a process. We need to deal with this deficit now, and this budget resolution does not do it. That is why we should defeat it, send it back to conference and do it right.

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

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

Let me just respond quickly and say, and I forgot this part, we are reducing the budget deficit by $100 billion. So I understand there is concern out there. We are taking $100 billion off the top as a result of this budget because we are planning our work and we are sticking to our plan, and it is a good plan.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NUSSLE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I ask this question for myself and my colleagues, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

I note on Wednesday, March 31, with 299 votes, the House passed House Resolution 581 regarding pay comparability for Federal employees. That language is not included in the resolution.

Is it the gentleman's understanding that the language of that resolution is the position of the House?

Mr. NUSSLE. It is my understanding. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), a very valued member of the committees.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time and commend him on his patience and persistence that was required to have this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report. In my view, the first job of the Federal government is to defend the country, and there is certainly no greater priority in this budget than protecting America.

When it comes to helping make the country strong, we in Congress have an

important role to play. Part of our role involves the other major bill we are working on this week, the defense authorization bill. But I believe that passing this budget today also puts in place an essential building block that helps make sure we do our job in keeping and improving on a strong America.

This budget fully funds the President's request for military and homeland security. It allocates $420 billion for the national security function. Included in that is $402 billion for the military, and on top of that is $50 billion that the chairman just talked about for the ongoing operations in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Once that allocation is translated into the various programs, we will have increased basic pay for soldiers in the military, 21 percent over the past 3 years.

□ 1915

We will have increased personnel funding 59 percent since 2001. Operation and maintenance will have increased 55 percent; procurement up 43 percent; R&D funding up 76 percent over the past 3 years.

In short, Mr. Speaker, we will have provided everything the Pentagon has asked for the troops in Iraq and Afghanistan and then some.

On homeland security, this budget allocates $33.4 billion, including $31 billion for the Department of Homeland Security. This is nearly double what those agencies were receiving in 2001, nearly double. The budget carves out $2.5 billion in advance funding for Bioshield, the effort to deal with that threat which many people view as the most dangerous to us, biological warfare.

But as I said when the House first considered this budget, we could slap a homeland security label on the whole Federal budget and still not be perfectly safe; but passing this budget today allows the other committees to do their work on the detailed programs and make sure that in Congress we stand up and do our job on homeland security and defense, supporting the men and women who are on the front lines every day protecting our lives and our freedom. It deserves our support.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

This is not a serious attempt to deal with a serious problem. This is a chart that shows the mess we have gotten ourselves into. It is the deficit since the Vietnam War, Reagan, and Bush. The Clinton administration cleaned up the mess, and here we are now with a huge deficit.

If you run up deficits, you have got to pay out interest on the national debt. This is the interest on the national debt we were projected to pay when this administration came in. This is the interest on the national debt we are going to have to pay for messing up the deficit, $300 billion additional interest on the national debt. $300 billion at $30,000 each, that is enough to hire every unemployed person in the country, over 10 million people.

The bill presented today is $367 billion more in debt. The chairman is right, we are not digging into our pockets. We are digging into our grandchildren's pockets.

This bill ignores the PAYGO rules of fiscal responsibility. It is a 1-year budget rather than the traditional 5- or 10-year budget. So a lot of the problems are hidden. It is not a serious attempt to deal with a serious problem.

We should reject the conference report.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire how much time is remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) has 13½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 24 minutes remaining.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, we will reserve our time and let the other side catch up a little bit.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this conference report.

In the 2000 campaign, President Bush declared that he was opposed to nation-building. Well, he has succeeded in keeping his commitment. When you leave $3 trillion of debt, a budget with $500 billion in deficit, 3 million Americans who have lost their jobs, 44 million Americans without health care, two more million Americans in poverty, George Bush can say he has kept his commitment against nation-building. Who knew it was America he was talking about.

This budget shows that you cannot finance three wars with three tax cuts and get a different result and continue the same policies by putting your foot on the accelerator on the same policy. You will get the same result: 3 million Americans without jobs, $3 trillion added to the Nation's debt, $500 billion in additional debt on top of that, and no ability to deal with the health care crisis and the college tuition crisis that middle-class families are facing.

We need new direction, a new set of policies to put middle-class families and their economic interests and the interests of their families at the heart of our economic policy. We need to break with the policies that continue to literally reward wealth at the expense of work.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) for the purposes of a unanimous consent request.

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

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the budget.

Mr. Speaker, over the past three years, fiscal recklessness has reigned over this House. Record surpluses have been molded into record deficits. Sensible spending has been overtaken by a bloated budget. Discipline and prosperity have been shoved aside for irresponsibility and mismanagement. Now comes today's budget conference report—an opportunity to acknowledge Federal misspending by establishing budget enforcement rules for, at the very least, the next 5 years. Instead, "pay-as-you-go" has been adopted for 1 year only, but there is no way to untangle this fiscal mess in 1 year. Perhaps our friends on the other side of the aisle realized that the voting public, in fact, embraces fiscal discipline. Perhaps they want to give the appearance of a balanced budget to score points in November. Unfortunately for our country, mere appearances won't fix this mess, and they won't create jobs. This thinly-veiled attempt at election-year discipline is far too little and far too late. Is our government's budget better off today than it was 4 years ago? Not by a long shot, and this conference reports is not going to do anything to change that any time soon. And that's why I am voting "no."

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, this budget conference report is another step backward in the action in reverse the Republican leadership and the White House have been conducting on transportation funding over the last 6 months.

Last fall, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure introduced a bipartisan bill at $375 billion over 6 years, but to appease the Bush administration, the House leadership jawboned that number down to $350 billion, then 325, then 300, finally $284 billion, the number which the House passed by an overwhelming vote; but that was not low enough for the White House.

Now the conference report cuts $11 billion from the will of the House to $273 billion. The White House still insists on its $256 billion figure. That means not one dollar more for highway and transit, not one new job compared to the current TEA–21 law. That is a formula for gridlock, congestion, and economic stagnation. We should reject this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to S. Con. Res. 95, the Budget Resolution Conference Report for FY2005. Mr. Speaker, let me briefly focus on the highway and transit funding assumed in the Republican Budget.

Last November, 73 Members of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure introduced a bipartisan bill to authorize $375 billion for the highway, transit, and transportation safety programs for the next 6 years. We developed these program funding levels based upon the Department of Transportation's report assessing the highway and transit needs of our Nation. In March, the Committee unanimously approved that bill. That bill would have

stemmed the tide of crippling congestion that is overcoming our metropolitan areas.

However, the Bush Administration adamantly opposes additional infrastructure investment, and the House Republican Leadership made clear that the bill would never see the light of day. We have seen a Republican "auction in reverse" ever since.

In February, the Senate, by a vote of 76–21, passed its bill authorizing $318 billion for surface transportation infrastructure. The White House threatened a veto.

To further appease the Bush Administration, the House Republican Leadership forced the Transportation Committee to cut this infrastructure investment even more—to $284 billion. In April, the House considered that downsized bill and it passed overwhelmingly, by a vote of 357–65. It still wasn't good enough for the White House and it again threatened a veto.

Now, the Republican Leadership, pursuant to the Budget Resolution Conference Report, cuts this critical infrastructure investment even further—to $273 billion. The Republican Budget assumes $273 billion for TEA-21 reauthorization, which is $11 billion less than the $284 billion provided by H.R. 3550 (TEA LU) as passed by the House just last month. The Republican Budget is $45 billion less than the Senate-passed funding level.

The reverse auction continues and I fear it will not end until infrastructure investment is cut to President Bush's proposal. The Administration is adamantly insisting that total investment be no more than $256 billion over 6 years. And let me be clear on what the Bush Administration bill provides: not one more dollar for highway and transit infrastructure, not one new job. Compared to where we are today, the Administration's bill provides no increase for highway funding and no increase for transit funding for the next five years—not a single additional dollar. As a result, not one additional job will be created by this zero-growth investment.

The result of the White House's absolute intransigence on its entirely unacceptable proposal is traffic gridlock in our communities and legislative deadlock in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, our country has worked too hard to put the current transportation system in place to allow this administration to squander previous investments made over generations and allow that system to deteriorate.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on S. Con. Res. 95.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and ranking member of the Committee on the Budget from South Carolina for the time.

Mr. Chairman, every minute, the Bush administration spends $991,000 more than it takes in, basically $1 million in deficit every single minute. We have lost control of the budget; and this is not going to give us control, even though this purportedly is what it is supposed to do.

One of the things that it does, and the American people need to know this, is that it increases the debt limit by $690 billion to over $8 trillion. We were told that the last time we increased the debt limit to $6.9 trillion that we would not have to do it again until 2008 because of the President's tax cuts, and here we are right back again increasing the debt limit to the $8.1 trillion. This is a bad budget resolution.

It used to be that we had a 10-year window. We could look out to see what this budget was going to do over 10 years; and then to hide the real deficit creative aspect of this budget, we reduced that to 5 years. Now none of us could have imagined that we would actually bring a budget resolution to the floor limited to one single year.

This is a bad budget resolution. There is no provision for the future. It digs the deficit even deeper, and then we do not even have PAYGO rules that apply. This budget is out of control and deserves to be defeated, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds, and then I will let them continue.

But I want people to listen. Listen. We have got half the speakers on that side saying, worry about the deficit and debt, and the other half coming like the gentleman from Minnesota saying we are not spending enough, we are not spending enough, we are not spending enough. So is it the deficit or is it spending? My goodness, my colleagues need to get their message straight.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY).

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, what we have before us today is not a serious document. Putting together a budget should be a reflection of the Nation's priorities. It should be a long-term road map for where we want this country to go and how we expect to get there.

This budget shows that we are not taking this process seriously. This is a 1-year budget providing no commitments or details after the first year. A failure to detail future plans masks the consequences of these policy decisions in future years.

This budget shows that the majority is not taking the deficit seriously, and the results of this budget will seriously tax our children and grandchildren.

Deficits do matter. We cannot just continue to run up massive deficits and add billions to the national debt.

This budget shows that we have no commitment to our future generations. In addition to passing on massive deficits, this budget underfunds education programs and cuts investments in our future, like scientific and medical research.

I urge my colleagues to take their jobs seriously. We have to have a road map for the future. Please vote "no" on this budget resolution.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

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

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

Mr. Speaker, these are budgets with pay-as-you-go rules. These are budgets that do not have pay-as-you-go rules, from 4 years of budget surpluses to record setting budget deficit. What is hard to understand here?

Mr. Speaker, this Congress and the legacy of this administration cannot be historically large budget deficits and rising anti-Americanism throughout the globe. Yet that is exactly what is taking place here this evening.

We have an obligation to do better. As the father of two little boys, I did not come to this Congress to leave a legacy of debt for our children and grandchildren to inherit. This will not make us more prosperous, nor will it make us more secure at the end of the day.

We can do better, and by applying pay-as-you-go rules just to the United States Senate and not to the House of Representatives is the height of deceit and double-speak that we have before us this evening.

I encourage my colleagues to reject this budget resolution. We can and must do better.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire of the Chair how much time is left on this side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 17 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) has 13¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, this Republican budget reminds me of Saint Augustine's famous prayer, "Lord, make me chaste but not just yet."

The budget resolution covers only 1 year, not the 5 years normally covered, in order to hide the true scope of the deficits their tax cuts have created.

Its pay-as-you-go provisions do not apply to all of the Republican tax cuts.

Oh, Lord, our Republican friends pray, make us fiscally chaste, but not just yet, and only for a year when it comes to the tax cuts we have given to our wealthy friends.

Since taking office, President Bush's reckless tax cutting policy has drilled a massive fiscal hole in our economy. Today, the Republican budget resolution drills even deeper.

Republicans are giving us Energizer Bunny deficits. They keep growing and growing and growing.

But the Republican paradox is that they hate the government, but they have to run for office in order to make sure that the government does not work, and the perfect form of that is when they control the House, the Senate, the White House, the Supreme Court because then they can take the notion of benign neglect which does not harm, it does not hurt, and turn it

into designed neglect where the tax cuts are so massive that cuts in Medicare and Social Security and Medicaid and education and the environment and every other program that has been put on the books over the last 60 years, as each year goes by, has a meat cleaver that has to be applied to it in order to make sure that tax cuts for the wealthiest 2 percentile is preserved.

Mr. Speaker, this Republican budget reminds me of Saint Augustine's famous prayer, "Lord make me chaste, but not just yet."

The budget resolution covers only one year, not the five years normally covered—in order to hide the true scope of the deficits their tax cuts have created.

And its pay-as-you-go provisions don't apply to all of the Republican tax cuts!

Oh Lord, our Republican friends pray, make us fiscally chaste, not just yet, and only for a year when it comes to the tax cuts we've given to our wealthy friends.

Since taking office, President Bush's reckless tax cutting policy has drilled a massive fiscal hole in our economy. Today, the Republican budget resolution drills even deeper.

Republicans are giving us Energizer Bunny deficits—they keep growing, and growing, and growing . . .

Just 3½ years ago, CBO projected a $5.6 billion surplus over the next 10 years. Today, we're looking at a whopping $4.4 trillion deficit through 2014.

The Republican budget on the Floor today reinforces this astonishing reversal of fortune. It is a stunning, self-inflicted fiscal wound that will fester for generations yet to come. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the budget deficit in 2004 will top last year's all-time high deficit and reach $600 billion when current borrowing from the Medicare and Social Security Trust Funds are included.

This resolution before us today will essentially freeze non-defense, non-homeland discretionary programs. Its budget proposes $13 billion in mandatory cuts over 5 years under the guise of reducing waste, fraud and abuse. But in reality these cuts could slash veterans' health care, Medicaid, unemployment assistance and other domestic programs that Americans depend on.

The Republican budget scheme calls not for benign neglect of Social Security, Medicare, health care, education and other domestic programs, but designed neglect, in order to siphon away the money the federal government needs to meet its obligations under critical programs that benefit seniors, veterans, the environment and our children.

Former Treasury Secretary Paul O'Neill reported that during cabinet meetings early in the Bush Administration, Vice President CHENEY brushed off concerns about tax cuts causing huge deficits by saying "Reagan proved that deficits don't matter."

The Republican paradox is that Conservatives hate government, but they have to run for office to make sure it doesn't work.

With this budget resolution, they will have succeeded—but their success spells disaster for all of those Americans who depend on the Federal government to help them, and for the future generations who will be stuck with the tab for the tax cuts the Republicans have given to the wealthy.

Mr. Speaker, Vice President CHENEY is wrong. Deficits do matter. Defeat this wrong-headed budget resolution, so that we can stop digging the deficit hole deeper.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

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

Mr. Speaker, what has happened to the heart and soul of the Republican Party? I used to have a lot of respect for my friends on the other side of the aisle when they called themselves fiscal conservatives. The Republicans can never again call themselves fiscal conservatives.

The American people are not foolish. Each person, each household in America understands that in a budget you only spend as much as you have. If you keep overspending year after year, if you spend more money than you take in time and time again, bad things happen; and that is what is happening here.

We are having an orgy of tax cuts, and we have an unbalanced budget, and we are passing on a legacy of debt to our children and our grandchildren.

□ 1930

Shame on us.

We fought long and hard in this Chamber to balance the budget during the Clinton Presidency. We succeeded by making hard choices. Yet today we are presented with an easy choice, borrow and spend. The borrow-and-spend Republicans have hit once again. Shame on the majority for this sham budget.

When the House debated the budget resolution earlier this year, I rose in opposition to it because it is a big fat IOU to our children and grandchildren. It is unfair. Shame on the majority for abandoning PAYGO for spending and tax cuts.

We should vote down this quick and easy fix. Let us make the hard choices that we were elected to make. Let us pass a budget that balances soon, not one that never balances, and not a phony one that is only 1 year because we want to masquerade the sham that we are causing.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for yielding me this time.

One of the statistics that I think is beyond dispute here is the Federal debt now totals $7 trillion. And if you break that down by every person living in the United States, it is $24,000 a person.

A few brave, moderate Republicans in the House stood for a central proposition that the American people expect us to live by, that is, Democrats, Republicans and Independents, and it is pay as you go. Do not cut taxes, do not spend, do not drive this massive Federal debt up further unless you can find a way to offset the tax cut or spending.

Tonight, the Republican majority in this House entirely repudiates that proposition over the objections of independent-minded Republicans in the House and Senate. There will be no pay-as-you-go. Instead, we will be adopting an historic debt ceiling in excess of $7 trillion. How abysmal. What reckless fiscal responsibility.

It is the Democrats standing on the floor of the House tonight fighting for fiscal responsibility. This is what taxpayers and citizens throughout the country expect. And I would urge the moderate Republicans in the U.S. House to reject this budget resolution. Join your comrades in the Senate and let us restore fiscal responsibility.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, could the Chair tell me how much time is left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 12½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) has 13¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER).

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a sad night for this House. The budget of the United States of America should be a blueprint for our Nation, but this budget only extends 1 year. We used to make 10-year budgets, and then our friends on the other side of the aisle got more modest in their expectations. It was reduced to 5 years because they were afraid for the American people to see what lay in the 5 years beyond. Now, they are apparently afraid for the American people to see what lies beyond 1 year.

We should be preparing for the future. We should be living within our means. And for all the good things that have been said about this budget, it hides the largest budget deficit in American history.

Now, if that were temporary, that would be one thing. But what we are looking at are permanent structural deficits that will burden this economy and burden our children and grandchildren for generations. They are doing irreparable harm to our Nation.

There were some good reasons for a temporary deficit, but not for a permanent structural deficit. My Republican colleagues on the other side of the aisle are good people, but they have been misled by ideology into abandoning principles like pay-as-you-go, which helped rescue our Nation before from a sea of debt. They have abandoned the principle of fiscal responsibility that used to be the lodestar for the Republican Party.

It is so important that we pull together and live within our means, spend responsibly, and tax responsibly so that we can have a stronger Nation.

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

respond to the gentleman that that is why our budget reduces the deficit next year, $100 billion alone, and that is without raising taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), a very valued member of the committee.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I find it interesting to come to the floor tonight and hear from my friends on the other side of the aisle that we need to have less spending and more fiscal discipline.

Having been on the Committee on the Budget and gone through the process of a markup where we heard again and again how we were not spending enough on education, we were not spending enough on the environment, we were not spending enough on health care, we were not spending enough on labor issues, we were not spending enough. And amendments were offered and amendments were voted down that would spend more and more and more.

And, yes, the Democrats offered an alternative, and I applaud them for that, on the floor of the House, although we did not have one in committee. And it offered more spending, and that is fine, that is fine. But then to come to the floor and say somehow this budget has too much spending in it just does not make too much sense.

The Democrat alternative also offered higher taxes and increasing taxes, and we disagree with that. We think this economy has finally turned. We now see not only the best growth we have had in 20 years, but jobs coming back. We think it is the wrong time to raise taxes.

So I just hope for those listening, my colleagues and others out there, that they realize the budget that is before us, that the chairman of the Committee on the Budget has put together, is a fair budget that provides for spending restraint. It does provide for increases in spending on homeland security and on defense, which are necessary right now, but for the rest of the budget it is pretty much flat.

And, unfortunately, given our budget deficit situation, we cannot make additional investments right now in some high-priority areas and other areas. We have to make, as someone said earlier, some tough choices, and we are making them in this budget.

I want to be clear why we believe that it is important to continue to allow the tax relief to work and not to increase taxes. We believe that because we have seen the impact of tax relief. We did not do it because we just like tax relief for tax relief itself. We did it because we thought it would grow the economy. And it has worked.

This chart shows that the growth of our economy is the greatest growth we have had in 20 years in this country. In the third quarter of last year, we actually had 8.2 percent growth. We had 4.2 percent growth in the last quarter. When you combine the last three quarters together, it is the best growth we have had since the 1980s, and we want to continue that.

The forecast for the future, in fact, is for much higher growth than we even thought was possible only a year ago. Why? Because the economy is really turning.

Along with that growing economy, we are seeing housing starts and permits at record highs. Home ownership in the country is at record highs right now. Minority home ownership is at record highs. This is what is happening out there in the real world, but it is good news about our economy that we want to continue.

We are also seeing here again that it is not just a growing economy and the fastest growth in 20 years, but the jobs are coming back. Unemployment in this country right now is 5.6 percent. That is lower unemployment, my colleagues, than we had in the 1970s, in the 1980s, or in the 1990s. The average unemployment in those three decades was higher than 5.6 percent. We are seeing unemployment at low levels, and we are seeing jobs coming back. There were 1.1 million jobs created in this country in the last 8 months. That is a million, 1.1 million, jobs in the last 8 months.

But let us talk about those jobs. Perhaps the gentleman would like to tell me what is wrong with 288,000 new jobs being added last month, 300,000 jobs in the month of March. We are seeing the jobs coming back big time, and this is not the time to change our direction and raise taxes on the American people and on small businesses and on our families. It is a time to continue to see this economy grow and prosper. That is what this budget provides.

It is a fair budget. It makes tough choices, but it also ensures that we continue to have the kind of economic growth that all of us hope to see.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to respond to the gentleman.

