United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 149 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY MAY 21, 2003 No. 76

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 21, 2003.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JACK QUINN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

The Reverend Gregory J. Jackson, Senior Pastor, Mt. Olive Baptist Church, Hackensack, New Jersey, offered the following prayer:

Fix our steps, O Lord, that we stagger not at the uneven motions of the world. Steady our fainting hearts and trembling hands as we journey ever forward into an unknown future.

As we gather in these hallowed halls, halls hallowed by the sacrifices of slaves and slave owners, halls hallowed by men and women who gave their lives for our freedom, halls hallowed by the blood, sweat, and tears of those who built our great Republic, hear our prayer.

Today, we ask that You would keep our minds focused upon righteousness, keep our hearts in tune with Your spirit, keep our eyes open to the pain and suffering of Your people, not only in our Nation but around the world.

We thank You, dear God, for the opportunity that is ours. Help us to use this wonderful privilege that You have given unto us to serve the poor, to encourage the depressed, and to make America everything she claims to be.

In Your name we pray, 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 Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LATHAM 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces that it will entertain 10 1-minute speeches per side.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN) to begin 1-minutes.

RECOGNIZING GUEST CHAPLAIN, THE REVEREND GREGORY J. JACKSON, SENIOR PASTOR, MT. OLIVE BAPTIST CHURCH

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

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have had the great privilege of representing the district that is the home to Reverend Gregory Jerome Jackson, the wonderful man who just gave the invocation.

Reverend Greg Jackson is a man of great ability, integrity, and compassion who has committed his life to helping others and in strengthening the bonds of family and community.

He started his life as the grandson of sharecroppers in South Carolina. He made his way at the age of 16, no doubt with divine guidance, to the promised land of New Jersey, where he went on to graduate from St. Peter's College and the Colgate Rochester Divinity School. He even served 2 years here as an intern to Congressman Cornelias Gallagher.

Whether it is in his role as pastor of the Mount Olive Baptist Church in Hackensack, New Jersey, whose membership has risen with 1,000 new members under his leadership since 1984, or as an executive board member of the Lott Carey Baptist Foreign Mission Convention, which seeks to prevent HIV–AIDS and provide comfort and counsel to those who have been affected by the disease in Africa and the Caribbean, or as a leader of countless other civic and community organizations, or as the loving husband of Barbara and father of Michael and Monique, Reverend Greg Jackson has used his unique gifts as a pastor and community leader to improve the lives of those around him.

Mr. Speaker, everyone who has ever met Greg Jackson knows that he is a true humanist, a man of great warmth, conviction, and character, who has literally improved the lives of tens of thousands of my constituents over his nearly 20-year career at Mt. Olive, and who has traveled the world saving lives and bringing his deep faith in service to millions more.

I am delighted and proud to be the Congressman for my dear friend, the honorable Reverend Gregory Jerome Jackson, and so proud, Mr. Speaker, that this institution saw fit to allow him to make the invocation this morning.

Printed on recycled paper.

JOB CREATION THROUGH TAX RELIEF, A VICTORY FOR AMERICAN FAMILIES

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

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, we all know that our sluggish economy is in need of a shot in the arm. As I travel my district and talk with constituents in Kansas, I am hearing one constant theme: reduce the tax burden on working families.

They tell me that on their tight budgets, even an additional $100 per month would make a significant difference. I believe their request is reasonable. They understand what many in Washington never seem to comprehend: their hard-earned money belongs to them and not to us. They know how best to stretch every dollar to take care of their family.

Tax relief for American families has always been one of my top priorities, so the plan that the House passed comes as a breath of fresh air. Under the House plan, a typical family of four in Kansas would see their earlier tax bill reduced by over $1,100. That is almost $100 per month.

Best of all, our plan would create almost 1 million jobs next year, 8,000 of those jobs in Kansas. Job creation through tax relief, this truly is a victory for American families.

AMERICA NEEDS ANSWERS ON ADMINISTRATION'S USE OF DEFENSE MONEY

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, as the House debates defense authorization, it is fair for the American people to ask what is happening to their tax dollars going for defense. Over $1 trillion in Department of Defense accounts remains unreconciled. Audits have been suspended.

Worse, this administration led this Nation into a war based on the pretext that Iraq was an imminent threat, which it was not. The President described Iraq as an imminent threat. It was not. The Secretary of State presented pictures to the world which he offered as proof. But as of today, with the administration having total control over Iraq, nothing that has been said has been substantiated.

Where are the weapons of mass destruction? What was the basis for this war? How can we spend $400 billion for defense if we cannot defend the truth? How do we defend the truth if we do not demand answers from an administration which took this Nation into a war on a pretext?

HONORING EMS WEEK

(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, I rise today to honor the vital work of emergency medical service professionals. These highly trained specialists are able to respond at a moment's notice, knowing that a matter of seconds can mean the difference between life and death.

There are over 750,000 EMS providers throughout the United States providing invaluable community service daily. Today, with the ever-present threat of terrorism, their job is more needed than ever. They stand on the front lines, trained and ready to respond to possible chemical and biological attacks to give us the best chance of survival in the case of a tragedy.

This week, we recognize the dedicated work of paramedics and emergency medical technicians through Emergency Medical Services Week. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in saying thank you to these men and women who work day and night all through the year to save lives.

In conclusion, God bless our troops.

''FIRST OBSTRUCTION, NOW DESTRUCTION''

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, ''There is no more fragile construct than a stone wall. In any scandal, the shortest route to safety is always the truth.'' [144 Cong. Rec. H1333 (1998).

These are the most appropriate words of Majority Leader, TOM DELAY. And yet one full week after asking the Departments of Homeland Security and Justice to come clean about the reported attempts to divert Federal resources for purely political purposes in Texas, all we have is that very same fragile stone wall.

The administration obstruction has now turned into State document destruction. Borrowing a page from Enron's playbook, State destruction has been ordered of all notes, correspondence, photos, et cetera, related to the search for Texas legislators; and at the same time, the Department of Homeland Security indicates that it has ''no idea how long the investigation would take or when the tapes might be released.''

Never known as ''Timid Tom,'' it is time for the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) to join us in getting immediate disclosure of all related documents and end the stonewalling.

HELP SMALL BUSINESS

(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, I am speaking on behalf of small businesses, owners and employees, in this time of economic downturn.

The key to President Bush's economic package is to provide jobs to Americans who desire to work. The plan will provide a great boost to small businesses, which create 70 percent of the jobs, or two out of every three jobs.

One of the most significant weaknesses in the present economy is the low level of business investment. The President's plan will triple write-offs for business equipment from $25,000 to $75,000, will reduce the cost of capital, and help these enterprises grow. There is a current phase-in schedule that will reduce the income tax paid by small businesses. This plan will speed these reductions up and make them immediately.

All of the components of the President's package put together are projected to return an average of over $2,000 to 23 million small business owners this year. The Council of Economic Advisors projects that the President's plan will create 10,000 new jobs in the second half of 2003, 890,000 jobs in 2004, and an increase of 1.4 million jobs in just 18 months. Private sector analyses reach similar conclusions.

The sooner Congress acts, the better it is for small businesses.

WATERGATE ALL OVER AGAIN?

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

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, destruction of evidence, obstruction of justice, withholding of secret taped conversations between government officials and possible wrongdoing, misuse of Federal law enforcement agencies for domestic political purposes.

It sounds like Watergate in 1974 and Richard Nixon, does it not? Yes, it does. But sadly, these government abuses have occurred in the last 10 days in our country. The silence of Republic leadership and the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), on these government abuses is deafening.

These are the facts: last week, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security had to admit it used Federal antiterrorism resources paid for by taxpayers to track down Texas State legislators, hardly a terrorist threat even on their worst days.

Fact number two: in a taped telephone conversation last week, the Texas Department of Public Safety apparently asked, unethically if not illegally, for the U.S. Homeland Security Agency to get involved in this political matter.

Fact number three: the U.S. Homeland Security Agency refuses to let the public know what was on those taped conversations. Today, we now find out there is destruction of evidence by the Texas Department of Public Safety.

The American people deserve answers.

KIDNEY SCREENING

(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, in January, a beautiful young staffer in my office by the name of Monique Bradley Brown died from a deadly form of kidney disease. Monique was my legislative correspondent.

Some of the symptoms from the disease appear as normal health anomalies, such as higher blood pressure and lower back pain. Often patients like Monique and their families are taken by surprise when discovery of the ailment is made. Regular screenings are necessary to detect the disease before it is too late.

In Monique's memory, we are having a kidney screening for all House Members and staff. The screening is free. It will take place on Tuesday, May 27, from 9 to 5, in H C–5. The National Kidney Foundation of the Capitol area will conduct the screening, and the various tests will take no longer than a half hour.

For more information, Members and staff may contact my office. Act now before it is too late.

□ 1015

MISUSE OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, as I was saying at a press conference last week, not since Watergate and Richard Nixon 30 years ago have government agencies been used for domestic political purposes. And now, as in Watergate, we have the smoking gun.

Today's issue of the Fort Worth Star telegram, my hometown newspaper, reports that the Department of Public Service in Texas sent an e-mail to all its officers in the middle of last week ordering that all records of the contact with the State legislators and government agencies be destroyed.

I will read you what appeared in today's Star Telegram addressed to captains. The order said, ''Any notes, correspondence, photos that were obtained pursuant to the absconded House of Representatives members shall be destroyed immediately. No copies are to be kept.''

Now, we have asked for records on the Federal level. Since they have already been destroyed on the State level, we demand that those records on the Federal level be released now before they can be destroyed.

Remember Rosemary Woods and the 18 minute gap. Release the record today here in Washington so that we will not have what happened in Texas the last week.

RELEASE THE FCC ORDER

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that today marks the third anniversary of the FCC's now-infamous press release announcing its decision on the local competition issue. In spite of the FCC's announcement, we still have not seen the text of the FCC's decision. This is a thorny issue, Mr. Speaker, one involving heartfelt disagreement. The only thing that both the incumbent local exchange carriers and competitive local exchange carriers agree on is the need for regulatory certainty.

This uncertainty is precisely the wrong prescription for the ailing telecom sector of our economy. The telecommunications sector has been extremely hard-hit over the course of the last few years, laying off thousands of employees and shrinking construction budgets. The FCC's decision has the promise for bringing some regulatory certainty to the sector upon which it can base investment and hiring decisions.

Instead of promptly releasing the text of the order, thereby hastening new investment and additional hiring, the FCC has delayed for 90 days. This delay has the effect of preventing any economic benefits that could result from the Commission's decision. Having worked so hard to pass jobs and growth packages that will get our economy back on track, this delay is simply unacceptable.

I hope the FCC will not delay the release of its order any longer. We need those jobs and investments in the telecom sector, and we need them soon.

AUSTIN COVER-UP

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

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, all is not well in the Republic.

Yesterday the Department of Homeland Security raised the terrorist alert level to orange. The threat of another terrorist attack on the United States has grown. That is why so many of us are wondering why the Department of Homeland Security took a time-out from the war on terror to help the Texas Department of Public Safety track down the private plane of State Representative Pete Laney.

Today we discover the shocking news that the Texas Department of Public Safety has destroyed all the documents, all records, all photos relating to the hot pursuit of Texas Democrats.

Mr. Speaker, we need answers to the basic questions. Who ordered the use of Federal law enforcement resources to hunt down the lawmakers in Texas? Was it politically motivated? Have we returned to the Nixon area of Federal executive power for political ends?

And now we must know why the Department of Public Safety destroyed all records. It might help in answering a lot of these questions.

Today I rise to ask the district attorney of Austin to look and investigate why the Department of Public Safety decided to move and destroy these records. It is criminal, and we need to investigate.

HONORING MIKE JENDRZEJCZYK

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

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to one of the great fighters for human rights and democracy in Asia, Mike Jendrzejczyk.

For 13 years as advocacy director, Mike, at the Asia Division of Human Rights Watch, fought for human rights in all corners of Asia, from China to Burma to Vietnam to Indonesia. His knowledge, insight, and information on these regions was invaluable to policymakers around the world and here in Washington.

Mike testified before the House Committee on International Relations and the Congressional Human Rights Caucus countless times, providing us with critical information on issues ranging from North Korean refugees to human rights abuses in Tibet to democracy in Hong Kong.

Mike's energy and enthusiasm were unwavering, and his ceaseless dedication was admired by all. Unfortunately, the human rights community lost this fighter too soon, and we need to continue his fight.

Mike, I will miss you. Mike, millions in Asia are now living in freedom from Taiwan to South Korea to the Philippines who owe you; and millions more depend on us to continue your work.

IS THERE A CONSPIRACY BETWEEN THE STATE OF TEXAS AND THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY?

(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, Texans woke up to stories like this one in today's Houston Chronicle that reports on something that is just ''unbelievable.'' On Wednesday, May 14, one day before the Texas legislative Democrats started returning to Austin, the Texas Department of Public Safety, DPS, ordered all records and photos gathered in the search for them to be destroyed.

The order addressed to ''Captains'' states, ''Any notes, correspondence, photos, etc., that were obtained pursuant to the absconded House of Representatives members should be destroyed. No copies kept.''

Who originated this order, this destruction?

Yesterday, Secretary Ridge again refused to release a full transcript and tape of the discussions between our

DPS and the Department of Homeland Security.

What are they hiding? Why is a law enforcement agency in Texas destroying records and a Federal agency refusing to release them? Were there political efforts to involve Federal law enforcement for purely political and partisan reasons? What are these agencies trying to cover up?

It does not pass the smell test.

While we have new international terrorist threats, a new high alert yesterday, we were looking for Texas Democrats last week. Secretary Ridge and the Department of Homeland Security are needlessly suffering a credibility gap.

Mr. Speaker, if there is nothing incriminating or embarrassing on the tapes, then there is nothing to cover up. Release the tapes and all the records. Do not destroy them.

VIETNAM VETERANS MOVING WALL

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to those who have paid the ultimate price for our freedom, our servicemen and women.

This Monday is Memorial Day, a day when America will recognize those who have served our country in war and peace. This weekend in our district I will visit the Moving Wall, a small replica of the sacred Vietnam Veterans Memorial. The Moving Wall is a half-sided replica of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial which is in Washington. It has been touring the country for nearly 20 years.

The Moving Wall allows people who cannot visit the breathtaking Vietnam Veterans Memorial a chance to experience this legendary landmark. The Moving Wall will be in Allen, Texas, open to the public 24 hours a day from May 24 to May 30 at Bethany Lakes Park. I encourage the people of north Texas to visit this excellent tribute to our veterans. God bless our servicemen and women. I salute you. May God bless America.

HONORING TAIWAN PRESIDENT CHEN

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to congratulate Taiwan President Chen on his third anniversary in office.

Taiwan and the United States have enjoyed a close relationship with each other for more than 50 years, both economically and politically. I hope that in the very near future we will increase trade opportunities with Taiwan by launching trade negotiations on a free trade agreement with Taiwan. America must let all countries know that we firmly stand behind the Taiwan Relations Act and that we believe that a peaceful solution is the only answer to the so-called Taiwan issue.

I also strongly support Taiwan's democratization at home and its campaign to join international organizations abroad. Taiwan is a strong ally of ours which stood shoulder to shoulder with the United States after 9/11. To Taiwan and President Chen I say, America appreciates your friendship and partnership.

MILITARY WASTE, FRAUD AND ABUSE

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, next week the Nation will celebrate Memorial Day. A fitting celebration of Memorial Day in this House would be to crack down on the waste, fraud, and abuse at the Pentagon so that we can better equip our troops and we can meet our obligations to our veterans.

At the run-up to the last war, the Pentagon was scrambling to find chemical and biological suits. But it turned out that another part of the Pentagon had put them up for sale for surplus on the Internet, usable suits, and were selling them for pennies on the dollar at the same time that we did not have enough to go around in the field.

But that is nothing new at the Pentagon. They have misplaced $1 trillion, T, trillion, not million, not billion, trillion dollars according to the GAO. They lost 56 airplanes, 32 tanks, 36 Javelin missile command launch units. They spent $20 billion trying to overhaul their accounting system, and then abandoned that effort.

That did not help one soldier in the field, did not help one veteran, did not help the Nation. Waste, fraud, and abuse by contractors and bureaucrats is not patriotic. Let us clean up the Pentagon. Let us do something in the bill today to make certain this no longer occurs.

READINESS AND RANGE PRESERVATION INITIATIVE HURTS THE ENVIRONMENT

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out against the Readiness and Range Prevention Initiative proposed by the Department of Defense. This initiative would provide exemptions to the United States military from enforcing and abiding by the Marine Mammal Protection Act and the Endangered Species Act, two very important pieces of legislation that have for decades provided safeguards and protections to our environment.

Many of our bases are home to critical habits and endangered species, especially, for example, Camp Pendleton, which is very near my district, where there are currently 17 endangered species.

Mr. Speaker, this initiative is harmful, it is unnecessary, and it is an attack on our environment. Laws already exist that provide exemptions for the military for purposes of national security. The military just has not bothered to enact those. There is absolutely no need for the type of broad-based policy such as the Readiness and Range Prevention Initiative.

We were able to defeat this measure last year, and I am confident that we will do it again this year. There is no evidence that suggests that our military should be exempted from these laws.

DAMAGING THE AMERICAN INSTITUTION OF JUSTICE

(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 is a time that we desire to honor those who have served us by committing the ultimate sacrifice, and I look forward to joining my communities on Monday and being reminded of the great service of our valiant troops throughout the years and months and days, weeks and minutes, for they are ever with us.

I rise this morning because sadly I believe that all we stand for in this House and in this Congress and in this Nation, democracy, freedom and respect for law, has certainly been damaged by the reckless, foolish and irresponsible destruction of documents that the Department of Public Safety in Texas has engaged in after tracking innocent civilian Texas legislators who happen to be Democratic and who happen to be respecting their democratic process.

□ 1030

It is interesting that the order said, ''Any notes, correspondence, photos, et cetera, that were obtained pursuant to the absconded House of Representatives members shall be destroyed immediately. No copies are to be kept. Any questions, please contact me,'' the message said. It is unusual for these matters to be destroyed. They cannot track down who gave the order. I would say track it to the Governor's house.

It is imperative the Congress begin an investigation immediately; that the Department of Justice investigate this and the U.S. Homeland Security Department. Our responsibilities are to the American people, to keep them safe, to provide them with a standard of law and order; and we are not to abuse our power. We must investigate now.

UNITED STATES LEADERSHIP AGAINST HIV/AIDS, TUBERCULOSIS, AND MALARIA ACT OF 2003

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. HYDE

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the unanimous consent agreement of yesterday, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HYDE moves to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1298) to provide assistance to foreign countries to combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the Senate amendments is as follows:

Senate amendments

Page 3, before line 1 insert:

TITLE V—INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Sec. 501. Modification of the Enhanced HIPC Initiative.

Sec. 502. Report on expansion of debt relief to non-HIPC countries.

Sec. 503. Authorization of appropriations.

Page 96, after line 14, insert:

TITLE V—INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 501. MODIFICATION OF THE ENHANCED HIPC INITIATIVE.

Title XVI of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262p—262p–7) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 1625. MODIFICATION OF THE ENHANCED HIPC INITIATIVE.

''(a) AUTHORITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury should immediately commence efforts within the Paris Club of Official Creditors, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Monetary Fund, and other appropriate multilateral development institutions to modify the Enhanced HIPC Initiative so that the amount of debt stock reduction approved for a country eligible for debt relief under the Enhanced HIPC Initiative shall be sufficient to reduce, for each of the first 3 years after the date of enactment of this section or the Decision Point, whichever is later—

''(A) the net present value of the outstanding public and publicly guaranteed debt of the country—

''(i) as of the decision point if the country has already reached its decision point, or

''(ii) as of the date of enactment of this Act, if the country has not reached its decision point,

to not more than 150 percent of the annual value of exports of the country for the year preceding the Decision Point; and

''(B) the annual payments due on such public and publicly guaranteed debt to not more than—

''(i) 10 percent or, in the case of a country suffering a public health crisis (as defined in subsection (e)), not more than 5 percent, of the amount of the annual current revenues received by the country from internal resources; or

''(ii) a percentage of the gross national product of the country, or another benchmark, that will yield a result substantially equivalent to that which would be achieved through application of subparagraph (A).

''(2) LIMITATION.—In financing the objectives of the Enhanced HIPC Initiative, an international financial institution shall give priority to using its own resources.

''(b) RELATION TO POVERTY AND THE ENVIRONMENT.—Debt cancellation under the modifications to the Enhanced HIPC Initiative described in subsection (a) should not be conditioned on any agreement by an impoverished country to implement or comply with policies that deepen poverty or degrade the environment, including any policy that—

''(1) implements or extends user fees on primary education or primary health care, including prevention and treatment efforts for HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, malaria, and infant, child, and maternal well-being;

''(2) provides for increased cost recovery from poor people to finance basic public services such as education, health care, clean water, or sanitation;

''(3) reduces the country's minimum wage to a level of less than $2 per day or undermines workers' ability to exercise effectively their internationally recognized worker rights, as defined under section 526(e) of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1995 (22 U.S.C. 262p–4p); or

''(4) promotes unsustainable extraction of resources or results in reduced budget support for environmental programs.

''(c) CONDITIONS.—A country shall not be eligible for cancellation of debt under modifications to the Enhanced HIPC Initiative described in subsection (a) if the government of the country—

''(1) has an excessive level of military expenditures;

''(2) has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism, as determined by the Secretary of State under section 6(j)(1) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2405(j)(1)) or section 620A(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2371(a));

''(3) is failing to cooperate on international narcotics control matters; or

''(4) engages in a consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights (including its military or other security forces).

''(d) PROGRAMS TO COMBAT HIV/AIDS AND POVERTY.—A country that is otherwise eligible to receive cancellation of debt under the modifications to the Enhanced HIPC Initiative described in subsection (a) may receive such cancellation only if the country has agreed—

''(1) to ensure that the financial benefits of debt cancellation are applied to programs to combat HIV/AIDS and poverty, in particular through concrete measures to improve basic services in health, education, nutrition, and other development priorities, and to redress environmental degradation;

''(2) to ensure that the financial benefits of debt cancellation are in addition to the government's total spending on poverty reduction for the previous year or the average total of such expenditures for the previous 3 years, whichever is greater;

''(3) to implement transparent and participatory policymaking and budget procedures, good governance, and effective anticorruption measures; and

''(4) to broaden public participation and popular understanding of the principles and goals of poverty reduction.

''(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) COUNTRY SUFFERING A PUBLIC HEALTH CRISIS.—The term 'country suffering a public health crisis' means a country in which the HIV/AIDS infection rate, as reported in the most recent epidemiological data for that country compiled by the Joint United Nations Program on HIV/AIDS, is at least 5 percent among women attending prenatal clinics or more than 20 percent among individuals in groups with high-risk behavior.

''(2) DECISION POINT.—The term 'Decision Point' means the date on which the executive boards of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund review the debt sustainability analysis for a country and determine that the country is eligible for debt relief under the Enhanced HIPC Initiative.

''(3) ENHANCED HIPC INITIATIVE.—The term 'Enhanced HIPC Initiative' means the multilateral debt initiative for heavily indebted poor countries presented in the Report of G–7 Finance Ministers on the Cologne Debt Initiative to the Cologne Economic Summit, Cologne, June 18–20, 1999.''.

SEC. 502. REPORT ON EXPANSION OF DEBT RELIEF TO NON-HIPC COUNTRIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to Congress a report on—

(1) the options and costs associated with the expansion of debt relief provided by the Enhanced HIPC Initiative to include poor countries that were not eligible for inclusion in the Enhanced HIPC Initiative;

(2) options for burden-sharing among donor countries and multilateral institutions of costs associated with the expansion of debt relief; and

(3) options, in addition to debt relief, to ensure debt sustainability in poor countries, particularly in cases when the poor country has suffered an external economic shock or a natural disaster.

(b) SPECIFIC OPTIONS TO BE CONSIDERED.—Among the options for the expansion of debt relief provided by the Enhanced HIPC Initiative, consideration should be given to making eligible for that relief poor countries for which outstanding public and publicly guaranteed debt requires annual payments in excess of 10 percent or, in the case of a country suffering a public health crisis (as defined in section 1625(e) of the Financial Institutions Act, as added by section 501 of this Act), not more than 5 percent, of the amount of the annual current revenues received by the country from internal resources.

(c) ENHANCED HIPC INITIATIVE DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''Enhanced HIPC Initiative'' means the multilateral debt initiative for heavily indebted poor countries presented in the Report of G–7 Finance Ministers on the Cologne Debt Initiative to the Cologne Economic Summit, Cologne, June 18–20, 1999.

SEC. 503. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the President such sums as may be necessary for the fiscal year 2004 and each fiscal year thereafter to carry out section 1625 of the International Financial Institutions Act, as added by section 501 of this Act.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) are authorized to remain available until expended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, May 20, 2003, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 1298, the legislation under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Rarely does Congress act with decisiveness for the benefit of so many suffering in the developing world. But this is precisely what we are doing today in enacting H.R. 1298, the United States

Leadership Against HIV/AIDS Act of 2003.

With each passing day, HIV/AIDS claims more and more innocent victims. Not since the bubonic plague swept across the world in the last millennium has our world confronted such a horrible, unspeakable curse as we are now witnessing with the growing HIV/AIDS pandemic. The number of dead or dying is grotesquely high: 25 million already dead worldwide, and the number growing at a rate of 8,500 every day, with the prospects of entire villages populated only by orphans because the adults are dead or dying from AIDS.

The bill we are considering today is the very same bill which passed the House May 1 by a vote of 375 to 41, with the exception of a minor amendment regarding debt forgiveness in poor countries. The Hyde-Lantos bill authorizes the President's 5-year $15 billion emergency plan for treatment and prevention of AIDS in those countries already facing crisis.

The legislation creates a more responsive, coordinated, and effective approach among the various agencies of the U.S. Government involved in the global fight against HIV/AIDS. During consideration of the Hyde-Lantos measure last week, the Senate added an amendment encouraging the administration to work with other countries to extend additional debt relief to poor countries most affected by HIV/AIDS. I support this amendment, and it is my hope that this legislation may be presented for the President's signature prior to his participation in the G–8 summit in France in June.

The Hyde-Lantos legislation promotes an approach that provides for antiretroviral therapy for more than 2 million people living with HIV. It encourages a strategy that extends palliative care to people living with AIDS. It supports efforts to find vaccines for HIV/AIDS and malaria. It emphasizes the need to keep families together, with particular focus on the needs of children and young people with HIV. The bill endorses prevention programs that stress sexual abstinence and monogamy as the first line of defense against the spread of this disease. And it contributes to multilateral initiatives that leverage the funds of other donor nations.

Many organizations and individuals from diverse backgrounds participated in the crafting of this legislation, including members of the Congregation of the Franciscan Sisters in Wheaton, Illinois; missionaries in Uganda; AIDS treatment access groups in downtown Chicago; and caregivers who administer assistance and counseling to people living with AIDS. The Committee on International Relations heard from African ambassadors, church leaders, and citizens from around the world who are calling for action. Your support for this legislation today answers their call for action. But our work now is only beginning in this fight to save lives and rescue families and villages from this scourge.

Mr. Speaker, today I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 1298, the Hyde-Lantos bill. The HIV/AIDS pandemic is more than a humanitarian crisis. Increasingly, it is a threat to the security of the developed world. Left unchecked, this plague will further rip the fabric of developing societies, pushing fragile governments and economies to the point of collapse.

America does not have to take on the HIV/AIDS crisis alone. But as is often the case, American leadership, political or financial, is necessary if our friends around the world are to bear their fair share of the burden. This is what the President's proposal does. It sets a pattern of American leadership that others, we believe, will follow.

Today, we have an opportunity to do something of significant and lasting importance, an obligation to do something reflecting our commitment to human solidarity, and the privilege of doing something truly compassionate. The AIDS virus is a mortal challenge to our civilization. I know today my colleagues will be animated by the compassion and vision that has always defined what it means to be an American and answer this call for help.

Before I close, I want to thank, in particular, the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the ranking Democrat member. It is absolutely clear we would not be gathered in this Chamber about to celebrate the passage of such monumental legislation without the leadership, courage, and vision of the gentleman from California. From the start, he has been a leader in the fight against AIDS, tenacious in fighting for the Global Fund, and for increased funding for bilateral efforts.

Yet during the past 3 years we have been working on this issue, he has always defended and represented his position with grace and eloquence. I would also like to recognize the essential and excellent contributions made to this legislation by his staff, in particular Peter Yeo and Pearl Alice Marsh. My own staff, Walker Roberts and Peter Smith, are also to be commended for their fine work and contributions to this bill.

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in strong support of H.R. 1298.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives would not be considering the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act today if it were not for the personal commitment of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) to seeing this initiative signed into law. We all owe him a profound debt of gratitude, and I am delighted to pay public tribute to him for his principled and effective leadership.

Mr. Speaker, as we near final congressional approval of H.R. 1298, let us recall the humanitarian impetus for this historic initiative. Since this virus first mutated into its deadly shape, 25 million people have died of HIV/AIDS worldwide. This number is greater than the populations of New York City, Los Angeles, Chicago, Houston, Philadelphia, Phoenix, San Diego, Dallas, San Antonio, Detroit, San Jose, and Indianapolis combined. It is more than nine times the total number of casualties we have suffered in all armed conflicts in our Nation's history combined. It is a number beyond comprehension.

This number, Mr. Speaker, represents much more than a statistic. It represents real people, with real families, real stories, and real futures. As we consider H.R. 1298, we remember these victims and pass this legislation in their name.

We remember Simon, a former seminary student and a student leader in South Africa who struggled against apartheid, but died at the young age of 31 years, hardly fulfilling his potential as a national leader.

We remember Srey, a poor illiterate Cambodian woman who had been infected by her husband. And this cruel killer showed no mercy, prolonging her agony long enough to see it claim the precious life of her baby son before consuming her.

We remember Jean David, a Haitian man whose brother sold his small house and three cows to pay for medicine. These desperate lifesaving measures proved futile. Jean David died, leaving his family impoverished, with no way to care for his son, who was also infected with HIV/AIDS.

But, Mr. Speaker, this legislation is also about life. It will ensure that there are fewer deaths due to HIV/AIDS, fewer parents grieving over the loss of their child to HIV/AIDS, and fewer children growing up without parents who have succumbed to this disease.

Our legislative work to combat HIV/AIDS worldwide does not end with today's vote. Today, I call on President Bush to do everything in his power to obtain the $3 billion in HIV/AIDS funding this year, and I call on our Committee on Appropriations to fund that amount as well.

And Congress must continue to play a strong oversight role to ensure that our Nation's HIV/AIDS programs are run effectively and efficiently. We have created a strong HIV/AIDS coordinator at the Department of State, and we expect that this coordinator will work hand in glove with the Agency for International Development.

We have required that 33 percent of HIV/AIDS prevention funds in this legislation be used for abstinence-until-marriage programs, and we expect that abstinence programs funded as part of larger multisectoral grants will count towards this 33 percent requirement.

We have provided a conscience clause to organizations implementing these programs, and we fully expect that all NGOs will only provide medically accurate and complete information about HIV/AIDS prevention methods.

Mr. Speaker, today we vote to create a top-flight bilateral HIV/AIDS program and to support the advancement of the Global Fund. I urge all of my colleagues across the aisle to once again support passage of this legislation in the name of all those who have already fallen victim to HIV/AIDS and in the hope that millions of lives will be saved by our actions.

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

□ 1045

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of this legislation, H.R. 1298, a truly historic piece of legislation authored by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS). The compassion, tenacity and vision of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) has always been inspirational to so many of us, but on this piece of legislation Chairman HYDE's leadership was extraordinary. In astoniship speed, Mr. HYDE has now shepherded through the House and Senate a bill that will soon be signed by President Bush that is absolutely landmark in that it will help save the lives of millions and mitigate suffering in the lives of many more. Many particularly in sub-Saharan Africa, who are suffering from this disease, will be aided by this bill.

The number of deaths due to the AIDS epidemic is horrifying. It is estimated that 25 million people have died from AIDS thus far, and another 30 million are infected, and approximately 8,500 people die every day. Thankfully, we are acting swiftly; and the sooner this legislation and the appropriations that will follow are passed, we can mitigate some of this disaster. Because if we do not, there will be as many as 80 million deaths by 2010, and 40 million AIDS orphans can be expected.

Mr. Speaker, statistics about specific countries and age groups are also staggering. In Botswana, for example, nearly 40 percent of the adult population is infected. In Africa, there are 3 million children under the age of 15 living with HIV–AIDS.

Mr. Speaker, today in sub-Saharan Africa it is estimated that only 50,000 out of 4 million people in need of drug treatment are receiving it. This legislation puts us on track to get that very important drug treatment to these individuals.

This is an outstanding piece of legislation. Again, on behalf of all of us, we thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) for his tremendous leadership, courage and compassion.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Northern California (Ms. LEE), my friend and colleague, who has shown years of leadership in bringing us to this point.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the ranking member, for those very kind remarks and also for his leadership. I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) for his leadership and commitment; and, to them together, I think this is the best in terms of how we work together and can work together in a bipartisan fashion. I thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) for his years of dedication and years of hard work as we negotiated this bill.

Also to our staff, we would not be here today without them. I would like express my appreciation to Christos Tsentas in my office and to Pearl Marsh and to Peter Yeo and to my former staff, Michael Riggs, and all of the minority and majority staff for their commitment and technical expertise but, most of all, their clear understanding of the reason why we are doing this today.

This bill we have before us, as we have all said, has been shaped for the most part by a very long and bipartisan and bicameral compromise that has largely focused on the needs of those most affected by the AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria pandemics.

I applaud the other body for adding an amendment to strengthen the Enhanced Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Initiative, but I am disappointed that they did not vote to include other amendments that were put forth by our colleagues, particularly the amendment offered by my colleague from California, to balance our HIV and AIDS prevention spending among all viable approaches by striking the 33 percent designation for abstinence-until-marriage programs. The balanced approach, the ABC approach, is what is working in Uganda; and I hope as we move forward we understand that strategy very clearly.

Although I do believe that the debt relief provisions should be strengthened to say instruct the Secretary of Treasury to enter into negotiations to expand HIPC, rather than just advising him to do so, I think it is critical for us to address the issue of debt cancellation whenever we discuss the global AIDS pandemic, particularly in the Africa context.

I am delighted that this amendment is in. It did not go far enough, but it is a beginning.

The passage, of course, of this legislation is historic. But, again, we should not be too quick I do not think to pat ourselves on the back, because we must urge our President and our colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations to fully fund the $3 billion authorization beginning this year. AIDS will not wait, and neither can we.

As part of our commitment to fight AIDS, we must also work to ensure that other donor nations contribute to the global effort. We would urge the President, along with Secretary Powell and Secretary Thompson to encourage the international community to provide a substantial and consistent contribution to fight TB, AIDS and malaria on a consistent basis beginning next week in France at the G8 summit that they will attend.

I would just like to close by saying, as we pass this very historic bill today, we cannot forget our own domestic AIDS crisis. Just under a million people are estimated to be infected in the United States, and a quarter of those do not even know they are infected. The Centers for Disease Control estimates that 40,000 are newly infected each year in our own country. We must attack this disease on a domestic and international basis. This is a major step in the right direction.

I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for their leadership and for ensuring that the people of Africa now have some hope as a result of the United States policy.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for their work on this important issue.

The bill that we will approve today emphasizes the model of Uganda. Uganda has helped people avoid exposure and infection to HIV/AIDS. They have saved lives. The world can take a lesson from Uganda, including the United States.

Uganda understood as a developing country working to build its way back from tyranny and exploitation it had to act to save itself. It had little money, no expertise, few resources. But Uganda had faith. Uganda had faith in God and in its people to save themselves.

President Museveni asked his people to change their behavior in order to stay alive. That is not a message that is dependent on cultural interpretation. It does not require technical or scientific understanding. It is a message that gave hope and health to the general population of Uganda; and it has worked and continues to work in Uganda, as well as Zambia, Jamaica and Namibia.

The bill that is before us is landmark legislation because it sets a course for what works in saving people's lives from the certain death of HIV/AIDS. It emphasizes treatment through antiretroviral therapy, care by assisting families and children affected by HIV/AIDS, and prevention by emphasizing education to help people avoid exposure.

This legislation makes a very important distinction between preventive activities and intervention activities. The bill details that are included regarding prevention and other activities are intended to help people avoid exposure by reducing the number of sexual

partners and, if they are adolescents, delaying sexual activity until they are married. This is a realistic and effective public health strategy to help end the grip of HIV/AIDS. This legislation does not eliminate the utilization of interventions that are intended to reduce the risk of infection, especially for specific high-risk populations. The distinction between prevention and intervention is important.

I am a physician who has treated AIDS patients dying from, in many instances, an avoidable disease. We need to emphasize risk avoidance but continue to provide options for risk reduction. This approach, called ABC, is a sound approach meant for the general population to save as many lives as possible. It is a comprehensive approach to AIDS prevention that recognizes that people are different and a range of behavioral options for AIDS prevention needs to be presented.

In 2 days I will be traveling to Uganda to see for myself the Uganda experience. One of the things I want to investigate in Uganda is if it is staying true to the ABC approach. Since the mid-1990s, there has been less of an emphasis on sexual behavior and more on medical solutions. In recent years, there has been a small but disturbing trend towards riskier sexual behavior, and for the first time in a decade there has been a slight increase in the national infection rate in Uganda.

The Uganda ABC model of the earlier period is the one that seems to have worked the best and is the one that has the most to teach the rest of the world. That is why I am so pleased to support this bill. I know it provides real solutions and real hope to people in Africa, and that is why I am pleased to go to Uganda in 2 days to see this firsthand myself.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the ranking member and the chairman for their work, and credit goes to President Bush for initiating this process.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), a leader on this issue.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for one of the most unique and collaborative efforts, which simply rings out to the entire world about saving lives. I thank them for their vision on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, might I remind this House about 6 years ago, in 1997, then President Clinton designated a presidential mission. Three Members of Congress were able to participate in that mission, and we visited the nations of Uganda, Zambia and South Africa. During that time, we heard stories about individuals who admitted that they were HIV positive and being stoned to death.

It was the first time that a 13-year-old boy came to my attention in South Africa, and he began to be a national spokesperson to challenge the world on the question of care, treatment and prevention.

I am gratified that today the United States Congress, through the journey of many of us who saw the works of Uganda, began to understand that we must balance a cultural understanding with the need for prevention, care and treatment.

This bill is an outstanding bill for many reasons. It deals with these issues, but in addition, it deals with malaria and tuberculosis. This is a devastating pandemic. The numbers are staggering in terms of whom we have lost. We expect to see by 2005 40 million African children who have lost their parents to HIV/AIDS. It is gratifying to see that the ABC plan in Uganda has worked, particularly that there are less sexually active teenagers. But we must be realistic. I am glad this legislation deals with prevention and the use of condoms.

It is important to remember that AIDS is an epidemic in the United States, but it is also an important reality that there is a provision that helps to diminish or be able to support the idea of debt relief because these countries will not be able to get the various drugs necessary if we do not have the debt relief that is necessary as well.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me say I had an amendment that encourages, if you will, seeks to have the corporate community contribute to the global fund. This is crucial because more monies are needed.

I conclude by saying simply that we must do the same thing for the extreme famine in Africa, particularly in Ethiopia and that region. I would ask my colleagues as they support this wonderful legislation, that as we move toward appropriation, we support this legislation in appropriation, and we also support dollars that will help bring down the famine in Africa. I ask my colleagues to vote for this legislation.

□ 1100

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, we all strongly support this bill as a needed and overdue national commitment. AIDS is a global crisis which threatens the security of every government in every nation, even including the United States. It has destroyed societies, and it will destabilize democratic governments. According to UNAIDS, nearly 22 million people have lost their lives and over 36 million people today are living with HIV and AIDS. Fewer than 2 percent of them have access to life-prolonging therapies or basic treatment. That is the problem. And we are the only ones with the resources to really do something about it. The number of new infections of HIV is estimated at 15,000 people a day, and it is growing.

In Africa, which has 70 percent of the AIDS cases, 22 million people are living with this disease. In some countries, 20 percent or more are infected; and in a number of countries that recently visited in Africa, 34 percent of women of childbearing age are infected. That means that an estimated 600,000 African children become infected with AIDS every single year as a result of mother-to-child transmission either at birth or through breast feeding. The deaths of parents with HIV/AIDS will result in 40 million orphans this decade alone. They have nowhere to go. They do not inherit anything. The boys go in to gangs, the girls too often into sexual slavery or some form of servitude.

This bill, while it is a terribly important step, raises concerns about the intent to limit our flexibility to do everything we can to combat this problem. Abstinence, for example, while a prevention strategy, is not a public health program. It is an education approach based on moral or religious belief. We do not argue with that moral or religious belief, but this is an urgent matter. We have to do everything possible that will work. The fact is that in the developing world, too many women do not have the option of abstinence. That is the reality they have to deal with. Their rights are almost nonexistent. Many of them do not have the option to say no to sex from men, control the number of partners or protect themselves from sexual assault. That is true, that is reality, and that is what we have to deal with. Even the restrictive provision on prostitution limits our effectiveness. We have got to get access to women who are endangered, whatever it takes to save their lives.

I urge the administration to use all the flexibility and common sense they can. We are talking about saving lives here. We are talking about a horrible reality. But we have got to roll up our sleeves and do what is necessary, do what is the moral imperative for this Nation to do today. All of us will strongly support the bill.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 3 minutes to my dear friend and good neighbor, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD), who has been a leader on this issue ever since we began this project.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this time to thank Chairman HYDE and ranking member LANTOS for being the driving force behind such an important bill, H.R. 1298, United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003. I would also like to commend the President for his leadership on this issue. I hope that other countries and their leaders follow his leadership on HIV/AIDS. This bill embodies true leadership on the part of the United States, dramatically increasing the U.S. participation in addressing the pandemic that is ravaging whole regions and millions of people. This unprecedented bill acknowledges

our moral responsibility to address the pandemic that has already resulted in the deaths of millions. I am so proud to be a part of this legislation, this distinguished body and this country.

H.R. 1298 contains a provision of mine included in the committee markup which my good friend, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO), offered for me as a member of that committee. While much attention is being paid to preventing mother-to-child transmission, we must turn to addressing the needs and rights of the child to grow up with parents so that millions more are not orphaned before he or she can even walk.

My language gives priority preference for Federal funds to groups that are currently administering a privately funded program to prevent mother-to-child transmission and provide lifelong care and treatment in family-centered programs so that children do not grow up as orphans. This would benefit programs by letting them hit the ground running, to treat immediately as many people as possible. My language benefits programs such as the MTCT-Plus Initiative, which is administered by Columbia University's Mailman School of Public Health. The MTCT-Plus Initiative is supported by United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan and the First Ladies of Africa and has $50 million in funding from several private philanthropic foundations, including the Bill and Melinda Gates, the William and Flora Hewlett, the Robert Wood Johnson and other foundations.

Family survival programs like the MTCT-Plus Initiative are critical to address the issues of millions of children orphaned by HIV/AIDS on a scale unrivaled in history. In sub-Saharan Africa, family and societal structures are breaking down because of the deaths of a generation of parents. The number of children in the developing world who have been orphaned by the AIDS pandemic will nearly double from 13.4 million to 25.4 million by the end of this decade. Today, 5.5 million children in Africa have lost both parents, and in most cases at least one of them, to AIDS; and that number will rise to 7.9 million by 2010.

Again let me thank the chairman and the ranking member for their leadership.

Older women are also profoundly affected since the responsibility for caring for the supporting grandchildren orphaned by AIDS infected parents often falls on the shoulders of the elderly.

Thank you again, Chairman HYDE and Ranking Member LANTOS, for agreeing to include my amendment, and thank you too, to Congresswoman NAPOLITANO for offering my amendment during the Committee markup.

Mr. Speaker, I also offered an amendment on the floor which was accepted that concerns Section 314 which calls for a pilot program of assistance for children and families affected by HIV/AIDS. My amendment requires that pilot program to ensure the importance of inheritance rights of women, particularly women in African countries, are included in this program. The relationship of the denial of inheritance rights for women, increased HIV/AIDS infection in women and the resulting exponential growth in the numbers of young widows, orphaned girls, and grandmothers becoming heads of households needs to be further studied and documented. My language does just that.

This is necessary because a majority of those infected by HIV/AIDs in African are women of all classes, ethnic groups, and levels of education. Women with AIDS are condemned to an early death when their homes, lands, and other property are taken. They not only lose assets they could use for medical care, but also the shelter they need to endure this disease.

The failure to ensure equal property and inheritance rights upon separation or divorce discourages women from leaving violent marriages. HIV risk is especially high for women in situations of domestic violence, which often involves coercive sex, diminished ability to negotiate with partners for safer sex, and impeded women from seeking health information and treatment.

In some places, widows are forced to undergo sexual practices such as ''wife inheritance'' or ritual ''cleansing'' in order to keep their property. ''Wife inheritance'' occurs when a male relative of the dead husband takes over the widow as a wife, often in a polygamous environment. ''Cleansing'' usually involves sex with a social outcast who is paid by the dead husband's family, supposedly to cleanse the woman of her dead husband's evil spirits. In both of these rituals, safe sex is seldom practiced and sex is often forced. Such women are at increased risk of contracting and spreading HIV.

For example, there are areas of Kenya where the wife inheritance and cleansing practices have created an alarmingly high rate of HIV/AIDS infection. Fully 22 percent of the population between ages 15 and 49 in the Nyanza province are infected, and 35 percent of ante-natal women in one district within that province are infected. Girls and young women in the Nyanza province are infected at six times the rate of their male counterparts.

Finally, in the last Congress Representative Eva Clayton and I introduced H. Con. Res. 421, recognizing the importance of inheritance rights of women in Africa, and its relationship to the HIV/AIDS pandemic. I have also chaired two briefings on this issue. Our resolution was very strongly supported by this body. It had 90 original cosponsors with bipartisan support. My amendment today to the underlying bill includes the crux of H. Con. Res. 421, which I have reintroduced as H. Con. Res. 158.

Thank you so much for putting H.R. 1298 on a fast track to present to the President for his signature. I look forward to the next step of actually ensuring that H.R. 1298 receives funds in the appropriations process giving this authorizing bill the teeth it needs to prevent infection and provide real relief to those suffering under the HIV/AIDS pandemic abroad.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), a distinguished member of the Committee on International Relations. He was the leader on the tuberculosis issue in this legislation, which is a significant and important and integral part of this bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank my friend from California for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased we are considering final passage of this global AIDS legislation. I want to recognize the hard work of Chairman HYDE and his good faith and strong efforts to make this legislation as good as it has become and to especially thank my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the ranking Democrat on the committee, and the minority and majority staff of the Committee on International Relations and the terrific work that they did. I also want to recognize the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), who has been working on this since her first election and her former and current staff, Michael Riggs and Christos Tsentas.

Last year, almost 3 million people died of AIDS, 2 million died of tuberculosis, and 1 million died of malaria. In this bill, we are responding to this pandemic on a scale that can absolutely make a difference in saving hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, of lives. This bill recognizes that the intersection of AIDS and tuberculosis is like the perfect storm, causing the most devastating epidemic since the bubonic plague of the 14th century where 20 million people died. Already, 25 million around the world have died of AIDS, 42 million people are infected with HIV/AIDS, and 1,100 people every day in India die of tuberculosis. This bill begins to recognize that the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria represents the best tool that we have to fight three epidemics that kill 6 million people each year.

This is good legislation, but it falls a bit short in a couple of areas. One of those is it limits flexibility so that local governments, local communities, local health departments, local nongovernment organizations are not able to be as flexible and I think as effective as they could be. I hope we can address that in the years ahead. It also fails to take as comprehensive an international approach as many of us hoped it would by underfunding, unfortunately, the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria. That fund is more flexible, believes in local control, has standards to make sure that the dollars are well spent, and has more accountability than any other kind of aid program. I am hoping we can address that in the future.

Every day we fail to act, Mr. Speaker, thousands die. I am here today to say I am proud we have done something. We have done much.

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

In closing, I would like to express my appreciation to Chairman HYDE's staff, Walker Roberts and Peter Smith; the staff of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), Christos Tsentas; and to my staff, Pearl Alice Marsh, Peter Yeo, David Abramowitz, and Bob King who have done an extraordinary job. I again want to express my profound personal thanks to the chairman of the

committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), without whose leadership we would not be able to pass this legislation.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 1298, the U.S. Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria Act. This bipartisan bill would provide $15 billion over the next 5 years to combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria. The text of this bill now includes the language of H.R. 1298 as passed by the House, along with a Senate amendment to recommend that the Secretary of the Treasury negotiate deeper debt relief for poor countries, especially those suffering from public health crises. I have been working on the issues of global HIV/AIDS and debt relief for over 4 years, and I know how interrelated they are.

Debt relief is desperately needed by poor countries trying to combat the HIV/AIDS epidemic. These countries cannot afford to provide health care to their people or educate their people about HIV/AIDS prevention because of their debts. At Least 18 heavily indebted poor countries are spending more money on debt payments than they are on health care. Debt relief will allow these countries to invest their resources in health, education, poverty reduction and HIV/AIDS treatment and prevention programs.

Zambia provides an excellent illustration of why deeper debt relief is necessary. Zambia is a deeply impoverished country with a per capita income of only $330 per year. Almost 20 percent of the adult population is infected with the AIDS virus, and 650,000 children have been orphaned by AIDS. The HIV/AIDS epidemic has also ravaged the educational system by causing a shortage of trained teachers. Yet, Zambia still spends more than twice as much money on debt payments as it does on health care.

Debt relief is critical to worldwide HIV/AIDS treatment and prevention efforts. I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill and enable poor countries to use their resources to address this devastating epidemic.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to this motion to concur in the Senate Amendment to H.R. 1298, the U.S. Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis & Malaria Act of 2003. Although the intentions of this legislation are well placed to help stem the tide of these highly infectious diseases, I am deeply concerned about the management of these scarce Federal dollars by the UN Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. Past practices of this organization leave me with little hope that these monies will be spent wisely to curtail these deadly diseases.

Notwithstanding my opposition to this bill, I hope that USAID will work closely with the Global Fund to ensure that these funds are managed properly. In the event products are needed to be procured to prevent the spread of these diseases, I strongly encourage that the U.S. Buy America Act be employed. The expenditure of Federal, taxpayer dollars should support American companies whenever possible.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 1298, the United States Leadership on HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003. This legislation affirms our commitment to stop the spread of these diseases which have ravaged much of the world. The President has made this a priority for the administration, and it is an opportunity for the United States to demonstrate our commitment to leadership on this issue. This is a comprehensive piece of legislation that will not only authorize our contribution to the Global AIDS Fund, promote transparency and accountability in the expenditure of these funds; it will also work to reduce the debt burdens of countries facing public health crisis.

The House Financial Services Committee has a key role in crafting U.S. policy in the international financial institutions, and this Committee has been examining the role of these institutions in preventing AIDS and reducing debt burdens. I would like to thank Representatives LEACH and BIGGERT of the Financial Services Committee for their leadership on U.S. global AIDS policy. They have been instrumental in ensuring that the World Bank remains the trustee of the Global AIDS Fund and in encouraging private contributions to the Global AIDS Fund. Additionally, Subcommittee Chairman SPENCER BAUCHUS has been a strong supporter of common sense debt relief policy over the years. It is his leadership that has brought the issue of debt relief to the attention of Congress.

Today we consider the House legislation with an amendment added by the Senate. This amendment encourages the Secretary of the Treasury to pursue debt relief initiatives in the international financial institutions. I have agreed to accept this amendment added by the Senate in order to ensure that the President can have this legislation on his desk this week and we can begin working to stop HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and demonstrate the U.S. Commitment to eliminating HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, with the passage of this landmark legislation, the United States has taken an immense step towards recognizing both the severity of the global HIV/AIDS epidemic, and our own humanitarian interest in treating and preventing the spread of this disease.

The HIV/AIDS crisis is just the tip of the iceberg for health in developing nations. The task of building communities that are safe, healthy and economically secure at home and abroad cannot be achieved when a disabling portion of our global population is sick, orphaned or dying. The HIV/AIDS pandemic is affecting all races, all ages and all nations and we must all work together to solve this serious public health crisis.

We have more at stake these days than just dealing with the AIDS epidemic, important as it is. I hope that the thoughtful approach taken by the administration and Congress on this measure will be a template for moving forward in other critical areas we must address, such as homeland security, our stalled economy, and other perilous issues in the international arena.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this important legislation that will enable us to effectively combat the global scourges of HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria. I am pleased with the bill as amended by the Senate, which will provide unprecedented funding to fight this deadly trio of diseases that are global in scope. I am grateful for the bipartisan leadership of my House colleagues who authored and were original co-sponsors of this bill, especially Chairman HYDE, Ranking Member LANTOS, Mr. WELDON, Ms. LEE, and Mr. LEACH.

This legislation enables the United States to take a strong leadership role to ameliorate, and, we hope, ultimately to eradicate one of the most devastating diseases that man has ever encountered. We count the victims of HIV/AIDS in the tens and hundreds of millions, worldwide. It is a disease that affects men and women, adults and children. Its impact is most devastating on the poorest, those with the least capacity to deal with the ravages of this disease or to act effectively to prevent its spread. By affecting so many millions across societal cross-sections, this disease presents a humanitarian crisis of unprecedented magnitude. Furthermore, the HIV/AIDS pandemic is a potentially destabilizing force that presents a grave threat to international security.

The African nations have been especially hard hit by the epidemic of HIV/AIDS and other diseases. Together, HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, malaria, and related diseases are undermining agricultural production throughout Africa—aggravating disease with hunger.

This bill will address these global problems by authorizing $15 billion to combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria, through a comprehensive 5-year integrated strategy. This legislation will use these funds effectively by promoting inter-agency coordination, supporting the expansions of public/private partnerships, and using targeted programs that will especially benefit children and families affected by HIV/AIDS.

Of course we must continue to work aggressively to combat the spread of this disease here in the United States and to continue our efforts to research a cure and to aid our own countrymen afflicted with this terrible illness.

I am proud to have been a co-sponsor of the House version of this vital legislation to attack one of the most significant threats to global health. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the motion we will approve today emphasizes the model of Uganda. Uganda has helped people avoid exposure and infection to HIV/AIDS. They have saved lives.

The world can take a lesson from Uganda—including the United States.

Uganda understood that, as a developing country working to build its way back from tyranny and exploitation, it had to act to save itself. It had little money, it had no expertise, it had few resources.

But Uganda had faith. Uganda had faith in God and in its people to save themselves.

President Museveni asked his people to change their behavior in order to stay alive. That is not a message that is dependent on cultural interpretation. It is not a message that requires specific technical or scientific understanding. It is a message that gave hope and health to the general population of Uganda.

And it has worked and continues to work in Uganda, Zambia, Jamaica, an Namibia.

The motion to agree to the Senate amendment that is before us is landmark legislation because it sets a course for what works in saving people's lives from the certain death of HIV/AIDS. It emphasizes treatment through antiretroviral therapy, care by assisting families and children affected by HIV/AIDS, and prevention by emphasizing education to help people avoid exposure.

This legislation makes a very important distinction between prevention activities and

intervention activities. The bill details that included in prevention are those activities intended to help people avoid exposure by reducing the number of sexual partners and—if they are adolescents—delaying sexual activity until they are married.

This is a realistic and effective public health strategy to help end the grip of HIV/AIDS.

This legislation does not eliminate the utilization of interventions that are intended to reduce the risk of infection, especially, for specific high risk populations.

The distinction between prevention and intervention is important. As a physician who has treated AIDS patients, dying from in most instances an avoidable disease, we need to emphasize risk avoidance but continue to provide options for risk reduction.

This approach, called ABC, is a sound approach meant for the general population to save as many lives as possible. It is a comprehensive approach to AIDS prevention that recognizes that people are different and a range of behavioral options for AIDS prevention needs to be presented.

In 2 days I will be traveling to Uganda to see for myself the Uganda experience. One of the things I want to investigate in Uganda is if it is staying true to the ABC approach. Since the mid 90s, there has been less of an emphasis on sexual behavior and more on medical solutions. In recent years, there has been a small but disturbing trend toward riskier sexual behavior, and for the first time in a decade there has been a slight up-tick in national infection rates.

The Uganda ABC model of the earlier period, the one that seems to have worked the best, is the one that has most to teach the rest of the world. That is why I am so pleased to support this motion and provide real solutions and real hope to the people of the world.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the following article from today's Washington Post be inserted in the RECORD.

IN ANOTHER BREAK WITH PAST, KENYANS SEE HOPE ON AIDS

(By Emily Wax)

NAIROBI.—The preacher's message to his 3,000-member congregation inside the Kenyan Local Believers Evangelical Church on a rainy Sunday was a simply one: Condoms don't protect against AIDS.

The crowd responded with a ringing ''Eh,'' meaning yes, nodding as they clapped and rocked to his confident voice and his message.

''In fact, if you have sex using a condom 10 times, you will get 10 percent of the AIDS each time,'' thundered the pastor, Solomon Ndoria, wearing a mustard-colored three-piece suit and pumping his hands in the air. ''Then you will actually have AIDS. So just abstain from sex.''

One day later, Lucy Wanjiku's message to the man in her dark metal shack, standing beside her thin foam mattress, was a simple one, too. But she mumbled it.

She needed cash. She had to feed her 4-year-old son. So the 30-year-old woman who usually sold African crafts was selling her body.

Wanjiku, one of the many members of Ndoria's church who live in Kangemi, a Nairobi slum, had listened to her pastor's words. But she had also heard discussions at the local health clinic and seen posters downtown, and she wanted her client to use a condom.

He refused, slapping her face. Then in the dark must of her room, on her cot, with her son crying nearby, they had sex, she said. Afterwards, she had enough money for pounded maize. Now she has the virus that causes AIDS. She said she believes she will die soon.

The preacher and the prostitute exemplify the emotional debate over AIDS in Africa and its life-and-death consequences. As of the end of last year, an estimated 29.4 million people in sub-Saharan Africa had AIDS or HIV, according to U.N. estimates. About 3.5 million were infected during 2002, and an estimated 2.4 million people died of AIDS complications that year.

In Kenya, a nation of 31 million, 15 percent of adults have AIDS or HIV, U.S. statistics indicate. An estimated 500 to 700 Kenyans will die each day this year from AIDS-related causes. Yet after two decades of outside assistance and internal debate, Kenya, like most of its neighbors, has yet to find an effective strategy for preventing the disease or for treating those who contract it. And AIDS continues to kill entire villages, to wipe out generations.

When the country's first free and fair elections in December brought an end to 24 years of autocratic rule by Daniel arap Moi, many hailed it as a decisive moment not only in Kenya's political history but in its fight against AIDS. The new president, Mwai Kibaki, proclaimed a ''total war on AIDS.'' He has committed his government to help pay for the treatment of 40,000 patients and abandoned Moi's self-described ''shy'' policy about condom use, taking a stand supporting condoms in addition to abstinence until marriage.

After Kibaki's election, more than 500,000 condoms were distributed in western Kenya, where HIV infection is most prevalent. Kibaki's government ordered 50 million condoms from German prophylactic maker Condomi, and Kibaki said he will now implement the country's dormant AIDS prevention strategy, which long included plans to distribute condoms in hair salons, banks, restaurants and bars in addition to health facilities. Kibaki said the government will use a $100 million ''soft'' loan from the World Bank to pay for 300 million condoms over a four-year period.

Kibaki maintains that if the AIDS problem is not tackled, none of his government's other programs will matter. ''We must all come out and fight and eradicate this disease, because there won't be any point of improving the welfare of people who are going to die,'' he said last month. ''I would want us to look back and say, 'That is the disease that used to kill us.'''

Anti-AIDS crusaders say they hope Kibaki continues to follow a path that diverges sharply from the practice of many African governments to keep silent about condom use and AIDS. Ghana and Rwanda, largely Christian nations, are still unclear about prevention policies. In contrast, Botswana, with its tiny population of 1.6 million and its massive infection rate of 36 percent, has been aggressive both in rhetoric and treatment.

The most widely praised example in Africa is Kenya's neighbor, Uganda, where the policies of President Yoweri Museveni are credited with helping bring HIV infection rates down from 30 percent to 5 percent. Museveni set up aggressive and candid campaigns that included condom distribution and a national plan to attract aid donors to the country of 24.7 million.

''I think saving these lives is feasible in Kenya—right now,'' said Christa Cepuch, a Kenya-based pharmacist with the French medical aid group Doctors Without Borders. ''I think with political will anything can happen. If Kibaki sat down at his desk and made this happen, it would be a different country in 10 years. Uganda did it and now Kenya can, too.''

In Africa's impoverished countries, the debate over whether to tackle AIDS by trying to prevent it, through abstinence or condom use, or by treating it with expensive antiretroviral drugs, or both, is a complicated tangle that involves every level of society—preachers, prostitutes and their clients, farmers, orphans, drug companies and politicians.

As AIDS drugs decrease in price and advocates around the globe lobby for more funding for their purchase, some AIDS experts say they are seeing the first signs that treatment might become affordable for poor countries. But at the moment, they say, prevention is the more pressing issue.

Few Kenyans take issue with the idea that abstinence from sex is an almost foolproof way to avoid AIDS. But in a country where more than half the people live on less than a dollar a day, it's not always that simple.

Because rural jobs are scarce, many Kenyans migrate to the cities for work, leaving their families behind in small villages. When spouses are separated for long periods, sexual relations outside marriage become common. Or when there are no jobs, it is not uncommon for a woman to sell her body—perhaps just a few times in a lifetime—to feed her family for a few days.

''Let's not be so naive and so bashful as to think people are not going to have sex,'' said Wilson Ndgu, an energetic Kenyan doctor who distributes condoms at bars and in health clinics around the slums of Nairobi. ''People are having sex, so we should be promoting condoms as a way to save lives. That is the ethical and, frankly, the most Christian response.''

Most Kenyans—78 percent—practice Christianity, and most Christian denominations in Africa oppose condoms, some on the grounds that they promote sex outside marriage, others because they are a form of birth control. Only a few socially liberal church leaders have come out in favor of condom use.

''To be honest, Kibaki is in for some real serious work here. The scale of the epidemic and complete lack of response to it has created a nation where a lot of people feel they are helpless,'' said Chris Ouma, a Kenyan who is national coordinator for the Action AIDS/HIV program. ''There is a lot of education to do and a lot of working with the churches. I've never seen such prominent leaders pray for people's lives and then tell people not to use condoms.''

This All Africa Conference of Churches, with 168 members from all branches of Christianity, is torn on the issue of promoting condom use and backs a plan that tells worshipers to wait until marriage to have sex. But Kibaki is now asking church leaders to spend the first 15 minutes of every Sunday sermon preaching the policy of ABC.

ABC stands for ''Abstain, Be faithful or use Condoms,'' the approach successfully adopted in Uganda and copied by other countries. President Bush, who has pledged $15 billion to help pay for drugs in Africa and the Caribbean, has made ABC official U.S. policy. The U.S. Senate approved a $15 billion bill Friday that earmarks $3 billion a year for the next five years for programs in Africa that include education about condom use and promotion of faithfulness and abstinence.

Still, some church leaders refuse to support ABC, saying it goes too far.

''This issue may be tougher than ever finding affordable drugs for AIDS patients,'' said Melaku Kifle, outgoing general secretary of the All Africa Conference of Churches. ''And Kibaki is trying to take a stand by pushing the ABC policy. What will happen? No one really knows. Kibaki's leadership in the coming years will be critical.''

As times change, there are signs that attitudes may be changing, too.

On the television soap opera ''Saints and Sinners,'' the characters talk about AIDS. In newspapers and on the radio, the new government has launched an ad campaign that talks about it, too. The ads say: ''Three people die every five minutes from AIDS in Kenya. What are you doing about it?''

Kenyan doctors now hand out condoms in bars and talk about prevention over warm Tusker beer. Even the national museum is addressing the issue, running an exhibit this month on how treatment and prevention improve the lives of patients.

''All of my friends say using condoms is like eating a banana with the skin on,'' said Walter Koga, 22, a jobless man who was hanging out with his friends at a barbershop in Kangemi. ''Men just won't wear them because of stubbornness. People say it's not manly. But attitudes are changing. People don't want to be diseased, suffer horribly and die. I actually thought I would never wear one and now I do. I've changed.''

As a group of Koga's friends gathered to joke about how they still don't want to use condoms, Lucy Wanjiku hovered nearby, listening. She folded her arms over her chest and rolled her eyes. She told a group of women standing nearby about a friend of hers who had asked a man to use a condom and ended up getting beaten.

She wanted to tell Koga's friends to stop joking, but she didn't. Instead she went inside her dark metal shack to rest. She was too sick and weak to fight with them.

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), for his generosity. Believe me, he is indispensable to this effort, too.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, May 20, 2003, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORRECTING THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 1298, UNITED STATES LEADERSHIP AGAINST HIV/AIDS, TUBERCULOSIS, AND MALARIA ACT OF 2003

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 46) to correct the enrollment of H.R. 1298, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 46

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate, in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 1298) to provide assistance to foreign countries to combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria, and for other purposes, shall make the following correction: In section 202(d)(4)(A)(i), strike ''from all other sources'' and insert ''from all sources''.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on table.

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 motions 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.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later today.

CHILD MEDICATION SAFETY ACT OF 2003

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1170) to protect children and their parents from being coerced into administering psychotropic medication in order to attend school, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1170

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 ''Child Medication Safety Act of 2003''.

SEC. 2. REQUIRED POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As a condition of receiving funds under any program or activity administered by the Secretary of Education, not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, each State shall develop and implement policies and procedures prohibiting school personnel from requiring a child to obtain a prescription for substances covered by section 202(c) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 812(c)) as a condition of attending school or receiving services.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subsection (a) shall be construed to create a Federal prohibition against teachers and other school personnel consulting or sharing classroom-based observations with parents or guardians regarding a student's academic performance or behavior in the classroom or school, or regarding the need for evaluation for special education or related services under section 612(a)(3) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(3)).

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) CHILD.—The term ''child'' means any person within the age limits for which the State provides free public education.

(2) STATE.—The term ''State'' means each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

SEC. 4. GAO STUDY AND REVIEW.

(a) REVIEW.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a review of—

(1) the variation among States in definitions of psychotropic medication as used in regard to State jurisdiction over public education;

(2) the prescription rates of medications used in public schools to treat children diagnosed with attention deficit disorder, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, and other disorders or illnesses;

(3) which medications used to treat such children in public schools are listed under the Controlled Substances Act; and

(4) which medications used to treat such children in public schools are not listed under the Controlled Substances Act, including the properties and effects of any such medications and whether such medications have been considered for listing under the Controlled Substances Act.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall prepare and submit a report that contains the results of the review under subsection (a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BURNS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BURNS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1170.

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

There was no objection.

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

Today we are considering H.R. 1170, the Child Medication Safety Act, which will prevent school personnel from requiring a child to obtain a prescription for a controlled substance in order to remain in the classroom. I would first like to thank Chairman BOEHNER and Speaker HASTERT for their support of this legislation and Subcommittee Chairman CASTLE for conducting an important hearing on this bipartisan bill.

In recent decades there has been a growing number of children diagnosed with attention deficit disorder and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder and then treated with medications such as Ritalin and Adderall. When a licensed medical professional properly diagnoses a child as needing these drugs, the administration of the drugs may be entirely appropriate and very beneficial. While these medications can be helpful, they also have the potential for serious harm and abuse, especially for children who do not need these medications. In many instances, school personnel freely offer diagnosis for ADD and ADHD disorders and urge parents to obtain drug treatment for the child.

Sometimes officials even attempt to force parents into choosing between medicating their child and remaining in the classroom. This is unconscionable. School personnel may have good intentions, but parents should never be required to decide between their child's education and keeping them off potentially harmful drugs. School personnel

should never presume to know the medication needs of a child. Only medical doctors have the authority to determine if a prescription for a medication is physically appropriate.

□ 1115

The bill before us today, the Child Medication Safety Act of 2003, is straightforward, sensible legislation that aims to remedy this problem facing parents across the Nation. It requires States to establish policies and procedures prohibiting school personnel from requiring a child to take medication in order to attend school. This bill has been carefully crafted to preserve communication between the school personnel and the parent, but it also protects parents from being coerced into placing their child on a drug in order to receive educational services. Parents would no longer be forced into making decisions about their child's health under duress from school officials.

The language as amended in committee makes some important clarifications to the bill. While the bill as introduced only included drugs listed in schedule II of the Controlled Substances Act, we learned that there are replacement drugs for Ritalin and Adderall in other schedules. For this reason and to answer concerns among the mental health community, the list of covered drugs was expanded to cover those listed in all five schedules of the Controlled Substances Act.

The bill before the House today also includes an important clarification to ensure that parents and teachers are able to have an open dialogue about any academic or behavior-related needs of the child. This legislation is intended only to prevent school personnel from requiring children to be medicated. It is not intended to stifle appropriate dialogue between parents and teachers. Teachers spend so much time with the students and observe a wide variety of situations and parents often ask their child's teachers to share their observations about their child's behavior in school. We certainly do not want to infringe on these important conversations. The Child Medication Safety Act of 2003 makes clear that appropriate conversations can still take place. This is an important change that was brought to my attention by a number of my colleagues, and I would like to particularly thank the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY), the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS), and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) for their help in this area.

This bill is not antischool, antiteacher, or antimedication. This bill is pro-children and pro-parent. The Child Medication Safety Act of 2003 is essential to protecting both parents and children. I urge my colleagues to support this bill that restores power to the parents.

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

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

When I asked the Marin County superintendent of public schools what she thought about H.R. 1170, she replied that it was a bill that would affect the many to solve the possible problem of just a few, and I think that describes it perfectly. Of course no one wants a school to force parents to medicate their children. In fact, we would not stand for that. But neither do we want teachers and other school personnel to be afraid to talk to parents about children's behavior or to suggest that a child should be evaluated by a medical health practitioner. That is why we worked with the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BURNS) to add a provision to H.R. 1170 that specifically protects a teacher's right to have these discussions with parents and to identify a child for evaluation just as they can do now under IDEA. While I do think this bill creates more paperwork than good public policy, I do understand the gentleman from Georgia's (Mr. BURNS) intentions, and I appreciate his willingness to work with us.

This bill was unanimously voted out of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and I know of no objection to it passing under suspension this morning.

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

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), a member of the committee.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to be here today to speak on behalf of the Child Medication Safety Act of 2003. I want to particularly commend the author of this bill, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BURNS). He himself is a professional educator and knows firsthand how significant that law can be. I have the perspective of being the father of four children, and I know how important this can be to their ability to do well in school. And it is a big day for us. My ninth grader completes his final day today. I know he is a happy creature at home on his way to the tenth grade. Additionally, my wife is a teacher, and I am really proud of her service. She just concluded her first grade class yesterday; so she is out for the summer.

But as a parent and a spouse of a teacher, I appreciate this legislation. The Child Medication Safety Act of 2003 requires States, as a condition of receiving Federal education funds, to establish policies and procedures prohibiting school personnel from requiring a child to take a controlled substance in order to attend school. Parents have felt pressured to place their child on drugs like Ritalin or Adderall. These are potentially dangerous drugs and only licensed medical practitioners should recommend these drugs and then carefully monitor the child for harmful side effects. School districts and teachers should not presume to know what medication a child needs or if the child even needs medication. Only medical personnel have the ability to determine if a prescription for a controlled substance is appropriate for a child.

The input and advice from schools and teachers carry weight with most parents. Parents should not be forced to decide between getting their child into school and keeping their child off mind-altering drugs. Parents are in the best position to determine what is best for the child. After listening to licensed medical personnel, a parent is the one who should determine whether their child should be medicated, not school personnel. Schools should respect a parent's choice and not use coercive measures that might be harmful to children merely to avoid dealing with behavioral problems. Most importantly, the bill ensures that there is open communication between the school personnel and parents.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1170.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend both sides for working out a good bill that passed unanimously from the committee. I want to commend the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BURNS), my good friend and colleague, and his office for working very closely with all of us in trying to ensure that we were able to address the needs of families and children in school.

When I travel around my district in Rhode Island, I find school teachers telling me that the biggest single problem they have is addressing the emotional and social development of the kids in their classrooms. These kids come to school often from broken families, family violence, situations that none of us can even begin to imagine, and to think that these children are going to learn and not be able to shut out these things from their mind about what is going on at home is just not being realistic. These kids need assistance, they need help, and they need counseling. That is why I think we have done so well by trying to ensure that there are more school counselors, but we still need to do more.

In terms of the mental health part, I think this is an important part of development. I think this bill does a lot to ensure that we do not tie the hands of teachers and principals and administrators insofar as their consulting with parents. In many respects teachers have a window into what is going on in that child's life, and they are best equipped to be able to talk to those parents and be able to consult with those parents about what those children might need. Obviously, none of us wants to see a situation where instead of getting these kids the necessary emotional and social support, all they give to these kids is medication. We do not need to do that, but we do need to

ensure that for those kids who do need medication who do have those kinds of chemical imbalances that make it very difficult for them to learn that they can get the needed support.

I think overall the biggest challenge that we have in this area is ending the stigma of mental health. Somehow, having any kind of range of mental illness is a stigma. I myself suffer from depression. I take medications for it. It is nothing I feel ashamed of. I also have asthma. I take medications for that. And yet in this country we still have this pervasive view that somehow if one has kind of an emotional problem that that is their problem, that is of their own making, that it is not some part of their brain chemistry. Just as diabetes or asthma or any other chronic disease would not be their fault, neither is any mental illness.

So that is why I think this bill is important in that it does not stigmatize those families and children that may be suffering from emotional and social challenges. So with that I ask for support for this legislation and commend the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) for her good work.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY), a professional in the health care field.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BURNS) for putting together this legislation which actually is extremely important. I know I have seen in my own practice as a psychologist the importance of helping to make sure that children get to the right professionals and that there is not coercion or threat that goes to the families.

I want to take a few moments, first of all, to lay out with regard to this bill the issues involved with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, an often misunderstood and often maligned diagnosis that because of that lends itself to prejudicial comments as certainly the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY) was also alluding to. Attention deficit disorder has a number of diagnostic criteria which are laid out in what is called the ''Diagnostic and Statistical Manual.'' They include categories of inattention, hyperactivity and impulsiveness. Because psychiatric and psychological symptoms are described in behavioral terms they oftentimes seem vague and only behavioral. For example, under the inattention category, it might mean a person who fails to give close attention to details or has difficulty sustaining attention in tasks or often does not seem to listen when spoken to directly or does not follow through on instructions to finish school work, et cetera; often has difficulty organizing tasks and activities or avoids or is reluctant to engage in tasks that require sustained mental effort.

When one just hears some of those symptoms, one may think that those could cover a wide range of behaviors that may not necessarily reach a diagnosis that requires medication, and there is something to that. That is why it is so very important when there is a concern raised about a child's symptom picture perhaps fitting the diagnosis of attention deficit disorder that that child be thoroughly evaluated by perhaps a team of professionals psychiatrists, psychologists, people who are trained to do this, but not simply referred on the basis of this child is difficult in the classroom.

And let me lay out why. In terms of attention behaviors, we look upon this as a primary, secondary, and tertiary diagnosis. A primary attention deficit disorder is one where a child actually has the symptom pictures of attention disorder related to the biological and in some cases some inherited factors for that, but it is pretty clearly in that category. They meet the diagnostic criteria.

Secondary attention deficit disorder is when the child may have the same problems with concentration and attention and getting their work done, but it is secondary to some other problems. For example, a child may have an anxiety disorder. They may be suffering from depression. They may have sensory problems. I have known children who were referred to me for attention disorder only to find out they needed glasses or they had a subtle hearing loss. They may be having social problems, cultural problems, as they are moving from one school district to another and have a great deal of difficulty. They may have speech and communication problems where they have trouble understanding the teacher. And yet those children's symptom picture can look similar. They are not paying attention, not concentrating, they are not getting their work done, they are agitated and hyperactive. It is important that those other problems are diagnosed clearly and those are treated and those are not the children who should be given medication.

A third type is a tertiary problem, and this is not the problem with the child so much as it is a problem with expectations. That is, people may expect a pre-school child to sit still. People may expect a teenager to concentrate and not daydream. We know anybody with any rudimentary knowledge of having children knows that those are not realistic expectations, and yet there are those sometimes who feel that children who are out of sync with their expectations will somehow require medication, and that is inappropriate.

These diagnostic criteria, I should also add, in the testimony that was given to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, there were some who raised the question of whether or not this was biological. I draw some attention to some research that was done, I believe, in 1990 where they did Positron Emission Tomography. That is, they could look at the activity in the brains of people who were identified with attention disorder and those who were not and found in those who had a diagnosis of attention disorder, their brain activity was somewhat lower.

That is not to mean that they had brain damage. It simply meant by looking at levels of brain activity, they found that those parts of the brain that generally control impulses and thought, that is, the frontal lobe, et cetera, were not as active as those in people who did not have attention disorder. That lent a great deal to the science of understanding attention disorder because all along before that we thought that the brains were overstimulated and it may actually be they were undercontrolled in some regions.

This of course also lends credence to why sometimes one may use medication. The medications used, such as Ritalin or Adderall or Dexedrine, are stimulant medications; and we for many years wondered about this paradoxical effect of why would you give a stimulant medication to actually slow someone down. And the point is that it appears to stimulate those portions of the brain. Basically, sometimes a layman can understand that if they feel tired and groggy and overwhelmed and they are having trouble staying alert and staying focused, sometimes a person, as they are driving down the road, will be overactive.

□ 1130

But the point is this: What I am trying to lay out here is the complexity of this.

Let me end with this one anecdote. When I was practicing as a psychologist, I received a call to evaluate a child, and did so. Then, calling back to the school district, said this child does not appear to have primary attention disorder. I think there were some other issues here, but not that.

I was told then by the referring source in the school district, put this child on Ritalin, or we will never refer another child to your practice again. I challenged that person on that immediately and said I need to go by what I believe an appropriate diagnostic criteria is and suggested they withdraw that threat.

But that is the very reason why we need legislation like this, to say this is not something that should be done to control children. This should be something that is done to help do the best thing in the child's best interest with the best people involved using the appropriate diagnostic criteria.

This is a positive thing for children and ultimately a positive thing for families, and I certainly implore my colleagues vote yes on this bill.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose H.R. 1170 on very simple grounds: It is a solution without a problem. The bill is based on the assumption that a substantial number of educators require students to take medication in order to attend school.

At a hearing 2 weeks ago, I asked all of the witnesses if they had any statistical evidence of the frequency with which this happens. Mr. Speaker, not a single one did. All they offered were anecdotes, often anonymous ones. I believe it is irresponsible to rush to legislative judgment without facts; and, indeed, I am requesting that the Government Accounting Office report, based on its ongoing research, whether there are verified instances of this being a cause for due process hearings.

Let us be clear: If parents believe that a school has pressured them to seek a medical evaluation for their child due to the child's behavior, and if a physician evaluates the child and prescribes appropriate medication, and if the parent nonetheless does not want to give the medication to the child, there may be a conflict about the child's placement in a regular classroom. Should that happen, the parent has clear due process rights to seek an evaluation through the special education process whether or not the child will ultimately qualify for special education services. If the parent is dissatisfied with those results, an appeal to a due process hearing officer is available.

Please note: Teachers educate. They cannot medicate; and physicians, as we know, must do that.

What happens in real life if a parent is unhappy with a school's placement of their child? As a former school board member, I can tell you that they pick up the phone and they call their school board representative. And that is exactly what they should do. Where a problem may indeed exist, the problem needs to be addressed specifically with the involved personnel and known circumstances.

Are there bad apples in the world of education who may have put inappropriate pressure on a parent to seek a pharmaceutical solution to a behavior problem? Well, yes, there possibly are. Bad apples do exist. But if we think of every one of tens of thousands of schools in our country as having a barrel of apples, the teachers of our children, is it fair to castigate all of those barrels of apples as being rotten because across the country there is one bad apple in a barrel here or there? I think we discredit the tens of thousands of wonderful teachers in our country when we legislate based on this false assumption.

But I want to thank, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BURNS) for having accepted changes to his original bill that mitigate the most alarming issue contained in the original language. He has accepted a provision that clearly states that it is the right and responsibility of teachers to counsel parents about the educational, physical and emotional attributes of their child as compared to the norm of children and to recommend professional evaluation, if warranted.

If a child is having trouble seeing the blackboard, the teacher must advise the parent to seek professional help. Teachers cannot prescribe glasses, but they certainly must identify the need. It is the same if a child with diabetes or asthma is having trouble regulating the medications he takes, and this affects the child's ability to learn. It is the same if the child's mental health needs require evaluation so that that child and the class can function beneficially.

The reason that this section is so important is that it appeared that the measure as originally proposed had provided an opportunity for groups who openly oppose all mental health evaluation to seek to affect the teacher-parent counseling relationship by chilling the teacher's right to speak of these matters to parents.

While the measure before us today contains some mitigating language, what is so alarming is that when the Individuals with Disabilities in Education Act came before the committee, this bill's original language was offered without notification and was voice-voted without the benefit of hearings or study. It is thus part of the House-passed IDEA bill; and it is critical that, should that language be included in the conference bill, that the mitigating paragraph contained in today's separate bill be included in that language as well.

Although today's bill has been improved, I would still ask Members as legislators to consider the process of this legislation. I believe that legislation should be based on the documented existence of a problem, not on hearsay and innuendo; and I believe that all of the wonderful, caring teachers in our country should be celebrated for their compassion for children's needs and not tarnished by the stated assumption of this measure.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD).

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, and I want to congratulate the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BURNS) on this legislation, H.R. 1170, and would like to encourage strongly all of our colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the Child Medication Safety Act of 2003 requires States, as a condition of receiving Federal education funds, to establish policies and procedures prohibiting school personnel from requiring a child to take a controlled substance in order to attend school. I could not agree with that more.

The problem is, parents feel the pressure from school officials to put their child on drugs like Ritalin or Adderall. Basically, these can be potentially dangerous drugs, and the underlying part here is that only licensed medical practitioners should recommend these drugs and then carefully be able to monitor the child for harmful side effects.

The very idea that the pressure can be brought to bear on a parent to force them to put a child on any of these drugs, and particularly Adderall and Ritalin, just goes against the principles of good common sense.

School districts and teachers ought not to presume to know medications that a child needs. If a child in fact needs medication, only medical personnel have the ability to determine that.

I am very pleased that this bill will hopefully begin to rein in some of the consequences of leaving it up simply to the school to determine if a child needs to be put on a medication and, more importantly, to put the pressure on the parents. This does not keep the school officials and the parents from having good conversations about a child. Obviously, we all want that. I am absolutely satisfied that the bill offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BURNS) does not keep that from happening.

Mr. Speaker, let us support this common sense legislation and move on.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1170, the Child Medication Safety Act, and commend the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BURNS) for taking the initiative to introduce this resolution.

I also would like to most directly associate my remarks with those of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), who made what I think to be some real points relative to medication, the utilization of it, and really the relationship of the whole question of mental health.

Mr. Speaker, there are several studies over the last decade pointing out the fact that prescription drug abuse is on the rise in America. In 1999, an estimated 4 million people, 2 percent of the population, aged 12 and older were currently using certain prescription drugs nonmedically. The data from the National Institute on Drug Abuse demonstrates that the most dramatic increase in new users of prescription drugs for nonmedical purposes occurs in the ages 12 to 17 and 18 to 25. This resolution will hopefully help this growing problem of addiction by giving parents a voice in whether their child should be medicated or not without the consequence of having their child removed from school.

Teachers and other school personnel will still be able to recommend to parents if they feel there is a medical problem with the child, be it a need for a hearing or vision test, or if there is concern that maybe the child should be seen by a physician for diabetes, epilepsy or attention deficit disorder.

Of course, our teachers and school personnel are with our children for a

longer period of time during the day and, of course, many may witness problems that parents may not see before or after school. But no parent or child should be forced to use prescription drugs to obtain an education. There is still something called patients' rights, parents' rights, children's rights; and certainly the parents of children should have the right to determine when and if their children should be medicated or not.

I think this legislation provides the opportunity for the kind of interaction between parents and teachers so that parents get the best information. They then can make a determination, and jointly the child's education can always be the first order of concern.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is an excellent piece of legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate all of the remarks we have heard on the floor today. I said before when the subject of Ritalin come up, I raised four children, and I am absolutely certain that Ritalin or some other psychotropic drug would have been suggested for each and every one of them sometime during their school career. In fact, when I was a kid, my grandfather used to offer to pay me 5 cents for every minute that I could sit still. Well, I never earned a nickel. So my kids came with this hyperactive behavior through the genes, and we all learned through behavior modification and through growing up that, indeed, moving around all the time was not going to get us anywhere. So they learned to be calm, before I did, actually.

But that is why I have concerns about blurring the line between the behavior of an active, high-spirited child and a child with a disability.

This is not to suggest, however, that attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, ADHD, is not a very real disability for many children. ADHD robs so many children and their parents of the pleasures of childhood and family. The children are labeled as ''bad'' for things that they actually cannot control. The parents find themselves frustrated and often angry at their child.

However, the growing increase in the manufacture and prescription of psychotropic drugs, like Ritalin, is a cause for concern. The decision to treat a child with any drug, but certainly a stimulant, should be made very, very carefully and only after comprehensive evaluation and diagnosis. It is crucial that parents be very well informed about these drugs, both the possible successes of the drug and the possible side effects of a drug, if it is being considered for their child.

It goes without saying, parents must have the final word in deciding whether or not their child takes any psychotropic drug.

□ 1145

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have been part of these negotiations with the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BURNS) and with the other side of the aisle in our committee so we could come up with a bill that we totally support and feel will be good for the child, for the parent, and for the education system for that child.

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

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

I would like to thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for working closely with us on this bill. I appreciate the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS), in particular, for their contributions to this important legislation.

I also would like to thank the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), for his support and guidance in this effort and also the leadership as we sought to bring this bill to the floor this day.

This is a straightforward, sensible bill. It just makes common sense. It is a bipartisan bill that has been worked out to ensure the appropriate and effective protection of our children. This bill protects children. It puts the power back in the hands of the parents so they can make an informed choice in the best interests of their family. It ensures that teachers and administrators are involved in the decision process, actively involved in the child's development.

In conversations with the National Association of Education, they in their review saw no problems and are supportive of this legislation.

The most important thing about this bill is it protects children and it keeps them from being inappropriately medicated. This bill is not antischool or antiteacher; it is not antimedication. There are appropriate and reasonable ways in which we should use medication in the best interests of our children. But this bill is prochild, it is prohealth, it is proparents. It ensures that America's children are protected.

Mr. Speaker, this is good legislation, it is reasonable legislation, and it is legislation that is good for America. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1170.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1170, the Child Medication Safety Act, which prohibits school personnel from requiring a child be medicated in order to receive an education and stay in the classroom.

There have been reports that schools have forced parents to put their children on medication, such as Ritalin, in order to allow them to continue attending school. Some have gone so far as to keep children out of the classroom until the parents relent and agree to put their kids on these drugs. In one specific case, a child was removed from their home because the parents refused to put them on medication as mandated by the school. This is outrageous. School personnel should never presume to know the medication needs of a child. Only medical doctors have the ability to determine if a prescription for a psychotropic drug is appropriate for a child.

As a former school teacher, I am sympathetic to need to have order in a classroom with as few disruptions as possible. However, it has been my experience that kids will be kids and there will always be children in the classroom who are overactive or inattentive.

It's important to note that nothing in this legislation prevents a school or school personnel from recommending a parent seek medical review of their child's physical or mental health. This legislation just keeps them from requiring medication in order to receive education services. The prescribing of medication should be left to parents and medical professionals not school officials.

Psychotropic drugs are serious medications and have an altering effect on the mind. These drugs have potential for serious harm, addiction and abuse that is why they are listed on Schedule II and IV of the Controlled Substances Act. Therefore, it is critical that they only be prescribed by licensed medical practitioners who have seen the child and made a medical evaluation to determine a diagnosis and the proper needs of a child.

H.R. 1170, the Child Medication Safety Act, is important legislation that protects children and parents. I would like to thank Congressman BURNS and Chairman BOEHNER for their hard work on this bill. I strongly support their efforts to move this legislation forward.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, no parent should feel forced to put their child on a psychotropic drug like Ritalin or Adderall. But that is just what is happening every day in schools across America. Currently, teachers can coerce parents by demanding that their child be medicated to attend their class.