The gentleman said jobs are coming back, and the recent job growth is a welcome development, but, Mr. Speaker, we are still 2.2 million jobs below the level of jobs existing in the economy in March of 2001 when the last recession began. We have never seen such a jobless recovery as we have seen now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this budget does not just deepen the fiscal deficit, it deepens the moral deficit of cynicism that Americans feel increasingly towards this government, because this budget is built upon a misrepresentation. It is built upon the misrepresentation that we can have it all and never make a tough choice. It says you can keep raising what you spend, you can continue to reduce taxes, you can continue to borrow massive sums of money, and nothing bad will ever happen.

Something very bad is going to happen if this budget should become law. We are going to borrow more money, drive up interest rates, dry up capital for the private sector, and kill jobs in this country for many, many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I think the majority has a point when they put forward a 1-year budget resolution. Maybe there is intuitive wisdom in that, because if they follow this policy next year, they will not be writing the budget resolution, a new President and a new majority will.

We welcome and look forward to that day.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk about the economy on that side of the aisle. I do not blame them. I would not talk about this budget either. I, frankly, would not talk much about the economy either. A net loss of jobs to this date. Does anybody want to dispute that? Apparently not.

Let none of us be mistaken about what we are witnessing here on the floor today. Mr. Speaker, as important as the budget debate is at a time of record deficits, at a time of exploding debt, at a time of war, this debate is about far more than the budget. This debate marks the death, in time and place, of the so-called Republican revolution.

Ten years ago, the Republican Party recaptured the majority on a pledge of reform and a wave of hot rhetoric. Today, with this, and I use this word advisedly, dishonest, phony, political Band-Aid that the majority wants to call a budget, they, for all intents and purposes, are raising the white flag of surrender and announcing to all of America: We Republicans simply cannot govern. We Republicans simply cannot fulfill one of our most basic responsibilities, to pass a real, honest budget. We Republicans have been so blinded by our tax cut ideology, that we do not recognize the irresponsibility and, yes, the immorality of policies that force our children and grandchildren to pay our bills.

Mr. Speaker, this 1-year Republican budget is simply not credible. It brazenly attempts to conceal the record deficits that Republican policies have created and the fact that they have no plan to rein in those deficits. In fact, for the 1 year it does cover, it projects a deficit of $367 billion.

It conceals the fact that Republicans are robbing the Social Security trust fund to pay for Republican tax cuts skewed toward the highest-income taxpayers.

It conceals the fact they would freeze domestic priorities, such as health care and the environment, and cut them drastically in the future.

And it conceals the fact that this conference report would increase the statutory debt limit by $690 billion.

And not one of my colleagues on that side of the aisle has the courage to stand up and vote for that increase. Not one.

I have been here long enough to hear my colleagues railing about increasing the debt. Last year, my colleagues increased it even more, without a vote. It was increased to almost as much as the entire debt from 1789 to 1981 at the time I came to Congress. It was $981 billion then, and my Republican colleagues increased it $940-plus billion last year and another $670 in this budget.

So, Republicans, my friends, when you vote on this budget, know that you are voting to increase the debt by $670 billion.

This budget also conceals the fact that this conference report would lead us into further debt of $8 trillion.

□ 1945

Yet under the Hastert rule, there will be no debate and no vote on that action.

Mr. Speaker, with this conference report, the majority demonstrates its inability to govern and refuses to address the problems that its own policies have created. This is the last gasp of the revolution. I do not think that they will accept it on the other side, certainly they should not; and I do not think they will. I urge my colleagues to vote against this conference report.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE).

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here this evening to discuss how well we treated the veterans in this budget.

Since Republicans took control of Congress in 1995, we have made great strides in improving the benefits for our Nation's veterans. During that period, total spending on veterans has increased from $38 billion to $60 billion. That is a 58 percent increase compared with only a 36 percent increase during the previous 10 years when the Democrats were in control.

And since 1995, payments per veteran have actually risen by 79 percent. Let us take a moment to review some of the most important improvements. For example, in veterans medical care, the Republican Congress has expanded eligibility for medical care in 1996 and 1999. As a result, the number of veterans using the VA medical care has increased from 2.5 million in 1995 to almost 4.7 million today.

Since 1995, the total spending on veterans medical care has increased from $16.2 billion to $28.3 billion this year alone. That is a 75 percent increase. In veterans educational benefits, since 1995 monthly education benefit levels under the Montgomery-GI bill increased from $405 to $985, a 143 percent increase. This compares with only a 35 percent increase during the time that the Democrats had control.

And under the 40 years of Democrat control prior to us taking control, there was no progress made whatsoever on concurrent receipt. We are very fortunate now that military retirees who are injured in combat or while training for combat or who are 50 percent or greater service disabled are eligible for the first time to receive retirement benefits concurrent with their veterans disability compensation. There is no doubt that the Republicans have helped the veterans in this budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, let me make a couple of points clear because they have been brought up repeatedly throughout this debate.

First of all, how much have we reaped in the way of jobs as a result of these enormous tax cuts mainly benefiting wealthy Americans? What has been the pay-off in jobs?

This economy went into a recession in March 2001. If we take the level of jobs in the private sector at that point in time and compare it to today, we are short. There are 2.2 million fewer jobs today, notwithstanding the enormous stimulus of all these tax cuts, 2.2 million fewer jobs. For the first time since President Hoover, we have a recovery where we have not recovered the jobs even though we are 15 months, 18 months out from the trough of the recession. Actually, it is longer than that.

It has also been said that revenues have been rising, and they have taken an up-tick recently; but this chart shows when President Bush proposed his tax cuts, and we said, Mr. Bush, you are betting the budget on a blue-sky forecast; you are betting it for everything it may be able to sustain, this was the course of revenues that he projected, OMB projected with the tax cuts. With the $3.5 trillion worth of tax cuts that was enacted in 2001, the Bush administration nevertheless projected that revenues would rise and stabilize at that level.

Here is the actual level. The broken blue line is the projected level, the red line which descends precipitously is the actual level of revenues, and the difference between these revenues here, which is about $1.1 trillion and this level here, which is below $750 billion, is at least $250 billion. Revenues have not risen; taxes have not rebounded. We have not had the supply-side phenomenon now, as we did not have in 1981. This is the actual record.

Let me show Members the situation we find ourselves in which makes it absolutely essential for us to use the budget resolution, the one tool that we have which deals in the aggregate with everything we have spent and everything we take in by way of taxes.

This is the curve on which we were proceeding in 2001 when Mr. Bush came to office. He inherited an advantage that no President in modern times has had, a budget in surplus. He was in surplus by $236 billion in fiscal year 2000, and this was the course that was projected by his economists at the Office of Management and Budget. This is the course that we have determined we are on today. If you are just for what Iraq is likely to cost and what Afghanistan is likely to cost, if you assume that all of the tax cuts are going to be renewed, which is a politically likely assumption, this is where we are. We get a little up-tick from the economy, but the bottom line shows that having risen a bit from a projected deficit of $521 billion this year, we go up a little bit over $324 billion, but 10 years from now we are right where we started: $502 billion. We tread water. We do nothing. We accumulate debt, and that is why we are having in this resolution to raise the debt ceiling by $690 billion, because year after year we are stacking debt on top of debt. That is the result of this budget, and this resolution does nothing on the revenue side or the spending side.

We have heard a lot of talk about how we have this runaway spending, but let me show where the spending is occurring. If we look at all of the spending in the Federal budget and you take these spikes in the budget where spending in certain accounts is faster than current services, guess what those accounts are: defense, homeland security, the response to 9/11, accounts for 4 fiscal years accounts for 90 to 95 percent of all of the increase in spending over and above current services.

There are two points Members can draw from this. First of all, the President has requested this. We provided it. We had to spend it.

Secondly, the likelihood this is going to be reined in significantly, defense, it goes up to $422 billion. That is without including the supplementals. This is not going to be reined in significantly. So to talk about accounts where spending is growing, we cannot expect in the near term any significant cuts in that area.

What we continually hear talk about is the sector of the budget called domestic nonhomeland security, domestic discretionary spending. That is it right there. That is one-sixth of the budget. It is about $384 billion. The budget deficit is bigger than that. Clearly, this has the FBI, the National Park Service, the court service, the whole operation of the government in it. Clearly, we cannot squeeze enough blood out of that turnip to begin to get rid of this enormous deficit.

Let me show Members one final chart just to show it can be done. This budget resolution does not do it, but it can be done. When President Clinton came to office in January 1992, we had just recorded our biggest deficit in history, $290 billion at the end of fiscal year 1992. He came into office in 1993. Spending was at 22.5 percent of GDP. We did it by lowering spending and raising revenues. It can be done again, but this budget resolution does not do it. Let us vote it down and send them back to conference and start over again.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) for the purpose of a colloquy between myself and the gentleman from Texas, and ask the gentleman to summarize.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, in the Senate Budget Committee, they adopted a provision which would have reduced the maximum payments farmers can receive under the 2002 farm bill, and I asked the gentleman to address that during the conference. Is that provision still in the budget?

Earlier this year, the Senate Budget Committee adopted a provision in its budget resolution which assumes enactment of legislation reducing the maximum payments farmers can receive from commodity support programs. As the Chairman knows, the 2002 Farm Bill addressed this issue through a delicate compromise acceptable to rural members across different regions of the country. Any erosion of this compromise would penalize producers in my West Texas district who would be punished for the efficiencies they have achieved. To clarify for my constituents who strongly oppose the Senate provision, I would like to ask the distinguished Chairman of the Budget Committee if the Senate payment limit provision was dropped in conference?

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

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, that provision is still in the budget. We worked to preserve that. I appreciate the gentleman's leadership on that. The provision in the Senate-passed budget resolution concerning the farm payment limitation is not included in the conference version. I thank the gentleman for his leadership and his continued efforts in this regard.

The gentleman is correct and I appreciate his leadership on this issue and work to ensure that we keep the promises of the Farm Bill. The provision in the Senate passed budget resolution concerning farm payment limitations is not included in this conference version. Any major changes to farm payment limits or any other agricultural policies should be addressed by the Agriculture Committee which has jurisdiction over these issues.

While the House passed budget resolution, H. Con. Res. 393, included $371 million over five years in reconciliation instructions for the Agriculture Committee, these instructions, which were never intended to reduce critical farm commodity support programs, are not included in the conference agreement.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his efforts on behalf of my constituents in West Texas.

My constituents will be most pleased and relieved by the decision to remove the Senate's farm payment limit proposal in the conference version of the budget resolution and the Chairman's continued affirmation that neither this budget, nor the House version, will reduce any Farm Bill program payments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Without objection, each Member will be allowed to revise and extend their remarks.

There was no objection.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), a very valued Member and the vice chairman of the committee.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, as we have developed this fiscal year 2005 budget resolution, I have listened carefully to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. The one common theme for the many budget alternatives offered by the Congressional Black Caucus, the Blue Dogs, and the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on the Budget on behalf of the Democratic Caucus has been higher taxes and more spending.

I have also heard too frequently that my side of the aisle is cutting spending for important programs, like education, veterans, and health care. The fact is when you look at Federal spending for the last few years, you will see few programs that have not received significant increases, in most cases very significant increases. Only in Washington do we call a spending increase a cut.

I think our budget can be summed up in one word: responsible.

We think it is responsible to control spending at a time of mounting budget deficits. By freezing nondefense, nonhomeland security spending for 1 year, we are taking a painful, but necessary, step towards fiscal responsibility. I strongly support many of these programs, but I also know being fiscally responsible requires tough choices, like we made in the late 1990s, including Members saying no to increases to many popular programs.

We think it is responsible to not raise taxes during a period of economic recovery. The tax relief we passed in 2001 and 2003 fueled the economy to 8.2 percent growth in the third quarter of 2003, the highest growth rate in 20 years; 4.1 percent growth in the fourth quarter of last year; and 4.2 percent growth in the first quarter of 2004. Additionally, the unemployment rate declined from 6.3 percent in June 2003 to 5.6 percent in April 2004. While this substantial growth in the economy is welcome news, we know there is still work to do, particularly with employment. We think it is important to continue the policies that have led to the current economic recovery. The fact is there are more jobs today than ever before, but there are more people looking for work.

We also think it is responsible to plan for ongoing military operations around the world. All of us, on both sides of the aisles, want to make sure we provide whatever resources are necessary for the men and women of our Armed Forces who are risking their lives as we speak. I look at the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) as a good example. For this reason, we have provided $50 billion for fiscal year 2005 for the additional cost associated with our operations in Iraq and Afghanistan.

I would just add it is absolutely critical we give this budget the force of law. The Committee on the Budget has marked up legislation that would reinstate discretionary spending caps and pay-as-you-go on mandatory spending. I appreciate the leadership's willingness to consider this legislation soon after we return in June.

Mr. Speaker, from 1997 until 2001, the books of the Federal budget showed that we were running a surplus. For the 40 years prior to that, the country was running deficits. I was grateful that we played a significant role in crafting the budget in the 1990s that not only got us to balance, but got us there ahead of time. We did it by cutting taxes, controlling the growth of spending, and growing the economy.

□ 2000

This budget begins to use that model to address the deficit and get our country's financial house in order.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

It is often asked at a time, is America better off than it was 4 years ago? Is it better off at all?

Well, it is.

Homeland security. Since 2000, we have greatly strengthened our homeland security, in part because of the budgets that we have passed to make sure that our homeland is protected through strength. We have created the Department of Homeland Security and more than doubled the funding for homeland security since September 11. With the improved resources, we have increased presence in key ports, the Bio Watch program now on many large U.S. cities, and over 500,000 first responders have been trained. America's homeland security is better off.

Defense. Over the past 3 years, we have made great strides in correcting the defense deficit done in the early 1990s, including increasing the Department of Defense's annual budget by over $110 billion to prosecute the global war on terrorism, greatly improving the military quality of life. Our defense is better off than it was 4 years ago, and it is better off under this budget.

Our economy. The economy is growing now in 2004, the best in 20 years, not on the verge of a recession the way it was when President Clinton left office. Real gross domestic product growth is at its highest pace in 20 years. Payroll employment is growing strongly now. We have had 1.1 million jobs added to this economy just since last August. Manufacturing jobs are increasing, the unemployment rate is falling, and housing markets are the strongest in 20 years. The economy is much better off than it was 4 years ago and it will be better if we continue the policies of this budget.

Our budget is the blueprint that allows these policies to continue, and we will all be better off if we adopt that budget here today. We need to adopt it to provide the strength of this country, the growth for our economy, and the

opportunity for our future. And we can do it without a tax increase and reduce the deficit by over $100 billion next year alone. That is what this budget accomplishes. The other side offers nothing but fear and trying to talk down the economy and trying to scare people about our future. That is not an agenda. Fear and anger is not an agenda.

The agenda we need to adopt today is a positive one of strength, growth, and opportunity for our future; and we can do it if we adopt this conference report on the budget. I ask for the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this Budget Conference Report and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support.

I want to thank Budget Chairman JIM NUSSLE for his yeoman's work under difficult circumstances.

My friends, this is a war-time budget.

We are at war, a war started on September 11, 2001.

This is world war, stretching from Afghanistan to Iraq, to almost every other continent on the globe.

This war has two battlefields.

One is the foreign theater, where our troops are fighting a more conventional war, fought by our brave soldiers in Afghanistan and Iraq. The Department of Defense is coordinating this fight.

The other battlefield is here at home, where we are fighting against unknown terrorists. Our Department of Homeland Security is coordinating that fight.

This budget includes responsible increases for both Departments. It also includes 50 billion dollars for possible additional expenditures on the war. Everything else is kept at a freeze level.

To those who don't like this budget, I say this is the most fiscally responsible budget conference report we have considered on the House floor since I have been in the Congress.

Now some of our friends on the other side of the aisle don't like the modest number we include for tax relief in this budget. But they won't be satisfied until we raise taxes on every man, woman and child in America.

We keep the tax cuts in place because the tax cuts keep the economy growing. In fact, since we last met on the floor to talk about the budget, the economy has grown so quickly, that the estimates of the 10-year budget deficit have dropped by a hundred billion dollars. That is why we want to keep the tax cuts in place. To keep more people working, to keep the economy growing, to keep America strong, and to win this war. That is why we need to pass this budget.

Mr. Speaker, let's pass this budget and start the process of getting our work done for the rest of the year.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in this distinguished body wanting more for the American public we were sworn to represent. It was my sincere hope that after 7 weeks in a Conference with Members of the Senate, that Republicans would find a way to make this budget better than it was; instead they somehow found a way to make it worse. Not only does this conference report maintain the prior insufficient funding for vital issues like education, veterans funding, and Homeland Security; but this conference report may very well be the most irresponsible piece of budget legislation to ever come before this body.

The fact that this conference report only truly provides budget figures for 1 year goes beyond being irresponsible, but is in fact cowardly. It is cowardly because the Republicans are putting out a 1-year budget to hide from the long term effects of their own reckless fiscal policies. The truth about this conference report is the same truth that was evident from President Bush's budget and then the House version of the budget; the truth is that Republicans will go to any length to permanently extend tax cuts that benefit the rich.

No longer can Republicans in either body of Congress claim that Democrats are the ones who hold irresponsible fiscal policies. It has been in fact the Democrats who time after time have argued for a lower deficit and more reasonable planning. It has been Democrats who have been working tirelessly to get our budget back into balance. Instead of embracing these goals, goals that the American people clearly care about, the Republicans have decided instead to pursue an extreme agenda that only truly benefits upper-class Americans.

The last time Congress provided a one-year budget was 1979. Any reasonable person can tell you why that is true, because you need to know that the decisions we make today will still make sense in the future. The sad truth is that this conference report is bad now and getting exponentially worse in the future; and the Republicans know it's true.

A vote for this conference report is also a vote to increase the debt limit by $690 billion, to a new limit of $8.1 trillion. When in the history of this Nation or any other nation in fact, has it been in the best interest to incur more debt? Again, the truth is clear, Republicans have used this budget for one reason and one reason alone, to make permanent their tax cuts for the wealthy. In fact, their oneyear budget provides $122 billion less in defense funding than the President has requested for 2006 through 2009. Instead of making a reasonable compromise, Republicans in both chambers of Congress have found a way to increase the debt while still under-funding vital national priorities.

This conference report may also be classified as cowardly because not only does it shy away from budget enforcement rules, but it runs and hides. Once again, the truth is open and known; Republicans refuse to have any reasonable constraint on their reckless tax policies.

The most disturbing aspect of this conference report is the way it avoids practical Pay-As-You-Go (PAYGO) budget enforcement rules. For years, the calls for fiscal responsibility were deafening from the Republicans in this body and yet when they have the opportunity to truly be responsible they decide to take the course of recklessness. When Democrats wanted to increase funding for necessary programs in education, veterans funding, and Homeland Security we were told that increasing spending would harm the economy. Yet, when Republicans themselves present wholesale changes in tax policy that have only been proven to benefit the wealthy, they are unprepared and unwilling to offer any offsets. This conference report will make these drastic tax cuts permanent with having any offsets to help bring our budget in to balance. Revenues coming in to the Federal Government are at an all-time low and yet this nation's needs are increasing.

This conference report represents the kind of irresponsible budget policies that have failed this Nation before. Republicans have not lived up to the promises they have made in the past. Unfortunately our children will be the ones forced to live with the consequences if we allow this conference report to pass today.

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as we know, the policies we've put in place to support economic growth are working.

But in addition to getting and keeping the economy going, we must also control spending. It matters. If you're going to say that deficits matter, you'd better believe that spending matters. All spending must be paid for, either through taxes or borrowing—and both are burdens on the economy. And for that simple reason alone, controlling spending is itself a policy for sustaining stronger economic growth.

This budget calls for several measures to help us get our hands around what has become an unsustainable rate of spending growth. This includes holding the line on all nondefense, nonhomeland security spending.

As Chairman NUSSLE mentioned earlier, this won't be easy. Many of us here in Congress have gotten pretty comfortable signing off on huge spending increases, and free-flowing new spending.

But success at keeping taxes and spending down will mean a stronger economy and better standards of living for our Nation. If we don't control spending the result will be higher borrowing or higher taxes.

Federal Reserve Chairman Greenspan has agreed that we need to control spending, not raise taxes, if we want to make sure that we don't harm our economy and our standards of living.

Here is his quote:

> Tax rate increases of sufficient dimension to deal with our looming fiscal problems arguably pose significant risks to economic growth and the revenue base. The exact magnitude of such risks are very difficult to estimate, but they are of enough concern, in my judgment, to warrant aiming to close the fiscal gap primarily, if not wholly, from outlay restraint.

The simple translation of what he said is that we need to restrain spending because the economy would be hurt by higher taxes. Our budget resolution does just that: it restrains spending and keeps taxes from increasing. That's good for our economy, and it's good for our Nation.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, the Budget Resolution Conference Report marks the end of a long, arduous process, during which our staff do most of the work and get little of the credit they are due. I would like to thank my excellent staff for their expertise and energy and tireless work. They are as follows: Tom Kahn, Sarah Abernathy, Arthur Burris, Linda Bywaters, Dan Ezrow, Jennifer Friedman, Jason Lumia, Sheila McDowell, Diana Meredith, Joe Minarik, Kimberly Overbeek, Scott Russell, Andy Smullian, Lisa Venus, Andrea Weathers, and Jesse Contario.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the Republican budget that we are being asked to vote on today. For several years now, responsible Members of this body have been speaking out against a budgeting process that has been getting more absurd and undemocratic by the year.

But I believe this year that the Republican leadership has outdone itself. Again this year, Republicans have given us a budget that fails to pay for health care, fails to pay for schools, fails to pay for veterans, and fails to pay for roads. Again this year, they have given us a budget that increases the debt that our children will have to pay, tying a thousand-pound weight around the neck of our economy.

But this year, the Republican leadership has added a new twist. This budget is structured so that it cannot even be passed by the other body and become law.

For those Americans outside of Washington who are watching this tonight, you deserve to know something about the cynical exercise we are engaged in here. The vote we will cast tonight will be purely symbolic. It will only be symbolic because some Republicans on the other side of the Capitol Building are finally saying enough is enough—that we cannot continue to rack up debt and force it onto our children. I regret that the Republican leadership in this House has not yet reached the same conclusion and decided to get our fiscal house in order.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to S. Con. Res. 95. As too many of us in this body know, this budget is a sham. It fails to account for the real costs of waging the war in Iraq and Afghanistan. At least on the House side, it allows tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans to go forward unchecked, while spending for important domestic programs is laid to waste.

Among those high priorities that will be severely underfunded is veterans' health care. Committee on Veterans Affairs Chairman CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH and I submitted Views and Estimates to the Budget Committee requesting that it add $2.5 billion to VA's budget for fiscal year 2004. This was not a ''pie in the sky'' request, but rather, focused on maintaining current services, restoring funds from the administration's failed proposals to increase copayments and introduce new enrollment fees, and slightly enhancing some services that will have to respond to the needs of demobilizing troops. The resolution we are voting on today will make less than half of these funds available to VA's discretionary programs.

Mr. Speaker, sadly, I realize VA programs are among those considered ''protected'' in this budget fiasco. Many social programs will fare worse. Unfortunately, that's not good enough for our veterans, especially during a time of war when we should be most sensitive toward keeping our promises to the men and women who have borne the battle.

Many of the major veterans' organizations have expressed great concern about the budget. As underfunded as the budget was by the Committee's reckoning, it is even more so according to the Independent Budget. The four major veterans service organizations who prepare this document estimate that VA requires almost $4 billion to maintain its services in fiscal year 2005. And that's not the worst of it—budget process bills that may be put forth in the near future may use the projections of future years spending to bind us to even more inadequate budgets. So as bad as fiscal year 2005 looks, the outlook for future years could be even bleaker.

Mr. Speaker, we must do better by the veterans who have served us. We must do better by the American people. Vote ''no'' on accepting this Conference Report.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, once again I rise in opposition to the irresponsible budget conference report before us today.

This conference report, for the first time in over twenty years, only provides us with a one-year budget plan. In the first version of the bill, my colleagues attempted to use a five-year budget instead of a ten-year budget to hide the massive fiscal irresponsibility of their plan. Now, because even a five-year plan was too much, they have reduced it even further to merely one year. There is no plan to reduce the deficit or to provide funding for this Nation's most important domestic programs, for our veterans, our seniors and our children. This rascality on the part of my Republican colleagues is unacceptable. The American people deserve to know the outrageous bills the Bush Administration is racking up in their name and with our children's credit.

Further, this bill included $55.2 billion in additional tax giveaways which will only add to the already ballooning deficit. My Republican colleagues will not even apply the ''pay-as-you-go'' (PAYGO) method to these tax giveaways because they know we cannot afford them. The PAYGO enforcement rule is a mere common sense attempt to steer clear of unnecessary excessive spending. This is especially necessary to afford the tremendous costs of war which we face today. In this budget, the PAYGO rule is only applied to entitlement spending for one year, and in reality would only apply to legislation in the Senate.

If this budget passes, we will also be agreeing to increase the debt limit by $690 billion, to $8.1 trillion. Including this measure in the budget and not as stand-alone legislation, is merely an attempt to conceal the catastrophic costs incurred by the fiscal policy of this Administration and Congress.

On the Medicare side, Republicans offer no proposals to improve the insufficient Medicare drug benefit enacted last year. Also absent from this budget are other proposals that could improve the Medicare program such as funding for increased nursing home staffing and quality improvement or fixing the flawed payment system for doctors. Nor are there any proposals to protect the Medicare program from being overcharged and defrauded by private insurance companies and Health Maintenance Organizations. And of course, there is the similarly outrageous effort of this White House to hide from both Democrats and Republicans the true cost of their Medicare privatization bill, which truly makes me wonder whether any of their budget numbers can even be trusted.

This budget continues the Republican war on the environment. The President and Republicans will try to sound like they are environmentalists, but the truth is in this budget which contains drastic cuts to major environmental protection programs. This budget cuts discretionary environmental spending by $900 billion below 2004 levels. My Republican colleagues would rather give tax breaks to their fat cat friends than invest in clean water and cleaning up toxic waste sites.

In addition, this budget does nothing to protect the Social Security trust fund, five years from when the first of the baby boomer generation reach retirement age. These Republicans' fiscal mismanagement will squander the entire $1 trillion Social Security surplus, adding to the ballooning deficit and throwing the long term economic security of millions of Americans into doubt.

For education, No Child Left Behind is already dramatically under funded and this budget will continue this disgrace. We cannot leave the states to pick up the tab for this federally mandated program. Special education, after school programs, teacher training, Pell grants, Perkins loans, and vocational education are all either frozen or cut under this draconian budget. I wonder if my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are trying to ensure that public schools fail so they can privatize the entire system?

We need to get back to fiscal responsibility and get the nation's economy back on track before this economic crisis gets even further out of control. We need to take care of our veterans, our children and our environment. We need to ensure that our citizens have healthcare and education and opportunities. This conference report is nothing but a sham and I urge my colleagues to reject it.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to the conference report on S. Con. Res. 95, the Republican budget.

Rhode Islanders are facing challenges on many fronts, and the budget resolution gave us an opportunity to address many of them, including education, health care, and housing shortfalls. Instead, Republicans chose to continue borrowing money from future generations to pay for their failed fiscal policies that have left the economy more than two million jobs lighter since the beginning of the current Administration. Under the Republican budget, the obstacles we face today will only grow in the coming years.

Although I did not believe it possible, the conference report before us today is actually less fiscally responsible than the budget which barely passed this House in March by a razor thin margin of 215–212. As a member of the Select Committee on Homeland Security and the Armed Services Committee, I understand the unprecedented challenges our nation is facing at home and abroad. All of us want to ensure that our troops have all the resources needed to protect us and themselves at home and abroad. Both the physical and economic security of our families are at stake. Working within this framework, the Republican leadership could have negotiated a bipartisan compromise that both parties could support, but instead continued down an ideological path without reaching out to Democrats.

This budget has too many shortfalls to list, so I will just cite a few of the most egregious problems. For the first time in more than two decades, the budget conference report fails to specify multi-year policy numbers. By providing the costs for only a single year of programs and policies, the budget provides no plan to reduce the deficit and no commitment that critical resources for defense, homeland security, education, health care, veterans, and other priorities will be available in future years. The absence of meaningful numbers beyond the first year masks the true consequences of Republican priorities.

In addition, this budget automatically raises the debt limit by nearly $700 billion, to $8.1 trillion. There will be no further debate or votes on this crucial issue that affects the pocketbooks of every American. At a time when the CBO anticipates a budget deficit of more than $400 billion, Congress must make the difficult decisions to return our budget to balance, but the Republicans failed to do so.

Finally, the budget rejects legitimate Pay-As-You-Go enforcement rules to keep the

budget deficit in check. The PAYGO rules would ensure that the government does not increase spending or cut taxes unless these changes would not add to the deficit. PAYGO rules fueled the unprecedented economic and job growth during the 1990s, but the budget before us chooses irresponsible deficits over fiscal restraint.

Deficit spending has stymied job growth and is plaguing our economy. We are facing a record deficit with no plan to return the budget to balance. No Rhode Islander would write a check without sufficient funds to cash that check. Neither should the government.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the Republican budget and working towards a bipartisan, fiscally responsible plan.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 213, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 198]

YEAS—216

Aderholt
Akin
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Collins
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goodlatte
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Upton
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—213

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Becerra
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Case
Chandler
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frost
Gephardt
Gerlach
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kleczka
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Simmons
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—5

Ballance
Delahunt
Hayworth
Leach
Tauzin

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE) (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 2028

Mr. SERRANO and Mr. GERLACH changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. HOBSON and Mr. BACHUS changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3473

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3473.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 648 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4200.

□ 2028

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4200) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2005 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2005, and for other purposes, with Mr. SWEENEY (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 108–499 offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 416, noes 4, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 199]

AYES—416

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Becerra
Bell
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Collins
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—4

Conyers
Kucinich
Lee
Woolsey

NOT VOTING—13

Baird
Ballance
Burr
Delahunt
Dooley (CA)
Emerson
Gephardt
Hayworth
Jones (NC)
Leach
Murtha
Smith (WA)
Tauzin

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY) (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 2045

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 199, the Hunter amendment, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 108–499.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. WELDON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania:

At the end of subtitle A of title XII (page 424, after line 12), insert the following new section:

SEC. 12____. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON DESTRUCTION OF ABU GHRAIB PRISON IN IRAQ.

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

(1) Under the regime of Saddam Hussein, the Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq was one of the world's most notorious prisons.

(2) Under that regime, as many as 50,000 men and women were jammed into the prison at one time in 12 feet by 12 feet cells.

(3) Under that regime, many people were tortured and executed in the Abu Ghraib prison.

(4) Recent activities have further highlighted the horrible memories that Abu Ghraib stands for.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that the Secretary of Defense should assist the Iraqi Government, with the approval of that government, in destroying the Abu Ghraib prison and replacing it with a modern detention facility.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 648, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON).

□ 2045

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment with my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA).

This amendment is a sense of Congress that gives the authority to the administration and the Pentagon with the appropriate approval of the new government of Iraq to dismantle the Abu Ghraib Prison that has been the site of so much torture under Saddam's rule and the most recent embarrassment we have had with our troops that have been administering that prison.

In the era of Saddam Hussein, Mr. Chairman, Abu Ghraib, 20 miles west of Baghdad, was one of the world's most notorious prisons with tortures, weekly executions, and vile living conditions. As many as 50,000 men and women were jammed into Abu Ghraib at one time in 12-by-12-foot cells that were little more than human holding pits.

Under Saddam Hussein, there were 4,000 prisoners executed in this prison in 1984. In December of 1997 more than 800 prisoners were executed, including 30 members of the Iraqi National Congress in an effort to clean the prison. On April 27, 1998, between 6 a.m. and 9 p.m. 2,000 inmates were executed in mass firing squads and hanging halls in an ongoing cleaning of the prison.

On December 13, 1998, there was an execution of 81 political detainees, including 18 members of the armed services.

Between October and December of 2000, Qusay Hussein executed 1,000 prisoners at this site. The closed wing of the prison housed only Shiite prisoners who were kept in 12-by-12-foot cells containing an average of 40 prisoners each.

Many of the Kurdish prisoners who were held in this prison and were out of sight were subjected to experimental chemical and biological programs. If we look at the studies by Amnesty

International and other U.N. groups, under Saddam Hussein, torture victims in Iraq in this prison were blindfolded, stripped, suspended from their wrists for long hours. Electric shocks and probes were used, including areas of the genitals, ears, the tongue and fingers. They were beaten and whipped. Every type of treatment that was inhumane and unimaginable was done in this prison.

It should have been closed down and it should have been torn down when we liberated Iraq, and it was not done. Unfortunately, for several months last year a small number of our soldiers, as yet to be determined, were involved in embarrassing situations with Iraqi prisoners that we detained.

Now, our justice system works very quickly. And I am proud to report to our colleagues today that within 2 hours, the first soldier that was involved in committing acts that many would call in violation of the Geneva Final Accord was convicted, having pled guilty to crimes against prisoners. This will follow very quickly a justice system that will not drag out for months or years, but within a matter of weeks will hold our American service personnel, a very small number of them, accountable for acts that they committed at this same prison.

What we are saying in this amendment very simply, Mr. Chairman, is assuming the new Iraqi Government, which will take place on July 1, agrees, and it will be their decision because it will be their country, then we are encouraging our Defense Department to work with that government in tearing down this symbol of terrorism, in tearing down this symbol of torture and hatred, to send a clear signal to the Iraqi people that this era of terrible atrocities has really ended; and a new prison will be constructed either at that site or some other site, to allow Iraq to house the prisoners that they have to hold for proper trial and for jurisprudence.

It is the sense of the Congress that the Secretary should assist the Iraqi Government, with the approval of that government, in destroying the prison and replacing it with a modern detention facility.

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

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman is recognized for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, while I strongly support the underlying bill and fully respect the intent of the esteemed Member's amendment, I reluctantly rise in opposition to it, which I believe at present could potentially result in the alacritous demolition of Iraq's Abu Ghraib Prison.

In so rising, I site the present disposition of another notorious site of murder and repression, Ireland's Kilmainham Jail. Built in Dublin by the British, from 1796 until the release of its last prisoner and future Irish president, Eamon de Valera, in 1924, Kilmainham Jail played a grim host to the incarceration, repression, and execution of Irish prisoners by both the English and then, most tragically, by the Irish themselves.

After initially falling into disrepair and dilapidation, the jail's restoration was commenced in 1960 and eventually concluded in the 1980s by the Irish Republic's Office of Public Works. Today, over 150,000 visitors a year come from all over the world to view Kilmainham Jail, for it constitutes a historical mirror into the torturous times which culminated in Irish independence.

In its present state, Kilmainham Jail has been wrested from its inhuman captors' use as a paradigm of oppression and death, and has instead been presented to humanity as an enduring testament to the transcendence and ultimate triumph of the human spirit in the face of evil.

Mr. Chairman, so too must stand Abu Ghraib Prison. For decades, Abu Ghraib Prison housed the murder, torture and rape of Iraqi citizens at the hands of a butcher, Saddam Hussein, and most tragically has seen the inhumane treatment of Iraqi prisoners by an unrepresentative smattering of despicable captors.

Thus, just as Irish suffering secured Irish ownership of Kilmainham Jail's fate, Iraqi suffering has secured Iraqi ownership over Abu Ghraib Prison's fate.

Abu Ghraib is not America's to obliterate as a site of evil. It is Iraq's to elevate as a testament to history and a caution of the future.

Yet, this is but my opinion, for not being an Iraqi, such is not my decision to make. Nor, I caution, is this a decision to be made by the Coalition Provisional Authority or the Iraqi Governing Council. The CPA and IGC are transitory stewards of Iraqi sovereignty. They are not the sovereign government comprised of the Iraqi people. Thus, if the CPA and/or the IGC makes a determination on Abu Ghraib's future, especially its demolition, such an action will be viewed by many Iraqis as having been done at the behest of the U.S. and our allies and not on behalf of the Iraqi people by the Iraqi people.

In a country and a time teeming with missed opportunities and impending deadlines, let us not miss this chance to act presciently, not precipitously.

I make then the following proposal: Immediately upon the transfer of sovereignty from the Coalition Provisional Authority to the Iraqi people on July 1, the United States must formally tender to the Iraqi government Abu Ghraib Prison. Then the Iraqi people and their new sovereign government, without external pressure and through free speech, debate, assembly, petition and all lawful political processes, the very political freedoms we are trying to impart to them, can justly make their final determination upon Abu Ghraib's final fate.

Nothing could more clearly and fully exhibit our true and sustained commitment to our own democratic principles and to the Iraqi people that our manifest comprehension of a few depraved captors' shame does not eclipse thousands of Iraqis' pain.

This is the sovereign Iraqis' decision to make. It is not ours to insist upon or suggest but only to abide.

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON).

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I happen to think the gentleman has a good amendment. In my opening statement on the bill in the committee, if the gentleman will recall, I suggested this very, very strongly. And without going into great detail, I will just reiterate what I said then and I will agree with the amendment of the gentleman.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished ranking member and good friend for his comments.

Just for the record, I would remind my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. McCOTTER) that there will no provisional authority when this bill becomes law. The fact that we vote on this tomorrow does nothing because this bill has to go through the process of working with the other body and being signed by the President. That cannot happen and will not happen until probably October or November of this year.

By October or November of this year, there will be no more provisional authority; it will not exist. There will be an Iraqi Government. And that is what this amendment says; it says only if the Iraqi Government suggests and approves that this action be taken is our Defense Department encouraged to cooperate in that effort.

I would say to my friend and colleague, in the institution he cited in Ireland, there was no U.S. involvement that I am aware of in committing atrocities at that Irish prison. And so perhaps that prison stands to the atrocities caused by those people in Ireland who committed them.

In this case, as all Arabs know, there were in fact very serious incidents caused by Americans. I do not want that prison to be a testament to American atrocities when the greater symbol for the Iraqi people should be the liberation of that country so that they can take care of their own jurisprudence as we have called for and allow them to move forward without the stigma of what was accomplished by a very small number of American soldiers in that prison.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I just want to join the gentleman and join the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) for what I think is a smart amendment that really brings all of us together on this floor.

We just got through voting almost unanimously on a resolution, or a sense of Congress, that we condemn the acts that occurred. The gentleman just noted that procedures occurred earlier this morning that addressed the question of some of those Reservists and National Guard.

Sometimes we disagree on how far up the chain this accountability should be held, but we do not disagree, if you will, on the symbol that that prison now represents; and as well, we do not disagree on the fact that so many men and women are on the front lines, honorably serving, whether it is in Iraq, whether it is in Bosnia or whether it is in Afghanistan.

I believe this is a solid statement. We know, putting aside the tragedies that happened, that we do not discard, I find them horrific, that this is a place that Saddam Hussein used to cut off fingers, to mutilate, to dehumanize, if you will, over the decades. And now, of course, we have these horrific acts by soldiers which we do not uphold.

This is a forward step. And I would think that if we are moving to a democracy, we do not need any more of the hanging prisons located in Iraq, a new democracy that we are all trying to get to. So I would argue beyond my plea for accountability at the very highest levels for these terrible incidents.

I would say this is a very smart amendment. I ask my colleague to support it.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments.

I would say in closing, Mr. Chairman, this does not mandate one thing. This does not require one action. This amendment simply says to the Department of Defense, if the new Iraqi legitimate government decides they want to proceed, we should assist in tearing down this prison. If the new Iraqi regime and government decides they do not want to proceed, then this amendment has no bearing.

I think it makes sense and I think it lets the new Iraqi Government know that we will be there if they decide to destroy this symbol of terrorism. That should be their decision. And if they make that decision, we should authorize our Defense Department to assist them in removing this symbol of terrorism and torture that has been there for so long.

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

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

First, I am aware of America's not having a role in Kilmainham Jail or grandpa would not have come here in the first place, quite likely. I never implied that. It was never stated.

I think the fact that we are having this debate is a worthwhile debate, but it is not what is reflected in the amendment. If the new Iraqi Government applies, if the Iraqi Government referenced in the amendment on line 17 applies to the new sovereign Iraqi Government, it should say so. And since this seems to be the age of deadlines or timelines, put July 1 or later.

It also should not suggest only one course of action. It should suggest that after a new sovereign Iraqi Government decides what they want to do with that facility, I cannot use that word, that evil site, then we should be able to assist them in whatever decision they make.

I was talking to another Member today, it was kind of ironic, about this situation, and he mentioned he had been to Dachau. And there are two testaments to evil that I can right off think of, Dachau and Auschwitz where America liberated.

Auschwitz, which is in Poland, still stands intact. Dachau is a fence with pictures; Dachau is in Germany.

This is an intensely personal decision for the Iraqi people. It should be done through their sovereign government. There should be no external pressure or suggestions as to what they should do.

I believe that a better amendment would have been that we will assist them and the new sovereign government after July 1 in whatever disposition of that prison that they sought and saw fit, based upon the suffering on that site.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCOTTER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this legislation will pass after July 1, so there is no way that this legislation can apply to a government that exists today because, by the time this legislation is completed, it will be the time frame of October or November or later this year. So by the time this bill is signed into law, there will be no provisional authority. There will be a legitimate Iraqi Government duly elected by the Iraq people under their constitution.

So to reference a date is a moot point because by the time this legislation is passed, that date will far have been over.

□ 2100

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, in a time of war events often lead legislation and precede it.

I have the utmost respect for the sponsors of this amendment and their intent. I believe him about the legislative process. It is my concern that come July 1 Abu Ghraib prison may not stand anymore and may not be there for a new sovereign Iraqi Government to make that determination. That is my concern; and the drafting of the amendment, as such, could arguably allow that to happen with the implicit consent of a House that passed this amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON).

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House report 108–499.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. MEEK OF FLORIDA

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Chairman pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. MEEK of Florida:

At the end of title IX (page 348, after the matter following line 21), insert the following new section:

SEC. 9___. SECRETARY OF DEFENSE GUIDANCE ON IDENTIFICATION AND INTERNAL TRANSMISSION OF CRITICAL INFORMATION.