This is wrong. Parents should not feel pressured to make a choice for their child because a teacher or school administator—individuals who do not have a medical background to make these suggestions—tells them their child must be medicated. That is why House Resolution 1170, the Child Medication Safety Act of 2003, is such an important piece of legislation. It gives parents the ultimate power in deciding whether or not their child should be on medication.

This bill requires states that receive Federal education funds to establish policies and procedures that prohibit school officials and teachers from requiring a child to be on a psychotropic drug to attend school.

Of course, parents often seek the advice and input of their child's teacher. But this bill calls for open communication between parents and teachers. Once a teacher or other school official meets with the parent and makes a suggestion that medication may be needed for a child to learn in the best way possible, the parent can then go to their family doctor to discuss both the risks and the benefits of these psychotropic drugs and make the choice themselves after weighing all of the options.

Parents are the only ones who should make the ultimate decision whether their child needs to be on medication. They should never be told that their child cannot attend school without being on a drug like Ritalin. H.R. 1170 gives the power to the parent when it comes to these choices.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1170, the Child Medication

Safety Act, which will prevent school personnel from requiring a child to obtain a prescription for a medication in order to remain in the classroom.

I would first like to thank my colleague from Georgia, Representative MAX BURNS, for his leadership in introducing this legislation to address this significant issue. I would also like to thank LYNN WOOLSEY for her help to improve this legislation. I am please to support this bipartisan legislation and am thankful for their efforts.

We have heard from numerous parents and grandparents that have been coerced or pressured by school districts into placing their child on medication in order for the child to attend school or receive services. I recognize the difficulty that children with attention or behavior problems bring to school, but no one should react by automatically assuming that the child should be on drugs. And certainly an individual without a medical license should not presume to understand the severity of a problem and simply assume that the child would be better off with drugs.

I'm sure that in these situations school personnel think they are doing the child, and the parents, a favor. But they are not. Instead they create new problems, unintended problems, and add to the culture where a pill should magically solve all of the child's problems. Worse, the quick fix of a pill fails to account for the potentially harmful effects of these drugs when not properly administered.

The diagnosis of a disability or emotional or behavioral problem requires the careful examination and discussion with a licensed medical practitioner. This bill protects that dialogue and ensures that parents are not forced to decide between their own preferences and a school official who is acting inappropriately.

I think it is also important to point out that we have provided strong safeguards to protect appropriate communication between the parent and the teacher. Teachers will still be able to share their observations with parents about the child's behavior in the classroom and the school. Teachers and parents will still be able to discuss the child's academic performance. This bill does not stifle appropriate communication.

This bill has the clear and simple goal of preventing school officials from requiring children to be medicated with a controlled substance in order to attend school. This is a goal we can and should all support.

H.R. 1170 is an important bill that will provide security and comfort to both teachers and parents to ensure that our children are protected. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for the ''Child Medication Safety Act of 2003 (H.R. 1170),'' which would prohibit the required administration of psychotropic medications in order for children to attend school.

Like many Members, I believe that our children are our future. We need to do our best to protect and improve the health and well-being of our Nation's children, including protecting them from medications that can potentially harm them.

While I was the Chairman of the Full Committee on Government Reform, I held a hearing on September 26, 2002, to examine allegations that too many children are being medicated for Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD) and Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) at increasingly younger ages, and to discuss the health implications of these drugs.

Our investigation found that disorders, such as ADD and ADHD, are diagnosed by a checklist of behaviors, not medical science. According to the National Institutes of Health, the behaviors, or ''symptoms'' used to diagnose these disorders are inattention, hyperactivity, and impulsivity. Based on these descriptions, almost every child in the United States would be considered afflicted, and under current law, be required to take psychotropic medication to attend school.

Ritalin is perhaps the most prescribed psychotropic drug used to control children with behavioral problems. It is estimated that four to six million children are taking this drug daily in the United States, a 500 percent increase since 1990.

Ritalin is classified as a Schedule II stimulant. This means that it has met three criteria: (1) it has a high potential for abuse; (2) it has a currently accepted medical use in the treatment; and (3) it is shown that abuse may lead to severe psychological or physical dependence. According to research published in the Journal of the American Medical Association, Ritalin was shown to be a more potent transport inhibitor than cocaine. In addition, the chronic use of Ritalin can lead to: aggression, agitation, disruption of food intake, weight loss, and even death.

Schools should not be able to force parents to administer these psychotropic drugs to their children—not only are these disorders diagnosed without physiological testing, but they can also lead these children to further drug-use and dependence, or even the worst of all scenarios . . . death.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1170 would protect our children from being required by schools to become subject to psychotropic medications that can lead to detrimental health effects as well as drug addiction based on unscientific diagnoses. I urge continued support from my colleagues on this important legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BURNS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1170, as amended.

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. BURNS. 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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1588, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 245 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 245

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. 1588) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2004 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2004, 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. 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. 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 those made in order by a subsequent order of the House. Each amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules may be offered only in the order printed in the report (except as specified in section 2 of this resolution), may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment (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), and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against amendments printed in the report are waived. After disposition of the amendments printed in the report, the Committee of the Whole shall rise without motion. No further consideration of the bill shall be in order except by a subsequent order of the House.

SEC. 2. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may recognize for consideration of any amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules 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. 3. During consideration of the bill under this resolution or by a subsequent order of the House—

(1) after a motion that the Committee rise has been rejected on a legislative day, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may entertain another such motion on that day only if offered by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services or the Majority Leader or a designee; and

(2) after a motion to strike out the enacting words of the bill (as described in clause 9 of rule XVIII) has been rejected, the Chairman may not entertain another such motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules met and granted a structured rule for H.R. 1588, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004. The rule provides for 2 hours of general debate, equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services. It waives all points of order against consideration of the bill.

Finally, it allows that the chairman of the Committee of the Whole may recognize for consideration of 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.

This is a fair rule, it is the traditional structured rule for defense authorization, and it provides for a debate on a number of pertinent issues, including nuclear policy, border security, and an assessment of NATO headquarters in Brussels, Belgium.

H.R. 1588 is a good bill. It firmly shows our commitment to restoring the strength of our Nation's military. The Committee on Armed Services has recommended $400.5 billion be authorized for the Department of Defense and the national security programs of the Department of Energy in fiscal year 2004.

I commend President Bush, Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld, and our military leaders for taking the fight to those who would do us harm. We stand committed to provide the resources to ensure our continued success.

The Iraqi conflict and our continuing war on terrorism have brought a renewed and proper focus on national defense. We owe much to our men and women in uniform. Their success in Iraq and Afghanistan is a testament to their bravery, training and equipment, and their commitment to defend our freedom.

With U.S. military personnel risking their lives on the front lines of the war on terrorism, H.R. 1588 is more than just a signal to our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines that this Nation recognizes their sacrifices. It is the means by which we make our commitment to providing them a decent quality of life by providing an across-the-board 4.1 percent pay increase for military personnel, so as to sustain the commitment and professionalism of America's all-volunteer Armed Forces, and the families that support them.

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. A lesson learned is that with the likelihood of the open-ended, long-term manpower requirements of stabilizing Iraq and the continuing war on terrorism, it is now crucial to begin addressing existing shortfalls.

I commend my colleagues, the gentleman from California (Chairman HUNTER), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), for crafting this legislation that will strengthen America's military.

Today, our forces must be able to respond quickly to rapidly changing threats. As such, nothing could be more important to our military than its current state of readiness. The pace of current operations has placed huge demands on personnel and equipment already suffering from a decade of underfunding. This legislation reduces non-warfighting spending and puts the money where it is of best use, training for our service members, maintenance of equipment, and support for the cost of operations.

I am pleased that H.R. 1588 authorizes $35.2 million for 39 Knight family systems to the Army National Guard. The Knight system is a high mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicle-mounted system which incorporates a Bradley fire support vehicle mission equipment package of a laser rangefinder, thermal sight, hand-held computer and global positioning systems. It is used to locate targets for laser-guided munitions.

As the Department of Defense increases the use of precision-guided munitions in combat, this money will help North Carolina's 30th Heavy Separate Brigade Armor use the Knight system to locate targets in support of these munitions.

H.R. 1588 makes the preparation and modernization of our National Guard a top priority.

I also want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES), for his work on strengthening the ''Buy American'' provisions included in this bill. His language will ensure that all of the components of DOD uniforms come from American companies. The language specifically works to more adequately cover domestic textile and leather industries.

However, there is one amendment the Committee on Rules made in order that I strongly oppose personally, the Sanchez amendment. It would allow abortions on our military bases overseas. Military treatment centers, which are dedicated to nurturing and healing, should not be forced to facilitate the taking of the most innocent human life, the child in the womb.

For the past 6 years, the House has voted to keep abortion-on-demand out of military 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, supporting our sons and daughters serving in the military, and preparing for war, thereby ensuring victory. 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, when it comes to supporting America's troops, there is no partisan divide in this Congress. Democrats and Republicans join together in saluting the soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines who serve America. More importantly, we work to provide them with the resources they need to do their jobs that we have asked them to do. So every year, Democrats and Republicans work very hard to put together a defense authorization bill that is as bipartisan as it is robust.

There is much to be proud of in this bill. Its core is a bipartisan product that provides more for national defense than the President requested and more than this Republican Congress approved in its budget. As always, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, deserves a lot of credit. He remains an unwavering advocate for the men and women in uniform who put their lives on the line every day to defend the United States.

As a longstanding supporter of the U.S. military, I am especially pleased by the success of Democrats' efforts to include substantial quality-of-life improvements for America's men and women in uniform and their families.

Specifically, this bill includes a 4.1 percent increase in basic pay for all members of the Armed Forces, plus targeted increases for midgrade and senior noncommissioned officers and select warrant officers to enhance retention. It also builds on our efforts to support the National Guard and the Reserves, who bear more and more of the burden of defending America at home and abroad.

□ 1200

For instance, it ensures is that when they serve in areas where those on active duty get hazardous duty pay, they will also.

Mr. Speaker, I want to particularly thank the Committee on Armed Services for including in this bill my legislation to make life easier for the National Guard and Reserves, both active duty and retirees, and their families by allowing them unlimited access to commissaries. They and their families are making great sacrifices for this Nation, and they deserve our support.

Additionally, this bill continues to invest in the wide range of weapons that ensure America's military superiority throughout the world. It includes $4.4 billion for the F–35 Joint Strike Fighter, the next generation multi-role fighter of the future for the Air Force, the Navy and Marines. It includes $4.3

billion for the F–22 Raptor aircraft, the high-technology air dominance fighter for the Air Force. It also includes over $1.6 billion for the V–22 Osprey aircraft.

Mr. Speaker, all of these important, pro-defense provisions have strong bipartisan support. They reflect the longstanding commitment of Democrats and Republicans to work together to ensure that the U.S. military has the resources it needs.

Unfortunately, several provisions of this bill are neither bipartisan nor necessary to maintain the strength of the U.S. military. Indeed, some are nothing more than extremist, right-wing ideology piggy-backed on an otherwise bipartisan bill.

For instance, does anyone really believe that national security requires that we gut environmental protections? Of course not.

But rolling back America's environmental protections is practically the Holy Grail of the Republican party. So Republicans stuck into this bill provisions that attack the Endangered Species Act and Marine Mammal Protection Act.

Similarly, Republicans are trying to use this bill to weaken the workplace protections of the patriotic men and women employed by the Pentagon. They even defeated a Democratic attempt to preserve the current rules prohibiting patronage at the Pentagon.

Mr. Speaker, these anti-environmental riders and attacks on the men and women who work at the Pentagon are not about supporting the military. There are about supporting the Republican party idealogy, and they have no business in a bipartisan bill to provide for the men and women of the United States Armed Forces.

So Democrats have filed amendments with the Committee on Rules to free this bipartisan bill of these partisan riders. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the House Republican leadership has chosen to make ideology of such paramount importance that they have shut out two of the most important Democratic amendments.

First, the Republican ideologues have denied the House the opportunity to even consider the amendment offered by the ranking members of the Committee on Resources and the Committee on Energy and Commerce. The Rahall-Dingell amendment is a common-sense and reasonable alternative to the anti-environmental language reported by the Committee on Resources and incorporated in the Committee on Armed Services bill relating to the Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act. This rule instead makes in order an amendment offered by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. It claims to fix the most egregious provisions in the Committee on Resources bill.

The fact that the Republican leadership has chosen to shut out Democrats in this manner gives many Members on this side of the aisle more than ample reason to oppose this rule.

Now the chairman of the Committee on Rules said last night that it was still possible for additional amendments to be considered for inclusion in the second rule on this bill to be considered by the committee later today. But I doubt any Members will be holding their breath.

The fact is, the Republican leadership would have done well to give this House the opportunity to have a vote on the Rahall-Dingell substitute, rather than risking losing this rule by shutting out so many reasonable Democrats who support the bill.

Additionally, the House Republican leadership has chosen to tell the second ranking Democrat on the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), a Member who has extensive expertise in the issue of nuclear threat reduction, that his amendment is just too hot to handle. The Spratt amendment sought to restore the President's requests for Cooperative Threat Reduction programs. That is the President's request that he sought to restore. Yet the Republican leadership has refused to make this amendment in order, in spite of the fact that President Bush asked for this money.

Again, the chairman of the Committee on Rules told me last night that it might be possible to consider including the Spratt amendment in the second rule, but, again, Members will not be holding their breath.

Such arrogance practically begs pro-defense Members on this side of the aisle to oppose this rule, and it ought to give plenty of reason to oppose this rule to Republican Members who value fair play and institutional integrity or President Bush's national security priorities.

Mr. Speaker, serious Members on both sides of the aisle have filed many other substantive amendments. But after seeing so many significant amendments blocked in this first rule, what do they have to look forward to in the second rule? Will they be shut out again just as their colleagues have today?

I, for instance, have submitted three important amendments that address defense issues I have pursued for some time: helping immigrant soldiers earn U.S. citizenship, providing tuition refunds to reservists called to active duty, and tax fairness for civilian Defense Department employees serving in combat zones.

Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly urged the Republican leadership to honor the long-standing tradition of allowing full consideration of substantive amendments like these on the defense authorization bill. That cooperative approach is fundamental to our efforts to keep partisan politics from polluting the Armed Forces bill and, in fact, has been followed in previous Congresses, both when the Democrats were in charge and even when the Republicans have been in charge. But this first rule has abandoned that cooperation.

For that reason, I urge Members to vote no on this rule so the Committee on Rules can go back upstairs and start this process over. Maybe on the second try the Republican leaders will allow us to get it right.

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

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

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

Let me say to all my colleagues, this is a great defense bill that is coming to the floor, and I hope everybody supports it. It does a lot of things for America's troops. They have just finished this extraordinary operation where they pushed up through Iraq in very dangerous circumstances, engaged in many conflicts at very close ranges and secured their objective and carried out their mission with extraordinary talent and capable and courage.

Now it is our turn. It is our turn to support the troops. It is our turn to provide the readiness capability. It is our turn to provide for modernization of old platforms, and it is our turn to not only fix what we need to win now but to look beyond the horizon and fix and create and produce what we are going to need tomorrow, and this bill does this.

It provides for many of the very important enablers. And I call enablers things like tankers, tanker aircraft, that allow us to maintain that aircraft bridge between the United States or a base that we have overseas and a potential point of conflict where we can keep aircraft going back and forth, whether those aircraft are cargo aircraft to supply the troops or strike aircraft that are putting rounds on target. And because of that we have got provisions in this bill to provide for tankers. We have a tanker fund that allows us to go forward on either a buy or a lease. We have got that provision in.

We have got provisions in for more of our airlift with C–17 aircraft, these great aircraft that are providing the centerpiece of our airlift today along with our older C–5s and our in-theater C–130s.

We worked on other so-called enablers. We have ramped up this stock of precision-guided munitions we need, those munitions that allow you to go in and hit one strut on a bridge and knock it down, instead of having to carpet bomb the entire bridge with hundreds of bombs. We have a so-called deep strike package that allows us to spend $100 million on a new system to replace these bomber aircraft that we are using today. And the newest B–52 was made in July of 1962, so it is more than 40 years old. We have 21 B–1s, and we now have a small batch of 21 B–2 aircraft, our stealth aircraft. We now have a very small fleet of B–1 aircraft, because we had pulled 23 B–1 aircraft out of the fleet because we could not

afford the spare parts to keep all of those aircraft running. We put those 23 aircraft back in the fleets, or as many of them that can be retrieved, and we provide for the spare parts and the sustainability to keep that part of our important deep strike fleet going.

We provide for the 4.1 pay increase. That is the average pay increase, and we do target parts of that to various aspects of the service where we need critical skills.

We do a good job with respect to housing for our troops, for our families. Today you do not just bring a troop, a uniformed person into the services. You bring a family into the services, and you have to provide for those families. We do that in this bill.

This bill has many good things; and our great subcommittee chairman and subcommittee ranking members and my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), my great partner who himself is home to the B–2 fleet in America, have done I think an excellent job on putting a great package together.

I want to speak to one aspect of this package that has been talked about a little this morning because people have said, are you killing the environment? Are you hurting the environment? Are you revamping the environment? The answer is no.

What we are doing is providing for freedom to train for our troops. What we have heard over the last many years now is that our bases around the country where these great troops that you saw in Iraq have an opportunity to train, whether they are hitting a beachhead or firing on a range or going through some type of amphibious warfare, those troops need to have places to train and those training grounds are becoming more and more constricted and more and more off-limits to our troops because of application, and I think wrongful application, of our environmental laws.

Let me show you a case in point.

This is a picture of the Marine base at Camp Pendleton in California. There is some 17 miles of beach here, and this is the beach on which the United States Marine Corps practices Iwo Jima. That is where they practice going ashore under heavy fire, where they know they will take substantial casualty for us, for freedom. And guess what we have done with our environmental laws? We have closed them out where they cannot practice.

This is a 17-mile beach. This is a base that is in excess of 100,000 acres. And I want to show my colleagues the various overlays, how the environmental applications have crept in and closed down more and more of this critical training base, and then I want to relate it to bases across this Nation.

Let us turn over to that first overlay. This is your 100,000-acre base. Here is the first overlay where training is now locked out. It is called the estuarine sanctuary. So training is locked out at Camp Pendleton. No Marines can go inside that estuarine sanctuary.

Now we have another restriction. These are the gnatcatcher restrictions. We found a small bird that is considered to be endangered; and because of that these huge areas and, remember, this is a 100,000-plus acre base, these huge areas are now restricted.

Now we have another restriction at Camp Pendleton. Let us turn the third page over. This is the rare plants restriction. It looks to me approximately another 10, 20,000 acres are now restricted from training activity.

Let us turn the next page. These are the riparian areas and the vernal pools which are now also restrictions.

So my point is, the United States Marines came in and talked to the Committee on Armed Services and they said, we used to try to work around these restrictions when we had just a couple of them. Now we can no longer work around them. And, incidentally, there is a lawsuit pending right now and there is an injunction in place for the Marines being able to practice amphibious operations on the vast majority of this beach that we put in place to allow them to practice Iwo Jima for the United States of America. So we have to do something.

So what did we do? Did we do something radical? No, we did not do anything radical. We simply said we want to balance conservation requirements and training requirements.

So what we are going to do is put together a process. It is called an inramp, which is a fancy term for saying if the Fish and Wildlife Department of the United States makes an agreement with the U.S. Marine Corps or the U.S. Navy or the U.S. Army or the U.S. Air Force and they also make an agreement with State Fish and Wildlife in the State, so if it is California, New Jersey, New York or whatever, everybody gets together and you take an area and you make a decision that allows you to balance these two important priorities, conservation and training, and you say, for example, we will allow the rifle range to be here. We will allow the gnatcatcher environment to be here. And maybe if the gnatcatchers migrate in the fall and they leave this area, we will let you have training in this area until they come back. It allows you to make a flexibility adjustment that takes care of both priorities, both conservation of endangered species and training.

Once Fish and Wildlife and State Fish and Game and the military makes this agreement, you cannot come on in after the agreement is made and place another critical habitat over the top of it and paralyze the training operation. That is what we do.

I think it is a very reasonable thing. This was passed first out of Resources with a bipartisan vote, and we passed it in the Committee on Armed Services. And the final vote on the Committee on Armed Services, I might add, when all the smoke cleared and all the dust settled and we had our final vote, I want to thank my ranking member from Missouri for his great leadership here, we had a vote of 58 to 2 in favor of this bill.

□ 1215

So this bill has really good stuff in it for the United States of America, and it balances some very important competing interests the American people have. I do not think any American, if you stopped them on the street and you went over this diagram of how training has been cut back further and further and further, at places like Camp Pendleton, where those Marines that went up the An Nasiriya Corridor trained, I do not think any American would disagree with the idea that you get together Fish and Wildlife and the Marine Corps, you make an arrangement, you set some land aside for the birds, set some land aside for the Marines, and let them both go through their operations.

So I want to thank the gentlewoman for letting me get up and explain this important aspect of the defense bill; and let me urge all Members, Republican and Democrat, to vote for this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Does the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) seek to control the time of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST)?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Yes, I do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection the gentleman is recognized.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. Once again, once again, this Republican majority shows no compunction about turning even the most bipartisan legislation into a vehicle of divisive and unnecessary partisanship.

The defense authorization traditionally unites Members on both sides of the aisle. I have always voted for it. The American people expect that. Our brave men and women in the service deserve no less. However, today the majority has purposefully loaded up this bill with extraneous and controversial provisions and forced the rule to deny our side of the aisle a fair opportunity to be heard.

Now, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the distinguished chairman of the committee, who is now speaking to the Committee on Rules chairman, just spent 10 minutes explaining how reasonable the provisions of the bill are. But they do not have the courage of that representation to allow us to debate fully on the floor and present an alternative.

My, my, my, how confident they must be of the reasonableness of their position. Again, the majority is trying to insulate sweeping policy changes from serious scrutiny by invoking the words ''national security,'' and casting anyone who raises questions as, at

best, an impediment to national security and, at worst, unpatriotic. The further down that road we go, the less democratic we will become.

Make no mistake, this bill contains many, many important provisions. It provides good pay, housing and training for our men and women in uniform, and funds important modernization priorities that will ensure that we have the most technologically advanced military in the world. I support that. Not only that, I have supported it for 23 years in this House.

However, the addition of controversial measures that will gut the civil service system and harm the environment only subvert the democratic process and demean this House. This bill would exempt the Defense Department from compliance with the Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act, even though both laws currently allow case-by-case exemptions. And here is the crucial point: the Pentagon has never before sought the exemptions that the majority would bestow today.

Fairness. Fairness. The American people expect fairness, and it dictates that the majority make the Rahall-Dingell amendment in order. It was not. The gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), who is the dean of the House, the senior Member in this House of Representatives, yet the Committee on Rules refused to allow him to offer an amendment. That is unconscionable. Furthermore, the process by which the civil service reform measures have been rushed to this floor is nothing short of appalling. This proposal was conceived by a handful of the President's advisers.

Without doubt, there are some problems in the Federal personnel system, reforms that I would support, but our military's stunning success in Iraq shows there is not a crisis. Mr. Speaker, we ought to consider this thoughtfully, and we ought to allow amendments to be offered on this floor which would provide for full debate. We are not doing that.

Vote against this rule. Vote against the previous question.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule, and I really am somewhat perplexed to hear all of the criticism of our attempts to be bipartisan on this legislation. Someone's been shut out in this process? Let me explain this rule to our colleagues, Mr. Speaker.

It is a rule which makes in order 2 hours of general debate, and it makes in order nine amendments for consideration that had been submitted to the Committee on Rules by the deadline we stated. But let me tell my colleagues what happened last night in the Committee on Rules. In our quest to try to have as many proposals as possible considered, what happened? It is the first time that I can remember, in this number, that this has taken place.

Three proposals were offered by our Democratic colleagues to actually knock out consideration of amendments that are made in order under this rule; meaning that while we were trying to provide an option of debate and then an up-or-down vote so we could in a bipartisan way address these issues, the Democrats were trying to shut out Members from having the opportunity to offer amendments. Now, I do not want to say it is unprecedented, but I do not recall it happening on three occasions as it did last night.

This should be, Mr. Speaker, a totally noncontroversial rule, because it is the same process that we have gone through. What we have done, Mr. Speaker, is we have said that we want to go with the two-rule procedure, which the Democrats did regularly and which we Republicans have done regularly in consideration of this massive Department of Defense authorization bill.

The great chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), was here and he has talked about the fact that this is a $400 billion measure. As was said so well by my friend, the minority whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), I agree with the fact that on an issue as important as our national security we should proceed in a bipartisan way, and we want to do that.

Now, we know that one of the issues of concern, and that has gotten a great deal of attention, is the environmental question. That was raised by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) when he made his presentation from the well. And I want to say that we have been sensitive to that. I happen to believe that the provision that is made in order under what will be tantamount to a manager's amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) does in fact move towards addressing some of the concerns that have been raised by the members of the minority.

I will acknowledge that there are some who would like to do more. But we happen to believe that the step that is taken by addressing the issues that were raised by our colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY), will in fact be able to be effectively addressed.

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

Mr. DREIER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, because I think this is an important procedural issue. And I have a quote of yours in my pocket, but I am not going to take it out.

Mr. DREIER. I think I may have heard it before.

Mr. HOYER. I am not going to regurgitate it, in terms of fairness.

But what my colleague is saying is that the dean of the House comes to your committee and wants to offer an amendment, and your committee responds, no, Dean, you have served here 40-plus years, but we know better than you do.

Mr. DREIER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules has not said that. The Committee on Rules acted on one of two rules last night when we passed out this rule granting 2 hours of general debate and allowing for the consideration of nine amendments, which we hope to proceed with in just a few minutes.

We will be meeting sometime mid-afternoon for consideration of a second rule which will allow for consideration of other amendments when we proceed with this tomorrow. So I think that it is really incorrect for anyone to conclude that all of the action on the Department of Defense authorization rule has in fact been completed. It has not been completed.

But I want to say that the issue of the environment is one that is very important to me as a Californian. It is one that is very important, I believe, to a broad cross-section of the membership of this House, Democrats and Republicans. We also know that there have been requests made by this administration to deal with the situation that was outlined so well by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, where in fact we may be jeopardizing the lives of our men and women in uniform if we do not take some action.

So I understand this is going to be debated. This will be discussed. There is no doubt about the fact that this will be a topic of discussion when the amendment of the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) comes up, and this will be a topic of discussion as we consider this rule as it is right now, as well as the second rule which we plan to report out tomorrow.

Let me just say that this should be a noncontroversial rule, and I do not want to foreclose the opportunity to consider any proposals that were submitted to the Committee on Rules. We will, in fact, have an opportunity to do that this afternoon, and then tomorrow we will debate a second rule that will allow for further consideration.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman again yield?

Mr. DREIER. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to yield further, but I do not know how we stand time-wise. We are using up our time here.

Mr. MCGOVERN. It looks like you have plenty of time.

Mr. DREIER. Excuse me. I think it is wonderful for the gentleman from Massachusetts to come to that conclusion, but let me just suggest we do this. I will yield back my time now to my friend, and I am happy to stand here and field questions from the minority on their time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I just have a question that requires a one-word answer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has yielded back his time. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman does not wish to yield to me?

Mr. MCGOVERN. Unfortunately, we have a lot of people who are outraged by this unfair rule.

Mr. DREIER. We have a lot of people who wish to speak on this issue as well.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking member on the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for giving me the opportunity to rise in strong, but reluctant, opposition to this rule.

By and large this is a good bill. It puts forward the opportunity for the United States military to continue research and development, procurement, training, attracting the bright young men and women who serve, and to continue to educate them along the way to think strategically, operationally, and tactically. Yet I find that this particular rule is shutting out some amendments that I thoroughly believe should be made in order. I hope that the Committee on Rules, on the second look, in the second rule that it will adopt, will hear our recommendations from the committee hearing yesterday and take us quite seriously.

Let me further state, though, that it is a pleasure working with the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER). And I thank him for his hard work, for his dedication, for his strong feeling for the military, and for his sincerity. I think that we should let it be known that he is a strong advocate for our national security.

This is a big bill, Mr. Speaker. It authorizes almost $400 billion for the Department of Defense and energy. This bill is over 600 pages long. The Congress has a constitutional duty, as you know, to raise and defend the military in law. I had highlighted three major issues when I testified before the Committee on Rules. The first are the changes in the civil service system. That has not been ruled upon yet. Revising our environmental laws. That has been addressed in a manager's amendment here, as I understand it. And our nuclear weapons policy has not been fully faced in this first rule.

On the face, amendments made in order by this first rule seem uncontroversial. However, I do take issue with amendment No. 73. This is a mere 10-minute alleged technical amendment that literally corrects spelling errors. But tacked on to that is the amendment that changes the Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act. Regardless how Members might feel about the substance, it is not only unacceptable; but, quite honestly, it is outrageous.

□ 1230

This is not the full debate that this House deserves on major policy changes. It is not right to cram changes to our environmental laws into technical amendments. It is not right to not make in order a major Democrat amendment on the environmental provisions, the Dingell-Rahall amendment, and not give us the full time and full debate. Ten minutes, that is all we are given.

I certainly hope, Mr. Speaker, that in the second look, the second rule, that the Committee on Rules must come forward with it, it will allow us to more fully debate and fully discuss all the issues that I have put forward to them in my testimony yesterday.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES), my neighbor and a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the rule that will allow for consideration of H.R. 1588, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004.

The legislation we have crafted in the Committee on Armed Services is targeted at two of the most critical areas crucial to maintaining a healthy and robust military quality of life and readiness. For the soldiers and airmen in my district at Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base respectively, the ability to adequately care for their families and train for the mission for which they are called are the two issues second to none.

I believe this legislation makes significant progress in these areas and will enable our men and women in uniform to continue prosecuting the war on terrorism. A recent trip to Iraq served to strongly reinforce my existing pride in our Nation's war fighters. These brave men and women served with honor and distinction as they liberated a nation. Troops from the Eighth Congressional District of North Carolina have been at the very tip of the spear that ended the dark reign of Saddam Hussein and continue to lead the way in post-conflict resolution in Iraq and Afghanistan. These men and women deserve our support for this rule and the underlying bill.

This legislation takes care of our most vital asset, our people. It provides every service member with an average 4.1 percent pay raise. It also boosts military special pay and extends enlisted and reenlistment bonuses. It funds programs to improve living and working facilities on military installations.

The bill under consideration indicates we have come a long way since the procurement moratorium of the mid-1990s and are seeing the results of a restoration of national security funding in our victories in Iraq and Afghanistan.

I believe we must continue to provide adequate funding for our Nation's military. President Kennedy spent 9 percent of our gross domestic product on national defense. President Ronald Reagan 6 percent. The legislation today spends only 3.4 but is inching upwards; and with the security threats we face today, I believe we must continue moving upward with our defense allocations.

I would like to highlight two issues the National Defense Authorization Act addresses which are of particular concern to me. The first is domestic violence.

Last year, in the wake of several murders involving soldiers stationed at Fort Bragg, I requested the Committee on Armed Services to conduct a series of fact-finding meetings at Fort Bragg and in the Fayetteville community to examine the problem of domestic violence in the military. Working close with the community and the Defense Task Force on Domestic Violence, we have made progress in implementing their recommendations.

The bill before us provides a provision that allows chaplains to work more closely with military families and gives them the maximum flexibility to work with all family members to prevent potentially tragic situations. It also provides funding for travel and transportation for military dependents who are relocating for reasons of personal safety. It provides traditional compensation for victims and additional measures for implementation of the task force recommendations.

I commend the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH), and the subcommittee for their leadership and attention to this matter and look forward to continuing their work to put an end to domestic violence.

The National Defense Authorization Act addresses another critical issue, that of fortifying the defense industrial base, ensuring that the DOD purchases products that are made in America. My two top priorities are national 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 this is a perfect opportunity to do so. Strengthening the ''Buy American'' provisions is the right thing to do for our workers and soldiers. Protecting national security is important; economic security is important as well.

Mr. Speaker, we debated this bill for 25 hours, and we had a good debate. It is time to support this rule in the underlying rule that supports our men and women in uniform.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the rule that will allow for consideration of H.R. 1588, the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2004. The legislation that we have crafted in the Armed Services Committee is targeted at two of the most critical areas crucial to maintaining a healthy and robust military—quality of life and readiness. For the soldiers and airmen in my district at Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base respectively, the ability to adequately care for their families and train for the mission for which they are called 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 prosecuting the war on terrorism. My recent trip to Iraq served to strongly reinforce my pride in our Nation's war fighters. 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 continue to lead the way in post conflict resolution in Iraq and Afghanistan. These men and women deserve our support for this rule and the underlying bill.

This legislation first and foremost takes care of our most vital asset of our military, our people. It provides every service member with an average 4.1 percent pay raise. It also boosts military special pay and extends enlisted and reenlistment bonuses. Furthermore, it funds programs to improve living and working facilities on military installations.

The bill under consideration today also indicates that we have come a long way since the procurement moratorium of the mid-1990s, and we are seeing results of the restoration of national security funding in our victories in Iraq and Afghanistan. I believe that we must continue to provide adaqaate funding for our Nation's military. President John F. Kennedy spent 9 percent of American's gross domestic product on defense. President Reagan spent six. The legislation in front of us today spends 3.4 percent and is inching upward. With the national security threats we face today, I believe we must continue moving upward in defense spending.

I would also like to take this opportunity to highlight two issues the National Defense Authorization Act for FY04 addresses that are of particular concern to me. The first is domestic violence. Last year, in the wake of several murders involving soldiers stationed at Fort Bragg, I requested that the Armed Services Committee conduct a series of fact-finding meetings at Fort Bragg and in the Fayetteville community to examine the problem of domestic violence in the military. Working closely with folks in the community and the Defense Task Force on Domestic Violence, we have made progress in implementing their recommendations. The bill before us today contains a provision that allows chaplains to work more closely with military families and gives them the maximum flexibility to work with all family members to prevent potentially tragic situations. It also provides funding for travel and transportation for military dependents who are relocating for reasons of personal safety. It provides transitional compensation for victims and additional measures for implementation of the Task Force recommendations. I commend Chairmen HUNTER and MCHUGH and the staff of the Total Force Subcommittee for their leadership and attention to this matter and look forward to continuing to work with them to end domestic violence.

The National Defense Authorization Act for 2004 also addresses another critical issue, that of fortifying the defense industrial base, ensuring that 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 this is a perfect opportunity to do so. Strengthening the ''Buy American'' provisions is the right thing to do for our workers and our soldiers. Protecting our national security is important but it's just as important to protect our economic security here at home. I have worked hard with Chairman HUNTER to mandate more accountability on the specialty metals used in all of the components used in DoD projects, ensure that all of the parts of DoD uniforms come from domestic sources, and require the Secretary of Defense to notify Congress in writing of the factors that would ever lead to a decision to waive the domestic sourcing requirement. I am hopeful that our colleagues in the other body will recognize the need to protect U.S. jobs and work with us through the conference process.

Mr. Speaker, it is a gross injustice and misfortune that it took the tragedy on September 11th, 2001 to focus the public eye on the need for a more robust defense budget. But I feel that the legislation in front of us today will help our troops accomplish their mission and the Rule that provides for its consideration is fair and effective. We are establishing a clear and strong course to rebuild our Nation's defenses. I urge my colleagues to send a message loud and clear to our soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines—that we will strongly support you and give you the resources necessary to perform the mission at hand. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the rule and in favor of H.R. 1588, the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2004.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the dean of our House, who it appears was shut out of the process by the Committee on Rules last night.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this is a bad rule. It should be defeated. My Republican colleagues have done the same thing that they usually do. They have gagged the minority. They have denied us a right to discuss important questions, and they refuse to give us the right to offer amendments.

The chairman of the Committee on Rules appears in the well of the House and tells us what a wonderful job they have done at being fair. If they were fair, they should have had the courage and decency on that side of the aisle to let us offer the amendments that should be offered to allow matters to be properly discussed.

This is the language of the Endangered Species Act. There is no need for them to take away the right of the government to properly protect our national symbol, the bald eagle, and other endangered species. There is no reason for the other side to afford the authorities that the leadership in the Department of Defense have sought. Indeed, the members of the agency itself, the fighting soldiers have not asked for and do not want it.

It is interesting to note that they not only amend the environmental laws, but they have amended many more, and they again foreclose the opportunity for amendments.

Now the chairman of the Committee on Rules comes down and says we are going to have more opportunities. We are going to be considering it again. Well, if we have to consider it again, why did they not offer us a fair rule in the first place? Why do they have to do it this way? They have basically a sound bill, but they have sought to change all manner of environmental laws, and they will put more on the floor if they are permitted to do so.

Indeed, one of the remarkable things that my Republican colleagues have sought to do is to change the Civil Service laws and to repeal, amongst other things, the laws against nepotism. Perhaps there is a little Cheney or a little Bush in the woods somewhere that needs a job, or perhaps a little Wolfowitz. There might even be a relative of the membership on that side of the aisle who happens to need employment.

We should address these issues properly. This is the People's House. We are supposed to discuss great national issues. We are supposed to, under the traditions and the practices of this body, to have the ability to discuss matters which the public thinks are important. Certainly the protection of conservation values, certainly the protection of Civil Service laws, certainly the protection of the values that all of us think are important enough to be discussed in this body and not strangled by the Committee on Rules when the chairman comes down and says, oh, we have been fair.

Well, if the gentleman from California has been fair, why in the name of common sense does he not have the goodness to allow us to have an opportunity simply to offer the amendment? Is it because my Republican colleagues are scared to death and afraid to permit an honest discussion, to have an honest application of the rules of the House with regard to the offering of amendments? Why are they so afraid on the other side of the aisle to have the truth brought forth and to offer a fair procedure?

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule because it makes a needed change. By including the Hefley amendment in the manager's amendment, we make a change narrowing the application of this DOD authorization bill on the environment just to DOD events alone. I think that is what the committee wanted to do originally. It is what the chairman of the Subcommittee on Readiness and the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Readiness support.

For those of us who are very strong supporters of the environment, we wanted this change made at the full committee, but because of jurisdictional reasons it was not made. By the manager's amendment including this, I think a change that the Committee on Armed Services wanted to have happen has happened. Now we are making the necessary modifications to the Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act, as narrowly applied, to support the Department of Defense but not with broad application. To make this early in the process in the manager's amendment is the right decision by the Committee on Rules, and I urge adoption of the rule and commend the committee for making that decision.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I certainly associate myself with the comments the distinguished dean of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL). Therefore, I also rise against this rule.

As many Members know, the underlying bill contains broad exemptions from the Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act which go far beyond what the military requested. For those of who found that the DOD has provided little in the way of justification for its own proposals, these broad exemptions were extremely troublesome.

In fact, under the guise of maintaining national security and military readiness, H.R. 1588 would weaken the ESA to allow critical habitat designations which are necessary for the recovery of imperiled species to be done on a discretionary basis and to do so in all instances, not just as it may apply to the military. In fact, when it came to marine mammals, any nonmilitary, nongovernmental activity also would be covered by the weakened standards of this bill.

Let me be clear, H.R. 1588 goes far beyond what even the military requested. As far as what DOD requested for itself, we have had two recent GAO reports which found that the Pentagon has failed miserably to provide any compelling examples to verify their allegation that the ESA and the MMPA are undermining the training and readiness of our fighting forces. In Iraq, we watched on live television the overwhelming strength and bravery of our Armed Forces. We salute them for a job well done. There is no doubt they were well-prepared for battle, and they did it under existing law.

Further, we know that existing law already provides exemptions to all laws when national security is at stake. Yet the military has not even availed themselves of those exemptions in current law.

However, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and myself are reasonable people. We are strong supporters of our military. We on this side of the aisle, just as strongly as anybody in this Chamber, support our troops. We are proud of the great sacrifice our fighting men and women have made to protect our Nation.

As such, we submitted to the Committee on Rules an amendment which would have, first, limited the proposed revisions to the ESA and the MMPA contained in this legislation strictly to military activities. Second, we would have ensured that those revisions, while providing the military with some compliance flexibility, would not have diminished the letter and intent of the ESA and the MMPA.

This reasonable amendment was not made in order. Instead, buried within the text of what was supposed to be a technical manager's amendment by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, we find a sleight-of-hand trick is being played.

Yes, the Hunter amendment revises the broad ESA and MMPA exemptions contained in H.R. 1588. It limits these changes to the military, but it does not do so in the prudent, protective manner that was part and parcel of the Rahall-Dingell amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to my colleagues that we not be lulled into believing that the Hunter amendment would have accomplished what the Rahall-Dingell amendment would have. On process and substance, the Hunter amendment should be rejected. Therefore, I urge a no vote on the previous question; and if that fails, I urge a no vote on the rule.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to enter into a colloquy with the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

It is my understanding that the bill before the House contains three sections that are largely based upon H.R. 2122, the Project BioShield Act which the Committee on Energy and Commerce ordered reported just last week; is that correct?

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

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's understanding is correct.

Mr. TAUZIN. The Committee on Energy and Commerce worked in a bipartisan fashion at the request of the President to report a strong BioShield bill. We expect the bill to be on the floor very shortly. However, just this week I learned similar DOD provisions have been incorporated in the bill that may not be wholly consistent with our efforts in this area.

□ 1245

We accomplished many of the gentleman's objectives in our bill. Because my committee will not have a chance to work its will on the gentleman's BioShield provisions, may I have his assurance that he will work with me as the bill heads to conference to ensure that any provisions agreed to there are properly drafted and not inconsistent with the President's proposed program?

Mr. HUNTER. Let me just say to my good colleague and the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and a guy who has a great dedication to the Armed Forces, we appreciate all his support and all of the hard work that his committee has done in this area. He has my assurance that we will work with him as this bill walks down through the process.

Mr. TAUZIN. I thank the chairman and look forward to working with him and the administration in ensuring that we properly implement the BioShield program and congratulate him and the committee for, again, a great effort in this bill to help secure our country and protect her.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 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, there were 99 amendments filed to the defense authorization bill. Nine were made in order: six for Republicans, three for Democrats. Among those not made in order was an amendment that I offered along with the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) which would simply have restored this bill so that the President's request for cooperative threat reduction, our efforts better known as Nunn-Lugar to get rid of Russian nuclear materials, chemical weapons and biological weapons, could be fully funded and fully expressed, freed of some encumbrances entered into the bill in the committee mark and allowed to go forward basically and only as the President has requested.

That is all we sought to do. But this is critically important because it addresses a particular facility in Russia called Schuch'ye which has maybe 75 percent of the deadliest chemical weapons, sarin and VX and other nerve agents, contained in Russia. We are right now at the threshold of beginning a project that would destroy those weapons, and this bill as now written without my amendment would hamstring and hinder the undertaking of that project.

Mr. Speaker, I have served in the Congress for 21 years, and all these years I have served on the House Armed Services Committee. I am the second ranking Democrat on the committee. I do not suggest that time served or rank necessarily entitles a Member to be heard on the floor, but when a Member has a serious and substantive provision, there should surely be some deference, some comity. We have always extended it in the past. In the 20 years I have served there, it has been done. I think it has been understood in the past if we are to have good policy, we have to have good debate on the House floor. And when you stiff-arm good proposals, worthy ideas, when you shut us out, you do not just diminish me, the individual Member who would offer the amendment, you diminish the House of Representatives. That is exactly what you are doing here.

My amendment is not as important as Nunn-Lugar, as the other amendments which have been addressed here, but it is important. We should have a right to be heard on this amendment, and we are diminishing the House. Every Member who respects this institution and has any sense of comity and fair play should vote against the previous question and against this rule.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important bill that we are debating here today. Every Member of this body deserves to be heard. In the Committee on Rules yesterday, I urged that we have a free and open debate and that at a minimum on important issues like the environmental rollbacks and our worker protections and rights and our nuclear weapons that we have an opportunity to deliberate and offer amendments. Instead, the Republican leadership appears to be shutting the door on an open debate and it appears has denied outright amendments from distinguished Members like the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

The majority has an opportunity to try to repair some of the damage, and they can start with the Cooper/Van Hollen amendment. There are almost 700,000 civilian employees at the Department of Defense who serve this country proudly and patriotically. But with the stroke of a pen this bill will strip them of their most basic rights and protections.

This is a dangerous door that we are opening. We are clearing the way to allowing political and personal favoritism to enter our civilian workforce, which is precisely what our Civil Service system is designed to prevent. This is wrong.

I am sick and tired of those on the other side of the aisle messing around with the lives of American workers. The Republican leadership's arrogance and insensitivity to working Americans is astonishing. The Cooper/Van Hollen amendment would fix these offensive provisions and would reinstate the most basic worker rights and protections. We do not want our civil servants to look like some corrupt Third World dictatorship.

Chairman DREIER last night declared that he would prefer that the Democrats offer a different amendment. Well, that is not how this process is supposed to work. If Chairman DREIER believes so strongly in a different amendment, then he should go and offer it. But the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) followed the procedures set by the Committee on Rules. They have a good amendment, and it deserves a vote up or down.

We are sick and tired of being shut out of this debate in this House. The minority has rights, and we expect the Republican leadership to honor them. The Committee on Rules could do the right thing when it meets later today by making the Cooper/Van Hollen amendment in order for tomorrow's debate.

This is not a trivial matter. This is an amendment on one of the most significant provisions in the defense bill. Anyone who wants to vote against it can vote against it, but it deserves genuine debate. We deserve to have our voices heard, and we deserve a vote on this amendment.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, 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. Speaker, this rule is not in the finest traditions of this House. As it applies to Washington State, we have three icons in Washington State: the United States Navy, orca whales in the Puget Sound, and the Columbia River. All of them can live in perfect cohabitation if we come up with a rule that respects the values of all three. This rule does not allow this House to do that, because it seriously weakens the protections of the orca whales in the waters of the State of Washington. That is wrong. It is unnecessary. The bill that we will be considering without allowing an amendment proposed by Democrats would seriously strip the protection of orca whales in a way that is not necessary. We have proposed a way to protect both the strong U.S. Navy and a strong orca whale population.

In the Columbia River system, we are now allowing potential leachate from radioactive materials being buried in unlined trenches, and the majority has denied us an amendment to solve that problem to keep radioactive waste out of the Columbia River system.

The State of Washington says we ought to have a strong Navy, a strong orca whale and a strong Columbia River; and this rule does not allow any of those to take place.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, this budget is 13 percent higher than Cold War levels, with money for a missile defense system which does not work, money for previously prohibited research on low-yield nukes and $626 million for a space-based laser. From Star Wars to fear wars, this administration led this Nation into a war based on a pretext that Iraq was an imminent threat, which it was not. The Secretary of State presented pictures to the world he said was proof. Today, despite having total control in Iraq, none of the very serious claims made to this Congress, this Nation and the world have been substantiated.

Where are the weapons of mass destruction? Indeed, what was the basis for the war? We spent $400 billion for defense. Will we spend a minute to defend truth? The truth is that this administration led America into a war with such great urgency and still is refusing to account to the American people for the false and misleading statements which brought America into war. The American people gave up their health care, education and veterans benefits for this war. And for what? Answer the questions, Mr. President.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute 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 my friend for yielding me this time.

This is a strong and good bill on which there are points of serious disagreement. One of those points of disagreement is the extent to which environmental protection laws should be rolled back in the case of military operations. Many of us on our side and some on the other believe they should not be rolled back as much. There are those on the majority side who believe that this is the right way to go. What we are asking for is a chance to debate that question and take a vote.

In this bill, there is a serious disagreement about the rollback of the civil protective rights of civilian workers in the Department of Defense. We believe it goes far too far. Many on the other side believe it is the right thing to do. All we are asking for is the right to debate that question and take a vote.

It is the supreme and bitter irony that the world's greatest fighting force that defends democracy around the world with great skill and in whom we take great pride, that the bill that funds that fighting force is not being pursued under basic democratic principles. Our military force defends democracy around the world, but we do not have democracy on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Vote ''no'' on this rule.

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

Mr. Speaker, I will call for a vote on the previous question, and I am going to urge Members to vote ''no'' on the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule that will make in order the Rahall/Dingell amendment that was offered in the Committee on Rules last night and defeated on a straight party line vote.

Mr. Speaker, I am absolutely amazed that today the Republican leadership is throwing away the long-standing tradition of bipartisan cooperation in shaping our national defense policies. It is a very sad day indeed when something as important as defending our Nation takes a back seat to partisan politics. In fact, it is more than a sad day. It is shameful, and it is wrong.

This bill is supposed to be about protecting our Nation and providing the very best policies and tools to help our brave servicemen and women defend this great land. Instead, it is a vehicle for fulfilling ideological agendas, agendas that have no place in this critical debate.

I urge every Member of this House to vote ''no'' on the previous question. This vote is a matter of fair play. Whether or not a Member supports the Rahall/Dingell substitute, Members of this body should support the right of other Members to be heard. There is no rational reason why any Member of this body should be denied the right to register his or her opinion on the alternative position advocated by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and many, many, many Members of this body.

I want to point out that a ''no'' vote will not stop the House taking up the Department of Defense authorization. However, voting ''yes'' is a vote to shut out alternative points of view, a point of view that happens to represent the views of millions of Americans. I stand firmly in my belief that ensuring a strong national defense is one of the most important duties I have as a Member of Congress. But I also stand firmly in my belief that the United States House of Representatives is supposed to be a representative body. It is not supposed to be an institution where the minority rights get shut out. Join with me to bring back some democracy in this institution by allowing the House to debate and vote on the Rahall/Dingell substitute.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment and extraneous materials immediately prior to the vote on the previous question. Again, vote ''no'' on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

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

PREVIOUS QUESTION FOR H. RES. 245—RULE ON H.R. 1588, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 245 OFFERED BY ____

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

''SEC. 4. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendment specified in section 5 shall be in order as though printed after the amendment numbered 1 in the report of the Committee on Rules if offered by Representative Rahall of West Virginia or a designee. That amendment shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. Section 2 shall not apply to the amendment numbered 1 or the amendment specified in section 5.

SEC. 5. The amendment referred to in section 4 is as follows:

Strike section 317 (page 59, line 16, through page 60, line 24) and insert the following new section:

SEC. 317. MILITARY READINESS AND CONSERVATION OF PROTECTED SPECIES.

(a) LIMITATION ON DESIGNATION OF CRITICAL HABITAT.—Section 4(a)(3) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(a)(3)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively;

(2) by inserting ''(A)'' after ''(3)''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(B)(i) The Secretary shall not designate as critical habitat any lands or other geographical areas owned or controlled by the Department of Defense, or designated for its use, that are subject to an integrated natural resources management plan prepared under section 101 of the Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670a), if the Secretary determines in writing that—

''(I) the management activities identified in the plan, for the term of the plan, are likely to provide conservation benefits for the species within the lands or areas covered by the plan;

''(II) the plan provides assurances that adequate funding will be provided for the management activities identified in the plan for the term of the plan; and

''(III) the biological goals and objectives, monitoring provisions, and reporting requirements provide reasonable certainty that the implementation of the plan will be effective to achieve the identified conservation benefits.

''(ii) Nothing in this paragraph affects the requirement to consult under section 7(a)(2) with respect to an agency action (as that term is defined in that section).

''(iii) Nothing in this paragraph affects the obligation of the Department of Defense to comply with section 9, including the prohibition preventing extinction and taking of endangered species and threatened species.''.

(c) CONSIDERATION OF EFFECTS OF DESIGNATION OF CRITICAL HABITAT.—Section 4(b)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(b)(2)) is amended by inserting ''the impact on national security,'' after ''the economic impact,''.

Strike section 318 (page 61, line 1, through page 64, line 7) and insert the following new section:

SEC. 318. MILITARY READINESS AND MARINE MAMMAL PROTECTION.

(a) DEFINITION OF HARASSMENT FOR MILITARY READINESS ACTIVITIES.—Section 3(18) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1362(18)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(D) In the case of a military readiness activity, the term 'harassment' means—

''(i) any act that has the potential to injure a marine mammal or marine mammal stock in the wild; or

''(ii) has the potential to disturb a marine mammal or marine mammal stock in the wild by causing meaningful disruption of biologically significant activities, including, but not limited to, migration, breeding, care of young, predator avoidance or defense, and feeding.''.

(b) EXEMPTION OF ACTIONS DURING WAR OR DECLARED NATIONAL EMERGENCY.—Section 101 of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1371) is amended by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

''(f) EXEMPTION OF ACTIONS DURING WAR OR DECLARED NATIONAL EMERGENCY.—(1) The President, during time of war or a declared national emergency, may exempt any action undertaken by the Department of Defense and its components from compliance with any requirement of this Act if the Secretary of Defense determines that such an exemption is necessary for reasons of national security.

''(2) An exemption granted under this subsection shall be effective for a period of not more than two years. Additional exemptions for periods not to exceed two years each may be granted for the same action upon the Secretary of Defense making a new determination that the exemption is necessary for reasons of national security. However, exemptions granted under this subsection shall terminate not more than 180 days after the end of the war or declared national emergency.

''(3) The President shall submit to the Congress, during the period of the war or national emergency, an annual report on all exemptions granted under this subsection, together with the reasons for granting such exemptions.''.

Strike section 319 (page 64, line 8, through page 65, line 15).

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 245 will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting the resolution, if ordered, and on questions previously postponed with respect to H.R. 1170 and H.R. 1911.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 203, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 201]

YEAS—225

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
Combest
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
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Janklow
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
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
Ney
Northup
Norwood
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
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
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—203

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Ballance
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
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
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
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
Sanchez, 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
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—6

Becerra
Cox
Gephardt
Levin
Sherwood
Simmons

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY) (during the vote). The Chair would inform Members that they have 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1317

Messrs. JEFFERSON, ALEXANDER and POMEROY 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. 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. MCGOVERN. 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 224, noes 200, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 202]

AYES—224

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
Fletcher
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
Hayworth
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Janklow
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
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
Ney
Northup
Norwood
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
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
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)

NOES—200

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Ballance
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
Clay
Clyburn
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
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
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
Sanchez, 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
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—10

Becerra
Combest
Conyers
Gephardt
Hefley
Levin
Peterson (PA)
Sherwood
Simmons
Watson

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining to vote.

□ 1324

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.

CHILD MEDICATION SAFETY ACT OF 2003

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1170, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BURNS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1170, as amended, 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 425, nays 1, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 203]

YEAS—425

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Ballance
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
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
Chocola
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Collins
Combest
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
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
Fletcher
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
Hayworth
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)
Janklow
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
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
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
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
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
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
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
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—1

Davis (CA)

NOT VOTING—8

Becerra
Gephardt
Levin
McInnis
Peterson (PA)
Simmons
Smith (NJ)
Spratt

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY) (during the vote). The Chair wishes to inform Members they have less than 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1331

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: ''A bill to protect children and their parents from being coerced into administering a controlled substance in order to attend school, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENHANCING COOPERATION AND SHARING OF RESOURCES BETWEEN DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1911.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1911, 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 426, nays 0, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 204]

YEAS—426

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Ballance
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bell
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
Chocola
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Collins
Combest
Conyers
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
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
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
Fletcher
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
Hayworth
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)
Janklow
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
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
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
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
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
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
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
Tauzin
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
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Becerra
Bereuter
Gephardt
Levin
McInnis
Peterson (PA)
Sanchez, Linda T.
Simmons

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). The Chair would remind Members there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1342

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, I was unavoidably absent on congressional business when recorded votes were taken on four matters. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: on rollcall 201, ordering the previous question on H. Res. 245, "nay"; on rollcall 202, the rule for the Defense Authorization bill, "nay"; on rollcall 203, the Child Medication Safety Act, "yea"; and on rollcall 204, final passage of H.R. 1911, "yea."

RECOGNIZING 100TH ANNIVERSARY YEAR OF FOUNDING OF FORD MOTOR COMPANY

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Commerce be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 100) recognizing the 100th anniversary year of the founding of the Ford Motor Company, which has been a significant part of the social, economic, and cultural heritage of the United States and many other nations and a revolutionary industrial and global institution, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 100

Whereas on June 16, 1903, then 39 year old Henry Ford and 11 associates, armed with little cash, some tools, a few blueprints, and unbounded faith, submitted incorporation papers to Michigan's capital, Lansing, launching the Ford Motor Company;

Whereas Ford began operations in a leased, small converted wagon factory on a spur of the Michigan Central Railroad in Detroit;

Whereas the first commercial automobile to emerge from Ford was the original 8-horsepower, two-cylinder Model A vehicle in 1903, which was advertised as the "Fordmobile" and had a two speed transmission, 28 inch wheels with wooden spokes, and 3 inch tires;

Whereas between 1903 and 1908, Ford and his engineers went through 19 letters of the alphabet, creating Models A through S, with some of these cars being experimental models only and not available to the public;

Whereas on October 1, 1908, Ford introduced its "universal car", the Model T (sometimes affectionately called the "Tin Lizzie"), which could be reconfigured by buyers to move cattle, haul freight, herd horses, and even mow lawns, and Ford produced 10,660 Model T vehicles its first year, an industry record;

Whereas, while in the early days all automakers built one car at a time, the idea of moving the work to the worker became a reality when parts, components, and 140 assemblers stationed at different intervals inaugurated the first moving assembly line at Ford in 1913, and a new era of industrial progress and growth began;

Whereas Henry Ford surprised the world in 1914 in setting Ford's minimum wage at $5.00 per an 8-hour day, which replaced the prior $2.34 wage for a 9-hour day and was a truly great social revolution for its time;

Whereas that same year, 1914, Henry Ford, with an eye to simplicity, efficiency, and affordability, ordered that the Model T use black paint exclusively because it dried faster than other colors, which meant more cars could be built daily at a lower cost, and Ford said the vehicle will be offered in "any color so long as it is black";

Whereas, upon its completion in 1925, Ford's self-contained Rouge Complex on the Rouge River encompassed diverse industries that allowed for the complete production of vehicles, from raw materials processing to final assembly, and was an icon of the 20th century and, with its current revitalization and redevelopment, will remain an icon in the 21st century;

Whereas, in 1925, the company built the first of 196 Ford Tri-Motor airplanes, nicknamed the "Tin Goose" and the "Model T of the Air";

Whereas consumer demand for more luxury and power pushed aside the Model A, and on March 9, 1932, the Ford car, with the pioneering Ford single V-8 engine block, rolled off the production line;

Whereas, while Ford offered only two models through 1937 (Ford and Lincoln), due to increased competition, the first Mercury was introduced in 1938, with a distinctive streamlined body style, a V-8 engine with more horsepower than a Ford, and hydraulic brakes, thus filling the void between the low-priced Ford and the high-priced Lincoln;

Whereas one of the largest labor unions in the Nation was formed as the United Automobile Workers (UAW) in 1935, and after a rather tumultuous beginning, won acceptance in the late 1930s by the auto industry and became a potent and forceful leader for auto workers, with Ford building a strong relationship with the union through its policies and programs;

Whereas by government decree all civilian auto production in the United States ceased on February 10, 1942, and Ford, under the control of the War Production Board, produced an extensive array of bombers, tanks, armored cars, amphibious craft, gliders, and other materials for the World War II war effort;

Whereas on September 21, 1945, Henry Ford II assumed the presidency of Ford and on April 7, 1947, Ford's founder, Henry Ford passed away;

Whereas a revitalized Ford met the postwar economic boom with Ford's famed F-Series trucks making their debut in 1948 for commercial and personal use, and the debut of the 1949 Ford sedan, with the first change in a Ford body since 1922, the first change in a chassis since 1932, and the first integration of body and fenders which would set the standard for auto design in the future;

Whereas these new models were followed by such well-known cars as the Mercury Turnpike Cruiser, the Ford Sunliner Convertible, the high performing Thunderbird, introduced in 1955, the Ford Galaxy, introduced in 1959, and the biggest success story of the 1960s, the Mustang, which has been a part of the American scene for almost 40 years;

Whereas the Thunderbird wowed the NASCAR circuit in 1959, winning more than 150 races in NASCAR's top division;

Whereas in 1953 President Dwight D. Eisenhower christened the new Ford Research and Engineering Center, which was a milestone in the company's dedication to automotive science and which houses some of the most modern facilities for automotive research;

Whereas Ford's innovation continued in the 1980s with the introduction of the Taurus, named the 1986 Car of the Year, which resulted in a new commitment to quality throughout Ford and future aerodynamic design trends in the industry;

Whereas this innovation continued in the 1990s with the debut in 1993 of the Ford Mondeo, European Car of the Year, the redesigned 1994 Mustang, and the introduction in 1990 of the Ford Explorer, which redefined the sports utility segment and remains the best selling SUV in the world;

Whereas as the 21st century begins, Ford continues its marvelous record for fine products with the best-selling car in the world, the Ford Focus, and the best-selling truck in the world, the Ford F-Series;

Whereas the Ford Motor Company is the world's second largest automaker, and includes Ford, Lincoln, Mercury, Aston Martin, Jaguar, Land Rover, Volvo, and Mazda, as well as other diversified subsidiaries in finance and other domestic and international business areas; and

Whereas on October 1, 2001, William Clay Ford, Jr., the great-grandson of Henry Ford, became Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of Ford, concentrating on the fundamentals that have powered Ford to greatness over the last century and made it a world-class auto and truck manufacturer, and that will propel it in the 21st century to develop even better products and innovations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the truly wondrous achievements of the Ford Motor Company, as its employees, retirees, suppliers, dealers, its many customers, automotive enthusiasts, and friends worldwide, commemorate and celebrate its 100th anniversary milestone;

(2) recognizes the great impact that Ford has had on the lives of Americans and people of all nations; and

(3) congratulates the Ford Motor Company for this achievement and trusts that Ford will continue to have an even greater impact in the 21st century and beyond in providing innovative products that are affordable and environmentally sustainable, and that will enhance personal mobility for generations to come.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a milestone in American ingenuity, to honor the 100th anniversary of the founding of Ford Motor Company.

It was June 16, 1903, when 39-year-old Henry Ford and 11 associates, armed with little cash, some tools, a few blueprints, and unbridled faith, traveled to Lansing, MI to file papers launching Ford Motor Company. With just $28,000 in cash, the pioneering industrialists gave birth to what was to become one of the world's largest corporations.

As with most great enterprises, Ford Motor Company's beginnings were modest. The company had anxious moments in its infancy. The earliest record of a shipment is July 20, 1903, approximately 1 month after incorporation, to a Detroit physician.

Perhaps Ford Motor Company's single greatest contribution to automotive manufacturing was the moving assembly line. First implemented at the Highland Park plant in 1913, the new technique allowed individual workers to stay in one place and perform the same task repeatedly on multiple vehicles that passed by them. The line proved tremendously efficient, helping the company far surpass the production levels of their competitors—and making the vehicles more affordable.

Henry Ford insisted that the company's future lay in the production of affordable cars for a mass market. Beginning in 1903, the company began using the first 19 letters of the alphabet to name new cars. In 1908, the Model T was born. Nineteen years and 15 million Model T's later, Ford Motor Company was a giant industrial complex that spanned the globe.

From the Model T, to the T-Bird and Mustang, to today's Ford Focus, Ford Motor Company has been at the forefront of the automotive industry.

What started that momentous June day in 1903 by Henry Ford and his 11 associates has grown into a worldwide franchise over the last 100 years. Today, Ford Motor Company is a family of automotive brands consisting of Ford, Lincoln, Mercury, Mazda, Jaguar, Land Rover, Aston Martin, and Volvo.

Ford Motor Company is synonymous with American ingenuity. They are a very part of the American cultural fabric. It is as if both Ford and the country grew together during the 20th century.

Ford's contributions to the country have been great. They are a stalwart presence in the American economy, and they employ tens of thousands of Americans. For millions of Americans, Ford has become a part of our everyday lives. And the Ford Motor Company will continue to be a major presence on the American scene over the next 100 years.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, as a long-time supporter and friend of the automotive industry I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the 100th anniversary of Ford Motor Company. Ford Motor Company is the quintessential model of industrial growth and capitalism at work. Ford has not only been a significant part of the social, economic, and cultural heritage of the United States, but a revolutionary industrial and global institution.

On June 16, 1903, then 39-year-old Henry Ford and 11 associates, armed with little cash, some tools, a few blueprints, and unbounded faith, submitted incorporation papers to Michigan's capital in Lansing. For the next 5 years, young Henry Ford, first as chief engineer and later as president, directed an all-out development and production program which shifted in 1905 from the rented quarters on Detroit's Mack Avenue to a much larger building at Piquette and Beaubien streets. A total of 1,700 cars—the early Model A's—came sputtering out of the old wagon factory during the first 15 months of operation.

The Model T chugged into history on October 1, 1908. Henry Ford called it the ''universal car.'' It became the symbol of low-cost, reliable transportation that could get through when other cars stuck in the muddy roads. The Model T won the approval of millions of Americans, who affectionately dubbed it the ''Tin Lizzie.'' The first year's production of Model T's reached 10,660, breaking all records for the industry.

By the end of 1913, Ford Motor Company was producing half of all the automobiles in the United States. In order to keep ahead of the demand, Ford initiated mass production in the factory. Mr. Ford reasoned that with each worker remaining in one assigned place, with one specific task to do, the automobile would take shape more quickly as it moved from section to section and countless man-hours would be saved. The advent of the assembly line truly revolutionized industry.

Henry Ford startled the world yet again on January 5, 1914, by announcing that Ford Motor Company's minimum wage would be $5 a day—more than double the existing minimum rate. Mr. Ford felt that since it was now possible to build inexpensive cars in volume, more of them could be sold if employees could afford to buy them. Ford considered the payment of $5 for an 8-hour day the finest cost-cutting move he ever made. ''I can find methods of manufacturing that will make high wages,'' he said. ''If you cut wages, you just cut the number of your customers.''

The Model T started a rural revolution. The $5 day and the philosophy behind it started a social revolution. The moving assembly line started an industrial revolution.

The Model A was finally pushed aside by a consumer demand for even more luxury and

power. Ford Motor Company was ready with plenty of both in its next entry—its first V–8—which was introduced to the public on April 1, 1932. Ford was the first company in history to cast a V–8 block in one piece successfully. Experts told Mr. Ford it could not be done. It was many years before Ford's competitors learned how to mass-produce a reliable V–8. In the meantime, the Ford car and its powerful engine became a favorite of performance-minded Americans.

Ford Motor Company was only a year old when it inaugurated its foreign expansion program in 1904 with the opening of a modest plant in Walkerville, Ontario, named Ford Motor Company of Canada, Ltd.

Senior managers from Ford Motor Company's branches and subsidiaries around the world descended on company headquarters in Dearborn, MI, in June 1948 to attend the company's first-ever full international management meeting. After 45 years in business the automaker had a presence in nearly every corner of the globe.

Today, Ford has manufacturing, assembly or sales facilities in 30 countries worldwide. Ford produces millions of cars and trucks annually; it is a leader in automobile sales outside North America.

The focus of the 1960's was on youth. A young president Kennedy led an economically healthy, upbeat America. Ford Motor Company recognized a strong market demand for an inexpensive sporty new vehicle targeted to the young buyer. Lee Iacocca, then the General Manager of the Ford Division, personally sold the startling new concept to Henry Ford II and a skeptical finance department. Start-up costs were a mere $75 million due to the incorporation of the existing Falcon engine, transmission and axle, but the return investment would prove phenomenal. The Mustang exploded onto the scene in a 1964 introduction that drew throngs to showrooms across the country. Such intense interest had not been witnessed since the introduction of the Model A. The sharp, 4-seat 1965 Mustang became the ''darling'' of America. The ''love affair'' brought about the sale of 100,000 Mustangs in the first 100 days. Total sales for the year reached 418,812, far exceeding the 100,000 projected by market research. Ford's design innovation of the late 1950's led to the Mustang's record-setting first year sales and $1 billion in profits.

Today, Ford's plans for continued expansion domestically and overseas and the company's wide diversification mean ongoing employment opportunities, not only in my home state of Michigan and the other 49 states in America, but around the globe. The driving force behind the Ford Motor Company has been and continues to be producing better products at a lower cost.

Through years of prosperity and hardship, through war and peace, Ford Motor Company grew from one man, a small garage and a quadricycle, to a mighty American force contributing to international economic stability. Meanwhile the nation became an industrial giant of unmatched strength and vitality. The Ford story, in a sense, is the story of the American Century.

Mr. Speaker, as Ford Motor Company celebrates its 100th anniversary, I would ask that all my colleagues rise and salute the legend and automobile company that is Ford.

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ford Motor Company's 100th anniversary. Throughout 2003, Ford Motor Company will celebrate 100 years of manufacturing automobiles. Ford's history is an integral part of America's rise to global economic prominence. I am very pleased that my hometown of Louisville, KY has played a key and long-standing role in that history.

In 1913, Ford began manufacturing Model T's in a small shop on South Third Street in Louisville. As our nation grew and met new challenges, Ford's Louisville operation also expanded. In 1942, Ford's Louisville operation began production of 44,000 trucks for the U.S. Army. During the fifties and sixties, Ford's Louisville presence expanded significantly with the construction and operation of two major manufacturing facilities. These facilities continue to produce high-quality trucks and sport utility vehicles which remain in great demand by the American public. In September of 2002, the Louisville Assembly Plant reached a historic milestone by producing the 5 millionth Ford Explorer.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise to recognize the hard work of Ford's 10,000 employees in Louisville. This hard-working team of professionals is a vital part of our community's economy. In addition to producing great products, they have set an example of generosity. In 2002, Ford Motor Company and its employees donated more than $2.5 million to Louisville community organizations.

I am very pleased that the House of Representatives has honored Ford Motor Company with Passage of H. Res. 100—a resolution recognizing the company's 100th anniversary. As a supporter of this legislation, I applaud its passage and commend the House for honoring Ford's contribution to American life.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO THE PREAMBLE OFFERED BY MR. UPTON

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the Preamble.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to Preamble offered by Mr. UPTON:

Strike the preamble and insert:

Whereas, on June 16, 1903, then 39 year old Henry Ford and 11 associates, armed with little cash, some tools, a few blueprints, and unbounded faith, submitted incorporation papers to Michigan's capital, Lansing, launching the Ford Motor Company;

Whereas the Ford Motor Company began operations in a leased, small converted wagon factory on a spur of the Michigan Central Railroad in Detroit;

Whereas the first commercial automobile to emerge from the Ford Motor Company in 1903 was the original 8-horsepower, two-cylinder Model A vehicle with a two speed transmission, 28 inch wheels with wooden spokes, and 3 inch tires;

Whereas, between 1903 and 1908, Henry Ford and his engineers went through 19 letters of the alphabet, creating Models A through S, with some of these cars being experimental models only and not available to the public;

Whereas, on October 1, 1908, the Ford Motor Company introduced its ''universal car'', the Model T (sometimes affectionately called the ''Tin Lizzie''), which could be reconfigured by buyers to move cattle, haul freight, herd horses, and even mow lawns, and Ford produced 10,660 Model T vehicles its first year, an industry record;

Whereas the Ford Motor Company inaugurated the first automotive integrated assembly line in 1913, changing the old manner of building one car at a time through moving the work to the worker by having parts, components, and assemblers stationed at different intervals, and beginning a new era of industrial progress and growth;

Whereas Henry Ford surprised the world in 1914 by setting Ford's minimum wage at $5.00 per an 8-hour day, which replaced the prior $2.34 wage for a 9-hour day and was a truly great social revolution for its time;

Whereas that same year, 1914, Henry Ford, with an eye to simplicity, efficiency, and affordability, ordered that the Model T use black paint exclusively because it dried faster than other colors, which meant more cars could be built daily at a lower cost, and Ford said the vehicle will be offered in ''any color so long as it is black'';

Whereas Ford's self-contained Rouge Manufacturing Complex on the Rouge River encompassed diverse industries, including suppliers, that allowed for the complete production of vehicles, from raw materials processing to final assembly, was an icon of the 20th century, and, with its current revitalization and redevelopment, will remain an icon in the 21st century;

Whereas, in 1925, the company built the first of 199 Ford Tri-Motor airplanes, nicknamed the ''Tin Goose'' and the ''Model T of the Air'';

Whereas consumer demand for more luxury and power pushed aside the then current model, and on March 9, 1932, a Ford vehicle with the pioneering Ford V–8 engine block rolled off the production line;

Whereas, while Ford offered only two brands through 1937 (Ford and Lincoln), due to increased competition, the first Mercury was introduced in 1938, a car with a distinctive streamlined body style, a V–8 engine with more horsepower than a Ford, and hydraulic brakes, thus filling the void between the low-priced Ford and the high-priced Lincoln brands;

Whereas one of the largest labor unions in the Nation was formed as the United Automobile Workers (UAW) in 1935, and after a rather tumultuous beginning, won acceptance by the auto industry and became a potent and forceful leader for auto workers, with Ford building a strong relationship with the union through its policies and programs;

Whereas by government decree all civilian auto production in the United States ceased on February 10, 1942, and Ford, under the control of the War Production Board, produced an extensive array of tanks, B–24 aircraft, armored cars, amphibious craft, gliders, and other materials for the World War II war effort;

Whereas Ford dealers rallied to aid the Ford Motor Company in its postwar comeback, proving their merit as the public's main point of contact with the company;

Whereas, on September 21, 1945, Henry Ford II assumed the presidency of Ford and on April 7, 1947, Ford's founder, Henry Ford passed away;

Whereas a revitalized Ford met the postwar economic boom with Ford's famed F-Series trucks making their debut in 1948 for commercial and personal use, and the debut of the 1949 Ford sedan, with the first change in a chassis since 1932, and the first integration of body and fenders which would set the standard for auto design in the future;

Whereas these new models were followed by such well-known cars as the Mercury Turnpike Cruiser, the retractable hardtop convertible Ford Skyliner, the high performing Thunderbird, introduced in 1955, the Ford Galaxie, introduced in 1959, and the biggest success story of the 1960s, the Ford Mustang, which has been a part of the American scene for almost 40 years;

Whereas, in 1953, President Dwight D. Eisenhower christened the new Ford Research and Engineering Center, which was a milestone in the company's dedication to automotive science and which houses some of the most modern facilities for automotive research;

Whereas Ford's innovation continued through the 1980s with the introduction of the Ford Taurus, which was named the 1986 Motor Trend Car of the Year, and which resulted in future aerodynamic design trends throughout the industry;

Whereas this innovation continued through the 1990s with the debut in 1993 of the Ford Mondeo, European Car of the Year, the redesigned 1994 Ford Mustang, and the introduction in 1990 of the Ford Explorer, which defined the sports utility vehicle (SUV) segment and remains the best selling SUV in the world;

Whereas, as the 21st century begins, Ford continues its marvelous record for fine products with the best-selling car in the world, the Ford Focus, and the best-selling truck in the world, the Ford F-Series;

Whereas the Ford Motor Company is the world's second largest automaker, and includes Ford, Lincoln, Mercury, Aston Martin, Jaguar, Land Rover, Volvo, and Mazda automotive brands, as well as other diversified subsidiaries in finance and other domestic and international business areas; and

Whereas, on October 30, 2001, William Clay Ford, Jr., the great-grandson of Henry Ford, became Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of the Ford Motor Company, and as such is concentrating on the fundamentals that have powered the Ford Motor Company to greatness over the last century and made it a world-class auto and truck manufacturer, and that will continue to carry the company through the 21st century to develop even better products and innovations: Now, therefore, be it

Mr. UPTON (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment to the preamble be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment to the preamble offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

TITLE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. UPTON

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the title offered by Mr. UPTON:

Amend the title so as to read: ''Resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary year of the founding of the Ford Motor Company, which has been a significant part of the social, economic, and cultural heritage of the United States and many other nations and a revolutionary industrial and global institution, and congratulating the Ford Motor Company for its achievements.''.

The amendment to the title was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have permission to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 100, the resolution just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON H.R. 1588, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services have permission to file a supplemental report on the bill (H.R. 1588) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2004 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2004, and for other purposes.

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 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY). Pursuant to House Resolution 245 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. 1588.

The Chair designates the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) as chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) to assume the chair temporarily.

□ 1346

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. 1588) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2004 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2004, 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. 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.

We have an excellent defense bill before us today. We have learned a number of lessons from the conflict we just concluded in Iraq. I think the lessons of the last 15 years are that we must have in this country broad military capabilities, and that means we have got to be able to handle a conventional armored attack or conventional warfare. We must be able to handle guerilla warfare. We must be able, at the same time, to conduct the war against terrorism, and we have to prepare for the eventuality that ballistic missiles may at some point be launched against the United States.

Mr. Chairman, this bill addresses America's military issues. We address all of the issues that are brought up with respect to personnel. We have a 4.1 percent average pay increase in this bill. We have targeted bonuses where we have critical skills requirements and critical grade requirements. We provide for family housing. We do all the things that are important for people. At the same time, we modernize and we have more money for modernization than we have in years past, Mr. Chairman.

We have lots of old platforms. We know that our Army helicopters average 18.6 years of age. Two-thirds of the Naval aircraft are over 15 years. And if you go down the line you even come up with some antiquities. You come up with B–52 bombers, the youngest of which was built in 1962. So we have many years where modernization is required, and we have embarked on this first step of modernization with this bill that provides a little over $70 billion for modernization.

Mr. Chairman, we have learned lessons in Iraq, and this committee, which worked very hard, Democrats and Republicans on all of our subcommittees listened to our military after the operation in Iraq, and we asked them what their lessons learned were, what new systems, what new capabilities could we work on to give them even more effectiveness on the battlefield. They talked to us, and we have embedded some of these requests, Mr. Chairman, in this bill.

So this bill reflects not just recommendations from the administration over the last several years, but it reflects what war-fighting leaders need on the battlefields and what they have learned is required as a result of this most recent conflict. So this is a very up-to-date bill.

Mr. Chairman, we need a number of what I would call so-called enablers to continue to fight today's wars and also prepare for tomorrow's wars. We need airlifts. You have to have the ability to move that air bridge and move across that air bridge either from the United States to a military operation around the world, or to move from foreign-based troops, troops in Germany or other places, move them into the battlefields and not only move troops in but move equipment in and provide that bridge of tankers to be able to move strike aircraft in, long-range strike aircraft or short-range tactical aircraft which, combined with precision munitions, can hit those targets, whether it is an al Qaeda cave in Afghanistan or a leadership bunker in

Iraq or in some other part of the world. We have supplied more money for that very important area, Mr. Chairman.

We also need to bolster precision-guided munitions which have provided us with so much leverage in this operation. We do that here.

We also provide for more robust missile defense because we know that Scud missiles launched in a theater can paralyze our tactical airfields. Until we can take care of those airfields and bring people in and bring aircraft in, we know we have to have the ability to pull down Scud-class ballistic missiles and increasingly effective ballistic missiles that are actually more high-powered, more capable than Scuds. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, we have money in this bill for Patriot missile systems, for more procurement of our missile systems, so we can protect our troops in theater and project American power around the world. That is another enabler.

We also put money in for the deep strike program, Mr. Chairman. That is important. That will follow on and bolster this fleet of B–1s, B–2s and B–52s that carried the war to the enemy so effectively in this last theater.

So we do a number of things, Mr. Chairman, that will enable us to not only fight today's wars but also look beyond the horizon and will help us fight tomorrow's wars.

Let me tell you, Mr. Chairman, you will be listening to the reports of our subcommittee chairman and the ranking members of those subcommittees and you will see that this bill is a product of a lot of hard work, a lot of folks who sat in those chairs and listened not only to the daily briefings on the Iraq operation but listened very intently to our people in uniform when they told us what we are going to need to protect this country. Our folks have done a great job.

So, finally, let me commend our commander-in-chief, President Bush, for the blueprint that he laid out for us, for Secretary Rumsfeld, our military leaders, but, lastly, everybody who projected American power in this last conflict, who went out, right down to that 19-year-old kid carrying an M–16 trying to go through the choke point at Nasiriya in Iraq.

America's military team has performed brilliantly for us. Now it is time for us to perform for them.

I want to thank my ranking member, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), for his great partnership in putting this bill together. We have had a few contentious moments and we may have a few more as we go through this bill. There are a few items that do not come up very often in the defense bill but will come up. But after the arm wrestling is over, Mr. Chairman, you will see a united Committee on Armed Services and hopefully a united House of Representatives standing tall behind the uniformed people in the United States military. So I am very grateful to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for his work.

I want to also say I am very grateful to our subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH), the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EVERETT), and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT), and also all of their ranking members on their subcommittees for the hard work they have put in.

Mr. Chairman, we will start presenting our subcommittee reports momentarily.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this Armed Services bill. I would like to first pay tribute to our chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), if I may, for his sincerity, for his hard work, and for his determination in taking care of the troops and making sure that they have the right equipment and ammunition that they need to succeed on the battlefield.

We are so very, very proud of the young men and young women and the victory that they have brought about in the fields of battle in Iraq for several reasons; and a lot of it is tied right back to the work we have done on the Committee on Armed Services through the years.

The first is the high caliber of young men and young women that we have. They are professionals. They are dedicated and highly trained. The operation and maintenance dollars we have given towards training has paid off.

Secondly, the equipment that they have had. When you speak of the M–1, A–1 tanks, the Bradley fighting vehicles or the B–2 bombers or whatever, their equipment has been the very best available.

Number three is the ammunition they have had, the precise ammunition, the targeted ammunition they have. Whether you are speaking about a red dot on the target through a rifle at 300 meters or a JDAM bomb being dropped from a B–2 bomber at 40,000 feet that goes through a window of choice, all of that has contributed.

On top of that, it was interesting to note that the gentleman in charge of all of the British troops, Air Marshall Brian Burrage, gave tribute to the plans that came out of the American war colleges through this whole effort in Iraq. He said that the plans that were fulfilled in the Iraqi campaign will be studied in war colleges for decades to come.

The last reason we did so well and as a result of a lot of work in the Committee on Armed Services going back a number of years was the jointness that was apparently seamless between each of the services. All of that came about as a result of the work that we did on the Committee on Armed Services.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, is a good bill. As the chairman has noted, it does a lot of good things for the troops: the 4.1 percent average pay raise, the family housing, the medical care, all of this combined together does a great deal. The research and development that grows into future systems. The procurement of the weapons systems and ammunition that we provide for and authorize is so very important. The O&M, Operation and Maintenance, which allows not just keeping the lights on but allows for extensive training, whether it be at Fort Irwin or whether it be on a ship or on an airplane.

All of this is so very important to the uniformed services. We are very proud of them, every one of them. We salute them on their recent victory.

We are, as you know, compelled to remind ourselves sadly that we are in a war against terrorism and there will be great burden on the military forces as we proceed with this war against those terrorists of which we have learned so much.

But I must say, Mr. Chairman, that there are provisions in this bill that I wish that the Committee on Rules had allowed full and fair debate thereon. We still have one more rule to go, so I am hopeful that the Committee on Rules will allow some of these amendments to be made in order, such as the one involving Civil Service. I think it is very important that we have a full and fair debate on that. Cooperative threat reduction should be a very important issue that we should debate here, among others. The base closing issue should be one that we should at least have a debate on in this forum.

So with that exception, hoping that the Committee on Rules can reverse itself and help us have a more complete debate probably tomorrow as a result of the second rule that will be forthcoming from the Committee on Rules, I certainly hope we can continue that insistence.

□ 1400

Overall, this is a good bill. Whether it is a young sailor on a ship or whether it is a general directing an operation, all of them fare well as a result of the work, and hard work by this committee.

Again, let me thank Chairman HUNTER for his sincerity through all of this.

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), the vice chairman of the committee, who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this bill is about America's patriots. This bill is about America's heroes. From Kabul to Baghdad, from Riyadh to Graznyy, our sons and

daughters are in harm's way doing a fantastic job, and we applaud them with this legislation.

But this bill is also about two other patriots. This bill is about the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), and it is about the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), two great Americans, Mr. Chairman, who brought us together; two great Americans who worked us for 30 hours over 2 days in the most extensive markup that I have been involved in in 17 years in this body. And while there were some issues that were very tightly split, in the end only two Members out of 60 dissented. And as we have done in the past, we will work our will and our way today to come up with a bill that we can be proud of.

But I want to pay tribute, especially to DUNCAN HUNTER and IKE SKELTON for their leadership. They are both great Americans. They both served their country in military combat. They both understand as much as anyone else in this body what this bill is all about. It is an honor and a privilege for me to serve with both of them. And I know my colleagues on the Committee on Armed Services and in this body understand and appreciated the leadership of both of these outstanding individuals.

So this bill is about their leadership in helping us mold a bill that will provide the support for our patriots. In our subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces, we increased funding, with the help of our two patriotic leaders, by almost $2 billion. And where do we put that money? We put $600 million of it into additional authorization for M1 tanks and Bradley Fighting Vehicles, because they did so well in the recent battles in Iraq. We put $200 million of extra money to maintain our ammunition industrial base, vitally important for our capabilities for the future.

On the F–22 program, we kept the authorized amount at the level requested by the Air Force and DOD; but we performed our legitimate role of oversight, and we said to the contractors in the Air Force, you are not making enough progress on the software for this vital aircraft; and until you do, we are going to fence a portion of this money. Because as stewards for the taxpayers, we must make sure that the money we spend is, in fact, spent in the most cost-effective way possible.

Mr. Chairman, we also put $1.7 billion in the legislation for the Future Combat System in transition of our Army, and we provided multiyear procurement for the E–2C and the F–18, as well as the C–130J.

Mr. Chairman, this bill will not be perfect to each one of us individually; but collectively, as we come together as 60 Members of the committee and 435 Members of the House, it is a bill that we all can support, a bill that would do what needs to be done to support those brave patriots who are today serving our Nation.

In addition, on some of the more contentious issues involving cooperative threat reduction and involving nuclear policy, the chairman and the ranking member have worked with us to craft some important additions in this bill. We, in fact, include in the bill the requirement of establishing a Strategic Nuclear Commission to look at what our nuclear posture should be over the next 20 years in a bipartisan approach. We have included language to find compromises on the way that we assist the former Soviet states in taking apart their weapons of mass destruction.

So, Mr. Chairman, I have no problem in supporting this legislation. There will be some amendments that will be offered that will be helping to perfect it even more. And in closing, besides thanking our two patriots, I want to thank my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE). He is the ranking member of our subcommittee. He is an outstanding American. He has been involved in every aspect of the development of this portion of our bill. He is a quiet man, who never speaks his mind; but all of us love him because, in the end, we know that he means well by those soldiers, sailors, Marines, and corpsmen who this bill is written to support.

Mr. Chairman, I thank our colleagues and urge a ''yes'' vote on the bill and again thank our two leaders for their great work.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR), the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Projection Forces.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I regret that my Republican colleague, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT), is not here, so I hope I do not steal his thunder. From the Subcommittee on Projection Forces, we have done a number of things for America's industrial base; but, more importantly, we have done a lot of good things for the men and women who serve our country. It is unconscionable to send them out to sea in old ships, old helicopters, and old planes. So we do take some steps to address those needs with this bill.

I regret that we really do not do enough. We are now down to a fleet of about 300 ships. And at the rate we are going, we are on our way to a fleet of 140 ships. Fleet age used to be about 30 years. We are now down to keeping them for about 20, and we are only putting 7 in the budget. So quick math tells you if you are going to build 7 ships a year, and only keep them for 20 years, you are down to a 140-ship fleet. I hope we can turn that around. We have not had much help from this administration. Quite frankly, we did not have much help from the previous administration. And I do think a navy is important for force projection, so I do think the Congress needs to pay more attention to that.

We authorized three DDG–51s, one LPD–17 advanced funding, two T–AKE ships, one Virginia-class submarine, which will be purchased with multiyear funds. The idea being that things are so expensive, things that take 4 or 5 years to build, we can go ahead and pay for them in four or five installments rather than one. Two SSBN to SSGN conversions. One LHD–8. $35 million for the Littoral Combat Ship, our next generation of small ships to operate in the Littoral zones around the world. One LCAC SLEP Program, Service Life Extension Program.

Additionally, we have authorized the money to replace about 333 Tomahawk missiles that were used up in the course of the most recent war, and about a $40 million increase to the production line so that they can be built quicker than they would have been. One C–17 for airlift, $229 million for aerial refueling, which gives the Pentagon the option to either purchase or lease those planes that we need. Long-range bombers. We add about $100 million for the next generation of the manned bomber, and we will see to it that a number of B–2s will be kept in the inventory that would have been expired.

So, again, we are not doing everything that I think any of us would like to do; and, quite frankly, I very much regret the Committee on Rules not allowing an amendment to be put on the floor so that every Member of this body could vote whether or not we are going to have another round of base closures. I think it is a particularly bad idea and a particularly bad idea when our Nation is at war.

I very much regret that the democratic process will not be given an opportunity to express itself. I hope the Committee on Rules will change their mind between now and tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) request unanimous consent to control the time on behalf of Chairman HUNTER?

Mr. SAXTON. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) is recognized.