(a) DEFENSE GUIDANCE.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish criteria for determining the types of critical information required to be made known expeditiously to senior decision makers in the Department of Defense. The types of information specified should be matters of extraordinary significance and potential strategic impact and should be immediately necessary to facilitate timely information management in the high-level, decision-making process affecting successful mission accomplishment. The Secretary may from time to time modify the list to suit the current strategic situation, as necessary. The Secretary should provide to the Secretaries of the military departments, the commanders of deployed forces, and other elements of the Department of Defense guidance for the purposes of identifying those critical information requirements.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The guidance under subsection (a) shall include, at a minimum, requirement for identification of the following:

(1) Any incident that may require a military contingency based on the incident's nature, gravity, or potential for significant adverse consequences to United States citizens, military personnel, or assets, including an incident that provides opportunities for significant adverse publicity of a nature that could have a strategic impact.

(2) Any event, development, or situation that can be reasonably assumed to escalate into a significant adverse incident described in paragraph (1).

(3) Any deficiency or error in policy, standards, or training that can be reasonably assumed to foster significant adverse incidents described in paragraph (1).

(c) POLICY FOR TRANSMISSION OF INFORMATION TO OSD.—The Secretary of Defense

shall establish a policy for the transmission from any element of the Department of Defense as expeditiously as possible to the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff of any report, assessment, or evaluation commissioned from any level within the Department of Defense that results in the identification of any of the items on the list required by subsection (a). As part of that policy, the Secretary should establish a timetable for transmission of any such report, assessment, or evaluation to the responsible major command upon receipt of the final document by the commissioning authority.

(d) TIME FOR ISSUANCE OF GUIDANCE.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish the list required by subsection (a) and issue the guidance required by that subsection not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 648, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

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

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

First of all, I am so appreciative here tonight. I want to thank the gentleman from California (Chairman HUNTER) and also the gentleman from Missouri (Ranking Member SKELTON) for the work that both their staffs have put on this amendment.

In the Committee on Armed Services we had great discussions about some of the testimony we heard from Joint Chief of Staff Myers and also from Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld about some of the issues that happened in Iraq that did not necessarily make it to the top of the chain of command, but they were committed to making sure that we correct those inequities within the DoD chain of command.

What this amendment does that I am offering today is making sure that the critical information from the theater moves up to the Pentagon when that information warrants.

It requires the Secretary to make sure that he identifies what kind of information he needs to know to determine the information that is critical to the strategic plan in theater, giving instructions to personnel on how to identify that information when they see it, and allow it to make it to the Secretary for them to determine how to deal with it in a timely manner.

The Secretary will also deem what is important information and what is not important information. This is basically giving some level of direction and a great deal of discretion to the Secretary, but making sure that this information can get to the Secretary's desk as soon as possible.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON).

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, let me take a moment. I rise in support of this amendment offered by my good friend from Florida.

When the Secretary of Defense appeared before the House Committee on Armed Services testifying about the prison abuses, he stated he could not possibly monitor each of the thousands of ongoing cases which might be important enough to warrant his needed attention. He does not need to do that. He needs to monitor only those ones that have potential strategic impact; and during that hearing and in subsequent discussions and investigations, it has become apparent that he has no mechanism to lift those sorts of matters to his attention expeditiously.

The gentleman from Florida's (Mr. MEEK) amendment does just that, and I support it.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say I do not think we need to take time on this side except to just say I think we have got a good work product here, and I think this reflects some pretty good bipartisan work in what are fairly useful sessions where we have briefings by SEC DEF and the other relevant leadership in DoD.

He brought up the fact, and we talked about the fact, that in the Abu Ghraib prison situation you had General Sanchez starting an investigation immediately after the soldier came forward, and the investigation proceeded apace; and under the UCMJ, the prosecutions proceeded apace; but nobody flagged this as something of particularly extraordinary or explosive impact. So we did not have a system that flagged something.

In this age of television and instant communications, these pictures were out in the press before SEC DEF knew about it or we knew about it or other people knew about it.

So I think this is a good result of the gentleman understanding that, talking it back and forth with DoD. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) worked on it, and we looked at it and worked on it; and I think the gentleman has a good work product here. It is a way in which they can do essentially what I understand the Air Force has right now, which is when you have something that could have enormous impact, it is flagged up the line so the Secretary and the other leadership can act on it.

I think the gentleman has done a good job, and I appreciate his thoughtfulness and his hard work on the committee; and I think this is a good amendment.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I appreciate the insight, also the insight from the gentleman's staff and the Democratic staff here. This is working towards definitely troop protection in theater and making sure that at the highest levels of the Pentagon that there are some criteria of what is critical to strategic planning and troops in theater.

So I want to thank the Chairman for his help.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does any Member claim time in opposition to the amendment?

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 108–499.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Chairman pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

At the end of subtitle A of title XII (page 424, after line 12), insert the following new section:

SEC. . SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF IRAQ.

It is the sense of Congress that—

No funds available to any department or agency of the United States Government may be used to provide assistance for the reconstruction of Iraq unless the President certifies to Congress that the United States Government has entered into an agreement with the Iraqi Governing Council or a transitional government in Iraq under which Iraq agrees that it will expend a significant portion of its revenues generated from oil production for reconstruction activities in Iraq.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 648, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules, for working with me to make this amendment in order; and I commend the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services; and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the distinguished ranking member, my very good friend, for the work that they have done on this entire bill.

Mr. Chairman, we can all agree wholeheartedly that supporting our soldiers and providing them what they need to get the job done is our highest priority. However, there are some other important matters that must also be addressed regarding the National Defense Authorization Act, issues that the American people want to hear about.

From the President on down to many of us, we have the view that Iraq could fund its own reconstruction. Prior to the war, the Secretary of Defense and his deputy testified to Congress that a war in Iraq and subsequent reconstruction costs could be financed by oil profits in Iraq.

This was reconfirmed on March 27 when Deputy Secretary of Defense Mr. Wolfowitz suggested that Iraqi oil revenues could pay for the cost of reconstituting Iraq. To date, Congress has already appropriated $148 billion to fund the war and reconstruction efforts, and the President is requesting an additional $25 billion for fiscal year 2005.

Moreover, Deputy Secretary Wolfowitz has suggested that between 50 and $60 billion is actually needed, and I, for one, agree with that; but this funding has yet to be supplemented by Iraqi oil revenue.

My amendment expresses the sense of Congress that no funds available for Iraqi reconstruction purposes may be used unless the President certifies to Congress that the United States Government has entered into an agreement with Iraq that it will expend a significant portion of its revenues generated from oil production on its own reconstruction.

This amendment is not intended to use Iraqi oil money to finance the broader U.S. military campaign. Instead, it states that the United States ought to share the cost of Iraqi reconstruction with the free government of Iraq for the benefit of the Iraqi people.

The United States has a responsibility to finish what we are involved in in Iraq. Iraq is an integral and critical ingredient in our recipe for success in the entire region. Nevertheless, the American people should not be expected to bear the full burden of these costs. American tax dollars are building roads in Mosul, but not in my hometown of Miramar.

We are building schools in Baghdad, but not in Boston; and we are funding hospitals in Basra, but not Baltimore. I find this troubling, especially in light of Iraq's vast natural resources and some of the comments that have been made regarding the funding reconstruction efforts with Iraqi oil revenue.

The fact is that if that is unhealthy for Iraq, it should not be healthy for the United States. After all, we are not the ones sitting on a $7 trillion oil reserve. At the very least, Iraqis should share this economic burden. To finance this huge effort, we need partners; and Iraq should be our first and foremost partner in the rebuilding of their country. We cannot afford these efforts any other way, and I ask for my colleagues' support for my amendment.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a good amendment, and I join the gentleman; and I urge its adoption.

We support the Iraqis. Everyone in America knows that, and we are supporting them with nearly 140,000 troops, $87 billion-plus in reconstruction funds, and I think the Americans expect this oil-rich country to help pay for reconstruction. This is not unreasonable to expect that they start investing in their own future as well.

As their oil sector recovers, they should be reinvesting those revenues in their own future. I think all across our country people will say why not, what is wrong with the Iraqis paying for their very own reconstruction and helping us in the process.

So I congratulate the gentleman, and I urge the adoption of this.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for his comments.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the chairman.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the time, and let me just add to the remarks made by my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON). I think it is absolutely appropriate that Iraqi resources be used to rebuild Iraq, and we have no objection to this amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Who seeks time in opposition?

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in House Report 108–499.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. SKELTON

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), I offer an amendment.

The Chairman pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 14 offered by Mr. SKELTON:

At the end of title V (page 200, after line 24), insert the following new section:

SEC. 598. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE POLICY AND PROCEDURES ON PREVENTION AND RESPONSE TO SEXUAL ASSAULTS INVOLVING MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) COMPREHENSIVE POLICY ON PREVENTION AND RESPONSE TO SEXUAL ASSAULTS.—(1) Not later than January 1, 2005, the Secretary of Defense shall develop a comprehensive policy for the Department of Defense on the prevention of and response to sexual assaults involving members of the Armed Forces.

(2) The policy shall be based on the recommendations of the Department of Defense Task Force on Care for Victims of Sexual Assaults and on such other matters as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(b) ELEMENTS OF COMPREHENSIVE POLICY.—The policy developed under subsection (a) shall address the following matters:

(1) Prevention measures.

(2) Education and training on prevention and response.

(3) Investigation of complaints by command and law enforcement personnel.

(4) Medical treatment of victims.

(5) Confidential reporting of incidents.

(6) Victim advocacy and intervention.

(7) Oversight by commanders of administrative and disciplinary actions in response to substantiated incidents of sexual assault.

(8) Disposition of victims of sexual assault, including review by appropriate authority of administrative separation actions involving victims of sexual assault.

(9) Disposition of members of the Armed Forces accused of sexual assault.

(10) Liaison and collaboration with civilian agencies on the provision of services to victims of sexual assault.

(11) Uniform collection of data on the incidence of sexual assaults and on disciplinary actions taken in substantiated cases of sexual assault.

(c) REPORT ON IMPROVEMENT OF CAPABILITY TO RESPOND TO SEXUAL ASSAULTS.—Not later than March 1, 2005, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a proposal for such legislation as the Secretary considers necessary to enhance the capability of the Department of Defense to address matters relating to sexual assaults involving members of the Armed Forces.

(d) APPLICATION OF COMPREHENSIVE POLICY TO MILITARY DEPARTMENTS.—The Secretary shall ensure that, to the maximum extent practicable, the policy developed under subsection (a) is implemented uniformly by the military departments.

(e) POLICIES AND PROCEDURES OF MILITARY DEPARTMENTS.—(1) Not later than March 1, 2005, the Secretaries of the military departments shall prescribe regulations, or modify current regulations, on the policies and procedures of the military departments on the prevention of and response to sexual assaults involving members of the Armed Forces in order—

(A) to conform such policies and procedures to the policy developed under subsection (a); and

(B) to ensure that such policies and procedures include the elements specified in paragraph (2).

(2) The elements specified in this paragraph are as follows:

(A) A program to promote awareness of the incidence of sexual assaults involving members of the Armed Forces.

(B) A program to provide victim advocacy and intervention for members of the Armed Force concerned who are victims of sexual assault, which program shall make available, at home stations and in deployed locations, trained advocates who are readily available to intervene on behalf of such victims.

(C) Procedures for members of the Armed Force concerned to follow in the case of an incident of sexual assault involving a member of such Armed Force, including—

(i) specification of the person or persons to whom the alleged offense should be reported;

(ii) specification of any other person whom the victim should contact;

(iii) procedures for the preservation of evidence; and

(iv) procedures for confidential reporting and for contacting victim advocates.

(D) Procedures for disciplinary action in cases of sexual assault by members of the Armed Force concerned.

(E) Other sanctions authorized to be imposed in substantiated cases of sexual assault, whether forcible or nonforcible, by members of the Armed Force concerned.

(F) Training on the policies and procedures for all members of the Armed Force concerned, including specific training for members of the Armed Force concerned who process allegations of sexual assault against members of such Armed Force.

(G) Any other matters that the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate.

(f) ANNUAL ASSESSMENT OF POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—Not later than January 15, 2006, and each year thereafter, each Secretary of a military department shall conduct an assessment of the implementation during the preceding fiscal year of the policies and procedures of such department on the prevention of and response to sexual assaults involving members of the Armed

Forces in order to determine the effectiveness of such policies and procedures during such fiscal year in providing an appropriate response to such sexual assaults.

(g) ANNUAL REPORTS.—(1) Not later than April 1, 2005, and January 15 of each year thereafter, each Secretary of a military department shall submit to the Secretary of Defense a report on the sexual assaults involving members of the Armed Force concerned during the preceding year.

(2) Each report on an Armed Force under paragraph (1) shall contain the following:

(A) The number of sexual assaults against members of the Armed Force, and the number of sexual assaults by members of the Armed Force, that were reported to military officials during the year covered by such report, and the number of the cases so reported cases that were substantiated.

(B) A synopsis of and the disciplinary action taken in each substantiated case.

(C) The policies, procedures, and processes implemented by the Secretary concerned during the year covered by such report in response to incidents of sexual assault involving members of the Armed Force concerned.

(D) A plan for the actions that are to be taken in the year following the year covered by such report on the prevention of and response to sexual assault involving members of the Armed Forces concerned.

(3) Each report under paragraph (1) in 2006, 2007, and 2008 shall also include the assessment conducted by the Secretary concerned under subsection (f).

(4) The Secretary of Defense shall transmit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives each report submitted to the Secretary under this subsection, together with the comments of the Secretary on each such report. The Secretary shall transmit the report on 2004 not later than May 1, 2005, and shall transmit the report on any year after 2004 not later than March 15 of the year following such year.

(h) REQUIREMENT TO DEVELOP DEFINITION OF SEXUAL ASSAULT.—Prior to developing policies and programs on the prevention of and response to sexual assaults, the Department of Defense, in consultation with the Service Secretaries, shall develop a definition of sexual assault that is uniform for all the Armed Forces, including but not limited to rape, acquaintance rape, sexual assault, and other criminal offenses.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 648, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON).

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

I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time at this moment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Who seeks time in opposition to the amendment?

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, but I am not in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

□ 2115

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

Mr. Chairman, Americans are concerned about the welfare of the men and women we send to defend our country. The American people understand that war is violent. What the American people will not tolerate is the assault or rape of a female soldier by a fellow soldier. Simply put, this is unacceptable.

Recent reports of sexual assaults of female soldiers serving abroad, along with numerous cases of assaults in or around military bases, clearly demonstrate the need for the Department of Defense to change their approach to this problem.

Women are serving in the military, and we are mighty proud of them. Along with my colleagues today, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE), we offer this amendment to help the military work through this problem, understand its causes, and put in place measures that will prevent it from happening.

The amendment calls for the Secretary of Defense to increase training for officers so they are better equipped to deal with sexual assaults. The amendment calls for a clear and precise protocol that protects privacy and ensures safety and which women can follow to report an attack. The amendment ensures access to the appropriate medical treatment and counseling for women at all times during their service, no matter where they are in the world. This policy is to be put in place by January 1, 2005.

Members of both the House and Senate, including my colleagues on the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues, have examined this issue, along with the Department of Defense's Task Force on Care For Victims of Sexual Assault. We agree that the action called for in this amendment is beyond necessary to deal with the multiple incidents of sexual assaults in the military.

These steps, which are being mirrored in the Senate's version of the legislation, will help the Armed Forces prevent attacks from happening, as well as put proper procedures in place that bring aid and comfort to those who have survived attacks.

I am hopeful the action by this Congress will help bring a change in the attitude in the U.S. military. It needs to be made perfectly clear that it is unacceptable to sexually assault a female soldier; and if you choose to make that mistake, you will be held accountable for your actions, no matter who you are, what your rank is, or what condition you serve under. I am in full and hardy support of this amendment.

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the principal author of this amendment, and that she be allowed to control that time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from Missouri very much for his leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of an amendment to the fiscal year 2005 DOD authorization bill which I am offering with the leadership of the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues and my good friend, the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

This bipartisan amendment will help us take a first step in addressing the problems of sexual assault within the military. Last Thursday, the DOD Task Force on Care For Victims of Sexual Assault released its report and recommendations concerning the problem based on a 90-day study. The Slaughter/Capito/Solis/Brown-Waite amendment is based on the report findings and will help to implement several of the recommendations made by the DOD task force.

Specifically, it would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a comprehensive policy for DOD on the prevention of and response to sexual assaults involving members of the Armed Forces. This comprehensive policy would be based on the recommendations of the task force. In addition, the amendment would require the DOD to take related measures to address sexual assaults in the military, such as reporting the improvement of DOD's capability to respond to sexual assaults, applying the comprehensive policy to all military departments instead of each branch having its own, modifying the policies and procedures of the military departments, annually assessing the policies and procedures, and issuing reports to the Senate and the House Committee on Armed Services.

On March 31 of this year, the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues held a forum on sexual assaults in the military and submitted its report from the caucus to the Secretary. The Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues has committed to continuing to take a leadership role in addressing this issue.

Mr. Chairman, 120 women have already come back from Iraq saying they have been sexually assaulted by their fellow soldiers. Only 20 of them reported it in the military because of the fact it would end their career. We want to change this attitude and this culture.

Now, a similar version of this amendment has already been included in the Senate version of the fiscal year 2005 DOD authorization bill and has good bipartisan support in the Senate. It has been developed in consultation with the Pentagon and is intended to help the Pentagon start implementing the concrete proactive measures that are outlined in the task force's report.

We want to help, because the Pentagon, in previous reports, has stated

over and over again the problem; but very few solutions have come from it. It is by no means intended to be a quick fix to the problem of sexual assault, but, instead, is intended to be a positive first step towards remedying this terrible problem.

Along with my colleagues on the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues, I also plan to introduce a comprehensive legislation package to deal with other aspects of this issue based on the findings from the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues hearing, additional research and information that we have been gathering, as well as the task force report.

We look forward to continuing to work together in a productive manner to eliminate sexual assaults of our United States servicewomen. Again, it is a first step, and I encourage my colleagues to approve this amendment to the fiscal year 2005 DOD authorization bill.

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

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this time to thank the members of the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues, and my co-chairwoman, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER). Her work on this issue has been very valuable, and she has been very aggressive; and I think the result of our hearings are bearing fruit here in this amendment.

I would also like to thank the chairman of the committee and the ranking member for their letting us offer this amendment and also, hopefully, making it a part of the bill.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS), the vice chair of the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues on the Democratic side.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of the amendment as vice chair of the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues. As we all know, our dedicated military servicemen and -women dedicate and risk their lives in order to protect our great Nation. We stand united on both sides of the aisle today as the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues to bring awareness to an alarming trend of sexual assaults against women in all branches of the military.

The Pentagon itself has reported more than 100 cases of sexual assaults amongst troops deployed in Iraq and Afghanistan over the past 14 months. These numbers are not necessarily reflective of the actual situation, because women are discouraged from seeking help or reporting their assaults because of our military system, which has no comprehensive policy to address sexual assaults.

We are in the midst of a growing problem of violence against women that will not be tolerated. In March, the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues held a hearing on sexual assaults in the military, where we heard directly from a courageous survivor, Captain Machmer. Her message was very powerful and clear: the military has a pervasive culture that needs to be aggressively addressed. She said, and I quote, ''My assailant received a reduction in rank to specialist, forfeited $826 for 2 months, and had extra duty for 30 days. And, still, this person works on the base I worked on.''

In fact, studies estimate that 75 to 84 percent of alleged offenders are honorably discharged. What type of message are we sending to women serving in our country, and, more importantly, the next generation of women interested in joining the Armed Forces?

Last week, the DOD Task Force on Care For Victims of Sexual Assault released a report with recommendations. In line with these recommendations, this amendment that we are presenting here tonight would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a comprehensive policy to prevent and respond to sexual assaults in the Armed Forces.

This amendment would also require the Secretary to take steps to improve the Defense Department's capacity to respond to sexual assaults and restructure procedures on how assaults against women are to be handled.

What we need is a commitment to taking action. At this time, when our troops are valiantly committed to our country, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this bipartisan effort.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time for debate on the amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON).

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) will be postponed.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FEENEY) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4200) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2005 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2005, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

MAKING IN ORDER ADDITIONAL AMENDMENTS AND MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT 13 DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4200, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, first I just want to commend the chairman pro tempore, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON), who has presided over the last several hours of debate. I thank him for a great job.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 4200, pursuant to House Resolution 648, the amendments I have placed at the desk shall be in order as though printed in House Report 108–499 and numbered 29, 30, 31, and 32; and

amendment No. 13 in that report be modified in the form that I have placed at the desk; and

the amendments and the modification that I have placed at the desk shall be considered as read for purposes of this unanimous consent request.

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object at this point, but I wish to offer a brief explanation to one aspect of one of the amendments addressed by this request offered by the gentleman from California, and I do so on behalf of my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MARSHALL).

Mr. Speaker, if you read the text of the amendment, it is very difficult to decipher, so the unanimous consent request makes in order this amendment to correct a mistake in the drafting of the bill. The amendment proposes to add a military construction project to replace the fire crash/rescue station for Warner Robins Air Force Base, Georgia. The amendment offsets this addition by deleting another military construction project, the Visitors Quarters at Homestead Air Reserve Base in Florida.