There was no objection.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY). This year, for the first time in the new subcommittee laydown, the chairman and the committee members decided to combine the Subcommittee on Readiness and the Subcommittee on Military Construction as part of the new configuration. The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) has a committee report on this new subcommittee.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1588, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2004.

We have all witnessed our military success in Afghanistan and Iraq and in the rest of the world. These successes are a tribute to the quality of our

servicemembers as well as to the importance of realistic and frequent military training. The act contains three environmental provisions that will ensure the military's continued ability to train in realistic scenarios without neglecting the military's commitment to be responsible environmental stewards. The act amends the Endangered Species Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, and reauthorizes the Sikes Act. I will speak to these environmental provisions as we go on during the course of the next few days when those subjects come up, but I think these are very important provisions.

H.R. 1588 also recognizes that the military services will face real challenges as personnel and equipment return home from the war. The level of effort necessary to resurge this equipment at our maintenance depots will be extraordinary. So the act recognizes this and adds funding to the key readiness depot accounts in order to take care of this problem. This act recommends an additional $680 million for active and reserve depot maintenance, an unprecedented but vital funding increase.

I am disappointed the military services have allowed funding to slip to an unacceptably low level during these times, and I hope the military services take advantage of the circumstances that have allowed the committee to add such a large increase and urge the Department to avoid getting itself into this situation in the future where such large increases from Congress are necessary.

This act also provides an additional $180 million for maintenance-related repair parts or flying hour spares to support readiness missions. This act also takes the unprecedented step of funding every unfunded requirement identified by the commandant of the United States Marine Corps.

In addition to readiness issues, I would like to address the Military Construction and Base Realignment and Closure, the BRAC, process. Once again, the Department's budget request for military construction and family housing fell far short of meeting the services' needs. To address some of the greatest readiness and quality-of-life shortfalls, H.R. 15888 includes $9.8 million in military construction and family housing, which is a real increase to the President's budget of more than $400 million.

H.R. 1588 also includes a number of commonsense improvements to existing base closure laws. First, H.R. 1588 establishes a force structure floor. U.S. forces are already under severe strain, and this provision would prevent further cuts that could further damage military readiness.

Second, the bill requires that the 2005 BRAC round result in a basing plan that is capable of supporting the base force, a modest but capable level of forces that was crafted immediately following the Cold War. In creating the basing plan, DOD would be required to assume a worst-case scenario in which no U.S. forces could be permanently stationed outside the United States. The act uses the base force, a slightly larger force than we have today, as the force baseline because it represents the level to which we might reasonably expect the United States military to surge to meet a future crisis or to change or a change in threats facing our Nation.

Finally, H.R. 1588 requires the Secretary of Defense to establish an ''early off'' list of military installations that are critical to our national defense. This list would include at least one-half of all U.S. installations and would spare many communities the worry and cost associated with the BRAC process by allowing their early removal from the list of facilities that the BRAC Commission may consider for closure. In other words, there are some bases that absolutely the Defense Department cannot do without. They know it. They know what these bases are. They know they are not going to be on the closure. For pity sake, get them off the list and spare these communities. And this amendment would do that.

H.R. 1588 will make real improvements in U.S. military readiness and ensure the continued strength of U.S. Armed Forces for years to come, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this act.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), for yielding the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on the Department of Defense authorization bill, and let me first of all say that I am concerned the technical corrections amendment aims to rewrite the Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act, two critical environmental laws.

□ 1415

The House Committee on Armed Services marked this bill up in a session that lasted over 24 hours. We debated issue after issue, and we raised serious concerns about the Department's efforts to effectively eliminate the Civil Service system and to gut important environmental protections. While the debate certainly was contentious, it was an open debate.

Today we are faced with a much different scenario. Amendments to restore Civil Service protections and protect the environment were not made in order. A rewrite of major environmental laws was included in the manager's amendment. I did not get an opportunity to speak on the rule, but I believe strongly that the rule that was passed by this House makes a mockery of the deliberative process.

As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities, I believe the committee's work, the legislative product before us, is on the whole a solid proposal. At a time when our Nation's military is being called upon to make greater than normal sacrifices, this bill in my estimation represents a step in the right direction, for I have seen firsthand an example of this personal sacrifice in traveling around the world to Afghanistan and other places.

I recognize the importance of providing a truly bipartisan authorization package in order to maintain a second-to-none military. Towards this end, the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities authorized increased spending on DARPA, chemical and biological defense measures, and at the Special Operations Command. I applaud the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) for his leadership for the ultimate approval of these issues.

That said, I would like to address a few less-than-impressive measures contained in the portion of the bill that pertains to the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities. For starters, this bill reduces funding for information technology or IT programs by as much as $2 billion to fund in some cases initiatives perhaps more suited for the conflict of yesterday rather than those of tomorrow.

I am particularly concerned about the nature of the proposed cut to the Navy-Marine Corps Internet. In my mind, the depth and breadth of the IT cuts represents a stunning recommendation, given that our military's complete transition into the information age is well under way.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that as this legislation moves forward that much work can be done in the conference committee, because, as of today, I believe this bill is a flawed bill, and I hope that we are open to operating, as we move further, in working with the conference committee to correct these flaws.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1588, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004.

Last week, the Committee on Armed Services approved this bill by a vote of 58–2, continuing the committee's tradition of bipartisanship in addressing the defense needs of this 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 which will help to transform the military services into the condition in which they need to be for the future.

I have the honor of chairing the first standing committee in this House devoted exclusively to defending from the terrorist threat, the Subcommittee on

Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities. As many in this body know, I worked for many years toward the establishment of such a subcommittee, and I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) for his wisdom in bringing this idea to fruition.

I believe our subcommittee has already proven its worth, and we plan to do much more in the weeks and months to come.

The subcommittee's ranking member, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN), and I have worked hard together to explore a multitude of ways to provide the Department of Defense with the capability to defeat and defend against terrorists at home as well as abroad.

I will be the first to acknowledge that we are off to a good start, but we have a long, long way to go before we are satisfied that we on this committee and in the Congress have done all we can to protect our country against the scourge of terrorism. There are many areas to address and so many good ideas abound that in some ways it is difficult to know where to concentrate our efforts. However, several enduring themes have appeared since the establishment of our subcommittee, all of which are addressed in some measure in this bill.

For example, we learned that the best way to fight terrorism is to keep terrorists as far from our shores as possible. I believe the Special Operations Command is our best weapon for this mission. This bill bolsters the bill's capabilities in several areas.

Let me just say this about the Special Operations Command. The defense of our country in the new war on terrorism is a many-fold type of defense, but for the purposes of this conversation, let me just separate it into two parts. The area of homeland security is important; and, to that end, this Congress and our government have established a new Department on Homeland Security. It is important. It works here within and close to the borders of the United States to put in place defensive measures as well as measures that will help us react properly should a terrorist attack occur.

The second part, and perhaps at least from my point of view an equally important part of the task, is the offensive and defensive capabilities offered to us through the Special Operations Command. In both Afghanistan and Iraq, an immense part of the effort went largely unnoticed by the American public. We embedded reporters, hundreds of them, within the ranks of our troops, and each day on television we could watch as we progressed in the desert.

A lady back home said, why did the American Department of Defense decide to put the Special Operations Command on television? I said, ma'am, we did not. You did not see what they did. But suffice it to say in this conversation, they were an extremely effective force that did a great deal. They are made up of Navy Seals, Army Rangers, Green Berets. There is an Air Force unit located at its permanent base here in Herbert Field in Texas, and we are standing up new Marine units to act in concert with the Special Forces groups.

This year we believe that they are so important that we are increasing the funding allotted for Special Forces by 33 percent, from about $4.3 billion to about $6 billion. This is important, and we recognize the wonderful job they have done. I will not go on to describe their methods of operation and the kinds of things that they do because it would in some ways perhaps inhibit their capabilities, but suffice it to say they are extremely important to today's war on terrorism.

In addition to the groups that I listed, there are some folks that do some other special kinds of jobs that are also in the Special Forces. Civil operations, for example. During a fight, is it important to try to bring along the people, the population within whom our Special Forces are working? Of course it is. We have civil operations units to do that. We also have communicators known as psychological operators who are part of the Special Forces, and they do a wonderful job in communicating messages to the people in the theater of operation.

Last week I had an opportunity to go to Walter Reed Hospital and visit some of our wounded soldiers. There were some special operators who had been wounded as well. They are great people, and to the person when I asked them what it is that they would wish most about their future, they said I would like to get out of this bed and go back to my unit. They are great people, and my hat is off to them for the great job they do under the leadership that we have provided them.

There are also emerging issues involving the role of the National Guard. We are working on these questions with the new Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense and will involve the Department of Homeland Security and the National Guard in the resolution of these matters.

There is need for more and better and cheaper chemical and biological detectors and countermeasures of various sorts. To meet this need, we have established a chemical and biological initiative fund to allow promising ideas to compete for funding.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on for a long time and talk about the activities of the subcommittee and the things that we oversee. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) mentioned information technology which is critical. We are trying to get our arms around that.

I strongly encourage all Members to support H.R. 1588. This is an excellent bill that should receive the overwhelming support of this body.

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Readiness.

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

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1588, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004.

I want to specifically address the provisions of the act relating to military readiness.

First, I thank my colleagues on the subcommittee and the full committee for the manner in which they participated in the business of the subcommittee this session.

I also want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) for his leadership and example in developing the readiness portion of the fiscal year 2004 National Defense Authorization Act. We were on an accelerated pace this session, and there were many issues that we were unable to address.

Additionally, this authorization act is based on a peacetime bill request from the administration that did not address many of the known reconstitution or post-conflict requirements. Our dedicated military and civilian personnel continue to do their part in protecting the security of this great Nation. We are obligated to do our part.

Mr. Chairman, while I am concerned that this act does not provide all that I would like to see in the direct readiness accounts, I am more distressed over the process.

First, there were issues that should have been addressed in the Subcommittee on Readiness that were presented during the full committee mark. I speak especially about the environmental provisions and the civilian personnel provisions that were inserted in the chairman's mark. Most troubling to me are the broad changes dismantling the safeguards in the civilian personnel system. Many of the changes are based on the homeland security model that has not been implemented yet. This bill would extend these experimental rollbacks to the more than 700,000 Department of Defense civilian employees who performed tremendously during Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom, a performance that we acknowledge.

There is no doubt in my mind that additional changes are needed to the civilian personnel management system, but that does not include wholesale removal of safeguards that ensure access and fair treatment for those dedicated civilian personnel who, like their military colleagues, also serve.

Second, for the first time in my long tenure here in the House and on the Committee on Armed Services, I am concerned about the partisan nature of the committee and its deliberations during the mark. We have debated many contentious issues in the past, and I see no reason why I should believe that the future will be different,

but I trust that in the future we will remember that the legislative process is a consultative process in which compromise among the parties is key to crafting some policy that would have a lasting effect and that it can only take place in an environment where mutual respect and bipartisanship is the norm.

Mr. Chairman, I support this act and will vote for it. On balance, it is not a bad start. It contains a lot of things that I am convinced are needed to permit the Department of Defense to perform its national security mission, but I do not want us to forget that significant work still needs to be done.

I urge Members to support this bill.

□ 1430

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EVERETT), chairman of the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces.

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

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Chairman, the bill reported out by the committee supports the administration's objectives while making significant improvements to the budget request. The recent conflict in Iraq dramatically demonstrated the effectiveness of emerging military technologies and at the same time validated the requirement to sustain and upgrade the Legacy Force. The committee's report strikes a balance between future investments and near-term priorities.

In the area of missile defense, the committee's bipartisan recommendation provides the full $9.1 billion requested by the administration, but shifts $282 million from longer-term and less well-defined objectives to nearer-term priorities, particularly in the area of theater missile defense. Notably, it provides $20 million for improved Patriot IFF, identification, friend or foe, to address friendly fire incidents in Iraq. It also supports the President's program to achieve an initial defensive operational capability in fiscal year 2004 by expanding the Pacific missile defense test bed.

In the area of military space, the committee's recommendation accelerates the next generation of satellite communications and navigation capabilities which have so recently allowed our military forces to act with unprecedented speed and precision. It also provides additional funds for operationally responsive space launch to shorten launch preparation times from months and years to days and weeks. Given the increasing importance of space to both the United States and potential adversaries, the committee recommends increased funding for space surveillance activities. The committee's recommendation provides for the sustainment and life extension of our strategic nuclear deterrent, which will remain a cornerstone of our national security posture for years to come.

It provides the funds necessary to ensure the Nation's enduring stockpile remains safe and reliable even as the weapons in that stockpile age well beyond their designed service lives. The committee's recommendation also funds at the budget request several programs of special interest. Specifically, this includes the robust nuclear Earth penetrator, the advanced concepts initiative, and the enhanced test readiness program. The report also contains a provision that would repeal the prohibition on low yield nuclear weapons research. These actions will allow the defense nuclear complex to better respond to new and future military requirements.

To quickly shift gears to an issue close to my heart, I am pleased to say that the committee was able to include an additional $147 million for Army aviation training to fully fund the Army's Flight School XXI program. Flight School XXI incorporates a new training syllabus derived from lessons learned from Kosovo's Task Force Hawk. Aviation students were being sent to operational units undertrained. To address this dilemma, Flight School XXI provides students with more flying hours in their ''go to war'' aircraft and calls for greater utilization of modern, state-of-the-art training simulators. Improved pilot and crew training is needed, and I firmly believe that Flight School XXI will better prepare Army aviators for real-world flying situations.

I would also like to pay tribute to my ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), for the great work he has done on these complex issues and to both the majority and the minority staffs for their long hours and hard work they put in on the issues before the subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, the committee's recommendation addresses administration objectives, Defense Department unfunded requirements, and Member priorities. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I am proud to be here to rise in strong support of the National Defense Authorization Act. In doing so, I would like to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), and in particular the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EVERETT), chairman of the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, and both staffs for their hard work and the great work they have done in order to report out of our subcommittee to the committee on issues that at times can be very contentious for all of us.

While I am concerned that this bill contains a few very dangerous provisions, especially related to civil service reform, I believe that this bill makes strides to help our men and women in uniform. This bill allows for an average pay raise of 4.1 percent for all personnel, reduces out-of-pocket expenses for housing, and eases the financial burdens when reservists are mobilized.

Mr. Chairman, I had the privilege of accompanying Chairman DAVID HOBSON and four other Members of Congress on a visit two weekends ago to the Middle East where we received briefings in Kuwait and Bahrain and Baghdad. I notice in the gallery we have got represented here members of all of our armed services who are watching with great interest the things that we do and the things that we say about this defense authorization bill here. I would like to share with you and with them in particular some of the comments that I heard from our men and women in uniform on that recent trip two weekends ago.

They were particularly proud of the job that they had done in winning this war in record time, with minimum losses; but they were not happy because they were asked to transition from war fighters to peacekeepers. That is one of the areas where I think we have a lot of work to do, Mr. Chairman, in terms of making sure that we are mindful of the role that our men and women in uniform play in terms of transitioning them from having just fought and won a war to the role of peacekeeper. Several times they made mention to me that they were happy to be involved in combat for this country, but they felt that their role as peacekeepers should be best done by somebody else. They mentioned the United Nations and other alternatives. They felt that being warriors they were not suited to become traffic cops immediately after a conflict. They did not have an interest in being city guards or maintainers of infrastructure or any of those kinds of things. Frankly, those are the kinds of issues that I hope as members of this committee and Members of Congress, we do a better job at doing this.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, these are the same men and women in uniform that later on in this authorization we are going to be talking about an amendment that would conceivably put them on the border as peacekeepers or law enforcement personnel. I hope that every Member of Congress remembers that these men and women have done us proud. Let us do them proud by keeping them focused on their role.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would remind Members to refrain from referencing occupants of the gallery.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), whose congressional district includes Camp Pendleton.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1588. As we have done in our recent successes with our fine troops, sailors, Marines, airmen, they have done a fantastic job. The reason they have done such a great job, Mr. Chairman, is because their success is dependent upon training.

The motto is ''train as you fight.'' I want to congratulate all of our people at all our military bases of the fine job that they do at managing those bases in spite of difficulties of increasing bureaucracies and restrictions to provide such training. In spite of that, they have done as good a job as they can. Not only have they succeeded in providing that training, but they have done a wonderful job in conserving our natural heritage.

In my own home State of California, Camp Pendleton, I cannot think of an area that has done a better job in preserving the heritage of Southern California. You can go down Highway 5 and look upon Camp Pendleton, a part of California that you do not see today. As a matter of fact, they have done such a fine job, the old motto goes, the other motto, ''no good deed goes unpunished,'' that many people try to restrict our Marines in training the way they fight. Right now of the many miles of beach front along Camp Pendleton, I believe it is close to 40 miles, only 500 yards can be used for training along that beach front. We have to make believe that there are foxholes there. We have to put these young Marines in buses and ship them to another location. They cannot train as they fight. We want to do just some modest modifications in this legislation which would allow our military, as I said, to train as they fight.

This is the right thing to do, Mr. Chairman. This is a good bill. This is going to provide the kind of training that those young men and women deserve. I would urge everyone to support this legislation.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, this legislation is vital to continuing our military readiness to further the war on terrorism and provide for the defense of our homeland. This bill also gives our troops and their commanders the tools necessary for the 21st century warfighting. Further, this legislation strengthens our Armed Forces, which so aptly demonstrated their effectiveness and survivability in Iraq.

I was pleased to hear the previous speaker talk about Camp Pendleton. I am a former Marine. Camp Pendleton is important to the Marine Corps, and it is a key base that we have had for many, many years. I believe that even a modest increase in funding can help it immensely.

I urge my colleagues to support these efforts to help our Nation remain strong and free. I salute Chairman HUNTER and ranking member SKELTON and their staffs for their hard work on this legislation.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to manage the time of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON).

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1588, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004. First and foremost, I would like to thank our troops, the troops of the United States Armed Forces, for their sacrifices and their outstanding work in Operation Iraqi Freedom, as well as in our ongoing fight in our war against terror. I also commend our Commander in Chief, President George W. Bush, for his leadership during recent operations, as well as in the rebuilding of a free Iraqi nation. I recognize Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld for managing along with his team including Chairman of the Joint Chiefs General Ryan and Field Commander General Tommy Franks for managing our troops in a very successful military campaign and also Secretary Rumsfeld for his vision for the transformation of the U.S. military into a more powerful and more efficient military force. Finally, I express deep respect for my friend, House Armed Services Committee Chairman DUNCAN HUNTER, for his leadership in bringing this authorization bill to the floor. I appreciate his respect and his responsiveness to all of the members of the committee, along with our ranking member and his sidekick IKE SKELTON.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us balances the need to address today's national security threats while preparing for tomorrow's challenges. It implements lessons learned from recent conflicts and addresses ongoing concerns by appropriately increasing funding for critical capabilities such as heavy armor, precision guided munitions, deep strike capability, airlift, and missile defense. H.R. 1588 incorporates needed policy, personnel, and procedural reforms at the Department of Defense, including modernizing the Department of Defense management system, which is imperative to national security and the retention and recruitment of civilian personnel.

Also, the bill addresses environmental concerns. While we must be responsible stewards of our environment, it is troubling when military officers return from operations and report that their ability to train for operations is far from ideal due to environmental issues affecting their mission profile. This legislation authorizes approximately $4 billion for environmental protection and cleanup programs while recommending a responsible set of initiatives intended to restore the balance between protecting the environment and military readiness.

Additionally, H.R. 1588 authorizes better pay and benefits for U.S. servicemembers by providing a 4.1 percent pay raise as well as an additional increase of allowances to cover the 96.5 percent of all housing costs. Finally, Mr. Chairman, the fiscal year DOD authorization bill is a courageous undertaking that strikes an appropriate balance between modernizing our existing forces and investing in next-generation capabilities that will empower the U.S. military and strengthen our national security. I strongly urge adoption of this legislation.

□ 1445

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER), the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Total Force.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I want to acknowledge the presence of our pages here today. I have a page from my district, Maggie Hobson, and their last day is June 6. So over the next couple of weeks if the Members have not said hello to them and thanked them, this would be a great time to do it.

I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH), our subcommittee chairman, for his leadership in defense issues. It has been a pleasure working with him and other members of the Subcommittee on Total Force. I also want to thank the gentleman from California (Chairman HUNTER) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), ranking member, for their continued leadership.

While I support and hope to support H.R. 1588 in its final form, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004, I am very disappointed in the manner in which this bill was brought to the floor. We have had many contentious issues come before the Congress on defense over the years, but we have usually approached these in a deliberate and thoughtful process which allowed for the consideration of many different viewpoints both for and against, helping develop a sound and thoughtful final product.

But the committee broke with that tradition this year and included provisions that made wholesale changes to current systems without benefit of thorough hearings or in-depth analysis of the information and proposals that were provided by the Department of Defense. Unfortunately, the decision to proceed on this path has distracted from the numerous very good provisions that were included that improved the quality of life for our military personnel, retirees, and their families: an average 4.1 percent pay raise, a reduction in out-of-pocket housing expenses, equity in certain reserve hazard pays, and improvements to the military healthcare system.

Mr. Chairman, there are items in this bill that are excellent, but there are also items in this bill that should have had greater thought and reflection. I hope that we will continue our efforts to improve and strengthen this bill on the floor over the next 2 days. We are all proud of our men and women and their service to our country. Surely we can produce a defense authorization bill that all of us, Americans all,

Democrats and Republicans, can be proud of.

The gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) in his opening statement talked about the professionalism of our military and how well they performed in Iraq, and I concur in his assessment, and he also said it is now our turn. But it is also our turn to work together, Americans all, on this product; and that has not occurred. I also hope after the conclusion of this bill that we will do a very good job of providing oversight in Iraq and Afghanistan because we must succeed in the peace in those two countries.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire about the time remaining on each side, please.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) has 40 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) has 27 minutes remaining.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, before proceeding, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Projection Forces, I believe it appropriate to first highlight the magnificent service rendered the Nation by the men and women serving in our Armed Forces all 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 our Nation. They continue to meet every challenge with true dedication and commitment. We thank all of them for their service, and we thank all Americans for their steadfast support of our servicemen and women.

History has taught us that we achieve peace through strength. It is not easy to quickly grasp and apply the lessons from the ongoing war on terrorism and Operation Iraqi Freedom. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 takes important steps to make our country more secure. It does so by strengthening our military's ability to project the force our Nation requires at almost a moment's notice anywhere in the world by sea and by air.

I am pleased to report that the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 increases the requested authorization for Department of Defense programs within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Projection Forces by $1.8 billion to nearly $30 billion. Nearly $400 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 in conducting operations of the type we have just concluded in Iraq. These programs include one additional C–17 aircraft for $182 million; an additional $20 million to sustain a force structure of 83 B–1's, 23 aircraft above the level planned; an airborne tanker initiative of $229 million that would give the Air Force the flexibility of retaining KC–135E aircraft, meeting unfunded requirements for depot maintenance for tanker aircraft, and/or preparing to, procure or lease KC–767 airborne tanker aircraft; an additional $376 million for Tomahawk missiles to increase our production capacity and procure missiles to meet the long-term inventory goal of the Navy; an additional $178 million for the Affordable Weapon, a relatively low-cost cruise missile; and an additional $100 million bomber R&D initiative for the next generation, follow-on stealth, deep strike bomber.

In addition, the recommended mark includes several important legislative proposals: first, a multiyear procurement authorization for Tomahawk missiles and *Virginia* class submarines; second, a limitation on C–5A aircraft retirement until a reliability and reengineering program completes testing and the results of which are reported to Congress; third, an electromagnetic gun initiative; fourth, a requirement that the Center for Naval Analysis initiate several independently conducted studies on potential future fleet architectures for the Navy; and, fifth, a transfer of authorization to advance procurement for LPD–17 should Congress enact appropriations for Tomahawk missiles for fiscal year 2003.

In conclusion, I would like to thank all of the members of the Subcommittee on Projection Forces and in particular the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR), my very good friend. Every member of the subcommittee was diligent in their commitment and support to achieve the mission of strengthening our military. I would also like to thank the gentleman from California (Chairman HUNTER) for his leadership and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), our ranking member. I thank them both. I would particularly like to thank the staff and particularly the staff director, Doug Roach. When one is a Member, one appreciates the staff. When one is a chairman, one really appreciates the staff. I thank them very much.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 is the product of a strong and cooperative bipartisan effort. I urge all of my colleagues to support the bill.

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), who is not only a member of the Committee on Armed Services but is the ranking member of the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for yielding me this time.

I applaud the efforts of the gentleman from Missouri, who has distinguished himself on this committee, along with the gentleman from California (Chairman HUNTER). I do rise, however, with strong reservation, as was already noted earlier today, about the environmental concerns, an issue with the Spratt amendment on cooperative threat reduction. Only recently on PBS we saw the documentary on avoiding Armageddon, and clearly we need that amendment to make sure that we are able to address this crucial and vital national security interest.

But my main objection stems from denying more than 750,000 workers their collective bargaining rights under civil service. The other body saw fit not to provide that in their proposal. I hope that through the rule or through discussion we are going to be able to alleviate that in our proposal as these deliberations go forward. As the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), our leader, has often said, our troops deserve a bill that is worthy of their sacrifice. It is my sincere hope that through the continued efforts of these two fine gentlemen, both the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), that allows us to be in a position in a bipartisan manner to support this bill.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), my colleague and very good friend, who is not on our committee but has a very important contribution to make to this debate.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1588 and urge my colleagues to vote for it. I also rise, if I may, in support of all the young men and women who are serving in our Armed Forces. I also want to say that the gentleman from California (Chairman HUNTER); the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), ranking member; the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON); and certainly the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) have brought a fine bill to the House floor.

I want to speak briefly to the environmental provisions in the bill here this afternoon. Some slightly unknown provision called the Sikes Act has been in effect since 1960 and has provided a means for our military to conserve fish and wildlife with the fish and wildlife agencies on 25 million acres of military land across this country; and for the most part they have done quite well, in some circumstances a magnificent job. It has been on this floor today alleged that we are going to change or degrade or reduce the effectiveness of the Endangered Species Act. This is not true. There is a provision in this bill that authorizes military facilities with cooperation of the Fish and Wildlife Service, with National Marine Fishery Service, and the fish and game agencies

of the States to create what is called a Natural Resource Management plan, and what that Natural Resource Management plan does, it can or it may replace ESA's critical habitat designation. This Integrated Natural Resource Management plan is actually more effective than the critical habitat as described in the Endangered Species Act because it is a holistic approach, it is an ecosystem approach to those problems which threaten an endangered species. It also integrates what the military does with off-site private land. This is an integrated approach. It is an approach that can be extremely effective and the criteria on which these Integrated Natural Resource Management plans are based are very specific criteria to ensure the protection and recovery of species. So this legislation improves the Endangered Species Act.

It has also been said that it is going to reduce the effectiveness of the Marine Mammal Protection Act under certain circumstances. This also is not true, and I understand the disagreement as to the language when one deals with what is harassing a marine mammal. What we have done across the board is to hold many hearings with the Department of Defense, with Fish and Wildlife, with the National Marine Fishery Service, with university scientists from as far afield as Hawaii, where we visited to look at marine mammals; Woodshole in Massachusetts, which we visited again to look at the problems with marine mammals.

When we implemented the change of the definition, we had two things in mind: the effectiveness of military training, which is critical; and enhanced protection for marine mammals and an understanding of how we as human beings coordinate our activities with the world's oceans. We took into consideration noise. We took into consideration resonance, decibels, variations in sonar. So in places in this legislation we are improving the process of understanding human activity in the ocean by protecting marine mammals and improving the quality of training for our military. So we have improved ESA. We have improved the Marine Mammal Protection Act. We have improved the Sikes Act provision which protects conservation on 25 million acres of land, and we have improved America's ability to train young people that go into harm's way. And I urge support on H.R. 1588.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

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

As a member of the House Committee on Armed Services, I am very pleased to speak in support of this bill before us. I wish to thank the gentleman from California (Chairman HUNTER) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), ranking member, for their outstanding leadership in crafting a bill that will provide for our military and the men and women who serve in it the resources they need to keep America strong in the 21st century.

I am pleased with the provisions of the legislation, particularly that demonstrate Congress's commitment to the role of submarines as an essential part of a strong naval fleet. The authorization of multiyear procurement for the *Virginia* class submarine will encourage more rapid and cost-effective production of this important system and give the United States Navy new capabilities to respond to future threats.

□ 1500

The people of Rhode Island have historically played an integral role in submarine production, and I am pleased that we will be a part of this important aspect of military transformation.

I remain concerned, however, with several controversial provisions of the measure that would undermine existing environmental and civil service protections. The Department of Defense's legislation recommendations delivered to Congress only shortly before the Committee on Armed Services began its markup requested changes to make its civilian employees more competitive and to enhance military readiness. Well, if the DOD wants assistance in these areas, then I believe it is our duty to work with them toward that important goal. However, their unprecedented effort to alter employment rules for 700,000 workers deserves no less than extensive and thoughtful discussion, which we, unfortunately, did not have.

Furthermore, the broad environmental exemptions in the bill exceed the needs of military readiness, and, unless amended, could pose a serious threat to mammals and endangered species.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that we will be able to address these problems during the upcoming amendment process so that all of my colleagues will be able to support this measure without reservation.

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER), a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services for their overall fine work on this bill.

Due to the shortness of time, I would like to focus on one, unfortunately, negative aspect of the bill. It starts on page 349.

I would urge all of my colleagues not on the committee to pay particular attention to these sections, because they deal with the 750,000 Pentagon civilian employees, DOD employees, who are some of the finest civil servants in our Nation's history.

Remember, these are the employees who were attacked viciously on September 11, 2001, with the terrorist attack on the Pentagon. These are the employees who have served so skillfully and with such hard work and dedication that we honored them in our committee last week with a resolution commending them for their actions.

This section of the bill is one of the most radical and risky reforms undertaken in almost half a century; and, unfortunately, it is being undertaken with very little real consideration. The first draft of language was presented to Congress on April 29, just about 3 weeks ago. We had one hurried hearing. There was no subcommittee markup of this language; and no improving amendment was allowed in full committee, despite the great length of the markup at full committee.

Members should be aware of the radical changes that are undertaken by this language. I think we all in this House support our troops. I would hope that we also support the civilian workers in DOD who are supporting our troops every day.

What does this language do? Well, at best, it throws these careers into great uncertainty, and, at worst, it could harm the morale and throw them into a situation of favoritism and patronage.

We have an amendment that we are hoping the Committee on Rules will allow us to offer. This amendment would establish a DOD Civilian Employee Bill of Rights so that we could make it clear that we are in favor of flexibility in management in the Pentagon, that we are in favor of pay for performance, but we are also in favor of basic civil rights for our DOD employees.

This amendment, for example, makes it clear in plain English, which the text of the bill does not do, that employees at the Pentagon and DOD should be free from favoritism or discrimination. We preserve the veterans' preference. If veterans do not get preference as Pentagon employees, where on Earth can they get it?

We require the Pentagon to bargain in good faith. That language is nowhere in this bill. We preserve such things as hazardous duty and overtime pay for these workers. Why were these protections explicitly taken out of the language that is in this bill? We preserve the right to collective bargaining, a fundamental American right.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is important that House Members pay attention, and hopefully the Committee on Rules will allow our amendment to be made in order so this can be a fairer bill.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER), an expert on civil service regulations, from Dayton, Ohio, the home of a great military base, Wright-Patterson, where there are a lot of civil servants.

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this bill is an important bill because it provides an opportunity for true reformation of the Department of Defense in its effort to go into the new century.

Certainly we have tremendous successes that we have seen through the Department of Defense and our civilian employees and our men and women in uniform. But the opportunity to always achieve more and to have greater efficiencies is there before us.

What we are doing in this bill in the area of the civil service is not something that is unknown or is speculative. It is based upon demonstration projects throughout the country, where civil service employees who have participated in it have found greater satisfaction, greater pay based on performance, greater retention of those employees who are contributing, a greater feeling that their work actually makes a difference with respect to their success and certainly the overall success of the Department of Defense.

There have been many things that have been said over the past debate concerning this that are just absolutely not true. There have been allegations that collective bargaining is not preserved in the bill, but in fact the bill specifically references collective bargaining, and on page 1118, lines 14 to 15 of the bill before the Committee on Armed Services specifically set out language requiring collective bargaining.

Similarly, the civil rights provisions are specifically provided in the bill, both by reference and by specific statement.

The allegations of nepotism are specifically not true. Section 9902(b)(3)(A) and (B) and also the incorporation of 5 USC 2302(b)(7) specifically prohibit nepotism.

Within the area of political patronage allegations, the bill specifically says that employees are protected against any actions based upon political affiliation. This is language in the bill.

What is interesting as we listen to the debate, as we listen to people that make allegations that say this bill is egregious in its impact to employees of the Department of Defense, their allegations really go to the extent that they would shock your conscience, if they were true.

But they are not true, because, in fact, in the committee 58 to 2 was the vote in the Committee on Armed Services, and the gentleman from Tennessee voted for the bill that includes all of these provisions.

Certainly, if all of these things were true, the gentleman from Tennessee and others would have found it in their conscience to try to defend them. But the reality is they are specifically included in the bill.

Veterans preferences are specifically identified and referenced in 5 U.S. 2302(b)(11). The Department of Defense has done a great job in making certain our veterans have access to the Department of Defense as part of the workforce.

The McHugh amendment in this provides for a grievance protection system in the civil service system.

In short, this bill provides the opportunity for the Department of Defense to look to the future, while protecting the rights of civil servants and actually giving them opportunities in known demonstration projects for greater achievement.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER).

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman, my friend from Ohio, realizes that this bill is being rammed through Congress with an absolute minimum of discussion. The protections that the gentleman makes an effort to reference, such as collective bargaining, is not collective bargaining as the Nation understands it but collective bargaining as defined in that chapter in that bill, which really gives no definition. Ask folks who know about collective bargaining, and the gentleman will find that real collective bargaining rights are not preserved in the bill.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I have been working 23 years on civil service. I was very pleased to hear the observations of the gentleman, who has had 5 months experience here dealing with this issue.

I agree with the gentleman from Tennessee. The only reason to rush this to judgment is because they are unwilling to debate it fully and to have it open for amendment fully. If they had the courage of the gentleman from Ohio's assertions, they would not fear having this fully considered and debated. That is not the case though, I tell my friend.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we have an amendment. I hope we are able to discuss it fully, at which time we will be able to discuss his thoughts, as the gentleman indicated, which gives some rhetorical tip of the hat to those protections. But they ultimately will be in the discretion of the Secretary and the management at the Pentagon, not of the Congress or the President.

I would hope that the gentleman would review more closely his assertions and that perhaps we could discuss them at greater length at some time in the future.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Guam (Mr. BORDALLO), a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I rise in support of the bill before us.

Let me briefly highlight three provisions of which I am very proud.

First, the legislation increases the number of nominations to a military academy that a Delegate may have.

Second, the act authorizes a new 5-year pilot program for invasive species eradication on military installations in Guam.

Third, the legislation includes two military construction projects for Guam in fiscal year 2004. It authorizes $1.7 million for the construction of the Victor Wharf Fender System for our nuclear submarines, and it authorizes $25 million for the construction of a new medical and dental clinic at Anderson Air Force Base.

Much could be said, Mr. Chairman, as to the procedures by which contentious aspects of this legislation have appeared, such as the civil service provisions, but, nonetheless I am pleased that we have taken action to strengthen the defense of our Nation through this piece of legislation.

I would like to thank the gentleman from California (Chairman HUNTER) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), for managing this challenging process.

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), not only a member of the Committee on Armed Services but the ranking member on the Committee on the Budget.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, we are going through what is basically a pro forma debate here, because this bill is off limits to serious debate. When you cannot offer an amendment you are only shadowboxing about the provisions of the bill, if you are not really putting in the well the issue itself and letting the House work its will on the bill, and that is the situation we have here.

We are seeing procedural devices employed by virtue of this rule which keep us from having substantive consideration for the most contentious parts of this bill.

This bill runs rough-shod over two major environmental laws. No recourse. This bill dis-establishes the civil service as we have known it for almost 100 years. Virtually no recourse on the floor. This bill takes a provision that the President of the United States requested for funding a very important project under the Nunn-Lugar Act, Cooperative Threat Reduction, in Shchuch'ye, Russia, where some 75 percent of the deadly chemical weapons in the arsenal of the former Soviet Union are stored in makeshift buildings with porous roofs under woeful conditions that, in my opinion, are security risks.

We have finally gotten everything together so we can move forward with a facility here. The funding is requested by the President of the United States to move forward with this facility. And guess what? We are right at the threshold of a significant undertaking that matters to our security and the rest of the world, and this bill hog-ties the

President's request, hamstrings everything that is carefully laid in place, so we cannot begin. We cannot use the money that the President has requested.

This bill takes $28 million out of that project and puts it in offensive arms elimination, which is fully funded. It then fences another $100 million until they can show us that every permit needed over the lifetime of the project is procured, which is an impossible hurdle to clear.

□ 1515

So that is what is at stake here. That project, in my opinion, is not as important as the substantive decision to disestablish the civil service, but it is important. It sets a model for how cooperative threat reduction will proceed in Russia. It is the single most important thing we are doing in that realm in terms of ridding that country of chemical weapons which could one day show up in our subways, on our streets, used by terrorists and rogue states against us.

But we will not be able to have a free, full, and fair debate about that because the rule that now prevails prevents us from doing that.

What I would say, Mr. Chairman, as one last plea, is that we need a rule that allows us to work the will of the House on this highly important bill. This bill will increase defense spending to $400 billion, makes major allocations within our budget. That is a $110 billion increase over the last 3 years.

On a matter of this gravity, of this importance, we need to have full and free and fair debate here in the well of the House. This should be America's forum, a crucible where we work out important issues like this. The rule they have adopted diminishes the stature of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, the rule governing today's debate on the fiscal year 2004 defense authorization act, we are told, is just part one of two. I hope that in part two we are allowed to debate an amendment I offered, together with ADAM SCHIFF, on behalf of scores of Members supportive of the President's request for Cooperative Threat Reduction.

When I testified at the Rules Committee yesterday, I filed and sought consideration of only one amendment, which I offered with Representative SCHIFF, who has been active on these issues. I can describe our amendment in very simple terms: it seeks to restore the President's request for the fiscal year 2004 program. Let me elaborate.

The President's request for the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) program from fiscal year 2004 totaled $450.8 million, and the Armed Services Committee authorized that amount. But don't be fooled: the committee bill makes substantial changes to the President's request for CTR.

First, the committee bill transfers $28.8 million from chemical weapons destruction activities in Russia—work at the Shchuch'ye facility—to strategic offensive arms elimination. The cut of nearly $30 million from the Schchuch'ye project will slow construction of this critically needed facility and postpone the day we begin to destroy chemical weapons there. My amendment restores these funds to Shchuch'ye leaving funds for both strategic offensive arms elimination and Shchuch'ye at the requested level.

Shchuch'ye represents a wake up call as to urgency of the problem of proliferable chemical weapons. In a building that is little more than a fortified barn, chemical munitions are lined up like wine bottles.

Shchuch'ye is home to a majority of Russia's weaponized stocks of nerve gas and sarin. While security there has been upgraded by the CTR program, the munitions at Shchuch'ye remain portable, and the security almost certainly penetrable. None of us that visited left without believing the United States should accelerate the destruction of these munitions, and I was pleased to see the President recommended exactly this course in his fiscal year 2004 request.

At Shchuch'ye, the United States has complete access to a critical WMD storage site, where some of the deadliest and most portable chemical munitions in the world are housed with minimal security, and the Russians are saying, come on, we'll work with you to build a facility to destroy the weapons. The bottom line is this: the chemical weapons stored at Shchuch'ye represent a critical threat to U.S. security, and a cut to the President's request for this project is both unwise and unwarranted.

My amendment also strikes several new restrictions imposed on the CTR program by the committee bill, found in sections 1303 through 1307.

In section 1303, the Chairmans' mark creates an impossible hurdle for the work at Shchuch'ye or any other CTR project, by requiring that all permits ever needed over the lifespan of a CTR project be presented to Congress before more than 35 percent of the cost of the project can be obligated. There is literally no way for a planner or program manager to reliably envision each and every permit that might ever be needed to complete that project. Yet the committee mark says funding for any project, new or incomplete, stops at 35 percent of total cost until every permit is not only identified, but obtained. Our amendment restores the President's request by striking section 1303 and replacing it with a common sense proposal.

I agree with Chairman HUNTER that the Department of Defense needs to do a better job planning for the uncertainties that come with doing business in Russia. DOD testified on March 4 to the Armed Services Committee that they have taken specific measures to address the issue. Assistant Secretary J.D. Crouch told the committee DOD has ''instituted a program of semi-annual executive reviews with Russia to re-validate project plans, assumptions, and schedules on a regular basis,'' and noted that OSD has asked the DOD inspector general to review how CTR is organized, more broadly. The first phase of the IG review is already complete.

That said, I understand that Congress needs visibility into potential problems, like the one at Votkinsk, and I have a proposal that will give us just that. My amendment would require annual notice to Congress of all permits ''expected to be required'' for completion of a project, and an annual status report on DOD efforts to obtain them. To ensure we get this information annually, with the budget submission, only 35 percent of funds for CTR projects would be available each year until DOD submits the report. This information will enable Congress to make wise decisions about specific CTR programs, without grinding important work to a halt, and is in keeping with the administration's request to Congress.

Section 1304 of the bill adds another new restriction: it requires on-site managers at any Department of Energy nonproliferation project in the former Soviet Union. The administration opposes the requirement, and has noted that the cost, both in dollars and in diplomatic capital, of such a requirement could be prohibitive. In fact, DOE has noted that it already has strong oversight of its program activities in place, which includes frequent visits to sites, stringent contract access and work-performance requirements, and close cooperation with the U.S. Embassy and DOE Moscow Embassy Office.

Section 1305 of the bill is not a fence, but it would undo an important administration request that the DOD be allowed to spend up to $50 million in prior year unobligated balances on WMD destruction outside the FSU, if such work becomes necessary. The committee bill mandates that if any such work is to be done, it be done by the State Department, with funds transferred from DOD to State. This is misguided policy, at odds with both the administration's request and a bipartisan effort last year to create such authority. Our amendment strikes section 1305 and restores the President's request.

Another fence can be found in section 1306, which establishes new requirements for any work at biological weapons sites. The administration did not request oversight at this point, and new restrictions will likely only slow progress.

Finally, section 1307(b) fences $100 million of the President's request for chemical weapons destruction at Shchuch'ye—that is, of what's left after the $29 million cut in the base bill—until Russia, or some other nation, puts up one-third of the total cost of the project. But our agreements with Russia for construction at Shchuch'ye require no such percentage-based contribution. Our agreement specifies a functional division of labor: Russia builds the infrastructure needed to manufacture a city next to nowhere in the Urals; we construct the chemical weapons destruction facility.

According to DOD, Russia is meeting its financial obligation at Shchuch'ye, and further, is contributing a significant resources elsewhere to destroy other chemical munitions, including blister agents no housed at Shchuch'ye. The Congress already gets regular updates on funding and international contributions to Shchuch'ye. And the administration testified earlier this year before this committee that it does not need new oversight measures. Now, with Russia on board and the administration asking to accelerate work at the facility, is not the time to add new and unwarranted hurdle.

Let me just conclude by saying again, the intent of our amendment is simply to uphold the administration's request. In terms of policy and funding, that is what the amendment does, with the modest exception the accountability provision I mentioned, which should equip Congress a good tool to enhance its already vigorous oversight of these programs.

This amendment should win bipartisan support, and I hope rule No. 2 for this defense bill

will make the Spratt-Schiff amendment in order.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. RYAN of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding to me, and I thank the gentleman for his fine leadership, especially on the ''Buy American'' provisions that are in this bill that we have strengthened, and also the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman Manzullo) from the Committee on Small Business, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON), as well, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), for all their help strengthening the ''Buy American'' provision.

This is really not a Democrat or Republican thing; this is a shift from the United States Congress to the executive branch to make major decisions.

Nobody came before the people to say it was okay. We are losing. The right to receive a veterans' preference is gone. The right to be free from discrimination based upon political opinion is gone. The right to overtime pay is gone. The right to collective bargaining rights is gone. The right to due process, gone; the right to an attorney if you are fired inappropriately, gone.

We just won a war in less than 100 days. This is the thanks we give these people. We want flexibility. We understand the new global order and we want to help. We should pass a bill of rights, which the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER) has been pushing. We should pass it, not because we are going to protect the Constitution, not because it is a Democratic thing, but because these ladies and gentlemen in the Department of Defense deserve it.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Missouri for yielding time to me. I thank him for his hard work on this bill, which I find for the most part unexceptional.

My amendment essentially from the Committee on Government Reform preserving certain appeal rights for Department of Defense civil servants, has been included in this bill. My concern is that the Committee on Armed Services had thrust upon it an area that should not be in that bill. Yet they said to deal with it, because that is the way the rule works, involving the civil service.

What essentially happens in this bill is the establishment of a new and separate personnel system without basic civil service protection or collective bargaining rights for Department of Defense employees. It is the first time we have separated out any civilian employees in this way in 100 years. We have taken OPM out of it, even though they are the only organization with expertise in civil service.

Of course, there are some stated collective bargaining and civil service rights here, but they are all waivable. They are either waived or waivable. We have somehow decided to reform the personnel system for DOD before we reform military DOD itself. It mars this bill. I hope somehow we are able to fix it.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT), a member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I am delighted to be here. I want to certainly extend my commendations to the Committee on Armed Services. This is a very important bill, and I rise to support this measure wholeheartedly and very strongly.

In my district of Georgia, I represent Fort McPherson and I also represent Fort Gillam, two very critical bases that play an important role.

We need to pass this measure as a strong, strong vindication and a way of showing great appreciation to members of our Armed Forces, who put their lives on the line and brought victory in Iraq. But also, as we look ahead into the future, we see a time and we see issues developing of unknown certainty.

Let nobody misunderstand: we want the world to know that the United States of America is going to and must always have the foremost and strongest military presence in the world. This bill, H.R. 1588, goes a long measure to doing that.

Also, Mr. Chairman, as one of those strong supporters of this measure, I do want to call attention to this issue of civil service, where we are taking away the collective bargaining and employment rights of 700,000 employees.

The issue here is not whether we do it or not, but the issue is, in this legislative body, is it not our function to ask the questions? This should not be done in the quiet of night in a back room. We are affecting employees, defense employees in this country. We need to ask the question why. Is it needed? Is it a matter of national security that we allow changes for the Pentagon civilian personnel system to allow the Secretary of Defense to strip from the Department of Defense employees their most basic workers' rights, including collective bargaining, due process, appeal rights, and the annual congressional pay raise?

These are very important questions. All we ask for is the opportunity to do our job as Congressmen and Congresswomen, to ask the questions, and to get the answers. If this is a measure that must be passed, then we will do so.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. Chairman, the thinnest sheet of paper has two sides, and I yield to the gentleman for a look at the other side of this sheet of paper.

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, it is interesting, hearing the debate about this bill, and the issues and opportunities for debate on the issues and input for amendments.

I serve on the Committee on Government Reform and the Committee on Armed Services, which this bill went through. We had over 10 hours of committee debate, including consideration of numerous amendments, and 20 hours on the Committee on Armed Services, including numerous amendments.

Clearly, we had a full and exhaustive discussion. No back-room discussions here. This was out in the open, with full participation and full airing of the amendments that were presented.

One thing we know is that the need for this is evident in some of the circumstances that we currently have in the Department of Defense. Members can look at some of the experiences that have occurred.

It took the American Federation of Government Employees and the Air Force 10 years to bargain over day care centers. Bargaining disputes led to an arbitration hearing, two appeals to the Federal Labor Relations Authority, two court challenges, a petition to the Supreme Court, a Court of Claims case, a decision by the Comptroller General, and $750,000.

Similarly, a case in St. Louis over an annual employee picnic took 6 years and $275,000.

A dispute over an agency's decision to close its facilities over a holiday weekend and require employees to use 1 day of leave took 8 years to resolve.

These are not issues that should be addressed at the expense of national security. Other agencies have similar flexibilities that we are providing to the Department of Defense, the CIA, the DIA, the NSA, NIMA, TSA, FAA, IRS, Foreign Service, and the GAO.

The Department of Homeland Security has many of the same flexibilities, including equally broad labor-management flexibility.

What is really important, and the allegations of what this is doing to employees are not true, the basic rights of employees are protected. Collective bargaining is specifically mentioned in the bill and is a right granted to the employees, both on a national and local level.

Civil rights are specifically protected and are referenced in 9902(b)(3)(c), and also the ability to have an appeals process. The McHugh amendment provided for an appeals process so grievances and disputes can be heard. The bill protects employees' rights, at the same time providing the flexibility we need as we move into the next century.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding time to me.

As we have heard, tucked into this bill, Mr. Chairman, which is so important to our national defense, is a provision that I believe could have long-term negative consequences for our military readiness and effectiveness. It is a provision that will rewrite the rules for 700,000 civil service employees in the Department of Defense.

Mr. Chairman, in our committee, the Committee on Government Reform, when the representatives from the Department of Defense came to testify, they made it clear that our military success in Iraq was the result of a team effort, a team effort between the military and between the civil servants within the Department of Defense that provided them the support. It was a true partnership.

Yet, just a few weeks after our military success in Iraq, the Pentagon launched what can only be described as a sneak, surprise attack on the rights of those civil servants within the Department of Defense. It is very ironic that just a few weeks after this body passed legislation endorsing the good work of public employees, that we would take this action that treats them so unfairly.

Mr. Chairman, there has been an amendment proposed that would strip these provisions or change these provisions in the bill. It should be a bipartisan amendment, it should be a nonpartisan amendment, because otherwise what this bill does is gives the Secretary of Defense, not just this Secretary but any Secretary of Defense, Republican or Democrat down the road, the unchecked authority to rewrite the rules for civil servants within the Department of Defense, the rules with respect to hiring, firing, pay, bonuses.

It will greatly damage our security if we open the Department of Defense to party politics. We want a personnel system that rewards people based on merit, not based on political favoritism. We want, for example, our procurement officers to be looking out for the public interest, to be looking out for our national interests, not the interests of the most politically connected contractors.

I strongly support pay for performance; but it should be merit-based performance, not a political loyalty test. Last December we saw the big bonuses going to those who were political appointees within the administration.

I think this bill, which is so important to our national security, should not contain this one provision that I think will damage our national security interests in the long run.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK), a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important for us to remember that this Committee on Armed Services bill is a needed bill and something that this country and our troops need. But at the same time, as it relates to those individuals that we hold up most, those civilian employees that are in the Department of Defense, some 700,000-plus employees, they are getting ready to be a part and victim of a political patronage situation.

We had an opportunity in the committee and we have an opportunity, or hopefully we will have an opportunity on this floor if we can get an amendment up, to put in this bill directing the Secretary of Defense to consult with legal counsel in making sure that we have strong rules against political favors, political pay increases, or whatever the case may be.

I will tell the Members of this Congress throughout all of our districts throughout this country, we do not want people at the Supervisor of Elections Office changing their party affiliation based on the administration that is serving.

□ 1530

If we appreciate and care about these employees, the politicalization of the Department of Defense is not the place for it to happen. This is a very serious, serious issue; and I want to make sure that the Members of this House are on full alert that it is very important that we do not allow individuals to have to, because they were a part of some campaign, that they are now a part of the Department of Defense. We want the best employees there possible; and I think it is very, very important that Members give strong consideration to this.

Please allow the Democrats on this side to be able to put forth amendments that are going to make this bill better. If this career service employment bill was so great, if this reform was so great, why can it not be a standalone bill? Why can it not be a standalone bill without putting it in the Department of Defense? Please let us not have to put donkeys and elephants on the canteens on our military bases.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) has 21½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, we are not going to be debating star wars, the missile defense program, out here on the House floor.

Now I made a request to the Committee on Rules that they put in order an amendment which I wanted to make which said that the missile defense system cannot be deployed until it is proven to work. In other words, the old defense test that you have got to fly before you buy. And that applies to every other weapons system, but it is not going to apply to missile defense. They want to deploy it even before they have proven that it works.

Now the interesting thing is that it is kind of a fantastical concept, but the Missile Defense Agency has actually put together, I am not kidding you, a Missile Defense Agency coloring book which they pass out to schools so they can help kids to understand how this system, which they do not want to test before it flies, will work. They actually have crayons that go with it. I am not kidding you. But unfortunately it says ''Made in China'' on the crayons, which means we should color this part Red in the book for the Red Chinese that we are going to deploy the missile system to protect ourselves against.

Then you reach the next part of the little coloring book, Ronald Reagan, who we can color red, white and blue, a great patriot who really believed in this system. He always did. But unfortunately it has yet to be proven to work. So that is red, white and blue.

Next we have the ground-based midcourse defense. Unfortunately, the incoming missile has to yell ''yoo-hoo'' at the rest of the world so that it can be shot down by the Defense Department. So we can color that black.

Finally, we have the airborne laser in the cartoon which is supposed to be on a plane. But the plane is so weighted down that it cannot fly, so we can color that gold for gold-plated for the Defense Department.

None of this will be debated on the House floor, although they have taken the time to give us a missile defense coloring book so we can all play out here on the floor rather than debate the national defense of our country.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute 40 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding me time, and I would like to add my appreciation to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for his continued commitment to this process and the chairman of the committee for his continued commitment and the collaborative efforts that they have made together.

I would like to rise to cite that there are very important aspects of this bill, Mr. Chairman, that I support. It is noteworthy that Fort Hood in Texas sent more troops to the war in Iraq than they sent over the last couple of wars and particularly World War I, World War II. So we have a stake in the outcome of treatment of the United States military and the outcome of this war in Iraq.

So the first order of business would be to thank our troops for their service and to acknowledge as we go home this weekend that we will be honoring the dead and celebrating and mourning with their families for the great and ultimate sacrifice that they gave. That is why this bill is so important to be accurate and to be inclusive.

I would have hoped that the gentleman from Tennessee's (Mr. COOPER)

amendment could have been included. That was responsive to many concerns of many of my constituents.

I also believe it is important to note, as I believe General Franks was very clear in his words to some of us who visited him in Doha Qatar, that he understands Americans stand side by side in their support for the troops, but it is important that we now begin to focus in an inclusive way on the aftermath, peace in Iraq, and we have not done that. And there is not much, as I understand, in this legislation that deals with that question. So we have to focus on that, how the military and Ambassador Bremer work together.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I think it is extremely important that we focus on the question of making sure that there is transparency in the contracts for rebuilding Iraq, more opportunities for women-owned business, more opportunities for small businesses, more opportunity for minority businesses. It is extremely important.

I hope that we will have the opportunity to debate these amendments because I have small business persons in my office today wondering why they have not been exposed to the opportunities of helping America, helping our troops and helping to rebuild Iraq by the American people. Let us open the doors of opportunity. Let everybody work for the betterment of this nation.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, aloha. I delighted to see you today.

Mr. Chairman, as the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Force, I have the distinct pleasure of working with my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON). I do not believe I see him on the floor at the moment. I see other good friends from the committee.

I wanted to express my personal appreciation to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON). His impressive familiarity with the details of the numerous programs under our subcommittee purview is one of the major reasons we are considering a defense authorization that correctly addresses the hardware needs of the military.

Our subcommittee held many in-depth, rigorous oversight hearings on a variety of programs, and I think our adherence to a sound process in this arena has served our committee, the Congress, and the Department of Defense very well.

While we dealt with significant programs in all services, this bill explicitly recognizes the importance of a strong Army. The Army has had an uphill fight inside the Pentagon the last few years, and I think the recent war showed how capable they really are.

I am especially pleased that our bill does no harm to the future Stryker Brigades and that the committee was able to come to an agreement about fencing off funding for the remaining brigades. We have struck a blow in a couple of cases for better program management. I am glad to see that the F–22 cut its cost. We fenced further money until its software works the way as it is promised.

The Army's future combat system may be a good thing. It is hard to tell because its budget structure makes it hard to evaluate. We changed that structure so that everybody can see whether the future combat system will work.

We are working on some very advanced systems in all the services. I believe we have struck the right balance between future forces and our legacy systems. In funding modernization of our heavy forces, this bill ensures that we do not sacrifice the real combat capability today for the promise of capability in the future.

I would like to conclude and I would be remiss, Mr. Chairman, if I did not acknowledge the hard work and long hours put in by our committee staff on all levels.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to close by again thanking the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and all the members of the various subcommittee with whom I have had the pleasure of working on this bill.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY), a valued member of our Committee on Armed Services.

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT), for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1588, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill as well.

I represent Columbus, Georgia, and Fort Benning, the home of the infantry as well as NAS Atlanta and Dobbins Air Reserve Base in my home, Marietta, Georgia, of Cobb County.

Mr. Chairman, as a first-term member of the House Committee on Armed Services, I am extremely proud of this legislation for many reasons; and I sincerely thank the chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the ranking member, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), and all the subcommittee chairmen, especially my subcommittee chairmen, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH), the ranking members, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER) for the manner in which they have led our committee and for producing a bill that accomplishes so many important goals.

As all Americans have seen over recent months, the American military today faces many different challenges, from urban warfare to more traditional air and ground combat to special operations missions and battles with irregular forces. Our brave men and women in uniform have met all kind of threats. They are committed to protecting our American homeland and to fostering democracy and liberty around the world. Today, Congress matches this commitment with the passage of H.R. 1588.

Mr. Chairman, this bill increases the combat capabilities of our Armed Forces with appropriate levels of spending for readiness, procurement and research and development. It funds programs such as the M–1 Abrams tank and the Bradley fighting vehicles that are used in current conflicts and transforms our military to meet the threats of tomorrow with futuristic systems like the Air Force's F/A–22 Raptor.

The bill provides funding to make our homeland safe as well by combatting terrorism at home and abroad and continuing to develop the ballistic missile defense system.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 1588 because it contains a number of benefits for our extremely valuable and often overlooked service members. This bill provides a 4.1 percent pay raise across the services and funds important military family housing priorities. It also improves the TRICARE system, the survivor benefit program, and has several provisions to improve the quality of life for members of National Guard and Reserves.

Mr. Chairman, we must remember that we owe all of our freedoms and safety to our brave men and women in uniform; and I am proud that many of them are with us today in the gallery. I am glad that Congress can help them in a small way with the passage of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of them to support this very important legislation.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would remind Members not to reference occupants of the gallery.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me time and his courtesy in allowing me to speak on this important issue.

I think we are all impressed with the gravity of the myriad of issues that deal with national defense and security. Mr. Chairman, there are a number of things that I would speak on, but there is one in particular that concerns me. I had an opportunity to hear, Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee reference some of the rationale for short-circuiting the environmental protections that we have come to rely on that deal with our Department of Defense and under this bill would actually be extended to other armies of the Federal Government.

There was reference made to Camp Pendleton. You saw the map and then

you saw overlays that made it appear as though 57 percent of 125,000 acres were unavailable for training activities.

Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, we ought to, I know there is no time to debate it, there is no time to fully be engaged in amendments that would allow the give and take that this body and the American public and the military deserve, but let me just suggest that between now and when we finally deal with the passage of this legislation, maybe we can clear up this one little item.

I have here a map that shows, according to information from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the U.S. Marine Corps itself, how much has been set aside for critical habit. It is 840 acres, and I have them outlined here. According to, again, the judge in place here in Fish and Wildlife, it would not interfere with amphibious landings, 840 acres, not 57 percent, when you went through and you used the process with Fish and Wildlife, with the Department of Defense, with the Marine Corps, which actually happened.

Now, I find, Mr. Chairman, that using short-circuited activity like this, exaggerating the problems, is not helping us at all.

The real threats to military readiness are here on this map; and they are encroachment from Oceanside, from Vista, from Fallbrook, from San Clemente. Does this bill have anything in it that deals with military encroachment like recently-passed legislation in the California legislature? No, it is silent. It just wants to gut environmental protections. We have a nuclear power plant that is located right here, Interstate 5, and we have areas that are a popular California State Park.

□ 1545

These are issues that affect military readiness. This bill ignores them. It would just simply gut environmental protection.

My experience, Mr. Chairman, is that when we give our fighting men and women the right resources and the right orders, they can accomplish anything. And we should be directing that they protect the environment, they clean up after themselves, and they solve problems, not eliminating simple commonsense environmental protections that, after all, not only protect everybody in this area, but they ultimately protect the fighting men and women, their families, and the overall Earth that we inhabit.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the amount of time remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) has 10 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) has 12¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Total Force.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, my colleague on the Committee on Armed Services, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman this is the 11th year in which I have had the great honor of serving on this very august, very important committee. And as happens every year, we obviously come to the floor with some disagreements, some perhaps that cause a great deal of controversy and a great deal of conflict amongst the various Members. But one thing that has been most heartening to me with respect to this committee has been the strong commitment on both sides of the aisle, both when my friends on the Democrat side were in the majority and now when the Republicans are in the majority, shared by both parties, and that is our interest, our primary commitment to the good, the welfare of the individuals throughout the various branches of the United States military, who, as has been seen so directly, particularly in recent months and years, fought the hard fight of freedom wherever the challenges arose.

As someone who has had the distinct honor now for 3 years to serve first as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Personnel and now the Subcommittee on Total Force, I can say without equivocation that this bill is not just a good bill; it is absolutely essential to the continued welfare, to the continued interest of those brave men and women in uniform who wear the patch of the United States military. Because this is a bill that not only addresses the emerging lessons learned from the global war on terrorism and with the war in Iraq, but also it reflects the longstanding committee concerns about the inadequacy of military manpower and the damaging effect of excessive operations, both personnel and operations tempo.

This bill reflects not just the Committee on Armed Services' belief in the need to be proactive in military personnel and policy matters, but also, I think, the belief of the entire United States population; and it acts to sustain the commitment and the professionalism of the men and women of America's magnificent all-volunteer armed services and, equally important, the families that support them and all of us.

I would also say, Mr. Chairman, this bill contains legislative and funding initiatives that enhance the ability of the National Guard and Reserves to play their important role, to continue their integration as a vital irreplaceable part of the new total force that is the United States military.

I would like to, Mr. Chairman, just highlight a couple of the initiatives that are contained in this legislation, many of which have been referenced by my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that are contained in the total force portion of this very important legislation.

Active end strength increases of 6,240 above the requested levels, with the $291 million necessary to support those increases.

We provide for growth in reserve component full-time support strength.

Military pay raises that average 4.1 percent, continuing this Congress's, this government's commitment and recognition of the understanding that we need to do better by these brave men and women in terms of what we pay them.

Reserve component pay and personnel policy enhancements that respond to the needs of the National Guard and Reserve personnel training in that total force.

Continuation of war-time pays that were approved in fiscal year 2003 for members engaged in both Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom.

We have taken steps to open up the access to the commissaries and exchange benefits to better define and protect those important benefits and to also make them available on a more regular basis to reserve component members, those in vital portions of the total force concept.

And we have provided a menu of health care improvements for the entire Department of Defense.

This is a vitally important bill at one of the most critical junctures in our Nation's history. And I should say, Mr. Chairman, in closing, that none of these great outcomes is achieved in a vacuum. I want to pay particular words of appreciation to the ranking member on the subcommittee which I have the honor of chairing, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER), who has done just a great job in both leading and providing invaluable support and insight into our activities, and to all of the committee's staff on both sides of the aisle for their absolutely unwavering commitment to this initiative.

This bill, at the end of the day, in spite of our disagreements as they may exist, needs to be supported. We need to continue our commitment to our great men and women in uniform who are protecting our freedoms each and every day.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I also want to agree with all of those who have extolled many of the virtues of this legislation; who have talked about the need for it to be efficient and effective; who have talked about making sure that we protect all of our military personnel and be in a position to protect our citizens.

But I must confess that I do not believe in throwing out the baby with the bath water. When we talk about getting rid of the personnel system, when we talk about taking away the rights of workers to unionize, when we talk about taking away the rights of individuals to appeal, when we talk about individuals not having the right to discuss their grievances, then I think that

is going a bit far. I agree there is a tremendous need for flexibility, and I believe that there ought to be those moved out of civilian positions who are part of the military; but I do not believe that all of the years of developing workers' rights ought to be taken away in one fell swoop.

Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, I do not even understand why those provisions are in the legislation. They simply are not needed, they are of no value, and I disagree with that part of it. If we cannot guarantee the rights of people who work, then what are we fighting for when we talk about protecting the rights of all the rest? I disagree with that portion of the legislation.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, our friends on the other side of the aisle continue to tell horror stories of what this bill, if enacted, would do with respect to civil service and the employees in the Department of Defense. I think we all know that we honor our employees at the Department of Defense. Just like the men and women in uniform who gave us the success in Iraq and in Afghanistan, they too make the difference in our success. They give us the tools, the weapons, the technology, the expertise that allow us to be successful on the battlefield and to have a strong national defense.

Certainly, if the horrors our friends on the other side of the aisle were true, then we should vote this bill down. They say the horrors are that this will result in political patronage; that civil rights will be taken away; that there will be no rights for collective bargaining. Surely if those things were the outcome of this bill, I would vote against it myself. So one would expect that our friends on the other side of the aisle voted against it too. But they did not. In fact, the gentleman from Florida, who told us of the horrors of the possibilities of political patronage, voted for this bill. The gentleman from Tennessee, who spoke about there being no civil rights or collective bargaining for employees of the Department of Defense, voted for this bill.

This bill comes to this floor out of the Committee on Armed Services with bipartisan support and a vote of 58 to two. The horrors they describe are not true. And instead of telling us the sections that would reference the truth about this bill, I thought it would be best to read from it. With respect to political patronage: ''The public employment principles of merit and fitness set forth in section 2301, including the principles of hiring based on merit, fair treatment without regard to political affiliation or other nonmerit considerations, equal pay for equal work, and protection of employees against reprisal for whistleblowing.'' Those are preserved and specifically set forth in the bill.

Then, with respect to collective bargaining, which again our friends on the other side of the aisle say do not exist if this bill passes, the bill specifically says: ''Ensure that employees may organize, bargain collectively as provided for in this chapter, and participate through labor organizations of their own choosing in decisions which affect them, subject to the provisions of this chapter.''

Clearly, the fact that this bill comes before us with bipartisan support, a vote of 58 to two out of the Committee on Armed Services, shows that the bipartisan support should carry through to passage of this bill; and that, truly, this system of increased flexibility would provide increased opportunity and actually honor our Department of Defense employees.

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

Shorty we will end the general debate on this all-important bill. And of course I wish first to thank the members of the committee on both sides of the aisle for tremendously hard work. A special thanks to that wonderful staff that we have for the efforts, the late hours they have put in. This could not have been done without them.

We have discussed in the last 2 hours the various problems that have crept into the bill. Hopefully, they will be debated at least on the second rule, which has not been made in order, so we can have a full and fair airing of those.

But on a larger notes than that, I would like to quote the great Roman orator, Mr. Chairman, who once said that ''gratitude is the greatest of all virtues.'' So in what we do today, in passing this bill, which is basically a very good and strong bill for the military of the United States, we are saying ''thank you.'' And we express our gratitude to them, to the men and women of all ranks, to the men and women of all branches, regardless of their specialty. They have done good. Back home in Missouri, the finest compliment you can give in the Ozarks-part of our State is, ''You done good.''

So to each one of the men and women, regardless of where they are, whether they be aboard ship, whether they be in a camp, whether they be in a plane, whether they are training or serving as a peacekeeper in one of those distant places, all of us, both sides of the aisle, should give them a special thanks and word of gratitude.

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

□ 1600

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY).

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

I want to speak to the amendment that is going to come up in just a moment, if I might. I appreciate the gentleman incorporating into that amendment an amendment I had that we could not do in committee because of a jurisdictional problem. It is an amendment to take care of two environmental relief points that the Department of Defense needs. I think they are well-thought out.

The amendment as it came to us in committee from the Committee on Resources broadened this. I want to narrow it back down to just deal with the Department of Defense. Here is what the two are:

In section 317 of H.R. 1588 last year, which amends the Endangered Species Act, it provides that the Secretary of Interior will not make future designations of critical habitat on military lands or threaten an endangered species where the installation has negotiated a mutually agreed upon, integrated natural resources management plan between the State Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Fish and Wildlife Service.

This is something that was in the bill last year, passed this House overwhelmingly on a bipartisan basis, passed the committee overwhelmingly on a bipartisan basis, and ran into some difficulty over in the Senate. We want to reenact this and narrow it down from what is actually in the bill. So the gentleman's en bloc amendment will do that, and it will be a tremendous help to the Department of Defense in their readiness activities when preparing to train as they prepare to fight wars.

The second aspect in the amendment is that the Department of Defense requested an adaptation of a new definition of harassment for the Marine Mammal Protection Act. Generally, you cannot take marine mammals. We are not out to kill marine mammals, but the term ''harassment'' has been interpreted in court cases in a ridiculous manner. This changes the definition of harassment so we do not have, if a sea lion is sleeping on a buoy and a Navy ship goes down the channel and the sea lion wakes up and looks at the boat, that can be defined as harassment under the present law.

What we are talking about making is major life changes. We do not want marine whales to beach themselves and that kind of thing, of course. This narrows that down.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment carefully defines the situation. It is a rifle shot dealing with the problems that the Department of Defense has. I think it will help tremendously in our preparation of our young men and women for fighting wars.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

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

I commend the chairman of this committee and the ranking member for their work in putting together this very important bill. As a strong supporter of the B–1 bomber program, I appreciate the committee's recognition

of the excellence of B–1 in combat and their importance in operations in the Korean Peninsula by directing the Air Force to restore the 23 aircraft set to be retired.

I hope it is the full intent of this committee that, should these 23 planes be restored to the fleet, that these bombers will be given adequate manpower and maintenance with additional funding to ensure that these costs will not come out of the operations and maintenance funds of the existing 60 bombers.

Mr. Chairman, I also commend the gentleman from California for his attention in this bill to the national defense needs of our Nation, and I also applaud his efforts to hold the Base Realignment and Closure round in 2005 accountable to our emerging national defense needs.

This bill stipulates that the required force structure for the armed services meet prescribed levels and that the Air Force would include in its force structure not less than 96 combat-coded bomber aircraft in active service. I hope it is the intent of this committee in this legislation that the 23 B–1s that would be restored to the fleet under this bill will be incorporated into the parameters of the Air Force bomber structure and taken into consideration for purposes of the base realignment process.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from California (Chairman HUNTER).

The gentleman will recall in this Chamber the very arduous series of debates that we had on what was then known as the Stealth bomber, now known as the B–2 bomber; and with the gentleman's leadership, some additional funds were put into this bill for additional research and development regarding a new wave of bombers. Would the gentleman be inclined to share that thought with us, please?

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

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) has been a champion of the idea of utilizing Stealth bombers and Stealth aircraft and coupling them with precision munitions and being able to give enormous leverage to American air power.

If we look at our array of deep-strike platforms, we have the 21 B–2s that are based in the gentleman's district, which are extremely valuable assets. We have a few, over 60 now, B–1 bombers, now that 23 are being retrieved or taken out of the force; and we are retrieving a number of those 23 bombers, bringing those back to the force. They worked very effectively in Iraq. And the balance of our 130 or so combat-coded bombers are made up of the old B–52s, the youngest one of which was built in July of 1962, so the newest B–52 is over 40 years old.

We need to strike out and to design and build a new deep-strike platform. So we put $100 million in this bill to commence pursuit of a new deep-strike platform, which may be manned or on the advice of some people may be unmanned. We could certainly have what I call the B–2 Chevy. That is the new variant of the B–2 that does not have some of the Cold War components but nonetheless would be excellent for conventional missions, and that would be somewhat less in terms of cost than the B–2s that were built for strategic delivery.

So it could be a manned system, it could be an unmanned system, but the point is we better start now because it is going to be years before we have new platforms for deep strike.

At the same time, we plussed up the purchases of precision munitions, those joint direct attack munitions that are used to eliminate the need for literally thousands of bombs, hundreds of bombs to one in terms of ratio where again, instead of carpet bombing a bridge to knock it out, you hit that one strut and bring that entire bridge down.

The gentleman is talking about our two most important systems, that is deep-strike platforms and precision munitions. When those two leveraged systems are coupled together, the United States has enormous capability, and I thank the gentleman for his efforts along these lines.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his full explanation and a special compliment on his foresight in helping insert these dollars for that additional research and development.

I remember the early days of the then Stealth, now B–2 bomber, when so many had such serious questions about it. And I might say, in three conflicts now, the B–2 bomber has spoken well for America. I thank the gentleman for his help and leadership in that area.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I thank the gentleman for his work; and if I could just mention, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) just spoke. One of his comments was to the effect that he knew that we were retrieving some of these B–1 bombers that the Air Force decided last year to shelve, and he hoped that the cost of maintaining those bombers would not be drawn from the spare parts accounts of the 60 or so bombers that we have right now.

Let me just say in response to the gentleman, who is a great friend of mine, the intent of the committee is to try to get a high mission-capable rate with our entire bomber force, all of the B–1s, and that means spending what it takes to keep those birds in the air, to give them the ability to deliver their platforms with deep ranges, with good protection to the crew. So we want to see higher maintenance dollars expended on that entire force because it is such an important leverage force.

We saw the B–1s being extremely flexible in its pursuit of targets in the Iraq theater. That was appreciated by the committee. I did not get a chance to respond to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), but I want to assure him that we are going to try to make sure that entire bomber force has a high mission-capable rate, both B–2s that the gentleman is so proud of, and home bases in his district, B–1s, and of course those ancient B–52s.

I know the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) talked about looking out his prison window in Hanoi in 1972 during Operation Linebacker and watching a B–52 explode in midair as it was hit by a Sand missile. Those planes were shot down over 40 years ago, and by the aircraft, anti-aircraft and Sand capability being delivered to North Vietnam by Russia. That means that we need to move along and develop this new technology as quickly as possible and get new birds in the air as quickly as possible. I know the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) and I share that goal.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and it appears in this bill regarding the additional research and development funding for future system or systems of advanced Stealth techniques, I think it is certainly on the right track.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to congratulate Chairman HUNTER and the Armed Services Committee on their work on the Defense authorization. This authorization better prepares the United States to face the new threats to our world.

I am pleased the committee has recognized that after playing a dominant role in Operation Iraqi Freedom, the Abrams battle tank proved that it will continue to play a central role in the defense of our Nation in the years to come. With the 129 Abrams System Enhancement Program upgrades the committee has provided for, the armored cavalry regiment, the ''eyes and ears'' of the Army's Counter Attack Corps, will join the 4th Infantry Division as the most advanced in the world.

As the Army begins transforming itself for future combat situations, heavy armor will continue to play an important role. We should take the lessons we learned in Iraq, and use those in the future. As the centerpiece of the Operation, the Abrams not only proved it's mettle in the desert, it also dominated in urban areas. The tank provided cover for infantrymen and offered precision fire helicopters and planes were not able to. Acting as a battering ram, the Abrams is the safest vehicle in our arsenal, not having suffered one combat-related casualty.

Whether it be the Sherman tank in World War II or the Abrams in the gulf war and Operation Iraqi Freedom, tanks have been critical to military success. The Abrams tank has proven that the tank will continue to play a prominent role in the defense of America well into the 21st century.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, traditionally, the Defense Authorization Act has been a bipartisan bill. Unfortunately, this year the majority has added highly controversial provisions to the bill regarding civil services law, contracting, environmental exemptions, and nuclear weapons policy.

As we all know, there has been significant controversy over the process of awarding contracts in Iraq, I would like to highlight one provision in the Defense authorization bill that adds much needed sunshine to the Iraq rebuilding effort (section 1456). I thank the Government Reform and Armed Services Committee members for including this section.

In a markup of H.R. 1837, the Services Acquisition Reform Act of 2003, I offered this public disclosure language in the form of an amendment. It was unanimously accepted by the House Government Reform Committee. H.R. 1837 was referred to House Armed Services and included in H.R. 1588, the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2004.

In the House Armed Services Committee, the Iraqi sunshine amendment was also offered by Mr. SNYDER of Arkansas. I thank Mr. SNYDER for his hard work. The amendment was accepted and included in an en bloc amendment to H.R. 1588. The amendment, now section 1456, will ensure that agencies entering into a contract for the repair, maintenance, or construction of the infrastructure in Iraq without full and open competition, publish details regarding the contract.

This section is very simple. It merely requires the government to publish details regarding these noncompetitive contractors.

It has been said that sunshine is the best disinfectant. The public has a right to know how billions of dollars will be spent in Iraq. As the people's Representatives, we have a duty and responsibility to ensure that funding Congress has appropriated for the Iraqi reconstruction is spent in a fair and open manner. Given the recent controversy, the least we could do is ensure that there is full disclose to the American people.

In recent weeks, we have seen several press reports that United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and other Federal agencies have been awarding no-bid or invitation-only contracts to firms for the rebuilding of Iraq.

For instance, one firm secured a $2 million Iraq school contract through an invitation-only process. USAID awarded an invitation-only contract for $680 million to rebuild Iraq's infrasture. A $50 million policing contract was awarded through a closed bidding process and so on.

I acknowledge that in some instances, noncompetitive contract will be awarded. USAID and others have argued that because of the need to move quickly, they chose to use noncompetitive procedure. The law clearly allows for these procedures. However, if a noncompetitive process is used, the American people have a right to know that it is being used and why it is being used. Section 1456 requires the Federal agencies to make these details public.

Section 1456 mirrors legislation offered in the Senate by Senators WYDEN, COLLINS, and CLINTON, S. 876, the ''Sunshine in Iraq Reconstruction Contracting Act of 2003.'' S. 876 is a bipartisan bill that sets out requirements for the government to publicly justify any closed bidding process used for Iraqi reconstruction work.

I thank Chairman DAVIS, Ranking Member WAXMAN, Chairman HUNTER, and Ranking Member SKELTON, and members of the Government Reform and Armed Services Committees, for their support of this straightforward, good-government provision.

I wholeheartedly support its inclusion in H.R. 1588.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman, the ranking member and both Republican and Democratic members of the Armed Service Subcommittee on Total Force and the full committee for unanimously supporting an amendment to increase the number of military academy appointments from American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands to the U.S. Military Academy, the U.S. Naval Academy, and the U.S. Air Force Academy.

For my constituents, this means that American Samoa will be able to send two students to each service academy. Given that American Samoa has a population of over 57,000 people, a per capita income of less than $4,500 and almost 5,000 men and women serving in the U.S. armed services, I am pleased that we may be able to offer more students the opportunity to attend one of the our Nation's prestigious military academies.

Like other States and Territories, American Samoa has a long and proud tradition of supporting and defending the United States of America. In 1900, the traditional leaders of American Samoa ceded the island of Tutuila to the United States.

Tutuila's harbor is the deepest in the South Pacific and the port village of Pago Pago was used as a coaling station for U.S. naval ships in the early part of the century and as a support base for U.S. soldiers during WWII. To this day, American Samoa serves as a refueling point for U.S. naval ships and military aircraft.

American Samoa also has a per capital enlistment rate in the U.S. military which is as high as any State or U.S. Territory. Our sons and daughters have served in record numbers in every U.S. military engagement from WWII to present operations in our war against terrorists. We have stood by the United States in good times and bad and I believe it is only appropriate that this relationship should be acknowledged by increasing our number of military academy appointments.

Again, I want to thank Chairman JOHN MCHUGH and Ranking Member VIC SNYDER of the Subcommittee on Total Force for supporting my request to increase the number of military academy appointments for American Samoa. I also want to thank my good friends, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, Congressman DUNCAN HUNTER, and Ranking Member IKE SKELTON, for their support.

On a personal note and as a Vietnam Veteran, I also want to thank the sons and daughters of this great Nation who are currently serving in the U.S. Armed Forces. As we consider the National Defense Authorization for Fiscal Year 2004, I am hopeful that we will remember the sacrifices they are making to protect our liberties and in so remembering I urge my colleagues to support this reauthorization.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to object to the sweeping, permanent exemptions from environmental laws at military bases included in this Defense authorization bill.

This set of provisions, the so-called ''Range and Readiness Preservation Initiative,'' would change critical provisions of the Clean Air Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, and the Endangered Species Act. These changes would remove Federal and State authority to require the Department of Defense to clean up its thousands of contaminated sites nationwide.

I am a staunch supporter of a strong military and a strong national defense. Yet the changes that have been included in this bill go well beyond any consideration of military preparedness, are overboard, and are ill-advised.

Environmental laws already include provisions for exemptions in the event of a national security issue. The proposals are rendered even more questionable by the fact that the Defense Department has not yet found a compelling case to plead for such an exemption. EPA Administrator Christine Todd Whitman has testified before Congress that compliance with environmental regulations has never impeded military readiness.

Furthermore, these blanket exemptions for the Department of Defense from environmental statutes are inappropriate. I have grave concerns regarding the adverse environmental impact of this initiative. This legislation would relax current requirements protecting wildlife habitats on military installations, as well as requirements to clean up contaminated sites and control air emissions. The Department of Defense is our nation's biggest polluter. I believe that, unless national security is directly affected, the Department of Defense should be required to comply with Federal environmental laws.

I call on my colleagues to strike these provisions.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BEREUTER). 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. 1588

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 2004''.

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 defined.

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—Army Programs

Sec. 111. Stryker vehicle program.

Subtitle C—Navy Programs

Sec. 121. Multiyear procurement authority for F/A–18 aircraft program.
Sec. 122. Multiyear procurement authority for Tactical Tomahawk cruise missile program.
Sec. 123. Multiyear procurement authority for Virginia class submarine program.
Sec. 124. Multiyear procurement authority for E–2C aircraft program.
Sec. 125. LPD–17 class vessel.

Subtitle D—Air Force Programs

Sec. 131. Air Force air refueling transfer account.
Sec. 132. Increase in number of aircraft authorized to be procured under multiyear procurement authority for Air Force C–130J aircraft program.
Sec. 133. Limitation on retiring C–5 aircraft.
Sec. 134. Limitation on obligation of funds for procurement of F/A–22 aircraft.

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. Collaborative program for development of electromagnetic gun technology.
Sec. 212. Authority to select civilian employee of Department of Defense as director of Department of Defense Test Resource Management Center.
Sec. 213. Development of the Joint Tactical Radio System.
Sec. 214. Future Combat Systems.
Sec. 215. Army program to pursue technologies leading to the enhanced production of titanium by the United States.
Sec. 216. Extension of reporting requirement for RAH–66 Comanche aircraft program.
Sec. 217. Studies of fleet platform architectures for the Navy.

Subtitle C—Ballistic Missile Defense

Sec. 221. Enhanced flexibility for ballistic missile defense systems.

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.

Subtitle B—Environmental Provisions

Sec. 311. Reauthorization and modification of title I of Sikes Act.
Sec. 312. Authorization for defense participation in wetland mitigation banks.
Sec. 313. Inclusion of environmental response equipment and services in Navy definitions of salvage facilities and salvage services.
Sec. 314. Clarification of Department of Defense response to environmental emergencies.
Sec. 315. Requirements for restoration advisory boards and exemption from Federal Advisory Committee Act.
Sec. 316. Report regarding impact of civilian community encroachment and certain legal requirements on military installations and ranges.
Sec. 317. Military readiness and conservation of protected species.
Sec. 318. Military readiness and marine mammal protection.
Sec. 319. Limitation on Department of Defense responsibility for civilian water consumption impacts related to Fort Huachuca, Arizona.
Sec. 320. Construction of wetland crossings, Camp Shelby Combined Arms Maneuver Area, Camp Shelby, Mississippi.

Subtitle C—Workplace and Depot Issues

Sec. 321. Exclusion of certain expenditures from percentage limitation on contracting for performance of depot-level maintenance and repair workloads.
Sec. 322. High-performing organization business process reengineering pilot program.
Sec. 323. Delayed implementation of revised Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76 by Department of Defense pending report.
Sec. 324. Naval Aviation Depots multi-trades demonstration project.

Subtitle D—Information Technology

Sec. 331. Performance-based and results-based management requirements for Chief Information Officers of Department of Defense.

Subtitle E—Other Matters

Sec. 341. Cataloging and standardization for defense supply management.
Sec. 342. Space-available transportation for dependents of members assigned to overseas duty locations for continuous period in excess of one year.
Sec. 343. Preservation of Air Force Reserve weather reconnaissance mission.

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.

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 2004 limitation on non-dual status technicians.
Sec. 415. Permanent limitations 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. Standardization of qualifications for appointment as service chief.

Subtitle B—Other Officer Personnel Policy Matters

Sec. 511. Repeal of prohibition on transfer between line of the Navy and Navy staff corps applicable to regular Navy officers in grades above lieutenant commander.
Sec. 512. Retention of health professions officers to fulfill active-duty service commitments following promotion nonselection.
Sec. 513. Increased flexibility for voluntary retirement for military officers.

Subtitle C—Reserve Component Matters

Sec. 521. Streamlined process for continuation of officers on the reserve active-status list.
Sec. 522. Consideration of reserve officers for position vacancy promotions in time of war or national emergency.
Sec. 523. Simplification of determination of annual participation for purposes of Ready Reserve training requirements.
Sec. 524. Authority for delegation of required secretarial special finding for placement of certain retired members in Ready Reserve.
Sec. 525. Authority to provide expenses of Army and Air Staff personnel and National Guard Bureau personnel attending national conventions of certain military associations.

Subtitle D—Military Education and Training

Sec. 531. Authority for the Marine Corps University to award the degree of master of operational studies.
Sec. 532. Expanded educational assistance authority for cadets and midshipmen receiving ROTC scholarships.
Sec. 533. Increase in allocation of scholarships under Army Reserve ROTC scholarship program to students at military junior colleges.
Sec. 534. Inclusion of accrued interest in amounts that may be repaid under Selected Reserve critical specialties education loan repayment program.
Sec. 535. Authority for nonscholarship senior ROTC sophomores to voluntarily contract for and receive subsistence allowance.
Sec. 536. Appointments to military service academies from nominations made by delegates from Guam, Virgin Islands, and American Samoa.
Sec. 537. Readmission to service academies of certain former cadets and midshipmen.
Sec. 538. Authorization for Naval Postgraduate School to provide instruction to enlisted members participating in certain programs.
Sec. 539. Defense task force on sexual harassment and violence at the military service academies.

Subtitle E—Administrative Matters

Sec. 541. Enhancements to high-tempo personnel program.
Sec. 542. Enhanced retention of accumulated leave for high-deployment members.
Sec. 543. Standardization of time-in-service requirements for voluntary retirement of members of the Navy and Marine Corps with Army and Air Force requirements.
Sec. 544. Standardization of statutory authorities for exemptions from requirement for access to secondary schools by military recruiters.
Sec. 545. Procedures for consideration of applications for award of the Purple Heart medal to veterans held as prisoners of war before April 25, 1962.
Sec. 546. Authority for reserve and retired regular officers to hold State and local elective office notwithstanding call to active duty.
Sec. 547. Clarification of offense under the Uniform Code of Military Justice relating to drunken or reckless operation of a vehicle, aircraft, or vessel.
Sec. 548. Public identification of casualties no sooner than 24 hours after notification of next-of-kin.

Subtitle F—Benefits

Sec. 551. Additional classes of individuals eligible to participate in the Federal long-term care insurance program.
Sec. 552. Authority to transport remains of retirees and retiree dependents who die in military treatment facilities outside the United States.

Sec. 553. Eligibility for dependents of certain mobilized reservists stationed overseas to attend defense dependents schools overseas.

Subtitle G—Other Matters

Sec. 561. Extension of requirement for exemplary conduct by commanding officers and others in authority to include civilians in authority in the Department of Defense.
Sec. 562. Recognition of military families.
Sec. 563. Assistance to local educational agencies that benefit dependents of members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense civilian employees.
Sec. 564. Permanent authority for support for certain chaplain-led military family support programs.
Sec. 565. Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Joint Executive Committee.
Sec. 566. Limitation on aviation force structure changes in the Department of the Navy.
Sec. 567. Impact-aid eligibility for heavily impacted local educational agencies affected by privitization of military housing.
Sec. 568. Investigation into the 1991 death of Marine Corps Colonel James E. Sabow.

Subtitle H—Domestic Violence

Sec. 571. Travel and transportation for dependents relocating for reasons of personal safety.
Sec. 572. Commencement and duration of payment of transitional compensation.
Sec. 573. Flexibility in eligibility for transitional compensation.
Sec. 574. Types of administrative separations triggering coverage.
Sec. 575. On-going review group.
Sec. 576. Resources for Department of Defense implementation organization.
Sec. 577. Fatality reviews.
Sec. 578. Sense of Congress.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances

Sec. 601. Increase in basic pay for fiscal year 2004.
Sec. 602. Computation of basic pay rate for commissioned officers with prior enlisted or warrant officer service.
Sec. 603. Special subsistence allowance authorities for members assigned to high-cost duty location or under other unique and unusual circumstances.

Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays

Sec. 611. One-year extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for reserve forces.
Sec. 612. One-year extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for certain health care professionals.
Sec. 613. One-year extension of special pay and bonus authorities for nuclear officers.
Sec. 614. One-year extension of other bonus and special pay authorities.
Sec. 615. Computation of hazardous duty incentive pay for demolition duty and parachute jumping by members of reserve components entitled to compensation under section 206 of title 37.
Sec. 616. Availability of hostile fire and imminent danger pay for reserve component members on inactive duty.
Sec. 617. Expansion of overseas tour extension incentive program to officers.
Sec. 618. Eligibility of appointed warrant officers for accession bonus for new officers in critical skills.
Sec. 619. Incentive pay for duty on ground in Antarctica or on Arctic icepack.
Sec. 620. Special pay for service as member of Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Team.
Sec. 621. Incentive bonus for agreement to serve in critically short military occupational specialty.
Sec. 622. Increase in rate for imminent danger pay and family separation allowance related to service in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom.

Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowances

Sec. 631. Shipment of privately owned motor vehicle within continental United States.
Sec. 632. Payment or reimbursement of student baggage storage costs for dependent children of members stationed overseas.
Sec. 633. Reimbursement for lodging expenses of certain reserve component and retired members during authorized leave from temporary duty location.

Subtitle D—Retired Pay and Survivors Benefits

Sec. 641. Funding for special compensation authorities for Department of Defense retirees.

Subtitle E—Commissary and Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentality Benefits

Sec. 651. Expanded commissary access for Selected Reserve members, reserve retirees under age 60, and their dependents.
Sec. 652. Defense commissary system and exchange stores system.
Sec. 653. Limitations on private operation of defense commissary store functions.
Sec. 654. Use of appropriated funds to operate defense commissary system.
Sec. 655. Recovery of nonappropriated fund instrumentality and commissary store investments in real property at military installations closed or realigned.
Sec. 656. Commissary shelf-stocking pilot program.

Subtitle F—Other Matters

Sec. 661. Repeal of congressional notification requirement for designation of critical military skills for retention bonus.

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS

Sec. 701. Revision of Department of Defense medicare-eligible retiree health care fund to permit more accurate actuarial valuations.
Sec. 702. Transfer of certain members from pharmacy and therapeutics committee to Uniform Formulary Beneficiary Advisory Panel under the pharmacy benefits program.
Sec. 703. Permanent extension of authority to enter into personal services contracts for the performance of health care responsibilities at locations other than military medical treatment facilities.
Sec. 704. Plan for providing health coverage information to members, former members, and dependents eligible for certain health benefits.
Sec. 705. Working group on military health care for persons reliant on health care facilities at military installations to be closed or realigned.
Sec. 706. Acceleration of implementation of chiropractic health care for members on active duty.
Sec. 707. Medical and dental screening for members of selected reserve units alerted for mobilization.

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

Subtitle A—Amendments to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations

Sec. 801. Extension of authority to carry out certain prototype projects.
Sec. 802. Elimination of certain subcontract notification requirements.
Sec. 803. Elimination of requirement to furnish written assurances of technical data conformity.
Sec. 804. Limitation period for task and delivery order contracts.
Sec. 805. Additional authorities relating to obtaining personal services.
Sec. 806. Evaluation of prompt payment provisions.

Subtitle B—United States Defense Industrial Base Provisions

Part I—Critical Items Identification and Domestic Production Capabilities Improvement Program

Sec. 811. Assessment of United States defense industrial base capabilities.
Sec. 812. Identification of critical items: military system breakout list.
Sec. 813. Procurement of certain critical items from American sources.
Sec. 814. Production capabilities improvement for certain critical items using Defense Industrial Base Capabilities Fund.

Part II—Requirements Relating to Specific Items

Sec. 821. Domestic source limitation for certain additional items.
Sec. 822. Requirements relating to buying commercial items containing specialty metals from American sources.
Sec. 823. Elimination of unreliable sources of defense items and components.
Sec. 824. Congressional notification required before exercising exception to requirement to buy specialty metals from American sources.
Sec. 825. Repeal of authority for foreign procurement of para-aramid fibers and yarns.
Sec. 826. Requirement for major defense acquisition programs to use machine tools entirely produced within the United States.

Part III—General Provisions

Sec. 831. Definitions.

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. Redesignation of National Imagery and Mapping Agency as National Geospatial-intelligence Agency.
Sec. 903. Pilot program for provision of space surveillance network services to non-United States governmental entities.
Sec. 904. Clarification of responsibility of military departments to support combatant commands.
Sec. 905. Biennial review of national military strategy by Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.
Sec. 906. Authority for acceptance by Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies of gifts and donations from nonforeign sources.
Sec. 907. Repeal of rotating chairmanship of Economic Adjustment Committee.
Sec. 908. Pilot program for improved civilian personnel management.

Sec. 909. Extension of certain authorities applicable to the Pentagon Reservation to include designated Pentagon continuity-of-government locations.
Sec. 910. Defense acquisition workforce reductions.
Sec. 911. Required force structure.

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Financial Matters

Sec. 1001. Transfer authority.
Sec. 1002. Authorization of supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2003.
Sec. 1003. Authority to transfer procurement funds for a major defense acquisition program for continued development work on that program.
Sec. 1004. Restoration of authority to enter into 12-month leases at any time during the fiscal year.
Sec. 1005. Authority for retention of additional amounts realized from energy cost savings.
Sec. 1006. Repeal of requirement for two-year budget cycle for the Department of Defense.
Sec. 1007. Authority to provide reimbursement for use of personal cellular telephones when used for official government business.

Subtitle B—Naval Vessels and Shipyards

Sec. 1011. Repeal of requirement regarding preservation of surge capability for naval surface combatants.
Sec. 1012. Enhancement of authority relating to use for experimental purposes of vessels stricken from Naval Vessel Register.
Sec. 1013. Authorization for transfer of vessels stricken from Naval Vessel Register for use as artificial reefs.
Sec. 1014. Pilot program for sealift ship construction.

Subtitle C—Reports

Sec. 1021. Repeal and modification of various reporting requirements applicable to the Department of Defense.
Sec. 1022. Report on Operation Iraqi Freedom.
Sec. 1023. Report on Department of Defense post-conflict activities in Iraq.
Sec. 1024. Report on development of mechanisms to better connect Department of Defense space capabilities to the war fighter.

Subtitle D—Procurement of Defense Biomedical Countermeasures

Sec. 1031. Research and development of defense biomedical countermeasures.
Sec. 1032. Procurement of defense biomedical countermeasures.
Sec. 1033. Authorization for use of medical products in emergencies.

Subtitle E—Other Matters

Sec. 1041. Codification and revision of defense counterintelligence polygraph program authority.
Sec. 1042. Codification and revision of limitation on modification of major items of equipment scheduled for retirement or disposal.
Sec. 1043. Additional definitions for purposes of title 10, United States Code.
Sec. 1044. Inclusion of annual military construction authorization request in annual defense authorization request.
Sec. 1045. Technical and clerical amendments.
Sec. 1046. Authority to provide living quarters for certain students in cooperative and summer education programs of the National Security Agency.
Sec. 1047. Use of drug interdiction and counterdrug funds to support activities of the Government of Colombia.
Sec. 1048. Authority for joint task forces to provide support to law enforcement agencies conducting counter-terrorism activities.
Sec. 1049. Use of National Driver Register for personnel security investigations and determinations.
Sec. 1050. Protection of operational files of the National Security Agency.
Sec. 1051. Assistance for study of feasibility of biennial international air trade show in the United States and for initial implementation.
Sec. 1052. Continuation of reasonable access to military installations for personal commercial solicitation.
Sec. 1053. Commission on Nuclear Strategy of the United States.
Sec. 1054. Extension of Counterproliferation Program Review Committee.

TITLE XI—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

Subtitle A—Department of Defense Civilian Personnel Generally

Sec. 1101. Modification of the overtime pay cap.
Sec. 1102. Military leave for mobilized Federal civilian employees.
Sec. 1103. Common occupational and health standards for differential payments as a consequence of exposure to asbestos.
Sec. 1104. Increase in annual student loan repayment authority.
Sec. 1105. Authorization for cabinet secretaries, secretaries of military departments, and heads of executive agencies to be paid on a biweekly basis.
Sec. 1106. Senior executive service and performance.
Sec. 1107. Design elements of pay-for-performance systems in demonstration projects.
Sec. 1108. Federal flexible benefits plan administrative costs.
Sec. 1109. Clarification to Hatch Act; limitation on disclosure of certain records.
Sec. 1110. Employee surveys.

Subtitle B—Department of Defense National Security Personnel System

Sec. 1111. Department of Defense national security personnel system.

TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO OTHER NATIONS

Sec. 1201. Expansion of authority to provide administrative support and services and travel and subsistence expenses for certain foreign liaison officers.
Sec. 1202. Recognition of superior noncombat achievements or performance by members of friendly foreign forces and other foreign nationals.
Sec. 1203. Expansion of authority to waive charges for costs of attendance at George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies.
Sec. 1204. Identification of goods and technologies critical for military superiority.
Sec. 1205. Report on acquisition by Iraq of advanced weapons.
Sec. 1206. Authority for check cashing and currency exchange services to be provided to foreign military members participating in certain activities with United States forces.
Sec. 1207. Requirements for transfer to foreign countries of certain specified types of excess aircraft.
Sec. 1208. Limitation on number of United States military personnel in Colombia.

TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION

Sec. 1301. Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction programs and funds.
Sec. 1302. Funding allocations.
Sec. 1303. Limitation on use of funds until certain permits obtained.
Sec. 1304. Limitation on use of funds for biological research in the former Soviet Union.
Sec. 1305. Authority and funds for nonproliferation and disarmament.
Sec. 1306. Requirement for on-site managers.
Sec. 1307. Provisions relating to funding for chemical weapons destruction facility in Russia.

TITLE XIV—SERVICES ACQUISITION REFORM

Sec. 1401. Short title.
Sec. 1402. Executive agency defined.

Subtitle A—Acquisition Workforce and Training

Sec. 1411. Definition of acquisition.
Sec. 1412. Acquisition workforce training fund.
Sec. 1413. Acquisition workforce recruitment program.
Sec. 1414. Architectural and engineering acquisition workforce.

Subtitle B—Adaptation of Business Acquisition Practices

Part I—Adaptation of Business Management Practices

Sec. 1421. Chief Acquisition Officers.
Sec. 1422. Chief Acquisition Officers Council.
Sec. 1423. Statutory and regulatory review.

Part II—Other Acquisition Improvements

Sec. 1426. Extension of authority to carry out franchise fund programs.
Sec. 1427. Agency acquisition protests.
Sec. 1428. Improvements in contracting for architectural and engineering services.
Sec. 1429. Authorization of telecommuting for Federal contractors.

Subtitle C—Contract Incentives

Sec. 1431. Incentives for contract efficiency.

Subtitle D—Acquisitions of Commercial Items

Sec. 1441. Preference for performance-based contracting.
Sec. 1442. Authorization of additional commercial contract types.
Sec. 1443. Clarification of commercial services definition.
Sec. 1444. Designation of commercial business entities.

Subtitle E—Other Matters

Sec. 1451. Authority to enter into certain procurement-related transactions and to carry out certain prototype projects.
Sec. 1452. Authority to make inflation adjustments to simplified acquisition threshold.
Sec. 1453. Technical corrections related to duplicative amendments.
Sec. 1454. Prohibition on use of quotas.
Sec. 1455. Applicability of certain provisions to sole source contracts for goods and services treated as commercial items.
Sec. 1456. Public disclosure of noncompetitive contracting for the reconstruction of infrastructure in Iraq.

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 2002 projects.

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. Family housing.
Sec. 2403. Improvements to military family housing units.
Sec. 2404. Energy conservation projects.
Sec. 2405. 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 authorization of certain fiscal year 2001 project.
Sec. 2703. Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2000 projects.
Sec. 2704. Effective date.

TITLE XXVIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes

Sec. 2801. Increase in maximum amount of authorized annual emergency construction.
Sec. 2802. Authority to lease military family housing units in Italy.
Sec. 2803. Changes to alternative authority for acquisition and improvement of military housing.
Sec. 2804. Additional material for annual report on housing privatization program.
Sec. 2805. Authority to convey property at military installations closed or to be closed in exchange for military construction activities.
Sec. 2806. Congressional notification and reporting requirements and limitations regarding use of operation and maintenance funds for construction.
Sec. 2807. Increase in authorized maximum lease term for family housing and other facilities in certain foreign countries.

Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration

Sec. 2811. Real property transactions.

Subtitle C—Land Conveyances

Sec. 2821. Termination of lease and conveyance of Army Reserve facility, Conway, Arkansas.
Sec. 2822. Actions to quiet title, Fallin Waters Subdivision, Eglin Air Force Base, Florida.
Sec. 2823. Modification of land conveyance, Eglin Air Force Base, Florida.
Sec. 2824. Land conveyance, Fort Campbell, Kentucky and Tennessee.
Sec. 2825. Land conveyance, Army and Air Force Exchange Service Property, Dallas, Texas.
Sec. 2826. Land conveyance, Naval Reserve Center, Orange, Texas.

Subtitle D—Other Matters

Sec. 2841. Redesignation of Yuma Training Range Complex as Bob Stump Training Range Complex.
Sec. 2842. Modification of authority to conduct a round of realignments and closures of military installations in 2005.
Sec. 2843. Use of force-structure plan for the Armed Forces in preparation of selection criteria for base closure round.
Sec. 2844. Requirement for unanimous vote of Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission to recommend closure of military installations not recommended for closure by Secretary of Defense.

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.
Sec. 3105. Energy supply.

Subtitle B—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations

Sec. 3111. Modification of prohibition relating to low-yield nuclear weapons.
Sec. 3112. Termination of requirement for annual updates of long-term plan for nuclear weapons stockpile life extension program.
Sec. 3113. Extension to all DOE facilities of authority to prohibit dissemination of certain unclassified information.
Sec. 3114. Department of Energy project review groups not subject to Federal Advisory Committee Act by reason of inclusion of employees of Department of Energy management and operating contractors.
Sec. 3115. Availability of funds.
Sec. 3116. Limitation on obligation of funds for Nuclear Test Readiness program.
Sec. 3117. Requirement for on-site managers.

Subtitle C—Consolidation of National Security Provisions

Sec. 3121. Transfer and consolidation of recurring and general provisions on Department of Energy national security programs.

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. Revisions to objectives for receipts for fiscal year 2000 disposals.

TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

Sec. 3401. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

Subtitle A—General Provisions

Sec. 3501. Short title.
Sec. 3502. Definitions.

Subtitle B—Maritime Security Fleet

Sec. 3511. Establishment of Maritime Security Fleet.
Sec. 3512. Award of operating agreements.
Sec. 3513. Effectiveness of operating agreements.
Sec. 3514. Obligations and rights under operating agreements.
Sec. 3515. Payments.
Sec. 3516. National security requirements.
Sec. 3517. Regulatory relief.
Sec. 3518. Special rule regarding age of former participating fleet vessel.
Sec. 3519. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 3520. Amendment to Shipping Act, 1916.
Sec. 3521. Regulations.
Sec. 3522. Repeals and conforming amendments.
Sec. 3523. Effective dates.

Subtitle C—National Defense Tank Vessel Construction Assistance

Sec. 3531. National defense tank vessel construction program.
Sec. 3532. Application procedure.
Sec. 3533. Award of assistance.
Sec. 3534. Priority for title XI assistance.
Sec. 3535. Authorization of appropriations.

Subtitle D—Maritime Administration Authorization

Sec. 3541. Authorization of appropriations for Maritime Administration for fiscal year 2004.
Sec. 3542. Authority to convey vessel USS HOIST (ARS–40).

SEC. 3. CONGRESSIONAL DEFENSE COMMITTEES DEFINED.

For purposes of this Act, the term ''congressional defense committees'' means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

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 2004 for procurement for the Army as follows:

(1) For aircraft, $2,194,585,000.

(2) For missiles, $1,594,662,000.

(3) For weapons and tracked combat vehicles, $2,197,404,000.

(4) For ammunition, $1,428,966,000.

(5) For other procurement, $4,321,496,000.

SEC. 102. NAVY AND MARINE CORPS.

(a) NAVY.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2004 for procurement for the Navy as follows:

(1) For aircraft, $9,050,048,000.

(2) For weapons, including missiles and torpedoes, $2,529,821,000.

(3) For ammunition, $963,355,000.

(4) For shipbuilding and conversion, $11,472,384,000.

(5) For other procurement, $4,614,892,000.

(b) MARINE CORPS.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2004 for procurement for the Marine Corps in the amount of $1,154,299,000.

SEC. 103. AIR FORCE.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2004 for procurement for the Air Force as follows:

(1) For aircraft, $12,604,451,000.

(2) For ammunition, $1,324,725,000.

(3) For missiles, $4,348,039,000.

(4) For other procurement, $11,376,059,000.

SEC. 104. DEFENSE-WIDE ACTIVITIES.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2004 for Defense-wide procurement in the amount of $3,734,821,000.

Subtitle B—Army Programs

SEC. 111. STRYKER VEHICLE PROGRAM.

(a) LIMITATION.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated under section 101 for procurement for the Army for fiscal year 2004 that are

available for the Stryker vehicle program, not more than $655,000,000 may be obligated until—

(1) the Secretary of the Army has submitted to the Deputy Secretary of Defense the report specified in subsection (b);

(2) the Secretary of Defense has submitted to the congressional defense committees the report and certification referred to in subsection (c); and

(3) a period of 30 days has elapsed after the date of the receipt by those committees of the report and certification under paragraph (2).

(b) SECRETARY OF THE ARMY REPORT.—The report referred to in subsection (a)(1) is the report required to be submitted by the Secretary of the Army to the Deputy Secretary of Defense not later than July 8, 2003, that identifies options for modifications to the equipment and configuration of the Army brigade designated as ''Stryker brigades'' to assure that those brigades, after incorporating such modifications, provide—

(1) a higher level of combat capability and sustainability;

(2) a capability across a broader spectrum of combat operations; and

(3) a capability to be employed independently of higher-level command formations and support.

(c) SECRETARY OF DEFENSE REPORT AND CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall transmit to the congressional defense committees not later than 30 days after the date of the receipt by the Deputy Secretary of Defense of the report of the Secretary of the Army referred to in subsection (b), the modification options identified by the Secretary of the Army for purposes of that report. The Secretary of Defense shall include any comments that may be applicable to the analysis of the Secretary of the Army's report and shall certify to the committees whether in the Secretary's judgment fielding the fourth Stryker brigade as planned by the Army in a different configuration from the first three such brigades will fulfill the three objectives set forth in subsection (b).

(d) AUTHORIZED USE OF REMAINDER OF FUNDS.—The funds authorized to be appropriated for procurement for the Army for fiscal year 2004 that are available for the Stryker vehicle program and that become available for obligation upon the conditions of subsection (a) being met shall be obligated either—

(1) to develop, procure, and field equipment and capabilities for the fourth Stryker brigade combat team that would accelerate the options for modifications to enhance Stryker brigades identified in subsection (b); or

(2) for the equipment identified in the fiscal year 2004 budget request to be procured for the fourth Stryker brigade, if the Secretary of Defense, after reviewing the Secretary of Army's report under subsection (b), determines that the current configuration of the fourth Stryker brigade meets the criteria in paragraphs (1) through (3) of subsection (b) and certifies to the congressional defense committees that the equipment identified in the fiscal year 2004 budget request to be procured for the fourth Stryker brigade provides those capabilities.

(e) LIMITATIONS.—(1) In obligating funds in accordance with either paragraph (1) or paragraph (2) of subsection (d), no action may be taken that would delay, hinder, or otherwise disrupt the current production and fielding schedule for the fourth Stryker brigade.

(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, all funds authorized to be appropriated under section 101 for procurement for the Army for fiscal year 2004 that are available for the Stryker vehicle program shall be used exclusively to develop, procure, and field Stryker combat vehicles.

Subtitle C—Navy Programs

SEC. 121. MULTIYEAR PROCUREMENT AUTHORITY FOR F/A–18 AIRCRAFT PROGRAM.

The Secretary of the Navy 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 aircraft in the F/A–18E, F/A–18F, and EA–18G configurations. The total number of aircraft procured through a multiyear contract under this section may not exceed 234.

SEC. 122. MULTIYEAR PROCUREMENT AUTHORITY FOR TACTICAL TOMAHAWK CRUISE MISSILE PROGRAM.

The Secretary of the Navy may, in accordance with section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, enter into a multiyear contract, beginning with the fiscal year 2004 program year, for procurement of Tactical Tomahawk cruise missiles. The total number of missiles procured through a multiyear contract under this section shall be determined by the Secretary of the Navy, based upon the funds available, but not to exceed 900 in any year.

SEC. 123. MULTIYEAR PROCUREMENT AUTHORITY FOR VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE PROGRAM.

(a) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of the Navy may, in accordance with section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, enter into a multiyear contract, beginning with the fiscal year 2004 program year, for procurement of seven Virginia-class submarines.

(b) LIMITATION.—The Secretary of the Navy may not enter into a contract authorized by subsection (a) until—

(1) the Secretary submits to the congressional defense committees a certification that the Secretary has made each of the findings with respect to such contract specified in subsection (a) of section 2306b of title 10, United States Code; and

(2) a period of 30 days has elapsed after the date of the transmission of such certification.

SEC. 124. MULTIYEAR PROCUREMENT AUTHORITY FOR E–2C AIRCRAFT PROGRAM.

(a) AIRCRAFT.—The Secretary of the Navy may, in accordance with section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, enter into a multiyear contract, beginning with the fiscal year 2004 program year, for procurement of four E-2C and four TE–2C aircraft.

(b) ENGINES.—The Secretary of the Navy may, in accordance with section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, enter into a multiyear contract, beginning with the fiscal year 2004 program year, for procurement of 16 engines for aircraft in the E-2C or TE–2C configuration.

(c) LIMITATION ON TERM OF CONTRACTS.—Notwithstanding subsection (k) of section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, a contract under this section may not be for a period in excess of four program years.

SEC. 125. LPD–17 CLASS VESSEL.

If after May 7, 2003, there is enacted an Act making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2003 that includes appropriation of an amount for procurement of Tomahawk cruise missiles for the Navy, then—

(1) the amount provided in section 102 for procurement of weapons for the Navy is reduced by the amount so appropriated or by $200,000,000, whichever is less, with such reduction to be derived from amounts authorized for procurement of Tomahawk cruise missiles; and

(2) the amount provided in section 102 for shipbuilding and conversion is increased by the amount of the reduction under paragraph (1), with the amount of such increase to be available for advance procurement of long-lead items, including the advance fabrication of components, for one LPD–17 class vessel.

Subtitle D—Air Force Programs

SEC. 131. AIR FORCE AIR REFUELING TRANSFER ACCOUNT.

(a) TRANSFER ACCOUNT.—There is hereby established an account for the Department of the Air Force to be known as the Air Force Air Refueling Transfer Account. Amounts in such account may be used in accordance with subsection (c).

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Within the amount provided in section 103(1), there is authorized to be appropriated to the Air Force Air Refueling Transfer Account for fiscal year 2004 the amount of $229,200,000.

(c) AUTHORIZED USE OF FUNDS.—Amounts in the Air Force Air Refueling Transfer Account may be used for any of the following purposes, as determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

(1) Necessary expenses for fiscal year 2004 to prepare for leasing of tanker aircraft under section 8159 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2002 (division A of Public Law 107–117; 115 Stat. 2284; 10 U.S.C. 2401a note).

(2) Necessary expenses for fiscal year 2004 to prepare for purchase of tanker aircraft for the Air Force.

(3) Retaining in active service (rather than retiring) KC–135E aircraft.

(4) Maintenance of equipment for KC–135 aircraft that was purchased through a depot.

(d) AUTHORIZED TRANSFERS.—Subject to subsections (e) and (f), the Secretary of the Air Force may transfer funds in the Air Force Air Refueling Transfer Account to appropriations of the Air Force available for purposes set forth in subsection (c), including appropriations available for procurement, for research, development, test, and evaluation, for operation and maintenance, and for military personnel (in the case of retaining KC–135E aircraft in active service), in such amounts as the Secretary determines necessary for such purpose.

(e) LIMITATION.—Amounts appropriated to the Air Force Air Refueling Transfer Account pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in subsection (b) may not be used to enter into a lease for tanker aircraft or to enter into a contract for procurement of tanker aircraft.

(f) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—A transfer of funds under subsection (d) may not be made until—

(1) the Secretary of the Air Force notifies the congressional defense committees in writing of the amount and purpose of the proposed transfer, including each account to which the transfer is to be made; and

(2) a period of 30 days has elapsed after the date on which the notice is received by those committees.

SEC. 132. INCREASE IN NUMBER OF AIRCRAFT AUTHORIZED TO BE PROCURED UNDER MULTIYEAR PROCUREMENT AUTHORITY FOR AIR FORCE C–130J AIRCRAFT PROGRAM.

Section 131(a) of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314; 116 Stat. 2475) is amended by striking ''40 C–130J aircraft'' and inserting ''42 C–130J aircraft''.

SEC. 133. LIMITATION ON RETIRING C–5 AIRCRAFT.

(a) LIMITATION.—The Secretary of the Air Force may not proceed with a decision to retire C–5A aircraft from the active inventory of the Air Force in any number that which would reduce the total number of such aircraft in the active inventory below 112 until—

(1) the Air Force has modified a C–5A aircraft to the configuration referred to as the Reliability Enhancement and Reengining Program (RERP) configuration, as planned under the C–5 System Development and Demonstration program as of May 1, 2003; and

(2) the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation of the Department of Defense—

(A) conducts an operational evaluation of that aircraft, as so modified; and

(B) provides to the Secretary of Defense and the congressional defense committees an operational assessment.

(b) OPERATIONAL EVALUATION.—An operational evaluation for purposes of paragraph (2)(A) of subsection (a) is an evaluation, conducted during operational testing and evaluation of the aircraft, as so modified, of the performance of the aircraft with respect to reliability, maintainability, and availability and with respect to critical operational issues

(c) OPERATIONAL ASSESSMENT.—An operational assessment for purposes of paragraph (2)(B) of subsection (a) is an operational assessment of the program to modify C–5A aircraft to the configuration referred to in subsection (a)(1) regarding both overall suitability and deficiencies of the program to improve performance of the C–5A aircraft relative to requirements and specifications for reliability, maintainability, and availability of that aircraft as in effect on May 1, 2003.

SEC. 134. LIMITATION ON OBLIGATION OF FUNDS FOR PROCUREMENT OF F/A–22 AIRCRAFT.

(a) LIMITATION.—Of the amount appropriated for fiscal year 2004 for procurement of F/A–22 aircraft, $136,000,000 may not be obligated until the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics submits to the congressional defense committees the Under Secretary's certification that—

(1) the four primary aircraft designated to participate in the dedicated initial operational test and evaluation program for the F/A–22 aircraft have each been equipped with the version of the avionics software operational flight program that is designated as version 3.1.2 or a later version; and

(2) before the commencement of that dedicated initial operational test and evaluation program, those four aircraft (as so equipped) demonstrate, on average, an avionics software mean time between instability events of at least 20 hours.

(b) CONTINGENCY WAIVER AUTHORITY.—If the Under Secretary notifies the Secretary of Defense that the Under Secretary is unable to make the certification described in subsection (a), the Secretary may waive the limitation under that subsection. Upon making such a waiver—

(1) the Secretary of Defense shall notify the congressional defense committees of the waiver and of the reasons therefor; and

(2) the funds described in subsection (a) may then be obligated, by reason of such waiver, after the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date on which the Secretary's notification is received by those committees.

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 2004 for the use of the Department of Defense for research, development, test, and evaluation as follows:

(1) For the Army, $9,332,382,000.

(2) For the Navy, $14,343,360,000.

(3) For the Air Force, $20,548,867,000.

(4) For Defense-wide activities, $18,461,046,000, of which $286,661,000 is authorized for the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation.

SEC. 202. AMOUNT FOR DEFENSE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY.

(a) FISCAL YEAR 2004.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated by section 201, $10,893,077,000 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. COLLABORATIVE PROGRAM FOR DEVELOPMENT OF ELECTROMAGNETIC GUN TECHNOLOGY.

(a) PROGRAM REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish and carry out a collaborative program for evaluation and demonstration of advanced technologies and concepts for advanced gun systems that use electromagnetic propulsion for direct and indirect fire applications.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM.—The program under subsection (a) shall be carried out collaboratively pursuant to a memorandum of agreement to be entered into among the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Director of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency. The program shall include the following activities:

(1) Identification of technical objectives, quantified technical barriers, and enabling technologies associated with development of the objective electromagnetic gun systems envisioned to meet the needs of each of the Armed Forces and, in so doing, identification of opportunities for development of components or subsystems common to those envisioned gun systems.

(2) Preparation of a time-based plan for development of electromagnetic gun systems for direct fire applications, indirect fire applications, or both direct and indirect fire applications (in the case of the Army and Marine Corps) and for indirect fire applications (in the case of the Navy), which—

(A) includes the programs currently planned by the Army and by the Navy and demonstrates how the enabling technologies common to such Army and Navy programs are used; and

(B) provides estimated dates for decision points, prototype demonstrations, and transitions of successful cases from the collaborative program under this section to an acquisition program.

(3) For each of the enabling technologies common to the Army and Navy programs, identification of whether lead responsibility for developing that technology should be assigned to the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Director, with the Director favored in cases in which the technology is highly challenging or high risk, high reward, and with each such Secretary favored in cases in which that Secretary's military department possesses superior expertise or experience with the technology.

(4) Identification of a strategy for the participation of industry in the program.

(c) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The advanced technologies and concepts included under the program may include, but are not limited to, the following:

(1) Advanced electrical power, energy storage, and switching systems.

(2) Electromagnetic launcher materials and construction techniques for long barrel life.

(3) Guidance and control systems for electromagnetically launched projectiles.

(4) Advanced projectiles and other munitions for electromagnetic gun systems.

(5) Hypervelocity terminal effects.

(d) RELATIONSHIP TO SEPARATE PROGRAMS OF MILITARY DEPARTMENTS.—The Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy shall carry out separate programs for the evaluation and demonstration of advanced technologies and concepts for, and for the further development and acquisition of, advanced gun systems referred to in subsection (a). Each such Secretary shall incorporate in that Secretary's program the most promising of the technology products matured under the program under subsection (a).

(e) REPORT.—Not later than March 31, 2004, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Director of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency shall jointly submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the implementation of the program under subsection (a). The report shall include the following:

(1) A description of the memorandum of agreement entered into under subsection (b).

(2) The time-based plan required by subsection (b)(2).

(3) A description of the goals and objectives of the program.

(4) Identification of funding required for fiscal year 2004 and for the future years defense program to carry out the program.

(5) A description of a plan for industry participation in the program.

SEC. 212. AUTHORITY TO SELECT CIVILIAN EMPLOYEE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AS DIRECTOR OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TEST RESOURCE MANAGEMENT CENTER.

Section 196(b)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''or from among senior civilian officials or employees of the Department of Defense who have substantial experience in the field of test and evaluation''; and

(2) in the second sentence, by striking ''vice admiral'' and inserting ''the grade of vice admiral, or, in the case of a civilian official or employee, an equivalent level.''.

SEC. 213. DEVELOPMENT OF THE JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM.

(a) JOINT PROGRAM OFFICE.—The Secretary of Defense shall designate a single joint program office within the Department of Defense for management of the Joint Tactical Radio System development program. The Secretary shall provide for the head of that office to be selected on a rotating basis from among officers of different Armed Forces.

(b) CONSOLIDATED PROGRAM ELEMENTS.—The Secretary shall provide that all funds for development and procurement of the Joint Tactical Radio System program shall be consolidated under and managed by the head of the joint program office designated under subsection (a).

(c) PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT.—The Secretary shall provide that, subject to the authority, direction, and control of the Secretary, the head of the joint program office designated under subsection (a) shall—

(1) establish and control the performance specifications for the Joint Tactical Radio System;

(2) establish and control the standards for development of the software and equipment for that system;

(3) establish and control the standards for operation of that system; and

(4) develop a single, unified concept of operations for all users of that system.

SEC. 214. FUTURE COMBAT SYSTEMS.

(a) LIMITATION.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated under section 201(1) for development and demonstration of systems for the Future Combat Systems program may be obligated or expended until 30 days after the Secretary of the Army submits to the congressional defense committees a report on such program. The report shall include the following:

(1) The findings and conclusions of—

(A) the review of the Future Combat Systems program carried out by the independent panel at the direction of the Secretary of Defense; and

(B) the milestone B review of the Future Combat Systems program carried out by the defense acquisition board.

(2) For each of the key performance parameters relating to the Future Combat Systems program, the threshold value at which the utility of the individual systems comprising the Future Combat Systems program become questionable.

(3) For each of the three projects requested under program element 64645A, Armored Systems Modernization, a completed analysis of alternatives.

(b) SEPARATE PROGRAM ELEMENTS.—For fiscal years beginning with 2004, the Secretary of Defense shall ensure that—

(1) each project under the Army's Future Combat Systems program (whether in existence before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act) is assigned a separate, dedicated program element; and

(2) before such a program element is assigned to such a project, an analysis of alternatives for such project is completed.

SEC. 215. ARMY PROGRAM TO PURSUE TECHNOLOGIES LEADING TO THE ENHANCED PRODUCTION OF TITANIUM BY THE UNITED STATES.

(a) EFFORTS REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) assess promising technologies leading to the enhanced production of titanium by the United States; and

(2) select, on a competitive basis, the most viable such technologies for research, development, and production.

(b) EXECUTIVE AGENT.—The Secretary of the Army shall serve as executive agent in carrying out subsection (a).

(c) FUNDING.—Of the funds authorized to be appropriated by section 201(1) for research, development, test, and evaluation, Army, for fiscal year 2004, $8,000,000 shall be available in program element 62624A to carry out this section.

SEC. 216. EXTENSION OF REPORTING REQUIREMENT FOR RAH–66 COMANCHE AIRCRAFT PROGRAM.

Section 211 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314; 116 Stat. 2479) is amended in subsection (a) by inserting ''and fiscal year 2004'' after ''fiscal year 2003''.

SEC. 217. STUDIES OF FLEET PLATFORM ARCHITECTURES FOR THE NAVY.

(a) INDEPENDENT STUDIES.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall provide for the performance of eight independent studies on alternative future fleet platform architectures for the Navy.

(2) The Secretary shall forward the results of each study to the congressional defense committees not later than March 1, 2004.

(3) Each such study shall be submitted both in unclassified, and to the extent necessary, in classified versions.

(b) ENTITIES TO PERFORM STUDIES.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide for the studies under subsection (a) to be performed as follows:

(1) One shall be performed by the Secretary of the Navy, using Department of the Navy personnel.

(2) Four shall be performed by qualified analytical organizations external to Department of Defense.

(3) Three shall be performed by defense firms, or teams of defense firms, in the private sector.

(c) PERFORMANCE OF STUDIES.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall require each entity undertaking one of the studies under this section to commit to performing the study independently from the other studies and, in the case of the entities selected under paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (b), independently from the Navy, so as to ensure independent analysis.

(2) In performing a study under this section, the entity performing the study shall consider the following:

(A) The National Security Strategy of the United States.

(B) Potential future threats to the United States and to United States naval forces.

(C) The traditional roles and missions of United States naval forces.

(D) Alternative roles and missions.

(E) The role of evolving technology on future naval forces.

(F) Opportunities for reduced manning and unmanned ships and vehicles in future naval forces.

(3) Each entity performing a study under this section, while cognizant of current overall fleet platform architecture, shall not allow the current features of fleet platform architecture to constrain the analysis for purposes of that study.

(d) NAVAL STUDIES.—Each study under this section shall present one or two possible overall fleet platform architectures. For each such architecture presented, the study shall include the following:

(1) The numbers, kinds, and sizes of vessels, the numbers and types of associated manned and unmanned vehicles, and the basic capabilities of each of those platforms.

(2) Other information needed to understand that architecture in basic form and the supporting analysis.

(e) COSTS.—Within the amount provided in section 201(2), the amount of $1,600,000 is authorized, within Program Element 65154N, for the purposes of this section.

Subtitle C—Ballistic Missile Defense

SEC. 221. ENHANCED FLEXIBILITY FOR BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS.

(a) FLEXIBILITY FOR SPECIFICATION OF PROGRAM ELEMENTS.—Subsection (a) of section 223 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''BY PRESIDENT'' in the subsection heading after ''SPECIFIED'';

(2) by striking ''program elements governing functional areas as follows:'' and inserting ''such program elements as the President may specify.''; and

(3) by striking paragraphs (1) through (6).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Subsection (c) of such section is amended by striking ''for each program element specified in subsection (a)'' and inserting ''for a fiscal year for any program element specified for that fiscal year pursuant to subsection (a)''.

(2) Subsection (c)(3) of section 232 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107; 115 Stat. 1037; 10 U.S.C. 2431 note) is amended by striking ''each functional area'' and all that follows through ''subsection (b),'' and inserting ''each then-current program element for ballistic missile defense systems in effect pursuant to subsection (a) or (b)''.

(c) AMENDMENTS RELATING TO CHANGES IN ACQUISITION TERMINOLOGY.—(1) Section 223(b)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''means the development phase whose'' and inserting ''means the period in the course of an acquisition program during which the''.

(2) Subsection (d)(1) of section 232 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107; 115 Stat. 1037; 10 U.S.C. 2431 note) is amended by striking '', as added by subsection (b)''.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

SEC. 301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FUNDING.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2004 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, $25,050,587,000.

(2) For the Navy, $27,901,790,000.

(3) For the Marine Corps, $3,517,756,000.

(4) For the Air Force, $25,434,460,000.

(5) For Defense-wide activities, $16,134,047,000.

(6) For the Army Reserve, $1,954,009,000.

(7) For the Naval Reserve, $1,171,921,000.

(8) For the Marine Corps Reserve, $199,452,000.

(9) For the Air Force Reserve, $2,170,188,000.

(10) For the Army National Guard, $4,194,331,000.

(11) For the Air National Guard, $4,404,646,000.

(12) For the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, $10,333,000.

(13) For Environmental Restoration, Army, $396,018,000.

(14) For Environmental Restoration, Navy, $256,153,000.

(15) For Environmental Restoration, Air Force, $384,307,000.

(16) For Environmental Restoration, Defense-wide, $24,081,000.

(17) For Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites, $212,619,000.

(18) For Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid programs, $59,000,000.

(19) For Cooperative Threat Reduction programs, $450,800,000.

(20) United States Industrial Base Capabilities Fund, $100,000,000.

SEC. 302. WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2004 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, $632,261,000.

(2) For the National Defense Sealift Fund, $1,102,762,000.

(3) For the Defense Commissary Agency Working Capital Fund, $1,089,246,000.

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 2004 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for the Defense Health Program, $15,317,063,000, of which—

(1) $14,923,441,000 is for Operation and Maintenance;

(2) $65,796,000 is for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation; and

(3) $327,826,000 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 2004 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense, $1,580,261,000, of which—

(A) $1,249,168,000 is for Operation and Maintenance;

(B) $251,881,000 is for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation; and

(C) $79,212,000 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 2004 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-wide, $817,371,000.

(d) DEFENSE INSPECTOR GENERAL.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2004 for expenses, not otherwise provided for, for the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, $162,449,000.

Subtitle B—Environmental Provisions

SEC. 311. REAUTHORIZATION AND MODIFICATION OF TITLE I OF SIKES ACT.

(a) REAUTHORIZATION.—Section 108 of the Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670f) is amended by striking ''fiscal years 1998 through 2003'' each place it appears and inserting ''fiscal years 2004 through 2008''.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING SECTION 107.—(1) Congress finds the following:

(A) The Department of Defense maintains over 25,000,000 acres of valuable fish and wildlife habitat on approximately 400 military installations nationwide.

(B) These lands contain a wealth of plant and animal life, vital wetlands for migratory birds, and nearly 300 federally listed threatened species and endangered species.

(C) Increasingly, land surrounding military bases are being developed with residential and commercial infrastructure that fragments fish and wildlife habitat and decreases its ability to support a diversity of species.

(D) Comprehensive conservation plans, such as integrated natural resource management

plans under the Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670 et seq.), can ensure that these ecosystem values can be protected and enhanced while allowing these lands to meet the needs of military operations.

(E) Section 107 of the Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670e–2) requires sufficient numbers of professionally trained natural resources management personnel and natural resources law enforcement personnel to be available and assigned responsibility to perform tasks necessary to carry out title I of the Sikes Act, including the preparation and implementation of integrated natural resource management plans.

(F) Managerial and policymaking functions performed by Department of Defense on-site professionally trained natural resource management personnel on military installations are appropriate governmental functions.

(G) Professionally trained civilian biologists in permanent Federal Government career managerial positions are essential to oversee fish and wildlife and natural resource conservation programs are essential to the conservation of wildlife species on military land.

(2) It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should take whatever steps are necessary to ensure that section 107 of the Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670e–2) is fully implemented consistent with the findings made in paragraph (1).

(c) PILOT PROGRAM FOR INVASIVE SPECIES MANAGEMENT FOR MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.—(1) Section 101(b)(1) of the Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670a(b)(1)) is amended by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (J) in order as subparagraphs (E) through (K), and by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

''(D) during fiscal years 2004 through 2008, in the case of a plan for a military installation in Guam, management, control, and eradication of invasive species that are not native to the ecosystem of the military installation and the introduction of which cause or may cause harm to military readiness, the environment, the economy, or human health and safety;''.

(2) The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply—

(A) to any integrated natural resources management plan prepared for a military installation in Guam under section 101(a)(1) of the Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670a(a)(1)) on or after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(B) to any integrated natural resources management plan prepared for a military installation in Guam under section 101(a)(1) of the Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670a(a)(1)) before the date of the enactment of this Act, effective March 1, 2004.

SEC. 312. AUTHORIZATION FOR DEFENSE PARTICIPATION IN WETLAND MITIGATION BANKS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 159 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2694a the following new section:

''§2694b. Participation in wetland mitigation banks

''(a) AUTHORITY TO PARTICIPATE.—The Secretary of a military department, and the Secretary of Defense with respect to matters concerning a Defense Agency, when engaged in an authorized activity that may or will result in the destruction of, or an adverse impact to, a wetland, may make payments to a wetland mitigation banking program or 'in-lieu-fee' mitigation sponsor approved in accordance with the Federal Guidance for the Establishment, Use and Operation of Mitigation Banks (60 Fed. Reg. 58605; November 28, 1995) or the Federal Guidance on the Use of In-Lieu-Fee Arrangements for Compensatory Mitigation Under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act (65 Fed. Reg. 66913; November 7, 2000), or any successor administrative guidance.

''(b) ALTERNATIVE TO CREATION OF WETLAND.—Participation in a wetland mitigation banking program or consolidated user site under subsection (a) shall be in lieu of mitigating wetland impacts through the creation of a wetland on Federal property.

''(c) TREATMENT OF PAYMENTS.—Payments made under subsection (a) to a wetland mitigation banking program or consolidated user site may be treated as eligible project costs for military construction.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2694a the following new item:

''2694b. Participation in wetland mitigation banks.''.

SEC. 313. INCLUSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSE EQUIPMENT AND SERVICES IN NAVY DEFINITIONS OF SALVAGE FACILITIES AND SALVAGE SERVICES.

(a) SALVAGE FACILITIES.—Section 7361 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) SALVAGE FACILITIES DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'salvage facilities' includes equipment and gear utilized to prevent, abate, or minimize damage to the environment in connection with a marine salvage operation.''.

(b) SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS FOR SALVAGE SERVICES.—Section 7363 of such title is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(a) AUTHORITY TO SETTLE CLAIM.—'' before ''The Secretary''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(b) SALVAGE SERVICES DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'salvage services' includes services performed in connection with a marine salvage operation that are intended to prevent, abate, or minimize damage to the environment.''.

SEC. 314. CLARIFICATION OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE RESPONSE TO ENVIRONMENTAL EMERGENCIES.

(a) TRANSPORTATION OF HUMANITARIAN RELIEF SUPPLIES TO RESPOND TO ENVIRONMENTAL EMERGENCIES.—Section 402 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection (d):

''(d) RESPONSE TO ENVIRONMENTAL EMERGENCIES.—The authority of the Secretary of Defense to transport humanitarian relief supplies under this section includes the authority to transport supplies intended for use to respond to, or mitigate the effects of, an event or condition, such as an oil spill, that threatens serious harm to the environment.''.

(b) CONDITIONS ON PROVISION OF TRANSPORTATION.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(C), by inserting ''or entity'' after ''people'';

(2) in paragraph (1)(E), by inserting ''or use'' after ''distribution''; and

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking ''donor to ensure that supplies to be transported under this section'' and inserting ''entity requesting the transport of supplies under this section to ensure that the supplies''.

(c) PROVISION OF DISASTER ASSISTANCE.—Section 404 of such title is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting ''or serious harm to the environment'' after ''loss of lives''; and

(2) in subsection (c)(2), by inserting ''or the environment'' after ''human lives''.

(d) PROVISION OF HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE.—Section 2561(a) of such title is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(1)'' before ''To the extent''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph

''(2) The authority of the Department of Defense to provide humanitarian assistance under this section includes the authority to transport supplies or provide assistance intended for use to respond to, or mitigate the effects of, an event or condition, such as an oil spill, that threatens serious harm to the environment.''.

SEC. 315. REQUIREMENTS FOR RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARDS AND EXEMPTION FROM FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.

(a) MEMBERSHIP AND MEETING REQUIREMENTS FOR RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARDS.—The Secretary of Defense shall amend the regulations required by section 2705(d)(2) of title 10, United States Code, relating to the establishment, characteristics, composition, and funding of restoration advisory boards to ensure that each restoration advisory board complies with the following requirements:

(1) Each restoration advisory board shall be fairly balanced in its membership in terms of the points of view represented and the functions to be performed.

(2) Unless a closed or partially closed meeting is determined to be proper in accordance with one or more of the exceptions listed in the section 552b(c) of title 5, United States Code, each meeting of a restoration advisory board shall be—

(A) held at a reasonable time and in a manner or place reasonably accessible to the public, including individuals with disabilities; and

(B) open to the public.

(3) Timely notice of each meeting of a restoration advisory board shall be published in a local newspaper of general circulation.

(4) Interested persons may appear before or file statements with a restoration advisory board, subject to such reasonable restrictions as the Secretary may prescribe.

(5) Subject to section 552 of title 5, United States Code, the records, reports, minutes, appendixes, working papers, drafts, studies, agenda, or other documents that were made available to, prepared for, or prepared by each restoration advisory board shall be available for public inspection and copying at a single, publicly accessible location, such as a public library or an appropriate office of the military installation for which the restoration advisory board is established, at least until the restoration advisory board is terminated.

(6) Detailed minutes of each meeting of each restoration advisory board shall be kept and shall contain a record of the persons present, a complete and accurate description of matters discussed and conclusions reached, and copies of all reports received, issued, or approved by the restoration advisory board. The accuracy of the minutes of a restoration advisory board shall be certified by the chairperson of the board.

(b) FACA EXEMPTION.—Section 2705(d)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to a restoration advisory board established under this subsection.''.

SEC. 316. REPORT REGARDING IMPACT OF CIVILIAN COMMUNITY ENCROACHMENT AND CERTAIN LEGAL REQUIREMENTS ON MILITARY INSTALLATIONS AND RANGES.

(a) STUDY REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a study on the impact, if any, of the following types of activities at military installations and operational ranges:

(1) Civilian community encroachment on those military installations and ranges whose operational training activities, research, development, test, and evaluation activities, or other operational, test and evaluation, maintenance, storage, disposal, or other support functions require, or in the future reasonably may require, safety or operational buffer areas. The requirement for such a buffer area may be due to a variety of factors, including air operations, ordnance operations and storage, or other activities that generate or might generate noise, electromagnetic interference, ordnance arcs, or environmental impacts that require or may require safety or operational buffer areas.

(2) Compliance by the Department of Defense with State Implementation Plans for Air Quality under section 110 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7410).

(3) Compliance by the Department of Defense with the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.) and the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.).

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED WITH RESPECT TO CIVILIAN ENCROACHMENTS.—With respect to paragraph (1) of subsection (a), the study shall include the following:

(1) A list of all military installations described in subsection (a)(1) at which civilian community encroachment is occurring.

(2) A description and analysis of the types and degree of such civilian community encroachment at each military installation included on the list.

(3) An analysis, including views and estimates of the Secretary of Defense, of the current and potential future impact of such civilian community encroachment on operational training activities, research, development, test, and evaluation activities, and other significant operational, test and evaluation, maintenance, storage, disposal, or other support functions performed by military installations included on the list. The analysis shall include the following:

(A) A review of training and test ranges at military installations, including laboratories and technical centers of the military departments, included on the list.

(B) A description and explanation of the trends of such encroachment, as well as consideration of potential future readiness problems resulting from unabated encroachment.

(4) An estimate of the costs associated with current and anticipated partnerships between the Department of Defense and non-Federal entities to create buffer zones to preclude further development around military installations included on the list, and the costs associated with the conveyance of surplus property around such military installations for purposes of creating buffer zones.

(5) Options and recommendations for possible legislative or budgetary changes necessary to mitigate current and anticipated future civilian community encroachment problems.

(c) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED WITH RESPECT TO SPECIFIED LAWS.—With respect to paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (a), the study shall include the following:

(1) A list of all military installations and other locations at which the Armed Forces are encountering problems related to compliance with the laws specified in such paragraphs.

(2) A description and analysis of the types and degree of compliance problems encountered.

(3) An analysis, including views and estimates of the Secretary of Defense, of the current and potential future impact of such compliance problems on the following functions performed at military installations:

(A) Operational training activities.

(B) Research, development, test, and evaluation activities.

(C) Other significant operational, test and evaluation, maintenance, storage, disposal, or other support functions.

(4) A description and explanation of the trends of such compliance problems, as well as consideration of potential future readiness problems resulting from such compliance problems.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than January 31, 2004, 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 subsection (a), including the specific matters required to be addressed by paragraphs (1) through (5) of subsection (b) and paragraphs (1) through (4) of subsection (c).

SEC. 317. MILITARY READINESS AND CONSERVATION OF PROTECTED SPECIES.

(a) DESIGNATION OF CRITICAL HABITAT.—Section 4(a)(3) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(a)(3)) is amended by striking ''prudent and determinable'' and inserting ''necessary''.

(b) LIMITATION ON DESIGNATION OF CRITICAL HABITAT.—Section 4(a)(3) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(a)(3)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively;

(2) by inserting ''(A)'' after ''(3)''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(B)(i) The Secretary shall not designate as critical habitat any lands or other geographical areas owned or controlled by the Department of Defense, or designated for its use, that are subject to an integrated natural resources management plan prepared under section 101 of the Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670a), if the Secretary determines that such plan addresses special management considerations or protection (as those terms are used in section 3(5)(A)(i)).

''(ii) Nothing in this paragraph affects the requirement to consult under section 7(a)(2) with respect to an agency action (as that term is defined in that section).

''(iii) Nothing in this paragraph affects the obligation of the Department of Defense to comply with section 9, including the prohibition preventing extinction and taking of endangered species and threatened species.''.

(c) CONSIDERATION OF EFFECTS OF DESIGNATION OF CRITICAL HABITAT.—Section 4(b)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(b)(2)) is amended by inserting ''the impact on national security,'' after ''the economic impact,''.

SEC. 318. MILITARY READINESS AND MARINE MAMMAL PROTECTION.

(a) DEFINITION OF HARASSMENT.—Section 3(18) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1362(18)) is amended by striking the matter preceding subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

''(18)(A) The term 'harassment' means—

''(i) any act that injures or has the significant potential to injure a marine mammal or marine mammal stock in the wild; or

''(ii) any act that disturbs or is likely to disturb a marine mammal or marine mammal stock in the wild by causing disruption of natural behavioral patterns, including, but not limited to, migration, surfacing, nursing, breeding, feeding, or sheltering, to a point where such behavioral patterns are abandoned or significantly altered.''.

(b) EXEMPTION OF ACTIONS NECESSARY FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE.—Section 101 of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1371) is amended by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

''(f) EXEMPTION OF ACTIONS NECESSARY FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE.—(1) The Secretary of Defense, after conferring with the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Interior, or both, as appropriate, may exempt any action or category of actions undertaken by the Department of Defense or its components from compliance with any requirement of this Act, if the Secretary determines that it is necessary for national defense.

''(2) An exemption granted under this subsection—

''(A) subject to subparagraph (B), shall be effective for a period specified by the Secretary of Defense; and

''(B) shall not be effective for more than 2 years.

''(3)(A) The Secretary of Defense may issue additional exemptions under this subsection for the same action or category of actions, after—

''(i) conferring with the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Interior, or both as appropriate; and

''(ii) making a new determination that the additional exemption is necessary for national defense.

''(B) Each additional exemption under this paragraph shall be effective for a period specified by the Secretary of Defense, of not more than 2 years.''.

(c) INCIDENTAL TAKINGS OF MARINE MAMMALS IN MILITARY READINESS ACTIVITIES.—Section 101(a)(5) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1371(a)(5)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking ''within a specified geographical region'';

(B) by striking ''within that region of small numbers''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, the Secretary is not required to publish notice under this subparagraph with respect to incidental takings while engaged in a military readiness activity (as defined in section 315(f) of Public Law 107–314; 16 U.S.C. 703 note) authorized by the Secretary of Defense, except in the Federal Register.'';

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by striking ''within a specified geographical region''; and

(B) by striking ''within one or more regions''; and

(3) in subparagraph (D)—

(A) in clause (i)—

(i) by striking ''within a specific geographic region'';

(ii) by striking ''of small numbers''; and

(iii) by striking ''within that region''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(vi) Notwithstanding clause (iii), the Secretary is not required to publish notice under this subparagraph with respect to an authorization under clause (i) of incidental takings while engaged in a military readiness activity (as defined in section 315(f) of Public Law 107–314; 16 U.S.C. 703 note) authorized by the Secretary of Defense, except in the Federal Register.''.

SEC. 319. LIMITATION ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE RESPONSIBILITY FOR CIVILIAN WATER CONSUMPTION IMPACTS RELATED TO FORT HUACHUCA, ARIZONA.

(a) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—For purposes of section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536), in the case of Fort Huachuca, Arizona, the Secretary of the Army may be held responsible for water consumption that occurs on that military installation (or outside of that installation but under the direct authority and control of the Secretary). The Secretary of the Army is not responsible for water consumption that occurs outside of Fort Huachuca and is beyond the direct authority and control of the Secretary even though the water is derived from a watershed basin shared by that military installation and the water consumption outside of that installation may impact a critical habitat or endangered species outside the installation.

(b) VOLUNTARY EFFORTS.—Nothing in this section shall prohibit the Secretary of the Army from voluntarily undertaking efforts to mitigate water consumption related to Fort Huachuca.

(c) DEFINITION OF WATER CONSUMPTION.—In this section, the term ''water consumption'' means the consumption of water, from any source, for human purposes of any kind, including household or industrial use, irrigation, or landscaping.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section applies only to Department of Defense actions regarding which consultation or reconsultation under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536) is first required with regard to Fort Huachuca on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 320. CONSTRUCTION OF WETLAND CROSSINGS, CAMP SHELBY COMBINED ARMS MANEUVER AREA, CAMP SHELBY, MISSISSIPPI.

Amounts authorized to be appropriated by section 301(1) for operation and maintenance for the Army shall be available to the Secretary of the Army to construct wetlands crossings at the

Camp Shelby Combined Arms Maneuver Area at Camp Shelby, Mississippi, for the purpose of ensuring that combat arms training performed at that area is conducted in conformance with the spirit and intent of applicable environmental laws.

Subtitle C—Workplace and Depot Issues

SEC. 321. EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN EXPENDITURES FROM PERCENTAGE LIMITATION ON CONTRACTING FOR PERFORMANCE OF DEPOT-LEVEL MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR WORKLOADS.

Section 2474(f)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''entered into during fiscal years 2003 through 2006''.

SEC. 322. HIGH-PERFORMING ORGANIZATION BUSINESS PROCESS REENGINEERING PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall establish a pilot program under which the Secretary of each military department shall administer, or continue the implementation of, high-performing organizations at military installations through the conduct of a Business Process Reengineering initiative.

(2) The implementation and management of a Business Process Reengineering initiative under the pilot program shall be the responsibility of the commander of the military installation at which the Business Process Reengineering initiative is carried out.

(b) ELIGIBLE ORGANIZATIONS.—Two types of organizations are eligible for selection to participate in the pilot program:

(1) Organizations that underwent a Business Process Reengineering initiative within the preceding five years, achieved major performance enhancements under the initiative, and will be able to sustain previous or achieve new performance goals through the continuation of its existing or completed Business Process Reengineering plan.

(2) Organizations that have not undergone or have not successfully completed a Business Process Reengineering initiative, but which propose to achieve, and reasonably could reach, enhanced performance goals through implementation of a Business Process Reengineering initiative.

(c) ADDITIONAL ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—(1) To be eligible for selection to participate in the pilot program under subsection (b)(1), an organization described in such subsection must be able to demonstrate the completion of a total organizational assessment that resulted in enhanced performance measures at least comparable to those that might be achieved through competitive sourcing.

(2) To be eligible for selection to participate in the pilot program under subsection (b)(2), an organization described in such subsection must be able to identify—

(A) functions, processes, and measures to be studied under the Business Process Reengineering initiative;

(B) adequate resources for assignment to carry out the Business Process Reengineering initiative; and

(C) labor/management agreements in place to ensure effective implementation of the Business Process Reengineering initiative.

(d) PILOT PROGRAM LIMITATIONS.—The pilot program shall be subject to the following limitations:

(1) Total participants is limited to 15 military installations, with some participants to be drawn from organizations described in subsection (b)(1) and some participants drawn from organizations described in subsection (b)(2).

(2) During the implementation period for the Business Process Reengineering initiative, but not to exceed one year, a participating organization shall not be subject to any Office of Management and Budget Circular A–76 competition or other public-private competition involving any function covered by the Business Process Reengineering initiative.

(e) EFFECT OF SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION.—An organization designated as a high-performing organization as a result of successful implementation of a Business Process Reengineering initiative under the pilot program shall be exempt, during the five-year period following such designation, from any Office of Management and Budget Circular A–76 competition or other public-private competition involving any function that was studied under the Business Process Reengineering initiative.

(f) REVIEWS AND REPORTS.—The Secretaries of the military departments shall conduct annual performance reviews of the participating organizations or functions within their respective departments. Reviews and reports shall evaluate organizational performance measures or functional performance measures and determine whether organizations are performing satisfactorily for purposes of continuing participation in the pilot program.

(g) PERFORMANCE MEASURES.—Performance measures should include the following, which shall be measured against organizational baselines determined before participation in the pilot program:

(1) Costs, savings, and overall financial performance of the organization.

(2) Organic knowledge, skills or expertise.

(3) Efficiency and effectiveness of key functions or processes.

(4) Efficiency and effectiveness of the overall organization.

(5) General customer satisfaction.

(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section

(1) The term ''high-performing organization'' means an organization whose performance exceeds that of comparable providers, whether public or private.

(2) The term ''Business Process Reengineering'' refers to an organization's complete and thorough analysis and reengineering of mission and support functions and processes to achieve improvements in performance, including a fundamental reshaping of the way work is done to better support an organization's mission and reduce costs.

SEC. 323. DELAYED IMPLEMENTATION OF REVISED OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET CIRCULAR A-76 BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PENDING REPORT.

(a) LIMITATION PENDING REPORT.—No studies or competitions may be conducted under the policies and procedures contained in any revisions to Office of Management and Budget Circular A–76, as the circular exists as of May 1, 2003, for possible contracting out of work being performed, as of such date, by employees of the Department of Defense, until the end of the 45-day period beginning on the date on which the Secretary of Defense submits to Congress a report on the impacts and effects of the revisions.

(b) CONTENT OF REPORT.—The report required by subsection (a) shall contain, at a minimum, specific information regarding the following:

(1) The extent to which the revisions will ensure that employees of the Department of Defense have the opportunity to compete to retain their jobs.

(2) The extent to which the revisions will provide appeal and protest rights to employees of the Department of Defense that are equivalent to those available to contractors.

(3) Identify safeguards in the revisions to ensure that all public-private competitions are fair, appropriate, and comply with requirements of full and open competition.

(4) The plans and strategies of the Department to ensure an appropriate phase-in period for the revisions, as recommended by the Commercial Activities Panel of the Government Accounting Office in its April 2002 report to Congress, including recommendations for any legislative changes that may be required to ensure a smooth and efficient phase-in period.

(5) The plans and strategies of the Department to collect and analyze data on the costs and quality of work contracted out or retained in-house as a result of a sourcing process conducted under the revised Office of Management and Budget circular A–76.

SEC. 324. NAVAL AVIATION DEPOTS MULTI-TRADES DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.

(a) DEMONSTRATION PROJECT REQUIRED.—In accordance with section 4703 of title 5, United States Code, the Secretary of the Navy shall establish a demonstration project under which three Naval Aviation Depots are given the flexibility to promote by one grade level workers who are certified at the journey level as able to perform multiple trades.

(b) SELECTION REQUIREMENTS.—As a condition on eligibility for selection to participate in the demonstration project, a Naval Aviation Depot shall submit to the Secretary a business case analysis and concept plan—

(1) that, on the basis of the results of analysis of work processes, demonstrate that process improvements would result from the trade combinations proposed to be implemented under the demonstration project; and

(2) that describes the resulting improvements in cost, quality, or schedule.

(c) PARTICIPATING WORKERS.—(1) Actual worker participation in the demonstration project shall be determined through competitive selection. Not more than 15 percent of the wage grade journeyman at a demonstration project location may be selected to participate.

(2) Job descriptions and competency-based training plans must be developed for each worker while in training under the demonstration project and once certified as a multi-trade worker. A certified multi-trade worker who receives a pay grade promotion under the demonstration project must use each new skill during at least 25 percent of the worker's work week.

(d) FUNDING SOURCE.—Amounts appropriated for operation and maintenance of the Naval Aviation Depots selected to participate in the demonstration project shall be used as the source of funds to carry out the demonstration project, including the source of funds for pay increases made under the project.

(e) DURATION.—The demonstration project shall be conducted during fiscal years 2004 through 2006.

(f) REPORT.—Not later than January 15, 2007, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress describing the results of the demonstration project.

(g) GAO EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall transmit a copy the report to the Comptroller General. Within 90 days after receiving a report, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress an evaluation of the report.

Subtitle D—Information Technology

SEC. 331. PERFORMANCE-BASED AND RESULTS-BASED MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS FOR CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICERS OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) ACCOUNTABILITY.—Section 2223 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

''(c) PERFORMANCE-BASED AND RESULTS-BASED MANAGEMENT.—In addition to the responsibilities provided for in subsections (a) and (b), the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense and the Chief Information Officer of a military department shall—

''(1) encourage the use of performance-based and results-based management in fulfilling the responsibilities provided for in subsections (a) and (b), as applicable;

''(2) evaluate the information resources management practices of the department concerned with respect to the performance and results of the investments made by the department in information technology;

''(3) establish effective and efficient capital planning processes for selecting, managing, and evaluating the results of all of the department's major investments in information systems;

''(4) ensure that any analysis of the missions of the department is adequate and make recommendations, as appropriate, on the department's mission-related processes, administrative processes, and any significant investments in information technology to be used in support of those missions; and

''(5) ensure that information security policies, procedures, and practices are adequate.''.

(b) DEFENSE AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES.—Section 2223 of title 10, United States Code, is further amended by inserting after subsection (c), as added by subsection (a), the following new subsection:

''(d) DEFENSE AGENCIES AND FIELD ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary of Defense shall require the Director of each Defense Agency and Department of Defense Field Activity to ensure that the responsibilities set forth in subsections (b) and (c) for Chief Information Officers of military departments are carried out within the Agency or Field Activity by any officer or employee acting as a chief information officer or carrying out duties similar to a chief information officer.''.

Subtitle E—Other Matters

SEC. 341. CATALOGING AND STANDARDIZATION FOR DEFENSE SUPPLY MANAGEMENT.

(a) STANDARDIZATION METHODS.—Section 2451 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 2451. Defense supply management

''(a) SINGLE CATALOG SYSTEM.—The Secretary of Defense shall adopt, implement and maintain a single catalog system for standardizing supplies for the Department of Defense. The single catalog system shall be used for each supply the Department uses, buys, stocks, or distributes.

''(b) STANDARDIZATION REQUIREMENTS.—To the highest degree practicable, the Secretary of Defense shall—

''(1) adopt and use single commercial standards or voluntary standards, in consultation with industry advisory groups, in order to eliminate overlapping and duplicate specifications for supplies for the Department of Defense and to reduce the number of sizes and kind of supplies that are generally similar;

''(2) standardize the methods of packing, packaging, and preserving supplies; and

''(3) make efficient use of the services and facilities for inspecting, testing, and accepting supplies.

''(c) CONSULTATION AND COOPERATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall maintain liaison with industry advisory groups to coordinate the development of the supply catalog and the standardization program with the best practices of industry and to obtain the fullest practicable cooperation and participation of industry in developing the supply catalog and the standardization program.''.

(b) EQUIPMENT STANDARDIZATION WITH NATO MEMBERS.—Section 2457 of such title is amended by striking subsection (d).

(c) CONFORMING REPEALS.—(1) Chapter 145 of such title is amended by striking sections 2452, 2453, and 2454.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by striking the items related to sections 2452, 2453, and 2454.

SEC. 342. SPACE-AVAILABLE TRANSPORTATION FOR DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS ASSIGNED TO OVERSEAS DUTY LOCATIONS FOR CONTINUOUS PERIOD IN EXCESS OF ONE YEAR.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 157 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 2648. Dependents of members assigned to overseas duty locations for continuous period in excess of one year: space-available transportation

''(a) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Defense shall authorize travel on Government aircraft on a space-available basis for dependents of members on active duty assigned to duty at an overseas location as described in subsection (b) to the same extent as such travel is authorized for a dependent of a member assigned to that duty location in a permanent change of station status.

''(b) DUTY STATUS COVERED.—Duty at an overseas location described in this subsection is duty for a continuous period in excess of one year that is in a temporary duty status or that is in a permanent duty status without change of station.

''(c) TYPES OF TRANSPORTATION AUTHORIZED.—If authorized for other members at that duty location, travel provided under this section may include (1) travel between the overseas duty location and the United States and return, and (2) travel between the overseas duty location and another overseas location and return.

''(d) ALASKA AND HAWAII.—For purposes of this section, duty in Alaska or Hawaii shall be considered to be duty at an overseas location.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''2648. Dependents of members assigned to overseas duty locations for continuous period in excess of one year: space-available transportation.''.

SEC. 343. PRESERVATION OF AIR FORCE RESERVE WEATHER RECONNAISSANCE MISSION.

The Secretary of Defense shall not disestablish, discontinue, or transfer the weather reconnaissance mission of the Air Force Reserve unless the Secretary determines that another organization or entity can demonstrate that it has the capability to perform the same mission with the same capability as the Air Force Reserve.

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, 2004, as follows:

(1) The Army, 482,375.

(2) The Navy, 375,700.

(3) The Marine Corps, 175,000.

(4) The Air Force, 361,268.

SEC. 402. REVISION IN PERMANENT ACTIVE DUTY END STRENGTH MINIMUM LEVELS.

Effective October 1, 2003, section 691(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) ARMY.—Paragraph (1) is amended by striking ''480,000'' and inserting ''482,375''.

(2) AIR FORCE.—Paragraph (4) is amended by striking ''359,000'' and inserting ''361,268''.

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, 2004, as follows:

(1) The Army National Guard of the United States, 350,000.

(2) The Army Reserve, 205,000.

(3) The Naval Reserve, 85,900.

(4) The Marine Corps Reserve, 39,600.

(5) The Air National Guard of the United States, 107,000.

(6) The Air Force Reserve, 75,800.

(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 proportionately increased 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, 2004, 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, 25,386.

(2) The Army Reserve, 14,374.

(3) The Naval Reserve, 14,384.

(4) The Marine Corps Reserve, 2,261.

(5) The Air National Guard of the United States, 12,140.

(6) The Air Force Reserve, 1,660.

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 2004 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 National Guard of the United States, 24,589.

(2) For the Army Reserve, 7,844.

(3) For the Air National Guard of the United States, 22,806.

(4) For the Air Force Reserve, 9,991.

SEC. 414. FISCAL YEAR 2004 LIMITATION ON NON-DUAL STATUS TECHNICIANS.

The number of non-dual status technicians of a reserve component of the Army or the Air Force as of September 30, 2004, may not exceed the following:

(1) For the Army Reserve, 910.

(2) For the Army National Guard of the United States, 1,600.

(3) For the Air Force Reserve, 90.

(4) For the Air National Guard of the United States, 350.

SEC. 415. PERMANENT LIMITATIONS ON NUMBER OF NON-DUAL STATUS TECHNICIANS.

Section 10217(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and Air Force Reserve may not exceed 175'' and inserting ''may not exceed 595 and by the Air Force Reserve may not exceed 90''.

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 2004 a total of $98,938,511,000. The authorization in the preceding sentence supersedes any other authorization of appropriations (definite or indefinite) for such purpose for fiscal year 2004.

SEC. 422. ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT HOME.

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2004 from the Armed Forces Retirement Home Trust Fund the sum of $65,279,000 for the operation of the Armed Forces Retirement Home.

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

Subtitle A—General and Flag Officer Matters

SEC. 501. STANDARDIZATION OF QUALIFICATIONS FOR APPOINTMENT AS SERVICE CHIEF.

(a) CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS.—Section 5033(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is

amended by striking ''from officers on the active-duty list in the line of the Navy who are eligible to command at sea and who hold the grade of rear admiral or above'' and inserting ''flag officers of the Navy''.

(b) COMMANDANT OF THE MARINE CORPS.—Section 5043(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''from officers on the active-duty list of the Marine Corps not below the grade of colonel'' and inserting ''general officers of the Marine Corps''.

Subtitle B—Other Officer Personnel Policy Matters

SEC. 511. REPEAL OF PROHIBITION ON TRANSFER BETWEEN LINE OF THE NAVY AND NAVY STAFF CORPS APPLICABLE TO REGULAR NAVY OFFICERS IN GRADES ABOVE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 5582 of title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 539 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 5582.

SEC. 512. RETENTION OF HEALTH PROFESSIONS OFFICERS TO FULFILL ACTIVE-DUTY SERVICE COMMITMENTS FOLLOWING PROMOTION NONSELECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 632 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by inserting ''except as provided in paragraph (3) and in subsection (c),'' before ''be discharged''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c)(1) If a health professions officer described in paragraph (2) is subject to discharge under subsection (a)(1) and, as of the date on which the officer is to be discharged under that paragraph, the officer has not completed a period of active duty service obligation that the officer incurred under section 2005, 2114, 2123, or 2603 of this title, the officer shall be retained on active duty until completion of such active duty service obligation, and then be discharged under that subsection, unless sooner retired or discharged under another provision of law.

''(2) The Secretary concerned may waive the applicability of paragraph (1) to any officer if the Secretary determines that completion of the active duty service obligation of that officer is not in the best interest of the service.

''(3) This subsection applies to a medical officer or dental officer or an officer appointed in a medical skill other than as a medical officer or dental officer (as defined in regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense).''.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—Sections 630(2), 631(a)(3), and 632(a)(3) of such title are amended by striking ''clause'' and inserting ''paragraph''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall not apply in the case of an officer who as of the date of the enactment of this Act is required to be discharged under section 632(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, by reason of having failed of selection for promotion to the next higher regular grade a second time.

SEC. 513. 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.

Subtitle C—Reserve Component Matters

SEC. 521. STREAMLINED PROCESS FOR CONTINUATION OF OFFICERS ON THE RESERVE ACTIVE-STATUS LIST.

(a) REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT FOR USE OF SELECTION BOARDS.—Section 14701 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''by a selection board convened under section 14101(b) of this title'' and inserting ''under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense; and

(B) in paragraph (6), by striking ''as a result of the convening of a selection board under section 14101(b) of this title'' and inserting ''under regulations prescribed under paragraph (1)'';

(2) by striking subsections (b) and (c); and

(3) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (b).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Section 14101(b) of such title is amended—

(A) by striking ''CONTINUATION BOARDS'' and inserting ''SELECTIVE EARLY SEPARATION BOARDS'';

(B) by striking paragraph (1);

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively; and

(D) by striking the last sentence.

(2) Section 14102(a) of such title is amended by striking ''Continuation boards'' and inserting ''Selection boards convened under section 14101(b) of this title''.

(3) Section 14705(b)(1) of such title is amended by striking ''continuation board'' and inserting ''selection board''.

SEC. 522. CONSIDERATION OF RESERVE OFFICERS FOR POSITION VACANCY PROMOTIONS IN TIME OF WAR OR NATIONAL EMERGENCY.

(a) PROMOTION CONSIDERATION WHILE ON ACTIVE-DUTY LIST.—(1) Subsection (d) of section 14317 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''If a reserve officer'' and inserting ''Except as provided in subsection (e), if a reserve officer''.

(2) Subsection (e) of such section is amended to read as follows:

''(e) OFFICERS ORDERED TO ACTIVE DUTY IN TIME OF WAR OR NATIONAL EMERGENCY.—(1) A reserve officer who is not on the active-duty list and who is ordered to active duty in time of war or national emergency may, if eligible, be considered for promotion—

''(A) by a mandatory promotion board convened under section 14101(a) of this title or a special selection board convened under section 14502 of this title; or

''(B) in the case of an officer who has been ordered to or is serving on active duty in support of a contingency operation, by a vacancy promotion board convened under section 14101(a) of this title.

''(2) An officer may not be considered for promotion under this subsection after the end of the two-year period beginning on the date on which the officer is ordered to active duty.

''(3) An officer may not be considered for promotion under this subsection during a period

when the operation of this section has been suspended by the President under the provisions of section 123 or 10213 of this title.

''(4) Consideration of an officer for promotion under this subsection shall be under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the military department concerned.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 14315(a)(1) of such title is amended by striking ''as determined by the Secretary concerned, is available'' and inserting ''under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned, has been recommended''.

SEC. 523. SIMPLIFICATION OF DETERMINATION OF ANNUAL PARTICIPATION FOR PURPOSES OF READY RESERVE TRAINING REQUIREMENTS.

Subsection (a) of section 10147 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(a)(1) Except as provided pursuant to paragraph (2), each person who is enlisted, inducted, or appointed in an armed force and who becomes a member of the Ready Reserve under any provision of law other than section 513 or 10145(b) of this title shall be required, while in the Ready Reserve, to participate in a combination of drills, training periods, and active duty equivalent to 38 days (exclusive of travel) during each year.

''(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 prescribe regulations providing specific exceptions for the requirements of paragraph (1).''.

SEC. 524. AUTHORITY FOR DELEGATION OF REQUIRED SECRETARIAL SPECIAL FINDING FOR PLACEMENT OF CERTAIN RETIRED MEMBERS IN READY RESERVE.

The last sentence of section 10145(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: ''The authority of the Secretary concerned under the preceding sentence may not be delegated—

''(1) to a civilian officer or employee of the military department concerned below the level of the Assistant Secretary of the military department concerned; or

''(2) to a member of the armed forces below the level of the lieutenant general or vice admiral in an armed force with responsibility for military personnel policy in that armed force.''.

SEC. 525. AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE EXPENSES OF ARMY AND AIR STAFF PERSONNEL AND NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU PERSONNEL ATTENDING NATIONAL CONVENTIONS OF CERTAIN MILITARY ASSOCIATIONS.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Section 107(a)(2) of title 32, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''officers'' and inserting ''members'';

(2) by striking ''Army General Staff'' and inserting ''Army Staff''; and

(3) by striking ''National Guard Association of the United States'' and inserting '', Enlisted Association of the National Guard of the United States, National Guard Association of the United States,''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to funds appropriated for a fiscal year before fiscal year 2004.

Subtitle D—Military Education and Training

SEC. 531. AUTHORITY FOR THE MARINE CORPS UNIVERSITY TO AWARD THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF OPERATIONAL STUDIES.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Section 7102 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection (c):

''(c) COMMAND AND STAFF COLLEGE OF THE MARINE CORP UNIVERSITY.—Upon the recommendation of the Director and faculty of the Command and Staff College of the Marine Corps University, the President of the Marine Corps University may confer the degree of master of operational studies upon graduates of the Command and Staff College's School of Advanced Warfighting who fulfill the requirements for that degree.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The authority to confer the degree of master of operational studies under section 7102(c) of title 10, United States Code (as added by subsection (a)) may not be exercised until the Secretary of Education determines, and certifies to the President of the Marine Corps University, that the requirements established by the Command and General Staff College of the Marine Corps University for that degree are in accordance with generally applicable requirements for a degree of master of arts. Upon receipt of such a certification, the President of the University shall promptly transmit a copy of the certification to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 532. EXPANDED EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE AUTHORITY FOR CADETS AND MIDSHIPMEN RECEIVING ROTC SCHOLARSHIPS.

(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:

''(3) In the case of a cadet or midshipman eligible to receive financial assistance under paragraph (1) or (2), the Secretary of the military department concerned may, in lieu of all or part of the financial assistance described in paragraph (1), provide financial assistance in the form of room and board expenses for the cadet or midshipman and other expenses required by the educational institution.

''(4) The total amount of financial assistance, including the payment of room and board and other educational expenses, provided to a cadet or midshipman in an academic year under this subsection may not exceed an amount equal to the amount that could be provided as financial assistance for such cadet or midshipman under paragraph (1) or (2), or other amount determined by the Secretary concerned, without regard to whether room and board and other educational expenses for such cadet or midshipman are paid under paragraph (3).''.

''(b) FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR SERVICE IN TROOP PROGRAM UNITS.—Section 2107a(c) of such title is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(c)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(2) In the case of a cadet eligible to receive financial assistance under paragraph (1), the Secretary of the military department concerned may, in lieu of all or part of the financial assistance described in paragraph (1), provide financial assistance in the form of room and board expenses for such cadet and other expenses required by the educational institution.

''(3) The total amount of financial assistance, including the payment of room and board and any other educational expenses, provided to a cadet in an academic year under this subsection may not exceed an amount equal to the amount that could be provided as financial assistance for such cadet under paragraph (1), or other amount determined by the Secretary of the Army, without regard to whether the room and board and other educational expenses for such cadet are paid under paragraph (2).''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to payment of expenses of cadets and midshipmen of the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program that are due after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 533. INCREASE IN ALLOCATION OF SCHOLARSHIPS UNDER ARMY RESERVE ROTC SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM TO STUDENTS AT MILITARY JUNIOR COLLEGES.

Section 2107a(h) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''10'' each place it appears and inserting ''17''.

SEC. 534. INCLUSION OF ACCRUED INTEREST IN AMOUNTS THAT MAY BE REPAID UNDER SELECTED RESERVE CRITICAL SPECIALTIES EDUCATION LOAN REPAYMENT PROGRAM.

Section 16301 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', plus the amount of any interest that may accrue during the current year''; and

(2) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''For the purposes of this section, any interest that has accrued on the loan for periods before the current year shall be considered as within the total loan amount that shall be repaid.''.

SEC. 535. AUTHORITY FOR NONSCHOLARSHIP SENIOR ROTC SOPHOMORES TO VOLUNTARILY CONTRACT FOR AND RECEIVE SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCE.

(a) AUTHORITY FOR ALLOWANCE.—Section 209 of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection (c):

''(c) NONSCHOLARSHIP SENIOR ROTC MEMBERS NOT IN ADVANCED TRAINING.—A member of the Selected Reserve Officers' Training Corps who has entered into an agreement under section 2103a of title 10 is entitled to a monthly subsistence allowance at a rate prescribed under subsection (a). The allowance may be paid to the member for a maximum of 20 months.''.

(b) AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT ENROLLMENT.—(1) Chapter 103 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2103 the following new section:

''§2103a. Students not eligible for advanced training: commitment to military service

''(a) A member of the program who has completed successfully the first year of a four-year Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps course and who is not eligible for advanced training under section 2104 of this title and is not a cadet or midshipman appointed under section 2107 of this title may—

''(1) contract with the Secretary of the military department concerned, or the Secretary's designated representative, to serve for the period required by the program; and

''(2) agree in writing to accept an appointment, if offered, as a commissioned officer in the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, as the case may be, and to serve in the armed forces for the period prescribed by the Secretary.

''(b) A member of the program may enter into a contract and agreement under this section (and receive a subsistence allowance under section 209(c) of title 37) only if the person—

''(1) is a citizen of the United States;

''(2) enlists in an armed force under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the military department concerned for the period prescribed by the Secretary; and

''(3) executes a certificate of loyalty in such form as the Secretary of Defense prescribes or take a loyalty oath as prescribed by the Secretary.

''(c) A member of the program who is a minor may enter into a contract under subsection (a)(1) only with the consent of the member's parent or guardian.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''2103a. Students not eligible for advanced training: commitment to military service.''.

SEC. 536. APPOINTMENTS TO MILITARY SERVICE ACADEMIES FROM NOMINATIONS MADE BY DELEGATES FROM GUAM, VIRGIN ISLANDS, AND AMERICAN SAMOA.

(a) UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY.—Section 4342(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraphs (6) and (8), by striking ''Two'' and inserting ''Three''; and

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking ''One'' and inserting ''Two''.

(b) UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY.—Section 6954(a) of such title is amended—

(1) in paragraphs (6) and (8), by striking ''Two'' and inserting ''Three''; and

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking ''One'' and inserting ''Two''.

(c) UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY.—Section 9342(a) of such title is amended—

(1) in paragraphs (6) and (8), by striking ''Two'' and inserting ''Three''; and

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking ''One'' and inserting ''Two''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to the nomination of candidates for appointment to the United States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, and the United States Air Force Academy for classes entering those academies after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 537. READMISSION TO SERVICE ACADEMIES OF CERTAIN FORMER CADETS AND MIDSHIPMEN.

(a) INSPECTOR GENERAL REPORT AS BASIS FOR READMISSION.—(1) When a formal report by an Inspector General within the Department of Defense concerning the circumstances of the separation of a cadet or midshipman from one of the service academies contains a specific finding specified in paragraph (2), the Secretary of the military department concerned may use that report as the sole basis for readmission of the former cadet or midshipman to the respective service or service academy.

(2) A finding specified in this paragraph is a finding that substantiates that a former service academy cadet or midshipman, while attending the service academy—

(A) received administrative or punitive action or nonjudicial punishment as a result of reprisal;

(B) resigned in lieu of disciplinary, administrative, or other action that the formal report concludes constituted a threat of reprisal; or

(C) otherwise suffered an injustice that contributed to the resignation of the cadet or midshipman.

(b) READMISSION.—In the case of a formal report by an Inspector General described in subsection (a), the Secretary concerned shall offer the former cadet or midshipman an opportunity for readmission to the service academy from which the former cadet or midshipman resigned, if the former cadet or midshipman is otherwise eligible for such readmission.

(c) APPLICATIONS FOR READMISSION.—A former cadet or midshipman described in a report referred to in subsection (a) may apply for readmission to the service academy on the basis of that report and shall not be required to submit the request for readmission through a board for the correction of military records.

(d) REGULATIONS TO MINIMIZE ADVERSE IMPACT UPON READMISSION.—The Secretary of each military department shall prescribe regulations for the readmission of a former cadet or midshipman described in subsections (a), with the goal, to the maximum extent practicable, of readmitting the former cadet or midshipman at no loss of the academic or military status held by the former cadet at the time of resignation.

(e) CONSTRUCTION WITH OTHER REMEDIES.—This section does not preempt or supercede any other remedy that may be available to a former cadet or midshipman.

(f) SERVICE ACADEMIES.—In this section, the term ''service academy'' means the following:

(1) The United States Military Academy.

(2) The United States Naval Academy.

(3) The United States Air Force Academy.

SEC. 538. AUTHORIZATION FOR NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL TO PROVIDE INSTRUCTION TO ENLISTED MEMBERS PARTICIPATING IN CERTAIN PROGRAMS.

(a) INSTRUCTION OF ENLISTED MEMBERS.—Subsection (a) of section 7045 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) The Secretary may permit enlisted members of the armed forces to receive instruction at the Naval Postgraduate School for the purpose of attending—

''(A) executive level seminars; or

''(B) the information security scholarship program under chapter 112 of this title.

''(3) In addition to instruction authorized under paragraph (2), the Secretary may, on a space-available basis, permit an enlisted member of any of the armed forces to receive instruction at the Naval Postgraduate School if the member is assigned permanently to the staff of the Naval Postgraduate School or to a nearby command.''.

(b) REIMBURSEMENT.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended—

(1) by striking ''The Department'' and inserting ''(1) Except as provided under paragraph (3), the Department '';

(2) by striking ''officers'' in the first sentence and inserting ''members'';

(3) by designating the second sentence as paragraph (2) and in that sentence—

(A) by inserting ''under subsection (a)(3)'' after ''permitted'';

(B) by inserting ''on a space-available basis'' after ''instruction at the Postgraduate School''; and

(C) by striking ''(taking into consideration the admission of enlisted members on a space-available basis)''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) The Secretary of Defense may prescribe exceptions to the requirements of paragraph (1) with regard to attendance at the Postgraduate School pursuant to chapter 112 of this title.''.

SEC. 539. DEFENSE TASK FORCE ON SEXUAL HARASSMENT AND VIOLENCE AT THE MILITARY SERVICE ACADEMIES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish a Department of Defense task force to examine matters relating to sexual harassment and violence at the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy.

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than 12 months after the date on which all members of the task force have been appointed, the task force shall submit to the Secretary of Defense a report recommending ways by which the Department of Defense and the military services may more effectively address matters relating to sexual harassment and violence at the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy. The report shall include an assessment of, and recommendations (including changes in law) for measures to improve, the following with respect to sexual harassment and violence at those academies:

(1) Victims' safety programs.

(2) Offender accountability.

(3) Effective prevention of sexual harassment and violence.

(4) Collaboration among military organizations with responsibility or jurisdiction with respect to sexual harassment and violence.

(5) Coordination between military and civilian communities, including local support organizations, with respect to sexual harassment and violence.

(6) Coordination between military and civilian communities, including civilian law enforcement relating to acts of sexual harassment and violence.

(7) Data collection and case management and tracking.

(8) Curricula and training, including standard training programs for cadets at the United States Military Academy and midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy and for permanent personnel assigned to those academies.

(9) Responses to sexual harassment and violence at those academies, including standard guidelines.

(10) Other issues identified by the task force relating to sexual harassment and violence at those academies.

(c) METHODOLOGY.—The task force shall consider the findings and recommendations of previous reviews and investigations of sexual harassment and violence conducted for those academies as one of the bases for its assessment.

(d) REPORT.—(1) The task force shall submit to the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the Army and the Navy a report on the activities of the task force and on the activities of the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy to respond to sexual harassment and violence at those academies.

(2) The report shall include the following:

(A) Any barriers to implementation of improvements as a result of those efforts.

(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 as the task force considers appropriate, including whether cases of sexual assault at those academies should be included in the Department of Defense database known as the Defense Incident-Based Reporting System.

(3) Within 90 days of 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.

(e) REPORT ON AIR FORCE ACADEMY.—Simultaneously with the submission of the report under subsection (d)(3), the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of the Air Force, shall submit to the committees specified in that subsection the Secretary's assessment of the effectiveness of corrective actions being taken at the United States Air Force Academy as a result of various investigations conducted at that Academy into matters involving sexual assault and harassment.

(f) COMPOSITION.—(1) The task force shall consist of not more than 14 members, to be appointed by the Secretary of Defense. Members shall be appointed from each of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and shall include an equal number of personnel of the Department of Defense (military and civilian) and persons from outside the Department of Defense. Members appointed from outside the Department of Defense may be appointed from other Federal departments and agencies, from State and local agencies, or from the private sector.

(2) The Secretary shall ensure that the membership of the task force appointed from the Department of Defense includes at least one judge advocate.

(3) In appointing members to the task force, the Secretary may—

(A) consult with the Attorney General regarding a representative from the Office of Violence Against Women of the Department of Justice; and

(B) consult with the Secretary of Health and Human Services regarding a representative from the Women's Health office of the Department of Health and Human Services.

(4) Each member of the task force appointed from outside the Department of Defense shall be an individual who has demonstrated expertise in the area of sexual harassment and violence or shall be appointed from one of the following:

(A) A representative from the Office of Civil Right in the Department of Education.