With that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I agree with the chairman in his request.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the amendments and the modification are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 29

At the end of title X (page 409, after line 13), insert the following new section:

SEC. 1077. PLACEMENT OF MEMORIAL IN ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY HONORING NONCITIZENS KILLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY WHILE SERVING IN THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Army shall place in Arlington National Cemetery a memorial marker honoring the service and sacrifice of noncitizens killed in the line of duty while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States.

(b) APPROVAL OF DESIGN AND SITE.—The Secretary of the Army, in consultation with Secretary of Veterans Affairs, shall approve an appropriate design and site within Arlington National Cemetery for the memorial marker provided for under subsection (a).

(c) USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS.—Federal funds shall not be required or permitted to be used for the design and construction of the memorial marker provided for under subsection (a).

(d) AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT DONATIONS.—(1) The Secretary of the Army may accept gifts and donations of services, money, and property (including personal, tangible, or intangible property) for the design and construction of the memorial marker provided for under subsection (a).

(2) The authority of the Secretary of the Army to accept gifts and donations under paragraph (1) shall expire on the date that is five years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 30

Page 479, in the table following line 9—

(1) in the item for Robins Air Force Base, strike ''$15,000,000'' and insert ''$21,570,000''; and

(2) in the total at the bottom of the table, strike ''$398,714,000'' and insert ''$405,284,000''.

Page 483, line 2, strike ''$2,493,679,000'' and insert ''$2,500,249,000''.

Page 483, line 5, strike ''$398,714,000'' and insert ''$405,284,000''.

Page 492, line 7, strike ''$114,090,000'' and insert ''$107,520,000''.

AMENDMENT NO. 31

At the end of title I (page 27, after line 10), insert the following new section:

SEC. ___. TRANSFER OF CERTAIN ARMY PROCUREMENT FUNDS.

(a) INCREASE FOR CERTAIN HELICOPTER ITEMS.—The amount provided in section 101(1) for procurement of aircraft for the Army is hereby increased by $4,000,000, of which—

(1) $2,000,000 shall be available for procurement of the Aircraft Wireless Intercom System; and

(2) $2,000,000 shall be available for procurement of bladefold kits for Apache Helicopters.

(b) OFFSET.—The amount provided in section 101(5) for Other Procurement, Army, is hereby reduced by $4,000,000, to be derived from amounts for Information Systems.

AMENDMENT NO. 32

At the end of subtitle F of title V (page 172, after line 9), insert the following new section:

SEC. 5___. ESTABLISHMENT OF COLLEGE FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NATIONAL GUARD.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary concerned may, in recognition of the unique position of the District of Columbia in the Federal system, provide financial assistance to eligible members of the National Guard of the District of Columbia for expenses of such a member while enrolled in an approved institution of higher education in a degree, certificate, or other program (including a program of study abroad approved for credit by the institution of higher education) leading to a recognized educational credential at the institution of higher education. Any such assistance may be provided only during the program applicability period specified in subsection (i).

(b) AUTHORITY SUBJECT TO AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS.—The authority provided in subsection (a) is subject to the availability of appropriations for that purpose.

(c) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible for financial assistance under this section, a member of the National Guard of the District of Columbia must—

(1) be a member of the National Guard of the District of Columbia for not less than the 12 consecutive months preceding the commencement of the tuition assistance and continue to be such a member while receiving such assistance;

(2) agree to serve one year in the National Guard of the District of Columbia for each academic year of assistance provided;

(3) be enrolled or accepted for enrollment in a program of education referred to in subsection (a) at an institution of higher education; and

(4) if already enrolled, maintain satisfactory progress in the course of study the member is pursuing in accordance with section 484(c) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1091(c)).

(d) COVERED EXPENSES.—Expenses for which financial assistance may be provided under this section are the following:

(1) Tuition and fees charged by an approved institution of higher education involved.

(2) The cost of books.

(3) Laboratory expenses.

(e) AMOUNT.—(1) The amount of financial assistance provided to a member of the National Guard of the District of Columbia under this section shall be prescribed by the Secretary concerned, but may not exceed $2,500 for any academic year. The Secretary concerned shall prorate assistance under this section for members who pursue a program of education on less than a full-time basis.

(2) A member may not receive more than $12,500 under this section.

(f) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to require an institution of higher education to alter the institution's admissions policies or standards in any manner to enable a member of the National Guard of the District of Columbia to enroll in the institution.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''approved institution of higher education'' means an institution of higher education (as defined in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001)) that—

(A) is eligible to participate in the student financial assistance programs under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.); and

(B) has entered into an agreement with the Secretary concerned containing such conditions as the Secretary may specify, including a requirement that the institution use the funds made available under this section to supplement and not supplant assistance that otherwise would be provided to eligible students from the District of Columbia National Guard.

(2) SECRETARY CONCERNED.—The term ''Secretary concerned'' means—

(A) the Secretary of the Army, in the case of the Army National Guard of the District of Columbia; and

(B) the Secretary of the Air Force, in the case of the Air National Guard of the District of Columbia.

(h) ANNUAL REPORT.—At the close of each year during which the program under this section is in effect, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the effectiveness of the program in improving recruiting and retention for the District of Columbia National Guard. Each such report shall include such recommendations for changes in law or policy as the Secretary considers appropriate. In the first such report, the Secretary shall include an analysis of means for improving the effectiveness as a recruitment and retention incentive of any program providing tuition assistance for members of the District of Columbia National Guard in existence as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(i) PROGRAM APPLICABILITY PERIOD.—Financial assistance may be provided under this section to eligible members of the National Guard of the District of Columbia for periods of instruction that begin during the three-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 13, AS MODIFIED

At the end of title XXXI (page 556, after line 10), insert the following new section:

SEC. 31___. ADDITIONAL AMOUNT FOR DEFENSE SITE ACCELERATION COMPLETION.

(a) ADDITIONAL AMOUNT.—The amount in section 3102 is hereby increased by $50,000,000, to be available under section 3102(1) for defense site acceleration completion.

(b) OFFSET.—The amount in section 301(4), operation and maintenance, Air Force, is hereby reduced by $50,000,000, to be derived from the transportation capital fund.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 649, the managers on the part of the House on H.R. 2660 are discharged and the bill is laid upon the table.

TRIBUTE TO TWO FALLEN VIRGINIA SOLDIERS

(Mr. GOODE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. Speaker, as we approach Memorial Day 2004, I rise today to salute two members of the military from the Fifth District of Virginia who gave their lives in service to the United States in the war on terrorism.

Lieutenant Colonel William R. Watkins III, lived in Halifax County; and Sergeant Michael Dooley lived in Bedford County. Both of these men loved this Nation and served bravely in Iraq in the war on terrorism. Their untimely death in the spring of 2003 came as they defended the freedoms that we cherish.

Because Lieutenant Colonel Watkins and Sergeant Dooley joined their fellow soldiers in removing the Taliban and Saddam Hussein from power, the terrorists no longer have Afghanistan and no longer have Iraq from which they can operate with impunity and with state-sponsored support to plot, plan, and mastermind another event like September 11 in our country.

Because of the bravery of Lieutenant Colonel Watkins, Sergeant Dooley, and the other hundreds of men and women who have given their lives, the United States and much of the world is safer. And we thank you.

□ 2130

BUSH RHETORIC DOES NOT MATCH RECORD

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it has happened again. The Timken Company of Canton, Ohio, owned by one of

the President's biggest fund-raisers, a place where the President a year ago said his tax cut policies were working, look at the prosperity of this company, the Timken Corporation closed its doors in Canton, Ohio, laying off 1,300 people.

The Bush economic record in Ohio: One out of six manufacturing jobs has disappeared, 177,000 manufacturing jobs in the State are gone, 200 jobs a day have been lost since President Bush took office.

The Timken Company sent out a press release 3 weeks ago, bragging about its quarterly sales of $1.1 billion, saying it set some kind of record.

The Bush administration economic record over the last 4 years has been to ship jobs overseas, give tax cuts to large corporations; those large corporations have huge profits, then they lay off American workers. It is the same old story.

This economic policy is not working for my State of Ohio. It is not working for manufacturing. It is not working for working Americans. It is not working for our communities.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FEENEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. HOYER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

MR. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order at this time.

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

There was no objection.

TIME FOR ACTION ON PRESCRIPTION DRUG IMPORTATION

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress to act on legislation to permit prescription drug importation.

Drug companies are the most profitable businesses in America. The drug companies earn profit margins of over 18 percent. That is three times the average of Fortune 500 firms.

These companies are huge multinational juggernauts. In 2001, the 10 biggest U.S. drug companies reported profits of $37 billion. That is more than the Federal Government spends each year on VA health care. It is more than the entire U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development budget. It is a full billion dollars more than the combined gross domestic product of Lebanon, Panama, and Yemen. That is not total revenue of the drug company; that is its profits.

So how is it the drug companies are able to do so well, even as other manufacturers and companies around this country are having trouble in many cases with staying afloat? By gouging American consumers, that is how.

Drug companies routinely charge American consumers, two, three, four, five, sometimes even ten times what they charge their customers in Canada and other wealthy countries. Medicine sold in Canada is the same safe, effective medicine, same manufacturer, same packaging, same drug, the same ones that our constituents buy at a neighborhood grocery store or drugstore in Elyria, Ohio, but it costs a fraction of the price.

Price data collected last fall by the Alliance for Retired Americans tells the story. Drugmakers charged Americans $89 for Celebrex, an arthritis medicine; Canadians paid $44. The drug industry charged Americans $108 for the cholesterol medicine Lipitor, which happens to be made in Ireland; Canadians paid $61 for Lipitor. Drug companies charged American women $246 for Tamoxifen, the breast cancer drug; Canadian women paid $44.

Our constituents paid 500 percent more for cancer medicine than Canadians paid, same manufacturer, same drug, same dosage. In fact, U.S. taxpayers helped develop that drug. But because the U.S. Government allows drug companies to charge any price they want for essential medicine, that is why these drugs cost so much more.

The best response would be for the American Government to stand up to the drug industry, but Republican leadership and President Bush have already rejected that common-sense policy. In fact, the Medicare prescription drug bill, written by the drug companies for the drug companies, and enacted last year and signed by the President, explicitly prohibits the Federal Government from negotiating on behalf of American consumers for fair prices for prescription drugs.

Think about that. Forty million Medicare beneficiaries ought to be able to get a get a great price because of the number of people that Medicare represents. Yet the Congress has prohibited negotiated prices. Since this Congress, the Republican leadership, will not allow the government to stand up to the drug industry, we should at least allow our constituents to benefit from the tough stance taken by other nations.

A bipartisan majority in this House on this, both sides of the aisle, solidly supported legislation last year that would give our constituents access to prescription drugs imported from Canada and other nations. That vote was a declaration of independence from the powerful drug lobby and a real step forward for our constituents.

Two big drugstore chains in America have announced their support for importation of safe, effective drugs and affordable medicine. They see the tough choices that their customers in this country make every day. We should heed that call. Four States have already established drug importation Web sites, five local governments have set up importation programs, 20 additional States are considering importation as a way to respond to their constituents.

These public officials, Democrats and Republicans alike, are doing what they can because Republican leadership in this body and President Bush have failed to act, and continue to do the bidding of the drug companies.

Seniors in Ohio and throughout the country continue to go to Canada for a better deal on prescription drugs. They know a full deck of discount cards does not offer a discount comparable to the fair prices charged to our neighbor country to the north. Their continued grass-roots fight against the drug companies is a cry for help.

We should answer that call. This Congress should send to the President's desk a responsible, bipartisan drug importation bill before the Fourth of July recess. The President should wean himself of drug company money and influence and sign that bill. America needs a declaration of independence from the drug companies. Let us get it to the President's desk before July 4.

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

(Mr. HENSARLING addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. BLUMENAUER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. PEARCE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. FEENEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order at this time.

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

There was no objection.

SMART SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I am here to express my opposition to H.R. 4200, the fiscal year 2005 Defense Authorization Act. Among other things, the bill would approve an additional $25 billion for the war in Iraq. For those that may have forgotten, let me refresh your memory.

Last November, that was a mere 6 months ago, Congress approved $87 billion to fund military operations and reconstruction efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan. At that time, President Bush misleadingly declared that no additional funds would be needed until the year 2005. Since then, funds allocated for Iraq appear to have been misused, misspent and in some cases downright stolen by the companies assigned the tasks of rebuilding Iraq's infrastructure.

It would be totally irresponsible to provide another blank check to this administration, which still has not accounted for how the last $87 billion was spent. But the last $87 billion and the $78 billion before that is just the tip of the iceberg.

The cost of maintaining our forces in Iraq alone costs the United States taxpayers $5 billion a month, and that does not take into consideration the vast reconstruction costs, and more importantly, the tremendous human costs that we are occurring every single day. That is $60 billion a year just to continue our military operations in that one country, assuming nothing goes wrong.

And as events in the streets of Fallujah and the abuses within the walls of the Abu Ghraib Prison have shown with this administration in charge, inevitably there will be more things going wrong. In fact, some estimates suggest that the cost of the war in Iraq could approach a total of $400 billion by 2006.

There are programs in H.R. 4200 that I support, including extending coverage under TRICARE, the military's health care system, to the National Guard and the Reserve forces and their families who lack health insurance.

H.R. 4200 also provides an across-the-board pay increase for military personnel, and it authorizes permanent increases to the imminent danger pay and the family separation allowance.

And finally, H.R. 4200 eliminates the widow's tax which veterans' spouses currently face by improving the existing survivor benefit plan.

I support all of these measures, and I have been working for their passage because each is an important step in keeping our promise to our Nation's servicemen and women, those who have sacrificed so much for their country. But to my great disappointment, in order to support these important measures for our troops and veterans, I would also have to support the development of new nuclear weapons and a gigantic missile defense system, which has never been proven effective, not to mention another gigantic $25 billion spending bill for the war in Iraq.

An open check for the President, despite the fact that, one, we have no idea why we are in Iraq in the first place; two, we have no idea how our money is being spent; and three, we have no exit strategy.

There has to be a better way, Mr. Speaker, because the Bush doctrine of spending without accountability has been tried in Iraq and it is failing.

But there is another way. I have introduced legislation to create a SMART security platform for the 21st century. SMART stands for sensible, multilateral American response to terrorism.

Instead of spending billions on new bunker-buster nuclear weapons and the President's beloved missile defense system, which would not provide an effective defense against a full frontal missile attack, SMART security calls for stronger and smarter investments at home, on homeland security and first responders, and abroad on peacekeeping and conflict-prevention programs.

SMART security defends America by relying on the very best of America: our commitment to peace and freedom, our compassion for the people of the world, and our capacity for multilateral leadership.

Let us be smart, let us be smart about our future. SMART security is tough, SMART security is pragmatic and patriotic, and SMART security will keep America safe.

□ 2145

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FEENEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SOUDER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask to claim the time of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

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

There was no objection.

HAPPY 102ND BIRTHDAY TO MRS. MAE BELL CARTER OF WOODLAND, GEORGIA

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great Georgian who has lived to witness almost half our State's history. Born in 1902, Mrs. Mae Bell Carter of Woodland, Georgia, will turn 102 years young on May 29.

Mrs. Carter was born in Woodland, married in Woodland, and raised her family in Woodland. Needless to say, she is a fixture in that community and the mother of the mayor and a member of the city council. Mrs. Carter obviously instilled in her children the heart for public service that she has personified for her entire life.

Mr. Speaker, she was long a member of the ''Mothers Board'' that performed missionary work for the people of Talbot County, nursing the sick and bringing food to the less fortunate. Perhaps her enthusiasm for mission work springs from her long affiliation with the aptly named Friendship Baptist Church in Woodland where she has been a member for at least 90 years.

Her family says in all her years she has been as fashionable as she has been charitable. She is always finely attired and actually walked every day to the post office wearing high-heel shoes. I can attest to this, Mr. Speaker. I met with her recently during a Medicare prescription drug card town hall meeting down in Talbot County. What a fine, distinguished lady she is and a credit to my district, to the State of Georgia, and to the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my fellow House Members on behalf of the people of Talbot County and Georgia's 11th Congressional District, the district that I am so privileged to represent in west Georgia, to join me tonight in wishing Mrs. Mae Bell Carter a happy and a blessed 102nd birthday.

ARMENIA-AZERBAIJAN MILITARY DISPARITY

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to address recent reports that I believe signal a conflict in Azeri President Ilham Aliyev's interest in promoting a peaceful resolution to the Nagorno-Karabagh conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan.

I am particularly troubled by reports from the BBC last week that President Aliyev said that, while he would continue to try to resolve the Nagorno-Karabagh conflict by peaceful means, the Azeri army is able at any moment to free what he called ''our territory.'' The article continues that President Aliyev stated, ''We have every right to do that, to restore our territorial integrity.''

Such statements, Mr. Speaker, are unsettling and send a message to Armenia as well as to all those involved in working towards a peaceful resolution to the conflict that Azerbaijan is prepared to undertake a military approach to addressing the conflict should recommendations by the Minsk Group not agree with Azerbaijan's position. In fact, such statements, I believe, Mr. Speaker, send the wrong message to the Minsk Group and undermine ongoing efforts regarding stabilization of the South Caucasus region.

Ten years after a mutually signed cease-fire in the region and 3 years after President Kocharian and former President Aliyev came together at Key West, current Azeri President Aliyev has warned that if no concrete issues remain on the agenda regarding a peaceful resolution to Nagorno-Karabagh, then it is ''not right to continue and imitate negotiations.'' President Aliyev's actions and statements do not signal a willingness to negotiate and, in fact, I think they illustrate the opposite. If there is any chance that the parties can move in the direction of a peaceful resolution, President Aliyev must show that he is willing to consider options developed by the Minsk Group without threatening military actions.

In this regard, I would like to highlight from the BBC article that Mr. Aliyev added that the Azeri government's expenditure on Azerbaijan's military was increasing each year and ''it will keep increasing in the future.'' I am discouraged by this, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to address this issue in light of the U.S.'s role in providing military assistance in the region.

I strongly believe we must do everything in our power here in Congress to signal that we will not support the use of military force to address this conflict. Specifically, I call upon Congress and congressional appropriators to restore the military aid parity between Armenia and Azerbaijan.

Earlier this year, President Bush's budget proposed including unequal military aid spending to Armenia and Azerbaijan. This request was contrary to a policy agreement between the Congress and the administration that there would be military parity between the two countries. While the administration believes that the unequal funding will not destroy the balance between Azerbaijan and Armenia, I point to President Aliyev's recent statements and question the Bush administration's recent assurances to Congress before the other Chamber's Foreign Relations Committee.

I would like to point out that waiver language included in section 907 of the Freedom Support Act specifically states that any assistance to Azerbaijan should not be used to undermine or hamper the Karabakh peace process or be used for offensive purposes against Armenia or the Armenian communities in the South Caucasus. President Aliyev's comments regarding current and future increases in Azerbaijan's military funding do not put me at ease that funding from the U.S. either directly or indirectly will not be used to unleash a military campaign against the people of Nagorno-Karabagh.

Amid rising tension and animosity in the region, it is more important today than ever for the United States to be sure that no signal is sent suggesting that one side is being provided a military advantage over the other. Our strength in fostering a diplomatic and peaceful solution is our balanced approach to and for each nation of the South Caucasus. At this time the U.S. should not be providing resources to Azerbaijan that can in any measure be turned into military efforts against Armenia to reclaim Nagorno-Karabagh.

Parity in this regard will help to restore a sense of stability in the region and hopefully add to the U.S.'s evenhandedness in its presence and support for the establishment of a peaceful resolution to the Nagorno-Karabagh conflict.

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

(Mr. MCCOTTER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. PENCE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. DREIER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. HINCHEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE WAR ON TERRORISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be joined by my colleague from Georgia this evening. What we would like to do is to talk a little bit about the war on terrorism, the situation in Iraq, the situation in Afghanistan. We want to start off by providing an answer to some of our colleagues from the other side of the aisle who have been asking the question, In 2004, are we better off than we were 4 years ago? In many ways as we have talked about this issue, we need to recognize and put it in the context of September 11, 2001. For the first time, America has a real and serious response to the war on terrorism. During the 1990s, were we better off in the 1990s as we were attacked in the World Trade Centers in the early 1990s? As our embassies were attacked in Africa? As our barracks were attacked in Saudi Arabia? And as the USS *Cole* was attacked in Yemen, but America did not respond? Was that a good position for us to be in? We found out the cost of neglecting the threat, the emerging threat of global terrorism on September 11. We found out what it would cost us not to have responded during the 1990s.

As this threat emerged, an administration, perhaps even we in Congress, said, this is not a threat that needs a serious focus. We now have an administration, a President, and a Congress that were united in our response to September 11. We said we do face a real threat. We face a global war on terrorism. We face a global war on terrorism that had been emerging throughout the 1990s, but had never been responded to. Now is the time to respond because it is a real threat and it is a threat that we need to take seriously and it is a threat that we need to respond to by taking the war to the terrorists.

The question may not be, Is America better off? We know that America is probably safer than what we were on September 11 or on September 12, 2001. We know that America is much safer than what we were before September 11. We also recognize that we may be safer, but we are still not safe. But there are other questions that can be asked: Are the Afghan people better off today than they were 4 years ago? Are the people of Iraq better off than they were 4 years ago? Are the people in Libya facing a brighter future because of the decisions that have been made over the last few months than they were 4 years ago?