(B) A representative from the Center for Disease Control.

(C) A sexual assault policy and advocacy organization.

(D) A civilian law enforcement agency.

(E) A judicial policy organization.

(F) A national crime victim policy organization.

(5) The members of the task force shall be appointed not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(g) CO-CHAIRS OF THE TASK FORCE.—There shall be two co-chairs of the task force. One of the co-chairs shall be designated by the Secretary of the Defense at the time of appointment from among the Department of Defense personnel on the task force. The other co-chair shall be selected from among the members appointed from outside the Department of Defense by those members.

(h) ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT.—(1) Each member of the task force who is a member of the Armed Forces or a civilian officer or employee of the United States shall serve without compensation (other than compensation to which entitled as a member of the Armed Forces or an officer or employee of the United States, as the case may be). Other members of the task force shall be appointed in accordance with, and subject to, section 3161 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) The Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, under the direction of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, shall provide oversight of the task force. The Washington Headquarters Service of the Department of Defense shall provide the task force with personnel, facilities, and other administrative support as necessary for the performance of the task force's duties.

(3) The Deputy Under Secretary shall coordinate with the Secretary of the Army to provide visits of the task force to the United States Military Academy and with the Secretary of the Navy to provide visits of the task force to the United States Naval Academy.

(i) 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 (d)(3).

Subtitle E—Administrative Matters

SEC. 541. ENHANCEMENTS TO HIGH-TEMPO PERSONNEL PROGRAM.

(a) REVISIONS TO DEPLOYMENT LIMITS AND AUTHORITY TO AUTHORIZE EXEMPTIONS.—Subsection (a) of section 991 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(a) SERVICE AND GENERAL OR FLAG OFFICER RESPONSIBILITIES.—(1) Subject to paragraph (3), the deployment (or potential deployment) of members of the armed forces shall be managed to ensure that a member is not deployed, or continued in a deployment, on any day on which the total number of days on which the member has been deployed out of the preceding 730 days would exceed the high-deployment threshold.

''(2) In this subsection, the term 'high-deployment threshold' means—

''(A) 400 days; or

''(B) a lower number of days prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

''(3) A member may be deployed, or continued in a deployment, without regard to paragraph (1) if the deployment, or continued deployment, is approved by the Secretary of Defense. The authority of the Secretary under the preceding sentence may only be delegated to—

''(A) a civilian officer of the Department of Defense appointed by the President, by and with the advise and consent of the Senate, or a member of the Senior Executive Service; or

''(B) a general or flag officer in that member's chain of command (including an officer in the grade of colonel, or in the case of the Navy, captain, serving an in a general or flag officer position who has been selected for promotion to the grade of brigadier general or rear admiral (lower half)).''.

(b) CHANGES FROM PER DIEM TO HIGH-DEPLOYMENT ALLOWANCE.—(1) Subsection (a) of section 436 of title 37, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(a) MONTHLY ALLOWANCE.—The Secretary of the military department concerned shall pay a high-deployment allowance to a member of the armed forces under the Secretary's jurisdiction for each month during which the member—

''(1) is deployed; and

''(2) at any time during that month—

''(A) has been deployed for 191 or more consecutive days (or a lower number of consecutive days prescribed by the Secretary of Defense);

''(B) has been deployed, out of the preceding 730 days, for a total of 401 or more days (or a lower number of days prescribed by the Secretary of Defense); or

''(C) in the case of a member of a reserve component, is on active duty under a call or order to active duty for a period of more than 30 days that is the second (or later) such call or order to active duty (whether voluntary or involuntary) for that member in support of the same contingency operation.''.

(2) Subsection (c) of such section is amended to read as follows:

''(c) RATE.—The monthly rate of the allowance payable to a member under this section shall be determined by the Secretary concerned, not to exceed $1,000 per month.''.

(3) Such section is further amended—

(A) in subsection (d), by striking ''per diem'';

(B) in subsection (e), by striking ''per diem'' and inserting ''allowance'';

(C) in subsection (f)—

(i) by striking ''per diem'' and inserting ''allowance''; and

(ii) by striking ''day on'' and inserting ''month during''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) AUTHORITY TO EXCLUDE CERTAIN DUTY ASSIGNMENTS.—The Secretary concerned may exclude members serving in specified duty assignments from eligibility for the high-deployment allowance while serving in those assignments. Any such specification of duty assignments may only be made with the approval of the Secretary of Defense. Specification of a particular duty assignment for purposes of this subsection may not be implemented so as to apply to the member serving in that position at the time of such specification.''.

(4)(A) The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

''§ 436. Monthly high-deployment allowance for lengthy or numerous deployments''.

(B) The item relating to that section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 7 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''436. Monthly high-deployment allowance for lengthy or numerous deployments.''.

(c) CHANGES TO REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Section 487(b)(5) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(5) For each of the armed forces, the description shall indicate, for the period covered by the report—

''(A) the number of members who received the high-deployment allowance under section 436 of title 37;

''(B) the number of members who received each rate of allowance paid;

''(C) the number of members who received the allowance for one month, for two months, for three months, for four months, for five months, for six months, and for more than six months; and

''(D) the total amount spent on the allowance.''.

SEC. 542. ENHANCED RETENTION OF ACCUMULATED LEAVE FOR HIGH-DEPLOYMENT MEMBERS.

(a) ENHANCED AUTHORITY TO RETAIN ACCUMULATED LEAVE.—Paragraph (1) of section 701(f) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(f)(1)(A) The Secretary concerned, under uniform regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, may authorize a member described in subparagraph (B) who, except for this paragraph, would lose any accumulated leave in excess of 60 days at the end of the fiscal year, to retain an accumulated total of 120 days leave.

''(B) This subsection applies to a member who serves on active duty for a continuous period of at least 120 days—

''(i) in an area in which the member is entitled to special pay under section 310(a) of title 37; or

''(ii) while assigned to a deployable ship or mobile unit or to other duty comparable to that specified in clause (i) that is designated for the purpose of this subsection.

''(C) Except as provided in paragraph (2), Leave in excess of 60 days accumulated under this paragraph is lost unless it is used by the member before the end of the third fiscal year after the fiscal year in which the continuous period of service referred to in subparagraph (B) terminated.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 2003, or the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever is later.

SEC. 543. STANDARDIZATION OF TIME-IN-SERVICE REQUIREMENTS FOR VOLUNTARY RETIREMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS WITH ARMY AND AIR FORCE REQUIREMENTS.

(a) OFFICERS IN REGULAR NAVY OR MARINE CORPS WHO COMPLETED 40 YEARS OF ACTIVE SERVICE.—Section 6321(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''after completing 40 or more years'' and inserting ''and has at least 40 years''.

(b) OFFICERS IN REGULAR NAVY OR MARINE CORPS WHO COMPLETED 30 YEARS OF ACTIVE SERVICE.—Section 6322(a) of such title is amended by striking ''after completing 30 or more years'' and inserting ''and has at least 30 years''.

(c) OFFICERS IN NAVY OR MARINE CORPS WHO COMPLETED 20 YEARS OF ACTIVE SERVICE.—Section 6323(a)(1) of such title is amended by striking ''after completing more than 20 years'' and inserting ''and has at least 20 years''.

(d) ENLISTED MEMBERS IN REGULAR NAVY OR MARINE CORPS WHO COMPLETED 30 YEARS OF ACTIVE SERVICE.—Section 6326(a) of such title is amended by striking ''after completing 30 or more years'' and inserting ''and has at least 30 years''.

(e) TRANSFER OF ENLISTED MEMBERS TO THE FLEET RESERVE AND FLEET MARINE CORPS RESERVE.—Section 6330(b) of such title is amended by striking ''who has completed 20 or more years'' both places it appears and inserting ''who has at least 20 years''.

(f) TRANSFER OF MEMBERS OF THE FLEET RESERVE AND FLEET MARINE CORPS RESERVE TO THE RETIRED LIST.—Section 6331(a) of such title is amended by striking ''completed 30 years'' and inserting ''has at least 30 years''.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The Secretary of the Navy shall prescribe the date on which the amendments made by this section shall take effect. The Secretary shall publish such date, when prescribed, in the Federal Register.

SEC. 544. STANDARDIZATION OF STATUTORY AUTHORITIES FOR EXEMPTIONS FROM REQUIREMENT FOR ACCESS TO SECONDARY SCHOOLS BY MILITARY RECRUITERS.

(a) CONSISTENCY WITH ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965.—Paragraph (5) of section 503(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''apply to—'' and all that follows through ''school which'' and inserting ''apply to a private secondary school that''.

(b) CORRECTION OF CROSS REFERENCE.—Paragraph (6)(A)(i) of such section is amended by striking ''14101'' and ''8801'' and inserting ''9101'' and ''7801'', respectively.

SEC. 545. PROCEDURES FOR CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS FOR AWARD OF THE PURPLE HEART MEDAL TO VETERANS HELD AS PRISONERS OF WAR BEFORE APRIL 25, 1962.

Subsection (b) of section 521 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat. 309; 10 U.S.C. 1129 note) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR AWARD.—In determining whether a former prisoner of war is eligible for the award of the Purple Heart under subsection (a), the Secretary concerned shall apply the following procedures:

''(1) The standard to be used by the Secretary concerned for awarding the Purple Heart under this section shall be to award the Purple Heart in any case in which a prisoner of war (A) was wounded while in captivity, or (B) while in captivity was subjected to systematic and prolonged deprivation of food, medical treatment, and other forms of deprivation or mistreatment likely to have prolonged aftereffects on the individual concerned.

''(2) When a former prisoner of war applies for the Purple Heart under subsection (a), the Secretary concerned may request the former prisoner of war to provide any documentation that the Secretary would otherwise require, but failure of the former prisoner of war to provide such documentation shall not by itself be a disqualification for award of the Purple Heart.

''(3) The Secretary concerned shall inform the former prisoner of war that historical information as to the prison camp or other circumstances in which the former prisoner of war was held captive and other information as to the circumstances of the former prisoner of war's captivity may be considered by the Secretary in evaluating the application for the award of the Purple Heart and that the former prisoner of war may submit such information.

''(4) The Secretary concerned shall provide assistance to the applicant for the Purple Heart in obtaining information referred to in paragraph (3).

''(5) The Secretary shall review a completed application under this section based upon the totality of the evidence presented and shall take into account the length of time between the period during which the applicant was held as a prisoner of war and the date of the application.

''(6) In considering an application under this section, the Secretary shall take into account the length of time that the applicant was held in captivity, which while not in itself establishing entitlement of the applicant to award of the Purple Heart, can and should be a factor in determining whether a former prisoner of war was likely to have been wounded, starved, or denied medical treatment to the extent likely to have prolonged aftereffects on the individual concerned.''.

SEC. 546. AUTHORITY FOR RESERVE AND RETIRED REGULAR OFFICERS TO HOLD STATE AND LOCAL ELECTIVE OFFICE NOTWITHSTANDING CALL TO ACTIVE DUTY.

Section 973(b)(3) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(A)'' after ''(3)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) The prohibition in subparagraph (A) does not apply to the functions of a civil office held by election, in the case of an officer to whom this subsection applies by reason of subparagraph (B) or (C) of paragraph (1).''.

SEC. 547. CLARIFICATION OF OFFENSE UNDER THE UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE RELATING TO DRUNKEN OR RECKLESS OPERATION OF A VEHICLE, AIRCRAFT, OR VESSEL.

Section 551 of title 10, United States Code (article 111 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2) by striking ''in excess of'' and inserting ''at, or in excess of,''; and

(2) in subsection (b)(4), by striking ''maximum permissible'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''amount of alcohol concentration in a person's blood or breath at which operation or control of a vehicle, aircraft, or vessel is prohibited.''.

SEC. 548. PUBLIC IDENTIFICATION OF CASUALTIES NO SOONER THAN 24 HOURS AFTER NOTIFICATION OF NEXT-OF-KIN.

The Secretary of Defense may not publicly release the name or other personally identifying information of any member of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps who while on active duty or performing inactive duty training is killed or injured, whose duty status becomes unknown, or who is otherwise considered to be a casualty until a period of 24 hours has elapsed after the notification of the next-of-kin of such member.

Subtitle F—Benefits

SEC. 551. ADDITIONAL CLASSES OF INDIVIDUALS ELIGIBLE TO PARTICIPATE IN THE FEDERAL LONG-TERM CARE INSURANCE PROGRAM.

(a) CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT.—Section 9001(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''2105(c),'' and all that follows and inserting ''2105(c).''.

(b) FORMER FEDERAL EMPLOYEES WHO WOULD BE ELIGIBLE TO BEGIN RECEIVING AN ANNUITY UPON ATTAINING THE REQUISITE MINIMUM AGE.—Section 9001(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) any former employee who, on the basis of his or her service, would meet all requirements for being considered an 'annuitant' within the meaning of subchapter III of chapter 83, chapter 84, or any other retirement system for employees of the Government, but for the fact that such former employee has not attained the minimum age for title to annuity.''.

(c) RESERVISTS TRANSFERRED TO THE RETIRED RESERVE WHO ARE UNDER AGE 60.—Section 9001(4) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''including'' and all that follows through ''who has'' and inserting ''and a member who has been transferred to the Retired Reserve and who would be entitled to retired pay under chapter 1223 of title 10 but for not having''.

SEC. 552. AUTHORITY TO TRANSPORT REMAINS OF RETIREES AND RETIREE DEPENDENTS WHO DIE IN MILITARY TREATMENT FACILITIES OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.

(a) AUTHORIZED TRANSPORTATION.—Section 1490 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''located in the United States''; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1), by striking ''outside the United States or to a place''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (c) of such section is amended to read as follows:

''(c) DEFINITION OF DEPENDENT.—In this section, the term 'dependent' has the meaning given such term in section 1072(2) of this title.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply only with respect to persons dying on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 553. ELIGIBILITY FOR DEPENDENTS OF CERTAIN MOBILIZED RESERVISTS STATIONED OVERSEAS TO ATTEND DEFENSE DEPENDENTS SCHOOLS OVERSEAS.

(a) TUITION-FREE STATUS PARITY WITH DEPENDENTS OF OTHER RESERVISTS.—Section 1404(c) of the Defense Dependents' Education Act of 1978 (20 U.S.C. 923(c)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(c)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2)(A) The Secretary shall include in the regulations prescribed under this subsection a requirement that children in the class of children described in subparagraph (B) shall be subject to the same tuition requirements, or waiver of tuition requirements, as children in the class of children described in subparagraph (C).

''(B) The class of children described in this subparagraph are children of members of reserve components of the Armed Forces who—

''(i) are on active duty under an order to active duty under section 12301 or 12302 of title 10, United States Code;

''(ii) were ordered to active duty from a location in the United States (other than in Alaska or Hawaii); and

''(iii) are serving on active duty outside the United States or in Alaska or Hawaii in a tour of duty that (voluntarily or involuntarily) has been extended to a period in excess of one year.

''(C) The class of children described in this subparagraph are children of members of reserve components of the Armed Forces who—

''(i) are on active duty under an order to active duty under section 12301 or 12302 of title 10, United States Code;

''(ii) were ordered to active duty from a location outside the United States (or in Alaska or Hawaii); and

''(iii) are serving on active duty outside the United States or in Alaska or Hawaii.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

''SPACE-AVAILABLE ENROLLMENT OF STUDENTS; TUITION''.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION OF REQUIRED NEW REGULATIONS.—Regulations required by paragraph (2) of section 1404(c) of the Defense Dependents' Education Act of 1978 (20 U.S.C. 923(c)), as added by subsection (a), shall be prescribed as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act in order to provide the earliest opportunity for dependents covered by that paragraph to enroll in Department of Defense dependents' schools, and in no event later than the beginning of the first school term beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Subtitle G—Other Matters

SEC. 561. EXTENSION OF REQUIREMENT FOR EXEMPLARY CONDUCT BY COMMANDING OFFICERS AND OTHERS IN AUTHORITY TO INCLUDE CIVILIANS IN AUTHORITY IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Chapter 50 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 992. Requirement of exemplary conduct: commanding officers and others in authority

''All commanding officers and others in authority in the Department of Defense are required—

''(1) to show in themselves a good example of virtue, honor, patriotism, and subordination;

''(2) to be vigilant in inspecting the conduct of all persons who are placed under their command or charge;

''(3) to guard against and to suppress all dissolute and immoral practices and to correct, according to applicable laws and regulations, all persons who are guilty of them; and

''(4) to take all necessary and proper measures, under the laws, regulations, and customs applicable to the armed forces, to promote and safeguard the morale, the physical well-being, and the general welfare of all under their command or charge.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''992. Requirement of exemplary conduct: commanding officers and others in authority.''.

(b) CONFORMING REPEALS.—Title 10, United States Code, is further amended as follows:

(1) Section 3583, 5947, and 8583 are repealed.

(2)(A) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 345 is amended by striking the item relating to section 3583.

(B) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 551 is amended by striking the item relating to section 5947.

(C) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 845 is amended by striking the item relating to section 8583.

SEC. 562. RECOGNITION OF MILITARY FAMILIES.

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

(1) The families of both active and reserve component military personnel, through their sacrifices and their dedication to the Nation and its values, contribute immeasurably to the readiness of the Nation's Armed Forces.

(2) Without the continued support of military families, the Nation's ability to sustain a high quality all-volunteer military force would be undermined.

(3) In these perilous and challenging times, with hundreds of thousands of active and reserve military personnel deployed overseas in places of combat and imminent danger, military families are making extraordinary sacrifices and will be required to do so for the foreseeable future.

(4) Beginning in 1997, military family service and support centers have received materials from private, non-profit organizational sources which are designed to encourage and assist those centers in conducting activities to celebrate the American military family during the Thanksgiving period each November.

(b) MILITARY FAMILY RECOGNITION.— In view of the findings in subsection (a), Congress determines that it is appropriate that special measures be taken annually to recognize and honor the American military family.

(c) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) implement and sustain programs, including appropriate ceremonies and activities, to celebrate the contributions and sacrifices of the American military family, including both families of both active and reserve component military personnel;

(2) focus the celebration of the American military family during a specific period of each year to give full and proper highlight to those families; and

(3) seek the assistance and support of appropriate civilian organizations, associations, and other entities in carrying out not only the annual celebration of the American military family, but also in sustaining longer-term efforts.

SEC. 563. 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 2004.—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated pursuant to section 301(5) for operation and maintenance for Defense-wide activities, $35,000,000 shall be available only for the purpose of providing educational agencies assistance to local educational agencies.

(b) NOTIFICATION.—Not later than June 30, 2004, the Secretary of Defense shall notify each local educational agency that is eligible for educational agencies assistance for fiscal year 2004 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. 564. PERMANENT AUTHORITY FOR SUPPORT FOR CERTAIN CHAPLAIN-LED MILITARY FAMILY SUPPORT PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Chapter 88 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end of subchapter I the following new section:

''§ 1789. Chaplain-led programs: authorized support

''(a) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of a military department may provide support services described in subsection (b) to support chaplain-led programs to assist members of the armed forces on active duty and their immediate family members, and members of reserve components in an active status and their immediate family members, in building and maintaining a strong family structure.

''(b) AUTHORIZED SUPPORT SERVICES.—The support services referred to in subsection (a) are costs of transportation, food, lodging, child care, supplies, fees, and training materials for members of the armed forces and their family members while participating in programs referred to in that subsection, including participation at retreats and conferences.

''(c) IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBERS.—In this section, the term 'immediate family members', with respect to a member of the armed forces, means—

''(1) the member's spouse; and

''(2) any child (as defined in section 1072(6) of this title) of the member who is described in subparagraph (D) of section 1072(2) of this title.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1788 the following new item:

''1789. Chaplain-led programs: authorized support.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 1789 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall take effect on October 1, 2003.

SEC. 565. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE-DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS JOINT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE.—(1) Chapter 3 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 320. Department of Veterans Affairs-Department of Defense Joint Executive Committee

''(a) JOINT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.—(1) There is established an interagency committee to be known as the Department of Veterans Affairs-Department of Defense Joint Executive Committee (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Committee').

''(2) The Committee is composed of—

''(A) the Deputy Secretary of Veterans Affairs and such other officers and employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs as the Secretary of Veterans Affairs may designate; and

''(B) the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness and such other officers and employees of the Department of Defense as the Secretary of Defense may designate.

''(b) ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS.—(1) The Deputy Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Under Secretary of Defense shall determine the size and structure of the Committee, as well as the administrative and procedural guidelines for the operation of the Committee.

''(2) The two Departments shall supply appropriate staff and resources to provide administrative support and services. Support for such purposes shall be provided at a level sufficient for the efficient operation of the Committee, including a subordinate Health Executive Committee, a subordinate Benefits Executive Committee, and such other committees or working groups as considered necessary by the Deputy Secretary and Under Secretary.

''(c) RECOMMENDATIONS.—(1) The Committee shall recommend to the Secretaries strategic direction for the joint coordination and sharing efforts between and within the two Departments under section 8111 of this title and shall oversee implementation of those efforts.

''(2) The Committee shall submit to the two Secretaries and to Congress an annual report containing such recommendations as the Committee considers appropriate.

''(d) FUNCTIONS.—In order to enable the Committee to make recommendations in its annual report under subsection (c)(2), the Committee shall do the following:

''(1) Review existing policies, procedures, and practices relating to the coordination and sharing of resources between the two Departments.

''(2) Identify changes in policies, procedures, and practices that, in the judgment of the Committee, would promote mutually beneficial coordination, use, or exchange of use of services and resources of the two Departments, with the goal of improving the quality, efficiency and effectiveness of the delivery of benefits and services to veterans, service members, military retirees and their families through an enhanced Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense partnership.

''(3) Identify and assess further opportunities for the coordination and collaboration between the Departments that, in the judgment of the Committee, would not adversely affect the range of services, the quality of care, or the established priorities for benefits provided by either Department.

''(4) Review the plans of both Departments for the acquisition of additional resources, especially new facilities and major equipment and technology, in order to assess the potential effect of such plans on further opportunities for the coordination and sharing of resources.

''(5) Review the implementation of activities designed to promote the coordination and sharing of resources between the Departments.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''320. Department of Veterans Affairs-Department of Defense Joint Executive Committee.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Subsection (c) of section 8111 of such title is repealed.

(2) Such section is further amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(2), by striking ''subsection (c)'' and inserting ''section 320 of this title'';

(B) in subsection (d)(1), by striking ''Committee established in subsection (c)'' and inserting ''Department of Veterans Affairs-Department of Defense Joint Executive Committee'';

(C) in subsection (e)(1), by striking ''Committee under subsection (c)(2)'' and inserting ''Department of Veterans Affairs-Department of Defense Joint Executive Committee with respect to health care resources''; and

(D) in subsection (f)(2), by striking subparagraphs (B) and (C) and inserting the following:

''(B) The assessment of further opportunities identified by the Department of Veterans Affairs-Department of Defense Joint Executive Committee under subsection (d)(3) of section 320 of this title for the sharing of health-care resources between the two Departments.

''(C) Any recommendation made by that committee under subsection (c)(2) of that section during that fiscal year.''.

(c) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—Subsection (f) of such section is further amended by inserting ''(Public Law 107–314)'' in paragraphs (3), (4)(A), (4)(B), and (5) after ''for Fiscal Year 2003''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—(1) If this Act is enacted before October 1, 2003—

(A) section 320 of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall take effect on October 1, 2003; and

(B) the amendments made by subsections (b) and (c) shall take effect on October 1, 2003, immediately after the amendment made by section 721(a)(1) of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314; 116 2589).

(2) If this Act is enacted on or after October 1, 2003, the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 566. LIMITATION ON AVIATION FORCE STRUCTURE CHANGES IN THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY.

(a) LIMITATION.—The Secretary of the Navy shall ensure that no reductions are made in the active and reserve force structure of the Navy and Marine Corps for fixed- and rotary-wing aircraft until 90 days have elapsed after the date as of which both of the reports required by subsections (b) and (c) have been received by the committees named in those subsections.

(b) NAVAL AVIATION FORCE STRUCTURE PLAN.—The Secretary of the Navy shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a detailed report on the changes to the active and reserve aviation force structure in the Department of the Navy that are proposed for fiscal years 2004 through 2009. The report shall include the following:

(1) The numbers of aircraft and helicopter force structure planned for retirement.

(2) The amounts of planned budget authority to be saved, shown by year and by appropriation, compared to the May 1, 2003, force structure.

(3) An assessment by the Chief of Naval Operations comparing the future force structure plan with capabilities of the Department of the Navy's aviation force structure on May 1, 2003.

(4) A risk assessment of the planned force structure to carry out the National Security Strategy of the United States, dated September 2002.

(5) A risk assessment of the planned force based on the assumptions applied in the September 30, 2001, Quadrennial Defense Review Report.

(c) ACTIVE AND RESERVE COMPONENT INTEGRATION PLAN.—The Secretary of the Navy shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a concept of operations for increasing the integration and use of Naval Reserve surface, aviation, and other units and personnel with active component forces in carrying out operational missions across the peacetime and wartime spectrum of naval operations during the period of 2004 through 2009.

SEC. 567. IMPACT AID ELIGIBILITY FOR HEAVILY IMPACTED LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES AFFECTED BY PRIVITIZATION OF MILITARY HOUSING.

Section 8003(b)(2)(H) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7703(b)(2)(H)) is amended by striking clauses (i) and (ii) and inserting the following:

''(i) ELIGIBILITY.—For any fiscal year beginning with fiscal 2003, a heavily impacted local educational agency that received a basic support payment under paragraph (b)(2) for the prior fiscal year, but is ineligible for such payment for the current fiscal year under subparagraph (B), (C), (D), or (E), as the case may be, by reason of the conversion of military housing units to private housing described in clause (iii), shall be deemed to meet the eligibility requirements under subparagraph (B) or (C), as the case may be for the period during which the housing units are undergoing such conversion.

''(ii) AMOUNT OF PAYMENT.—The amount of a payment to a heavily impacted local educational agency for a fiscal year by reason of the application of clause (i), and calculated in accordance with subparagraph (D) or (E), as the case may be, shall be based on the number of children in average daily attendance in the schools of such agency for the fiscal year and under the same provisions of subparagraph (D) or (E) under which the agency was paid during the prior fiscal year.''.

SEC. 568. INVESTIGATION INTO THE 1991 DEATH OF MARINE CORPS COLONEL JAMES E. SABOW.

(a) INVESTIGATION REQUIRED.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall commence a new investigation into the death of Colonel James S. Sabow, United States Marine Corps, who died on January 22, 1991, at the Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California.

(b) FOCUS OF INVESTIGATION.—The principal focus of the investigation under subsection (a) shall be to determine the cause of Colonel Sabow's death, given the medical and forensic factors associated with that death.

(c) REVIEW BY OUTSIDE EXPERTS.—The Secretary of Defense shall provide that the evidence concerning the cause of Colonel Sabow's death and the medical and forensic factors associated with his death shall be reviewed by medical and forensic experts outside the Department of Defense.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, 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 written report on the findings of the investigation under subsection (a). The Secretary shall include in the report (1) the Secretary's conclusions as a result of the investigation, including the Secretary's conclusions regarding the cause of death of Colonel Sabow, and (2) the conclusions of the experts reviewing the matter under subsection (c).

Subtitle H—Domestic Violence

SEC. 571. TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION FOR DEPENDENTS RELOCATING FOR REASONS OF PERSONAL SAFETY.

Section 406(h) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4)(A) The Secretary concerned shall provide to the dependents of a member the travel and transportation allowances described in paragraphs (1) and (3) in a case in which—

''(i) a commander has substantiated that the member has committed dependent abuse, as defined in section 1059(c) of title 10;

''(ii) a safety plan and counseling have been provided;

''(iii) there has been a determination that the victim's safety is at stake and that relocation is the best course of action; and

''(iv) the abused dependent, or parent of the abused dependent if the abused dependent is a child, requests relocation,

''(B) In the case of allowances paid under subparagraph (A), any monetary allowances shall accrue to the dependents in lieu of the member and may be paid to the dependents.

''(C) Shipment of the dependent's baggage and household effects, and of any motor vehicle, may not be provided until there is a property division established by written agreement with the member or by order of a court of competent jurisdiction .''.

SEC. 572. COMMENCEMENT AND DURATION OF PAYMENT OF TRANSITIONAL COMPENSATION.

(a) COMMENCEMENT.—Paragraph (1)(A) of section 1059(e) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''shall commence'' and all that follows and inserting ''shall commence—

''(i) as of the date the court martial sentence is adjudged if the sentence, as adjudged, includes a dismissal, dishonorable discharge, bad conduct discharge, or forfeiture of all pay and allowances; or

''(ii) if there is a pretrial agreement that includes disapproval or suspension of the dismissal, dishonorable discharge, bad conduct discharge, or forfeiture of all pay and allowances, as of the date of the approval of the court-martial sentence by the person acting under section 860(c) of this title (article 60(c) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice) if the sentence, as approved, includes an unsuspended dismissal, dishonorable discharge, bad conduct discharge, or forfeiture of all pay and allowances;''.

(b) DURATION.—Paragraph (2) of such section is amended by striking '', except that'' and all that follows through ''12 months''.

(c) TERMINATION.—Paragraph (3)(A) of such section is amended by striking ''punishment applicable to the member under the sentence is remitted, set aside, or mitigated'' and inserting ''conviction is disapproved by the person acting under section 860(c) of this title (article 60(c) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice) or set aside, or each such punishment applicable to the member under the sentence is disapproved by the person acting under section 860(c) of this title, remitted, set aside, suspended, or mitigated''.

SEC. 573. FLEXIBILITY IN ELIGIBILITY FOR TRANSITIONAL COMPENSATION.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Section 1059 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(m) ADDITIONAL ELIGIBILITY.—The Secretary concerned, under regulations prescribed under subsection (k), may authorize eligibility for benefits under this section to dependents of a member or former member of the armed forces not covered by subsection (b) if the Secretary concerned determines that there are extenuating circumstances such that granting benefits under this section is consistent with the intent of this section.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The authority under subsection (m) of section 1059 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), may only be exercised with respect to eligibility for benefits under such section by reason of conduct on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 574. TYPES OF ADMINISTRATIVE SEPARATIONS TRIGGERING COVERAGE.

Section 1059(b)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting '', voluntarily or involuntarily,'' after ''administratively separated''.

SEC. 575. ON-GOING REVIEW GROUP.

Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall convene a working group of not less than 12 members, composed in the same manner as the Defense Task Force on Domestic Violence established pursuant to section 591 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65). The purpose of the working group shall be to review and assess the progress of the Department of Defense in implementation of the recommendations of the Defense Task Force on Domestic Violence. In reviewing the status of the Department's efforts, the group should specifically focus on the Department's efforts to ensure confidentiality for victims and accountability and education of commanding officers and chaplains.

SEC. 576. RESOURCES FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE IMPLEMENTATION ORGANIZATION.

The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that necessary resources, including personnel, facilities, and other administrative support, are provided to the organization within the Office of the Secretary of Defense with direct responsibility for oversight of implementation by the military departments of recommendations of the Task Force in order for that organization to carry out its duties and responsibilities.

SEC. 577. FATALITY REVIEWS.

(a) REVIEW OF FATALITIES.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a multidisciplinary, impartial review (referred to as a ''fatality review'') in the case of each fatality known or

suspected to have resulted from domestic violence or child abuse against—

(1) a member of the Armed Forces;

(2) a current or former dependent of a member of the Armed Forces; or

(3) a current or former intimate partner who has a child in common or has shared a common domicile with a member of the Armed Forces.

(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report of a fatality review under subsection (a) shall, at a minimum, include the following:

(1) An executive summary.

(2) Data setting forth victim demographics, injuries, autopsy findings, homicide or suicide methods, weapons, police information, assailant demographics, and household and family information.

(3) Legal disposition.

(4) System intervention and failures within the Department of Defense.

(5) A discussion of significant findings.

(6) Recommendations for systemic changes within the Department of Defense.

SEC. 578. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Secretary of Defense should adopt the strategic plan proposed by the Defense Task Force on Domestic Violence in its Third Year Report, as required by section 591(a) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65); and

(2) the Secretary of each military department should establish and support a Victim Advocate Protocol and provide for nondisclosure to ensure confidentiality for victims who come forward to receive advocacy, support, information, and resources, as recommended by the Defense Task Force on Domestic Violence.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances

SEC. 601. INCREASE IN BASIC PAY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004.

(a) WAIVER OF SECTION 1009 ADJUSTMENT.—The adjustment to become effective during fiscal year 2004 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 FOR MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES.—Effective on January 1, 2004, the rates of monthly basic pay for members of the Armed Forces within each pay grade are as follows:

COMMISSIONED OFFICERS[1]

Years of service computed under section 205 of title 37, United States Code

Pay Grade	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6
O–10[2]	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
O–9	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
O–8	7,751.10	8,004.90	8,173.20	8,220.60	8,430.30
O–7	6,440.70	6,739.80	6,878.40	6,988.50	7,187.40
O–6	4,773.60	5,244.30	5,588.40	5,588.40	5,609.70
O–5	3,979.50	4,482.90	4,793.40	4,851.60	5,044.80
O–4	3,433.50	3,974.70	4,239.90	4,299.00	4,545.30
O–3[3]	3,018.90	3,422.40	3,693.90	4,027.20	4,220.10
O–2[3]	2,595.60	2,956.50	3,405.00	3,519.90	3,592.50
O–1[3]	2,253.60	2,345.10	2,834.70	2,834.70	2,834.70
	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16
O–10[2]	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
O–9	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
O–8	8,781.90	8,863.50	9,197.10	9,292.80	9,579.90
O–7	7,384.20	7,611.90	7,839.00	8,066.70	8,781.90
O–6	5,850.00	5,882.10	5,882.10	6,216.30	6,807.30
O–5	5,161.20	5,415.90	5,602.80	5,844.00	6,213.60
O–4	4,809.30	5,137.80	5,394.00	5,571.60	5,673.60
O–3[3]	4,431.60	4,568.70	4,794.30	4,911.30	4,911.30
O–2[3]	3,592.50	3,592.50	3,592.50	3,592.50	3,592.50
O–1[3]	2,834.70	2,834.70	2,834.70	2,834.70	2,834.70
	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 24	Over 26
O–10[2]	$0.00	$12,524.70	$12,586.20	$12,847.80	$13,303.80
O–9	0.00	10,954.50	11,112.30	11,340.30	11,738.40
O–8	9,995.70	10,379.10	10,635.30	10,635.30	10,635.30
O–7	9,386.10	9,386.10	9,386.10	9,386.10	9,433.50
O–6	7,154.10	7,500.90	7,698.30	7,897.80	8,285.40
O–5	6,389.70	6,563.40	6,760.80	6,760.80	6,760.80
O–4	5,733.00	5,733.00	5,733.00	5,733.00	5,733.00
O–3[3]	4,911.30	4,911.30	4,911.30	4,911.30	4,911.30
O–2[3]	3,592.50	3,592.50	3,592.50	3,592.50	3,592.50
O–1[3]	2,834.70	2,834.70	2,834.70	2,834.70	2,834.70

[1] *Notwithstanding the basic pay rates specified in this table, the actual rate of basic pay for commissioned officers in pay grades O–7 through O–10 may not exceed the rate of pay for level III of the Executive Schedule and the actual rate of basic pay for all other officers may not exceed the rate of pay for level V of the Executive Schedule.*

[2] *Subject to the preceding footnote, the rate of basic pay for an officer in this grade while serving as Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Naval Operations, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, Commandant of the Marine Corps, or Commandant of the Coast Guard, is $14,679.30, regardless of cumulative years of service computed under section 205 of title 37, United States Code.*

[3] *This table does not apply to commissioned officers in pay grade O–1, O–2, or O–3 who have been credited with over 4 years of active duty service as an enlisted member or warrant officer.*

COMMISSIONED OFFICERS WITH OVER 4 YEARS OF ACTIVE DUTY SERVICE AS AN ENLISTED MEMBER OR WARRANT OFFICER

Years of service computed under section 205 of title 37, United States Code

Pay Grade	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6
O–3E	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$4,027.20	$4,220.10
O–2E	0.00	0.00	0.00	3,537.00	3,609.90
O–1E	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,848.50	3,042.30
	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16
O–3E	$4,431.60	$4,568.70	$4,794.30	$4,984.20	$5,092.80
O–2E	3,724.80	3,918.60	4,068.60	4,180.20	4,180.20
O–1E	3,154.50	3,269.40	3,382.20	3,537.00	3,537.00
	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 24	Over 26

COMMISSIONED OFFICERS WITH OVER 4 YEARS OF ACTIVE DUTY SERVICE AS AN ENLISTED MEMBER OR WARRANT OFFICER

Years of service computed under section 205 of title 37, United States Code

Pay Grade	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6
O–3E	$5,241.30	$5,241.30	$5,241.30	$5,241.30	$5,241.30
O–2E	4,180.20	4,180.20	4,180.20	4,180.20	4,180.20
O–1E	3,537.00	3,537.00	3,537.00	3,537.00	3,537.00

WARRANT OFFICERS[1]

Years of service computed under section 205 of title 37, United States Code

Pay Grade	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6
W–5	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
W–4	3,119.40	3,355.80	3,452.40	3,547.20	3,710.40
W–3	2,848.80	2,967.90	3,089.40	3,129.30	3,257.10
W–2	2,505.90	2,649.00	2,774.10	2,865.30	2,943.30
W–1	2,212.80	2,394.00	2,515.20	2,593.50	2,802.30
	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16
W–5	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
W–4	3,871.50	4,035.00	4,194.30	4,359.00	4,617.30
W–3	3,403.20	3,595.80	3,786.30	3,988.80	4,140.60
W–2	3,157.80	3,321.60	3,443.40	3,562.20	3,643.80
W–1	2,928.30	3,039.90	3,164.70	3,247.20	3,321.90
	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 24	Over 26
W–5	$0.00	$5,360.70	$5,544.30	$5,728.80	$5,914.20
W–4	4,782.60	4,944.30	5,112.00	5,277.00	5,445.90
W–3	4,291.80	4,356.90	4,424.10	4,570.20	4,716.30
W–2	3,712.50	3,843.00	3,972.60	4,103.70	4,103.70
W–1	3,443.70	3,535.80	3,535.80	3,535.80	3,535.80

[1] Notwithstanding the basic pay rates specified in this table, the actual rate of basic pay for warrant officers may not exceed the rate of pay for level V of the Executive Schedule.

ENLISTED MEMBERS[1]

Years of service computed under section 205 of title 37, United States Code

Pay Grade	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6
E–9[2]	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
E–8	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
E–7	2,145.00	2,341.20	2,430.60	2,549.70	2,642.10
E–6	1,855.50	2,041.20	2,131.20	2,218.80	2,310.00
E–5	1,700.10	1,813.50	1,901.10	1,991.10	2,130.60
E–4	1,558.20	1,638.30	1,726.80	1,814.10	1,891.50
E–3	1,407.00	1,495.50	1,585.50	1,585.50	1,585.50
E–2	1,331.40	1,331.40	1,331.40	1,331.40	1,331.40
E–1[3]	1,173.90	1,173.90	1,173.90	1,173.90	1,173.90
	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16
E–9[2]	$0.00	$3,769.20	$3,854.70	$3,962.40	$4,089.30
E–8	3,085.50	3,222.00	3,306.30	3,407.70	3,517.50
E–7	2,801.40	2,891.10	2,980.20	3,139.80	3,219.60
E–6	2,516.10	2,596.20	2,685.30	2,763.30	2,790.90
E–5	2,250.90	2,339.70	2,367.90	2,367.90	2,367.90
E–4	1,891.50	1,891.50	1,891.50	1,891.50	1,891.50
E–3	1,585.50	1,585.50	1,585.50	1,585.50	1,585.50
E–2	1,331.40	1,331.40	1,331.40	1,331.40	1,331.40
E–1[3]	1,173.90	1,173.90	1,173.90	1,173.90	1,173.90
	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 24	Over 26
E–9[2]	$4,216.50	$4,421.10	$4,594.20	$4,776.60	$5,054.70
E–8	3,715.50	3,815.70	3,986.40	4,081.20	4,314.30
E–7	3,295.50	3,341.70	3,498.00	3,599.10	3,855.00
E–6	2,809.80	2,809.80	2,809.80	2,809.80	2,809.80
E–5	2,367.90	2,367.90	2,367.90	2,367.90	2,367.90
E–4	1,891.50	1,891.50	1,891.50	1,891.50	1,891.50
E–3	1,585.50	1,585.50	1,585.50	1,585.50	1,585.50
E–2	1,331.40	1,331.40	1,331.40	1,331.40	1,331.40
E–1[3]	1,173.90	1,173.90	1,173.90	1,173.90	1,173.90

[1] Notwithstanding the basic pay rates specified in this table, the actual rate of basic pay for enlisted members may not exceed the rate of pay for level V of the Executive Schedule.

[2] Subject to the preceding footnote, the rate of basic pay for an enlisted member in this grade while serving as Sergeant Major of the Army, Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy, Chief Master Sergeant of the Air Force, Sergeant Major of the Marine Corps, or Master Chief Petty Officer of the Coast Guard, is $6,090.90, regardless of cumulative years of service computed under section 205 of title 37, United States Code.

[3] In the case of members in pay grade E–1 who have served less than 4 months on active duty, the rate of basic pay is $1,086.00.

(c) INCREASE IN BASIC PAY FOR OTHER MEMBERS OF UNIFORMED SERVICES.—Effective on January 1, 2004, the rates of monthly basic pay for members of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the Public Health Service are increased by 2 percent.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ''armed forces'' and ''uniformed services'' have the meanings given such terms in section 101 of title 37, United States Code.

SEC. 602. COMPUTATION OF BASIC PAY RATE FOR COMMISSIONED OFFICERS WITH PRIOR ENLISTED OR WARRANT OFFICER SERVICE.

Section 203(d)(2) of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''enlisted member,'' and all that follows through the period and inserting ''enlisted member.''; and

(2) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

''(B) Service as a warrant officer, as an enlisted member, or as a warrant officer and an enlisted member, for which at least 1,460 points have been credited to the officer for the purposes of section 12732(a)(2) of title 10.''.

SEC. 603. SPECIAL SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCE AUTHORITIES FOR MEMBERS ASSIGNED TO HIGH-COST DUTY LOCATION OR UNDER OTHER UNIQUE AND UNUSUAL CIRCUMSTANCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 402 of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (f) and (g) as subsections (g) and (h), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

''(f) SPECIAL RULE FOR HIGH-COST DUTY LOCATIONS AND OTHER UNIQUE AND UNUSUAL CIRCUMSTANCES.—The Secretary of Defense may authorize a member of the armed forces who is assigned to duty in a high-cost duty location or under other unique and unusual circumstances, but is not entitled to the meals portion of the per diem in connection with that duty, to receive any or all of the following:

''(1) Meals at no cost to the member, regardless of the entitlement of the member to a basic allowance for subsistence under subsection (a).

''(2) A basic allowance for subsistence at the standard rate, regardless of the entitlement of the member for all meals or select meals during the duty day.

''(3) A supplemental subsistence allowance at a rate higher than the basic allowance for subsistence rates in effect under this section, regardless of the entitlement of the member for all meals or select meals during the duty day.''.

(b) RETROACTIVE AND PROSPECTIVE APPLICATION.—Subsection (f) of section 402 of title 37, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to members of the Armed Forces assigned to duty in a high-cost duty location or under other unique and unusual circumstances, as determined pursuant to regulations prescribed pursuant to subsection (c), after September 11, 2001.

(c) REGULATIONS; TIME LIMITS.—Final regulations to carry out subsection (f) of section 402 of title 37, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall be prescribed not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. The regulations shall provide a method by which a member of the Armed Forces covered by such subsection (f) may obtain reimbursement for subsistence expenses incurred by the member during the period beginning on September 11, 2001, and ending on the date the regulations take effect.

Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays

SEC. 611. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BONUS AND SPECIAL PAY AUTHORITIES FOR RESERVE FORCES.

(a) SELECTED RESERVE REENLISTMENT BONUS.—Section 308b(f) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking ''December 31, 2003'' and inserting ''December 31, 2004''.

(b) SELECTED RESERVE ENLISTMENT BONUS.—Section 308c(e) of such title is amended by striking ''December 31, 2003'' and inserting ''December 31, 2004''.

(c) SPECIAL PAY FOR ENLISTED MEMBERS ASSIGNED TO CERTAIN HIGH PRIORITY UNITS.—Section 308d(c) of such title is amended by striking ''December 31, 2003'' and inserting ''December 31, 2004''.

(d) SELECTED RESERVE AFFILIATION BONUS.—Section 308e(e) of such title is amended by striking ''December 31, 2003'' and inserting ''December 31, 2004''.

(e) READY RESERVE ENLISTMENT AND REENLISTMENT BONUS.—Section 308h(g) of such title is amended by striking ''December 31, 2003'' and inserting ''December 31, 2004''.

(f) PRIOR SERVICE ENLISTMENT BONUS.—Section 308i(f) of such title is amended by striking ''December 31, 2003'' and inserting ''December 31, 2004''.

SEC. 612. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BONUS AND SPECIAL PAY AUTHORITIES FOR CERTAIN HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONALS.

(a) NURSE OFFICER CANDIDATE ACCESSION PROGRAM.—Section 2130a(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''December 31, 2003'' and inserting ''December 31, 2004''.

(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, 2004'' and inserting ''January 1, 2005''.

(c) ACCESSION BONUS FOR REGISTERED NURSES.—Section 302d(a)(1) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking ''December 31, 2003'' and inserting ''December 31, 2004''.

(d) INCENTIVE SPECIAL PAY FOR NURSE ANESTHETISTS.—Section 302e(a)(1) of such title is amended by striking ''December 31, 2003'' and inserting ''December 31, 2004''.

(e) SPECIAL PAY FOR SELECTED RESERVE HEALTH PROFESSIONALS IN CRITICALLY SHORT WARTIME SPECIALTIES.—Section 302g(f) of such title is amended by striking ''December 31, 2003'' and inserting ''December 31, 2004''.

(f) ACCESSION BONUS FOR DENTAL OFFICERS.—Section 302h(a)(1) of such title is amended by striking ''December 31, 2003'' and inserting ''December 31, 2004''.

SEC. 613. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF SPECIAL PAY AND BONUS AUTHORITIES FOR NUCLEAR OFFICERS.

(a) SPECIAL PAY FOR NUCLEAR-QUALIFIED OFFICERS EXTENDING PERIOD OF ACTIVE SERVICE.—Section 312(e) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking ''December 31, 2003'' and inserting ''December 31, 2004''.

(b) NUCLEAR CAREER ACCESSION BONUS.—Section 312b(c) of such title is amended by striking ''December 31, 2003'' and inserting ''December 31, 2004''.

(c) NUCLEAR CAREER ANNUAL INCENTIVE BONUS.—Section 312c(d) of such title is amended by striking ''December 31, 2003'' and inserting ''December 31, 2004''.

SEC. 614. ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF OTHER BONUS AND SPECIAL PAY AUTHORITIES.

(a) AVIATION OFFICER RETENTION BONUS.—Section 301b(a) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking ''December 31, 2003'' and inserting ''December 31, 2004''.

(b) REENLISTMENT BONUS FOR ACTIVE MEMBERS.—Section 308(g) of such title is amended by striking ''December 31, 2003'' and inserting ''December 31, 2004''.

(c) ENLISTMENT BONUS FOR ACTIVE MEMBERS.—Section 309(e) of such title is amended by striking ''December 31, 2003'' and inserting ''December 31, 2004''.

(d) RETENTION BONUS FOR MEMBERS WITH CRITICAL MILITARY SKILLS.—Section 323(i) of such title is amended by striking ''December 31, 2003'' and inserting ''December 31, 2004''.

(e) ACCESSION BONUS FOR NEW OFFICERS IN CRITICAL SKILLS.—Section 324(g) of such title is amended by striking ''December 31, 2003'' and inserting ''December 31, 2004''.

SEC. 615. COMPUTATION OF HAZARDOUS DUTY INCENTIVE PAY FOR DEMOLITION DUTY AND PARACHUTE JUMPING BY MEMBERS OF RESERVE COMPONENTS ENTITLED TO COMPENSATION UNDER SECTION 206 OF TITLE 37.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 301(f) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) or (2), if a member described in paragraph (1) performs the duty described in clauses (3) or (4) of subsection (a) in any month, the member shall be entitled for that month to the full amount specified in the first sentence of subsection (c)(1), in the case of the duty described in clause (4) of subsection (a) or parachute jumping involving the use of a static line, or the full amount specified in the second sentence of subsection (c)(1), in the case of parachute jumping in military free fall operations.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect October 1, 2003.

SEC. 616. AVAILABILITY OF HOSTILE FIRE AND IMMINENT DANGER PAY FOR RESERVE COMPONENT MEMBERS ON INACTIVE DUTY.

(a) EXPANSION AND CLARIFICATION OF CURRENT LAW.—Section 310 of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively; and

(2) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following new subsections:

''(a) ELIGIBILITY AND SPECIAL PAY AMOUNT.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, a member of a uniformed service may be paid special pay at the rate of $150 for any month in which—

''(1) the member was entitled to basic pay or compensation under section 204 or 206 of this title; and

''(2) the member—

''(A) was subject to hostile fire or explosion of hostile mines;

''(B) was on duty in an area in which the member was in imminent danger of being exposed to hostile fire or explosion of hostile mines and in which, during the period the member was on duty in the area, other members of the uniformed services were subject to hostile fire or explosion of hostile mines;

''(C) was killed, injured, or wounded by hostile fire, explosion of a hostile mine, or any other hostile action; or

''(D) was on duty in a foreign area in which the member was subject to the threat of physical harm or imminent danger on the basis of civil insurrection, civil war, terrorism, or wartime conditions.

''(b) CONTINUATION DURING HOSPITALIZATION.—A member covered by subsection (a)(2)(C) who is hospitalized for the treatment of the injury or wound may be paid special pay under this section for not more than three additional months during which the member is so hospitalized.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—Such section is further amended—

(1) in subsection (c), as redesignated by subsection (a)(1), by inserting ''LIMITATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION.—'' before ''(1)''; and

(2) in subsection (d), as redesignated by subsection (a)(1), by inserting ''DETERMINATIONS OF FACT.—'' before ''Any''.

SEC. 617. EXPANSION OF OVERSEAS TOUR EXTENSION INCENTIVE PROGRAM TO OFFICERS.

(a) SPECIAL PAY OR BONUS FOR EXTENDING OVERSEAS TOUR OF DUTY.—(1) Subsections (a) and (b) of section 314 of title 37, United States Code, are amended by striking ''an enlisted member'' and inserting ''a member''.

(2)(A) The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

''§ 314. Special pay or bonus: qualified members extending duty at designated locations overseas''.

(B) The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 5 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''314. Special pay or bonus: qualified members extending duty at designated locations overseas.''.

(b) REST AND RECUPERATIVE ABSENCE IN LIEU OF PAY OR BONUS.—(1) Subsection (a) of section

705 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''an enlisted member'' and inserting ''a member''.

(2)(A) The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

''§ 705. Rest and recuperation absence: qualified members extending duty at designated locations overseas''.

(B) The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 40 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''705. Rest and recuperative absence for qualified members extending duty at designated locations overseas.''.

SEC. 618. ELIGIBILITY OF APPOINTED WARRANT OFFICERS FOR ACCESSION BONUS FOR NEW OFFICERS IN CRITICAL SKILLS.

Section 324 of title 37, United States Code, is amended in subsections (a) and (f)(1) by inserting ''or an appointment'' after ''commission''.

SEC. 619. INCENTIVE PAY FOR DUTY ON GROUND IN ANTARCTICA OR ON ARCTIC ICEPACK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 301e the following new section:

''§ 301f. Incentive pay: duty on ground in Antarctica or on Arctic icepack

''(a) AVAILABILITY OF INCENTIVE PAY.—A member of the uniformed services who performs duty at a location described in subsection (b) is entitled to special pay under this section at a rate of $5 for each day of that duty.

''(b) COVERED LOCATIONS.—Subsection (a) applies with respect to duty performed on the ground in Antarctica or on the Arctic icepack.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 301e the following new item:

''301f. Incentive pay: duty on ground in Antarctica or on Arctic icepack.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 301f of title 37, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall take effect on October 1, 2003.

SEC. 620. SPECIAL PAY FOR SERVICE AS MEMBER OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION CIVIL SUPPORT TEAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 305a the following new section:

''§ 305b. Special pay: service as member of Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Team

''(a) AVAILABILITY OF SPECIAL PAY.—The Secretary of a military department may pay special pay under this section to a member of the armed forces under the jurisdiction of that Secretary who is entitled to basic pay under section 204 and is assigned by orders to duty as a member of a Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Team.

''(b) MONTHLY RATE.—Special pay payable under subsection (a) shall be paid at a rate equal to $150 a month.

''(c) ELIGIBILITY OF RESERVE COMPONENT MEMBERS WHEN PERFORMING INACTIVE DUTY TRAINING.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned and to the extent provided for in appropriation Acts, when a member of a reserve component of the armed forces who is entitled to compensation under section 206 of this title performs duty under orders as a member of a Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Team, the member may be paid an increase in compensation equal to 1/30 of the monthly special pay specified in subsection (b) for each day on which the member performs such duty.

''(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Team' means a team of members of the reserve components of the armed forces that is established under section 12310(c) of title 10 in support of emergency preparedness programs to prepare for or to respond to any emergency involving the use of a weapon of mass destruction.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 305a the following new item:

''305b. Special pay: service as member of Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Team.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 305b of title 37, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall take effect on October 1, 2003.

SEC. 621. INCENTIVE BONUS FOR AGREEMENT TO SERVE IN CRITICALLY SHORT MILITARY OCCUPATIONAL SPECIALTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 326. Incentive bonus: lateral conversion bonus for service in critically short military occupational speciality

''(a) INCENTIVE BONUS AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary concerned may pay a bonus under this section to a member of the armed forces who executes a written agreement to convert to, and serve for a period of not less than two years in, a critically short military occupational specialty.

''(b) ELIGIBLE MEMBERS.—A bonus may only be paid under this section only to a member who—

''(1) is entitled to basic pay; and

''(2) is serving in pay grade E–6 (with less than 10 years of service computed under section 205 of this title) or pay grade E–5 or below (regardless of years of service) at the time the agreement under subsection (a) is executed.

''(c) AMOUNT AND PAYMENT OF BONUS.—(1) A bonus under this section may not exceed $4,000.

''(2) A bonus payable under this section shall be disbursed in one lump sum payment when the member's conversion to the critically short military occupational specialty is approved by the personnel chief of the member's armed force.

''(d) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PAY AND ALLOWANCES.—A bonus paid to a member under this section is in addition to any other pay and allowances to which the member is entitled.

''(e) REPAYMENT OF BONUS.—(1) A member who receives a bonus under this section and who, voluntarily or because of misconduct, fails to serve in the critically short military occupational specialty for the period specified in the agreement shall refund to the United States an amount that bears the same ratio to the bonus amount paid to the member as the unserved part of such period bears to the total period agreed to be served.

''(2) An obligation to reimburse the United States imposed under paragraph (1) is, for all purposes, a debt owed to the United States.

''(3) A discharge in bankruptcy under title 11 that is entered less than five years after the termination of the agreement for which a bonus was paid under this section shall not discharge the person signing such agreement from the debt arising under paragraph (1).

''(4) Under regulations prescribed pursuant to subsection (f), the Secretary concerned may waive, in whole in part, a refund required under paragraph (1) if 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) REGULATIONS.—The Secretaries concerned shall prescribe regulations to carry out this section. Regulations prescribed by the Secretary of a military department shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense.

''(g) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'critically short military occupational specialty' means a military occupational specialty, military rating, or other military speciality designated by the Secretary concerned as undermanned for purposes of this section.

''(h) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—No agreement under this section may be entered into after December 31, 2004.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''326. Incentive bonus: lateral conversion bonus for service in critically short military occupational speciality.''.

SEC. 622. INCREASE IN RATE FOR IMMINENT DANGER PAY AND FAMILY SEPARATION ALLOWANCE RELATED TO SERVICE IN OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM OR OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM.

(a) SPECIAL PAYMENT RATES.—Effective October 1, 2003, in the case of a member of the uniformed services who serves, for any period of time during a month, in a combat zone designated for Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom, the monthly rate for imminent danger pay under section 310 of title 37, United States Code, shall be deemed to be $225 and the monthly rate for the family separation allowance under section 427 of such title shall be deemed to be $250.

(b) DURATION.—The special rates for imminent danger pay and the family separation allowance in effect under subsection (a) for an operation referred to in such subsection expire on the date the President terminates the operation.

Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowances

SEC. 631. SHIPMENT OF PRIVATELY OWNED MOTOR VEHICLE WITHIN CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES.

(a) AUTHORITY TO PROCURE CONTRACT FOR TRANSPORTATION OF MOTOR VEHICLE.—Section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (i); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (g) the following new subsection (h):

''(h) In the case of a change of permanent station described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (i)(1), the Secretary concerned may authorize the member to arrange for the shipment of the motor vehicle in lieu of transportation at the expense of the United States under this section. The Secretary concerned may pay the member a monetary allowance in lieu of transportation, as established under section 404(d)(1) of title 37, and the member shall be responsible for any transportation costs in excess of such allowance.''.

(b) ALLOWANCE FOR SELF-PROCUREMENT OF TRANSPORTATION OF MOTOR VEHICLE.—Section 406(b)(1)(B) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''In the case of the transportation of a motor vehicle arranged by the member under section 2634(h) of title 10, the Secretary concerned may pay the member, upon proof of shipment, a monetary allowance in lieu of transportation, as established under section 404(d)(1) of this title.''.

SEC. 632. PAYMENT OR REIMBURSEMENT OF STUDENT BAGGAGE STORAGE COSTS FOR DEPENDENT CHILDREN OF MEMBERS STATIONED OVERSEAS.

Section 430(b)(2) of title 37, United States Code, is amended in the first sentence by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''or during a different period in the same fiscal year selected by the member''.

SEC. 633. REIMBURSEMENT FOR LODGING EXPENSES OF CERTAIN RESERVE COMPONENT AND RETIRED MEMBERS DURING AUTHORIZED LEAVE FROM TEMPORARY DUTY LOCATION.

(a) REIMBURSEMENT AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary concerned (as defined in section 101 of title 37, United States Code) may reimburse a member of the Armed Forces described in subsection (b) for lodging expenses incurred by the member at the member's duty location while the member is in an authorized leave status.

(b) COVERED MEMBERS.—Subsection (a) applies with respect to a member of a reserve component who is called or ordered to active duty for a period of more than 30 days, or a retired member who is ordered to active duty under section 688(a) of title 10, United States Code, if the member—

(1) immediately before taking authorized leave was performing duty at a location away from the member's home;

(2) was receiving a per diem allowance under section 404(a)(4) of title 37, United States Code, to cover lodging and subsistence expenses incurred at the duty location because quarters of the United States were not available for assignment to the member at that location; and

(3) immediately after completing the authorized leave, returned to the duty location.

(c) AMOUNT OF REIMBURSEMENT.—The amount of the reimbursement provided to a member under subsection (a) may not exceed the lesser of—

(1) the actual daily cost of lodging incurred by the member at the duty location while the member was in an authorized leave status; and

(2) the lodging portion of the applicable daily per diem rate for that duty location.

(d) RETROACTIVE APPLICATION.—This section applies with respect to members of the reserve components described in subsection (b) who, since September 11, 2001, were or are called or ordered to active duty for a period of more than 30 days and retired members described in such subsection who, since that date, were or are ordered to active duty under section 688(a) of title 10, United States Code.

Subtitle D—Retired Pay and Survivors Benefits

SEC. 641. FUNDING FOR SPECIAL COMPENSATION AUTHORITIES FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE RETIREES.

(a) SOURCE OF PAYMENTS.—

(1) Section 1413(g) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by inserting before ''Payments under'' the following new sentence: ''Payments under this section for a member of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps shall be paid from the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund.''; and

(B) by inserting ''for any other member'' before ''for any fiscal year''.

(2) Section 1413a(h) of such title is amended—

(A) by inserting before ''Payments under'' the following new sentence: ''Payments under this section for a member of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps shall be paid from the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund.''; and

(B) by inserting ''for any other member'' before ''for any fiscal year''.

(b) PAYMENT OF INCREASED RETIREMENT TRUST FUND COSTS DUE TO CONCURRENT RECEIPT OR ENHANCED SPECIAL DISABILITY COMPENSATION PAYMENTS.—

(1) Section 1463(a)(1) of this title is amended by inserting before the semicolon the following: ''and payments under section 1413, 1413a, or 1414 of this title paid to such members''.

(2) Section 1465(b) of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) 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)(D) 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)(4), rather than those determined under subsection (c)(1).''.

(3) 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: '', to be determined without regard to section 1413, 1413a, or 1414 of this title'';

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', to be determined without regard to section 1413, 1413a, or 1414 of this title''; and

(iii) in the sentence following subparagraph (B), by striking ''subsection (b)'' and inserting ''subsection (b)(1)'';

(B) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph (4):

''(4) 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 based only upon the provisions of section 1413, 1413a, or 1414 of this title (whichever is in effect).

''(B) A determination of a single level percentage determined in the same manner as applies under subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1), but based only upon the provisions of section 1413, 1413a, or 1414 of this title (whichever is in effect).

Such single level percentages shall be used for the purposes of subsection (b)(3).''.

(4) Section 1466(b) of such title is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''sections 1465(a) and 1465(c)'' and inserting ''sections 1465(a), 1465(b)(3), 1465(c)(2), and 1465(c)(3)''; and

(B) by adding at the end of paragraph (2) the following new subparagraph:

''(D) The amount for that year determined by the Secretary of Defense under section 1465(b)(3) of this title for the cost to the Fund arising from increased amounts payable from the Fund by reason of section 1413, 1413a, or 1414 of this title.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2003.

Subtitle E—Commissary and Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentality Benefits

SEC. 651. EXPANDED COMMISSARY ACCESS FOR SELECTED RESERVE MEMBERS, RESERVE RETIREES UNDER AGE 60, AND THEIR DEPENDENTS.

(a) ACCESS TO MILITARY COMMISSARIES.—Section 1065 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsections (a), (b), and (c), by inserting ''commissary stores and'' after ''use'' each place it appears; and

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) by inserting ''commissary stores and'' after ''use'' the first and third places it appears; and

(B) by inserting ''stores and'' after ''use'' the second and fourth places it appears.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS; TRANSFER OF SECTION.—Chapter 54 of such title is amended—

(1) by striking sections 1063 and 1064;

(2) in section 1063a(c)(2), by striking ''section 1065(e)'' and inserting ''section 1063(e)'';

(3) by redesignating section 1063a, as amended by paragraph (2), as section 1064;

(4) by transferring section 1065, as amended by subsection (a), so as to appear after section 1062; and

(5) by striking the heading of such section, as amended by subsection (a) and transferred by paragraph (4), and inserting the following new heading:

''§ 1063. Use of commissary stores and MWR retail facilities: members of reserve components and reserve retirees under age 60''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by striking the items relating to sections 1063, 1063a, 1064, and 1065 and inserting the following new items:

''1063. Use of commissary stores and MWR retail facilities: members of reserve components and reserve retirees under age 60.

''1064. Use of commissary stores and MWR retail facilities: members of National Guard serving in federally declared disaster or national emergency.''.

SEC. 652. DEFENSE COMMISSARY SYSTEM AND EXCHANGE STORES SYSTEM.

(a) EXISTENCE OF SYSTEMS.—Chapter 147 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting before section 2482 the following new section:

''§ 2481. Existence of defense commissary system and exchange stores system

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall operate a defense commissary system and an exchange stores system in the manner provided by this chapter and other provisions of law.

''(b) SEPARATE SYSTEMS.—Except as authorized by section 2490a of this title, the defense commissary system and the exchange stores system shall be operated as separate systems of the Department of Defense.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting before the item relating to section 2482 the following new item:

''2481. Existence of defense commissary system and exchange stores system.''.

SEC. 653. LIMITATIONS ON PRIVATE OPERATION OF DEFENSE COMMISSARY STORE FUNCTIONS.

Section 2482(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking the first and second sentences and inserting the following: ''(1) Under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense may approve, private persons may operate selected commissary store functions, except that such functions may not include functions relating to the procurement of products to be sold in a commissary store or functions relating to the overall management of a commissary system or the management of a commissary store.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) Any change to private operation of a commissary store function shall not take effect until the Secretary of Defense submits written notice of the proposed change to Congress and a period of 90 days of continuous session of Congress expires following the date on which notice was received, determined as provided in section 2486(d)(2) of this title.''.

SEC. 654. USE OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS TO OPERATE DEFENSE COMMISSARY SYSTEM.

(a) REQUIREMENT THAT COMMISSARY OPERATING EXPENSES BE PAID FROM APPROPRIATED FUNDS.—Section 2484 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''may'' and inserting ''shall''; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''may'' in the first sentence and inserting ''shall''.

(b) SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDS FOR COMMISSARY OPERATIONS.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDS FOR COMMISSARY OPERATIONS.—Amounts appropriated to cover the expenses of operating the Defense Commissary Agency and the defense commissary system may be supplemented with additional funds from manufacturers' coupon redemption fees, handling fees for tobacco products, and other amounts received as reimbursement for other support activities provided by commissary activities.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2003.

SEC. 655. RECOVERY OF NONAPPROPRIATED FUND INSTRUMENTALITY AND COMMISSARY STORE INVESTMENTS IN REAL PROPERTY AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS CLOSED OR REALIGNED.

(a) 1988 LAW.—Section 204(b)(7)(C)(i) of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (Public Law 100–526; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) is amended in the second sentence by striking ''The Secretary may use amounts in the account (in such an aggregate amount as is provided in advance in appropriation Acts)'' and inserting ''Amounts in the account shall be available to the Secretary, without appropriation and until expended,''.

(b) 1990 LAW.—Section 2906(d)(3) 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 ''The Secretary may use amounts in the account (in such an aggregate amount as is provided in advance in appropriation Acts)'' and inserting ''Amounts in the account shall be available to the Secretary, without appropriation and until expended,''.

SEC. 656. COMMISSARY SHELF-STOCKING PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM AUTHORITY.—Subject to subsection (c), the Secretary of Defense may conduct a pilot program under which the stocking of shelves at three defense commissary stores operated by the Defense Commissary Agency shall be the sole responsibility of Federal employees of the Agency or employees contracted by the agency.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.—(1) 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 plan for the conduct of the pilot program. The plan shall be submitted not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) The plan shall include the following:

(A) The financial structure of the pilot program and expected costs.

(B) The Secretary's request to the Office of Personnel Management to conduct the pilot program as a Federal civilian personnel demonstration project under chapter 47 of title 5, United States Code, or a plan to provide otherwise a sufficiently flexible Federal civilian workforce for the pilot program through another authority.

(C) Specification of the three sites for the conduct of the pilot program and the criteria used to select those sites.

(D) Proposed duration of the pilot program and the expected timing for providing to Congress the results of the pilot program and recommendations of the Secretary.

(E) Other observations and recommendations of the Secretary.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary of Defense may not begin to conduct the pilot program until a period of 30 days has elapsed after the date of the submission of the plan for the pilot program under subsection (b).

Subtitle F—Other Matters

SEC. 661. REPEAL OF CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT FOR DESIGNATION OF CRITICAL MILITARY SKILLS FOR RETENTION BONUS.

Section 323(b) of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''(1)''; and

(2) by striking paragraph (2).

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. REVISION OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MEDICARE-ELIGIBLE RETIREE HEALTH CARE FUND TO PERMIT MORE ACCURATE ACTUARIAL VALUATIONS.

Section 1115(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of paragraph (1) the following: ''In determining single level dollar amounts under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of this paragraph, the Secretary of Defense may determine a separate single level dollar amount under either or both subparagraphs for any participating uniformed service, if, in the judgment of the Secretary, such a determination would produce a more accurate and appropriate actuarial valuation for that uniformed service.''.

SEC. 702. TRANSFER OF CERTAIN MEMBERS FROM PHARMACY AND THERAPEUTICS COMMITTEE TO UNIFORM FORMULARY BENEFICIARY ADVISORY PANEL UNDER THE PHARMACY BENEFITS PROGRAM.

Section 1074g of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1) in the second sentence, by striking ''facilities,'' and all that follows through the end of the sentence and inserting ''facilities and representatives of providers in facilities of the uniformed services.''; and

(2) in subsection (c)(2)—

(A) by striking ''represent nongovernmental'' and inserting the following: ''represent—

''(A) nongovernmental'';

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

''(B) contractors responsible for the TRICARE retail pharmacy program;

''(C) contractors responsible for the national mail-order pharmacy program; and

''(D) TRICARE network providers.''.

SEC. 703. PERMANENT EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO PERSONAL SERVICES CONTRACTS FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF HEALTH CARE RESPONSIBILITIES AT LOCATIONS OTHER THAN MILITARY MEDICAL TREATMENT FACILITIES.

Section 1091(a)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''The Secretary may not enter into a contract under this paragraph after December 31, 2003.''.

SEC. 704. PLAN FOR PROVIDING HEALTH COVERAGE INFORMATION TO MEMBERS, FORMER MEMBERS, AND DEPENDENTS ELIGIBLE FOR CERTAIN HEALTH BENEFITS.

(a) HEALTH INFORMATION PLAN REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall develop a plan to—

(1) ensure that each household that includes one or more eligible persons is provided information concerning—

(A) the extent of health coverage provided by sections 1079 or 1086 of title 10, United States Code, for each such person;

(B) the costs, including the limits on such costs, that each such person is required to pay for such health coverage;

(C) sources of information for locating TRICARE-authorized providers in the household's locality; and

(D) methods to obtain assistance in resolving difficulties encountered with billing, payments, eligibility, locating TRICARE-authorized providers, collection actions, and such other issues as the Secretary considers appropriate;

(2) provide mechanisms to ensure that each eligible person has access to information identifying TRICARE-authorized providers in the person's locality who have agreed to accept new patients under section 1079 or 1086 of title 10, United States Code, and to ensure that such information is periodically updated;

(3) provide mechanisms to ensure that each eligible person who requests assistance in locating a TRICARE-authorized provider is provided such assistance;

(4) provide information and recruitment materials and programs aimed at attracting participation of health care providers as necessary to meet health care access requirements for all eligible persons; and

(5) provide mechanisms to allow for the periodic identification by the Department of Defense of the number and locality of eligible persons who may intend to rely on TRICARE-authorized providers for health care services.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION OF PLAN.—The Secretary of Defense shall implement the plan required by subsection (a) with respect to any contract entered into by the Department of Defense after May 31, 2003, for managed health care.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''eligible person'' means a person eligible for health benefits under section 1079 or 1086 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) The term ''TRICARE-authorized provider'' means a facility, doctor, or other provider of health care services—

(A) that meets the licensing and credentialing certification requirements in the State where the services are rendered;

(B) that meets requirements under regulations relating to TRICARE for the type of health care services rendered; and

(C) that has accepted reimbursement by the Secretary of Defense as payment for services rendered during the 12-month period preceding the date of the most recently updated provider information provided to households under the plan required by subsection (a).

(d) SUBMISSION OF PLAN.—Not later than March 31, 2004, the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives the plan required by subsection (a), together with a schedule for implementation of the plan.

SEC. 705. WORKING GROUP ON MILITARY HEALTH CARE FOR PERSONS RELIANT ON HEALTH CARE FACILITIES AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS TO BE CLOSED OR REALIGNED.

Section 722 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102–484; 10 U.S.C. 1073 note) is amended by striking subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) and inserting the following new subsections:

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than December 31, 2003, the Secretary of Defense shall establish a working group on the provision of military health care to persons who rely for health care on health care facilities located at military installations—

''(1) inside the United States that are selected for closure or realignment in the 2005 round of realignments and closures authorized by sections 2912, 2913, and 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 title XXX of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107; 155 Stat. 1342); or

''(2) outside the United States that are selected for closure or realignment as a result of force posture changes.

''(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The members of the working group shall include, at a minimum, the following:

''(1) The Assistant Secretary of Defense of Health Affairs, or the designee of the Assistant Secretary.

''(2) The Surgeon General of the Army, or the designee of that Surgeon General.

''(3) The Surgeon General of the Navy, or the designee of that Surgeon General.

''(4) The Surgeon General of the Air Force, or the designee of that Surgeon General.

''(5) At least one independent member from each TRICARE region, but not to exceed a total of 12 members appointed under this paragraph, whose experience in matters within the responsibility of the working group qualify that person to represent persons authorized health care under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code.

''(c) DUTIES.—(1) In developing the selection criteria and recommendations for the 2005 round of realignments and closures required by sections 2913 and 2914 of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, the Secretary of Defense shall consult with the working group.

''(2) The working group shall be available to provide assistance to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

''(3) In the case of each military installation referred to in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a) whose closure or realignment will affect the accessibility to health care services for persons entitled to such services under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, the working group shall provide to the Secretary of Defense a plan for the provision of the health care services to such persons.

''(d) SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS.—In carrying out its duties under subsection (c), the working group—

''(1) shall conduct meetings with persons entitled to health care services under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, or representatives of such persons;

''(2) may use reliable sampling techniques;

''(3) may visit the areas where closures or realignments of military installations will adversely affect the accessibility of health care for such persons and may conduct public meetings; and

''(4) shall ensure that members of the uniformed services on active duty, members and former members of the uniformed services entitled to retired or retainer pay, and dependents and survivors of such members and retired personnel are afforded the opportunity to express their views.''.

SEC. 706. ACCELERATION OF IMPLEMENTATION OF CHIROPRACTIC HEALTH CARE FOR MEMBERS ON ACTIVE DUTY.

The Secretary of Defense shall accelerate the implementation of the plan required by section 702 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398) (relating to chiropractic health care services and benefits), with a goal of completing implementation of the plan by October 1, 2005.

SEC. 707. MEDICAL AND DENTAL SCREENING FOR MEMBERS OF SELECTED RESERVE UNITS ALERTED FOR MOBILIZATION.

Section 1074a of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f)(1) The Department of Defense may provide medical and dental screening and care to members of the Selected Reserve who are assigned to a unit that has been alerted that the unit will be mobilized for active duty in support of an operational mission or contingency operation, during a national emergency, or in a time of war.

''(2) The medical and dental screening and care that may be provided under this subsection is screening and care necessary to ensure that a member meets the medical and dental standards for required deployment.

''(3) The services provided under this subsection shall be provided to a member at no cost to the member and at any time after the unit to which the member is assigned is alerted or otherwise notified that the unit will be mobilized.''.

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

Subtitle A—Amendments to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations

SEC. 801. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN PROTOTYPE PROJECTS.

Section 845 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103-160; 10 U.S.C. 2371 note) is amended in subsection (g) by striking ''September 30, 2004'' and inserting ''September 30, 2008''.

SEC. 802. ELIMINATION OF CERTAIN SUBCONTRACT NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.

Subsection (e) of section 2306 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''(A)'' and ''(B)'' and inserting ''(i)'' and ''(ii)'', respectively;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively,

(3) by striking ''Each'' and inserting ''(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), each''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a prime contract with a contractor that maintains a purchasing system approved by the contracting officer for the contract.''.

SEC. 803. ELIMINATION OF REQUIREMENT TO FURNISH WRITTEN ASSURANCES OF TECHNICAL DATA CONFORMITY.

Section 2320(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (7); and

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (8) and (9) as paragraphs (7) and (8), respectively.

SEC. 804. LIMITATION PERIOD FOR TASK AND DELIVERY ORDER CONTRACTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 2304a—

(A) in subsection (e)—

(i) by inserting ''(1)'' before ''A task''; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(2) Unless use of procedures other than competitive procedures is authorized by an exception in subsection (c) of section 2304 of this title and approved in accordance with subsection (f) of such section, competitive procedures shall be used for making such a modification.

''(3) Notice regarding the modification shall be provided in accordance with section 18 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 416) and section 8(e) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(e)).''; and

(B) by striking subsection (f) and inserting the following:

''(f) LIMITATION ON CONTRACT PERIOD.—The base period of a task order contract or delivery order contract entered into under this section may not exceed five years unless a longer period is specifically authorized in a law that is applicable to such contract. The contract may be extended for an additional 5 years (for a total contract period of not more than 10 years) through modifications, options, or otherwise.''; and

(2) in section 2304b—

(A) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—A task order contract (as defined in section 2304d of this title) for procurement of advisory and assistance services shall be subject to the requirements of this section, sections 2304a and 2304c of this title, and other applicable provisions of law.'';

(B) by striking subsections (b), (f), and (g) and redesignating subsections (c), (d), (e), (h), and (i) as subsections (b) through (f);

(C) by amending subsection (c) (as redesignated by subparagraph (B)) to read as follows:

''(c) REQUIRED CONTENT OF CONTRACT.—A task order contract described in subsection (a) shall contain the same information that is required by section 2304a(b) to be included in the solicitation of offers for that contract.''; and

(D) in subsection (d) (as redesignated by subparagraph (B))—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking ''under this section'' and inserting ''described in subsection (a)''; and

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking ''under this section''.

(b) REPEALS.—(1) Subsection (g) of section 2306c of title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

(2) Subsection (c) of section 811 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314; 116 Stat. 2608) is repealed.

SEC. 805. ADDITIONAL AUTHORITIES RELATING TO OBTAINING PERSONAL SERVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 129b of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking ''in accordance with section 3109 of title 5''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY.—(1) In addition to the authority provided under subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense may enter into personal services contracts with individuals, regardless of their nationality, outside of the United States.

''(2) The contracting officer for a personal services contract shall be responsible for ensuring that a personal services contract is the appropriate vehicle for carrying out the purpose of the contract.''.

(b) INTELLIGENCE COMPONENTS.—(1) Subchapter I of chapter 21 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§426. Personal services contracts: authority and limitations

''(a) PERSONAL SERVICES.—(1) The Secretary of Defense may, notwithstanding section 3109 of title 5, enter into personal services contracts in the United States if the personal services directly support the mission of a defense intelligence component or counter-intelligence organization.

''(2) The contracting officer for a personal services contract shall be responsible for ensuring that a personal services contract is the appropriate vehicle for carrying out the purpose of the contract.

''(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'defense intelligence component' means a component of the Department of Defense that is an element of the intelligence community, as defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 401a(4)).''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such subchapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''426. Personal services contracts: authority and limitations.''.

(c) SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND.—Section 167 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(l) PERSONAL SERVICES CONTRACTS.—(1) The Secretary of Defense may, notwithstanding section 3109 of title 5, enter into personal services contracts in the United States if the personal services directly support the mission of the special operations command.

''(2) The contracting officer for a personal services contract shall be responsible for ensuring that a personal services contract is the appropriate vehicle for carrying out the purpose of the contract.''.

SEC. 806. EVALUATION OF PROMPT PAYMENT PROVISIONS.

(a) EVALUATION REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall evaluate provisions of law and regulation relating to the prompt payment of amounts due contractors under contracts with the Department of Defense.

(b) MATTERS COVERED.—In carrying out such evaluation, the Secretary shall focus in particular on the implementation of prompt payment provisions with respect to small businesses, including—

(1) an analysis of compliance by the Department of Defense with chapter 39 of title 31, United States Code, and regulations applicable to the Department of Defense under that chapter, with respect to small business contractors;

(2) a determination of the number of Department of Defense contracts with small businesses that are not in compliance with prompt payment requirements; and

(3) a determination of the average length of time that elapses between performance of work by small business contractors under Department of Defense contracts and payment for such work.

Subtitle B—United States Defense Industrial Base Provisions

Part I—Critical Items Identification and Domestic Production Capabilities Improvement Program

SEC. 811. ASSESSMENT OF UNITED STATES DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL BASE CAPABILITIES.

(a) ASSESSMENT PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of each military department, shall establish a program to assess the capabilities of the United States defense industrial base to produce military systems necessary to support national security requirements.

(b) DESIGNEE.—The Secretary of each military department shall designate a position to be responsible for assisting in carrying out the program under subsection (a) with respect to the military department concerned. The person designated to serve in such position shall do the following:

(1) Report to the Service Acquisition Executive of the military department concerned on defense industrial base matters affecting the acquisition and production of military systems.

(2) Provide information to assist the Secretary of Defense in carrying out the Secretary's duties as a member of the National Defense Technology and Industrial Base Council (as established under section 2502 of title 10, United States Code).

(3) Oversee the collection of data to assist the Secretary of Defense in carrying out subsection (c).

(4) Oversee the process for identifying and determining critical items to assist the Secretary of Defense in carrying out section 812.

(c) COLLECTION OF DATA.—The Secretary of Defense shall collect data in support of the program. At a minimum, with respect to each procurement for a covered military system, the following information shall be collected:

(1) With respect to the contractor awarded the contract:

(A) An identification of the critical item or items included in the covered military system and whether the item is of a domestic or foreign source.

(B) Whether the contractor is a foreign contractor, and, if so—

(i) whether the contract was awarded on a sole source basis because of the unavailability of responsible offerors with United States production capabilities; or

(ii) whether the contract was awarded after receipt of offers from responsible offerors with United States production capabilities.

(C) Whether the contractor is a United States contractor, and, if the contractor plans to perform work under the contract outside the United States, an identification of the locations where the work (including research, development, and manufacturing) will be performed.

(2) With respect to the offerors submitting bids or proposals (other than the offeror awarded the contract):

(A) An identification of the critical item or items included in the covered military system and whether the item is of a domestic or foreign source.

(B) An identification of the domestic and foreign offerors and the locations where the work (including research, development, and manufacturing) was proposed to be performed under the contract.

(C) A statement of whether there were no offerors or whether there was only one offeror.

(d) CONFIDENTIALITY.—The Secretary of Defense shall make every effort to ensure that the information collected under this section from private sector entities remains confidential.

(e) ASSESSMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall prepare an assessment of the data compiled under this section during every two-year period and shall submit the results of the assessment to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The first such assessment shall cover the period of fiscal Year 2002 and fiscal Year 2003 and shall be submitted to the Committees no later than November 1, 2004.

SEC. 812. IDENTIFICATION OF CRITICAL ITEMS: MILITARY SYSTEM BREAKOUT LIST.

(a) IDENTIFICATION PROCESS.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish a process to identify, with respect to each military system—

(1) the items and components within the military system;

(2) the items and components within the military system that are essential, in accordance with subsection (c); and

(3) the items and components within the military system that are critical, in accordance with subsection (d).

(b) MILITARY SYSTEM BREAKOUT LIST.—The Secretary of Defense shall produce a list, to be known as the ''military system breakout list'', consisting of the items and components identified under the process established under subsection (a).

(c) ESSENTIAL ITEMS AND COMPONENTS.—For purposes of determining whether an item or component is essential, the Secretary shall include only an item or component that—

(1) is essential for the proper functioning and performance of the military system of which the item or component is a part; or

(2) involves a critical technology (as defined in section 2500 of title 10, United States Code).

(d) CRITICAL ITEMS OR COMPONENTS.—(1) For purposes of determining whether an item or component is critical, the Secretary shall include only an item or component that—

(A) is essential, as determined under subsection (c); and

(B) with respect to which there is a high barrier to entry for the production of the item or component.

(2) For purposes of paragraph (1)(B), a high barrier to entry for the production of an item or component means that—

(A) there would be a significant period of time required to reestablish United States production capabilities; and

(B) the level of investment necessary to reestablish United States production capabilities that are able to meet surge and sustained production rates for wartime requirements is significant.

(e) REPORT.—Not later than November 1 of each year, beginning with November 1, 2004, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the implementation of this section. The report shall include the following:

(1) A list of each military system covered by the process established under subsection (a).

(2) A list of items and components determined to be essential.

(3) A list of items and components determined to be critical.

(4) A list of the items and components contained in the lists provided under paragraphs (2) and (3) that are manufactured or produced outside the United States.

SEC. 813. PROCUREMENT OF CERTAIN CRITICAL ITEMS FROM AMERICAN SOURCES.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR PROCUREMENT OF CERTAIN CRITICAL ITEMS PRODUCED IN UNITED STATES.—With respect to items that meet the criteria set forth in subsection (b), the Secretary of Defense may procure such items only if the items are entirely produced in the United States.

(b) CRITERIA.—For purposes of subsection (a), an item meets the criteria of this subsection if—

(1) it is a critical item; and

(2) there are limited sources of production capability of the item in the United States.

(c) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) does not apply to a procurement of an item when the Secretary of Defense determines in writing that the Department of Defense's need for the item is of such an unusual and compelling urgency that the United States would be seriously injured unless the Department is permitted to procure the item from sources outside the United States.

(d) APPLICABILITY.—Subsection (a) shall apply to contracts for the procurement of covered military systems and subcontracts under such contracts.

SEC. 814. PRODUCTION CAPABILITIES IMPROVEMENT FOR CERTAIN CRITICAL ITEMS USING DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL BASE CAPABILITIES FUND.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF FUND.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a separate fund to be known as the Defense Industrial Base Capabilities Fund (hereafter in this section referred to as the'Fund').

(b) MONEYS IN FUND.—There shall be credited to the Fund amounts appropriated to it.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Fund $100,000,000 for fiscal year 2004.

(d) USE OF FUND.—The Secretary of Defense is authorized to use all amounts in the Fund, subject to appropriation, for the purposes of establishing capabilities within the United States to produce critical items that meet any of the following criteria:

(1) The item is available only from foreign contractors.

(2) The item is available only from a limited number of United States contractors.

(e) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUND.—Before the obligation of any amounts in the Fund, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report describing the Secretary's plans for implementing the Fund established in subsection (a), including the priorities for the obligation of amounts in the Fund, the criteria for determining the recipients of such amounts, and the mechanisms through which such amounts may be provided to the recipients.

(f) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts in the Fund shall remain available until expended.

(g) FUND MANAGER.—The Secretary of Defense shall designate a Fund manager. The duties of the Fund manager shall include—

(1) ensuring the visibility and accountability of transactions engaged in through the Fund; and

(2) reporting to Congress each year regarding activities of the Fund during the previous fiscal year.

Part II—Requirements Relating to Specific Items

SEC. 821. DOMESTIC SOURCE LIMITATION AMENDMENTS.

(a) ADDITIONAL ITEMS.—Section 2534(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of the following new paragraphs:

''(6) Fuzes used for ordnance.

''(7) Microwave power tubes or traveling wave tubes.

''(8) PAN carbon fiber.

''(9) Aircraft tires.

''(10) Ground vehicle tires.

''(11) Tank track assemblies.

''(12) Tank track components.

''(13) Packaging in direct contact with meals within meals ready-to-eat listed in Federal Supply Class 8970.''.

(b) AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL TECHNOLOGY AND INDUSTRIAL BASE.—Paragraph (1) of section 2500 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking all that follows after ''States'' to the end of the paragraph and inserting a period; and

(2) by striking ''production, or maintenance'' and inserting ''production, and maintenance''.

(c) AMENDMENT OF WAIVER AUTHORITY.—Section 2534(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the text before paragraph (1), by inserting ''in writing'' after ''determines'';

(2) by striking paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (6), (7), and (8);

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively, and in such paragraph (3), as so redesignated, by adding at the end the following: ''This exception shall not apply to items determined to be critical by the Secretary of Defense under section 812 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004.''; and

(4) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following new paragraph (1):

''(1) The Department of Defense's need for the item is of such an unusual and compelling urgency that the United States would be seriously injured unless the Department is permitted to procure the item from sources outside the United States.''.

SEC. 822. REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO BUYING COMMERCIAL ITEMS CONTAINING SPECIALTY METALS FROM AMERICAN SOURCES.

(a) SPECIALTY METALS AND OTHER INDUSTRIAL BASE PROTECTION MEASURES.—(1) Subsection (b) of section 2533a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B), by inserting before the semicolon the following: ''and the materials and components thereof''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting before the period the following: '' and any specialty metal that may be part of another item''.

(2) Subsection (c) is amended—

(A) by striking ''or the Secretary of the military department concerned''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following: ''For each such determination, the Secretary of Defense shall notify Congress in writing of the factors supporting the determination.''.

(3) Section 2533a of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(l) AUTHORITY NOT DELEGABLE.—The Secretary may not delegate any authority under this section to anyone other than the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics.''.

(b) EXCEPTION TO BERRY AMENDMENT FOR COMMERCIAL ITEMS CONTAINING SPECIALTY METALS.—Section 2533a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (i) and (j) as subsections (j) and (k), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (h) the following new subsection:

''(i) EXCEPTION FOR COMMERCIAL ITEMS CONTAINING SPECIALTY METALS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) does not apply to the procurement of a commercial item containing specialty metals if—

''(A) the contractor agrees to comply with the requirement set forth in paragraph (2); or

''(B) the Secretary of Defense determines in writing that the Department of Defense's need for the commercial item containing specialty metal is of such an unusual and compelling urgency that the United States would be seriously injured unless the Department is permitted to procure the item containing specialty metal from outside the United States.

''(2) REQUIREMENT TO PURCHASE EQUIVALENT AMOUNT OF DOMESTIC METAL.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(A), the requirement set forth in this paragraph is that the contractor for each contract entered into by the Secretary for the procurement of a commercial item containing specialty metal agrees to purchase, over the 18-month period beginning on the date of award of the contract, an amount of specialty metal that is—

''(A) produced, including such functions as melting and smelting, in the United States; and

''(B) equivalent to—

''(i) the amount of specialty metal (measured by factors including volume, type, and grade) purchased to carry out the work under the contract (including the work under each subcontract at any tier under the contract); plus

''(ii) 10 percent of the amount referred to in clause (i).

''(3) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER EXCEPTIONS.—The exceptions under subsections (c), (d), and (h) of this section shall not apply to the procurement of a commercial item containing specialty metals.

''(4) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary of Defense shall not enter into a contract to procure a commercial item containing specialty metal pursuant to the exception in subsection (a) until Congress is notified that the Secretary has applied the exception and a period of 15 days has expired after such notification is made.

''(5) NOTICE TO INDUSTRY.—The Secretary of Defense shall publish a notice in the Federal Register on the method that the Department of Defense will use to measure an equivalent amount of specialty metal for purposes of this subsection. Such a method shall consider factors such as volume, type, and grade of specialty metal that otherwise would be produced from United States sources.''.

(c) REMOVAL OF SPECIALTY METAL FROM SUBSECTION (e) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (e) of such section is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking ''SPECIALTY METALS AND''; and

(2) by striking ''specialty metals or''.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (a) of section 2533a of such title is amended by striking ''through (h)'' and inserting ''through (i)''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 2533a(i) of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply to each contract for the procurement of a commercial item containing specialty metal entered into before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 823. ELIMINATION OF UNRELIABLE SOURCES OF DEFENSE ITEMS AND COMPONENTS.

(a) IDENTIFICATION OF CERTAIN COUNTRIES.—The Secretary of Defense shall identify foreign countries that, by law, policy, or regulation, restricted the provision or sale of military goods or services to the United States because of United States policy toward, or military operations in, Iraq since September 12, 2002.

(b) PROHIBITION ON PROCUREMENT OF CERTAIN ITEMS FROM IDENTIFIED COUNTRIES.—The Secretary of Defense may not procure any items or components contained in military systems if the items or components, or the systems, are manufactured in any foreign country identified under subsection (a).

(c) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Defense may waive the limitation in subsection (b) if the Secretary determines in writing and notifies Congress that the Department of Defense's need for the item is of such an unusual and compelling urgency that the United States would be seriously injured unless the Department is permitted to procure the item from the sources identified in subsection (a).

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—(1) Subject to paragraph (2), subsection (b) applies to contracts in existence on the date of the enactment of this Act or entered into after such date.

(2) With respect to contracts in existence on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall take such action as is necessary to ensure that such contracts are in compliance with subsection (b) not later than 24 months after such date.

SEC. 824. CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION REQUIRED BEFORE EXERCISING EXCEPTION TO REQUIREMENT TO BUY SPECIALTY METALS FROM AMERICAN SOURCES.

Section 2533a(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''The Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the military department concerned may not procure specialty metals pursuant to the exception authorized by this subsection until the Secretary submits to Congress and publishes in the Federal Register notice of the determination made under this subsection and a period of 15 days expires after the date such notification is submitted.''.

SEC. 825. REPEAL OF AUTHORITY FOR FOREIGN PROCUREMENT OF PARA-ARAMID FIBERS AND YARNS.

Section 807 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261; 112 Stat. 2084) is repealed.

SEC. 826. REQUIREMENT FOR MAJOR DEFENSE ACQUISITION PROGRAMS TO USE MACHINE TOOLS ENTIRELY PRODUCED WITHIN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Chapter 144 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2435 the end the following new section:

''§2436. Major defense acquisition programs: requirement for certain items to be entirely produced in United States

''The Secretary of Defense shall require that, for any procurement of a major defense acquisition program—

''(1) the contractor for the procurement shall use only machine tools entirely produced within the United States to carry out the contract; and

''(2) any subcontractor under the contract shall comply with paragraph (1) in the case of any contract in an amount that is $5,000,000 or greater.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''2436. Major defense acquisition programs: requirement for certain items to be entirely produced in United States.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 2436 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to contracts entered into after the date occurring four years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Part III—General Provisions

SEC. 831. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) COVERED MILITARY SYSTEM.—The term ''covered military system'' means a military system that includes one or more critical items.

(2) MILITARY SYSTEM.—The term ''military system'' means a military system necessary to support national security requirements, as determined by the Secretary of Defense, and which costs more than $25,000. At a minimum, the term includes the following:

(A) Weapons listed in Federal Supply Group 10.

(B) Nuclear ordnance listed in Federal Supply Group 11.

(C) Fire control equipment listed in Federal Supply Group 12.

(D) Ammunition and explosives listed in Federal Supply Group 13.

(E) Guided missiles listed in Federal Supply Group 14.

(F) Aircraft and related components, accessories, and equipment listed in Federal Supply Groups 15, 16, and 17.

(G) Space vehicles listed in Federal Supply Group 18.

(H) Ships, small craft, pontoons, and floating docks listed in Federal Supply Group 19.

(I) Ship and marine equipment listed in Federal Supply Group 20.

(J) Tracked combat vehicles listed in Federal Supply Class 2350.

(K) Engines, turbines, and components listed in Federal Supply Group 28.

(3) CRITICAL ITEM.—The term ''critical item'' means an item or component determined to be critical by the Secretary of Defense under section 812.

(4) ITEM.—The term ''item'' means an end item.

(5) COMPONENT.—The term ''component'' means an article, material, or supply incorporated into an end item. The term includes software and subassemblies.

(6) FOREIGN CONTRACTOR.—The term ''foreign contractor'' means a contractor or subcontractor

organized or existing under the laws of a country other than the United States.

(7) UNITED STATES CONTRACTOR.—The term ''United States contractor'' means a contractor or subcontractor organized or existing under the laws of the United States.

(8) UNITED STATES PRODUCTION CAPABILITIES.—The term ''United States production capabilities'' means, with respect to an item or component, facilities located in the United States to design, develop, or manufacture the item or component.

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. REDESIGNATION OF NATIONAL IMAGERY AND MAPPING AGENCY AS NATIONAL GEOSPATIAL-INTELLIGENCE AGENCY.

(a) REDESIGNATION.—The National Imagery and Mapping Agency of the Department of Defense is hereby redesignated as the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency.

(b) DEFINITION OF GEOSPATIAL INTELLIGENCE.—Section 467 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) The term 'geospatial intelligence' means the exploitation and analysis of imagery and geospatial information to describe, assess, and visually depict physical features and geographically referenced activities on the earth. Geospatial intelligence consists of imagery, imagery intelligence, and geospatial information.''.

(c) AGENCY MISSIONS.—(1) Section 442(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''geospatial intelligence consisting of'' after ''provide''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''Imagery, intelligency, and information'' and inserting ''Geospatial intelligence''.

(2) Section 110(a) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 404e(a)) is amended by striking ''imagery'' and inserting ''geospatial intelligence''.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.—Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) The heading of chapter 22 is amended to read as follows:

''CHAPTER 22—NATIONAL GEOSPATIAL-INTELLIGENCE AGENCY''.

(2) Chapter 22 is amended—

(A) by striking ''National Imagery and Mapping Agency'' each place it appears and inserting ''National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency''; and

(B) in section 453(b), by striking ''NIMA'' in paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting ''NGA''.

(3) Section 193 is amended—

(A) by striking ''National Imagery and Mapping Agency'' in subsections (d)(1), (d)(2), (e), and (f)(4) and inserting ''National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency'';

(B) in the heading for subsection (d), by striking ''NATIONAL IMAGERY AND MAPPING AGENCY'' and inserting ''NATIONAL GEOSPATIAL-INTELLIGENCE AGENCY''; and

(C) in the heading for subsection (e), by striking ''NIMA'' and inserting ''NGA''.

(4) Section 201 is amended by striking ''National Imagery and Mapping Agency'' in subsections (b)(2)(C) and (c)(2)(C) and inserting ''National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency''.

(5)(A) Section 424 is amended by striking ''National Imagery and Mapping Agency'' in subsection (b)(3) and inserting ''National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency''.

(B)(i) The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

''§ 424. Disclosure of organizational and personnel information: exemption for specified intelligence agencies''.

(ii) The item relating to that section in the table of sections at the beginning of subchapter I of chapter 21 is amended to read as follows:

''424. Disclosure of organizational and personnel information: exemption for specified intelligence agencies.''.

(6) Section 425(a) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) The words 'National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency', the initials 'NGA,' or the seal of the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency.''.

(7) Section 1614(2)(C) is amended by striking ''National Imagery and Mapping Agency'' and inserting ''National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency''.

(8) The tables of chapters at the beginning of subtitle A, and at the beginning of part I of subtitle A, are each amended by striking ''Imagery and Mapping'' in the item relating to chapter 22 and inserting ''Geospatial-Intelligence''.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 1947.—The National Security Act of 1947 is amended as follows:

(1) Section 3 (50 U.S.C. 401a) is amended by striking ''National Imagery and Mapping Agency'' in paragraph (4)(E) and inserting ''National Geospatial- Intelligence Agency''.

(2) Section 105 (50 U.S.C. 403–5) is amended by striking ''National Imagery and Mapping Agency'' in subsections (b)(2) and (d) and inserting ''National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency''.

(3) Section 105A (50 U.S.C. 403–5a) is amended by striking ''National Imagery and Mapping Agency'' in subsection (b)(1)(C) and inserting ''National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency''.

(4) Section 105C (50 U.S.C. 403-5c) is amended—

(A) by striking ''National Imagery and Mapping Agency'' each place it appears and inserting ''National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency'';

(B) by striking ''NIMA'' each place it appears and inserting ''NGA''; and

(C) by striking ''NATIONAL IMAGERY AND MAPPING AGENCY'' in the section heading and inserting ''NATIONAL GEOSPATIAL-INTELLIGENCE AGENCY''.

(5) Section 106 (50 U.S.C. 403–6) is amended by striking ''National Imagery and Mapping Agency'' in subsection (a)(2)(C) and inserting ''National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency''.

(6) Section 110 (50 U.S.C. 404e) is amended—

(A) by striking ''National Imagery and Mapping Agency'' in subsections (a), (b), and (c) and inserting ''National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency''; and

(B) by striking ''NATIONAL IMAGERY AND MAPPING AGENCY'' in the section heading and inserting ''NATIONAL GEOSPATIAL-INTELLIGENCE AGENCY''.

(7) The table of contents in the first section is amended—

(A) by striking the item relating to section 105C and inserting the following:

''Sec. 105C. Protection of operational files of National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency.'';

and

(B) by striking the item relating to section 110 and inserting the following:

''Sec. 110. National mission of National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency.''.

(f) CROSS REFERENCE CORRECTION.—Section 442(d) of title 10, United States Code, is by striking ''section 120(a) of the National Security Act of 1947'' and inserting ''section 110(a) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 404e(a))''.

(g) REFERENCES.—Any reference to the National Imagery and Mapping Agency in any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States shall be considered to be a reference to the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency.

SEC. 903. PILOT PROGRAM FOR PROVISION OF SPACE SURVEILLANCE NETWORK SERVICES TO NON-UNITED STATES GOVERNMENTAL ENTITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 135 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 2272. Space surveillance network: pilot program for provision of satellite tracking support to entities outside Unites States Government

''(a) PILOT PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Defense may carry out a pilot program to determine the feasibility and desirability of providing to non-United States Governmental entities space surveillance data support described in subsection (b).

''(b) SPACE SURVEILLANCE DATA SUPPORT.—Under such a pilot program, the Secretary may provide to a non-United States Governmental entity, subject to an agreement described in subsection (c), the following:

''(1) Satellite tracking services from assets owned or controlled by the Department of Defense, but only if the Secretary determines, in the case of any such agreement, that providing such services to that entity is in the national security interests of the United States.

''(2) Space surveillance data and the analysis of space surveillance data, but only if the Secretary determines, in the case of any such agreement, that providing such data and analysis to that entity is in the national security interests of the United States.

''(c) REQUIRED AGREEMENT.—The Secretary may not provide space surveillance data support to a non-United States Governmental entity under the pilot program unless that entity enters into an agreement with the Secretary under which the entity—

''(1) agrees to pay an amount that may be charged by the Secretary under subsection (f); and

''(2) agrees not to transfer any data or technical information received under the agreement, including the analysis of tracking data, to any other entity without the Secretary's express approval.

''(d) REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO FOREIGN TRANSACTIONS.—(1) The Secretary may enter into an agreement under subsection (c) to provide space surveillance data support to a foreign government or other foreign entity only with the concurrence of the Secretary of State.

''(2) In the case of such an agreement that is entered into with a foreign government or other foreign entity, the Secretary of Defense may provide approval under subsection (c)(2) for a transfer of data or technical information only with the concurrence of the Secretary of State.

''(e) PROHIBITION CONCERNING PROVISION OF INTELLIGENCE ASSETS OR DATA.—Nothing in this section shall be considered to authorize the provision of services or information concerning, or derived from, United States intelligence assets or data.

''(f) CHARGES.—As a condition of an agreement under subsection (c), the Secretary of Defense may require the non-United States Governmental entity entering into the agreement to pay to the Department of Defense—

''(1) such amounts as the Secretary determines to be necessary to reimburse the Department of Defense for the costs to the Department of providing space surveillance data support under the agreement; and

''(2) any other amount or fee that the Secretary may prescribe

''(g) CREDITING OF FUNDS RECEIVED.—Funds received pursuant to an agreement under this section shall be credited to accounts of the Department of Defense that are current when the proceeds are received and that are available for

the same purposes as the accounts originally charged to perform the services. Funds so credited shall merge with and become available for obligation for the same period as the accounts to which they are credited.

''(h) PROCEDURES.—The Secretary shall establish procedures for the conduct of the pilot program. As part of those procedures, the Secretary may allow space surveillance data and analytical support to be provided through a contractor of the Department of Defense.

''(i) DURATION OF PILOT PROGRAM.—The pilot program under this section shall be conducted during the three-year period beginning on a date specified by the Secretary of Defense, which date shall be not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of 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:

''2272. Space surveillance network: pilot program for provision of satellite tracking services and data to entities outside Unites States Government.''.

SEC. 904. CLARIFICATION OF RESPONSIBILITY OF MILITARY DEPARTMENTS TO SUPPORT COMBATANT COMMANDS.

Sections 3013(c)(4), 5013(c)(4), and 8013(c)(4) of title 10, United States Code, are each amended by striking ''(to the maximum extent practicable)''.

SEC. 905. BIENNIAL REVIEW OF NATIONAL MILITARY STRATEGY BY CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF.

(a) BIENNIAL REVIEW.—Section 153 of title 10, United States Code, by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) BIENNIAL REVIEW OF NATIONAL MILITARY STRATEGY.—(1) Not later then February 15 of each even-numbered year, the Chairman 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 a comprehensive examination of the national military strategy. Each such examination shall be conducted by the Chairman in conjunction with the other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the commanders of the unified and specified commands.

''(2) Each report on the examination of the national military strategy under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

''(A) Delineation of a national military strategy consistent with the most recent National Security Strategy prescribed by the President pursuant to section 108 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 404a) and the most recent Quadrennial Defense Review prescribed by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to section 118 of this title.

''(B) A description of the strategic environment and the opportunities and challenges that affect United States national interests and United States national security.

''(C) A description of the regional threats to United States national interests and United States national security.

''(D) A description of the international threats posed by terrorism, weapons of mass destruction, and asymmetric challenges to United States national security.

''(E) Identification of United States national military objectives and the relationship of those objectives to the strategic environment, regional, and international threats.

''(F) Identification of the strategy, underlying concepts, and component elements that contribute to the achievement of United States national military objectives.

''(G) Assessment of the capabilities and adequacy of United States forces (including both active and reserve components) to successfully execute the national military strategy.

''(H) Assessment of the capabilities, adequacy, and interoperability of regional allies of the United States and or other friendly nations to support United States forces in combat operations and other operations for extended periods of time.

''(I) Assessment of the resources, basing requirements, and support structure needed to provide the capabilities necessary to be assured United States forces can successfully achieve national military objectives and to assess what resources and support might be required to sustain allies or friendly nation forces during combat operations.

''(3)(A) As part of the assessment under this subsection, the Chairman, in conjunction with the other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the commanders of the unified and specified commands, shall undertake an assessment of the nature and magnitude of the strategic and military risks associated with successfully executing the missions called for under the current National Military Strategy.

''(B) In preparing the assessment of risk, the Chairman should assume the existence of those threats described in subparagraphs (C) and (D) of paragraph (2) and should assess the risk associated with two regional threats occurring nearly simultaneously.

''(C) In addition to the assumptions to be made under subparagraph (B), the Chairman should make other assumptions pertaining to the readiness of United States forces (in both the active and reserve components), the length of conflict and the level of intensity of combat operations, and the levels of support from allies and other friendly nations.

''(4) Before submitting a report under this subsection to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Chairman shall provide the report to the Secretary of Defense. The Secretary's assessment and comments thereon (if any) shall be included with the report. If the Chairman's assessment in such report in any year is that the risk associated with executing the missions called for under the National Military Strategy is significant, the Secretary shall include with the report as submitted to those committees the Secretary's plan for mitigating the risk.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (b)(1) of such section is amended by striking ''each year'' and inserting ''of each odd-numbered year''.

SEC. 906. AUTHORITY FOR ACCEPTANCE BY ASIA-PACIFIC CENTER FOR SECURITY STUDIES OF GIFTS AND DONATIONS FROM NONFOREIGN SOURCES.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Subsection (a) of section 2611 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''FOREIGN'' in the subsection caption;

(2) by striking ''foreign'' in paragraph (1) after ''Center,''; and

(3) by adding at the end of paragraph (1) the following sentence: ''Such gifts and donations may be accepted from any agency of the United States, any State or local government, any foreign government, any foundation or other charitable organization (including any that is organized or operates under the laws of a foreign country), or any other private source in the United States or a foreign country.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Such section is further amended

(1) by striking ''foreign'' in subsection (c); and

(2) in subsection (f)—

(A) by striking ''FOREIGN'' in the subsection caption;

(B) by striking ''foreign'' after ''section, a''; and

(C) by striking ''from a foreign'' and all that follows through ''country.'' and inserting a period.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.— The heading of such section, and the item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 155 of such title, are each amended by striking the third word after the colon.

SEC. 907. REPEAL OF ROTATING CHAIRMANSHIP OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT COMMITTEE.

Section 4004(b) of the Defense Economic Adjustment, Diversification, Conversion, and Stabilization Act of 1990 (division D of Public Law 101–510; 10 U.S.C. 2391 note) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Until October 1, 1997, the'' and inserting ''The''; and

(2) by striking the second sentence.

SEC. 908. PILOT PROGRAM FOR IMPROVED CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT.

(a) PILOT PROGRAM.—(1) The Secretary of Defense may carry out a pilot program using an automated workforce management system to demonstrate improved efficiency in the performance of civilian personnel management.

(2) Under the pilot program, the Secretary of Defense shall provide the Secretary of each military department with the authority for the following:

(A) To use an automated workforce management system for its civilian workforce to assess its potential to substantially reduce hiring cycle times, lower labor costs, increase efficiency, improve performance management, provide better management reporting, and enable it to make operational new personnel management flexibilities granted under the civilian personnel transformation program.

(B) Identify one regional civilian personnel center (or equivalent) in each military department for participation in the pilot program.

(3) The Secretary may carry out the pilot program under this subsection at each selected regional civilian personnel center for a period of two years beginning not later than March 1, 2004.

(b) PILOT PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS.—The pilot program civilian personnel management system shall have at a minimum the following characteristics:

(1) Currently in use by Federal government agencies outside the Department of Defense.

(2) Able to be purchased on an annual subscription basis.

(3) Requires no capital investment, software license fees, transaction charges, or ''per seat'' or ''concurrent user'' restrictions.

(4) Capable of automating the workforce management functions of job definition, position management, recruitment, staffing, and performance management using integrated vendor-supplied and supported data, expert system rules engines, and software functionality across those functions.

(5) Has a ''native web'' technical architecture and an Oracle database.

(6) Fully hosted by the vendor so that the customer requires only Internet access and an Internet browser to use the system.

(8) Capable of operating completely ''server side'' so that no software is required on the client system and no invasive elements are used.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.—(1) 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 plan for the implementation of the pilot program. The plan shall be submitted no later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) The plan shall include the following:

(A) The Secretary's request to the Office of Personnel Management to conduct the pilot program as a Federal civilian personnel demonstration project under chapter 47 of title 5, United States Code, or a plan to provide for the pilot program through another plan.

(B) The expected cost of the pilot program.

(C) Identification of the regional civilian personnel centers for participation in the pilot program and the criteria used to select them.

(D) Expected timing for providing to Congress the results of the pilot program and recommendations of the Secretary.

(d) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary may not begin to implement the pilot program until a period of 30 days has elapsed after the date of the

submission of the plan for the pilot program under subsection (c).

SEC. 909. EXTENSION OF CERTAIN AUTHORITIES APPLICABLE TO THE PENTAGON RESERVATION TO INCLUDE DESIGNATED PENTAGON CONTINUITY-OF-GOVERNMENT LOCATIONS.

Section 2674 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) For purposes of subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e), the terms 'Pentagon Reservation' and 'National Capital Region' shall be treated as including the land and physical facilities at the Raven Rock Mountain Complex and such other areas of land, locations, and physical facilities of the Department of Defense within 100 miles of the District of Columbia as the Secretary of Defense determines are necessary to meet the needs of the Department of Defense directly relating to continuity of operations and continuity of government.''.

SEC. 910. DEFENSE ACQUISITION WORKFORCE REDUCTIONS.

(a) REVISED LIMITATION.—Subchapter V of chapter 87 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 1765. Defense acquisition workforce: limitation

''(a) LIMITATION.—Effective October 1, 2008, the number of defense acquisition and support personnel in the Department of Defense may not exceed 75 percent of the baseline number.

''(b) PHASED REDUCTION.—The number of defense acquisition and support personnel in the Department of Defense—

''(1) as of October 1, 2004, may not exceed 95 percent of the baseline number;

''(2) as of October 1, 2005, may not exceed 90 percent of the baseline number;

''(3) as of October 1, 2006, may not exceed 85 percent of the baseline number; and

''(4) as of October 1, 2007, may not exceed 80 percent of the baseline number.

''(c) BASELINE NUMBER.—In this section, the term 'baseline number' means the number of defense acquisition and support personnel in the Department of Defense as of October 1, 2003.

''(d) DEFENSE ACQUISITION AND SUPPORT PERSONNEL DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'defense acquisition and support personnel' means military 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 organizations which the Secretary may determine to have a predominantly acquisition mission.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such subchapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''1765. Defense acquisition workforce: limitation.''.

SEC. 911. REQUIRED FORCE STRUCTURE.

(a) ARMY.—Section 3062 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) The Army shall be so organized as to include not less than—

''(1) 10 active and eight National Guard combat divisions or their equivalents;

''(2) one active armored cavalry regiment and one light cavalry regiment or their equivalents;

''(3) 15 National Guard enhanced brigades or their equivalents; and

''(4) such other active and reserve component land combat, rotary-wing aviation, and other services as may be required to support forces specified in paragraphs (1) through (3).''.

(b) NAVY.—Section 5062 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) The Navy, within the Department of the Navy, shall be so organized as to include—

''(1) not less than 305 vessels in active service;

''(2) not less than 12 aircraft carrier battle groups or their equivalents, not less than 12 amphibious ready groups or their equivalents, not less than 55 attack submarines, not less than 108 active surface combatant vessels, and not less than 8 reserve combatant vessels; and

''(3) such other active and reserve naval combat, naval aviation, and service forces as may be required to support forces specified in paragraphs (1) and (2).''.

(c) AIR FORCE.—Section 8062 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) Notwithstanding subsection (e), the Air Force shall be so organized as to include not less than—

''(1) 46 active fighter squadrons or their equivalents;

''(2) 38 National Guard and Reserve squadrons or their equivalents;

''(3) 96 combat-coded bomber aircraft in active service; and

''(4) such other squadrons, reserve groups, and supporting auxiliary and reserve units as may be required to support forces specified in paragraphs (1) through (3).''.

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 2004 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.

(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; and

(2) may not be used to provide authority for an item that has been denied authorization by Congress.

(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. AUTHORIZATION OF SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003.

(a) DOD AUTHORIZATIONS.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2003 in the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314) are hereby adjusted, with respect to any such authorized amount, by the amount by which appropriations pursuant to such authorization are increased (by a supplemental appropriation) or decreased (by a rescission), or both, or are increased by a transfer of funds, pursuant to the following:

(1) Chapters 3 and 8 of title I of the Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2003 (Public Law 108–11).

(2) Any Act enacted after May 23, 2003, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2003 for the military functions of the Department of Defense.

(b) NNSA AUTHORIZATIONS.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2003 in the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314) are hereby adjusted, with respect to any such authorized amount, by the amount by which appropriations pursuant to such authorization are increased (by a supplemental appropriation) or decreased (by a rescission), or both, or are increased by a transfer of funds, pursuant to the following:

(1) Chapter 4 of the Emergency Wartime Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2003 (Public Law 108–11).

(2) Any Act enacted after May 23, 2003, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2003 for the atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy.

SEC. 1003. AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER PROCUREMENT FUNDS FOR A MAJOR DEFENSE ACQUISITION PROGRAM FOR CONTINUED DEVELOPMENT WORK ON THAT PROGRAM.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Section 2214 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b), (c), and (d) as subsections (c), (d), and (e), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection (b):

''(b) TRANSFER OF PROCUREMENT FUNDS FOR DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES FOR MAJOR DEFENSE ACQUISITION SYSTEMS.—(1) In the case of a major defense acquisition program (as defined in section 2430 of this title) for which funds are currently available both for procurement and for research, development, test, and evaluation, if the Secretary concerned determines that funds are required for further research, development, test, and evaluation activities for that program in excess of the funds currently available for that purpose, the Secretary may (subject to paragraph (2)) transfer funds available for that program for procurement to funds available for that program for research, development, test, and evaluation for the purpose of continuing research, development, test, and evaluation activities for that program.

''(2)(A) The total amount transferred under the authority of paragraph (1) for any acquisition program may not exceed $20,000,000.

''(B) The total amount transferred under the authority of paragraph (1) from amounts made available for any fiscal year may not exceed $250,000,000.

''(3) The authority provided by paragraph (1) is in addition to any other transfer authority that may be provided by law.

''(4) Upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred under paragraph (1) are not necessary for the purpose for which the transfer was made, such amounts may be transferred back to a Procurement appropriation for the purpose of procurement of the acquisition program for which funds were transferred.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to funds appropriated for a fiscal year before fiscal year 2004.

SEC. 1004. RESTORATION OF AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO 12-MONTH LEASES AT ANY TIME DURING THE FISCAL YEAR.

Section 2410a(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after ''severable services'' the following: ''and the lease of real or personal property, including the maintenance of such property when contracted for as part of the lease agreement,''.

SEC. 1005. AUTHORITY FOR RETENTION OF ADDITIONAL AMOUNTS REALIZED FROM ENERGY COST SAVINGS.

(a) INCREASE IN AMOUNT OF ENERGY COST SAVINGS RETAINED.—Section 2865(b)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Two-thirds of the portion of the funds appropriated to Department of Defense for a fiscal year that is'' and inserting ''Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for a fiscal year that are''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall not apply to funds appropriated for a fiscal year before fiscal year 2004.

SEC. 1006. REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT FOR TWO-YEAR BUDGET CYCLE FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

Section 1405 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (Public Law 99–145; 31 U.S.C. 1105 note), is repealed.

SEC. 1007. AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE REIMBURSEMENT FOR USE OF PERSONAL CELLULAR TELEPHONES WHEN USED FOR OFFICIAL GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Chapter 134 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2257 the following new section:

"§ 2258. Personal cellular telephones: reimbursement when used for Government business

''(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Defense may reimburse members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corp, and civilian officers and employees of the Department of Defense, for cellular telephone use on a privately owned cellular telephone when used on official Government business. Such reimbursement shall be on a flat-rate basis.

''(b) REIMBURSEMENT RATE.—The Secretary of Defense may prescribe the reimbursement rate for purposes of subsection (a). That reimbursement rate may not exceed the equivalent Government costs of providing a cellular telephone to employees on official Government business.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter II of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2257 the following new item:

''2258. Personal cellular telephones: reimbursement when used for Government business.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 2258 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall take effect on October 1, 2003, and shall apply with respect to the use of cellular phones on or after that date.

Subtitle B—Naval Vessels and Shipyards

SEC. 1011. REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT REGARDING PRESERVATION OF SURGE CAPABILITY FOR NAVAL SURFACE COMBATANTS.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 7296 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (b).

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—Such section is further amended—

(1) by striking ''(3) Any notification under paragraph (1)(A)'' and inserting ''(b) CONTENT OF NOTIFICATION.—Any notification under subsection (a)(1)(A)'';

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of subsection (b) (as redesignated by paragraph (1)) as paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively; and

(3) by striking ''subparagraph (B)'' in subsection (b)(3) (as redesignated by paragraphs (1) and (2)) and inserting ''paragraph (2)''.

SEC. 1012. ENHANCEMENT OF AUTHORITY RELATING TO USE FOR EXPERIMENTAL PURPOSES OF VESSELS STRICKEN FROM NAVAL VESSEL REGISTER.

(a) SALE OF MATERIAL AND EQUIPMENT STRIPPED FROM VESSEL.—Subsection (b)(1) of section 7306a of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''Material and equipment stripped from the vessel may be sold by a contractor or a designated sales agent on behalf of the Navy.''.

(b) USE OF PROCEEDS.—(1) Subsection (b)(2) of such section is amended by striking ''scrapping services'' and all that follows through and inserting ''services needed for such stripping and for environmental remediation required for the use of the vessel for experimental purposes. Amounts received in excess of amounts needed for reimbursement of those costs shall be deposited into the account from which the stripping and environmental remediation expenses were incurred and shall be available for stripping and environmental remediation of other vessels to be used for experimental purposes.''.

(2) The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to proceeds from the stripping of a vessel under any vessel stripping contract entered into before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) CLARIFICATION OF COVERED EXPERIMENTAL PURPOSES.—Such section is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) USE FOR EXPERIMENTAL PURPOSES DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'use for experimental purposes' includes use of a vessel in a Navy sink exercise or for target purposes.''.

SEC. 1013. AUTHORIZATION FOR TRANSFER OF VESSELS STRICKEN FROM NAVAL VESSEL REGISTER FOR USE AS ARTIFICIAL REEFS.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Chapter 633 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 7306a the following new section:

"§ 7306b. Vessels stricken from Naval Vessel Register: transfer by gift or otherwise for use as artificial reefs

''(a) AUTHORITY TO MAKE TRANSFER.—The Secretary of the Navy may transfer, by gift or otherwise, any vessel stricken from the Naval Vessel Register to any State, Commonwealth, or possession of the United States or any municipal corporation or political subdivision thereof for use as an artificial reef as provided in subsection (b).

''(b) VESSEL TO BE USED AS ARTIFICIAL REEF.—An agreement for the transfer of a vessel under subsection (a) shall require that—

''(1) the transferee use, site, construct, monitor, and manage the vessel only as an artificial reef in accordance with the requirements of the National Fishing Enhancement Act of 1984 (33 U.S.C. 2101 et seq.), except that the transferee also may use the artificial reef to enhance diving opportunities if that use does not have an adverse effect on fishery resources; and

''(2) the transferee shall obtain, and bear all of the responsibility for complying with, all applicable Federal, State, interstate, and local permits for siting, constructing, monitoring, and managing a vessel as an artificial reef.

''(c) ADDITIONAL TERMS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms in connection with a conveyance authorized by this section as the Secretary considers appropriate.

''(d) COST SHARING ON TRANSFERS.—The Secretary of the Navy may share with the recipient any of the costs associated with transferring a vessel under this section.

''(e) APPLICATION FOR MORE THAN ONE VESSEL.—A State, Commonwealth, or possession of the United States, or any municipal corporation or political subdivision thereof, may apply for more than one vessel under this section.

''(f) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'fishery resources' has the meaning given such term in section 3(14) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 1802(14)).''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 7306a the following new item:

''7306b. Vessels stricken from Naval Vessel Register: transfer by gift or otherwise for use as artificial reefs.''.

SEC. 1014. PILOT PROGRAM FOR SEALIFT SHIP CONSTRUCTION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PILOT PROGRAM.—The Secretary of the Navy may establish a pilot program, under which the Secretary of the Navy, subject to the availability of appropriations, may guarantee loans for—

(1) the construction in a United States shipyard of two qualified sealift ships that are to be documented under the laws of the United States for use in United States-flag commercial service; and

(2) the acquisition of facilities or equipment pertaining to the marine operations of those ships, which may include specialized loading equipment.

(b) CONDITIONS OF GUARANTEE.—A guarantee under this section is subject to the following conditions:

(1) MSP.—The owner of the ships for which guarantees are issued shall apply for an operating agreement with the Secretary of Transportation under subtitle B of this title.

(2) NDF; CHARTER.—If the Secretary of the Navy requests, the owner of the ships shall engage in negotiations on reasonable terms and conditions for—

(A) installation and maintenance of defense features for national defense purposes on one or both ships under section 2218 of title 10, United States Code; and

(B) a short-term charter to the United States Government of at least one ship for which a guarantee is issued, for a period of at least 60 days prior to entry into commercial service, for the purpose of demonstrating the military capabilities of the ships.

(c) PAYMENT OF COST.—The cost of a guarantee under this section shall be paid for with amounts made available in appropriations Acts.

(d) PERCENTAGE LIMITATION; TERM.—A guarantee under this section may apply—

(1) to up to 87.5 percent of the loan principal; and

(2) for a term ending up to 25 years after delivery of the second ship.

(e) AUTHORITIES, PROCEDURES, REQUIREMENTS, AND RESTRICTIONS.—The Secretary of the Navy, subject to the other provisions of this section—

(1) in implementing this section, may exercise authorities that are substantially the same as the authorities available to the Secretary of Transportation under title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 App. U.S.C. 1271 et seq.) with respect to loan guarantees under that title;

(2) shall implement this section under procedures, requirements, and restrictions that are substantially the same as those under which loan guarantees are made under that title, including the regulations implementing that title; and

(3) may establish such additional requirements for loan guarantees under this section as the Secretary determines to be necessary to minimize the cost of such guarantees.

(f) INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT.—The Secretary of Transportation shall enter into an interagency agreement or other appropriate arrangement with the Secretary of the Navy to make available to the Department of the Navy such Maritime Administration personnel with expertise in vessel construction financing as are necessary to carry out the program under this section.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COST.—The term ''cost'', with respect to a loan guarantee under this section, has the meaning given that term in section 502 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 661a).

(2) QUALIFIED SEALIFT SHIP.—The term ''qualified sealift ship'' means a roll-on, roll-off vessel that is—

(A) militarily useful for additional medium- to long-haul strategic sealift capacity;

(B) designed to carry at least 10,000 tons of cargo; and

(C) capable of operating commercially in the foreign commerce of the United States.

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Navy to carry out this section $40,000,000.

Subtitle C—Reports

SEC. 1021. REPEAL AND MODIFICATION OF VARIOUS REPORTING REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.—Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 113 is amended by striking subsection (m).

(2) Section 117(e) is amended by striking ''each month'' and all that follows through ''subsection (d)'' and inserting ''each quarter submit to the congressional defense committees a report in writing containing the results of the most recent joint readiness review under subsection (d)(1)(A)''.

(3) Section 127(d) is amended to read as follows:

''(d) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than December 1 each year, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on expenditures during the preceding fiscal year under subsections (a) and (b).''.

(4) Section 127a is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking paragraph (3); and

(ii) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (3); and

(B) by striking subsection (d).

(5) Section 128 is amended by striking subsection (d).

(6) Section 129 is amended by striking subsection (f).

(7) Section 184 is amended by striking subsection (b).

(8) Section 226(a) is amended—

(A) by striking ''December 15'' and inserting ''January 15''; and

(B) by striking ''in the following year'' in paragraph (1) and inserting ''in that year''.

(9)(A) Section 228 is amended—

(i) in subsection (a)—

(I) by striking ''MONTHLY'' in the subsection heading and inserting ''QUARTERLY'';

(II) by striking ''monthly'' and inserting ''quarterly''; and

(III) by striking ''month'' and inserting ''fiscal-year quarter''; and

(ii) in subsection (c), by striking ''month'' each place it appears and inserting ''quarter''.

(B)(i) The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

''§ 228. Quarterly reports on allocation of funds within operation and maintenance budget subactivities''.

(ii) The item relating to section 228 in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 9 is amended to read as follows:

''228. Quarterly reports on allocation of funds within operation and maintenance budget subactivities.''.

(10) Section 401 is amended by striking subsection (d).

(11) Section 437 is amended—

(A) by striking the second sentence of subsection (b); and

(B) by striking subsection (c).

(12)(A) Section 484 is repealed.

(B) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by striking the item relating to section 484.

(13)(A) Section 520c is amended—

(i) by striking subsection (b);

(ii) by striking ''(a) PROVISION OF MEALS AND REFRESHMENTS.''; and

(iii) by striking the heading for such section and inserting the following:

''§ 520c. Recruiting functions: provision of meals and refreshments''.

(B) The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 31 is amended to read as follow:

''520c. Recruiting functions: provision of meals and refreshments.''.

(14) Section 983(e)(1) is amended by striking ''and to Congress''.

(15) Section 1060 is amended by striking subsection (d).

(16) Section 1130 is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''the other determinations necessary to comply with subsection (b)'' and inserting ''respond with a detailed description of the rationale supporting the determination''; and

(B) by striking subsection (b).

(17) Section 1557 is amended by striking subsection (e).

(18) Section 1563 is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking ''the other determinations necessary to comply with subsection (b)'' and inserting ''respond with a detailed description of the rationale supporting the determination''; and

(B) by striking subsection (b).

(19) Section 2010 is amended by striking subsection (b).

(20) Section 2166 is amended—

(A) in subsection (e)(5), by inserting ''and to Congress'' after ''to the Secretary of Defense''; and

(B) by striking subsection (i).

(21) Section 2208(j)(2) is amended by striking ''and notifies Congress regarding the reasons for the waiver''.

(22) Section 2216(a) is amended—

(A) by striking ''QUARTERLY REPORTS.—(1) Not later than 15 days after the end of each calendar quarter'' and inserting ''ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the end of each fiscal year''; and

(B) by striking ''quarter'' in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (1) and inserting ''fiscal year''.

(23) Section 2224(e) is amended by inserting ''through 2007'' after ''Each year''.

(24) Section 2255(b)—

(A) by striking paragraph (2); and

(B) by striking ''(1)'' after ''(b) EXCEPTION.—''.

(25) Section 2281 is amended by striking subsection (d).

(26)(A) Section 2282 is repealed.

(B) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 136 is amended by striking the item relating to section 2282.

(27) Section 2323 is amended—

(A) in subsection (d)—

(i) by striking ''Defense—'' and all that follows through ''the extent'' and inserting ''Defense to the extent'';

(ii) by striking ''; and'' and inserting a period; and

(iii) by striking paragraph (2); and

(B) by striking subsection (i).

(28) Section 2327(c)(1) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''after the date on which such head of an agency submits to Congress a report on the contract'' and inserting ''if in the best interests of the Government'';

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''A report under subparagraph (A)'' and inserting ''The Secretary shall maintain records of each contract entered into by reason of subparagraph (A). Such records''; and

(C) by striking subparagraph (C).

(29) Section 2350a is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (f); and

(B) in subsection (g), by striking paragraph (3).

(30) Section 2350j is amended by striking subsections (e) and (g).

(31) Section 2367 is amended by striking subsection (d).

(32) Section 2371 is amended by striking subsection (h).

(33) Section 2374a is amended by striking subsection (e).

(34) Section 2410i(c) is amended by striking the last sentence.

(35) Section 2410m(c) is amended—

(A) by striking ''REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Each year'' and inserting ''ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the end of each fiscal year'';

(B) by inserting ''at the end of such fiscal year'' in paragraph (1) before the period;

(C) by striking ''during the year preceding the year in which the report is submitted'' in paragraph (2) and inserting ''under this section during that fiscal year'';

(D) by striking ''in such preceding year'' in paragraph (3) and inserting ''under this section during that fiscal year''; and

(E) by striking ''in such preceding year'' in paragraph (4) and inserting ''under this section during that fiscal year''.

(36) Section 2433 is amended—

(A) in subsection (d)—

(i) in paragraphs (1) and (2), by striking '', or by at least 25 percent,''; and

(ii) in paragraph (3)—

(I) by striking ''or by at least 25 percent,'' both places it appears; and

(II) by inserting a comma after ''paragraph (1)''; and

(B) in subsection (e)—

(i) by striking paragraph (2);

(ii) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2);

(iii) in paragraph (2), as so redesignated, by striking ''or if a'' in the first sentence and all that follows through ''paragraph (2),''; and

(iv) by designating the second sentence of such paragraph as paragraph (3) and in that paragraph—

(I) by inserting ''under paragraph (2)'' after ''The prohibition''; and

(II) by striking ''the date—'' and all that follows through ''subsection (d).'' and inserting ''the date on which Congress receives the Selected Acquisition Report under paragraph (1) with respect to that program.''.

(37) Section 2457 is amended by striking subsection (d).

(38) Section 2493 is amended by striking subsection (g).

(39) Section 2515 is amended by striking subsection (d).

(40) Section 2521 is amended by striking subsection (e).

(41) Section 2536 is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(2)—

(i) by striking ''notify Congress'' in the first sentence and inserting ''maintain a record''; and

(ii) by striking the second sentence and inserting the following: ''The records maintained under the preceding sentence with respect to a waiver shall include a justification in suport of the decision to grant the waiver and shall be retrievable for any particular waiver or for waivers during any period of time.''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) The Secretary of Defense shall maintain an account of actions relating to the award of contracts to a prime contractor. The Secretary of Defense shall include in such accounts the reasons for exercising the awards and the work expected to be performed.''.

(42) Section 2541d is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (b); and

(B) in subsection (a), by striking ''(a)'' and all that follows through ''The Secretary of Defense'' and inserting ''The Secretary of Defense''.

(43) Section 2561 is amended by striking subsections (c), (d) and (f).

(44) Section 2563(c)(2) is amended by striking ''and notifies Congress regarding the reasons for the waiver''.

(45) Section 2645 is amended by striking subsections (d) and (g).

(46) Section 2667a(c)(2) is amended by striking ''45 days'' and inserting ''14 days''.

(47) Section 2676(d) is amended by striking ''21 days'' and inserting ''14 days''.

(48) Section 2680 is amended by striking subsection (e).

(49) Section 2696 is amended by striking subsections (c) and (d).

(50) Section 2703(c)(2) is amended—

(A) by striking subparagraph (B);

(B) by striking ''unless the Secretary—'' and all that follows through ''determines that'' and inserting ''unless the Secretary determines that''; and

(C) by redesignating clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), respectively, and realigning such subparagraphs (as so redesignated) two ems from the left margin.

(51)(A) Section 2723 is repealed.

(B) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 161 is amended by striking the item relating to section 2723.

(52) Section 2803(b) is amended by striking ''21–day period'' and inserting ''seven-day period''.

(53) Section 2804(b) is amended by striking ''21–day period'' and inserting ''14–day period''.

(54) Section 2805(b) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''$750,000'' and inserting ''$1,000,000''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''by striking ''21–day period'' and inserting ''seven-day period'''.

(55) Section 2807 is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking ''$500,000'' and inserting ''$1,000,000''; and

(ii) by striking ''not less than 21 days''; and

(B) in subsection (c)(2), by striking ''21 days'' and inserting ''14 days''.

(56) Section 2809(f)(2) is amended by striking ''21 calendar days'' and inserting ''14 days''.

(57) Section 2812(c)(1)(B) is amended by striking ''21 days'' and inserting ''14 days''.

(58) Section 2813(c) is amended by striking ''30–day period'' and inserting ''21–day period''.

(59) Section 2825 is amended—

(A) by striking ''21 days'' in the last sentence of subsection (b)(1)(B) and inserting ''14 days''; and

(B) by striking ''21 days'' in subsection (c)(1)(D) and inserting ''14 days''.

(60) Section 2826 is amended—

(A) by striking ''(a) LOCAL COMPARABILITY.—''; and

(B) by striking subsection (b).

(61) Section 2827(b)(2) is amended by striking ''21 days'' and inserting ''14 days''.

(62) Section 2836(f)(2) is amended by striking ''21 calendar days'' and inserting ''14 days''.

(63) Section 2837(c)(2) is amended by striking ''21–day period'' and inserting ''14–day period''.

(64) Section 2854(b) is amended by striking ''21–day period'' and inserting ''seven-day period''.

(65) Section 2854a(c)(2) is amended by striking ''21 calendar days'' and inserting ''14 days''.

(66) Section 2865 is amended—

(A) in subsection (e)—

(i) by striking ''(1)'' before ''The Secretary''; and

(ii) by striking paragraph (2); and

(B) by striking subsection (f).

(67) Section 2866(c) is amended—

(A) by striking ''(1)'' before ''The Secretary''; and

(B) by striking paragraph (2).

(68) Section 2867(c) is amended by striking ''21–day period'' and inserting ''14–day period''.

(69) Section 2875(e) is amended by striking ''30–day period'' and inserting ''14–day period''.

(70) Section 2883(f) is amended by striking ''30–day period'' and inserting ''14–day period''.

(71) Section 2902(g) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (2); and

(B) by striking ''(1)'' after ''(g)''.

(72) Section 4342(h) is amended by striking ''Secretary of the Army'' and inserting ''Superintendent''.

(73) Section 4357(c) is amended is amended by striking ''the expiration of 30 days following''.

(74) Section 6954(f) is amended by striking ''Secretary of the Navy'' and inserting ''Superintendent of the Naval Academy''.

(75) Section 6975(c) is amended is amended by striking ''the expiration of 30 days following''.

(76) Section 7049(c) is amended—

(A) by striking ''CERTIFICATION'' in the subsection heading and inserting ''DETERMINATION''; and

(B) by striking '', and certifies to'' and all that follows through ''House of Representatives,''.

(77) Section 9342(h) is amended by striking ''Secretary of the Air Force'' and inserting ''Superintendent''.

(78) Section 9356(c) is amended is amended by striking ''the expiration of 30 days following''.

(79) Section 12302—

(A) in subsection (b), by striking the last sentence; and

(B) by striking subsection (d).

(80)(A) Section 16137 is repealed.

(B) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 1606 is amended by striking the item relating to section 16137.

(b) FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961.—Section 656 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2416) is repealed.

(c) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1991.—Part B of title XXIX of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101–510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) is amended as follows:

(1) Section 2921 is amended—

(A) in subsection (f)(1), by striking ''30 days'' and inserting ''14 days''; and

(B) in subsection (g), by striking ''30 days'' in paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting ''14 days''.

(2) Section 2926 is amended by striking subsection (g).

(d) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 1992 AND 1993.—The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993 (Public Law 102–190) is amended as follows:

(1) Section 734 (10 U.S.C. 1074 note) is amended by striking subsection (c).

(2) Section 2868 (10 U.S.C. 2802 note) is amended by striking ''The Secretary of Defense'' and all that follows through ''is to be authorized'' and inserting ''Not later than 30 days after the date on which a decision is made selecting the site or sites for the permanent basing of a new weapon system, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress''.

(e) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1993.—The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102–484) is amended as follows:

(1) Section 324 (10 U.S.C. 2701 note) is amended—

(A) by striking ''(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—''; and

(B) by striking subsection (b).

(2) Section 1082(b)(1) (10 U.S.C. 113 note) is amended by striking ''the Secretary of Defense—'' and all that follows and inserting ''the Secretary of Defense determines that it is in the national security interests of the United States for the military departments to do so.''.

(f) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995.—Section 721 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103–337; 10 U.S.C. 1074 note) is amended by striking subsection (h).

(g) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997.—The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201) is amended as follows:

(1) Section 324 (10 U.S.C. 2706 note) is amended by striking subsection (c).

(2) Section 1065(b) (10 U.S.C. 113 note) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(1)'' before ''Notwithstanding''; and

(2) by striking paragraph (2).

(h) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997.—Section 8009 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1997 (as contained in section 101(b) of Public Law 104–208; 110 Stat. 3009-89), is amended by striking '', unless the congressional defense committees have been notified at least thirty days in advance of the proposed contract award''.

(i) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998.— Section 349 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85; 10 U.S.C. 2702 note) is amended by striking subsection (e).

(j) STROM THURMOND NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999.—The Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261) is amended as follows:

(1) Section 745(e) (10 U.S.C. 1071 note) is amended—

(A) by striking ''(1)'' before ''The Secretary of Defense''; and

(B) by striking paragraph (2).

(2) Section 1223 (22 U.S.C. 1928 note) is repealed.

(k) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000.—The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) is amended as follows:

(1) Section 212 (10 U.S.C. 2501 note) is amended by striking subsection (c).

(2) Section 724 (10 U.S.C. 1092 note) is amended by striking subsection (e).

(4) Section 1039 (10 U.S.C. 113 note) is amended by striking subsection (b).

(l) MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001.—Section 125 of the Military Construction Appropriations Act, 2001 (division A of Public Law 106–246; 114 Stat. 517), is repealed.

(m) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001.—Section 8019 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2001 (Public Law 106–259; 114 Stat. 678; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note), is amended by striking ''of Congress:'' and all that follows through ''this provision'' and inserting ''of Congress''.

(n) FLOYD D. SPENCE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001.—Section 1006 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–247; 10 U.S.C. 2226 note), is amended by striking subsection (c).

(o) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002.—Section 8009 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2002 (division A of Public Law 107–117; 115 Stat. 2249; 10 U.S.C. 401 note), is amended by striking '', and these obligations shall be reported to the Congress''.

SEC. 1022. REPORT ON OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than June 15, 2004, 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 Operation Iraqi Freedom. The Secretary shall submit to those committees a preliminary report on the conduct of those hostilities not later than January 15, 2004.

(b) DISCUSSION OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND SHORTCOMINGS.—The report (and the preliminary report, to the extent feasible) shall contain a discussion, with a particular emphasis on accomplishments and shortcomings, of the following matters:

(1) The military objectives of the multinational coalition.

(2) The military strategy of the multinational coalition to achieve those military objectives and how the military strategy contributed to the achievement of those objectives.

(3) The deployment of United States forces and the transportation of supplies to the theater of operations, including an assessment of airlift, sealift, afloat prepositioning ships, and Maritime Prepositioning Squadron ships.

(4) The conduct of military operations.

(5) The use of special operations forces, including operational and intelligence uses classified under special access procedures.

(6) The use and performance of United States military equipment, weapon systems, and munitions (including items classified under special access procedures) and an analysis of—

(A) any equipment or capabilities that were in research and development and if available could have been used in the theater of operations; and

(B) any equipment or capabilities that were available and could have been used but were not introduced into the theater of operations.

(7) The scope of logistics support, including support from other nations.

(8) The acquisition policies and processes used to support the forces in the theater of operations.

(9) The personnel management actions taken to support the forces in the theater of operations.

(10) The effectiveness of reserve component forces, including a discussion of each of the following matters:

(A) The readiness and activation of such forces.

(B) The decisionmaking process regarding both activation of reserve component forces and deployment of those forces to the theater of operations.

(C) The post-activation training received by such forces.

(D) The integration of forces and equipment of reserve component forces into the active component forces.

(E) The use and performance of the reserve component forces in operations in the theater of operations.

(F) The use and performance of such forces at duty stations outside the theater of operations.

(11) The role of the law of armed conflict in the planning and execution of military operations by United States forces and the other coalition forces and the effects on operations of Iraqi compliance or noncompliance with the law of armed conflict, including a discussion regarding each of the following matters:

(A) Use of Iraqi civilians as human shields.

(B) Collateral damage and civilian casualties.

(C) Treatment of prisoners of war.

(D) Repatriation of prisoners of war.

(E) Use of ruses and acts of perfidy.

(F) War crimes.

(G) Environmental terrorism.

(H) Conduct of neutral nations.

(12) The actions taken by the coalition forces in anticipation of, and in response to, Iraqi acts of environmental terrorism.

(13) The actions taken by the coalition forces in anticipation of possible Iraqi use of weapons of mass destruction.

(14) Evidence of Iraqi weapons of mass destruction programs and Iraqi preparations for the use of such weapons.

(15) The contributions of United States and coalition intelligence and counterintelligence systems and personnel, including contributions regarding bomb damage assessments and particularly including United States tactical intelligence and related activities (TIARA) programs and the Joint Military Intelligence Program (JMIP).

(16) Command, control, communications, and operational security of the coalition forces as a whole, and command, control, communications, and operational security of the United States forces.

(17) The rules of engagement for the coalition forces.

(18) The actions taken to reduce the casualties among coalition forces caused by the fire of such forces.

(19) The role of supporting combatant commands and Defense Agencies of the Department of Defense.

(20) The policies and procedures relating to the media, including the use of embedded media.

(21) The assignment of roles and missions to the United States forces and other coalition forces and the performance of those forces in carrying out their assigned roles and missions.

(22) The preparedness, including doctrine and training, of the United States forces.

(23) The acquisition of foreign military technology from Iraq, and any compromise of military technology of the United States or other countries in the multinational coalition.

(24) The problems posed by Iraqi possession and use of equipment produced in the United States and other coalition nations.

(25) The use of deception by Iraqi forces and by coalition forces.

(26) The military criteria used to determine when to progress from one phase of military operations to another phase of military operations.

(27) The role, if any, of the Status of Resources and Training System (SORTS) in determining which units would be employed during the operation.

(28) The role of the Coast Guard.

(29) The direct and indirect cost of military operations, including an assessment of the total incremental expenditures made by the Department of Defense as a result of Operation Iraqi Freedom.

(c) CASUALTY STATISTICS.—The report (and the preliminary report, to the extent feasible) shall also contain—

(1) the number of military and civilian casualties sustained by coalition nations; and

(2) estimates of such casualties sustained by Iraq and by nations not directly participating in hostilities during Operation Iraqi Freedom.

(d) CLASSIFICATION OF REPORTS.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit both the report and the preliminary report in a classified form and an unclassified form.

SEC. 1023. REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE POST-CONFLICT ACTIVITIES IN IRAQ

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the activities of the Department of Defense in post-conflict Iraq.

(b) REPORT ELEMENTS.—The report shall discuss the range of infrastructure reconstruction, civil administration, humanitarian assistance, interim governance, and political development activities undertaken in Iraq by officials of the Department and by those civilians reporting to the Secretary of Defense and the missions undertaken in Iraq by United States military forces during the post-conflict period. In particular, the report shall include a discussion of the following:

(1) The evolution of the organizational structure of the civilian groups reporting to the Secretary, including the Office of Reconstruction and Humanitarian Assistance, on issues of Iraqi post-conflict administration and reconstruction and the factors influencing that evolution.

(2) The relationship of the Department of Defense with other United States departments and agencies involved in post-conflict administration and reconstruction planning and execution in Iraq.

(3) The relationship of Department of Defense entities, including the Office of Reconstruction and Humanitarian Assistance, with intergovernmental and nongovernmental organizations contributing to the reconstruction and governance efforts.

(4) Progress made to the date of the report in—

(A) rebuilding Iraqi infrastructure;

(B) providing for the humanitarian needs of the Iraqi people;

(C) reconstituting the Iraqi governmental bureaucracy and its provision of services; and

(D) developing mechanisms of fully transitioning Iraq to representative self-government.

(5) Progress made to the date of the report by Department of Defense civilians and military personnel in accounting for any Iraqi weapons of mass destruction and associated weapons capabilities.

(6) Progress made to the date of the report by United States military personnel in providing security in Iraq and in transferring security functions to a reconstituted Iraqi police force and military.

(7) The Secretary's assessment of the scope of the ongoing needed commitment of United States military forces and of the remaining tasks to be completed by Department of Defense civilian personnel in the governance and reconstruction areas, including an estimate of the total expenditures the Department of Defense expects to make for activities in post-conflict Iraq.

SEC. 1024. REPORT ON DEVELOPMENT OF MECHANISMS TO BETTER CONNECT DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SPACE CAPABILITIES TO THE WAR FIGHTER.

Not later than March 15, 2004, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on development and implementation of systematic mechanisms to provide for integrating into activities of the United States Strategic Command planning and requirements for connecting space capabilities of that command with the war fighter.

Subtitle D—Procurement of Defense Biomedical Countermeasures

SEC. 1031. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT OF DEFENSE BIOMEDICAL COUNTERMEASURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense (in this section referred to as the ''Secretary'') shall carry out a program to accelerate the research, development and procurement of biomedical countermeasures, including but not limited to therapeutics and vaccines, for the protection of the Armed Forces from attack by one or more biological, chemical, radiological, or nuclear agents.

(b) INTERAGENCY COOPERATION.—(1) In carrying out the program under subsection (a), the Secretary may enter into interagency agreements and other collaborative undertakings with other Federal agencies. Under such agreements and undertakings, the participating agencies are authorized to provide funds and receive funds from other participating agencies.

(2) The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall ensure that the activities of the Department of Defense in carrying out the program are coordinated with, complement, and do not unnecessarily duplicate activities of the Department of Health and Human Services or the Department of Homeland Security.

(c) EXPEDITED PROCUREMENT AUTHORITY.—(1)(A) For any procurement by the Secretary, of property or services for use (as determined by the Secretary) in performing, administering, or supporting biomedical countermeasures research or development, the amount specified in section 4(11) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(11)), as applicable pursuant to section 302A(a) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 252a(a)), shall be deemed to be $25,000,000 in the administration, with respect to such procurement, of sections 302A(b) (41 U.S.C. 252a(b)) and 303(g)(1)(A) (42 U.S.C. 253(g)(1)(A)) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and the regulations implementing those sections.

(B) The Secretary shall institute appropriate internal controls for use of the authority under subparagraph (A), including requirements for documenting the justification for each use of such authority.

(2)(A) For a procurement described in paragraph (1), the amount specified in subsections (c), (d), and (f) of section 32 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 428) shall be deemed to be $15,000 in the administration of that section with respect to such procurement.

(B) The Secretary shall institute appropriate internal controls for each use of the authority under subparagraph (A) for a procurement greater than $2,500.

(d) FACILITIES AUTHORITY.—(1) The Secretary may acquire, lease, construct, improve, renovate, remodel, repair, operate, and maintain laboratories, other research facilities and equipment, and other real or personal property that the Secretary determines necessary for carrying out the program under this section. The authority under this paragraph is in addition to any other authority under law.

(2) The Secretary may exercise the authorities of paragraph (1) as part of an intergency cooperation activity under subsection (b).

(e) AUTHORITY FOR PERSONAL SERVICES CONTRACTS.—The authority provided by section 1091 of title 10, United States Code, for personal services contracts to carry out health care responsibilities in medical treatment facilities of the

Department of Defense shall also be available, subject to the same terms and conditions, for personal services contracts to carry out research and development activities under this section. The number of individuals whose personal services are obtained under this subsection may not exceed 30 at any time.

(f) STREAMLINED PERSONNEL AUTHORITY.—(1) Without regard to any provision of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to any provision of chapter 51, or subchapter III of chapter 43, of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, the Secretary may appoint professional and technical employees, not to exceed 30 such employees at any time, to positions in the Department of Defense to carry out research and development under the program under this section. The authority under this paragraph is in addition to any other authority under law.

(2) The Secretary may use the authority under paragraph (1) only upon a determination by the Secretary that use of such authority is necessary to accelerate the research and development under the program.

(3) The Secretary shall institute appropriate internal controls for each use of the authority under paragraph (1).

SEC. 1032. PROCUREMENT OF DEFENSE BIOMEDICAL COUNTERMEASURES.

(a) DETERMINATION OF MATERIAL THREATS.—(1) The Secretary of Defense (in this section referred to as the ''Secretary''), in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Homeland Security shall on an ongoing basis—

(A) assess current and emerging threats of use of biological, chemical, radiological, and nuclear agents; and

(B) identify, on the basis of such assessment, those agents that present a material risk of use against the Armed Forces.

(2) The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall on an ongoing basis—

(A) assess the potential consequences to the health of members of the Armed Forces of use against the Armed Forces of the agents identified under paragraph (1)(B); and

(B) identify, on the basis of such assessment, those agents for which countermeasures are necessary to protect the health of members of the Armed Forces.

(b) ASSESSMENT OF AVAILABILITY AND APPROPRIATENESS OF COUNTERMEASURES.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall on an ongoing basis assess the availability and appropriateness of specific countermeasures to address specific threats identified under subsection (a).

(c) SECRETARY'S DETERMINATION OF COUNTERMEASURES APPROPRIATE FOR PROCUREMENT.—(1) The Secretary, in accordance with paragraph (2), shall on an ongoing basis identify specific countermeasures that the Secretary determines to be appropriate for procurement for the Department of Defense stockpile of biomedical countermeasures.

(2) The Secretary may not identify a specific countermeasure under paragraph (1) unless the Secretary determines that—

(A) the countermeasure is a qualified countermeasure; and

(B) it is reasonable to expect that producing and delivering, within 5 years, the quantity of that countermeasure required to meet the needs of the Department (as determined by the Secretary) is feasible.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''qualified countermeasure'' means a biomedical countermeasure—

(A) that is approved under section 505(a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355) or licensed under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262), or that is approved under section 515 or cleared under section 510(k) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360e and 360) for use as such a countermeasure to a biological, chemical, radiological, or nuclear agent identified as a material threat under subsection (a); or

(B) with respect to which the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, makes a determination that sufficient and satisfactory clinical experience or research data (including data, if available, from preclinical and clinical trials) exists to support a reasonable conclusion that the product will, not later than 5 years after the date on which the Secretary identifies the product under subsection (c)(1), qualify for such approval or licensing for use as such a countermeasure.

(2) The term ''biomedical countermeasure'' means a drug (as defined in section 201(g)(1) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321(g)(1))), device (as defined in section 201(h) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321(h))), or biological product (as defined in section 351(i) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(i)) that is—

(A) used to treat, identify, or prevent harm from any biological, chemical, radiological, or nuclear agent that may cause a military health emergency affecting the Armed Forces; or

(B) used to treat, identify, or prevent harm from a condition that may result in adverse health consequences or death and may be caused by administering a drug or biological product that is used as described in subparagraph (A).

(e) FUNDING.—(1) Of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense and available within the transfer authority established under section 1001 of this Act for fiscal year 2004 and for each fiscal year thereafter, such sums are authorized as may be necessary for the costs incurred by the Secretary in the procurement of countermeasures under this section, subject to paragraph (2).

(2) Amounts authorized to be appropriated under paragraph (1) shall not be available to pay—

(A) costs for the purchase of vaccines under procurement contracts entered into before January 1, 2003;

(B) costs under new contracts, or costs of new obligations under contracts previously entered into, for procurement of a countermeasure after the date of a determination under subsection (c)(2)(D) that the countermeasure does have a significant commercial market other than as a biomedical countermeasure; or

(C) administrative costs.

SEC. 1033. AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MEDICAL PRODUCTS IN EMERGENCIES.

(a) USE OF MEDICAL PRODUCTS AUTHORIZED.—During the period in which a declaration of emergency under subsection (b) is in effect, the Secretary of Defense, in accordance with this section, may authorize the use on members of the Armed Forces of a drug or device intended solely for use in an actual or potential emergency.

(b) DECLARATION OF EMERGENCY.—(1) A declaration of emergency referred to in subsection (a) is a declaration by the Secretary of Defense that there exists a military emergency, or a significant potential for a military emergency, involving a heightened risk to the Armed Forces of attack by one or more biological, chemical, radiological, or nuclear agents.

(2) Subject to paragraph (3), the period during which a declaration of emergency under this subsection is in effect begins upon the making of the declaration and ends upon the first to occur of the following events:

(A) The making of a determination by the Secretary that the military emergency, or the significant potential for a military emergency, has ceased to exist.

(B) The expiration of the one-year period beginning on the date on which the declaration of emergency is made.

(3) Before the expiration of the period during which a declaration of emergency is in effect, the Secretary may declare one or more extensions of that declaration of emergency. In such a case, the date on which the most recent extension was declared shall be treated for purposes of subsection (2)(B) as the date on which the declaration of emergency is made.

(c) CRITERIA FOR ISSUANCE OF AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, may use the authority under subsection (a) with respect to a biomedical countermeasure only if the Secretary make a determination that—

(1) an agent to which a declaration of emergency under subsection (b) relates can cause a serious or life-threatening disease or condition;

(2) based on the totality of scientific evidence available to the Secretary, including data from adequate and well-controlled clinical trials, if available, it is reasonable to believe that—

(A) such countermeasure may be effective in detecting, diagnosing, treating, or preventing such disease or condition; or

(B) the known and potential benefits of such countermeasure, when used to detect, diagnose, treat, or prevent such disease or condition, outweigh the known and potential risks of such countermeasure;

(3) no adequate, approved, and available alternative exists to such countermeasure for detecting, diagnosing, treating, or preventing such disease or condition; and

(4) such other criteria as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe are satisfied.

(d) SCOPE OF AUTHORIZATION.—For each use of the authority under subsection (a), the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall—

(1) specify each disease or condition that the biological countermeasure may be used to detect, diagnose, treat, or prevent; and

(2) set forth each determination under subsection (c) with respect to that countermeasure and the basis for each such determination.

(e) CONDITION.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall ensure compliance with section 1107 of title 10, United States Code, and section 731(a)(3) of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261; 112 Stat. 2071; 10 U.S.C. 1107 note).

Subtitle E—Other Matters

SEC. 1041. CODIFICATION AND REVISION OF DEFENSE COUNTERINTELLIGENCE POLYGRAPH PROGRAM AUTHORITY.

(a) CODIFICATION.—(1) Chapter 21 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 425 the following new section:

''§ 426. Counterintelligence polygraph program

''(a) AUTHORITY FOR PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Defense may carry out a program for the administration of counterintelligence polygraph examinations to persons described in subsection (b). The program shall be based on Department of Defense Directive 5210.48, dated December 24, 1984.

''(b) PERSONS COVERED.—Except as provided in subsection (c), the following persons whose duties involve access to information that has been classified at the level of top secret or designated as being within a special access program under section 4.4(a) of Executive Order 12958 (or a successor Executive order) are subject to this section:

''(1) Military and civilian personnel of the Department of Defense.

''(2) Personnel of defense contractors.

''(3) A person assigned or detailed to the Department of Defense.

''(4) An applicant for a position in the Department of Defense.

''(c) EXCEPTIONS FROM COVERAGE FOR CERTAIN INTELLIGENCE AGENCIES AND FUNCTIONS.—This section does not apply to the following persons:

''(1) A person assigned or detailed to the Central Intelligence Agency or to an expert or consultant under a contract with the Central Intelligence Agency.

''(2) A person who is—

''(A) employed by or assigned or detailed to the National Security Agency;

''(B) an expert or consultant under contract to the National Security Agency;

''(C) an employee of a contractor of the National Security Agency; or

''(D) a person applying for a position in the National Security Agency.

''(3) A person assigned to a space where sensitive cryptographic information is produced, processed, or stored.

''(4) A person employed by, or assigned or detailed to, an office within the Department of Defense for the collection of specialized national foreign intelligence through reconnaissance programs or a contractor of such an office.

''(d) OVERSIGHT.—(1) The Secretary shall establish a process to monitor responsible and effective application of polygraphs within the Department of Defense.

''(2) The Secretary shall make information on the use of polygraphs within the Department of Defense available to the congressional defense committees.

''(e) POLYGRAPH RESEARCH PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Defense shall carry out a continuing research program to support the polygraph activities of the Department of Defense. The program shall include—

''(1) an on-going evaluation of the validity of polygraph techniques used by the Department;

''(2) research on polygraph countermeasures and anti-countermeasures; and

''(3) developmental research on polygraph techniques, instrumentation, and analytic methods.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter I of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''426. Counterintelligence polygraph program.''.

(b) CONFORMING REPEAL.—Section 1121 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1988 and 1989 (10 U.S.C. 113 note), is repealed.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2003.

SEC. 1042. CODIFICATION AND REVISION OF LIMITATION ON MODIFICATION OF MAJOR ITEMS OF EQUIPMENT SCHEDULED FOR RETIREMENT OR DISPOSAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Chapter 134 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2244 the following new section:

''§ 2244a. Equipment scheduled for retirement or disposal: limitation on expenditures for modifications

''(a) PROHIBITION.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, the Secretary of a military department may not carry out a significant modification of an aircraft, weapon, vessel, or other item of equipment that the Secretary plans to retire or otherwise dispose of within five years after the date on which the modification, if carried out, would be completed.

''(b) SIGNIFICANT MODIFICATIONS DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, a significant modification is any modification for which the cost is in an amount equal to or greater than $1,000,000.

''(c) EXCEPTION FOR SAFETY MODIFICATIONS.—The prohibition in subsection (a) does not apply to a safety modification.

''(d) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—The Secretary concerned may waive the prohibition in subsection (a) in the case of any modification otherwise subject to that subsection if the Secretary determines that carrying out the modification is in the national security interest of the United States. Whenever the Secretary issues such a waiver, the Secretary shall notify the congressional defense committees in writing.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such subchapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2244 the following new item:

''2244a. Equipment scheduled for retirement or disposal: limitation on expenditures for modifications.''.

(b) CONFORMING REPEAL.—Section 8053 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1998 (10 U.S.C. 2241 note), is repealed.

SEC. 1043. ADDITIONAL DEFINITIONS FOR PURPOSES OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.

(a) GENERAL DEFINITIONS.—Section 101(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(16) The term 'congressional defense committees' means—

''(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

''(B) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

''(17) The term 'base closure law' means the following:

''(A) Section 2687 of this title.

''(B) 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).

''(C) Title II of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (Public Law 100–526; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note).

(b) REFERENCES TO CONGRESSIONAL DEFENSE COMMITTEES.—Title 10, United States Code, is further amended as follows:

(1) Section 135(e) is amended—

(A) by striking ''(1)'';

(B) by striking ''each congressional committee specified in paragraph (2)'' and inserting ''each of the congressional defense committees''; and

(C) by striking paragraph (2).

(2) Section 153(c) is amended—

(A) by striking ''committees of Congress named in paragraph (2)'' and inserting ''congressional defense committees'';

(B) by striking paragraph (2); and

(C) by designating the second sentence of paragraph (1) as paragraph (2) and in that paragraph (as so designated) by striking ''The report'' and inserting ''Each report under paragraph (1)''.

(3) Section 181(d)(2) is amended—

(A) by striking ''subsection:'' and all that follows through ''oversight'' and inserting ''subsection, the term 'oversight''; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (B).

(4) Section 224 is amended by striking subsection (f).

(5) Section 228(e) is amended—

(A) by striking ''DEFINITIONS'' and all that follows through ''(1) The term'' and inserting ''O&M BUDGET ACTIVITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term''; and

(B) by striking paragraph (2).

(6) Section 229 is amended by striking subsection (f).

(7) Section 1107(f)(4) is amended by striking subparagraph (C).

(8) Section 2216(j) is amended by striking paragraph (3).

(9) Section 2218(l) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (4); and

(B) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (4).

(10) Section 2306b(l) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (9); and

(B) by redesignating paragraph (10) as paragraph (9).

(11) Section 2308(e)(2) is amended—

(A) by striking subparagraph (A); and

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively.

(12) Section 2366(e) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (7); and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (8) and (9) as paragraphs (7) and (8), respectively.

(13) Section 2399(h) is amended—

(A) by striking ''DEFINITIONS.—'' and all that follows through ''(1) The term'' and inserting ''OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION DEFINED.—In this section, the term'';

(B) by striking paragraph (2);

(C) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) as paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively; and

(D) by realigning those paragraphs (as so redesignated) so as to be indented two ems from the left margin.

(14) Section 2667(h) is amended by striking paragraph (1).

(15) Section 2688(e)(1) is amended by striking ''the Committee on'' the first place it appears and all that follows through ''House of Representatives'' and inserting ''the congressional defense committees''.

(16) Section 2801(c)(4) is amended by striking ''the Committee on'' the first place it appears and all that follows through ''House of Representatives'' and inserting ''the congressional defense committees''.

(c) REFERENCES TO BASE CLOSURE LAWS.—Title 10, United States Code, is further amended as follows:

(1) Section 2306c(h) is amended by striking ''ADDITIONAL'' and all that follows through ''(2) The term'' and inserting ''MILITARY INSTALLATION DEFINED.—In this section, the term''.

(2) Section 2490a(f) is amended—

(A) by striking ''DEFINITIONS.—'' and all that follows through ''(1) The term'' and inserting ''NONAPPROPRIATED FUND INSTRUMENTALITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term''; and

(B) by striking paragraph (2).

(3) Section 2667(h), as amended by subsection (b)(13), is further amended by striking ''section:'' and all that follows through ''(3) The term'' and inserting ''section, the term''.

(4) Section 2696(e) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) and inserting the following:

''(1) A base closure law.''; and

(B) by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (2).

(4) Section 2705 is amended by striking subsection (h).

(5) Section 2871 is amended by striking paragraph (2).

SEC. 1044. INCLUSION OF ANNUAL MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION REQUEST IN ANNUAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST.

(a) INCLUSION OF MILITARY CONSTRUCTION REQUEST.—Section 113a(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph (3):

''(3) Authority to carry out military construction projects, as required by section 2802 of this title.''.

(b) REPEAL OF SEPARATE TRANSMISSION OF REQUEST.—(1) Section 2859 of such title is repealed.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter III of chapter 169 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 2859.

SEC. 1045. TECHNICAL AND CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) 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 IV of subtitle A, are amended by striking ''2701'' in the item relating to chapter 160 and inserting ''2700''.

(2) Section 101(a)(9)(D) is amended by striking ''Transportation'' and inserting ''Homeland Security''.

(3) Section 2002(a)(2) is amended by striking ''Foreign Service Institute'' and inserting ''George P. Schultz National Foreign Affairs Training Center''.

(4)(A) Section 2248 is repealed.

(B) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 134 is amended by striking the item relating to section 2248.

(5) Section 2305a(c) is amended by striking ''the Brooks Architect-Engineers Act (40 U.S.C. 541 et seq.)'' and inserting ''chapter 11 of title 40''.

(6) Section 2432(h)(1) is amended by inserting ''program'' in the first sentence after ''for such''.

(7) Section 7503(d) is amended by inserting ''such'' before ''title III.''

(b) TITLE 37, UNITED STATES CODE.—Title 37, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 323(a) is amended by striking ''1 year'' in paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting ''one year''.

(2) Section 402(b) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (1); and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''On and after January 1, 2002, the'' and inserting ''The''.

(c) FLOYD D. SPENCE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATON ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001.—The Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (as enacted into law by Public Law 106–398) is amended as follows:

(1) Section 1308(c) (22 U.S.C. 5959) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (8); and

(B) by redesignating the second paragraph (6) as paragraph (7).

(2) Section 814 (10 U.S.C. 1412 note) is amended in subsection (d)(1) by striking ''the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 (divisions D and E of Public Law 104–106)'' and inserting ''subtitle III of title 40, United States Code''.

(d) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000.—Section 1305 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65; 22 U.S.C. 5952 note) is amended by striking the second period at the end.

(e) STROM THURMOND NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999.—Section 819 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261; 112 Stat. 2089) is amended by striking ''section 201(c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 481(c)),'' and inserting ''section 503 of title 40, United States Code,''.

(f) NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997.—Section 1084(e) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201; 110 Stat. 2675) is amended by striking ''98–515'' and inserting ''98–525''. The amendment made by the preceding sentence shall take effect as if included in Public Law 104–201.

(g) FEDERAL ACQUISITION STREAMLINING ACT OF 1994.—Subsection (d) of section 1004 of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–355; 108 Stat, 3253) is amended by striking ''under—'' and all that follows through the end of paragraph (2) and inserting ''under chapter 11 of title 40, United States Code.''.

(h) ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT HOME ACT OF 1991.—Section 1520(b)(1)(C) of the Armed Forces Retirement Home Act of 1991 (24 U.S.C. 420(b)(1)(C)) is amended by inserting ''Armed Forces'' before ''Retirement Home Trust Fund''.

SEC. 1046. AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE LIVING QUARTERS FOR CERTAIN STUDENTS IN COOPERATIVE AND SUMMER EDUCATION PROGRAMS OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY.

Section 2195 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d)(1) The Director of the National Security Agency may provide a qualifying employee of a defense laboratory of that Agency with living quarters at no charge, or at a rate or charge prescribed by the Director by regulation, without regard to section 5911(c) of title 5.

''(2) In this subsection, the term 'qualifying employee' means a student who is employed at the National Security Agency under—

''(A) a Student Educational Employment Program of the Agency conducted under this section or any other provision of law; or

''(B) a similar cooperative or summer education program of the Agency that meets the criteria for Federal cooperative or summer education programs prescribed by the Office of Personnel Management.''.

SEC. 1047. USE OF DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG FUNDS TO SUPPORT ACTIVITIES OF THE GOVERNMENT OF COLOMBIA.

(a) AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE.—During fiscal years 2004 and 2005, 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. 1048. AUTHORITY FOR JOINT TASK FORCES TO PROVIDE SUPPORT TO LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES CONDUCTING COUNTER-TERRORISM ACTIVITIES.

(a) AUTHORITY.—A joint task force of the Department of Defense that provides support to law enforcement agencies conducting counter-drug activities may also provide, consistent with all applicable laws and regulations, support to law enforcement agencies conducting counter-terrorism activities.

(b) CONDITIONS.—Any support provided under subsection (a) may only be provided in the geographic area of responsibility of the joint task force.

SEC. 1049. 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 is being investigated for—

''(A) eligibility for access to a particular level of classified information for purposes of Executive Order 12968, or any successor Executive order; or

''(B) 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 classified 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. Information may not be obtained from the Register under this paragraph if the information was entered in the Register more than 3 years before the request, unless the information is about a revocation or suspension still in effect on the date of the request.''.

SEC. 1050. PROTECTION OF OPERATIONAL FILES OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY.

The National Security Agency Act of 1959 (50 U.S.C. 402 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 19. (a) EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN OPERATIONAL FILES FROM SEARCH, REVIEW, PUBLICATION, OR DISCLOSURE.—(1) The Director of the National Security Agency, with the coordination of the Director of Central Intelligence, may exempt operational files of the National Security Agency from the provisions of section 552 of title 5, United States Code, which require publication, disclosure, search, or review in connection therewith.

''(2)(A) Subject to subparagraph (B), for the purposes of this section, the term 'operational files' means files of the National Security Agency that document the means by which foreign intelligence or counterintelligence is collected through technical systems.

''(B) Files that contain disseminated intelligence are not operational files.

''(3) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), exempted operational files shall continue to be subject to search and review for information concerning—

''(A) United States citizens or aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence who have requested information on themselves pursuant to the provisions of section 552 of title 5 or section 552a of title 5, United States Code;

''(B) any special activity the existence of which is not exempt from disclosure under the provisions of section 552 of title 5, United States Code; or

''(C) the specific subject matter of an investigation by any of the following for any impropriety, or violation of law, Executive order, or Presidential directive, in the conduct of an intelligence activity:

''(i) The Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

''(ii) The Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

''(iii) The Intelligence Oversight Board.

''(iv) The Department of Justice.

''(v) The Office of General Counsel of the National Security Agency.

''(vi) The Office of the Director of the National Security Agency.

''(4)(A) Files that are not exempted under paragraph (1) which contain information derived or disseminated from exempted operational files shall be subject to search and review.

''(B) The inclusion of information from exempted operational files in files that are not exempted under paragraph (1) shall not affect the exemption under paragraph (1) of the originating operational files from search, review, publication, or disclosure.

''(C) The declassification of some of the information contained in exempted operational files shall not affect the status of the operational file as being exempt from search, review, publication, or disclosure.

''(D) Records from exempted operational files which have been disseminated to and referenced in files that are not exempted under paragraph (1) and which have been returned to exempted operational files for sole retention shall be subject to search and review.

''(5) The provisions of paragraph (1) may not be superseded except by a provision of law which is enacted after the date of the enactment of this section, and which specifically cites and repeals or modifies its provisions.

''(6)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), whenever any person who has requested agency records under section 552 of title 5, United States Code, alleges that the National Security Agency has withheld records improperly because of failure to comply with any provision of this section, judicial review shall be available under the terms set forth in section 552(a)(4)(B) of title 5, United States Code.

''(B) Judicial review shall not be available in the manner provided for under subparagraph (A) as follows:

''(i) In any case in which information specifically authorized under criteria established by an Executive order to be kept secret in the interests of national defense or foreign relations which is filed with, or produced for, the court by the National Security Agency, such information shall be examined ex parte, in camera by the court.

''(ii) The court shall, to the fullest extent practicable, determine the issues of fact based on sworn written submissions of the parties.

''(iii) When a complainant alleges that requested records are improperly withheld because of improper placement solely in exempted operational files, the complainant shall support such allegation with a sworn written submission based upon personal knowledge or otherwise admissible evidence.

''(iv)(I) When a complainant alleges that requested records were improperly withheld because of improper exemption of operational files, the National Security Agency shall meet its burden under section 552(a)(4)(B) of title 5, United States Code, by demonstrating to the court by sworn written submission that exempted operational files likely to contain responsive records currently perform the functions set forth in paragraph (2).

''(II) The court may not order the National Security Agency to review the content of any exempted operational file or files in order to make the demonstration required under subclause (I), unless the complainant disputes the National Security Agency's showing with a sworn written submission based on personal knowledge or otherwise admissible evidence.

''(v) In proceedings under clauses (iii) and (iv), the parties may not obtain discovery pursuant to rules 26 through 36 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, except that requests for admission may be made pursuant to rules 26 and 36.

''(vi) If the court finds under this paragraph that the National Security Agency has improperly withheld requested records because of failure to comply with any provision of this subsection, the court shall order the Agency to search and review the appropriate exempted operational file or files for the requested records and make such records, or portions thereof, available in accordance with the provisions of section 552 of title 5, United States Code, and such order shall be the exclusive remedy for failure to comply with this subsection.

''(vii) If at any time following the filing of a complaint pursuant to this paragraph the National Security Agency agrees to search the appropriate exempted operational file or files for the requested records, the court shall dismiss the claim based upon such complaint.

''(viii) Any information filed with, or produced for the court pursuant to clauses (i) and (iv) shall be coordinated with the Director of Central Intelligence prior to submission to the court.

''(b) DECENNIAL REVIEW OF EXEMPTED OPERATIONAL FILES.—(1) Not less than once every 10 years, the Director of the National Security Agency and the Director of Central Intelligence shall review the exemptions in force under subsection (a)(1) to determine whether such exemptions may be removed from the category of exempted files or any portion thereof. The Director of Central Intelligence must approve any determination to remove such exemptions.

''(2) The review required by paragraph (1) shall include consideration of the historical value or other public interest in the subject matter of the particular category of files or portions thereof and the potential for declassifying a significant part of the information contained therein.

''(3) A complainant that alleges that the National Security Agency has improperly withheld records because of failure to comply with this subsection may seek judicial review in the district court of the United States of the district in which any of the parties reside, or in the District of Columbia. In such a proceeding, the court's review shall be limited to determining the following:

''(A) Whether the National Security Agency has conducted the review required by paragraph (1) before the expiration of the 10-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this section or before the expiration of the 10-year period beginning on the date of the most recent review.

''(B) Whether the National Security Agency, in fact, considered the criteria set forth in paragraph (2) in conducting the required review.''.

SEC. 1051. 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, 2004. 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 2004 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, 2004.

SEC. 1052. CONTINUATION OF REASONABLE ACCESS TO MILITARY INSTALLATIONS FOR PERSONAL COMMERCIAL SOLICITATION.

(a) CONTINUED ACCESS TO MEMBERS.—Section 2679 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting ''ACCESS BY REPRESENTATIVES OF VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS.—(1)'' before ''Upon certification'';

(2) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as paragraphs (2) and (3), respectively;

(3) in paragraph (2), as so redesignated, by striking ''subsection (a)'' and inserting ''paragraph (1)'';

(4) in paragraph (3), as so redesignated, by striking ''section'' and inserting ''subsection'';

(5) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c); and

(6) by inserting before such subsection the following new subsection (b):

''(b) ACCESS FOR PERSONAL COMMERCIAL SOLICITATION.—An amendment or other revision to a Department of Defense directive relating to access to military installations for the purpose of conducting limited personal commercial solicitation shall not take effect until the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date the Secretary of Defense submits to Congress notice of the amendment or revision and the reasons therefor.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—(1) The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

''§2679. Access to and use of space and equipment at military installations: representatives of veterans' organizations and other persons''.

(2) The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 159 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''2679. Access to and use of space and equipment at military installations: representatives of veterans' organizations and other persons.''.

SEC. 1053. COMMISSION ON NUCLEAR STRATEGY OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established a commission to be known as the ''Commission on Nuclear Strategy of the United States'' (hereinafter this this section referred to as the ''Commission''). The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, shall enter into a contract with a federally funded research and development center to provide for the organization, management, and suport of the Commission.

(2) COMPOSITION.—(A) The Commission shall be composed of 12 members 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 NUCLEAR STRATEGY.—The Commission shall consider all matters of policy, force structure, nuclear stockpile stewardship, estimates of threats and force requirements, and any other issue the Commission may consider necessary in order to assess and make recommendations about current United States nuclear strategy as envisioned in the National Security Strategy of the United States and the Nuclear Posture Review, as well as possible alternative future strategies.

(2) ASSESSMENT OF RANGE OF NUCLEAR STRATEGIES.—The Commission shall assess possible future nuclear strategies for the United States that could be pursued over the next 20 years.

(3) RELATIONS WITH RUSSIA.—The Commission shall give special attention to assessing how the United States goal of strengthening partnership with Russia may be advanced or adversely affected by each of the possible nuclear strategies considered. The Commission shall also assess how relations with China, and the overall global security environment, may be affected by each of those possible nuclear strategies.

(4) OTHER MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—For each of the possible nuclear strategies considered, the Commission shall include in its report under subsection (c)(1), at a minimum, the following:

(A) A discussion of the policy defining the deterrence and military-political objectives of the United States against potential adversaries.

(B) A discussion of the military requirements for United States forces, the force structure and capabilities necessary to meet those requirements, and how they relate to the achievement of the objectives identified under subparagraph (A).

(C) Appropriate quantitative and qualitative analysis, including force-on-force exchange modeling, to calculate the effectiveness of the strategy under various scenario conditions, including scenarios of strategic and tactical surprise.

(D) An assessment of the role of missile defenses in the strategy, the dependence of the strategy on missile defense effectiveness, and the effect of missile defenses on the threat environment.

(E) An assessment of the implications of the proliferation of missiles and weapons of mass destruction, the proliferation of underground facilities and mobile launch platforms, and China's modernization of strategic forces.

(F) An assessment of the implications of asymmetries between the United States and Russia, including doctrine, nonstrategic nuclear weapons, and active and passive defenses.

(G) An assessment of strategies or options for dealing with nuclear capable nations that may provide nuclear weapons to terrorist or transnational groups.

(H) An assessment of the contribution of nonproliferation strategies and programs to the overall security of the United States and how those strategies and programs may affect the overall requirements of future nuclear strategy.

(I) An assessment of the effect of the strategy on the nuclear programs of emerging nuclear weapons states, including North Korea, Iran, Pakistan, and India.

(5) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Commission shall include in its report recommendations for any continuities or changes in nuclear strategy it believes should be taken to enhance the national security of the United States.

(6) 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. The Director of Central Intelligence may designate at least one officer or employee of the Central Intelligence Agency to serve as a liaison officer between that agency and the Commission.

(c) REPORTS.—

(1) COMMISSION REPORT.—The Commission shall submit to the Secretary of Defense and to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report on the Commission's findings and conclusions not later than 18 months after the date of its first meeting.

(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 referred to in 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, any 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 than 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. 1054. EXTENSION OF COUNTERPROLIFERATION PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE.