Tonight I do not claim that we have solved all of these problems or all of these issues. I think that we recognize that there is still a tremendous amount of work to do in each of these areas. But Afghanistan does have a new government. Afghanistan does have a new constitution. The Taliban is gone from power. They still exist in various forms of resistance. Al Qaeda no longer has a safe haven in Afghanistan to plan additional attacks against the United States and the rest of the free world. They are still planning those attacks, but the first thing that they have to plan each and every day is how they are going to get through that day. They no longer have the luxury of believing, and during the 1990s knowing, that America would not strike them, even though we knew where they were and we maybe had some idea of their overall intentions and that they had declared war on the United States that we would leave them alone.

So Afghanistan is freer and better off than they were. Saddam Hussein is no longer in power. As ugly as the abuses have been in the prisons by American troops, by a limited number of American troops, we cannot lose the perspective that probably over 300,000 Iraqis were driven to their graves through the brutality of the regime of Saddam Hussein.

Libya is now in the process of disarming. A couple of months ago, I had the opportunity to meet with Muammar Qaddafi in Libya. We tried to understand exactly why Qaddafi had made this switch in strategy, why from being on a list of terrorist states he had evolved to a position where now he was disclaiming any terrorist intent, working with the United States and working with the European Union to disarm, but not only to disarm from weapons of mass destruction but to disclose to the United States and others the capabilities that he had in his nuclear weapons program, which is a step forward, to also not only describe what his program was and to give us many of the materials but also to give us an understanding as to how he had acquired those materials and what was the network of suppliers that facilitated the development of his nuclear weapons program.

As we better understand that network, we also get a clearer picture of what maybe exists today in Iran, what may exist in North Korea as they were on the market shopping for nuclear weapons programs.

So are these three countries and the people in these countries better off? The 50 million people alone in Afghanistan and Iraq that have been liberated from terrorist regimes, are they better off than what they were 4 years ago? Are the people of Libya better off in the new course that their leader has embarked on? I think the answer is very, very clear. The answer is absolutely yes. Is America safer because of a change in regimes in Afghanistan, Libya, and Iraq? I think the answer is clear. It is an absolute yes.

Again I am not saying that the work is done. As we see in the media, as we get in our briefings each and every day, there is still a tremendous amount of work that needs to be done. But we cannot forget the unity that this Nation had after September 11, a unity that said we need to stare terrorism in its face and we need to stare it down and we need to take the battle to the terrorists. That was the message that came from the White House. But that was also the message that was embraced by this Congress and supported by this Congress.

□ 2200

What we need to recognize is that going to war and rebuilding or building representative government or new governments in each of these countries is not an easy process. We maybe had a quick major conflict, a McDonald's war, but when we get done with it, we recognize that building a new Iraq and a new Afghanistan is going to take a tremendous amount of time. And that is the process that we are embarking on today.

But take a look at what has happened. It is progress. Afghanistan is free. Libya has disarmed. Saddam Hussein is no longer in power. Iraq is becoming a free country, making the heart of the Middle East more stable and, therefore, making America more secure. We are more secure because we now have a Department of Homeland Security. Is all the work in the Department of Homeland Security complete? Absolutely not. We do not create that type of an agency and give them that type of a mission and believe in 12 to 18 months that all of that work is going to be completed.

But we now have a Department of Homeland Security that is focused on making sure that our airports are more secure, making sure that our ports are more secure, making sure that our local communities are more secure, because we are developing an infrastructure, a database that allows information-sharing across all levels of government so that we will be more prepared to identify the threats that we face and hopefully to respond to those threats in such a way that a threat never becomes a successful attack on America.

All of our border activities have been consolidated into the Department of Homeland Security, a single agency, doing away with a multitude of different organizations that allowed in some cases the opportunities for some of the 9/11 hijackers to slip through our borders, to rent apartments, to find employment and to train in flight schools, only to have their visas approved by INS after they carried out the attacks on the Twin Towers.

So we are facing the issues that have been identified and moving forward, moving forward in a very difficult process because America is still a free country. And that is exactly what we want to maintain. We want to maintain a free society, but we want to maintain a society that is free and safe. Those are the two paths that we are continuing to try to balance.

I do not know if the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) has any comments. There are lots of things we want to talk about, but I think this is kind of set in context to answer that first question: Are we better off? Absolutely. We recognize the threat that this Nation faces. We are addressing that threat, and we are working and focusing on that real threat each and every day. We do not claim absolute security and safety, but we do now recognize the threat and continue to work to try to make sure that we will not have another terrorist attack in the United States.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I certainly thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) for organizing this Special Order tonight.

Mr. Speaker, we are here to pay tribute really to the courage, the commitment, and the endurance of our service men and women. And specifically I would like to spend a few moments kind of reflecting on the tremendous job that our troops have been doing in Iraq.

We must never forget that our American forces are primarily responsible for one of the most complex and awesome military successes in history. And the overwhelming majority of our troops did it with compassion, with care for the dignity and the basic human rights of the Iraqi people.

Remember that our military, our military, liberated 25 million Iraqi citizens in just over 3 short weeks. And when we include Afghanistan, American troops have now liberated over 50 million people from oppressive regimes.

Yet despite this military success story, Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of another time in which so much precious time and treasure have been invested in the reconstruction of another country. An international coalition led by America is now building new, modern power plants, a totally new phone system, and nearly 2,500 schools.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan I know has been to Iraq several times, has been to Afghanistan, been to Libya. He has seen what I saw

the one opportunity that I had to visit Iraq just before Christmas of 2003, and at that time Fallujah was a little more peaceful than it is today. And I remember General Swanick took us on a patrol. We were in a situation where things were relatively stable. We obviously could not do that today, but we went in those Humvees with those soldiers of the 101st, and we visited a school, which by our standards, Mr. Speaker, one probably would not want their child in a building that has no air conditioning and no heat. It is lighted, but there is not a nice playground or anything like that. But, by golly, there is a chalkboard, and those kids were there and not only little male children but of course for the first time probably in 30 years little precious female children were able to get an education. They were sitting there. They were bright eyed, and they were hopeful. And that is what we were doing in Fallujah before Sadr and all of these terrorist thugs started killing everybody just wantonly and the mass destruction that is going on there right now.

But, I mean, this is the kind of thing that we were doing. More than 8.7 million textbooks have been printed and distributed throughout Iraq; 32,000 secondary school teachers and administrative staff have been trained to teach Iraqi children; 240 hospitals; 1,200 health clinics. Health care spending in Iraq has increased 30 times over its prewar. Five million children have been immunized for measles, mumps, and rubella. That is because of the liberation and the compassion that this country has brought to Iraq.

And I know the gentleman from Michigan has seen so much of that and agrees with me that the good stories are not being told. All of us are appalled with the activity of a miscreant few in that Abu Ghraib prison there in Baghdad and what they did is unforgivable. There is no excuse for that, and they will pay the price.

But it is a shame that we have got 165,000 brave men and women serving in Iraq and Afghanistan and 25,000 coalition forces that are laying it on the line and indeed sometimes paying the ultimate sacrifice to do the right thing, and that is the message that of course does not get the soundbites on this 24-hour news that we have to literally put up with every day in this country. But we are here tonight, and I am just so pleased to have an opportunity. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for allowing me to join with him and talk about the good things that we are doing, and at the end of the day we will succeed in this mission.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his comments.

I want to again talk a little bit about the war that we are in. The Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, Steve Cambone, gave a speech back in January that I think kind of describes the challenges that we face as a Nation. And as we talk about the progress that we make in Iraq, as we talk about the progress that we make in Afghanistan, we cannot lose context of the total situation that we face as a Nation. And here is how the Under Secretary described it: ''We are a Nation at war. We do not know how long it will last, but it is unlikely to be short. We cannot know where or against whom all of its battles will be fought. There are multiple fronts in this war, and there is no single theatre of operations. We do know that we are all at risk, at home and abroad, civilians and military alike. We do know that battles and campaigns will both be conventional and unconventional in their conduct. Some of those battles and campaigns will be fought in the open, and others will be fought in secret where our victories will be known to only a few.''

Going on in his speech he says: ''We are facing a turbulent and volatile world populated by a number of highly adaptive state and nonstate actors. Some of these are weighing whether, to what extent, or how they might oppose the interests of the United States and its friends. Others such as the terrorist organizations responsible for attacks on the United States, Turkey, Indonesia, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, Israel, Kenya, the Philippines, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iraq, and other places have committed themselves to war.''

I think this gives us some idea as to the full context of the threat that we face and the number of different places that we face that threat.

He also goes on to say: ''It is impossible to predict with confidence what nation or entity will pose a threat in 5, 10, or 20 years to the United States or to our friends and allies.''

His speech goes on: ''But not everything that unfolds in the coming years should be a surprise.'' Here is what we can expect: ''We can expect that an adversary will continuously search for effective means to attack our people, our economy, military and political power, and the people in power of our friends and allies. We can also expect that an adversary will have access to a range of modern technologies and will be prepared to use them to magnify the destructiveness of their attacks, using truck bombs and improvised explosives, cyberintrusions to attack the computer systems upon which we rely, radio transmitters to jam our space assets, small laboratories to develop new and biological or genetically altered agents, and chemical and nuclear technology materials delivered by missile, plane, boat, or backpack to poison our environment and destroy human lives.''

Here is what candidate Bush said in 1999, perhaps better understanding that threat than the administration at that point: ''Now our President reminded his audience of an earlier time when a free people confronted what he called 'rapid change and momentous choices.' That time was the 1930s. Nazi Germany was rearming, and the British Government was reluctant to take forceful steps to stave off war. To give voice to his own concerns, candidate Bush quoted Winston Churchill, who repeatedly called upon his countrymen to respond to the gathering storm.''

Here is what candidate Bush said and quoted from Winston Churchill: '' 'The era of procrastination, of half-measures, of soothing and baffling expedients, of delays, is coming to a close,' Churchill said. 'In its place we are entering a period of consequences.' That period of consequences arrived not only for the military but for those who practiced intelligence just 2 years after the President's Citadel speech on September 11, 2001. Like our colleagues in the military forces, we will be judged by our successors on our response to this period of consequences. We face few substantial impediments to transforming intelligence. We are led by individuals at the Department of Defense and agencies who embrace the need for and who likewise are committed to this effort. Congress has provided the resources.''

What we see is a true response. ''There is an urgency to transform intelligence, defining and achieving operational goals.'' But what we will not see and what we have not seen from this President, what we perhaps saw during the 1990s and what the folks in Great Britain saw in the 1930s, what they saw and what we perhaps saw, the British Government, the U.S. Government in the 1990s was reluctant to take forceful steps to stave off war. Again: ''The era of procrastination, of half measures, of soothing and baffling expedients, of delays, is coming to a close. In its place we are entering a period of consequences.''

That was the end of the quote from Winston Churchill. It was the end of an era where we had delays and baffling expediency.

What this President has provided us is an era of leadership, strategically. There can be differences on the tactics. We have done things wrong. Mistakes have been made. It is always great in hindsight to identify a mistake, 20/20 vision, saying we should have done that 2 years ago or we should have done that 3 months ago, and we are second guessing our military commanders in the field, but what we do have is we have a clear sense of vision and commitment to move forward and to get this done. That is what this President has provided. Strategically we are headed in the right direction. Tactically we have got some work to do.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

□ 2015

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to thank him, too, I really appreciate the historical perspective that he brings to this debate, because we learn from our history. God help us if we do not learn from our history. We repeat the same mistakes.

But the bottom line here is, as the gentleman from Michigan was explaining at the top of the hour, we had 10 years, we had a lot of time, where the gentleman mentioned the USS *Cole*, the Marine barracks in Lebanon, the embassies, and it goes on and on. What did we do? It was a series of drawing a line in the sand, and let me suggest not a very deep one, and a series of double-dog-dare-you.

And what happened? The Twin Towers attack on September 11, 2001. I want to remind, Mr. Speaker, all of my colleagues, that that indeed was not the first attack. It happened in 1993. And what did we do? It is just like, you bomb an aspirin factory?

The gentleman from Michigan put it in such great perspective. We are hearing from the other side, and you are going to hear it for the next 6 months of this presidential election year, we know it, we have heard it, we have heard all about campaign rhetoric, are you better off than you were 4 years ago? They are trying to borrow a phrase from a great president, President Reagan. And what a wonderful job he did, probably one of the greatest presidents we ever had.

I will tell you, like the gentleman from Michigan said, we are better off than we were 4 years ago. But it is not so much important are we better off, but the world is better off. The world is a better place. It is kind of like borrowing from Charles Dickens in the Tale of Two Cities, on that first page, the first paragraph, when he said, It is the worst of times, it is the best of times.

Well, in many ways it is the worst of times. It is always a bad time, a very bad time when we are losing men and women who are paying the ultimate sacrifice defending this country. Even though we agree with Thomas Jefferson when he said that every now and then the Tree of Liberty has to be nourished again by the blood of patriots.

That is what is going on today. Those are the worst of times, but they are the best of times, because we, by the grace of God, have a Commander-in-Chief, a leader of this country, that is a man of faith, a God-fearing President with resolute determination, and he will lead this country out of the morass that we find ourselves in, because it is the right thing to do.

I am so appreciative for having an opportunity to share a little time with the gentleman from Michigan, because the story needs to be told.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Reclaiming my time, we talk about are we better off. Think about it. It is 1995–1996. We have been attacked a few different times in a few different places around the globe. We know that the organization that is attacking us is a terrorist organization. It is not a nation state, so it does not have a defined boundary. It does not have buildings that you could go and occupy or you could declare war on.

So, what is the response that we have in the intelligence community in 1995–1996? We may have talked about this the last time we had an opportunity to do a special order. It is the called the Deutch Doctrine. Deutch was the head of the CIA during that time.

Are we better off? Well, the response to terrorist organizations, to the uncertainty in Iraq, Saddam was in there. A few years later he kicked out the UN inspectors and continued to flaunt the different resolutions that came out of the UN.

What was the response in the intelligence community to what was a growing and emerging threat? It was the Deutch Doctrine, which says, well, if you are in the field in the CIA and you are thinking about recruiting spies, if they have any human rights violations or they have a criminal record, they really need to go through a special screening process. And, by the way, we do not really want to do business with those kinds of folks. So if you want a career-ending move, send us a bunch of folks that have questionable backgrounds and tell us you would like to recruit them to be spies. In effect, we closed down our human intelligence.

We took a look at what was going on in Iraq prior to the war and what was going on there the last few years. We have excellent imagery from space. We can see buildings and we can see trucks and people moving around, but we do not know what is actually in the building. We can guess. We do not know exactly what is on the minds of the people. Are they stockpiling and producing weapons of mass destruction, or have they decided that they will put the facilities in place that once the UN is out? Do they think, we can produce the stuff in massive quantities in a very short period of time, a just-in-time inventory? We could not understand their strategy, because we went blind on the human intelligence side.

We went worse than that. We went through a process in the CIA that scrubbed the folks that were working for the CIA. What does that mean? Not only were we not going to recruit any more of these folks, but we also said, let us go through and see if we have any kind of these people working for us, and, if we do have these people working for us, it is time to cut them off.

My colleague and I, we know enough about al Qaeda, we know about the other kinds of terrorist organizations, we know enough about Saddam Hussein. The question is, what do you think the profile is? How many of the Eagle Scouts that we said we would only recruit to work for the CIA were in the tent with bin Laden or in one of the palaces with Saddam?

Mr. GINGREY. That is exactly right. As the gentleman said, back in the previous administration, they scrubbed it to the extent that if you had ever had a history of spitting on the sidewalk or jaywalking, you were ineligible to work for the CIA or work in our intelligence.

You have got to fight fire with fire. These are bad guys. When you think of somebody in retaliation, as they might say, or retribution, because we had a few miscreants mistreating, horribly mistreating, and we do not condone that, in one cell block in Abu Ghraib prison in Baghdad, so, tit-for-tat, you chop off the head of a 26-year-old young man who is in Baghdad, who has a history of being compassionate and wanting to help people and do the right thing and maybe restore some communication networks in Iraq. That is what we are dealing with.

So, it is absolutely right. We fell asleep at the switch. But not in this administration. Not on this watch and this president. He immediately responded after 9/11 and told us, and reminded us, this war against terrorism, this is not going to end with the capture of Osama bin Laden. This does not end because we have found Saddam Hussein. He told us 2½ years ago that this war on terrorism is a global war, and it is something that is going to be with us for a long time.

These oceans no longer protect us. It is easy for people to forget.

I want to make one other point, if the gentleman from Michigan will allow me a little bit more time. You know, somebody told me today, I did not realize this, but I went to a movie recently, the premier of ''Ike,'' starring Tom Selleck, a great movie about the lead-up to Normandy, Operation Overlord, and the agony, of course, they went through in trying to time that mission and train the troops on the coast of England.

I did not realize that they actually practiced the invasion of Normandy there on the beaches in England. Of course, a lot of live fire was used practicing that invasion to make sure they got it just right, and over 700 of our soldiers were killed practicing for Normandy, for D-Day, because they were using live fire. There were some accidents that occurred, but we lost over 700 soldiers in the preparation for Normandy.

What if the our Greatest Generation, what if we were in a digital world back then and all that news got out to the 24 hour news network, and, oh my God, what would have happened? Maybe D-Day never would have occurred.

I realize, of course, we have lost over 700 by comparison, maybe 800 now in Iraq and Afghanistan, but we need to put it in perspective. If you ask the Greatest Generation, what should be our exit strategy in Iraq, they would quickly tell you the exit strategy is to win; to win. You do not pull your team off in the fourth quarter because the going gets tough. That is when the tough get going. That is with what made that generation the Greatest Generation.

I think today we may have an even greater generation with these young men and women, these 135,000, 140,000

active component, Guard and Reserve over there laying it on the line for us, spilling their blood to nourish that Tree of Liberty. It makes me very proud of them, and humble as a Member of Congress.

But we have got to stay the course. We have got to continue to, as the gentleman from Michigan has said, to let the American people understand, to know, to put this in the right perspective.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Reclaiming my time, one of the things we wanted to do tonight, we wanted to talk a little bit about the young men and women who are serving in Iraq. We have a list of many who have received the Distinguished Service Cross or the Bronze Star and those types of things. Maybe we will read some of those citations.

But today in USA Today there was a story entitled ''A Marine sees what defeatists do not.'' This is a young man who is now serving his third deployment with the 1st Marine Division in the Middle East, Ben Connable.

Here is one of the things he talked about when he first went in 1991. ''Waiting for war in the Saudi Arabian desert as a young corporal in 1991, I recall reading news clippings portending massive tank battles, fiery death from Saddam Hussein's ''flame trenches'' and bitter defeat at the hands of the fourth largest army in the world. My platoon was told to expect 75 percent casualties. Being Marines and, therefore, naturally cocky, we still felt pretty good about our abilities.

''The panicky predictions failed to come true. The flame trenches sputtered. Nobody from my platoon died. Strength, ingenuity and willpower won the day. Crushing the fourth largest army in the world in four days seemed to crush the doubts back home.

''Twelve years passed, during which time America was faced with frustrating actions in Somalia and the Balkans. Doubt had begun to creep back into public debate.

''In the spring of last year, I was a Marine captain, back with the division for Operation Iraqi Freedom. As I waited for war in the desert just 100 miles to the north from our stepping-off point in 1991, I was again subjected to the panicky analysis of talking heads. There weren't enough troops to do the job, the oil fields would be destroyed, we could not fight in urban terrain, our offensive would grind to a halt, and we should expect more than 10,000 casualties.

''Remembering my experience in Desert Storm, I took these assessments with a grain of salt. As a staff officer in the division command post, I was able to follow the larger battle as we moved forwards. I knew that our tempo was keeping the enemy on his heels and that our plan would lead us to victory.

''But war is never clean and simple. Mourning our losses quietly, the Marines drove to Baghdad, then to Tikrit, liberating the Iraqi people while losing fewer men than were lost in Desert Storm.''

Then he talks about on March 30 he was reading a U.S. newspaper that was in one of the packages that he had received. The stories in the paper: ''Horror in Nassariyah, faltering supply lines and demonstrations in Cairo. The mood of the paper was impenetrably gloomy, and predictions of disaster abounded. The offensive was stalled; everyone was running out of supplies; we would be forced to withdraw.

''The Arab world was about to ignite into a fireball of rage, and the Middle East was on the verge of collapse. If I read those stories on March 30, I would have had a tough time either restraining my laughter or, conversely, falling into a funk. I was concerned about the bizarre kaleidoscope image of Iraq presented to the American people by writers viewing the world through a soda straw,'' not taking a look at the total picture.

He now says, ''As I write this, the supply lines are open, there is plenty of ammunition and food, the Sunni Triangle is back to status quo, and Sadr is marginalized in Najaf. Once again, dire predictions of failure and disaster have been dismissed by America's willpower and military professionalism.

''War is inherently ugly and dramatic. I do not blame reporters for focusing on the burning vehicles, the mutilated bodies or the personal tragedies. These things sell news and remind us of the sober reality of our commitment to the Iraqi people. The actions of our armed forces are rightfully subject to scrutiny.

''As a professional, I have the luxury of putting politics aside and focusing on the task at hand. Protecting people from terrorists and criminals while building schools and lasting friendships is a good mission, no matter what brush it is tarred with.''