Section 1605(f) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (22 U.S.C. 2751 note) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2004'' and inserting ''September 30, 2008''.

TITLE XI—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

Subtitle A—Department of Defense Civilian Personnel Generally

SEC. 1101. MODIFICATION OF THE OVERTIME PAY CAP.

Section 5542(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''the greater of'' before ''one and one-half''; and

(2) by inserting ''or the hourly rate of basic pay of the employee'' after ''law)'' the second place it appears.

SEC. 1102. MILITARY LEAVE FOR MOBILIZED FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 6323 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and at the end of clause (ii), as so redesignated, by inserting ''or''; and

(B) by inserting ''(A)'' after ''(2)''; and

(2) by inserting the following before the text beginning with ''is entitled'':

''(B) performs full-time military service as a result of a call or order to active duty in support of a contingency operation as defined in section 101(a)(13) of title 10;''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to military service performed on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1103. COMMON OCCUPATIONAL AND HEALTH STANDARDS FOR DIFFERENTIAL PAYMENTS AS A CONSEQUENCE OF EXPOSURE TO ASBESTOS.

(a) PREVAILING RATE SYSTEMS.—Section 5343(c)(4) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: '', and for any hardship or hazard related to asbestos, such differentials shall be determined by applying occupational safety and health standards consistent with the permissible exposure limit promulgated by the Secretary of Labor under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970''.

(b) GENERAL SCHEDULE PAY RATES.—Section 5545(d) of such title is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence the following: '', and for any hardship or hazard related to asbestos, such differentials shall be determined by applying occupational safety and health standards consistent with the permissible exposure limit promulgated by the Secretary of Labor under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970''.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—Subject to any vested constitutional property rights, any administrative or judicial determination after the date of enactment of this Act concerning backpay for a differential established under sections 5343(c)(4) or 5545(d) of such title shall be based on occupational safety and health standards described in the amendments made by subsections (a) and (b).

SEC. 1104. INCREASE IN ANNUAL STUDENT LOAN REPAYMENT AUTHORITY.

Section 5379(b)(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''$6,000'' and inserting ''$10,000''.

SEC. 1105. AUTHORIZATION FOR CABINET SECRETARIES, SECRETARIES OF MILITARY DEPARTMENTS, AND HEADS OF EXECUTIVE AGENCIES TO BE PAID ON A BIWEEKLY BASIS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Section 5504 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d);

(2) by striking the last sentence of both subsection (a) and subsection (b); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

''(c) For the purposes of this section:

''(1) The term 'employee' means—

''(A) an employee in or under an Executive agency;

''(B) an employee in or under the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, the Botanic Garden, and the Library of Congress, for whom a basic administrative workweek is established under section 6101(a)(5) of this title; and

''(C) an individual employed by the government of the District of Columbia.

''(2) The term 'employee' does not include—

''(A) an employee on the Isthmus of Panama in the service of the Panama Canal Commission; or

''(B) an employee or individual excluded from the definition of employee in section 5541(2) of this title other than an employee or individual excluded by clauses (ii), (iii), and (xiv) through (xvii) of such section.

''(3) Notwithstanding paragraph (2), an individual who otherwise would be excluded from the definition of employee shall be deemed to be an employee for purposes of this section if the individual's employing agency so elects, under guidelines in regulations promulgated by the Office of Personnel Management under subsection (d)(2).''.

(b) GUIDELINES.—Subsection (d) of section 5504 of such title, as redesignated by subsection (a), is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(d)''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) The Office of Personnel Management shall provide guidelines by regulation for exemptions to be made by the heads of agencies under subsection (c)(3). Such guidelines shall provide for such exemptions only under exceptional circumstances.''.

SEC. 1106. SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE AND PERFORMANCE.

(a) SENIOR EXECUTIVE PAY.—Chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 5304—

(A) in subsection (g)(2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A) by striking ''subparagraphs (A)–(E)'' and inserting ''subparagraphs (A)–(D)''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B) by striking ''subsection (h)(1)(F)'' and inserting ''subsection (h)(1)(D)'';

(B) in subsection (h)(1)—

(i) by striking subparagraphs (B) and (C);

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (D), (E), and (F) as subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D), respectively;

(iii) in clause (ii) by striking ''or'' at the end;

(iv) in clause (iii) by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(v) by adding at the end the following new clauses:

''(iv) a Senior Executive Service position under section 3132;

''(v) a position in the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Drug Enforcement Administration Senior Executive Service under section 3151; or

''(vi) a position in a system equivalent to the system in clause (iv), as determined by the President's Pay Agent designated under subsection (d).''; and

(C) in subsection (h)(2)(B)—

(i) in clause (i)—

(I) by striking ''subparagraphs (A) through (E)'' and inserting ''subparagraphs (A) through (C)''; and

(II) by striking ''clause (i) or (ii)'' and inserting ''clause (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), or (vii)''; and

(ii) in clause (ii)—

(I) by striking ''paragraph (1)(F)'' and inserting ''paragraph (1)(D)''; and

(II) by striking ''clause (i) or (ii)'' and inserting ''clause (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), or (vi)'';

(2) by amending section 5382 to read as follows:

''§ 5382. Establishment of rates of pay for the Senior Executive Service

''(a) Subject to regulations prescribed by the Office of Personnel Management, there shall be established a range of rates of basic pay for the Senior Executive Service, and each senior executive shall be paid at one of the rates within the range, based on individual performance, contribution to the agency's performance, or both, as determined under a rigorous performance management system. The lowest rate of the range shall not be less than the minimum rate of basic pay payable under section 5376, and the highest rate, for any position under this system or an equivalent system as determined by the President's Pay Agent designated under section 5304(d), shall not exceed the rate for level III of the Executive Schedule. The payment of the rates shall not be subject to the pay limitation of section 5306(e) or 5373.

''(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), the applicable maximum shall be level II of the Executive Schedule for any agency that is certified under section 5307 as having a performance appraisal system which, as designed and applied, makes meaningful distinctions based on relative performance.

''(c) No employee may suffer a reduction in pay by reason of transfer from an agency with an applicable maximum rate of pay prescribed under subsection (b) to an agency with an applicable maximum rate of pay prescribed under subsection (a).''; and

(3) in section 5383—

(A) in subsection (a) by striking ''which of the rates established under section 5382 of this title'' and inserting ''which of the rates within a range established under section 5382''; and

(B) in subsection (c) by striking ''for any pay adjustment under section 5382 of this title'' and inserting ''as provided in regulations prescribed by the Office under section 5385''.

(b) POST-EMPLOYMENT RESTRICTIONS.—(1) Clause (ii) of section 207(c)(2)(A) of title 18, United States Code is amended to read as follows:

''(ii) employed in a position which is not referred to in clause (i) and for which that person is paid at a rate of basic pay which is equal to or greater than 96 percent of the rate of basic pay for level II of the Executive Schedule, or, for a period of 2 years following the enactment of the Federal Employees Pay for Performance Act of 2003, a person who, on the day prior to the enactment of that Act, was employed in a position which is not referred to in clause (i) and for which the rate of basic pay, exclusive of any locality-based pay adjustment under section 5304 or section 5304a of title 5, was equal to or greater than the rate of basic pay payable for level 5 of the Senior Executive Service on the day prior to the enactment of that Act,''.

(2) Subchapter I of chapter 73 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end the following new section:

''§ 7302. Post-employment notification

''(a) Not later than the effective date of the amendments made by sections 3 and 4 of the Federal Employees Pay for Performance Act of 2003, or 180 days after the date of enactment of that Act, whichever is later, the Office of Personnel Management shall, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Office of Government Ethics, promulgate regulations requiring that each Executive branch agency notify any employee of that agency who is subject to the provisions of section 207(c)(1) of title 18, as a result of the amendment to section 207(c)(2)(A)(ii) of that title by that Act.

''(b) The regulations shall require that notice be given before, or as part of, the action that affects the employee's coverage under section 207(c)(1) of title 18, by virtue of the provisions of section 207(c)(2)(A)(ii) of that title, and again when employment or service in the covered position is terminated.''.

(c) The table of sections for chapter 73 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 7301 the following:

''7302. Post-employment notification.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICABILITY.—(1) The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after the first January 1 following the date of enactment of this section.

(2) The amendments made by subsection (a) may not result in a reduction in the rate of basic pay for any senior executive during the first year after the effective date of those amendments.

(3) For the purposes of subsection (c)(2), the rate of basic pay for a senior executive shall be deemed to be the rate of basic pay set for the senior executive under section 5383 of title 5, United States Code, plus applicable locality pay paid to that senior executive, as of the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1107. DESIGN ELEMENTS OF PAY-FOR-PERFORMANCE SYSTEMS IN DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.

A pay-for-performance system may not be initiated under chapter 47 of title 5, United States Code, after the date of enactment of this Act, unless it incorporates the following elements:

(1) adherence to merit principles set forth in section 2301 of such title;

(2) a fair, credible, and transparent employee performance appraisal system;

(3) a link between elements of the pay-for-performance system, the employee performance appraisal system, and the agency's strategic plan;

(4) a means for ensuring employee involvement in the design and implementation of the system;

(5) adequate training and retraining for supervisors, managers, and employees in the implementation and operation of the pay-for-performance system;

(6) a process for ensuring ongoing performance feedback and dialogue between supervisors, managers, and employees throughout the appraisal period, and setting timetables for review;

(7) effective safeguards to ensure that the management of the system is fair and equitable and based on employee performance; and

(8) a means for ensuring that adequate agency resources are allocated for the design, implementation, and administration of the pay-for-performance system.

SEC. 1108. FEDERAL FLEXIBLE BENEFITS PLAN ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an agency or other employing entity of the Government which provides or plans to provide a flexible spending account option for its employees shall not impose any fee with respect to any of its employees in order to defray the administrative costs associated therewith.

(b) OFFSET OF ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Each such agency or employing entity that offers a flexible spending account option under a program established or administered by the Office of Personnel Management shall periodically forward to such Office, or entity designated by such Office, the amount necessary to offset the administrative costs of such program which are attributable to such agency.

(c) REPORTS.—(1) The Office shall submit a report to the Committee on Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate no later than March 31, 2004, specifying the administrative costs associated with the Governmentwide program (referred to in subsection (b)) for fiscal year 2003, as well as the projected administrative costs of such program for each of the 5 fiscal years thereafter.

(2) At the end of each of the first 3 calendar years in which an agency or other employing entity offers a flexible spending account option under this section, such agency or entity shall submit a report to the Office of Management and Budget showing the amount of its employment tax savings in such year which are attributable to such option, net of administrative fees paid under section (b).

SEC. 1109. CLARIFICATION TO HATCH ACT; LIMITATION ON DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN RECORDS.

(a) CLARIFICATION TO HATCH ACT.—No Federal employee or individual who voluntarily separates from the civil service (including by transferring to an international organization in the circumstances described in section 3582(a) of title 5, United States Code) shall be subject to enforcement of the provisions of section 7326 of such title (including any loss of rights under subchapter IV of chapter 35 of such title resulting from any proceeding under such section 7326), except that this subsection shall not apply in the event that such employee or individual subsequently becomes reemployed in the civil service. The preceding sentence shall apply to any complaint which is filed with or pending before the Merit Systems Protection Board after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) LIMITATION ON DISCLOSURE OF CERTAIN RECORDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, rule, or regulation, nothing described in paragraph (2) or (3) of use ''q'' of the proposed revisions published in the Federal Register on July 12, 2001 (66 Fed. Reg. 36613) shall be considered to constitute a routine use of records maintained by the Office of Special Counsel.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

(1) the term ''Federal employee or individual'' means any employee or individual, as referred to in section 7326 of title 5, United States Code;

(2) the term ''civil service'' has the meaning given such term by section 2101 of title 5, United States Code;

(3) the term ''international organization'' has the meaning given such term by section 3581 of title 5, United States Code; and

(4) the terms ''routine use'' and ''record'' have the respective meanings given such terms under section 552a(a) of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 1110. EMPLOYEE SURVEYS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Each agency shall conduct an annual survey of its employees (including survey questions unique to the agency and questions prescribed under subsection (b)) to assess—

(1) leadership and management practices that contribute to agency performance; and

(2) employee satisfaction with—

(A) leadership policies and practices;

(B) work environment;

(C) rewards and recognition for professional accomplishment and personal contributions to achieving organizational mission;

(D) opportunity for professional development and growth; and

(E) opportunity to contribute to achieving organizational mission.

(b) REGULATIONS.—The Office of Personnel Management shall issue regulations prescribing survey questions that should appear on all agency surveys under subsection (a) in order to allow a comparison across agencies.

(c) AVAILABILITY OF RESULTS.—The results of the agency surveys under subsection (a) shall be made available to the public and posted on the website of the agency involved, unless the head of such agency determines that doing so would jeopardize or negatively impact national security.

(d) AGENCY DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term ''agency'' means an Executive agency (as defined by section 105 of title 5, United States Code).

Subtitle B—Department of Defense National Security Personnel System

SEC. 1111. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE NATIONAL SECURITY PERSONNEL SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Subpart I of part III of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new chapter:

''CHAPTER 99—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE NATIONAL SECURITY PERSONNEL SYSTEM

''Sec.
''9901. Definitions.
''9902. Establishment of human resources management system.
''9903. Attracting highly qualified experts.
''9904. Employment of older Americans.
''9905. Special pay and benefits for certain employees outside the United States.

''§ 9901. Definitions

''For purposes of this chapter—

''(1) the term 'Director' means the Director of the Office of Personnel Management; and

''(2) the term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Defense.

''§ 9902. Establishment of human resources management system

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this part, the Secretary may, in regulations prescribed jointly with the Director, establish, and from time to time adjust, a human resources management system for some or all of the organizational or functional units of the Department of Defense. If the Secretary certifies that issuance or adjustment of a regulation, or the inclusion, exclusion, or modification of a particular provision therein, is essential to the national security, the Secretary may, subject to the decision of the President, waive the requirement in the preceding sentence that the regulation or adjustment be issued jointly with the Director.

''(b) SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS.—Any system established under subsection (a) shall—

''(1) be flexible;

''(2) be contemporary;

''(3) not waive, modify, or otherwise affect—

''(A) the public employment principles of merit and fitness set forth in section 2301, including the principles of hiring based on merit, fair treatment without regard to political affiliation or other nonmerit considerations, equal pay for equal work, and protection of employees against reprisal for whistleblowing;

''(B) any provision of section 2302, relating to prohibited personnel practices;

''(C)(i) any provision of law referred to in section 2302(b)(1), (8), and (9); or

''(ii) any provision of law implementing any provision of law referred to in section 2302(b)(1), (8), and (9) by—

''(I) providing for equal employment opportunity through affirmative action; or

''(II) providing any right or remedy available to any employee or applicant for employment in the public service;

''(D) any other provision of this part (as described in subsection (c)); or

''(E) any rule or regulation prescribed under any provision of law referred to in this paragraph;

''(4) ensure that employees may organize, bargain collectively as provided for in this chapter, and participate through labor organizations of their own choosing in decisions which affect them, subject to the provisions of this chapter and any exclusion from coverage or limitation on negotiability established pursuant to law;

''(5) not be limited by any specific law or authority under this title that is waivable under this chapter or by any provision of this chapter or any rule or regulation prescribed under this title that is waivable under this chapter, except as specifically provided for in this section; and

''(6) include a performance management system that incorporates the following elements:

''(A) adherence to merit principles set forth in section 2301;

''(B) a fair, credible, and transparent employee performance appraisal system;

''(C) a link between the performance management system and the agency's strategic plan;

''(D) a means for ensuring employee involvement in the design and implementation of the system;

''(E) adequate training and retraining for supervisors, managers, and employees in the implementation and operation of the performance management system;

''(F) a process for ensuring ongoing performance feedback and dialogue between supervisors, managers, and employees throughout the appraisal period, and setting timetables for review;

''(G) effective safeguards to ensure that the management of the system is fair and equitable and based on employee performance; and

''(H) a means for ensuring that adequate agency resources are allocated for the design, implementation, and administration of the performance management system.

''(c) OTHER NONWAIVABLE PROVISIONS.—The other provisions of this part referred to in subsection (b)(3)(D) are (to the extent not otherwise specified in this title)—

''(1) subparts A, B, E, G, and H of this part; and

''(2) chapters 41, 45, 47, 55 (except subchapter V thereof), 57, 59, 72, 73, and 79, and this chapter.

''(d) LIMITATIONS RELATING TO PAY.—(1) Nothing in this section shall constitute authority to modify the pay of any employee who serves in an Executive Schedule position under subchapter II of chapter 53 of this title.

''(2) Except as provided for in paragraph (1), the total amount in a calendar year of allowances, differentials, bonuses, awards, or other similar cash payments paid under this title to any employee who is paid under section 5376 or 5383 of this title or under title 10 or under other comparable pay authority established for payment of Department of Defense senior executive or equivalent employees may not exceed the total annual compensation payable to the Vice President under section 104 of title 3.

''(3) To the maximum extent practicable, the rates of compensation for civilian employees at the Department of Defense shall be adjusted at the same rate, and in the same proportion, as are rates of compensation for members of the uniformed services.

''(e) PROVISIONS TO ENSURE COLLABORATION WITH EMPLOYEE REPRESENTATIVES.—(1) In order to ensure that the authority of this section is exercised in collaboration with, and in a manner that ensures the participation of, employee representatives in the planning, development, and implementation of any human resources management system or adjustments to such system under this section, the Secretary and the Director shall provide for the following:

''(A) The Secretary and the Director shall, with respect to any proposed system or adjustment—

''(i) provide to the employee representatives representing any employees who might be affected a written description of the proposed system or adjustment (including the reasons why it is considered necessary);

''(ii) give such representatives at least 30 calendar days (unless extraordinary circumstances require earlier action) to review and make recommendations with respect to the proposal; and

''(iii) give any recommendations received from such representatives under clause (ii) full and fair consideration in deciding whether or how to proceed with the proposal.

''(B) Following receipt of recommendations, if any, from such employee representatives with respect to a proposal described in subparagraph (A), the Secretary and the Director shall accept such modifications to the proposal in response to the recommendations as they determine advisable and shall, with respect to any parts of the proposal as to which they have not accepted the recommendations—

''(i) notify Congress of those parts of the proposal, together with the recommendations of the employee representatives;

''(ii) meet and confer for not less than 30 calendar days with the employee representatives, in order to attempt to reach agreement on whether or how to proceed with those parts of the proposal; and

''(iii) at the Secretary's option, or if requested by a majority of the employee representatives participating, use the services of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service during such meet and confer period to facilitate the process of attempting to reach agreement.

''(C)(i) Any part of the proposal as to which the representatives do not make a recommendation, or as to which the recommendations are accepted by the Secretary and the Director, may be implemented immediately.

''(ii) With respect to any parts of the proposal as to which recommendations have been made but not accepted by the Secretary and the Director, at any time after 30 calendar days have elapsed since the initiation of the congressional notification, consultation, and mediation procedures set forth in subparagraph (B), if the Secretary, in his discretion, determines that further consultation and mediation is unlikely to produce agreement, the Secretary may implement any or all of such parts (including any modifications made in response to the recommendations as the Secretary determines advisable), but only after 30 days have elapsed after notifying Congress of the decision to implement the part or parts involved (as so modified, if applicable).

''(iii) The Secretary shall notify Congress promptly of the implementation of any part of the proposal and shall furnish with such notice an explanation of the proposal, any changes made to the proposal as a result of recommendations from the employee representatives, and of the reasons why implementation is appropriate under this subparagraph.

''(D) If a proposal described in subparagraph (A) is implemented, the Secretary and the Director shall—

''(i) develop a method for the employee representatives to participate in any further planning or development which might become necessary; and

''(ii) give the employee representatives adequate access to information to make that participation productive.

''(2) The Secretary may, at the Secretary's discretion, engage in any and all collaboration activities described in this subsection at an organizational level above the level of exclusive recognition.

''(3) In the case of any employees who are not within a unit with respect to which a labor organization is accorded exclusive recognition, the Secretary and the Director may develop procedures for representation by any appropriate organization which represents a substantial percentage of those employees or, if none, in such other manner as may be appropriate, consistent with the purposes of this subsection.

''(f) PROVISIONS REGARDING NATIONAL LEVEL BARGAINING.—(1) Any human resources management system implemented or modified under this chapter may include employees of the Department of Defense from any bargaining unit with respect to which a labor organization has been accorded exclusive recognition under chapter 71 of this title.

''(2) For any bargaining unit so included under paragraph (1), the Secretary may bargain at an organizational level above the level of exclusive recognition. Any such bargaining shall—

''(A) be binding on all subordinate bargaining units at the level of recognition and their exclusive representatives, and the Department of Defense and its subcomponents, without regard to levels of recognition;

''(B) supersede all other collective bargaining agreements, including collective bargaining agreements negotiated with an exclusive representative at the level of recognition, except as otherwise determined by the Secretary;

''(C) not be subject to further negotiations for any purpose, including bargaining at the level of recognition, except as provided for by the Secretary; and

''(D) except as otherwise specified in this chapter, not be subject to review or to statutory third-party dispute resolution procedures outside the Department of Defense.

''(3) The National Guard Bureau and the Army and Air Force National Guard are excluded from coverage under this subsection.

''(4) Any bargaining completed pursuant to this subsection with a labor organization not otherwise having national consultation rights with the Department of Defense or its subcomponents shall not create any obligation on the Department of Defense or its subcomponents to confer national consultation rights on such a labor organization.

''(g) PROVISIONS RELATING TO APPELLATE PROCEDURES.—(1) The Secretary shall—

''(A) establish an appeals process that provides that employees of the Department of Defense are entitled to fair treatment in any appeals that they bring in decisions relating to their employment; and

''(B) in prescribing regulations for any such appeals process—

''(i) ensure that employees of the Department of Defense are afforded the protections of due process; and

''(ii) toward that end, be required to consult with the Merit Systems Protection Board before issuing any such regulations.

''(2) Any regulations establishing the appeals process required by paragraph (1) that relate to any matters within the purview of chapter 77 shall—

''(A) provide for an independent review panel, appointed by the President, which shall not include the Secretary or the Deputy Secretary of Defense or any of their subordinates;

''(B) be issued only after—

''(i) notification to the appropriate committees of Congress; and

''(ii) consultation with the Merit Systems Protection Board and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission;

''(C) ensure the availability of procedures that—

''(i) are consistent with requirements of due process; and

''(ii) provide, to the maximum extent practicable, for the expeditious handling of any matters involving the Department of Defense; and

''(D) modify procedures under chapter 77 only insofar as such modifications are designed to further the fair, efficient, and expeditious resolution of matters involving the employees of the Department of Defense.

''(h) PROVISIONS RELATED TO SEPARATION AND RETIREMENT INCENTIVES.—(1) The Secretary may establish a program within the Department of Defense under which employees may be eligible for early retirement, offered separation incentive pay to separate from service voluntarily, or both. This authority may be used to reduce the number of personnel employed by the Department of Defense or to restructure the workforce to meet mission objectives without reducing the overall number of personnel. This authority is in addition to, and notwithstanding, any other authorities established by law or regulation for such programs.

''(2) For purposes of this section, the term 'employee' means an employee of the Department of Defense, serving under an appointment without time limitation, except that such term does not include—

''(A) a reemployed annuitant under subchapter III of chapter 83 or chapter 84 of this title, or another retirement system for employees of the Federal Government;

''(B) an employee having a disability on the basis of which such employee is or would be eligible for disability retirement under any of the retirement systems referred to in paragraph (1); or

''(C) for purposes of eligibility for separation incentives under this section, an employee who is in receipt of a decision notice of involuntary separation for misconduct or unacceptable performance.

''(3) An employee who is at least 50 years of age and has completed 20 years of service, or has at least 25 years of service, may, pursuant to regulations promulgated under this section, apply and be retired from the Department of Defense and receive benefits in accordance with chapter 83 or 84 if the employee has been employed continuously within the Department of Defense for more than 30 days before the date on which the determination to conduct a reduction or restructuring within 1 or more Department of Defense components is approved pursuant to the program established under subsection (a).

''(4)(A) Separation pay shall be paid in a lump sum or in installments and shall be equal to the lesser of—

''(i) an amount equal to the amount the employee would be entitled to receive under section 5595(c) of this title, if the employee were entitled to payment under such section; or

''(ii) $25,000.

''(B) Separation pay shall not be a basis for payment, and shall not be included in the computation, of any other type of Government benefit. Separation pay shall not be taken into account for the purpose of determining the amount of any severance pay to which an individual may be entitled under section 5595 of this title, based on any other separation.

''(C) Separation pay, if paid in installments, shall cease to be paid upon the recipient's acceptance of employment by the Federal Government, or commencement of work under a personal services contract as described in paragraph (5).

''(5)(A) An employee who receives separation pay under such program may not be reemployed by the Department of Defense for a 12-month period beginning on the effective date of the employee's separation, unless this prohibition is waived by the Secretary on a case-by-case basis.

''(B) An employee who receives separation pay under this section on the basis of a separation occurring on or after the date of the enactment of the Federal Workforce Restructuring Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–236; 108 Stat. 111) and accepts employment with the Government of the United States, or who commences work through a personal services contract with the United States within 5 years after the date of the separation on which payment of the separation pay is based, shall be required to repay the entire amount of the separation pay to the Department of Defense. If the employment is with an Executive agency (as defined by section 105 of this title) other than the Department of Defense, the Director may, at the request of the head of that agency, waive the repayment if the individual involved possesses unique abilities and is the only qualified applicant available for the position. If the employment is within the Department of Defense, the Secretary may waive the repayment if the individual involved is the only qualified applicant available for the position. If the employment is with an entity in the legislative branch, the head of the entity or the appointing official may waive the repayment if the individual involved possesses unique abilities and is the only qualified applicant available for the position. If the employment is with the judicial branch, the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts may waive the repayment if the individual involved possesses unique abilities and is the only qualified applicant available for the position.

''(6) Under this program, early retirement and separation pay may be offered only pursuant to regulations established by the Secretary, subject to such limitations or conditions as the Secretary may require.

''(i) PROVISIONS RELATING TO REEMPLOYMENT.—If annuitant receiving an annuity from the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund becomes employed in a position within the Department of Defense, his annuity shall continue. An annuitant so reemployed shall not be considered an employee for purposes of chapter 83 or 84.

''(j) ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS RELATING TO PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT.—Notwithstanding subsection (c), the Secretary may exercise authorities that would otherwise be available to the Secretary under paragraphs (1), (3), and (8) of section 4703(a) of this title.

''§ 9903. Attracting highly qualified experts

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may carry out a program using the authority provided in subsection (b) in order to attract highly qualified experts in needed occupations, as determined by the Secretary.

''(b) AUTHORITY.—Under the program, the Secretary may—

''(1) appoint personnel from outside the civil service and uniformed services (as such terms are defined in section 2101 of this title) to positions in the Department of Defense without regard to any provision of this title governing the appointment of employees to positions in the Department of Defense;

''(2) prescribe the rates of basic pay for positions to which employees are appointed under paragraph (1) at rates not in excess of the maximum rate of basic pay authorized for senior-level positions under section 5376 of this title, as increased by locality-based comparability payments under section 5304 of this title, notwithstanding any provision of this title governing the rates of pay or classification of employees in the executive branch; and

''(3) pay any employee appointed under paragraph (1) payments in addition to basic pay within the limits applicable to the employee under subsection (d).

''(c) LIMITATION ON TERM OF APPOINTMENT.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the service of an employee under an appointment made pursuant to this section may not exceed 5 years.

''(2) The Secretary may, in the case of a particular employee, extend the period to which service is limited under paragraph (1) by up to 1 additional year if the Secretary determines that such action is necessary to promote the Department of Defense's national security missions.

''(d) LIMITATIONS ON ADDITIONAL PAYMENTS.—(1) The total amount of the additional payments paid to an employee under this section for any 12-month period may not exceed the lesser of the following amounts:

''(A) $50,000 in fiscal year 2004, which may be adjusted annually thereafter by the Secretary, with a percentage increase equal to one-half of 1 percentage point less than the percentage by which the Employment Cost Index, published quarterly by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, for the base quarter of the year before the preceding

calendar year exceeds the Employment Cost Index for the base quarter of the second year before the preceding calendar year.

''(B) The amount equal to 50 percent of the employee's annual rate of basic pay.

For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'base quarter' has the meaning given such term by section 5302(3).

''(2) An employee appointed under this section is not eligible for any bonus, monetary award, or other monetary incentive for service except for payments authorized under this section.

''(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection or of section 5307, no additional payments may be paid to an employee under this section in any calendar year if, or to the extent that, the employee's total annual compensation will exceed the maximum amount of total annual compensation payable at the salary set in accordance with section 104 of title 3.

''(e) SAVINGS PROVISIONS.—In the event that the Secretary terminates this program, in the case of an employee who, on the day before the termination of the program, is serving in a position pursuant to an appointment under this section—

''(1) the termination of the program does not terminate the employee's employment in that position before the expiration of the lesser of—

''(A) the period for which the employee was appointed; or

''(B) the period to which the employee's service is limited under subsection (c), including any extension made under this section before the termination of the program; and

''(2) the rate of basic pay prescribed for the position under this section may not be reduced as long as the employee continues to serve in the position without a break in service.

''§ 9904. Employment of older Americans

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may appoint older Americans into positions in the excepted service for a period not to exceed 2 years, provided that—

''(1) any such appointment shall not result in—

''(A) the displacement of individuals currently employed by the Department of Defense (including partial displacement through reduction of nonovertime hours, wages, or employment benefits); or

''(B) the employment of any individual when any other person is in a reduction-in-force status from the same or substantially equivalent job within the Department of Defense; and

''(2) the individual to be appointed is otherwise qualified for the position, as determined by the Secretary.

''(b) EFFECT ON EXISTING RETIREMENT BENEFITS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an individual appointed pursuant to subsection (a) who otherwise is receiving an annuity, pension, retired pay, or other similar payment shall not have the amount of said annuity, pension, or other similar payment reduced as a result of such employment.

''(c) EXTENSION OF APPOINTMENT.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Secretary may extend an appointment made pursuant to this section for up to an additional 2 years if the individual employee possesses unique knowledge or abilities that are not otherwise available to the Department of Defense.

''(d) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term 'older American' means any citizen of the United States who is at least 55 years of age.

''§ 9905. Special pay and benefits for certain employees outside the United States

''The Secretary may provide to certain civilian employees of the Department of Defense assigned to activities outside the United States as determined by the Secretary to be in support of Department of Defense activities abroad hazardous to life or health or so specialized because of security requirements as to be clearly distinguishable from normal Government employment—

''(1) allowances and benefits—

''(A) comparable to those provided by the Secretary of State to members of the Foreign Service under chapter 9 of title I of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (Public Law 96–465, 22 U.S.C. 4081 et seq.) or any other provision of law; or

''(B) comparable to those provided by the Director of Central Intelligence to personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency; and

''(2) special retirement accrual benefits and disability in the same manner provided for by the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement Act (50 U.S.C. 2001 et seq.) and in section 18 of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 403r).''.

(2) The table of chapters for part III of such title is amended by adding at the end of subpart I the following new item:

''99. Department of Defense National Security Personnel System ..... 9901''.

(b) IMPACT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN PERSONNEL.—(1) Any exercise of authority under chapter 99 of such title (as added by subsection (a)), including under any system established under such chapter, shall be in conformance with the requirements of this subsection.

(2) No other provision of this Act or of any amendment made by this Act may be construed or applied in a manner so as to limit, supersede, or otherwise affect the provisions of this section, except to the extent that it does so by specific reference to this section.

TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO OTHER NATIONS

SEC. 1201. EXPANSION OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT AND SERVICES AND TRAVEL AND SUBSISTENCE EXPENSES FOR CERTAIN FOREIGN LIAISON OFFICERS.

(a) ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT AND SERVICES.—Subsection (a) of section 1051a of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''involved in a coalition with the United States'';

(2) by striking ''temporarily''; and

(3) by striking '' in connection with the planning for, or conduct of, a coalition operation''.

(b) TRAVEL, SUBSISTENCE, AND OTHER EXPENSES.—Subsection (b) of such section is amended—

(1) by striking ''(1)'';

(2) by striking ''expenses specified in paragraph (2)'' and inserting ''travel, subsistence, and similar personal expenses'';

(3) by striking ''developing country'' and inserting ''developing nation'';

(4) by striking ''in connection with the assignment of that officer to the headquarters of a combatant command as described in subsection (a)'' and inserting ''involved in a coalition while the liaison officer is assigned temporarily to a headquarters described in subsection (a) in connection with the planning for, or conduct of, a coalition operation''; and

(5) by striking paragraph (2).

(c) REIMBURSEMENT.—Subsection (c) of such section is amended by striking ''by'' before ''subsection (a)'' and inserting ''under''.

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—(1) The heading for section 1051a of such title is amended to read as follows:

''§ 1051a. Foreign officers: administrative services and support; travel, subsistence, and other personal expenses''.

(2) The subsection heading for subsection (a) is amended by striking ''AUTHORITY'' and inserting ''ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES AND SUPPORT''.

(3) The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 53 of each title is amended to read as follows:

''1051a. Foreign officers: administrative services and support; travel, subsistence, and other personal expenses.''.

SEC. 1202. RECOGNITION OF SUPERIOR NONCOMBAT ACHIEVEMENTS OR PERFORMANCE BY MEMBERS OF FRIENDLY FOREIGN FORCES AND OTHER FOREIGN NATIONALS.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Chapter 53 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1051a the following new section:

''§ 1051b. Bilateral or regional cooperation programs: awards and mementos funds to recognize superior noncombat achievements or performance

''(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—The Secretary of Defense may present awards and mementos purchased with funds appropriated for operation and maintenance of the armed forces to recognize superior noncombat achievements or performance by members of friendly foreign forces and other foreign nationals that significantly enhance or support the National Security Strategy of the United States.

''(b) ACTIVITIES THAT MAY BE RECOGNIZED.—Activities that may be recognized under subsection (a) include superior achievement or performance that—

''(1) plays a crucial role in shaping the international security environment in ways that protect and promote United States interests;

''(2) supports or enhances United States overseas presence and peacetime engagement activities, including defense cooperation initiatives, security assistance training and programs, and training and exercises with the armed forces;

''(3) helps to deter aggression and coercion, build coalitions, and promote regional stability; or

''(4) serves as a role model for appropriate conduct by military forces in emerging democracies.

''(c) LIMITATION.—Expenditures for the purchase or production of mementos for award under this section may not exceed the 'minimal value' established in accordance with section 7342(a)(5) of title 5.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1051a the following new item:

''1051b. Bilateral or regional cooperation programs: awards and mementos to recognize superior noncombat achievements or performance.''.

SEC. 1203. EXPANSION OF AUTHORITY TO WAIVE CHARGES FOR COSTS OF ATTENDANCE AT GEORGE C. MARSHALL EUROPEAN CENTER FOR SECURITY STUDIES.

Section 1306(b)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103-337; 108 Stat. 2892) is amended by striking ''of cooperation partner states of the North Atlantic Council or the Partnership for Peace'' and inserting ''from states located in Europe or the territory of the former Soviet Union''.

SEC. 1204. IDENTIFICATION OF GOODS AND TECHNOLOGIES CRITICAL FOR MILITARY SUPERIORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Subchapter II of chapter 148 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 2508. Goods and technologies critical for military superiority: list

''(a) REQUIREMENT TO MAINTAIN LIST.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall maintain a list of any goods or technology that, if obtained by a potential adversary, could undermine the military superiority or qualitative military advantage of the United States over potential adversaries.

''(2) In this section, the term 'goods or technology' means—

''(A) any article, natural or manmade substance, material, supply, or manufactured product, including inspection and test equipment; and

''(B) any information and know-how (whether in tangible form, such as models, prototypes,

drawings, sketches, diagrams, blueprints, or manuals, or in intangible form, such as training or technical services) that can be used to design, produce, manufacture, utilize, or reconstruct goods, including computer software and technical data.

''(b) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED ON LIST.—The Secretary shall include on the list the following:

''(1) Any technology or developing critical technology (including conventional weapons, weapons of mass destruction, and delivery systems) that could enhance a potential adversary's military capabilities or that is critical to the United States maintaining its military superiority and qualitative military advantage.

''(2) Any dual-use good, material, or know-how that could enhance a potential adversary's military capabilities or that is critical to the United States maintaining its military superiority and qualitative military advantage, including those used to manufacture weapons of mass destruction and their associated delivery systems.

''(c) REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall ensure that—

''(1) the list is subject to a systematic, ongoing assessment and analysis of dual-use technologies; and

''(2) the list is updated not less often than every two months.

''(d) AVAILABILITY.—The list shall be made available—

''(1) in unclassified form on the Department of Defense public website, in a usable form; and

''(2) in classified form to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such subchapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''2508. Goods and technologies critical for military superiority: list.''.

(b) DEADLINE FOR ESTABLISHMENT.—The list required by section 2508 of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall be established not later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1205. REPORT ON ACQUISITION BY IRAQ OF ADVANCED WEAPONS.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committees on Armed Services and International Relations of the House of Representatives a report on the acquisition by Iraq of weapons of mass destruction and associated delivery systems and the acquisition by Iraq of advanced conventional weapons.

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

(1) A description of how Iraq was able to obtain any materials, technology, and know-how for its nuclear, chemical, biological, ballistic missile, and unmanned aerial vehicle programs, and advanced conventional weapons programs, from 1979 through April 2003 from entities (including Iraqi citizens) outside of Iraq.

(2) An assessment of the degree to which United States, foreign, and multilateral export control regimes prevented acquisition by Iraq of weapons of mass destruction-related technology and materials and advanced conventional weapons and delivery systems since the commencement of international inspections in Iraq.

(3) An assessment of the effectiveness of United Nations sanctions at halting the flow of militarily-useful contraband to Iraq from 1991 until the end of Operation Iraqi Freedom.

(4) An assessment of how Iraq was able to evade International Atomic Energy Agency and United Nations inspections regarding chemical, nuclear, biological, and missile weapons and related capabilities.

(5) Identification and a catalogue of the entities and countries that transferred militarily useful contraband to Iraq between 1991 and the end of Operation Iraqi Freedom, and the nature of that contraband.

(c) FORM OF REPORT.—The report shall be submitted in unclassified form with a classified annex, if necessary.

SEC. 1206. AUTHORITY FOR CHECK CASHING AND CURRENCY EXCHANGE SERVICES TO BE PROVIDED TO FOREIGN MILITARY MEMBERS PARTICIPATING IN CERTAIN ACTIVITIES WITH UNITED STATES FORCES.

(a) AUTHORITY.—Subsection (b) of section 3342 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(8) A member of the military forces of an allied or coalition nation who is participating in a joint operation, joint exercise, humanitarian mission, or peacekeeping mission with the Armed Forces of the United States, but—

''(A) only if—

''(i) such disbursing official action for members of the military forces of that nation is approved by the senior United States military commander assigned to that operation or mission; and

''(ii) that nation has guaranteed payment for any deficiency resulting from such disbursing official action; and

''(B) in the case of negotiable instruments, only for a negotiable instrument drawn on a financial institution located in the United States or on a foreign branch of such an institution.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—That subsection is further amended—

(1) by striking ''only for—'' in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and inserting ''only for the following:'';

(2) by striking ''an'' at the beginning of paragraph (1) and inserting ''An'';

(3) by striking ''personnel'' in paragraphs (2) and (6) and inserting ''Personnel'';

(4) by striking ''a'' at the beginning of paragraphs (3), (4), (5), and (7) and inserting ''A'';

(5) by striking the semicolon at the end of paragraphs (1) through (5) and inserting a period;

(6) by striking ''; or'' at the end of paragraph (6) and inserting a period; and

(7) by striking ''1752(1))'' in paragraph (7) and inserting ''1752(1)))''.

SEC. 1207. REQUIREMENTS FOR TRANSFER TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES OF CERTAIN SPECIFIED TYPES OF EXCESS AIRCRAFT.

(a) EXPANSION OF TRANSFER REQUIREMENT.—Section 2581 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking ''UH–1 Huey helicopter or AH–1 Cobra helicopter'' and inserting ''UH–1 Huey aircraft, AH–1 Cobra aircraft, T–2 Buckeye aircraft, or T–37 Tweet aircraft''; and

(2) by striking ''helicopter'' each subsequent place it appears in such section and inserting ''aircraft''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—(1) The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

''§ 2581. Specified excess aircraft: requirements for transfer to foreign countries''.

(2) The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 153 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''2581. Specified excess aircraft: requirements for transfer to foreign countries.''.

SEC. 1208. 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.

(c) NATIONAL SECURITY WAIVER.—(1) The Secretary of Defense may waive the limitation in subsection (a) if the Secretary determines that such waiver is in the national security interest of the United States.

(2) The Secretary shall notify the congressional defense committees not later 15 days after the date of the exercise of the waiver authority under paragraph (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 2004 COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION FUNDS DEFINED.—As used in this title, the term ''fiscal year 2004 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 $450,800,000 authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2004 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, $86,400,000.

(2) For strategic nuclear arms elimination in Ukraine, $3,900,000.

(3) For nuclear weapons transportation security in Russia, $23,200,000.

(4) For nuclear weapons storage security in Russia, $48,000,000.

(5) For activities designated as Other Program Support, $13,100,000.

(6) For defense and military contacts, $11,100,000.

(7) For chemical weapons destruction in Russia, $171,500,000.

(8) For biological weapons proliferation prevention in the former Soviet Union, $54,200,000.

(9) For weapons of mass destruction proliferation prevention in the states of the former Soviet Union, $39,400,000.

(b) REPORT ON OBLIGATION OR EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR OTHER PURPOSES.—No fiscal year 2004 Cooperative Threat Reduction funds may be obligated or expended for a purpose other than a purpose listed in paragraphs (1) through (9) 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 2004 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 2004 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. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS UNTIL CERTAIN PERMITS OBTAINED.

(a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—With respect to a new project or an incomplete project carried out by the Department of Defense under Cooperative Threat Reduction programs, not more than 35 percent of the total costs of the project may be obligated or expended from Cooperative Threat Reduction funds for any fiscal year until—

(1) the Secretary of Defense determines—

(A) in the case of a new project, the number and type of permits that may be required for the lifetime of the project in the proposed location or locations of the project; and

(B) in the case of an incomplete project, the number and type of permits that may be required for the remaining lifetime of the project; and

(2) the government of the state of the former Soviet Union in which the project is being or is proposed to be carried out obtains and transmits copies of all such permits to the Department of Defense.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, with respect to a project under Cooperative Threat Reduction programs:

(1) NEW PROJECT.—The term ''new project'' means a project for which no funds have been obligated or expended as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) INCOMPLETE PROJECT.—The term ''incomplete project'' means a project for which funds have been obligated or expended before the date of the enactment of this Act and which is not completed as of such date.

(3) PERMIT.—The term ''permit'' means any local or national permit for development, general construction, environmental, land use, or other purposes that is required in the state of the former Soviet Union in which the project is being or is proposed to be carried out.

SEC. 1304. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR BIOLOGICAL RESEARCH IN THE FORMER SOVIET UNION.

Of the funds authorized to be appropriated for biological weapons proliferation prevention pursuant to section 1302, no funds may be obligated for cooperative biodefense research or bioattack early warning and preparedness under a Cooperative Threat Reduction program at a site in a state of the former Soviet Union until the Secretary of Defense notifies Congress that—

(1) the Secretary has determined, through access to the site, that no biological weapons research prohibited by international law is being conducted at the site;

(2) the Secretary has assessed the vulnerability of the site to external or internal attempts to exploit or obtain dangerous pathogens illicitly; and

(3) the Secretary has begun to implement appropriate security measures at the site to reduce that vulnerability and to prevent the diversion of dangerous pathogens from legitimate research.

SEC. 1305. AUTHORITY AND FUNDS FOR NONPROLIFERATION AND DISARMAMENT.

The Secretary of Defense is authorized to transfer $50,000,000 in prior year Cooperative Threat Reduction funds from the Department of Defense to the Department of State Nonproliferation and Disarmament Fund for disarmament and nonproliferation purposes outside the territory of the former Soviet Union.

SEC. 1306. REQUIREMENT FOR ON-SITE MANAGERS.

(a) ON-SITE MANAGER REQUIREMENT.—Before obligating any Cooperative Threat Reduction funds for a project described in subsection (b), the Secretary of Defense shall appoint a United States Federal Government employee as an on-site manager.

(b) PROJECTS COVERED.—Subsection (a) applies to a project—

(1) to be located in a state of the former Soviet Union;

(2) which involves dismantlement, destruction, or storage facilities, or construction of a facility; and

(3) with respect to which the total contribution by the Department of Defense is expected to exceed $25,000,000.

(c) DUTIES OF ON-SITE MANAGER.—The on-site manager appointed under subsection (a) shall—

(1) develop, in cooperation with representatives from governments of countries participating in the project, a list of those steps or activities critical to achieving the project's disarmament or nonproliferation goals;

(2) establish a schedule for completing those steps or activities;

(3) meet with all participants to seek assurances that those steps or activities are being completed on schedule; and

(4) suspend United States participation in a project when a non-United States participant fails to complete a scheduled step or activity on time, unless directed by the Secretary of Defense to resume United States participation.

(d) STEPS OR ACTIVITIES.—Steps or activities referred to in subsection (c)(1) are those activities that, if not completed, will prevent a project from achieving its disarmament or nonproliferation goals, including, at a minimum, the following:

(1) Identification and acquisition of permits (as defined in section 1303(b)).

(2) Verification that the items, substances, or capabilities to be dismantled, secured, or otherwise modified are available for dismantlement, securing, or modification.

(3) Timely provision of financial, personnel, management, transportation, and other resources.

(e) NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS.—In any case in which the Secretary of Defense directs an on-site manager to resume United States participation in a project under subsection (c)(4), the Secretary shall concurrently notify Congress of such direction.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect six months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 1307. PROVISIONS RELATING TO FUNDING FOR CHEMICAL WEAPONS DESTRUCTION FACILITY IN RUSSIA.

(a) INAPPLICABILITY OF LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—(1) The conditions described in section 1305 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65; 22 U.S.C. 5952 note) shall not apply to the obligation and expenditure of funds available for obligation during fiscal year 2004 for the planning, design, or construction of a chemical weapons destruction facility in Russia if the President submits to Congress a written certification that includes—

(A) a statement as to why waiving the conditions is important to the national security interests of the United States;

(B) a full and complete justification for exercising this waiver; and

(C) a plan to promote a full and accurate disclosure by Russia regarding the size, content, status, and location of its chemical weapons stockpile.

(2) The authority under paragraph (1) shall expire on September 30, 2004.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), of the funds that may be obligated for a chemical weapons destruction facility in Russia as specified in section 1302(a)(7), the Secretary of Defense may not obligate an amount greater than two times the amount obligated by Russia and any other state for the planning, design, construction, or operation of a chemical weapons destruction facility in Russia.

(2) Of the funds that may be obligated for a chemical weapons destruction facility in Russia as specified in section 1302(a)(7), $71,500,000 shall be available for obligation on and after October 1, 2003.

TITLE XIV—SERVICES ACQUISITION REFORM

SEC. 1401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Services Acquisition Reform Act of 2003''.

SEC. 1402. EXECUTIVE AGENCY DEFINED.

In this title, the term ''executive agency'' has the meaning given that term in section 4(1) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(1)), unless specifically stated otherwise.

Subtitle A—Acquisition Workforce and Training

SEC. 1411. DEFINITION OF ACQUISITION.

Section 4 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(16) The term 'acquisition'—

''(A) means the process of acquiring, with appropriated funds, by contract for purchase or lease, property or services (including construction) that support the missions and goals of an executive agency, from the point at which the requirements of the executive agency are established in consultation with the chief acquisition officer of the executive agency; and

''(B) includes—

''(i) the process of acquiring property or services that are already in existence, or that must be created, developed, demonstrated, and evaluated;

''(ii) the description of requirements to satisfy agency needs;

''(iii) solicitation and selection of sources;

''(iv) award of contracts;

''(v) contract performance;

''(vi) contract financing:

''(vii) management and measurement of contract performance through final delivery and payment; and

''(viii) technical and management functions directly related to the process of fulfilling agency requirements by contract.''.

SEC. 1412. ACQUISITION WORKFORCE TRAINING FUND.

(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are to ensure that the Federal acquisition workforce—

(1) adapts to fundamental changes in the nature of Federal Government acquisition of property and services associated with the changing roles of the Federal Government; and

(2) acquires new skills and a new perspective to enable it to contribute effectively in the changing environment of the 21st century.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF FUND.—Section 37 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 433) is amended by adding at the end of subsection (h) the following new paragraph:

''(3) ACQUISITION WORKFORCE TRAINING FUND.—(A) The Administrator of General Services shall establish an acquisition workforce training fund. The Administrator shall manage the fund through the Federal Acquisition Institute to support the training of the acquisition workforce of the executive agencies other than the Department of Defense. The Administrator shall consult with the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy in managing the fund.

''(B) There shall be credited to the acquisition workforce training fund 5 percent of the fees collected by executive agencies (other than the Department of Defense) under the following contracts:

''(i) Governmentwide task and delivery-order contracts entered into under sections 303H and 303I of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253h and 253i).

''(ii) Governmentwide contracts for the acquisition of information technology as defined in section 11101 of title 40, United States Code, and multiagency acquisition contracts for such technology authorized by section 11314 of such title.

''(iii) Multiple-award schedule contracts entered into by the Administrator of General Services.

''(C) The head of an executive agency that administers a contract described in subparagraph (B) shall remit to the General Services Administration the amount required to be credited to the fund with respect to such contract at the end of each quarter of the fiscal year.

''(D) The Administrator of General Services, through the Office of Federal Acquisition Policy, shall ensure that funds collected for training under this section are not used for any purpose other than the purpose specified in subparagraph (A).

''(E) Amounts credited to the fund shall be in addition to funds requested and appropriated for education and training referred to in paragraph (1).

''(F) Amounts credited to the fund shall remain available until expended.''.

(c) EXCEPTION.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall not apply to the acquisition workforce of the Department of Defense.

SEC. 1413. ACQUISITION WORKFORCE RECRUITMENT PROGRAM.

(a) AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT PROGRAM.—For purposes of sections 3304, 5333, and 5753 of title 5, United States Code, the head of a department or agency of the United States (including the Secretary of Defense) may determine that certain Federal acquisition positions are ''shortage category'' positions in order to recruit and appoint directly to positions of employment in the department or agency highly qualified persons, such as any person who—

(1) holds a bachelor's degree from an accredited institution of higher education;

(2) holds, from an accredited law school or an accredited institution of higher education—

(A) a law degree; or

(B) a masters or equivalent degree in business administration, public administration, or systems engineering; or

(3) has significant experience with commercial acquisition practices, terms, and conditions.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The exercise of authority to take a personnel action under this section shall be subject to policies prescribed by the Office of Personnel Management that govern direct recruitment, including policies requiring appointment of a preference eligible who satisfies the qualification requirements.

(c) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—The head of a department or agency may not appoint a person to a position of employment under this section after September 30, 2007.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than March 31, 2007, the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy shall submit to Congress a report on the implementation of this section. The report shall include—

(1) the Administrator's assessment of the efficacy of the exercise of the authority provided in this section in attracting employees with unusually high qualifications to the acquisition workforce; and

(2) any recommendations considered appropriate by the Administrator on whether the authority to carry out the program should be extended.

SEC. 1414. ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING ACQUISITION WORKFORCE.

The Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of General Services, and the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, shall develop and implement a plan to ensure that the Federal Government maintains the necessary capability with respect to the acquisition of architectural and engineering services to—

(1) ensure that Federal Government employees have the expertise to determine agency requirements for such services;

(2) establish priorities and programs (including acquisition plans);

(3) establish professional standards;

(4) develop scopes of work; and

(5) award and administer contracts for such services.

Subtitle B—Adaptation of Business Acquisition Practices

PART I—ADAPTATION OF BUSINESS MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

SEC. 1421. CHIEF ACQUISITION OFFICERS.

(a) APPOINTMENT OF CHIEF ACQUISITION OFFICERS.—(1) Section 16 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 414) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 16. CHIEF ACQUISITION OFFICERS.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF AGENCY CHIEF ACQUISITION OFFICERS.—The head of each executive agency (other than the Department of Defense) shall appoint or designate a non-career employee as Chief Acquisition Officer for the agency, who shall—

''(1) have acquisition management as that official's primary duty; and

''(2) advise and assist the head of the executive agency and other agency officials to ensure that the mission of the executive agency is achieved through the management of the agency's acquisition activities.

''(b) AUTHORITY AND FUNCTIONS OF AGENCY CHIEF ACQUISITION OFFICERS.—The functions of each Chief Acquisition Officer shall include—

''(1) monitoring the performance of acquisition activities and acquisition programs of the executive agency, evaluating the performance of those programs on the basis of applicable performance measurements, and advising the head of the executive agency regarding the appropriate business strategy to achieve the mission of the executive agency;

''(2) increasing the use of full and open competition in the acquisition of property and services by the executive agency by establishing policies, procedures, and practices that ensure that the executive agency receives a sufficient number of sealed bids or competitive proposals from responsible sources to fulfill the Government's requirements (including performance and delivery schedules) at the best value considering the nature of the property or service procured;

''(3) making acquisition decisions consistent with all applicable laws and establishing clear lines of authority, accountability, and responsibility for acquisition decisionmaking within the executive agency;

''(4) managing the direction of acquisition policy for the executive agency, including implementation of the unique acquisition policies, regulations, and standards of the executive agency;

''(5) developing and maintaining an acquisition career management program in the executive agency to ensure that there is an adequate professional workforce; and

''(6) as part of the strategic planning and performance evaluation process required under section 306 of title 5, United States Code, and sections 1105(a)(28), 1115, 1116, and 9703 of title 31, United States Code—

''(A) assessing the requirements established for agency personnel regarding knowledge and skill in acquisition resources management and the adequacy of such requirements for facilitating the achievement of the performance goals established for acquisition management;

''(B) in order to rectify any deficiency in meeting such requirements, developing strategies and specific plans for hiring, training, and professional development; and

''(C) reporting to the head of the executive agency on the progress made in improving acquisition management capability.''.

(2) The item relating to section 16 in the table of contents in section 1(b) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

''Sec. 16. Chief Acquisition Officers.''.

(b) REFERENCES TO SENIOR PROCUREMENT EXECUTIVE.—

(1) AMENDMENT TO THE OFFICE OF FEDERAL POLICY ACT.—

(A) Subsections (a)(2)(A) and (b) of section 20 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 418(a)(2)(A), (b)) are amended by striking ''senior procurement executive'' each place it appears and inserting ''Chief Acquisition Officer''.

(B) Subsection (c)(2)(A)(ii) of section 29 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 425(c)(2)(A)(ii)) is amended by striking ''senior procurement executive'' and inserting ''Chief Acquisition Officer''.

(C) Subsection (c) of section 37 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 433(c)) is amended—

(i) by striking ''SENIOR PROCUREMENT EXECUTIVE'' in the heading and inserting ''CHIEF ACQUISITION OFFICER''; and

(ii) by striking ''senior procurement executive'' each place it appears and inserting ''Chief Acquisition Officer''.

(2) AMENDMENT TO TITLE III OF THE FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949.—Sections 302C(b) and 303(f)(1)(B)(iii) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 252c, 253) are amended by striking ''senior procurement executive'' each place it appears and inserting ''Chief Acquisition Officer''.

(3) AMENDMENT TO TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.—The following sections of title 10, United States Code are amended by striking ''senior procurement executive'' each place it appears and inserting ''Chief Acquisition Officer'':

(A) Section 133(c)(1).

(B) Subsections (d)(2)(B) and (f)(1) of section 2225.

(C) Section 2302c(b).

(D) Section 2304(f)(1)(B)(iii).

(E) Section 2359a(i).

(4) REFERENCES.—Any reference to a senior procurement executive of a department or agency of the United States in any other provision of law or regulation, document, or record of the United States shall be deemed to be a reference to the Chief Acquisition Officer of the department or agency.

(c) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 1115(a) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 1105(a)(29)'' and inserting ''section 1105(a)(28)''.

SEC. 1422. CHIEF ACQUISITION OFFICERS COUNCIL.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF COUNCIL.—The Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 16 the following new section:

"SEC. 16A. CHIEF ACQUISITION OFFICERS COUNCIL.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the executive branch a Chief Acquisition Officers Council.

''(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The members of the Council shall be as follows:

''(1) The Deputy Director for Management of the Office of Management and Budget, who shall act as Chairman of the Council.

''(2) The Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy.

''(3) The chief acquisition officer of each executive agency.

''(4) The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics.

''(5) Any other officer or employee of the United States designated by the Chairman.

''(c) LEADERSHIP; SUPPORT.—(1) The Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy shall lead the activities of the Council on behalf of the Deputy Director for Management.

''(2)(A) The Vice Chairman of the Council shall be selected by the Council from among its members.

''(B) The Vice Chairman shall serve a 1-year term, and may serve multiple terms.

''(3) The Administrator of General Services shall provide administrative and other support for the Council.

''(d) PRINCIPAL FORUM.—The Council is designated the principal interagency forum for monitoring and improving the Federal acquisition system.

''(e) FUNCTIONS.—The Council shall perform functions that include the following:

''(1) Develop recommendations for the Director of the Office of Management and Budget on Federal acquisition policies and requirements.

''(2) Share experiences, ideas, best practices, and innovative approaches related to Federal acquisition.

''(3) Assist the Administrator in the identification, development, and coordination of multiagency projects and other innovative initiatives to improve Federal acquisition.

''(4) Promote effective business practices that ensure the timely delivery of best value products to the Federal Government and achieve appropriate public policy objectives.

''(5) Further integrity, fairness, competition, openness, and efficiency in the Federal acquisition system.

''(6) Work with the Office of Personnel Management to assess and address the hiring, training, and professional development needs of the Federal Government related to acquisition.

''(7) Work with the Administrator and the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council to promote the business practices referred to in paragraph (4) and other results of the functions carried out under this subsection.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 16 the following new item:

''Sec. 16A. Chief Acquisition Officers Council.''.

SEC. 1423. STATUTORY AND REGULATORY REVIEW.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy shall establish an advisory panel to review laws and regulations regarding the use of commercial practices, performance-based contracting, the performance of acquisition functions across agency lines of responsibility, and the use of Governmentwide contracts.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The panel shall be composed of at least nine individuals who are recognized experts in acquisition law and Government acquisition policy. In making appointments to the panel, the Administrator shall—

(1) consult with the Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of General Services, the Committees on Armed Services and Government Reform of the House of Representatives, and the Committees on Armed Services and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and

(2) ensure that the members of the panel reflect the diverse experiences in the public and private sectors.

(c) DUTIES.—The panel shall—

(1) review all Federal acquisition laws and regulations with a view toward ensuring effective and appropriate use of commercial practices and performance-based contracting; and

(2) make any recommendations for the repeal or amendment of such laws or regulations that are considered necessary as a result of such review—

(A) to eliminate any provisions in such laws or regulations that are unnecessary for the effective, efficient, and fair award and administration of contracts for the acquisition by the Federal Government of goods and services;

(B) to ensure the continuing financial and ethical integrity of acquisitions by the Federal Government; and

(C) to protect the best interests of the Federal Government.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the establishment of the panel, the panel shall submit to the Administrator and to the Committees on Armed Services and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Armed Services and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report containing a detailed statement of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the panel.

PART II—OTHER ACQUISITION IMPROVEMENTS

SEC. 1426. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT FRANCHISE FUND PROGRAMS.

Section 403(f) of the Federal Financial Management Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–356; 31 U.S.C. 501 note) is amended by striking ''October 1, 2003'' and inserting ''October 1, 2006''.

SEC. 1427. AGENCY ACQUISITION PROTESTS.

(a) DEFENSE CONTRACTS.—(1) Chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2305a the following new section:

''§ 2305b. Protests

''(a) IN GENERAL.—An interested party may protest an acquisition of supplies or services by an agency based on an alleged violation of an acquisition law or regulation, and a decision regarding such alleged violation shall be made by the agency in accordance with this section.

''(b) RESTRICTION ON CONTRACT AWARD PENDING DECISION.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), a contract may not be awarded by an agency after a protest concerning the acquisition has been submitted under this section and while the protest is pending.

''(2) The head of the acquisition activity responsible for the award of the contract may authorize the award of a contract, notwithstanding pending protest under this section, upon making a written finding that urgent and compelling circumstances do not allow for waiting for a decision on the protest.

''(c) RESTRICTION ON CONTRACT PERFORMANCE PENDING DECISION.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), performance of a contract may not be authorized (and performance of the contract shall cease if performance has already begun) in any case in which a protest of the contract award is submitted under this section before the later of—

''(A) the date that is 10 days after the date of contract award; or

''(B) the date that is five days after an agency debriefing date offered to an unsuccessful offeror for any debriefing that is requested and, when requested, is required, under section 2305(b)(5) of this title.

''(2) The head of the acquisition activity responsible for the award of a contract may authorize performance of the contract notwithstanding a pending protest under this section upon making a written finding that urgent and compelling circumstances do not allow for waiting for a decision on the protest.

''(d) DEADLINE FOR DECISION.—The head of an agency shall issue a decision on a protest under this section not later than the date that is 20 working days after the date on which the protest is submitted to such head of an agency.

''(e) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall affect the right of an interested party to file a protest with the Comptroller General under subchapter V of chapter 35 of title 31 or in the United States Court of Federal Claims.

''(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms 'protest' and 'interested party' have the meanings given such terms in section 3551 of title 31.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2305a the following new item:

''2305b. Protests.''.

(b) OTHER AGENCIES.—Title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 is amended by inserting after section 303M (41 U.S.C. 253m) the following new section:

"SEC. 303N. PROTESTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—An interested party may protest an acquisition of supplies or services by an executive agency based on an alleged violation of an acquisition law or regulation, and a decision regarding such alleged violation shall be made by the agency in accordance with this section.

''(b) RESTRICTION ON CONTRACT AWARD PENDING DECISION.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), a contract may not be awarded by an agency after a protest concerning the acquisition has been submitted under this section and while the protest is pending.

''(2) The head of the acquisition activity responsible for the award of a contract may authorize the award of the contract, notwithstanding a pending protest under this section, upon making a written finding that urgent and compelling circumstances do not allow for waiting for a decision on the protest.

''(c) RESTRICTION ON CONTRACT PERFORMANCE PENDING DECISION.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), performance of a contract may not be authorized (and performance of the contract shall cease if performance has already begun) in any case in which a protest of the contract award is submitted under this section before the later of—

''(A) the date that is 10 days after the date of contract award; or

''(B) the date that is five days after an agency debriefing date offered to an unsuccessful offeror for any debriefing that is requested and, when requested, is required, under section 303B(e) of this title.

''(2) The head of the acquisition activity responsible for the award of a contract may authorize performance of the contract notwithstanding a pending protest under this section upon making a written finding that urgent and compelling circumstances do not allow for waiting for a decision on the protest.

''(d) DEADLINE FOR DECISION.—The head of an executive agency shall issue a decision on a protest under this section not later than the date that is 20 working days after the date on which the protest is submitted to the executive agency.

''(e) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall affect the right of an interested party to file a protest with the Comptroller General under subchapter V of chapter 35 of title 31, United States Code, or in the United States Court of Federal Claims.

''(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms 'protest' and 'interested party' have the meanings given such terms in section 3551 of title 31, United States Code.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3553(d)(4) of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(2) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) in the case of a protest of the same matter regarding such contract that is submitted under section 2305b of title 10 or section 303N of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, the date that is 5 days after the date on which a decision on that protest is issued.''.

SEC. 1428. IMPROVEMENTS IN CONTRACTING FOR ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING SERVICES.

(a) TITLE 10.—Section 2855(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''$85,000'' and inserting ''$300,000''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) The selection and competition requirements described in subsection (a) shall apply to any contract for architectural and engineering services (including surveying and mapping services) that is entered into by the head of an agency (as such term is defined in section 2302 of this title).''.

(b) ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING SERVICES.—Architectural and engineering services (as defined in section 1102 of title 40, United States Code) shall not be offered under multiple-award schedule contracts entered into by the Administrator of General Services or under Governmentwide task and delivery-order contracts entered into under sections 2304a and 2304b of title 10, United States Code, or sections 303H and 303I of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253h and 253i) unless such services—

(1) are performed under the direct supervision of a professional engineer licensed in a State; and

(2) are awarded in accordance with the selection procedures set forth in chapter 11 of title 40, United States Code.

SEC. 1429. AUTHORIZATION OF TELECOMMUTING FOR FEDERAL CONTRACTORS.

(a) AMENDMENT TO THE FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council shall amend the Federal Acquisition Regulation issued in accordance with sections 6 and 25 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 405 and 421) to permit telecommuting by employees of Federal Government contractors in the performance of contracts entered into with executive agencies.

(b) CONTENT OF AMENDMENT.—The regulation issued pursuant to subsection (a) shall, at a minimum, provide that solicitations for the acquisition of property or services may not set forth any requirement or evaluation criteria that would—

(1) render an offeror ineligible to enter into a contract on the basis of the inclusion of a plan of the offeror to permit the offeror's employees to telecommute; or

(2) reduce the scoring of an offer on the basis of the inclusion in the offer of a plan of the offeror to permit the offeror's employees to telecommute, unless the contracting officer concerned first—

(A) determines that the requirements of the agency, including the security requirements of the agency, cannot be met if the telecommuting is permitted; and

(B) documents in writing the basis for that determination.

(c) GAO REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date on which the regulation required by subsection (a) is published in the Federal Register, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress—

(1) an evaluation of—

(A) the conformance of the regulations with law; and

(B) the compliance by executive agencies with the regulations; and

(2) any recommendations that the Comptroller General considers appropriate.

(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''executive agency'' has the meaning given that term in section 4 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403).

Subtitle C—Contract Incentives

SEC. 1431. INCENTIVES FOR CONTRACT EFFICIENCY.

(a) INCENTIVES FOR CONTRACT EFFICIENCY.—The Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 41. INCENTIVES FOR EFFICIENT PERFORMANCE OF SERVICES CONTRACTS.

''(a) OPTIONS FOR SERVICES CONTRACTS.—An option included in a contract for services to extend the contract by one or more periods may provide that it be exercised on the basis of exceptional performance by the contractor. A contract that contains such an option provision shall include performance standards for measuring performance under the contract, and to the maximum extent practicable be performance-based. Such option provision shall only be exercised in accordance with applicable provisions of law or regulation that set forth restrictions on the duration of the contract containing the option.

''(b) DEFINITION OF PERFORMANCE-BASED.—In this section, the term 'performance-based', with respect to a contract, task order, or contracting, means that the contract, task order, or contracting, respectively, includes the use of performance work statements that set forth contract requirements in clear, specific, and objective terms with measurable outcomes.''.

(b) CLERICAL AND TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—(1) The table of contents in section 1(b) of such Act is amended by striking the last item and inserting the following:

''Sec. 40. Protection of constitutional rights of contractors.

''Sec. 41. Incentives for efficient performance of services contracts.''.

(2) The section before section 41 of such Act (as added by subsection (a)) is redesignated as section 40.

Subtitle D—Acquisitions of Commercial Items

SEC. 1441. ADDITIONAL INCENTIVE FOR USE OF PERFORMANCE-BASED CONTRACTING FOR SERVICES.

(a) OTHER CONTRACTS.—Section 41 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act, as added by section 1431, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

''(b) INCENTIVE FOR USE OF PERFORMANCE-BASED SERVICES CONTRACTS.—(1) A performance-based contract for the procurement of services entered into by an executive agency or a performance-based task order for services issued by an executive agency may be treated as a contract for the procurement of commercial items if—

''(A) the contract or task order sets forth specifically each task to be performed and, for each task—

''(i) defines the task in measurable, mission-related terms; and

''(ii) identifies the specific end products or output to be achieved; and

''(B) the source of the services provides similar services to the general public under terms and conditions similar to those offered to the Federal Government.

''(2) The regulations implementing this subsection shall require agencies to collect and maintain reliable data sufficient to identify the contracts or task orders treated as contracts for commercial items using the authority of this subsection. The data may be collected using the Federal Procurement Data System or other reporting mechanism.

''(3) Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall prepare and submit to the Committees on Governmental Affairs and on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committees on Government Reform and on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a report on the contracts or task orders treated as contracts for commercial items using the authority of this subsection. The report shall include data on the use of such authority both government-wide and for each department and agency.

''(4) The authority under this subsection shall expire 10 years after the date of the enactment of this subsection.''.

(b) CENTER OF EXCELLENCE IN SERVICE CONTRACTING.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy shall establish a center of excellence in contracting for services. The center of excellence shall assist the acquisition community by identifying, and serving as a clearinghouse for, best practices in contracting for services in the public and private sectors.

(c) REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED PROVISION.—Subsection (b) of section 821 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–218) is repealed.

SEC. 1442. AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL COMMERCIAL CONTRACT TYPES.

Section 8002(d) of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–355; 108 Stat. 3387; 41 U.S.C. 264 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''and'';

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) authority for use of a time and materials contract or a labor-hour contract for the procurement of commercial services that are commonly sold to the general public through such contracts.''

SEC. 1443. CLARIFICATION OF COMMERCIAL SERVICES DEFINITION.

Subparagraph (F) of section 4(12) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(12)(F)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''catalog or''; and

(2) by inserting ''or specific outcomes to be achieved'' after ''performed''.

SEC. 1444. DESIGNATION OF COMMERCIAL BUSINESS ENTITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403), as amended by section 1411, is further amended—

(1) by adding at the end of paragraph (12) the following new subparagraph:

''(I) Items or services produced or provided by a commercial entity.''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(17) The term 'commercial entity' means any enterprise whose primary customers are other than the Federal Government. In order to qualify as a commercial entity, at least 90 percent (in dollars) of the sales of the enterprise over the past three business years must have been made to private sector entities.''.

(b) COLLECTION OF DATA.—Regulations implementing the amendments made by subsection (a) shall require agencies to collect and maintain reliable data sufficient to identify the contracts entered into or task orders awarded for items or services produced or provided by a commercial entity. The data may be collected using the Federal Procurement Data System or other reporting mechanism.

(c) OMB REPORT.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall prepare and submit to

the Committees on Governmental Affairs and on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committees on Government Reform and on Armed Services of the House of Representatives a report on the contracts entered into or task orders awarded for items or services produced or provided by a commercial entity. The report shall include data on the use of such authority both government-wide and for each department and agency.

(d) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REVIEW.—The Comptroller General shall review the implementation of the amendments made by subsection (a) to evaluate the effectiveness of such implementation in increasing the availability of items and services to the Federal Government at fair and reasonable prices.

Subtitle E—Other Matters

SEC. 1451. AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO CERTAIN PROCUREMENT-RELATED TRANSACTIONS AND TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN PROTOTYPE PROJECTS.

Title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 251 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 318. AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS FOR DEFENSE AGAINST OR RECOVERY FROM TERRORISM OR NUCLEAR, BIOLOGICAL, CHEMICAL, OR RADIOLOGICAL ATTACK.

''(a) AUTHORITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of an executive agency who engages in basic research, applied research, advanced research, and development projects that—

''(A) are necessary to the responsibilities of such official's executive agency in the field of research and development, and

''(B) have the potential to facilitate defense against or recovery from terrorism or nuclear, biological, chemical, or radiological attack,

may exercise the same authority (subject to the same restrictions and conditions) with respect to such research and projects as the Secretary of Defense may exercise under section 2371 of title 10, United States Code, except for subsections (b) and (f) of such section 2371.

''(2) PROTOTYPE PROJECTS.—The head of an executive agency may, under the authority of paragraph (1), carry out prototype projects that meet the requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1) in accordance with the requirements and conditions provided for carrying out prototype projects under section 845 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103–160; 10 U.S.C. 2371 note). In applying the requirements and conditions of that section 845—

''(A) subsection (c) of that section shall apply with respect to prototype projects carried out under this paragraph; and

''(B) the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall perform the functions of the Secretary of Defense under subsection (d) of that section.

''(3) APPLICABILITY TO SELECTED EXECUTIVE AGENCIES.—

''(A) OMB AUTHORIZATION REQUIRED.—The head of an executive agency may exercise authority under this subsection only if authorized by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to do so.

''(B) RELATIONSHIP TO AUTHORITY OF DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.—The authority under this subsection shall not apply to the Secretary of Homeland Security while section 831 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-296; 116 Stat. 2224) is in effect.

''(b) ANNUAL REPORT.—The annual report of the head of an executive agency that is required under subsection (h) of section 2371 of title 10, United States Code, as applied to the head of the executive agency by subsection (a), shall be submitted to the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Government Reform of the House of Representatives.

''(c) REGULATIONS.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall prescribe regulations to carry out this section.''.

SEC. 1452. AUTHORITY TO MAKE INFLATION ADJUSTMENTS TO SIMPLIFIED ACQUISITION THRESHOLD.

Section 4(11) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403(11)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', except that such amount may be adjusted by the Administrator every five years to the amount equal to $100,000 in constant fiscal year 2003 dollars (rounded to the nearest $10,000)''.

SEC. 1453. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS RELATED TO DUPLICATIVE AMENDMENTS.

(a) REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED SUBCHAPTER AND RELATED CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Subchapter II of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, is repealed.

(2) Subchapter III of such chapter is redesignated as subchapter II.

(3) Section 3549 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking the sentence beginning with ''While this subchapter''.

(4) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking the items relating to sections 3531 through 3538; and

(B) by striking the heading ''SUBCHAPTER III—INFORMATION SECURITY''.

(5) Section 2224a of title 10, United States Code, is repealed, and the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 131 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to such section.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATED TO REPEALS OF SHARE-IN-SAVINGS AND SOLUTIONS-BASED CONTRACTING PILOT PROGRAMS.—(1) Chapter 115 of title 40, United States Code, is repealed.

(2) The table of chapters at the beginning of subtitle III of such title is amended by striking the item relating to chapter 115.

(c) AMENDMENTS MADE BY E-GOVERNMENT ACT MADE APPLICABLE.—The following provisions of law shall read as if the amendments made by title X of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–296) to such provisions did not take effect:

(1) Section 2224 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) Sections 20 and 21 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g-3 and 278g-4).

(3) Sections 11331 and 11332 of title 40, United States Code.

(4) Subtitle G of title X of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398; 44 U.S.C. 3531 note).

(5) Sections 3504(g), 3505, and 3506(g) of title 44, United States Code.

(d) CORRECTION OF CROSS REFERENCE.—Section 2224(c) of title 10, United States Code, as amended by section 301(c)(1)(B)(iii) of the E-Government Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–347; 116 Stat. 2955), is amended by striking ''subchapter III'' and inserting ''subchapter II''.

SEC. 1454. PROHIBITION ON USE OF QUOTAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—After the date of enactment of this Act, the Office of Management and Budget may not establish, apply, or enforce any numerical goal, target, or quota for subjecting the employees of a department or agency of the Government to public-private competitions or converting such employees or the work performed by such employees to contractor performance under Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76 or any other administrative regulation, directive, or policy unless the goal, target, or quota is based on considered research and sound analysis of past activities and is consistent with the stated mission of the department or agency.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—Subsection (a) shall not—

(1) otherwise affect the implementation or enforcement of the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (107 Stat. 285); or

(2) prevent any agency of the Executive branch from subjecting work performed by Federal employees or private contractors to public-private competition or conversions.

SEC. 1455. APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS TO SOLE SOURCE CONTRACTS FOR GOODS AND SERVICES TREATED AS COMMERCIAL ITEMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the amendments made by subtitle D of this Act, no contract for the procurement of services or goods awarded on a sole source basis shall be exempt from—

(1) cost accounting standards promulgated pursuant to section 26 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 422); and

(2) cost or pricing data requirements (commonly referred to as truth in negotiating) under section 2306a of title 10, United States Code, and section 304A of title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 254b).

(b) LIMITATION.—This section shall not apply to any contract in an amount not greater than $15,000,000.

SEC. 1456. PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF NONCOMPETITIVE CONTRACTING FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF INFRASTRUCTURE IN IRAQ.

(a) DISCLOSURE REQUIRED.—

(1) PUBLICATION AND PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The head of an executive agency of the United States that enters into a contract for the repair, maintenance, or construction of infrastructure in Iraq without full and open competition shall publish in the Federal Register or Commerce Business Daily and otherwise make available to the public, not later than 30 days after the date on which the contract is entered into, the following information:

(A) The amount of the contract.

(B) A brief description of the scope of the contract.

(C) A discussion of how the executive agency identified, and solicited offers from, potential contractors to perform the contract, together with a list of the potential contractors that were issued solicitations for the offers.

(D) The justification and approval documents on which was based the determination to use procedures other than procedures that provide for full and open competition.

(2) INAPPLICABILITY TO CONTRACTS AFTER FISCAL YEAR 2013.—Paragraph (1) does not apply to a contract entered into after September 30, 2013.

(b) CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—

(1) AUTHORITY TO WITHHOLD.—The head of an executive agency may—

(A) withhold from publication and disclosure under subsection (a) any document that is classified for restricted access in accordance with an Executive order in the interest of national defense or foreign policy; and

(B) redact any part so classified that is in a document not so classified before publication and disclosure of the document under subsection (a).

(2) AVAILABILITY TO CONGRESS.—In any case in which the head of an executive agency withholds information under paragraph (1), the head of such executive agency shall make available an unredacted version of the document containing that information to the chairman and ranking member of each of the following committees of Congress:

(A) The Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Government Reform of the House of Representatives.

(B) The Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives.

(C) Each committee that the head of the executive agency determines has legislative jurisdiction for the operations of such department or agency to which the information relates.

(c) FISCAL YEAR 2003 CONTRACTS.—This section shall apply to contracts entered into on or after October 1, 2002, except that, in the case of

a contract entered into before the date of the enactment of this Act, subsection (a) shall be applied as if the contract had been entered into on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER DISCLOSURE LAWS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as affecting obligations to disclose United States Government information under any other provision of law.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ''executive agency'' and ''full and open competition'' have the meanings given such terms in section 4 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 403).

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 2001. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the ''Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004''.

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 and 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	Redstone Arsenal	$5,500,000
Alaska	Fort Wainwright	$138,800,000
California	Fort Irwin	$3,350,000
Colorado	Fort Carson	$2,150,000
Georgia	Fort Benning	$34,500,000
	Fort Stewart/Hunter Army Air Field	$138,550,000
Hawaii	Helemano Military Reservation	$1,400,000
	Schofield Barracks	$128,100,000
Kansas	Fort Leavenworth	$115,000,000
	Fort Riley	$40,000,000
Kentucky	Fort Knox	$5,500,000
Louisiana	Fort Polk	$72,000,000
Maryland	Fort Meade	$9,600,000
Massachusetts	Soldier Systems Center, Natick	$5,500,000
Missouri	Fort Leonard Wood	$5,900,000
New Jersey	Naval Air Engineering Center, Lakehurst	$2,250,000
	Picatinny Arsenal	$11,800,000
New York	Fort Drum	$139,300,000
North Carolina	Fort Bragg	$163,400,000
Oklahoma	Fort Sill	$5,500,000
Texas	Fort Bliss	$5,400,000
	Fort Hood	$56,700,000
Virginia	Fort Belvoir	$7,000,000
	Fort Lee	$3,850,000
	Fort Myer	$9,000,000
Washington	Fort Lewis	$3,900,000
	Total	$1,108,500,000

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Subject to subsection (c), 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 and 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	$76,000,000
	Heidelberg	$17,000,000
	Hohenfels	$13,200,000
	Vilseck	$31,000,000
Italy	Aviano Air Base	$28,500,000
	Livorno	$22,000,000
Korea	Camp Humphreys	$191,150,000
Kwajalein	Kwajalein	$9,400,000
	Total	$388,250,000

(c) CONDITION ON PROJECTS AUTHORIZATION.—The authority of the Secretary of the Army to proceed with the projects at Camp Humphreys, Korea, referred to in the table in subsection (b), and to obligate amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2104(a)(2) in connection with such project, is subject to the condition that the Secretary submit to the congressional defense committees written notice in advance that the United States and the Republic of Korea have entered into an agreement to ensure the availability and use of land sufficient for such projects.

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, for the purposes, and in the amounts set forth in the following table:

Army: Family Housing

State or Country	Installation or location	Purpose	Amount
Alaska	Fort Wainwright	140 Units	$64,000,000
Arizona	Fort Huachuca	220 Units	$41,000,000
Kansas	Fort Riley	62 Units	$16,700,000
Kentucky	Fort Knox	178 Units	$41,000,000
New Mexico	White Sands Missile Range	58 Units	$14,600,000
Oklahoma	Fort Sill	120 Units	$25,373,000
Virginia	Fort Lee	90 Units	$18,000,000
		Total:	$220,673,000

(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 $34,488,000.

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 $156,030,000.

SEC. 2104. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, ARMY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2003, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Army in the total amount of $3,056,697,000, as follows:

(1) For military construction projects inside the United States authorized by section 2101(a), $902,000,000.

(2) For military construction projects outside the United States authorized by section 2101(b), $359,350,000.

(3) For unspecified minor construction projects authorized by section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, $22,550,000.

(4) For architectural and engineering services and construction design under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, $128,580,000.

(5) For military family housing functions:

(A) For construction and acquisition, planning and design, and improvement of military family housing and facilities, $409,191,000.

(B) For support of military family housing (including the functions described in section 2833 of title 10, United States Code), $1,043,026,000.

(6) For the construction of phase 3 of a barracks complex, D Street, at Fort Richardson, Alaska, authorized by section 2101(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (division B of Public Law 107–107; 115 Stat. 1280), as amended by section 2105 of this Act, $33,000,000.

(7) For the construction of phase 3 of a barracks complex, 17th and B Streets, at Fort Lewis, Washington, authorized by section 2101(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (division B of Public Law 107–107; 115 Stat. 1280), $48,000,000.

(8) For the construction of phase 2 of a barracks complex, Capron Road, at Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, 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), $49,000,000.

(9) For the construction of phase 2 of a barracks complex, Range Road, at Fort Campbell, Kentucky, 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), $49,000,000.

(10) For the construction of phase 2 of a consolidated 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), $13,000,000.

(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 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) $32,000,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2101(a) for construction of a barracks, Fort Stewart/Hunter Army Airfield, Georgia).

(3) $87,000,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2101(a) for construction of the Lewis and Clark Instructional Facility, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas).

(4) $43,000,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2101(a) for construction of a barracks complex, Wheeler Army Airfield, Fort Drum, New York).

(5) $50,000,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2101(a) for construction of a barracks complex, Bastogne Drive, Fort Bragg, North Carolina).

(6) $18,900,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2101(b) for construction of a barracks complex, Vilseck, Germany).

SEC. 2105. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2002 PROJECTS.

(a) MODIFICATION.—The table in section 2101(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (division B of Public Law 107-107; 115 Stat. 1281), as amended by section 2105 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (division B of Public Law 107–314; 116 Stat. 2689), is further amended—

(1) in the item relating to Fort Richardson, Alaska, by striking ''$115,000,000'' in the amount column and inserting ''$117,000,000''; and

(2) by striking the amount identified as the total in the amount column and inserting ''$1,364,750,000''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 2104(b)(2) of that Act (115 Stat. 1284) is amended by striking ''$52,000,000'' and inserting ''$54,000,000''.

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 and 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	$22,230,000
California	Marine Corps Air-Ground Task Force Training Center, Twentynine Palms	$42,090,000
	Marine Corps Air Station, Miramar	$7,640,000
	Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton	$73,580,000
	Naval Air Facility, San Clemente Island	$18,940,000
	Naval Air Station, Lemoore	$34,510,000
	Naval Air Station, North Island	$49,240,000
	Naval Air Warfare Center, China Lake	$12,230,000
	Naval Air Warfare Center, Point Mugu, San Nicholas Island	$6,150,000
	Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey	$42,560,000
	Naval Station, San Diego	$49,710,000
Connecticut	Naval Submarine Base, New London	$3,120,000
District of Columbia	Marine Corps Barracks	$1,550,000
Florida	Blount Island (Jacksonville)	$115,711,000
	Naval Air Station, Jacksonville	$9,190,000
	Naval Air Station, Whiting Field, Milton	$4,830,000
	Naval Surface Warfare Center, Coastal Systems Station, Panama City	$9,550,000
Georgia	Strategic Weapons Facility Atlantic, Kings Bay	$11,510,000
Hawaii	Fleet and Industrial Supply Center, Pearl Harbor	$32,180,000
	Naval Magazine, Lualualei	$6,320,000
	Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor	$7,010,000
Illinois	Naval Training Center, Great Lakes	$137,120,000
Indiana	Naval Surface Warfare Center, Crane	$11,400,000
Maryland	Naval Air Warfare Center, Patuxent River	$28,270,000
	Naval Surface Warfare Center, Indian Head	$14,850,000
Mississippi	Naval Air Station, Meridian	$4,570,000
	Naval Station, Pascagoula	$6,100,000
Nevada	Naval Air Station, Fallon	$4,700,000
New Jersey	Naval Air Warfare Center, Lakehurst	$20,681,000
	Naval Weapons Station, Earle	$123,720,000
North Carolina	Marine Corps Air Station, New River	$6,240,000
	Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune	$29,450,000
Rhode Island	Naval Station, Newport	$16,140,000
	Naval Undersea Warfare Center, Newport	$10,890,000

Navy: Inside the United States—Continued

State	Installation or location	Amount
South Carolina	Naval Weapons Station, Charleston	$2,350,000
Texas	Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi	$5,400,000
Virginia	Henderson Hall, Arlington	$1,970,000
	Marine Corps Combat Development Command, Quantico	$3,700,000
	Naval Air Station, Oceana	$10,000,000
	Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek	$3,810,000
	Naval Space Command Center, Dahlgren	$24,020,000
	Naval Station, Norfolk	$182,240,000
	Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth	$17,770,000
Washington	Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island	$4,350,000
	Naval Magazine, Indian Island	$2,240,000
	Naval Shipyard, Puget Sound	$12,120,000
	Naval Submarine Base, Bangor	$33,820,000
	Strategic Weapons Facility Pacific, Bangor	$6,530,000
Various Locations	Various Locations, CONUS	$56,360,000
	Total	$1,340,662,000

(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 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
Bahrain	Naval Support Activity, Bahrain	$18,030,000
Guam	Commander, United States Naval Forces, Marianas	$1,700,000
Italy	Naval Air Station, Sigonella	$48,749,000
	Naval Support Activity, La Maddalena	$39,020,000
United Kingdom	Joint Maritime Facility, St. Mawgan	$7,070,000
	Total	$114,569,000

SEC. 2202. FAMILY HOUSING.

(a) CONSTRUCTION AND ACQUISITION.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2204(a)(5)(A), the Secretary of the Navy may construct or acquire family housing units (including land acquisition and supporting facilities) at the installations, for the purposes, and in the amounts set forth in the following table:

Navy: Family Housing

State or Country	Installation or location	Purpose	Amount
California	Naval Air Station, Lemoore	187 Units	$41,585,000
Florida	Naval Air Station, Pensacola	25 Units	$4,447,000
North Carolina	Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point	339 Units	42,803,000
	Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune	519 Units	$68,531,000
		Total	$157,366,000

(b) PLANNING AND DESIGN.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriation in section 2204(a)(5)(A), the Secretary of the Navy 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 $8,381,000.

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)(5)(A), the Secretary of the Navy may improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $20,446,000.

SEC. 2204. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, NAVY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2003, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Navy in the total amount of $2,288,917,000, as follows:

(1) For military construction projects inside the United States authorized by section 2201(a), $1,005,882,000.

(2) For military construction projects outside the United States authorized by section 2201(b), $114,569,000.

(3) For unspecified minor construction projects authorized by section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, $13,624,000.

(4) For architectural and engineering services and construction design under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, $71,141,000.

(5) For military family housing functions:

(A) For construction and acquisition, planning and design, and improvement of military family housing and facilities, $184,193,000.

(B) For support of military family housing (including functions described in section 2833 of title 10, United States Code), $852,778,000.

(6) For construction of a bachelors enlisted quarters shipboard ashore at Naval Shipyard Norfolk, Virginia, authorized by section 2201(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (division B of Public Law 107-314; 116 Stat. 2687), $46,730,000.

(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) and (2) of subsection (a).

(2) $25,690,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2101(a) for construction of a tertiary sewage treatment facility, Marine Corp Base, Camp Pendleton, California).

(3) $58,190,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2101(a) for construction of a battle station training facility, Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois).

(4) $96,980,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2101(a) for construction of a general purpose berthing pier, Naval Weapons Station Earle, New Jersey).

(5) $118,170,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2101(a) for construction of the Pier 11 replacement, Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia).