□ 2230

Think about it. This is what one of our soldiers said there. And I have heard this story over and over and over, if you talk to our troops when they are coming back, whether you are in your district or they are in the airport, and you go up to them and say, Thank you.

Here is why they are, I think, overwhelmingly positive because this is what they see their mission as, and they know that when they are doing this mission, they are also doing a mission which protects you and I and our constituents.

Here is how he described it: ''Protecting people from terrorists and criminals while building schools and lasting friendships is a good mission no matter what brush it is tarred with. Nothing any talking head will say can deter me or my fellow Marines from caring about the people of Iraq or take away from the sacrifices of our comrades. Fear in the face of adversity is human nature, and many people who take counsel with their fears speak today. We are not deaf to their cries. Neither do we take heed.''

His closing two sentences are absolutely awesome. This is one of our young men who is over there with the Iraq people each and every day. He is not talking about in Iraq where the people, as we sometimes perceive in the media, where all the Iraqis and all the people of Islam, hate Americans. Here is what he says, and think about this; this is a soldier who is representing the troops that are putting their lives on the line each and every day. ''All we ask is that Americans stand by us by supporting not just the troops, but also the mission.'' And then I guess as any Marine would say, Here is how he closes. ''We will take care of the rest.''

Mr. GINGREY. The gentleman is wearing a poppy in his lapel as most of us did today. He continues to wear his, and I am proud of him for that.

Memorial Day is coming up pretty soon, and we all know the symbol of the poppy. And we passed a resolution today honoring those who have served. Our country is almost 230 years old. We have had a lot of conflicts, and that poppy represents our tribute to the fallen many in multiple conflicts.

I cannot help but think about that poem at a time like this that was written by a physician, a surgeon, a Canadian, Doc McCrae, when his best friend was killed in Flanders, Belgium, and buried on their hallowed ground where those poppies grow. It was inspiration to Dr. McCrae to write that poem that we all know so well today.

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure my memory reciting poetry is that good, but I do remember that last stanza is, a short poem, a very short poem. It went something like:

''Take up our quarrel with the foe, to you from failing hands we pass the torch, be yours to hold it high, for if you break faith with us who die, we shall not sleep, though poppies grow in Flanders Field.''

Mr. Speaker, it says it all. It is just what the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) was referring to. We owe such a debt of gratitude to these brave men and women who have paid it, an ultimate sacrifice, to those soldiers at Walter Reed or at Bethesda who are over there trying to rehabilitate and get used to wearing those prostheses because they have lost a limb or maybe multiple limbs.

It is very easy to stand here in the House, and sometimes some of our colleagues are awfully critical in talking again about the exit strategy, and we will probably hear some of that later on tonight from the other side. But I think that is absolutely despicable when these men and women, no matter what the cause, have paid that price.

You go back and you talk about the Civil War, you talk about the Korean conflict, you talk about Vietnam where we lost 58,000 men and some women in that conflict. But let me, if I can, just to kind of put it in perspective to bring some reality to it.

Yeah, we had some thugs running that cell block in Abu Ghraib that no

matter how much training they may have received, there is no excuse, because what they did, it does not take $50,000 worth of military training to teach them that it is wrong. Any Boy Scout or Girl Scout that follows the creed and knows the Scout oath would never, would never do a thing like that.

But let me just talk a little bit about one, just one of the brave many who serve and, in this particular instance, paid the ultimate sacrifice for his country and does it the right way. Listen to this, Mr. Speaker.

''The President of the United States takes pride in presenting the Silver Star posthumously to Gunnery Sergeant Jeffrey E. Bohr, Jr., United States Marine Corps, for service as set forth in the following citation:

''For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in action against the enemy while serving as Company Gunnery Sergeant, Company A, 1st Battalion, 5th Marine Regiment, Regimental Combat Team 5, 1st Marine Division, I Marine Expeditionary Force in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom on 10 April 2003. With his company assigned the dangerous mission of seizing a presidential palace in Baghdad and concerned that logistical resupply might be slow in reaching his comrades once they reached the objective, Gunnery Sergeant Bohr selflessly volunteered to move in his two soft-skinned vehicles with the company's main armored convoy. While moving through narrow streets toward the main objective, the convoy took intense small arms and rocket-propelled grenade fire. Throughout this movement, Gunnery Sergeant Bohr delivered accurate, effective fires on the enemy, while encouraging his Marines and supplying critical information to his company commander.

''When the lead vehicles of the convoy reached a dead end and were subjected to enemy fire, Gunnery Sergeant Bohr continued to boldly engage the enemy while calmly maneuvering his Marines to safety. Upon learning of a wounded Marine in a forward vehicle, Gunnery Sergent Bohr immediately coordinated medical treatment and evacuation. Moving to the position of the injured Marine, Gunnery Sergeant Bohr continued to lay down a high volume of suppressive fire, while simultaneously guiding the medical evacuation vehicle, until he was mortally wounded by enemy fire.

''By his bold leadership, wise judgment, and complete dedication to duty, Gunnery Sergeant Bohr reflected great credit upon himself and upheld the highest tradition of the Marine Corps and the United States Naval Service.''

God bless him, Mr. Speaker. We all need to remember people like Gunnery Sergeant Jeffrey Bohr.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank my colleague. We have a long list of folks who have served heroically in Iraq and Afghanistan. In my own district I have had two young men who were killed in Iraq, Steve Hewlett and Todd Robbins.

Again, I want the folks in the district and in the country to recognize that, as was described in USA Today, the work that Steve and Todd were engaged in was protecting people from terrorists and criminals while building schools and lasting friendships, a good mission no matter what brush it is tarred with and no matter how other people try to paint that picture.

Ridding the world of Saddam Hussein was the right thing to do, just as they are protecting people from terrorists in Iraq and Afghanistan and other places. As we eliminate terrorists in Iraq and Afghanistan and other places, we also have to remember that the larger goal and objective of these terrorist organizations is not to terrorize the people of Iraq, not to terrorize the people of Afghanistan. They were already doing that. Their larger goal was to build a network to terrorize the rest of the world.

We felt on September 11 that the terrorists that were based in Afghanistan attacked the United States. The people in Israel and other parts of the Middle East have felt it for years, as Saddam Hussein exported terrorism and paid bounties and cash bonuses to the families of suicide bombers in Israel. There is no doubt that these nations and the leadership in these countries were actively engaged in a global war on terrorism.

For them, it was only a matter of time before they would have taken those resources and expanded that to continue to attack U.S. interests in the Middle East, in Europe and other parts of the world, but also to take that battle to the United States.

When we talk about some of the other things that have happened in Iraq, Jim Hoffman, an individual from my district, served 8 or 9 months in Iraq, served as the Minister of Health; on April 1 the Ministry of Health was turned over to the Iraqis. Today, health care is not being provided by the coalition. Health care is now being provided by Iraqis.

There is a Ministry of Education, teachers' salaries $120 a month; entry level salaries have gone from $5 a month to $66 a month. The Minister of Public Works and Municipalities established programs to rehabilitate 14 water treatment plants.

The Ministry of Science and Technology has taken the lead in establishing the foundation for E-government in Iraq. The Ministry of Culture has revitalized the national symphony orchestra, begun clearing Iraq's library collection.

The Ministry of Agriculture is rehabilitating Iraq's agriculture colleges to carry forward Iraq's long agricultural history of displacement and migration. The Ministry of Water Resources cleared over 17,000 kilometers of irrigation canals.

So there is a tremendous amount of work, and as I talk to our troops that come back, one of the things that frustrates them is that the bad news is what is focused on here. Many of the troops that I talk to say they do not even watch the news anymore when they come home. They do not watch it when they are in Iraq because what they see on the news they say is not reflective of what they see while they are on the ground in Iraq. These are the kinds of things that are not talked about.

I think my colleague and I, we are not denying that the bad things, they are happening, but again I think as Ben Conable pointed out in his article in USA Today, and this is a person that is there in his third tour, he says, the media is looking at Iraq through a straw, not giving the total picture.

Mr. GINGREY. The gentleman is so right. He referred earlier about the McDonald's mentality. Of course, meaning no disrespect to a great company. Just suggesting at that time ''quick fix,'' the fast delivery which that company is so well respected for, that is just not what happens in a situation like we are in in Iraq. And in the 24-hour news networks, of course, it is one sound bite after another.

And as the gentleman said, and I asked when I was in Iraq, I asked some of the soldiers, and unfortunately, when they get a break from those patrols or they are in those Humvees, whether they are up-armored or aftermarket armored or unarmored and they are on those dangerous missions. They probably go 12, 14-hour, 16-hour shifts and they get back to the billet and maybe they have access to relax, knowing that they have to go back out the next day and do it all over again and every day their lives are at risk. So sure they watch television. And it is just unbelievable what they are seeing and the discouragement.

God forbid if they are tuning into some of the coverage of what they hear here in the halls of Congress; you would think that they would get a little bit discouraged. It is funny how sometimes you hear the opposition say, Oh, we support the troops. The troops we love. They are brave men and women. We support the troops, but, hey, you know, the coach sucks.

You just put it in perspective of a high school football team. If the booster club says, We want the boys to go out there. We love them. They are doing a great job, but we do not like the coach. We question all the plays. Pretty soon it gets down to the players and they are not going to win too many games that season and that is what you are seeing here, that sort of thing.

The Iraqi people, they were not as fortunate as we were in this great country called the United States of America. We were born to freedom.

□ 2245

Our Forefathers bought and paid for that, and certainly all of us today never knew anything different. We have freedom of press, freedom of religion, freedom of speech. We take it for granted, unfortunately.

These people, the Iraqi people, the 25 million most of whom are good people.

They have never known that. So it is going to take a long time, Mr. Speaker, for them to understand, to get the feel of that, and yet we hear from the other side, well, Mr. President, what is your exit strategy. Indeed, indeed.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, there was an editorial today by William Safire in the New York Times, and it is kind of an interesting thing because what he talks about today, ''In this rush to misjudgment, we can see an example of the 'Four Noes' that have become the defeatists' platform.''

''The first 'no' is no stockpiles of WMD, used to justify the war, were found.'' He goes on to say what we may find is ''the successful concealment of WMD, as well as pre-war shipments thereof to Syria,'' I think what most likely happened is that Saddam moved away from stockpiling weapons of mass destruction to putting in place plans ''for production and missile delivery,'' but that is my own conjecture, ''by Saddam's Special Republican Guard and Fedayeen, as part of his planned guerrilla war.''

This is what Safire goes on to say. ''The present story line of 'Saddam was stupid, fooled by his generals' would then be replaced by 'Saddam was shrewder than we thought.' ''

''Defeatism's second 'no' is no connection was made between Saddam and al Qaeda or any of its terrorist affiliates. This is asserted as revealed truth with great fervor.''

Now we see, going on in the article that he wrote today, ''most damning is the rise to terror's top rank of Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, who escaped Afghanistan to receive medical treatment in Baghdad. He joined Ansar al-Islam, a Qaeda offshoot whose presence in Iraq to murder Kurds at Saddam's behest was noted in this space in the weeks after 9/11. His activity in Iraq was cited by President Bush 6 months before our invasion. Osama's disciple Zarqawi is now thought to be the televised beheading of a captive American.

''The third 'no' is no human-rights high ground can be claimed by us regarding Saddam's torture chambers because we mistreated Iraqi prisoners. This equates sleep deprivation with life deprivation, illegal individual humiliation with official mass murder. We flagellate ourselves for mistreatment by a few of our guards, who will be punished; he delightedly oversaw the shoveling of 300,000 innocent Iraqis into unmarked graves.'' He goes on to say, ''Iraqis know the difference.

''The fourth 'no' is no Arab nature is culturally ready for political freedom and our attempt to impose democracy in Iraq is arrogant Wilsonian idealism.

''In coming years, this will be blasted by revisionist supporters as an ignoble ethnic-racist slur. Iraqis will gain the power, with our help, to put down the terrorists and find their own brand of political equilibrium.

''Will today's defeatists then admit they were wrong?'' Safire goes on to say, he answers that question with, ''That's a fifth 'no.' ''

Once a defeatist always a defeatist. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank the gentleman for bringing this hour to our colleagues in the House on both sides of the aisle and for giving me an opportunity to share with him this time because it is so important.

Mr. Speaker, it is so important for not just American people but for those men and women who are over there in harm's way defending our freedom and liberty and allowing us to sleep well at night and to hopefully bring in peace, democracy, liberty, freedom that we enjoy, that we take for granted, to the people in the Middle East.

I think that we just need to remember that our every waking hour and never forget what they are doing for us and we are doing the right thing, and I thank the gentleman from Michigan for being courageous to bring this time to the American people, but especially to those men and women who maybe, yes, they just came off patrol from Fallujah or the Sunni triangle or hottest of the hot spots in Iraq, and they take that backpack off and that body armor off and they take off their boots and they relax a little bit and they turn on the television and hopefully maybe they are watching what we are saying tonight, and I hope they are because they need to know that people like the gentleman from Michigan, a distinct leader in this 108th Congress, we believe in them and we are going to support them, and we are going to stick with them, and we are going to see them to the end, and we are going to have victory for the world, not just for the United States of America.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I want to just close again by going back to the article that was written by Ben Connable from Ramadi, Iraq. Remember, this is his third deployment, and when we talk about the voices of defeatism, as Safire talks about it in the New York Times today, these guys hear that message.

He says doubt had begun to creep back into the public debate. He sees and hears that now. He saw it when they were talking what about was going on in the Sunni triangle and what really is going on. He knows and admits that war is inherently ugly and dramatic, but here is again what he said.

''But as a professional, I have the luxury of putting politics aside and focusing on the task at hand. Protecting people from terrorists and criminals while building schools and lasting friendships is a good mission, no matter what brush it's tarred with.

''Nothing any talking head will say can deter me or my fellow Marines from caring about the people of Iraq,'' and I would say they are there because they know that by caring for the people of Iraq or Afghanistan, they know that they are caring for the people of the United States, ''or take away from the sacrifices of our comrades. Fear in the face of adversity is human nature, and many people who take the counsel of their fears speak today. We are not deaf to their cries; neither do we take heed.''

A simple request from Major Ben Connable is this. ''All we ask is that Americans stand by us by supporting not just the troops, but also the mission. We'll take care of the rest.''

WHO INVESTIGATES THE INVESTIGATORS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, today a 24-year-old Army Reserve specialist was sentenced to do a year in jail, reduction in rank and dishonorable discharge for his role in the Abu Ghraib prison scandal. What would his sentence have been if this soldier had served as judge, jury, prosecution and defense? Indeed, would there have been any charges filed at all if the 24-year-old soldier had investigated himself? Of course not. It would be justice denied.

Yet that is exactly what the military commanders and civilian leaders at the Pentagon are trying to pull off.

Yesterday, before a Senate committee, Lieutenant General Ricardo Sanchez, the top military commander in Iraq, vowed that the scandal would be investigated up the chain of command, including himself.

At a time when the world must see that no one in the U.S. is above the law, the Pentagon arrogantly acts as if it answers only to itself. The first low-ranking soldier was thrown overboard today. Other low-ranking soldiers will soon follow.

This is how Secretary Rumsfeld, Lieutenant General Sanchez and all of their minions define justice. Do as I say, not as I do. The world is watching, and the world is not buying the Pentagon justice charade.

Outside the courtroom today, an Iraqi civilian told the Associate Press, ''Those who are executing the laws and orders are not the problem. Punishment of the officials who gave the orders is what matters.''

More than anything else, these court-martials may just reinforce the mistrust and resentment against the United States throughout the Arab world.

The way the proceedings are being handled is under fire. The Pentagon allowed media to attend the court-martial but television cameras were barred, even as representatives from Middle East networks demanded access.

Apparently, it is okay for the President to go on Arab television but it is not okay for the Arab world to see an

example of justice in the United States military. Why not?

What is more, the U.S. refused to allow either Iraqi or international human rights groups to attend and observe the court-martial. U.S. military brass cited unspecified ''security'' issues for denying the request. Human Rights Watch could not even get the name of a U.S. military leader in order to lodge a complaint.

The leader of the human rights organization in the Middle East called the U.S. military's refusal ''a bad decision in its own right. It also sends a terrible signal to the Iraqis and others deeply concerned about what transpired in Abu Ghraib.''

America's credibility is on the line around the world, but U.S. military commanders deny access to a courtroom by credible, independent human rights organizations. What will it take for Secretary Rumsfeld and the military commanders to get it?

Another soldier at the prison told ABC News today, ''There's definitely a cover-up,'' and the soldier said military commanders authorized the abuse.

Several soldiers may be on trial in a military court in Iraq, but America is on trial in the world court. Denying access to human rights organizations will be seen round the world as a cover-up. Claiming this scandal begins and ends with a few low-ranking soldiers will be seen around the world as a cover-up. Claiming the military can investigate itself all the way up the chain of command will be seen as what it is, an end run around justice.

If there is nothing to hide, then get it out in the open. For the sake of every good and decent American soldier in harm's way in Iraq, this Congress must show the world that no one is above the law in America.

Every day, there are new allegations of abuses in Iraq and Guantanamo Bay. The Observer, which is a London newspaper, is reporting that a British prisoner just released from Guantanamo claims there are organized American punishment units called Extreme Reaction Forces or ERFs. Prisoners fear being ERF'd. They have created a new word for this kind of abuse. There are rumors, in fact, that a member of each ERF team takes a videotape and they are there. We need to see those ERF tapes.

A woman in Iraq claimed U.S. military forces took her husband and is holding him without charges because her father was not in the house. They said, well, if your father is not here, we are going to take your husband.

The International Red Cross quoted military intelligence officers as saying between 70 and 90 percent of the Iraqis in prison were arrested by mistake.

□ 2300

Iraq is spinning out of control. This war has gone from crisis to calamity to catastrophe. If the President will not lead the Nation, the Congress must. We need an investigation now. We need to remove Rumsfeld and Wolfowitz and Cambone and Feith, for that matter. We need to do it now. Some low-ranking U.S. soldiers are not the only ones on trial. America is on trial as well.

What is fascinating about reading the American press today is that if that is all you watch, if you watch Fox TV, which is a Republican body, I mean, the guy who runs it used to be the PR director, or the National Committee Chairman for the Republican Party. Or if you read the newspapers, there is a tight control on the news that you and I get in the United States.

Now, if you pick up a foreign newspaper, you find some very interesting things. In the Guardian, on May 18, there is an article by a man named Crispin Blunt. He says, ''I voted for intervention in Iraq. Not because of the threat of weapons of mass destruction, but because of the failure to ensure the removal of Saddam Hussein in 1991 and its consequences.'' Meaning the effects of sanctions. Now, he says, I have changed my mind. We need to get out. We must get out.

''The reason for the failed policy is simple: When the British occupied Iraq following the first world war, they were greeted initially as liberators of Iraqis from the Ottoman Empire. But over time, the British came to be seen as occupiers. Iraq experts and historians predict that after 9 months or so, the American and British forces that came to liberate Iraq from the Ba'athists rule would be seen as foreign occupiers.''

My colleagues, we are there today. We are there today. We are just like the British were in 1923 or whatever.

''The insurgents in Iraq cannot be written off as a small minority led by foreign jihadis. The silent majority of Iraqis increasingly side with the insurgents, who are viewed as part of the Iraqi nation waging resistance against the foreign occupiers. However nasty their tactics, the insurgents are viewed as the 'us' in this new battle to expunge the occupiers. However noble and rational the goals of the coalition, U.S. and Britain, they are perceived as the alien 'them.' ''

It goes on to say ''an exit strategy is needed above all to preserve and restore in Arab eyes the moral authority of our liberal democratic values, which have been under intense assault most recently with the emergence of Abu Ghraib.''

Another article in the Guardian dated May 19, is entitled ''Former Guantanamo Chief Clashed with Army Interrogators. General's Sacking Cleared Way for Pentagon to Rewrite Rules.''

What we are seeing in those pictures that have been on the front pages of the newspapers of this country are the result of decisions made a long time ago, not by six or seven soldiers, but by people at the very top, beginning with Mr. Rumsfeld. This article reports on the sacking of a General Rick Baccus. He is the commander of the Rhode Island National Guard. He was sacked amid charges from the Pentagon that he was too soft on the detainees at Guantanamo Bay.

Now, ''General Baccus was removed in October of 2002. That is a long time ago. Apparently, after frustrating military intelligence officers by granting detainees such privileges as distributing copies of the Koran and adjusting meal times for Ramadan. He also disciplined prison guards for screaming at inmates.''

This is why he was sacked. He was too soft on the prisoners. This goes on to say ''General Baccus' unceremonious departure offers a rare insight as to how the Pentagon rewrote the rules of warfare to suit the Bush administration's view of a radically changed world following the attacks of September 11. It also suggests what happens to military personnel slow to sign up to the Pentagon's changed view of the world.

''Eighteen months after being removed from Guantanamo, General Baccus, aged 51, and commander of the National Guard in Rhode Island, is still waiting for a new military assignment.''

Do you think he will get one in this administration? I doubt it.

Now, the connection between Guantanamo and Abu Ghraib grew clearer this month when General Baccus' successor at the camp, guess who, Major General Geoffrey Miller, was put in charge of the U.S. prisons in Iraq. He was in Guantanamo, and they said, come on over here and fix up what is going on in Iraq.

''General Miller's recommendations for Abu Ghraib, merging the functions of prison guard and interrogator, as he did at Guantanamo, was cited in the Pentagon's internal report on abuse at the now notorious prison.''

This is the Pentagon's report on abuse. They said that was wrong, to merge the guards and the interrogators. You had guards who had no training whatsoever in interrogation being put in the position of being interrogators. It is no wonder we had this problem.

There is an article that talks about what happened after the Second World War and how long they trained the people before they went to Nuremberg to question the Nazis, how long it took them to prepare the interrogators to do it in a humane and professional way.

This administration, run by the Secretary of War, Mr. Rumsfeld, had no time to wait, to plan. They had to go right now. It was a war of choice. It was not a war where there was any impending danger to us. It is very clear now. But they wanted to get in and get it done as quick as possible before anybody figured out what they were up to. So they rushed in, totally ill prepared, and put these young people that they are now convicting and throwing out of the military.

I was a psychiatrist during the Vietnam era, and I saw these people coming

back from Vietnam. A lot of them wound up in the brig, and I would see them. And let me tell my colleagues something. Giving somebody a bad conduct discharge really scars them for life. Every time you go for a job, you are asked, do you have an honorable discharge? Well, no, I do not, I got a bad conduct discharge. They are going to have trouble getting jobs the rest of their lives on the basis of orders given to them by somebody who will take his very generous Federal pension and go off in real luxury for the rest of his life.

Those six or seven people that are being dumped out on their ear or will be dumped out in the near future are being treated unfairly, and everybody should know that, and everybody should be able to see it.

Now, today, there was also a story in the Los Angeles Times, because you have to read widely in this country. You cannot just read the papers here in Washington, DC. The L.A. Times carries a story by Richard Serrano entitled ''3 Witnesses at Iraq Abuse Hearing Refuse to Testify.''

''Three key witnesses, including a senior officer in charge of interrogations, refused to testify during a secret hearing against an alleged ringleader of the Abu Ghraib prison abuse scandal on the grounds that they might incriminate themselves.''

They took the 5th. An officer of the United States military took the 5th, and this House does not have an investigation. We do not think it is worthwhile to find out what is going on here.

''The witnesses appeared on April 26 at a preliminary hearing behind closed doors for Corporal Charles A. Graner, who has been identified in court-martial documents as the leader of a band of military police guards who humiliated and abused Iraqi detainees and compiled a bizarre photographic record of their activities. The prospective witnesses' refusal to testify is described in court-martial documents obtained by the Times on Tuesday.

''That all of the prospective witnesses called up by prosecutors invoked the military equivalent of the Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination indicates the key players in the abuse scandal may be closing ranks to save themselves and one another.''

So here comes the coverup. And if the House of Representatives, with the responsibility for oversight given to us by the Constitution, shirks their duty on this issue, they are participating in the coverup as well.

□ 2310

There is no way the House can excuse itself from investigating this, and our leadership just laughs and says it is a frat house prank. This was no frat house prank. This has ruined our reputation in the world. It has taken away our moral authority to deal because not only did we do it, but we will not own up to it and talk about how it happened.

Just a week after the hearing on May 3, the judge, Major Dewayne McOsker, Jr., ruled there was enough evidence to proceed. He cited a CD-ROM containing photographs and videos taken inside the prison showing detainees being abused and humiliated, along with written statements from four of the other six guards implicated in the scandal. ''I believe there is enough credible evidence to establish reasonable grounds'' that Graner is guilty, McOsker concluded.

Now he went ahead and did it anyway in spite of the fact that a senior officer said I cannot talk about this because I might incriminate myself. The New York Times, May 19, ''Two Generals Deny Issuing Orders to Allow Prison Abuse in Iraq.'' Big surprise, right.

''The two generals in charge of the occupation of Iraq took responsibility today for the prison abuse scandal there, but they also denied having issued or approved any orders that they say could have been interpreted to allow humiliation or mistreatment of prisoners.''

Now if there is nothing to hide, we should have an investigation. Why do we not bring it out? That is the question that this House must face. Members cannot go out with a straight face and talk to the friends and the families and the loved ones of people who have died in Iraq and say that you have done your job as a U.S. Congressman if you have not participated in demanding an investigation.

To say that this will be handled by the Army, the Army will handle it, I guess they will.

ABC News, May 18, ''Definitely a Cover-Up. Former Abu Ghraib Intel Staffer Says Army Concealed Involvement in Abuse Scandal.''

'' 'There is definitely a cover-up,' the witness, Sergeant Samuel Provance said. 'People are either telling themselves or being told to be quiet.'

''Provance, 30, was part of the 302nd Military Intelligence Battalion stationed at Abu Ghraib last September. He spoke to ABC despite orders from his commanders not to.

'' 'What I am surprised at was the silence,' says Provance. 'The collective silence by so many people that had to be involved, that had to have seen something or heard something.'

''Provance, now stationed in Germany, ran the top secret computer network used by military intelligence at the prison.''

This is not just some guy who heard scuttlebutt around someplace. He was in the unit doing the intelligence work. He said while he did not see the actual abuses, the interrogators with whom he worked freely admitted they directed the MP's rough treatment of prisoners.

I do not know, it sounds like a smoking gun if somebody wanted to look at it. Anybody who has been in a military organization realizes there is something called the Uniform Code of Military Justice, the UCMJ. And as an enlisted person at the bottom, you are responsible to carry out the orders of your superior. Privates carry out the orders of corporals, sergeants and lieutenants and captains and major and so forth up the line. Failure to do so leads to a court-martial or to an article 15 or some kind of punishment, and everybody knows it.

So the fact that they threw this poor guy out today with a bad conduct discharge, and we will see if anything more happens. If by the end of a few weeks all we see are seven people that they threw out as rogue soldiers, the injustice and the cover-up started by the people in the Department of Defense will be clear as it is in the sunshine.

This House cannot allow that to happen. The New York Times again, ''Officers Say U.S. Colonel at Abu Ghraib Prison Felt Intense Pressure to Get Inmates to Talk.''

When they sent Colonel Thomas Pappas over there as the head of military intelligence, he was under enormous pressure from his superiors to extract more information from prisoners there, according to senior Army officers.

People knew this. This is not something that was not known, it is just that the House of Representatives does not want to ask. They do not want to look. They want to close their eyes and hope it will go away. This is not going to go away because the world is watching and looking and reacting to it. Maybe you can close your eyes until after the election is over, but you will not be able to close your eyes to the impact that it has on the United States and to our troops.

These pictures have stirred up the opposition, the people out there. All they have to do is show those pictures around, and people will say, yes, I will get them, which makes it more dangerous for our people every single day.

Being out there in a guerilla warfare is awful. I heard about it from the soldiers and sailors that I dealt with in Vietnam. I did not experience it myself. I did not have to. I know it was awful. We are making their job tougher by not saying we committed a mistake, we were wrong, we are going to right it. It is not just going to be the folks down at the bottom.

There is a wonderful movie that everybody in the House of Representatives ought to have to see, ''Paths of Glory.'' It is a story from the First World War about French troops who did not want to get up out of the trenches and charge into the fire because as they got to the top of the ladder, they were getting their heads shot off, so they failed to charge. The general called a court-martial and picked three guys at random. They shot them in firing squads, and the movie is about how they were selected, who they were, and why they were picked. These six or seven people will be those same sorts of people, while the generals sit in the back, have a steak, drink a glass of wine, take their pension and go off with their life.

This issue is too big for this House to ignore.

Mr. Speaker, as the third-ranking person in the United States of America, ahead of you is only the President and the Vice President, you are the Speaker, the one who controls the House of the people, for you to allow this to go uninvestigated is absolutely unacceptable. In this next election, the American people ought to turn out the Republicans wholesale if they do not deal with this issue because what it has cost us, never mind the money, the $200 billion we have already spent and $25 billion more they are going to ask for in a few days; the money is important, of course, but what we have done to our reputation and our ability to lead the free world may be irreparable. I hope not.

If we act quickly and decisively, I think we can change it, but it cannot be dragged along and acted as though this is all right. It is not all right, and it will not be solved by throwing seven people out of the United States Army.

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. BROWN of Ohio) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HINCHEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. CAPITO) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCCOTTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DREIER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GINGREY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, May 20.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 923. An act to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to allow certain premier certified lenders to elect to maintain an alternative loss reserve.

H.R. 3104. An act to provide for the establishment of separate campaign medals to be awarded to members of the uniformed services who participate in Operation Enduring Freedom and to members of the uniformed services who participate in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 20, 2004, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8189. A letter from the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Manpower and Personnel), Department of Defense, transmitting notification of a decision to implement performance by the Most Efficient Organization (MEO) for the Public Works Center Norfolk, VA, Detachments Philadelphia and Mechanicsburg, PA, and Earle, NJ (initiative number NC20010758); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8190. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Admiral James O. Ellis, Jr., United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8191. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Richard E. Brown III, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8192. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Algeria pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

8193. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of Navy's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Japan for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 04-06), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

8194. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment and defense articles to Poland (Transmittal No. DDTC 005-04), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

8195. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment and defense articles to Israel (Transmittal No. DDTC 026-04), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

8196. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed transfer of major defense equipment from the Government of Switzerland (GOS) (Transmittal RSAT-3-04), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

8197. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's annual report on entitled, ''Patterns of Global Terrorism: 2003,'' pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2656f; to the Committee on International Relations.

8198. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12170 of November 14, 1979; to the Committee on International Relations.

8199. A letter from the Under Secretary for Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's report entitled, ''Imposition of Foreign Policy Controls on Protective and Detection Equipment and Components, not Specially Designed for Military Use,'' pursuant to Section 6 of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended; to the Committee on International Relations.

8200. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on ''Overseas Surplus Property,'' pursuant to Public Law 105–277, section 2215; to the Committee on International Relations.

8201. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Secretary's determination that five countries are not cooperating fully with U.S. antiterrorism efforts: Cuba, Iran, Libya, North Korea, and Syria, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2781; to the Committee on International Relations.

8202. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting a report on a proposed archival depository for the Presidential records and other historical materials of the Clinton administration, pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 2112; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8203. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States and in teh Western Pacific; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Annual Specifications and Management Measures; Inseason Adjustments; Corrections [Docket No. 031216314-3314-01; I.D. 041904C] received May 17, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8204. A letter from the Acting 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; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Annual Specifications and Management Measures; Inseason Adjustments; Pacific Halibut Fisheries; Corrections [Docket No. 031216314-3314-01; I.D. 042604D] (RIN: 0648-AR54) received May 12, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8205. 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; Species in the Rock Sole/Flathead Sole/''Other flatfish'' Fishery Category by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 031124287-4060-02; I.D. 041404B] received May 10, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8206. 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 Economic Exclusive Zone Off Alaska; Deep-Water Species Fishery by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Gulf of

Alaska [Docket No. 031125292-4061-02; I.D. 042304C] received May 11, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8207. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Extension of Marine Reserves [Docket No. 0312173020-4126-02; I.D. 112403D] (RIN: 0648-AR66) received May 11, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8208. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast (NE) Multispecies Fishery; Amendment [Docket No. 040112010-4114-02; I.D. 122203A] (RIN: 0648-AN17) received May 11, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8209. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting Final Feasibility Report and Final Environmental Impact Statement, dated September 2000, discussing the construction of ecosystem restoration and recreation improvements along the Wolf River, Memphis, Tennessee, as authorized by Section 101(b)(25) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8210. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting an informational copy of the General Services Administration's Fiscal Year 2005 Capital Investment and Leasing Program, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 606(a); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8211. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's report entitled, ''2003 Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor,'' pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2464; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8212. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Reduction of Tax Attributes Due to Discharge of Indebtedness [TD 9127] (RIN: 1545-BC47) received May 13, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8213. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Last-in, First-out Inventories (Rev. Rul. 2004-48) received May 13, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8214. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, 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. 2004-26) received May 12, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8215. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Changes in accounting periods and in methods of accounting. (Rev. Proc. 2004-32) received May 12, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8216. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations, 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. 2004-29) received May 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8217. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Br., Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Losses Reported from Inflated Basis Assets from Lease Stripping Transactions — received May 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8218. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Expenses and interest relating to tax-exempt income (Rev. Rul. 2004-47) received May 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8219. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publication and Reg. Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Qualified Amended Returns [Notice 2004-38] received May 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8220. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Br., Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Deduction for Interest on Qualified Education Loans [TD 9125] (RIN: 1545-AW01) received May 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8221. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Reg. Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Son of Boss Settlement Iniative (Announcement 2004-46) received May 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8222. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Section 704(b) and Capital Account Revaluations [TD 9126] (RIN: 1545-BB10) received May 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8223. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Capital Gains Dividends of RICs and REITs [Notice 2004-39] received May 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8224. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Health Savings Accounts — Interaction with Other Health Arrangements (Rev. Rul. 2004-45) received May 14, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8225. A letter from the Acting Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Weighted Average Interest Rates Update [Notice 2004-40] received May 14, 2004, 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. THOMAS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4103. A bill to extend and modify the trade benefits under the African Growth and Opportunity Act; with an amendment (Rept. 108–501). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2912. A bill to reaffirm the inherent sovereign rights of the Osage Tribe to determine its membership and form of government (Rept. 108–502). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 83. Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding the appointment of individuals to fill vacancies in the House of Representatives; adversely (Rept. 108–503). 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. ISSA:

H.R. 4389. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct facilities to provide water for irrigation, municipal, domestic, military, and other uses from the Santa Margarita River, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (for himself and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 4390. A bill to extend the Military Extraterritorial Jurisdiction Act (MEJA) to provide for the arrest and commitment of contractor personnel who commit Federal offenses or war crimes while supporting the mission of the Department of Defense overseas; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mr. SHAW, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. MICHAUD):

H.R. 4391. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the windfall elimination provision and protect the retirement of public servants; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELLER (for himself, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. MANZULLO):

H.R. 4392. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income for certain education and training expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASE:

H.R. 4393. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating certain lands along the northern coast of Maui, Hawaii, as a unit of the National Park System; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 4394. A bill to make ineligible for Federal contract awards any expatriated corporations and any companies that do business with, or own foreign subsidiaries that do business with, state sponsors of terrorism or foreign terrorist organizations; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma (for himself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

H.R. 4395. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to the regulation of ephedrine alkaloids, including ephedrine and pseudoesphedrine; to the Committee

on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DEMINT (for himself, Mr. NORWOOD, and Mrs. MUSGRAVE):

H.R. 4396. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to clarify the exemption from the minimum wage and overtime compensation requirements of that Act for certain construction engineering and design professionals; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ENGLISH:

H.R. 4397. A bill to temporarily exempt scrapping of naval vessels and Maritime Administration vessels from certain environmental statutes governing handling of hazardous materials; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. CARDOZA):

H.R. 4398. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to provide that the calculation of the duty imposed on imported cherries that are provisionally preserved does not include the weight of the preservative materials of the cherries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 4399. A bill to establish certain conditions on the Secretary of Veterans Affairs implementing any recommendation of the CARES Commission that would have the effect of eliminating or severely reducing any medical service provided to veterans throughout the United States at Department of Veterans Affairs medical facilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. TURNER of Texas, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. DICKS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. LEE, Mr. REYES, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. CASE, Mr. FROST, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. MOORE, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. NADLER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WYNN, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, and Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky):

H.R. 4400. A bill to establish the Office of Wireless Public Safety Interoperable Communications, to provide grants and other support to achieve communications interoperability in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security (Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 4401. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 9,10-Anthracenedione, 1,8-dihydroxy-4-nitro-5-(phenylamino)-; 9,10-Anthracenedione, 1,5-dihydroxy-4-nitro-8-(phenylamino)-; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 4402. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 2-Naphthalenesulfonic acid, 6-[(2,4-diaminophenyl)azo]-3-[[4-[[4-[[7-[(2,4-diaminophenyl azo]-1-hydroxy-3-sulfo-2-naphthalenyl]azo]phenyl]amino]-3-sulfophenyl]azo]-4-hydroxy-, trisodium salt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 4403. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Bis-Ethylhexyloxyphenol Methoxyphenol Triazine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 4404. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Benzamide, 3-amino-N-[2-[[2-(sulfooxy)ethyl]sulfonyl]ethyl]-; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 4405. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Methylene Bis-Benzotriazolyl Tetramethylbutylphenol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself and Mr. HOSTETTLER):

H.R. 4406. A bill to reform the judicial review process of orders of removal for purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

H.R. 4407. A bill to authorize appropriations for the National Institute of Standards and Technology for fiscal years 2005, 2006, 2007, and 2008, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. COLLINS:

H. Con. Res. 431. Concurrent resolution urging the Government of Vietnam to provide to the United States all information in the possession of Vietnam regarding Americans unaccounted for from the Vietnam War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

H. Res. 650. A resolution expressing the sense of the House with respect to the life and work of Tony Randall; to the Committee on Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

330. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to Senate Resolution No. 63 memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to pass legislation to allow prescription drugs to be imported from Canada; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

331. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to Senate Resolution No. 64 expressing diappointment in the lack of support the current administration has shown toward veterans of the armed forces, and memorializing Congress to increase funding for the continuation and expansion of veterans benefits and services; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas introduced a bill (H.R. 4408) for the relief of Jen-Hui Tsai; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 82: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 83: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 85: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 163: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 284: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California and Mr. LANTOS.
H.R. 333: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 527: Mr. CHANDLER.
H.R. 716: Mr. CHANDLER.
H.R. 742: Mr. COLLINS and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 806: Mrs. TAUSCHER and Mr. WICKER.
H.R. 843: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 1043: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1105: Mr. CHANDLER.
H.R. 1155: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 1310: Mr. ISAKSON.
H.R. 1322: Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
H.R. 1477: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 1638: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Mr. Chandler.
H.R. 1639: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. STARK, and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 1716: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 1735: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 1746: Mr. SWEENEY and Mr. GOODE.
H.R. 1782: Mr. WATT.
H.R. 1793: Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 1805: Mr. CHANDLER.
H.R. 1824: Mr. SANDLIN.
H.R. 1830: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 1884: Mr. WATT.
H.R. 1935: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
H.R. 1993: Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 2133: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin and Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 2217: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 2293: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.
H.R. 2366: Mr. CHANDLER.
H.R. 2387: Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 2394: Mr. MCINTYRE and Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 2402: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. FORD.
H.R. 2527: Ms. WATSON and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 2568: Mr. CHANDLER.
H.R. 2621: Mr. LYNCH and Ms. LEE.
H.R. 2627: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.
H.R. 2674: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. FROST, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 2699: Mr. WAMP, Mr. HILL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. STENHOLM, and Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky.
H.R. 2863: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 2956: Mr. CHANDLER.
H.R. 3066: Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 3069: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. NEY.
H.R. 3078: Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 3111: Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 3192: Mr. CHANDLER.
H.R. 3306: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 3313: Mr. COLLINS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. RYUN of Kansas.
H.R. 3412: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3422: Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 3441: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 3474: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 3574: Mr. CASE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. POMBO, and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
H.R. 3596: Mr. EMANUEL, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 3619: Mr. CASE and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 3716: Mr. DINGELL.
H.R. 3737: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 3743: Mr. CHANDLER.
H.R. 3779: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 3798: Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 3801: Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 3803: Mr. BOUCHER and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 3810: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 3831: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 3936: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 3950: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 3953: Mr. SOUDER and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 3960: Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 3968: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 3988: Mr. LAMPSON, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 4032: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 4043: Mr. RUSH and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
H.R. 4057: Ms. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. ENGLISH.
H.R. 4097: Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WALSH, Mr. FROST, and Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 4103: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 4108: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SHAW, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FROST, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 4175: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 4191: Ms. LEE, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 4212: Mr. BERMAN and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 4248: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 4255: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 4256: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 4257: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. COSTELLO.
H.R. 4263: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. GORDON, Mr. ROSS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. MOORE, Mr. OWENS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. DEUTSCH.
H.R. 4264: Mr. VITTER.
H.R. 4312: Mr. FROST, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. SKELTON, Ms. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MOORE, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. NADLER, Ms. ROYAL-ALLARD, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. WYNN.
H.R. 4341: Mr. RUSH, Mr. FORD, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 4343: Mr. PITTS.
H.R. 4346: Mr. COOPER, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. FROST, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ROSS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. FILNER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. TURNER of Texas, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. BELL, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 4359: Mr. COLE, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. KLINE, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. TERRY, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 4363: Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 4370: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. STARK, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 4377: Mr. BELL.
H.R. 4378: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. MCNULTY.
H.R. 4384: Mr. SHAW.
H.J. Res. 56: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.J. Res. 94: Mr. CULBERSON.
H. Con. Res. 298: Ms. HARRIS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. COLLINS.
H. Con. Res. 366: Mr. GONZALEZ.
H. Con. Res. 399: Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H. Con. Res. 416: Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. ETHERIDGE, and Mr. MARSHALL.
H. Con. Res. 422: Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. MEEHAN.
H. Res. 550: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HOEFFEL, and Mr. WEXLER.
H. Res. 604: Mrs. LOWEY.
H. Res. 642: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3473: Mr. CAMP.