(6) $28,750,000 (the balance of the amount authorized under section 2101(a) for construction of outlying landing field facilities, various locations in the continental United States).

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 and 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
Alabama	Maxwell Air Force Base	$26,000,000
Alaska	Eielson Air Force Base	$33,261,000
	Elmendorf Air Force Base	$2,000,000
Arizona	Davis-Monthan Air Force Base	$10,062,000
Arkansas	Little Rock Air Force Base	$7,445,000
California	Beale Air Force Base	$22,750,000
	Edwards Air Force Base	$26,744,000
	Vandenberg Air Force Base	$16,500,000
Colorado	Buckley Air Force Base	$7,019,000
District of Columbia	Bolling Air Force Base	$9,300,000
Florida	Hurlburt Field	$27,200,000
	Tyndall Air Force Base	$20,720,000
Georgia	Robins Air Force Base	$37,164,000
Hawaii	Hickam Air Force Base	$73,296,000
Idaho	Mountain Home Air Force Base	$5,445,000
Illinois	Scott Air Force Base	$1,900,000
Mississippi	Columbus Air Force Base	$2,200,000
	Keesler Air Force Base	$2,900,000
Missouri	Whiteman Air Force Base	$11,600,000
New Jersey	McGuire Air Force Base	$11,861,000
New Mexico	Kirtland Air Force Base	$11,247,000
	Tularosa Radar Test Site	$3,600,000
North Carolina	Pope Air Force Base	$24,499,000
	Seymour Johnson Air Force Base	$23,022,000
North Dakota	Minot Air Force Base	$3,190,000
Ohio	Wright-Patterson Air Force Base	$21,100,000
Oklahoma	Altus Air Force Base	$1,167,000
	Tinker Air Force Base	$19,444,000
South Carolina	Charleston Air Force Base	$9,042,000
	Shaw Air Force Base	$8,500,000
Texas	Goodfellow Air Force Base	$20,335,000
	Lackland Air Force Base	$57,360,000
	Laughlin Air Force Base	$12,400,000
	Sheppard Air Force Base	$38,167,000
Utah	Hill Air Force Base	$15,848,000
Virginia	Langley Air Force Base	$25,474,000
Washington	McChord Air Force Base	$19,000,000
	Total	$668,762,000

(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 and 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	$41,866,000
	Spangdahlem Air Base	$5,411,000
Italy	Aviano Air Base	$14,025,000
Korea	Kunsan Air Base	$7,059,000
	Osan Air Base	$16,638,000
Portugal	Lajes Field, Azores	$4,086,000
Turkey	Incirlik Air Base	$3,262,000
United Kingdom	Royal Air Force, Lakenheath	$42,487,000
	Royal Air Force, Mildenhall	$10,558,000
Wake Island	Wake Island	$24,000,000
	Total	$169,392,000

(c) UNSPECIFIED WORLDWIDE.—Using 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 installation and location, and in the amount, set forth in the following table:

Air Force: Unspecified Worldwide

Location	Installation or location	Amount
Unspecified Worldwide	Classified Location	$29,501,000
	Total	$29,501,000

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, for the purposes, and in the amounts set forth in the following table:

Air Force: Family Housing

State or Country	Installation or location	Purpose	Amount
Arizona	Davis-Monthan Air Force Base	93 Units	$19,357,000
California	Travis Air Force Base	56 Units	$12,723,000
Delaware	Dover Air Force Base	112 Units	$19,601,000
Florida	Eglin Air Force Base	279 Units	$32,166,000
Idaho	Mountain Home Air Force Base	186 Units	$37,126,000
Maryland	Andrews Air Force Base	50 Units	$20,233,000
Missouri	Whiteman Air Force Base	100 Units	$18,221,000
Montana	Malmstrom Air Force Base	94 Units	$19,368,000
North Carolina	Seymour Johnson Air Force Base	138 Units	$18,336,000
North Dakota	Grand Forks Air Force Base	144 Units	$29,550,000
	Minot Air Force Base	200 Units	$41,117,000
South Dakota	Ellsworth Air Force Base	75 Units	$16,240,000
Texas	Dyess Air Force Base	116 Units	$19,973,000
	Randolph Air Force Base	96 Units	$13,754,000
Korea	Osan Air Base	111 Units	$44,765,000
Portugal	Lajes Field, Azores	42 Units	$13,428,000
United Kingdom	Royal Air Force, Lakenheath	89 Units	$23,640,000
		Total	$399,598,000

(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 $33,488,000.

SEC. 2303. IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS.

Subject to section 2825 of title 10, Unites 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 $227,979,000.

SEC. 2304. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, AIR FORCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2003, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Air Force in the total amount of $2,477,609,000, as follows:

(1) For military construction projects inside the United States authorized by section 2301(a), $660,282,000.

(2) For military construction projects outside the United States authorized by section 2301(b), $169,392,000.

(3) For military construction projects at unspecified worldwide locations authorized by section 2301(c), $28,981,000.

(4) For unspecified minor 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, $115,421,000.

(6) For military housing functions:

(A) For construction and acquisition, planning and design, and improvement of military family housing and facilities, $657,065,000.

(B) For support of military family housing (including functions described in section 2833 of title 10, United States Code), $834,468,000.

(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 2405(a)(1), the Secretary of Defense may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installations and 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 Education Activity	Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina	$15,259,000
Defense Logistics Agency	Defense Distribution Depot, New Cumberland, Pennsylvania	$27,700,000
	Eglin Air Force Base, Florida	$4,800,000
	Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska	$17,000,000
	Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii	$14,100,000
	Hurlburt Field, Florida	$4,100,000
	Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska	$13,400,000
	Langley Air Force Base, Virginia	$13,000,000
	Laughlin Air Force Base, Texas	$4,688,000
	McChord Air Force Base, Washington	$8,100,000
	Naval Air Station, Kingsville, Texas	$9,200,000
	Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada	$12,800,000
National Security Agency	Fort Meade, Maryland	$1,842,000
Special Operations Command	Dam Neck, Virginia	$15,281,000
	Fort Benning, Georgia	$2,100,000
	Fort Bragg, North Carolina	$36,300,000
	Fort Campbell, Kentucky	$7,800,000
	Harrisburg International Airport, Pennsylvania	$3,000,000
	Hurlburt Field, Florida	$6,000,000
	MacDill, Air Force Base, Florida	$25,500,000
	Naval Amphibious Base, Coronado, California	$2,800,000
TRICARE Management Activity	Fort Hood, Texas	$9,400,000
	Naval Station, Anacostia, District of Columbia	$15,714,000
	Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut	$6,700,000
	United States Air Force Academy, Colorado	$22,100,000
	Walter Reed Medical Center, District of Columbia	$9,000,000
Washington Headquarters Services	Arlington, Virginia	$38,086,000
	Total	$345,770,000

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2405(a)(2), the Secretary of Defense may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects for the installations and 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*
	Heidelberg, Germany	*$3,086,000*
	Vilseck, Germany	*$1,773,000*
	Sigonella, Italy	*$30,234,000*
	Vicenza, Italy	*$16,374,000*
	Camp Humphreys, Korea	*$31,683,000*
Special Operations Command	*Stuttgart, Germany*	*$11,400,000*
TRICARE Management Activity	*Anderson Air Force Base, Guam*	*$26,000,000*
	Grafenwoehr, Germany	*$12,585,000*
	Total	*$169,382,000*

SEC. 2402. FAMILY HOUSING.

Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2405(a)(8)(A), the Secretary of Defense 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 $300,000.

SEC. 2403. 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 2405(a)(8)(A), the Secretary of Defense may improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $50,000.

SEC. 2404. ENERGY CONSERVATION PROJECTS.

Using amounts appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations in section 2405(a)(6), the Secretary of Defense may carry out energy conservation projects under section 2865 of title 10, United States Code, in the amount of $69,500,000.

SEC. 2405. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, DEFENSE AGENCIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2003, 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 $1,223,066,000, as follows:

(1) For military construction projects inside the United States authorized by section 2401(a), $343,570,000.

(2) For military construction projects outside the United States authorized by section 2401(b), $152,017,000.

(3) For unspecified minor construction projects under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, $16,153,000.

(4) For contingency construction projects of the Secretary of Defense under section 2804 of title 10, United States Code, $8,960,000.

(5) For architectural and engineering services and construction design under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, $66,834,000.

(6) For energy conservation projects authorized by section 2404, $69,500,000.

(7) 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), $370,427,000.

(8) For military family housing functions:

(A) For planning, design, and improvement of military family housing and facilities, $350,000.

(B) For support of military family housing (including functions described in section 2833 of title 10, United States Code), $49,440,000.

(C) For credit to the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund established by section 2883(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code, $300,000.

(9) For construction of the Defense Threat Reduction Center at Fort Belvoir, Virginia, authorized by section 2401(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (division B of Public Law 107–314; 116 Stat. 2695), $25,700,000.

(10) For the construction of phase 5 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), $88,388,000.

(11) For the construction of phase 6 of an ammunition demilitarization facility at Newport Army Ammunition Plant, Indiana, authorized by section 2401(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (division B of Public Law 105–261; 112 Stat. 2193), as amended by section 2406 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (division B of Public Law 107–314; 116 Stat. 2698), $15,207,000.

(12) For the construction of phase 4 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 for Fiscal Year 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), $16,220,000.

(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 total amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a).

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, 2003, 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 $169,300,000.

TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

SEC. 2601. AUTHORIZED GUARD AND RESERVE CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 2003, 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, $253,788,000; and

(B) for the Army Reserve, $89,840,000.

(2) For the Department of the Navy, for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, $45,762,000.

(3) For the Department of the Air Force—

(A) for the Air National Guard of the United States, $123,408,000; and

(B) for the Air Force Reserve, $61,143,000.

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, 2006; or

(2) the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2007.

(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, 2006; or

(2) the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for fiscal year 2007 for military construction projects, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, and contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment program.

SEC. 2702. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2001 PROJECT.

(a) EXTENSION OF CERTAIN PROJECT.—Notwithstanding section 2701 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), the authorization set forth in the table in subsection (b), as provided in section 2102 of that Act, shall remain in effect until October 1, 2004, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2005, whichever is later.

(b) TABLE.—The table referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

Army: Extension of 2001 Project Authorization

State	Installation or location	Project	Amount
South Carolina	Fort Jackson	New Construction—GFOQ	$250,000

SEC. 2703. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 2000 PROJECTS.

(a) EXTENSION.—Notwithstanding section 2701 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (division B of Public Law 106–65; 113 Stat. 841), the authorizations set forth in the tables in subsection (b), as provided in section 2302 or 2601 of that Act and extended by section 2702 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (division B of Public Law 107–314; 116 Stat. 2700), shall remain in effect until October 1, 2004, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2005, whichever is later.

(b) TABLES.—The tables referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

Air Force: Extension of 2000 Project Authorization

State	Installation or location	Project	Amount
Oklahoma	Tinker Air Force Base	Replace Family Housing (41 Units)	$6,000,000

Army National Guard: Extension of 2000 Project Authorization

State	Installation or location	Project	Amount
Virginia	Fort Pickett	Multi-purpose Range-Heavy	$13,500,000

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, 2003; or

(2) the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE XXVIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes

SEC. 2801. INCREASE IN MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF AUTHORIZED ANNUAL EMERGENCY CONSTRUCTION.

Section 2803(c)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''$30,000,000'' and inserting ''$45,000,000''.

SEC. 2802. AUTHORITY TO LEASE MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS IN ITALY.

Section 2828(e)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''2,000 units'' and inserting ''2,800 units''.

SEC. 2803. CHANGES TO ALTERNATIVE AUTHORITY FOR ACQUISITION AND IMPROVEMENT OF MILITARY HOUSING.

(a) SPACE LIMITATIONS BY PAY GRADE.—Section 2880(b)(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''unless the unit is located on a military installation''.

(b) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE HOUSING FUND.—(1) Section 2883 of such title is amended by striking subsections (a), (b), and (c) and inserting the following new subsections (a) and (b):

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established on the books of the Treasury an account to be known as the Department of Defense Housing Improvement Fund (in this section referred to as the 'Fund').

''(b) CREDITS TO FUND.—There shall be credited to the Fund the following:

''(1) Amounts authorized for and appropriated to the Fund.

''(2) Subject to subsection (e), any amounts that the Secretary of Defense transfers, in such amounts as are provided for in appropriation Acts, to the Fund from amounts authorized and appropriated to the Department of Defense for the acquisition or construction of military family housing or military unaccompanied housing.

''(3) Proceeds from the conveyance or lease of property or facilities under section 2878 of this title for the purpose of carrying out activities under this subchapter with respect to military family housing or military unaccompanied housing.

''(4) Income derived from any activities under this subchapter with respect to military family housing or military unaccompanied housing, income and gains realized from investments under section 2875 of this title, and any return of capital invested as part of such investments.

''(5) Any amounts that the Secretary of the Navy transfers to the Fund pursuant to section 2814(i)(3) of this title, subject to the restrictions on the use of the transferred amounts specified in that section.''.

(2) Such section is further amended—

(A) by redesignating subsections (d) through (g) as (c) through (f), respectively;

(B) in subsection (c), as so redesignated—

(i) in the subsection heading, by striking ''FUNDS'' and inserting ''FUND'';

(ii) in paragraph (1)—

(I) by striking ''subsection (e)'' and inserting ''subsection (d)''; and

(II) by striking ''Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund'' and inserting ''Fund'';

(iii) by striking paragraph (2); and

(iv) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2);

(C) in subsection (e), as so redesignated, by striking ''a Fund under paragraph (1)(B) or (2)(B) of subsection (c)'' and inserting ''the Fund under subsection (b)(2)''; and

(D) in subsection (f), as so redesignated, by striking ''$850,000,000'' in paragraph (1) and inserting ''$900,000,000''.

(c) TRANSFER OF UNOBLIGATED AMOUNTS.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall transfer to the Department of Defense Housing Improvement Fund established under section 2883(a) of title 10, United States Code (as amended by subsection (b)), any amounts in the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund and the Department of Defense Military Unaccompanied Housing Improvement that remain available for obligation as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) Amounts transferred to the Department of Defense Housing Improvement Fund under paragraph (1) shall be merged with amounts in that Fund, and shall be available for the same purposes, and subject to the same conditions and limitations, as other amounts in that Fund.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Paragraph (3) of section 2814(i) of such title is amended—

(A) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following new subparagraph (A):

''(A) The Secretary may transfer funds from the Ford Island Improvement Account to the Department of Defense Housing Improvement Fund established by section 2883(a) of this title.''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''a fund'' and inserting ''the Fund''.

(2) Section 2871(6) of such title is amended by striking ''Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund or the Department of Defense Military Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund'' and inserting ''Department of Defense Housing Improvement Fund''.

(3) Section 2875(e) of such title is amended by striking ''Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund or the Department of Defense Military Unaccompanied Housing Improvement Fund'' and inserting ''Department of Defense Housing Improvement Fund''.

(e) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—(1) The section heading for section 2883 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''§ 2883. Department of Defense Housing Improvement Fund''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning subchapter IV of chapter 169 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 2883 and inserting the following new item:

''2883. Department of Defense Housing Improvement Fund.''.

SEC. 2804. ADDITIONAL MATERIAL FOR ANNUAL REPORT ON HOUSING PRIVATIZATION PROGRAM.

Section 2884(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', and such recommendations as the Secretary considers necessary for improving the extent and effectiveness of the use of such authorities in the future''; and

(2) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

''(3) A review of activities of the Secretary under this subchapter during such preceding fiscal year, shown for military family housing, military unaccompanied housing, dual military family housing and military unaccompanied housing, and ancillary supporting facilities.

''(4) If a contract for the acquisition or construction of military family housing, military unaccompanied housing, or dual military family housing and military unaccompanied housing

entered into during the preceding fiscal year did not include the acquisition or construction of the types of ancillary supporting facilities specifically referred to in section 2871(1) of this title, a explanation of the reasons why such ancillary supporting facilities were not included.

''(5) A description of the Secretary's plans for housing privatization activities under this subchapter (A) during the fiscal year for which the budget is submitted, and (B) during the period covered by the then-current future-years defense plan under section 221 of this title.''.

SEC. 2805. AUTHORITY TO CONVEY PROPERTY AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS CLOSED OR TO BE CLOSED IN EXCHANGE FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) Subchapter III of chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 2869. Conveyance of property at military installations closed or to be closed in exchange for military construction activities

''(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED; CONSIDERATION.—The Secretary of Defense may enter into an agreement to convey real property, including any improvements thereon, located on a military installation that is closed or realigned under a base closure law to any person who agrees, in exchange for the real property—

''(1) to carry out, or provide services in connection with, an authorized military construction project; or

''(2) to transfer to the Secretary of Defense housing that is constructed or provided by the person and located at or near a military installation at which there is a shortage of suitable military family housing or military unaccompanied housing (or both).

''(b) CONDITIONS ON CONVEYANCE AUTHORITY.—A conveyance of real property may be made under subsection (a) only if—

''(1) the fair market value of the consideration to be received in exchange for the real property conveyed under subsection (a) is equal to or greater than the fair market value of the property, including any improvements thereon, as determined by the Secretary concerned; and

''(2) in the event the fair market value of the consideration to be received is equal to at least 90 percent, but less than 100 percent, of the fair market value of the real property to be conveyed, including any improvements thereon, the recipient of the property agrees to pay to the Secretary of Defense an amount equal to the difference in the fair market values.

''(c) USE OF AUTHORITY.—(1) To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary of Defense shall use the authority provided by subsection (a) to convey at least 20 percent of the total acreage conveyed each fiscal year at military installations closed or realigned under the base closure laws. Notice of the proposed use of this authority shall be provided in such manner as the Secretary may prescribe, including publication in the Federal Register and otherwise. In determining such total acreage for a fiscal year, the Secretary shall exclude real property identified in a redevelopment plan as property essential to the reuse or redevlopment of a military installation closed or to be closed under a base closure law.

''(2) To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary of Defense shall endeavor to use the authority provided by subsection (a) to obtain military construction and military housing services having a total value of at least $200,000,000 each fiscal year for each of the military departments.

''(3) The Secretary concerned shall utilize the authority provided in subsection (a) in lieu of obligating and expending funds appropriated for military construction and military housing projects that are authorized by law.

''(d) DEPOSIT OF FUNDS.—The Secretary of Defense may deposit funds received under subsection (b)(2) in the Department of Defense Housing Improvement Fund established under section 2883(a) of this title.

''(e) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Secretary of Defense shall include each year in the materials that the Secretary submits to Congress in support of the budget submitted by the President pursuant to section 1105 of title 31 a report detailing the extent to which the Secretary used the authority provided by subsection (a) to convey real property in exchange for military construction and military housing and plans for the use of such authority for the future. The report shall include the following:

''(1) The total value of the real property that was actually conveyed during the preceding fiscal year using the authority provided by subsection (a).

''(2) The total value of the military construction and military housing services obtained in exchange, and, if the dollar goal specified in subsection (c)(2) was not achieved for a military department, an explanation regarding the reasons why the goal was not achieved.

''(3) The current inventory of unconveyed lands at military installations closed or realigned under a base closure law.

''(4) A description of the results of conveyances under subsection (a) during the preceding fiscal year and plans for such conveyances for the current fiscal year, the fiscal year covered by the budget, and the period covered by the current future-years defense program under section 221 of this title.

''(f) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of real property conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by surveys satisfactory to the Secretary of Defense.

''(g) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary of Defense may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with a conveyance under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such subchapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''2869. Conveyance of property at military installations closed or to be closed in exchange for military construction activities.''.

(b) EXCEPTION TO REQUIREMENT FOR AUTHORIZATION OF NUMBER OF HOUSING UNITS.—Section 2822 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) Housing units constructed or provided under section 2869 of this title.''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND.—Section 2883(b) of such title, as amended by section 2803, is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) Any amounts that the Secretary concerned transfers to the Fund pursuant to section 2869 of this title.''.

(d) CONFORMING REPEALS TO BASE CLOSURE LAWS.—(1) Section 204(e) of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (Public Law 100–526; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) is repealed.

(2) Section 2905(f) 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 repealed.

SEC. 2806. CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS AND LIMITATIONS REGARDING USE OF OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FUNDS FOR CONSTRUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2809 the following new section:

''§ 2810. Use of operation and maintenance funds for construction: notification and reporting requirements and limitations

''(a) ADVANCE NOTIFICATION OF OBLIGATION OF FUNDS.—(1) The Secretary concerned shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress advance written notice before appropriations available for operation and maintenance are obligated for construction described in paragraph (2). The notice shall be submitted not later than 14 days before the date on which appropriations available for operation and maintenance are first obligated for that construction and shall contain the information required by subsection (c).

''(2) Paragraph (1) applies with respect to any construction having an estimated total cost of more than $1,500,000, but not more than $5,000,000, which is paid for in whole or in part using appropriations available for operation and maintenance, if—

''(A) the construction is necessary to meet urgent military operational requirements of a temporary nature;

''(B) the construction was not carried out at a military installation where the United States is reasonably expected to have a long-term interest or presence;

''(C) the United States has no intention of using the construction after the operational requirement has been satisfied; and

''(D) the level of construction is the minimum necessary to meet the temporary operational need.

''(b) WAIVER AUTHORITY; CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—(1) The Secretary concerned may waive the advance notice requirement under subsection (a) on a case-by-case basis if the Secretary determines that—

''(A) the project is vital to the national security or to the protection of health, safety, or the quality of the environment; and

''(B) the requirement for the construction is so urgent that deferral of the construction during the period specified in subsection (a)(1) would be inconsistent with national security or the protection of health, safety, or environmental quality, as the case may be.

''(2) Not later than five days after the date on which a waiver is granted under paragraph (1), the Secretary concerned shall provide to the appropriate committees of Congress written notice containing the reasons for the waiver and the information required by subsection (c) with regard to the construction for which the waiver was granted.

''(c) CONTENT OF NOTICE.—The notice provided under subsection (a) or (b) with regard to construction funded using appropriations available for operation and maintenance shall include the following:

''(1) A description of the purpose for which the funds are being obligated.

''(2) An estimate of the total amount to be obligated for the construction.

''(3) The reasons appropriations available for operation and maintenance are being used.

''(d) LIMITATIONS ON USE OF OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FUNDS.—(1) The Secretary concerned shall not use appropriations available for operation and maintenance to carry out any construction having an estimated total cost of more than $5,000,000.

''(2) The total cost of construction carried out by the Secretaries concerned in whole or in part using appropriations available for operation and maintenance shall not exceed $200,000,000 in any fiscal year.

''(e) QUARTERLY REPORT.—The Secretary concerned shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a quarterly report on the worldwide obligation and expenditure of appropriations available for operation and maintenance by the Secretary concerned for construction during the preceding quarter.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such subchapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2809 the following new item:

''2810. Use of operation and maintenance funds for construction: notification and reporting requirements and limitations.''.

SEC. 2807. INCREASE IN AUTHORIZED MAXIMUM LEASE TERM FOR FAMILY HOUSING AND OTHER FACILITIES IN CERTAIN FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

(a) LEASE OF MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING.—Section 2828(d)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''ten years,'' and inserting ''10 years, or 15 years in the case of leases in Korea,''.

(b) LEASES OF OTHER FACILITIES.—Section 2675 of such title is amended by inserting after ''five years,'' the following: ''or 15 years in the case of a lease in Korea,''.

Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration

SEC. 2811. REAL PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS.

(a) INCREASE IN LAND ACQUISITION AUTHORITY COST THRESHOLD.—Section 2672 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking ''$500,000'' both places it appears and inserting ''$1,500,000''.

(b) PROMPT NOTIFICATION OF CERTAIN LAND ACQUISITIONS.—Section 2672a of such title is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking ''he or his designee'' and inserting ''the Secretary'';

(2) in subsection (b), by striking the last sentence; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) Not later than 10 days after the determination is made under subsection (a)(1) that acquisition of an interest in land is needed in the interest of the national defense, the Secretary of the military department making that determination shall provide to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives written notice containing a description of the property and interest to be acquired and the reasons for the acquisition.''.

(c) MODIFICATION OF RELATED NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.—Section 2662 of such title is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''30 days'' and all that follows through ''is submitted'' and inserting ''14 days after the beginning of the month with respect to which a single report containing the facts concerning such transaction and all other such proposed transactions for that month is submitted, not later than the first day of that month,''; and

(B) by striking ''$500,000'' each place it appears and inserting ''$1,500,000'';

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''more than'' and all that follows through ''$500,000'' and inserting ''more than $250,000 but not more than $1,500,000'';

(3) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking ''$500,000'' and inserting ''$1,000,000''; and

(B) by striking ''thirty days'' and inserting ''14 days''; and

(4) in subsection (g)(3), by striking ''30 days'' and inserting ''14 days''.

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—(1) The heading of section 2672 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''§2672. Authority to acquire low-cost interests in land''.

(2) The item relating to section 2672 in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 159 of such title is amended to read as follows:

''2672. Authority to acquire low-cost interests in land.''.

Subtitle C—Land Conveyances

SEC. 2821. TERMINATION OF LEASE AND CONVEYANCE OF ARMY RESERVE FACILITY, CONWAY, ARKANSAS.

(a) TERMINATION OF LEASE.—Upon the completion of the replacement facility authorized for the Army Reserve facility located in Conway, Arkansas, the Secretary of the Army may terminate the 99-year lease between the Secretary and the University of Central Arkansas for the property on which the old facility is located.

(b) CONVEYANCE OF FACILITY.—As part of the termination of the lease under subsection (a), the Secretary may convey, without consideration, to the University of Central Arkansas all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Army Reserve facility located on the leased property.

(c) ASSUMPTION OF LIABILITY.—The University of Central Arkansas shall expressly accept any and all liability pertaining to the physical condition of the Army Reserve facility conveyed under subsection (b) and shall hold the United States harmless from any and all liability arising from the facility's physical condition.

SEC. 2822. ACTIONS TO QUIET TITLE, FALLIN WATERS SUBDIVISION, EGLIN AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA.

(a) AUTHORITY TO QUIET TITLE.—Notwithstanding the restoration provisions under the heading ''QUARTERMASTER CORPS'' in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1940 (Act of June 27, 1940; chapter 437; 54 Stat. 655), the Secretary of the Air Force may take appropriate action to quiet title to tracts of land referred to in paragraph (2) on, at, adjacent, adjoining, or near Eglin Air Force Base, Florida. The Secretary may take such action in order to resolve encroachments upon private property by the United States and upon property of the United States by private parties, which resulted from reliance on inaccurate surveys.

(2) The tracts of land referred to in paragraph (1) are generally described as south of United States Highway 98 and bisecting the north/south section line of sections 13 and 14, township 2 south, range 25 west, located in the platted subdivision of Fallin Waters, Okaloosa County, Florida. The exact acreage and legal description of such tracts of land shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary.

(b) AUTHORIZED ACTIONS.—In carrying out subsection (a), appropriate action by the Secretary may include any of the following:

(1) Disclaiming, on behalf of the United States, any intent by the United States to acquire by prescription any property at or in the vicinity of Eglin Air Force Base.

(2) Disposing of tracts of land owned by the United States.

(3) Acquiring tracts of land by purchase, by donation, or by exchange for tracts of land owned by the United States at or adjacent to Eglin Air Force Base.

(c) ACREAGE LIMITATIONS.—Individual tracts of land acquired or conveyed by the Secretary under paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (a) may not exceed .10 acres. The total acreage so acquired may not exceed two acres.

(d) CONSIDERATION.—Any conveyance by the Secretary under this section may be made, at the discretion of the Secretary, without consideration, or by exchange for tracts of land adjoining Eglin Air Force Base in possession of private parties who mistakenly believed that they had acquired title to such tracts.

SEC. 2823. MODIFICATION OF LAND CONVEYANCE, EGLIN AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA.

(a) MODIFICATION.—Public Law 91-347 (84 Stat. 447) is amended—

(1) in the first section, by inserting ''or for other public purposes'' before the period at the end; and

(2) in section 3(1)—

(A) by inserting ''or for other public purposes'' after ''schools''; and

(B) by striking ''such purpose'' and inserting ''such a purpose''.

(b) ALTERATION OF LEGAL INSTRUMENT.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall execute and file in the appropriate office an amended deed or other appropriate instrument effectuating the modification of the reversionary interest retained by the United States in connection with the conveyance made pursuant to Public Law 91-347.

SEC. 2824. LAND CONVEYANCE, FORT CAMPBELL, KENTUCKY AND TENNESSEE.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of the Army may convey to the department of transportation of the State of Tennessee (in this section referred to as the ''department'') all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property (right-of-way), including any improvements thereon, located at Fort Campbell, Kentucky and Tennessee, for the purpose of realigning and upgrading United States Highway 79 from a two-lane highway to a four-lane highway.

(b) CONSIDERATION.—(1) As consideration for the conveyance under subsection (a), the department shall pay from any source (including Federal funds made available to the State from the Highway Trust Fund) all of the costs of the Secretary incurred—

(A) to convey the property, including costs related to the preparation of documents under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), surveys (including all surveys required under subsection (c)), cultural reviews, and administrative oversight;

(B) to relocate a cemetery to permit the highway realignment and upgrading;

(C) to acquire approximately 200 acres of mission-essential replacement property required to support the training mission at Fort Campbell; and

(D) to dispose of residual Federal property located south of the realigned highway.

(2) The Secretary may accept funds under this subsection from the Federal Highway Administration or the State of Tennessee to pay costs described in paragraph (1) and credit them to the appropriate Department of the Army accounts for the purpose of paying such costs.

(3) All funds accepted by the Secretary under this subsection shall remain available until expended.

(c) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the property to be conveyed under subsection (a) or acquired and disposed of under section (b) 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 conveyance under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 2825. LAND CONVEYANCE, ARMY AND AIR FORCE EXCHANGE SERVICE PROPERTY, DALLAS, TEXAS.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of Defense may authorize the Army and Air Force Exchange Service, a nonappropriated fund instrumentality of the United States, to convey, by sale, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property, including any improvements thereon, located at 1515 Roundtable Drive in Dallas, Texas.

(b) CONSIDERATION.—As consideration for conveyance under subsection (a), the purchaser shall pay to the Secretary, in a single lump sum payment, an amount equal to the fair market value of the real property conveyed, as determined by the Secretary. Section 574(a) of title 40, United States Code, shall apply with respect to the amounts received by the Secretary under this subsection.

(c) 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 purchaser.

(d) 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. 2826. LAND CONVEYANCE, NAVAL RESERVE CENTER, ORANGE, TEXAS.

(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of the Navy may convey to the City of Orange, Texas (in this section referred to as the ''City''), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of unimproved real property consisting of approximately 2.5 acres at Naval Reserve Center, Orange, Texas for the purpose of permitting the City to use the property for road construction, economic development, and other public purposes.

(b) CONSIDERATION.—As consideration for the conveyance under subsection (a), the City shall provide the United States, whether by cash payment, in-kind contribution, or a combination thereof, an amount that is not less than the fair market value, as determined by the Secretary, of the property conveyed under such subsection.

(c) PAYMENT OF COSTS OF CONVEYANCE.—(1) The Secretary may require the City 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 City 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 City.

(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) 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.

(e) 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.

(f) 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.

Subtitle D—Other Matters

SEC. 2841. REDESIGNATION OF YUMA TRAINING RANGE COMPLEX AS BOB STUMP TRAINING RANGE COMPLEX.

The military aviation training facility located in southwestern Arizona and southeastern California and known as the Yuma Training Range Complex shall be known and designated as the ''Bob Stump Training Range Complex''. Any reference to such training range complex in any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States shall be considered to be a reference to the Bob Stump Training Range Complex.

SEC. 2842. MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT A ROUND OF REALIGNMENTS AND CLOSURES OF MILITARY INSTALLATIONS IN 2005.

(a) REVISION TO FORCE STRUCTURE PLAN FOR 2005 ROUND.—Section 2912(a) 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) by striking subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(A) A force-structure plan for the Armed Forces that—

''(i) at a minimum, assumes the force structure under the 1991 Base Force force structure (as defined in paragraph (5)) that is also known as the 'Cheney-Powell force structure'; and

''(ii) includes such consideration as the Secretary considers appropriate of an assessment by the Secretary of—

''(I) the probable threats to the national security during the 20-year period beginning with fiscal year 2005;

''(II) 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) needed to meet those threats; and

''(III) the anticipated levels of funding that will be available for national defense purposes during such period.'';

(2) in paragraph (2)(A), by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', based upon an assumption that there are no installations available outside the United States for the permanent basing of elements of the Armed Forces'';

(3) in paragraph (4), by inserting after the first sentence the following new sentence: ''Any such revision shall be consistent with this subsection.''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) BASE FORCE.—In this subsection, the term '1991 Base Force force structure' means the force structure plan for the Armed Forces, known as the 'Base Force', that was adopted by the Secretary of Defense in November 1990 based upon recommendations of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and as incorporated in the President's budget for fiscal year 1992, as submitted to Congress in February 1991 and that assumed the following force structure:

''(A) For the Department of Defense, 1,600,000 members of the Armed Forces on active duty and 900,000 members in an active status in the reserve components.

''(B) For the Army, 12 active divisions, six National Guard divisions, and two cadre divisions or their equivalents.

''(C) For the Navy, 12 aircraft carrier battle groups or their equivalents and 451 naval vessels, including 85 attack submarines.

''(D) For the Marine Corps, three active and one Reserve divisions and three active and one Reserve air wings.

''(E) For the Air Force, 15 active fighter wings and 11 National Guard fighter wings or their equivalents.''.

(b) PREPARATION OF LIST OF MILITARY INSTALLATIONS EXCLUDED FROM CONSIDERATION IN 2005 ROUND.—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 by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(g) BASE EXCLUSION CRITERIA.—In preparing the selection criteria required by this section that will be used in making recommendations for the closure or realignment of military installations inside the United States, the Secretary shall ensure that the final criteria reflect the requirement to develop a list of those military installations to be excluded from the base closure and realignment process, as provided in subsection (h).

''(h) LIST OF INSTALLATIONS EXCLUDED FROM CONSIDERATION FOR CLOSURE OR REALIGNMENT.—(1) Before preparing the list required by section 2914(a) of the military installations inside the United States that the Secretary recommends for closure or realignment, the Secretary shall prepare a list of core military installations that the Secretary considers absolutely essential to the national defense and that should not be considered for closure.

''(2) Not later than April 1, 2005, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees, publish in the Federal Register, and send to the Commission the list required by paragraph (1). The list shall contain at least 50 percent of the total number of military installations located inside the United States as of the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004.

''(3) The Commission shall consider the list based on the final criteria developed under subsection (e). The Commission may modify this list, in the manner provided in section 2903(d) and section 2914(d), if the Commission finds that the inclusion of a military installation on the list substantially violates the criteria. The Commission shall forward to the President, not later than April 30, 2005, a report containing its recommendations regarding the list, which must comply with the percentages specified in paragraph (2). The Comptroller General shall also comply with section 2903(d)(5) by that date.

''(4) If the Commission submits a report to the President under paragraph (3), the President shall notify Congress, not later than May 10, 2005, regarding whether the President approves or disapproves the report. If the President disapproves the report, the Commission shall be dissolved, and the process by which military installations may be selected for closure or realignment under this part in 2005 shall be terminated.

''(5) A military installation included on the exclusion list approved under this subsection may not be included on the closure and realignment list prepared under section 2914(a) or otherwise considered for closure or realignment as part of the base closure process in 2005.''.

SEC. 2843. USE OF FORCE-STRUCTURE PLAN FOR THE ARMED FORCES IN PREPARATION OF SELECTION CRITERIA FOR BASE CLOSURE ROUND.

Section 2913(a) 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 by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) USE OF FORCE-STRUCTURE PLAN.—In preparing the proposed and final criteria to be used by the Secretary in making recommendations under section 2914 for the closure or realignment of military installations inside the United States, the Secretary shall use the force-structure plan for the Armed Forces prepared under section 2912(a).''

SEC. 2844. REQUIREMENT FOR UNANIMOUS VOTE OF DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION TO RECOMMEND CLOSURE OF MILITARY INSTALLATION NOT RECOMMENDED FOR CLOSURE 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) in paragraph (5)—

(A) by inserting ''AND UNANIMOUS VOTE'' after ''SITE VISIT''; and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end the following: ''and the decision of the Commission to recommend the closure of the installation is unanimous''.

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 2004 for the activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration in carrying out programs necessary for national security in the amount of $8,822,075,000, to be allocated as follows:

(1) For weapons activities, $6,393,000,000.

(2) For defense nuclear nonproliferation activities, $1,312,695,000.

(3) For naval reactors, $768,400,000.

(4) For the Office of the Administrator for Nuclear Security, $347,980,000.

(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 04–D–101, test capabilities revitalization, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, New Mexico, $36,450,000.

Project 04–D–102, exterior communications infrastructure modernization, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, New Mexico, $20,000,000.

Project 04–D–103, project engineering and design, various locations, $2,000,000.

Project 04–D–104, national security sciences building, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico, $38,000,000.

Project 04–D–125, chemistry and metallurgy facility replacement project, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico, $20,500,000.

Project 04–D–126, Building 12-44 production cells upgrade, Pantex plant, Amarillo, Texas, $8,780,000.

Project 04–D–127, cleaning and loading modifications, Savannah River Site, Aiken, South Carolina, $2,750,000.

Project 04–D–128, TA–18 Mission relocation project, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico, $8,820,000.

Project 04–D–203, facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program, project engineering and design, various locations, $3,719,000.

SEC. 3102. DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2004 for environmental management activities in carrying out programs necessary for national security in the amount of $6,819,314,000, to be allocated as follows:

(1) For defense site acceleration completion, $5,824,135,000.

(2) For defense environmental services, $995,179,000.

(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 defense site acceleration completion, the following new plant projects:

Project 04–D–408, glass waste storage building #2, Savannah River Site, Aiken, South Carolina, $20,259,000.

Project 04–D–414, project engineering and design, various locations, $23,500,000.

Project 04–D–423, 3013 container surveillance capability in 235-F, Savannah River Site, Aiken, South Carolina, $1,134,000.

SEC. 3103. OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2004 for other defense activities in carrying out programs necessary for national security in the amount of $497,331,000.

SEC. 3104. DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2004 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 $430,000,000.

SEC. 3105. ENERGY SUPPLY.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2004 for energy supply activities in carrying out programs necessary for national security in the amount of $110,473,000.

Subtitle B—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations

SEC. 3111. MODIFICATION OF PROHIBITION RELATING TO LOW-YIELD NUCLEAR WEAPONS.

Section 3136 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (42 U.S.C. 2121 note) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by striking ''**RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT**'' and inserting ''**DEVELOPMENT AND PRODUCTION**'';

(2) in subsection (a), by striking ''conduct research and development which could lead to the production by the United States of'' and insert ''develop or produce'';

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''conduct, or provide for the conduct of, research and development which could lead to the production by the United States of'' and insert ''develop, produce, or provide for the development or production of,''; and

(B) by striking ''the date of the enactment of this Act,'' and inserting ''November 30, 1993,'';

(4) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking ''RESEARCH AND'' in the subsection heading;

(B) by striking ''research and'' in the matter preceding paragraph (1); and

(C) by inserting '', including assessment of low-yield nuclear weapons development by other nations that may pose a national security risk to the United States'' before the period at the end of paragraph (3);

(5) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(6) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection (d):

''(d) EFFECT ON STUDIES AND DESIGN WORK.—Nothing in this section shall prohibit the Secretary of Energy from conducting, or providing for the conduct of, concept definition studies, feasibility studies, or detailed engineering design work.''.

SEC. 3112. TERMINATION OF REQUIREMENT FOR ANNUAL UPDATES OF LONG-TERM PLAN FOR NUCLEAR WEAPONS STOCKPILE LIFE EXTENSION PROGRAM.

Section 3133 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (42 U.S.C. 2121 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) TERMINATION OF ANNUAL UPDATES.—Effective December 31, 2004, the requirements of subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f) shall terminate.''.

SEC. 3113. EXTENSION TO ALL DOE FACILITIES OF AUTHORITY TO PROHIBIT DISSEMINATION OF CERTAIN UNCLASSIFIED INFORMATION.

Subsection a. of section 148 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2168) is amended in paragraph (1)—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking '', with respect to atomic energy defense programs,'';

(2) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''production facilities or utilization facilities'' and inserting ''production facilities, utilization facilities, nuclear waste storage facilities, or uranium enrichment facilities, or any other facilities at which activities relating to nuclear weapons or nuclear materials are carried out, that are under the control or jurisdiction of the Secretary of Energy''; and

(3) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''production or utilization facilities'' and inserting ''such facilities''.

SEC. 3114. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY PROJECT REVIEW GROUPS NOT SUBJECT TO FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT BY REASON OF INCLUSION OF EMPLOYEES OF DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY MANAGEMENT AND OPERATING CONTRACTORS.

An officer or employee of a management and operating contractor of the Department of Energy, when serving as a member of a group reviewing or advising on matters related to any one or more management and operating contracts of the Department, shall be treated as an officer or employee of the Department for purposes of determining whether the group is an advisory committee within the meaning of section 3 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

SEC. 3115. AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.

Section 3628 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314; 116 Stat. 2760; 42 U.S.C. 7386h) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 3628. AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), amounts appropriated pursuant to a DOE national security authorization for a fiscal year—

''(1) shall remain available to be expended only in that fiscal year and the two succeeding fiscal years, in the case of amounts for the National Nuclear Security Administration; and

''(2) may, when so specified in an appropriations Act, remain available until expended, in all other cases.

''(b) PROGRAM DIRECTION.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to a DOE national security authorization for a fiscal year for program direction shall remain available to be obligated only until the end of that fiscal year.''.

SEC. 3116. LIMITATION ON OBLIGATION OF FUNDS FOR NUCLEAR TEST READINESS PROGRAM.

Not more than 40 percent of the funds made available to the Secretary of Energy for fiscal year 2004 for the Nuclear Test Readiness program of the Department of Energy may be obligated until—

(1) the Secretary of Energy submits to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives the report required by section 3142(c) of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314; 116 Stat. 2733), relating to plans for achieving enhanced readiness postures for resumption by the United States of underground nuclear weapons tests; and

(2) a period of 30 days has passed after the date on which such report is received by those committees.

SEC. 3117. REQUIREMENT FOR ON-SITE MANAGERS.

(a) ON-SITE MANAGER REQUIREMENT.—Before obligating any defense nuclear nonproliferation funds for a project described in subsection (b), the Secretary of Energy shall appoint a United States Federal Government employee as an on-site manager.

(b) PROJECTS COVERED.—Subsection (a) applies to a project—

(1) to be located in a state of the former Soviet Union;

(2) which involves dismantlement, destruction, or storage facilities, or construction of a facility; and

(3) with respect to which the total contribution by the Department of Energy is expected to exceed $25,000,000.

(c) DUTIES OF ON-SITE MANAGER.—The on-site manager appointed under subsection (a) shall—

(1) develop, in cooperation with representatives from governments of countries participating in the project, a list of those steps or activities critical to achieving the project's disarmament or nonproliferation goals;

(2) establish a schedule for completing those steps or activities;

(3) meet with all participants to seek assurances that those steps or activities are being completed on schedule; and

(4) suspend United States participation in a project when a non-United States participant fails to complete a scheduled step or activity on time, unless directed by the Secretary of Energy to resume United States participation.

(d) STEPS OR ACTIVITIES.—Steps or activities referred to in subsection (c)(1) are those activities that, if not completed, will prevent a project from achieving its disarmament or nonproliferation goals, including, at a minimum, the following:

(1) Identification and acquisition of permits (as defined in subsection (f)).

(2) Verification that the items, substances, or capabilities to be dismantled, secured, or otherwise modified are available for dismantlement, securing, or modification.

(3) Timely provision of financial, personnel, management, transportation, and other resources.

(e) NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS.—In any case in which the Secretary of Energy directs an on-site manager to resume United States participation in a project under subsection (c)(4), the Secretary shall concurrently notify Congress of such direction.

(f) PERMIT DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''permit'' means any local or national permit for development, general construction, environmental, land use, or other purposes that is required in the state of the former Soviet Union in which the project is being or is proposed to be carried out.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect six months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Subtitle C—Consolidation of National Security Provisions

SEC. 3121. TRANSFER AND CONSOLIDATION OF RECURRING AND GENERAL PROVISIONS ON DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS.

(a) PURPOSE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The purpose of this section is to assemble together, without substantive amendment but with technical and conforming amendments of a non-substantive nature, recurring and general provisions of law on Department of Energy national security programs that remain in force in order to consolidate and organize such provisions of law into a single Act intended to comprise general provisions of law on such programs.

(2) CONSTRUCTION OF TRANSFERS.—The transfer of a provision of law by this section shall not be construed as amending, altering, or otherwise modifying the substantive effect of such provision.

(3) COORDINATION WITH OTHER AMENDMENTS.—For purposes of applying amendments made by provisions of this Act other than provisions of this section, this section shall be treated as having been enacted immediately after the other provisions of this Act.

(4) TREATMENT OF SATISFIED REQUIREMENTS.—Any requirement in a provision of law transferred under this section (including a requirement that an amendment to law be executed) that has been fully satisfied in accordance with the terms of such provision of law as of the date of transfer under this section shall be treated as so fully satisfied, and shall not be treated as being revived solely by reason of transfer under this section.

(5) CLASSIFICATION.—The provisions of the Atomic Energy Defense Act, as amended by this section, shall be classified to the United States Code as a new chapter of title 50, United States Code.

(b) DIVISION HEADING.—The Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314) is amended by adding at the end the following new division heading:

"DIVISION D—ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE PROVISIONS".

(c) SHORT TITLE; DEFINITION.—

(1) SHORT TITLE.—Section 3601 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (title XXXVI of Public Law 107–314; 116 Stat. 2756) is—

(A) transferred to the end of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003;

(B) redesignated as section 4001;

(C) inserted after the heading for division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as added by subsection (b); and

(D) amended by striking ''title'' and inserting ''division''.

(2) DEFINITION.—Division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 4002. DEFINITION.

''In this division, the term 'congressional defense committees' means—

''(1) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

''(2) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.''.

(d) ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS.—

(1) TITLE HEADING.—Division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"TITLE XLI—ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS".

(2) NAVAL NUCLEAR PROPULSION PROGRAM.—Section 1634 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1985 (Public Law 98–525; 98 Stat. 2649) is—

(A) transferred to title XLI of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as added by paragraph (1);

(B) inserted after the title heading for such title, as so added; and

(C) amended—

(i) by striking the section heading and inserting the following new section heading:

***"SEC. 4101. NAVAL NUCLEAR PROPULSION PROGRAM."**; and*

(ii) by striking ''SEC. 1634.''.

(3) MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE FOR FACILITIES AND LABORATORIES.—Section 3140 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201; 110 Stat. 2833) is—

(A) transferred to title XLI of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4102;

(C) inserted after section 4101, as added by paragraph (2); and

(D) amended in subsection (d)(2), by striking ''120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act,'' and inserting ''January 21, 1997,''.

(4) RESTRICTION ON LICENSING REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN ACTIVITIES AND FACILITIES.—Section 210 of the Department of Energy National Security and Military Applications of Nuclear Energy Authorization Act of 1981 (Public Law 96–540; 94 Stat. 3202) is—

(A) transferred to title XLI of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) inserted after section 4102, as added by paragraph (3); and

(C) amended—

(i) by striking the section heading and inserting the following new section heading:

***"SEC. 4103. RESTRICTION ON LICENSING REQUIREMENT FOR CERTAIN DEFENSE ACTIVITIES AND FACILITIES."**;*

(ii) by striking ''SEC. 210.''; and

(iii) by striking ''this or any other Act'' and inserting ''the Department of Energy National Security and Military Applications of Nuclear Energy Authorization Act of 1981 (Public Law 96–540) or any other Act''.

(e) NUCLEAR WEAPONS STOCKPILE MATTERS.—

(1) HEADINGS.—Division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following new headings:

"TITLE XLII—NUCLEAR WEAPONS STOCKPILE MATTERS

"Subtitle A—Stockpile Stewardship and Weapons Production".

(2) STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP PROGRAM.—Section 3138 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103–160; 107 Stat. 1946), as amended by section 3152(e) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85; 111 Stat. 2042), is—

(A) transferred to title XLII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as added by paragraph (1);

(B) redesignated as section 4201; and

(C) inserted after the heading for subtitle A of such title, as so added.

(3) STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP CRITERIA.—Section 3158 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261; 112 Stat. 2257), as amended, is—

(A) transferred to title XLII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4202; and

(C) inserted after section 4201, as added by paragraph (2).

(4) PLAN FOR STEWARDSHIP, MANAGEMENT, AND CERTIFICATION OF WARHEADS IN STOCKPILE.—Section 3151 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85; 111 Stat. 2041) is—

(A) transferred to title XLII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4203; and

(C) inserted after section 4202, as added by paragraph (3).

(5) STOCKPILE LIFE EXTENSION PROGRAM.—Section 3133 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65; 113 Stat. 926) is—

(A) transferred to title XLII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4204;

(C) inserted after section 4203, as added by paragraph (4); and

(D) amended in subsection (c)(1) by striking ''the date of the enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''October 5, 1999''.

(6) ANNUAL ASSESSMENTS AND REPORTS ON CONDITION OF STOCKPILE.—Section 3141 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314; 116 Stat. 2730) is—

(A) transferred to title XLII of division D of such Act, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4205;

(C) inserted after section 4204, as added by paragraph (5); and

(D) amended in subsection (d)(3)(B) by striking ''section 3137 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (42 U.S.C. 2121 note)'' and inserting ''section 4212''.

(7) FORM OF CERTAIN CERTIFICATIONS REGARDING STOCKPILE.—Section 3194 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–481) is—

(A) transferred to title XLII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4206; and

(C) inserted after section 4205, as added by paragraph (6).

(8) NUCLEAR TEST BAN READINESS PROGRAM.—Section 1436 of the National Defense Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1989 (Public Law 100–456; 102 Stat. 2075) is—

(A) transferred to title XLII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4207;

(C) inserted after section 4206, as added by paragraph (7); and

(D) amended in the section heading by adding a period at the end.

(9) STUDY ON NUCLEAR TEST READINESS POSTURES.—Section 3152 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat. 623), as amended by section 3192 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–480), is—

(A) transferred to title XLII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4208; and

(C) inserted after section 4207, as added by paragraph (8).

(10) REQUIREMENTS FOR REQUESTS FOR NEW OR MODIFIED NUCLEAR WEAPONS.—Section 3143 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314; 116 Stat. 2733) is—

(A) transferred to title XLII of division D of such Act, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4209; and

(C) inserted after section 4208, as added by paragraph (9).

(11) LIMITATION ON UNDERGROUND NUCLEAR WEAPONS TESTS.—Subsection (f) of section 507 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1993 (Public Law 102–337; 106 Stat. 1345) is—

(A) transferred to title XLII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) inserted after section 4209, as added by paragraph (10); and

(C) amended—

(i) by inserting before the text the following new section heading:

***"SEC. 4210. LIMITATION ON UNDERGROUND NUCLEAR WEAPONS TESTS."**; and*

(ii) by striking ''(f)''.

(12) TESTING OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS.—Section 3137 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103–160; 107 Stat. 1946) is—

(A) transferred to title XLII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4211;

(C) inserted after section 4210, as added by paragraph (11); and

(D) amended—

(i) in subsection (a), by inserting ''of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103–160)'' after ''section 3101(a)(2)''; and

(ii) in subsection (b), by striking ''this Act'' and inserting ''the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994''.

(13) MANUFACTURING INFRASTRUCTURE FOR STOCKPILE.—Section 3137 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat. 620), as amended by section 3132 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201; 110 Stat. 2829), is—

(A) transferred to title XLII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4212;

(C) inserted after section 4211, as added by paragraph (12); and

(D) amended in subsection (d) by inserting ''of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106)'' after ''section 3101(b)''.

(14) REPORTS ON CRITICAL DIFFICULTIES AT LABORATORIES AND PLANTS.—Section 3159 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201; 110 Stat. 2842), as amended by section 1305 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85; 111 Stat. 1954) and section 3163 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65; 113 Stat. 944), is—

(A) transferred to title XLII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4213; and

(C) inserted after section 4212, as added by paragraph (13).

(15) SUBTITLE HEADING ON TRITIUM.—Title XLII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subtitle heading:

"Subtitle B—Tritium".

(16) TRITIUM PRODUCTION PROGRAM.—Section 3133 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat. 618) is—

(A) transferred to title XLII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4231;

(C) inserted after the heading for subtitle B of such title XLII, as added by paragraph (15); and

(D) amended—

(i) by striking ''the date of the enactment of this Act'' each place it appears and inserting ''February 10, 1996''; and

(ii) in subsection (b), by inserting ''of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106)'' after ''section 3101''.

(17) TRITIUM RECYCLING.—Section 3136 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat. 620) is—

(A) transferred to title XLII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4232; and

(C) inserted after section 4231, as added by paragraph (16).

(18) TRITIUM PRODUCTION.—Subsections (c) and (d) of section 3133 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201; 110 Stat. 2830) are—

(A) transferred to title XLII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) inserted after section 4232, as added by paragraph (17); and

(C) amended—

(i) by inserting before the text the following new section heading:

***"SEC. 4233. TRITIUM PRODUCTION."**;*

(ii) by redesignating such subsections as subsections (a) and (b), respectively; and

(iii) in subsection (a), as so redesignated, by inserting ''of Energy'' after ''The Secretary''.

(19) MODERNIZATION AND CONSOLIDATION OF TRITIUM RECYCLING FACILITIES.—Section 3134 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201; 110 Stat. 2830) is—

(A) transferred to title XLII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4234;

(C) inserted after section 4233, as added by paragraph (18); and

(D) amended in subsection (b) by inserting ''of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201)'' after ''section 3101''.

(20) PROCEDURES FOR MEETING TRITIUM PRODUCTION REQUIREMENTS.—Section 3134 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65; 113 Stat. 927) is—

(A) transferred to title XLII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4235; and

(C) inserted after section 4234, as added by paragraph (19).

(f) PROLIFERATION MATTERS.—

(1) TITLE HEADING.—Division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following new title heading:

"TITLE XLIII—PROLIFERATION MATTERS".

(2) INTERNATIONAL COOPERATIVE STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP.—Section 3133 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85; 111 Stat. 2036), as amended by sections 1069 and 3131 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261; 112 Stat. 2136, 2246), is—

(A) transferred to title XLIII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as added by paragraph (1);

(B) redesignated as section 4301;

(C) inserted after the heading for such title, as so added; and

(D) amended in subsection (b)(3) by striking ''of this Act'' and inserting ''of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85)''.

(3) NONPROLIFERATION INITIATIVES AND ACTIVITIES.—Section 3136 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65; 113 Stat. 927) is—

(A) transferred to title XLIII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4302;

(C) inserted after section 4301, as added by paragraph (2); and

(D) amended in subsection (b)(1) by striking ''this title'' and inserting ''title XXXI of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65)''.

(4) ANNUAL REPORT ON MATERIALS PROTECTION, CONTROL, AND ACCOUNTING PROGRAM.—Section 3171 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (as enacted into law by Public Law 106–398; 114 Stat. 1645A–475) is—

(A) transferred to title XLIII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4303;

(C) inserted after section 4302, as added by paragraph (3); and

(D) amended in subsection (c)(1) by striking ''this Act'' and inserting ''the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (as enacted into law by Public Law 106–398)''.

(5) NUCLEAR CITIES INITIATIVE.—Section 3172 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (as enacted into law by Public Law 106–398; 114 Stat. 1645A–476) is—

(A) transferred to title XLIII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4304; and

(C) inserted after section 4303, as added by paragraph (4).

(6) PROGRAMS ON FISSILE MATERIALS.—Section 3131 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat. 617), as amended by section 3152 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314; 116 Stat. 2738), is—

(A) transferred to title XLIII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4305; and

(C) inserted after section 4304, as added by paragraph (5).

(g) ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT MATTERS.—

(1) HEADINGS.—Division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following new headings:

"TITLE XLIV—ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT MATTERS

"Subtitle A—Environmental Restoration and Waste Management".

(2) DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT.—Section 3134 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993 (Public Law 102–190; 105 Stat. 1575) is—

(A) transferred to title XLIV of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as added by paragraph (1);

(B) redesignated as section 4401; and

(C) inserted after the heading for subtitle A of such title, as so added.

(3) FUTURE USE PLANS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM.—Section 3153 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201; 110 Stat. 2839) is—

(A) transferred to title XLIV of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4402;

(C) inserted after section 4401, as added by paragraph (2); and

(D) amended—

(i) in subsection (d), by striking ''the date of the enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''September 23, 1996,''; and

(ii) in subsection (h)(1), by striking ''the date of the enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''September 23, 1996''.

(4) INTEGRATED FISSILE MATERIALS MANAGEMENT PLAN.—Section 3172 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65; 113 Stat. 948) is—

(A) transferred to title XLIV of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4403; and

(C) inserted after section 4402, as added by paragraph (3).

(5) BASELINE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT REPORTS.—Section 3153 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103–160; 107 Stat. 1950), as amended by section 3160 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103–337; 108 Stat. 3094), section 3152 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201; 110 Stat. 2839), and section 3160 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85; 111 Stat. 2048), is—

(A) transferred to title XLIV of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4404; and

(C) inserted after section 4403, as added by paragraph (4).

(6) ACCELERATED SCHEDULE OF ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT.—Section 3156 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat. 625) is—

(A) transferred to title XLIV of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4405;

(C) inserted after section 4404, as added by paragraph (5); and

(D) amended in subsection (b)(2) by inserting before the period the following: '', the predecessor provision to section 4404 of this Act''.

(7) DEFENSE WASTE CLEANUP TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM.—Section 3141 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101–189; 103 Stat. 1679) is—

(A) transferred to title XLIV of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4406;

(C) inserted after section 4405, as added by paragraph (6); and

(D) amended in the section heading by adding a period at the end.

(8) REPORT ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION EXPENDITURES.—Section 3134 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101–510; 104 Stat. 1833) is—

(A) transferred to title XLIV of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4407;

(C) inserted after section 4406, as added by paragraph (7); and

(D) amended in the section heading by adding a period at the end.

(9) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN PLANNING FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT.—Subsection (e) of section 3160 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103–337; 108 Stat. 3095) is—

(A) transferred to title XLIV of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) inserted after section 4407, as added by paragraph (8); and

(C) amended—

(i) by inserting before the text the following new section heading:

"SEC. 4408. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN PLANNING FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT AT DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES."*; and*

(ii) by striking ''(e) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN PLANNING.—''.

(10) SUBTITLE HEADING ON CLOSURE OF FACILITIES.—Title XLIV of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subtitle heading:

"Subtitle B—Closure of Facilities".

(11) PROJECTS TO ACCELERATE CLOSURE ACTIVITIES AT DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES.—Section 3143 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201; 110 Stat. 2836) is—

(A) transferred to title XLIV of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4421;

(C) inserted after the heading for subtitle B of such title, as added by paragraph (10); and

(D) amended in subsection (i), by striking ''the expiration of the 15-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''September 23, 2011''.

(12) REPORTS IN CONNECTION WITH PERMANENT CLOSURE OF DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES.—Section 3156 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101–189; 103 Stat. 1683) is—

(A) transferred to title XLIV of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4422;

(C) inserted after section 4421, as added by paragraph (11); and

(D) amended in the section heading by adding a period at the end.

(13) SUBTITLE HEADING ON PRIVATIZATION.—Title XLIV of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subtitle heading:

"Subtitle C—Privatization".

(14) DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRIVATIZATION PROJECTS.—Section 3132 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85; 111 Stat. 2034) is—

(A) transferred to title XLIV of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4431;

(C) inserted after the heading for subtitle C of such title, as added by paragraph (13); and

(D) amended—

(i) in subsections (a), (c)(1)(B)(i), and (d), by inserting ''of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85)'' after ''section 3102(i)''; and

(ii) in subsections (c)(1)(B)(ii) and (f), by striking ''the date of enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''November 18, 1997''.

(h) SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY MATTERS.—

(1) HEADINGS.—Division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following new headings:

"TITLE XLV—SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY MATTERS

"Subtitle A—Safeguards and Security".

(2) PROHIBITION ON INTERNATIONAL INSPECTIONS OF FACILITIES WITHOUT PROTECTION OF RESTRICTED DATA.—Section 3154 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat. 624) is—

(A) transferred to title XLV of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as added by paragraph (1);

(B) redesignated as section 4501;

(C) inserted after the heading for subtitle A of such title, as so added; and

(D) amended—

(i) by striking ''(1) The'' and inserting ''The''; and

(ii) by striking ''(2) For purposes of paragraph (1),'' and inserting ''(c) RESTRICTED DATA DEFINED.—In this section,''.

(3) RESTRICTIONS ON ACCESS TO LABORATORIES BY FOREIGN VISITORS FROM SENSITIVE COUNTRIES.—Section 3146 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65; 113 Stat. 935) is—

(A) transferred to title XLV of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization

Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4502;

(C) inserted after section 4501, as added by paragraph (2); and

(D) amended—

(i) in subsection (b)(2)—

(I) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''on November 4, 1999,''; and

(II) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''The date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''January 3, 2000'';

(ii) in subsection (d)(1), by striking ''the date of the enactment of this Act,'' and inserting ''October 5, 1999,''; and

(iii) in subsection (g), by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(3) The term 'national laboratory' means any of the following:

''(A) Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California.

''(B) Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico.

''(C) Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, New Mexico and Livermore, California.

''(4) The term 'Restricted Data' has the meaning given that term in section 11 y. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2014(y)).''.

(4) BACKGROUND INVESTIGATIONS ON CERTAIN PERSONNEL.—Section 3143 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65; 113 Stat. 934) is—

(A) transferred to title XLV of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4503;

(C) inserted after section 4502, as added by paragraph (3); and

(D) amended—

(i) in subsection (b), by striking ''the date of the enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''October 5, 1999,''; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms 'national laboratory' and 'Restricted Data' have the meanings given such terms in section 4502(g)).''.

(5) COUNTERINTELLIGENCE POLYGRAPH PROGRAM.—

(A) DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY COUNTERINTELLIGENCE POLYGRAPH PROGRAM.—Section 3152 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107; 115 Stat. 1376) is—

(i) transferred to title XLV of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(ii) redesignated as section 4504;

(iii) inserted after section 4503, as added by paragraph (4); and

(iv) amended in subsection (c) by striking ''section 3154 of the Department of Energy Facilities Safeguards, Security, and Counterintelligence Enhancement Act of 1999 (subtitle D of title XXXI of Public Law 106–65; 42 U.S.C. 7383h)'' and inserting ''section 4504A''.

(B) COUNTERINTELLIGENCE POLYGRAPH PROGRAM.—Section 3154 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65; 113 Stat. 941), as amended by section 3135 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–456), is—

(i) transferred to title XLV of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(ii) redesignated as section 4504A;

(iii) inserted after section 4504, as added by subparagraph (A); and

(iv) amended in subsection (h) by striking ''180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act,'' and inserting ''April 5, 2000,''.

(6) NOTICE OF SECURITY AND COUNTERINTELLIGENCE FAILURES.—Section 3150 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65; 113 Stat. 939) is—

(A) transferred to title XLV of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4505;

(C) inserted after section 4504A, as added by paragraph (5)(B).

(7) ANNUAL REPORT ON SECURITY FUNCTIONS AT NUCLEAR WEAPONS FACILITIES.—Section 3162 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85; 111 Stat. 2049) is—

(A) transferred to title XLV of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4506;

(C) inserted after section 4505, as added by paragraph (6); and

(D) amended in subsection (b) by inserting ''of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85; 111 Stat. 2048; 42 U.S.C. 7251 note)'' after ''section 3161''.

(8) REPORT ON COUNTERINTELLIGENCE AND SECURITY PRACTICES AT LABORATORIES.—Section 3152 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65; 113 Stat. 940) is—

(A) transferred to title XLV of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4507;

(C) inserted after section 4506, as added by paragraph (7); and

(D) amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) NATIONAL LABORATORY DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'national laboratory' has the meaning given that term in section 4502(g)(3).''.

(9) REPORT ON SECURITY VULNERABILITIES OF NATIONAL LABORATORY COMPUTERS.—Section 3153 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65; 113 Stat. 940) is—

(A) transferred to title XLV of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4508;

(C) inserted after section 4507, as added by paragraph (8); and

(D) amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) NATIONAL LABORATORY DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'national laboratory' has the meaning given that term in section 4502(g)(3).''.

(10) SUBTITLE HEADING ON CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—Title XLV of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subtitle heading:

''Subtitle B—Classified Information''.

(11) REVIEW OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS BEFORE DECLASSIFICATION AND RELEASE.—Section 3155 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat. 625) is—

(A) transferred to title XLV of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4521; and

(C) inserted after the heading for subtitle B of such title, as added by paragraph (10).

(12) PROTECTION AGAINST INADVERTENT RELEASE OF RESTRICTED DATA AND FORMERLY RESTRICTED DATA.—Section 3161 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261; 112 Stat. 2259), as amended by section 1067(3) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65; 113 Stat. 774) and section 3193 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–480), is—

(A) transferred to title XLV of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4522;

(C) inserted after section 4521, as added by paragraph (11); and

(D) amended—

(i) in subsection (c)(1), by striking ''the date of the enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''October 17, 1998,'';

(ii) in subsection (f)(1), by striking ''the date of the enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''October 17, 1998''; and

(iii) in subsection (f)(2), by striking ''The Secretary'' and inserting ''Commencing with inadvertent releases discovered on or after October 30, 2000, the Secretary''.

(13) SUPPLEMENT TO PLAN FOR DECLASSIFICATION OF RESTRICTED DATA AND FORMERLY RESTRICTED DATA.—Section 3149 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65; 113 Stat. 938) is—

(A) transferred to title XLV of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4523;

(C) inserted after section 4522, as added by paragraph (12); and

(D) amended—

(i) in subsection (a), by striking ''subsection (a) of section 3161 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261; 112 Stat. 2260; 50 U.S.C. 435 note)'' and inserting ''subsection (a) of section 4522'';

(ii) in subsection (b)—

(I) by striking ''section 3161(b)(1) of that Act'' and inserting ''subsection (b)(1) of section 4522''; and

(II) by striking ''the date of the enactment of that Act'' and inserting ''October 17, 1998,'';

(iii) in subsection (c)—

(I) by striking ''section 3161(c) of that Act'' and inserting ''subsection (c) of section 4522''; and

(II) by striking ''section 3161(a) of that Act'' and inserting ''subsection (a) of such section''; and

(iv) in subsection (d), by striking ''section 3161(d) of that Act'' and inserting ''subsection (d) of section 4522''.

(14) PROTECTION OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION DURING LABORATORY-TO-LABORATORY EXCHANGES.—Section 3145 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65; 113 Stat. 935) is—

(A) transferred to title XLV of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4524; and

(C) inserted after section 4523, as added by paragraph (13).

(15) IDENTIFICATION IN BUDGETS OF AMOUNT FOR DECLASSIFICATION ACTIVITIES.—Section 3173 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65; 113 Stat. 949) is—

(A) transferred to title XLV of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4525;

(C) inserted after section 4524, as added by paragraph (14); and

(D) amended in subsection (b) by striking ''the date of the enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''October 5, 1999,''.

(16) SUBTITLE HEADING ON EMERGENCY RESPONSE.—Title XLV of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for

Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subtitle heading:

"Subtitle C—Emergency Response".

(17) RESPONSIBILITY FOR DEFENSE PROGRAMS EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROGRAM.—Section 3158 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat. 626) is—

(A) transferred to title XLV of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4541; and

(C) inserted after the heading for subtitle C of such title, as added by paragraph (16).

(i) PERSONNEL MATTERS.—

(1) HEADINGS.—Division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following new headings:

"TITLE XLVI—PERSONNEL MATTERS

"Subtitle A—Personnel Management".

(2) AUTHORITY FOR APPOINTMENT OF CERTAIN SCIENTIFIC, ENGINEERING, AND TECHNICAL PERSONNEL.—Section 3161 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103–337; 108 Stat. 3095), as amended by section 3139 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85; 111 Stat. 2040), sections 3152 and 3155 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261; 112 Stat. 2253, 2257), and section 3191 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–480), is—

(A) transferred to title XLVI of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as added by paragraph (1);

(B) redesignated as section 4601; and

(C) inserted after the heading for subtitle A of such title, as so added.

(3) WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION PROGRAM.—Section 3164 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65; 113 Stat. 946) is—

(A) transferred to title XLVI of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4602;

(C) inserted after section 4601, as added by paragraph (2); and

(D) amended in subsection (n) by striking ''60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act,'' and inserting ''December 5, 1999,''.

(4) EMPLOYEE INCENTIVES FOR WORKERS AT CLOSURE PROJECT FACILITIES.—Section 3136 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–458) is—

(A) transferred to title XLVI of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4603;

(C) inserted after section 4602, as added by paragraph (3); and

(D) amended—

(i) in subsections (c) and (i)(1)(A), by striking ''section 3143 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (42 U.S.C. 7274n)'' and inserting ''section 4421''; and

(ii) in subsection (g), by striking ''section 3143(h) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997'' and inserting ''section 4421(h)''.

(5) DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITY WORKFORCE RESTRUCTURING PLAN.—Section 3161 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102–484; 106 Stat. 2644), as amended by section 1070(c)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103–337; 108 Stat. 2857), Public Law 105–277 (112 Stat. 2681–419, 2681–430), and section 1048(h)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107; 115 Stat. 1229), is—

(A) transferred to title XLVI of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4604;

(C) inserted after section 4603, as added by paragraph (4); and

(D) amended—

(i) in subsection (a), by striking ''(hereinafter in this subtitle referred to as the 'Secretary')''; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'Department of Energy defense nuclear facility' means—

''(1) a production facility or utilization facility (as those terms are defined in section 11 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2014)) that is under the control or jurisdiction of the Secretary and that is operated for national security purposes (including the tritium loading facility at Savannah River, South Carolina, the 236 H facility at Savannah River, South Carolina; and the Mound Laboratory, Ohio), but the term does not include any facility that does not conduct atomic energy defense activities and does not include any facility or activity covered by Executive Order Number 12344, dated February 1, 1982, pertaining to the naval nuclear propulsion program;

''(2) a nuclear waste storage or disposal facility that is under the control or jurisdiction of the Secretary;

''(3) a testing and assembly facility that is under the control or jurisdiction of the Secretary and that is operated for national security purposes (including the Nevada Test Site, Nevada; the Pinnellas Plant, Florida; and the Pantex facility, Texas);

''(4) an atomic weapons research facility that is under the control or jurisdiction of the Secretary (including Lawrence Livermore, Los Alamos, and Sandia National Laboratories); or

''(5) any facility described in paragraphs (1) through (4) that—

''(A) is no longer in operation;

''(B) was under the control or jurisdiction of the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, or the Energy Research and Development Administration; and

''(C) was operated for national security purposes.''.

(6) AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE CERTIFICATE OF COMMENDATION TO EMPLOYEES.—Section 3195 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–481) is—

(A) transferred to title XLVI of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4605; and

(C) inserted after section 4604, as added by paragraph (5).

(7) SUBTITLE HEADING ON TRAINING AND EDUCATION.—Title XLVI of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subtitle heading:

"Subtitle B—Education and Training".

(8) EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT TRAINING.—Section 3142 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101–189; 103 Stat. 1680) is—

(A) transferred to title XLVI of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4621;

(C) inserted after the heading for subtitle B of such title, as added by paragraph (7); and

(D) amended in the section heading by adding a period at the end.

(9) STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP RECRUITMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM.—Section 3131 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103–337; 108 Stat. 3085) is—

(A) transferred to title XLVI of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4622;

(C) inserted after section 4621, as added by paragraph (8); and

(D) amended—

(i) in subsection (a)(1), by striking ''section 3138 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103–160; 107 Stat. 1946; 42 U.S.C. 2121 note)'' and inserting ''section 4201''; and

(ii) in subsection (b)(2), by inserting ''of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103–337)'' after ''section 3101(a)(1)''.

(10) FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM FOR DEVELOPMENT OF SKILLS CRITICAL TO NUCLEAR WEAPONS COMPLEX.—Section 3140 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996 (Public Law 104–106; 110 Stat 621), as amended by section 3162 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65; 113 Stat. 943), is—

(A) transferred to title XLVI of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4623; and

(C) inserted after section 4622, as added by paragraph (9).

(11) SUBTITLE HEADING ON WORKER SAFETY.—Title XLVI of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subtitle heading:

"Subtitle C—Worker Safety".

(12) WORKER PROTECTION AT NUCLEAR WEAPONS FACILITIES.—Section 3131 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993 (Public Law 102–190; 105 Stat. 1571) is—

(A) transferred to title XLVI of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4641;

(C) inserted after the heading for subtitle C of such title, as added by paragraph (11); and

(D) amended in subsection (e) by inserting ''of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993 (Public Law 102–190)'' after ''section 3101(9)(A)''.

(13) SAFETY OVERSIGHT AND ENFORCEMENT AT DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES.—Section 3163 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103–337; 108 Stat. 3097) is—

(A) transferred to title XLVI of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4642;

(C) inserted after section 4641, as added by paragraph (12); and

(D) amended in subsection (b) by striking ''90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act,'' and inserting ''January 5, 1995,''.

(14) PROGRAM TO MONITOR WORKERS AT DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES EXPOSED TO HAZARDOUS OR RADIOACTIVE SUBSTANCES.—Section 3162 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102–484; 106 Stat. 2646) is—

(A) transferred to title XLVI of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization

Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4643;

(C) inserted after section 4642, as added by paragraph (13); and

(D) amended—

(i) in subsection (b)(6), by striking ''1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''October 23, 1993'';

(ii) in subsection (c), by striking ''180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act,'' and inserting ''April 23, 1993,''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) The term 'Department of Energy defense nuclear facility' has the meaning given that term in section 4604(g).

''(2) The term 'Department of Energy employee' means any employee of the Department of Energy employed at a Department of Energy defense nuclear facility, including any employee of a contractor of subcontractor of the Department of Energy employed at such a facility.''.

(j) BUDGET AND FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT MATTERS.—

(1) HEADINGS.—Division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following new headings:

''TITLE XLVII—BUDGET AND FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT MATTERS

''Subtitle A—Recurring National Security Authorization Provisions''.

(2) RECURRING NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATION PROVISIONS.—Sections 3620 through 3631 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314; 116 Stat. 2756) are—

(A) transferred to title XLVII of division D of such Act, as added by paragraph (1);

(B) redesignated as sections 4701 through 4712, respectively;

(C) inserted after the heading for subtitle A of such title, as so added; and

(D) amended—

(i) in section 4702, as so redesignated, by striking ''sections 3629 and 3630'' and inserting ''sections 4710 and 4711'';

(ii) in section 4706(a)(3)(B), as so redesignated, by striking ''section 3626'' and inserting ''section 4707'';

(iii) in section 4707(c), as so redesignated, by striking ''section 3625(b)(2)'' and inserting ''section 4706(b)(2)'';

(iv) in section 4710(c), as so redesignated, by striking ''section 3621'' and inserting ''section 4702'';

(v) in section 4711(c), as so redesignated, by striking ''section 3621'' and inserting ''section 4702''; and

(vi) in section 4712, as so redesignated, by striking ''section 3621'' and inserting ''section 4702''.

(3) SUBTITLE HEADING ON PENALTIES.—Title XLVII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subtitle heading:

''Subtitle B—Penalties''.

(4) RESTRICTION ON USE OF FUNDS TO PAY PENALTIES UNDER ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS.—Section 3132 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1987 (Public Law 99–661; 100 Stat. 4063) is—

(A) transferred to title XLVII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4721;

(C) inserted after the heading for subtitle B of such title, as added by paragraph (3); and

(D) amended in the section heading by adding a period at the end.

(5) RESTRICTION ON USE OF FUNDS TO PAY PENALTIES UNDER CLEAN AIR ACT.—Section 211 of the Department of Energy National Security and Military Applications of Nuclear Energy Authorization Act of 1981 (Public Law 96–540; 94 Stat. 3203) is—

(A) transferred to title XLVII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) inserted after section 4721, as added by paragraph (4); and

(C) amended—

(i) by striking the section heading and inserting the following new section heading:

''SEC. 4722. RESTRICTION ON USE OF FUNDS TO PAY PENALTIES UNDER CLEAN AIR ACT.'';

(ii) by striking SEC. 211.''; and

(iii) by striking ''this or any other Act'' and inserting ''the Department of Energy National Security and Military Applications of Nuclear Energy Authorization Act of 1981 (Public Law 96–540) or any other Act''.

(6) SUBTITLE HEADING ON OTHER MATTERS.—Title XLVII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subtitle heading:

''Subtitle C—Other Matters''.

(7) SINGLE REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR COMMON DEFENSE AND SECURITY PROGRAMS.—Section 208 of the Department of Energy National Security and Military Applications of Nuclear Energy Authorization Act of 1979 (Public Law 95–509; 92 Stat. 1779) is—

(A) transferred to title XLVII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) inserted after the heading for subtitle C of such title, as added by paragraph (6); and

(C) amended—

(i) by striking the section heading and inserting the following new section heading:

''SEC. 4731. SINGLE REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR COMMON DEFENSE AND SECURITY PROGRAMS.''; *and*

(ii) by striking ''SEC. 208.''.

(k) ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS.—

(1) HEADINGS.—Division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following new headings:

''TITLE XLVIII—ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

''Subtitle A—Contracts''.

(2) COSTS NOT ALLOWED UNDER CERTAIN CONTRACTS.—Section 1534 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (Public Law 99–145; 99 Stat. 774), as amended by section 3131 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1988 and 1989 (Public Law 100–180; 101 Stat. 1238), is—

(A) transferred to title XLVIII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as added by paragraph (1);

(B) redesignated as section 4801;

(C) inserted after the heading for subtitle A of such title, as so added; and

(D) amended—

(i) in the section heading, by adding a period at the end; and

(ii) in subsection (b)(1), by striking ''the date of the enactment of this Act,'' and inserting ''November 8, 1985,''.

(3) PROHIBITION ON BONUSES TO CONTRACTORS OPERATING DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES.—Section 3151 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101–189; 103 Stat. 1682) is—

(A) transferred to title XLVIII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4802;

(C) inserted after section 4801, as added by paragraph (2); and

(D) amended—

(i) in the section heading, by adding a period at the end;

(ii) in subsection (a), by striking ''the date of the enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''November 29, 1989'';

(iii) in subsection (b), by striking ''6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act,'' and inserting ''May 29, 1990,''; and

(iv) in subsection (d), by striking ''90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''March 1, 1990''.

(4) CONTRACTOR LIABILITY FOR INJURY OR LOSS OF PROPERTY ARISING FROM ATOMIC WEAPONS TESTING PROGRAMS.—Section 3141 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101–510; 104 Stat. 1837) is—

(A) transferred to title XLVIII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4803;

(C) inserted after section 4802, as added by paragraph (3); and

(D) amended—

(i) in the section heading, by adding a period at the end; and

(ii) in subsection (d), by striking ''the date of the enactment of this Act'' each place it appears and inserting ''November 5, 1990,''.

(5) SUBTITLE HEADING ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—Title XLVIII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subtitle heading:

''Subtitle B—Research and Development''.

(6) LABORATORY-DIRECTED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—Section 3132 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101–510; 104 Stat. 1832) is—

(A) transferred to title XLVIII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4811;

(C) inserted after the heading for subtitle B of such title, as added by paragraph (5); and

(D) amended in the section heading by adding a period at the end.

(7) LIMITATIONS ON USE OF FUNDS FOR LABORATORY DIRECTED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—

(A) LIMITATIONS ON USE OF FUNDS FOR LABORATORY DIRECTED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—Section 3137 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85; 111 Stat. 2038) is—

(i) transferred to title XLVIII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(ii) redesignated as section 4812;

(iii) inserted after section 4811, as added by paragraph (6); and

(iv) amended—

(I) in subsection (b), by striking ''section 3136(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201; 110 Stat. 2831; 42 U.S.C. 7257b)'' and inserting ''section 4812A(b)'';

(II) in subsection (d)—

(aa) by striking ''section 3136(b)(1)'' and inserting ''section 4812A(b)(1)''; and

(bb) by striking ''section 3132(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (42 U.S.C. 7257a(c))'' and inserting ''section 4811(c)''; and

(III) in subsection (e), by striking ''section 3132(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (42 U.S.C. 7257a(d))'' and inserting ''section 4811(d)''.

(B) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PURPOSES.—Section 3136 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201; 110 Stat. 2830), as amended by section 3137 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85; 111 Stat. 2038), is—

(i) transferred to title XLVIII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(ii) redesignated as section 4812A;

(iii) inserted after section 4812, as added by paragraph (7); and

(iv) amended in subsection (a) by inserting ''of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201)'' after ''section 3101''.

(8) CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY PARTNERSHIPS.—Section 3136 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993 (Public Law 102–190; 105 Stat. 1577), as amended by section 203(b)(3) of Public Law 103–35 (107 Stat. 102), is—

(A) transferred to title XLVIII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4813; and

(C) inserted after section 4812A, as added by paragraph (7)(B).

(9) UNIVERSITY-BASED RESEARCH COLLABORATION PROGRAM.—Section 3155 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85; 111 Stat. 2044) is—

(A) transferred to title XLVIII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4814;

(C) inserted after section 4813, as added by paragraph (8); and

(D) amended in subsection (c) by striking ''this title'' and inserting ''title XXXI of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85)''.

(10) SUBTITLE HEADING ON FACILITIES MANAGEMENT.—Title XLVIII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subtitle heading:

"Subtitle C—Facilities Management".

(11) TRANSFERS OF REAL PROPERTY AT CERTAIN FACILITIES.—Section 3158 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85; 111 Stat. 2046) is—

(A) transferred to title XLVIII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4831; and

(C) inserted after the heading for subtitle C of such title, as added by paragraph (10).

(12) ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND DEMONSTRATION AT CERTAIN NUCLEAR WEAPONS PRODUCTION PLANTS.—Section 3156 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–467) is—

(A) transferred to title XLVIII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4832; and

(C) inserted after section 4831, as added by paragraph (11).

(13) PILOT PROGRAM ON USE OF PROCEEDS OF DISPOSAL OR UTILIZATION OF CERTAIN ASSETS.—Section 3138 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85; 111 Stat. 2039) is—

(A) transferred to title XLVIII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4833;

(C) inserted after section 4832, as added by paragraph (12); and

(D) amended in subsection (d) by striking ''sections 202 and 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 483 and 484(j))'' and inserting ''subchapter II of chapter 5 and section 549 of title 40, United States Code,''.

(14) SUBTITLE HEADING ON OTHER MATTERS.—Title XLVIII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subtitle heading:

"Subtitle D—Other Matters".

(15) SEMIANNUAL REPORTS ON LOCAL IMPACT ASSISTANCE.—Subsection (f) of section 3153 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85; 111 Stat. 2044) is—

(A) transferred to title XLVIII of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) inserted after the heading for subtitle D of such title, as added by paragraph (14); and

(C) amended—

(i) by inserting before the text the following new section heading:

"SEC. 4851. SEMIANNUAL REPORTS ON LOCAL IMPACT ASSISTANCE.";

(ii) by striking ''(f) SEMIANNUAL REPORTS ON LOCAL IMPACT ASSISTANCE.—''; and

(iii) by striking ''section 3161(c)(6) of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fisca Year 1993 (42 U.S.C. 7274h(c)(6))'' and inserting ''section 4604(c)(6)''.

(l) MATTERS RELATING TO PARTICULAR FACILITIES.—

(1) HEADINGS.—Division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following new headings:

"TITLE XLIX—MATTERS RELATING TO PARTICULAR FACILITIES

"Subtitle A—Hanford Reservation, Washington".

(2) SAFETY MEASURES FOR WASTE TANKS.—Section 3137 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101–510; 104 Stat. 1833) is—

(A) transferred to title XLIX of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as added by paragraph (1);

(B) redesignated as section 4901;

(C) inserted after the heading for subtitle A of such title, as so added; and

(D) amended—

(i) in the section heading, by adding a period at the end;

(ii) in subsection (a), by striking ''Within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act,'' and inserting ''Not later than February 3, 1991,'';

(iii) in subsection (b), by striking ''Within 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act,'' and inserting ''Not later than March 5, 1991,'';

(iv) in subsection (c), by striking ''Beginning 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act,'' and inserting ''Beginning March 5, 1991,''; and

(v) in subsection (d), by striking ''Within six months of the date of the enactment of this Act,'' and inserting ''Not later than May 5, 1991,''.

(3) PROGRAMS FOR PERSONS WHO MAY HAVE BEEN EXPOSED TO RADIATION RELEASED FROM HANFORD RESERVATION.—Section 3138 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101–510; 104 Stat. 1834), as amended by section 3138 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103–337; 108 Stat. 3087), is—

(A) transferred to title XLIX of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4902;

(C) inserted after section 4901, as added by paragraph (2); and

(D) amended—

(i) in the section heading, by adding a period at the end;

(ii) in subsection (a), by striking ''this title'' and inserting ''title XXXI of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101–510)''; and

(iii) in subsection (c)—

(I) in paragraph (2), by striking ''six months after the date of the enactment of this Act,'' and inserting ''May 5, 1991,''; and

(II) in paragraph (3), by striking ''18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act,'' and inserting ''May 5, 1992,''.

(4) WASTE TANK CLEANUP PROGRAM.—Section 3139 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261; 112 Stat. 2250), as amended by section 3141 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–463) and section 3135 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107; 115 Stat. 1368), is—

(A) transferred to title XLIX of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4903;

(C) inserted after section 4902, as added by paragraph (3); and

(D) amended in subsection (d) by striking ''30 days after the date of the enactment of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001,'' and inserting ''November 29, 2000,''.

(5) RIVER PROTECTION PROJECT.—Subsection (a) of section 3141 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–462) is—

(A) transferred to title XLIX of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) inserted after section 4903, as added by paragraph (4); and

(C) amended—

(i) by inserting before the text the following new section heading:

"SEC. 4904. RIVER PROTECTION PROJECT."; *and*

(ii) by striking ''(a) REDESIGNATION OF PROJECT.—''.

(6) FUNDING FOR TERMINATION COSTS OF RIVER PROTECTION PROJECT.—Section 3131 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–454) is—

(A) transferred to title XLIX of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4905;

(C) inserted after section 4904, as added by paragraph (5); and

(D) amended—

(i) by striking ''section 3141'' and inserting ''section 4904''; and

(ii) by striking ''the date of the enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''October 30, 2000''.

(7) SUBTITLE HEADING ON SAVANNAH RIVER SITE, SOUTH CAROLINA.—Title XLIX of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subtitle heading:

"Subtitle B—Savannah River Site, South Carolina".

(8) ACCELERATED SCHEDULE FOR ISOLATING HIGH-LEVEL NUCLEAR WASTE AT DEFENSE WASTE

PROCESSING FACILITY.—Section 3141 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201; 110 Stat. 2834) is—

(A) transferred to title XLIX of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as 4911; and

(C) inserted after the heading for subtitle B of such title, as added by paragraph (7).

(9) MULTI-YEAR PLAN FOR CLEAN-UP.—Subsection (e) of section 3142 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201; 110 Stat. 2834) is—

(A) transferred to title XLIX of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) inserted after section 4911, as added by paragraph (8); and

(C) amended—

(i) by inserting before the text the following new section heading:

"SEC. 4912. MULTI-YEAR PLAN FOR CLEAN-UP."; and

(ii) by striking ''(e) MULTI-YEAR PLAN FOR CLEAN-UP AT SAVANNAH RIVER SITE.—The Secretary'' and inserting ''The Secretary of Energy''.

(10) CONTINUATION OF PROCESSING, TREATMENT, AND DISPOSAL OF LEGACY NUCLEAR MATERIALS.—

(A) FISCAL YEAR 2001.—Subsection (a) of section 3137 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–460) is—

(i) transferred to title XLIX of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(ii) inserted after section 4912, as added by paragraph (9); and

(iii) amended—

(I) by inserting before the text the following new section heading:

"SEC. 4913. CONTINUATION OF PROCESSING, TREATMENT, AND DISPOSAL OF LEGACY NUCLEAR MATERIALS."; and

(II) by striking ''(a) CONTINUATION.—''.

(B) FISCAL YEAR 2000.—Section 3132 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65; 113 Stat. 924) is—

(i) transferred to title XLIX of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(ii) redesignated as section 4913A; and

(iii) inserted after section 4913, as added by subparagraph (A).

(C) FISCAL YEAR 1999.—Section 3135 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261; 112 Stat. 2248) is—

(i) transferred to title XLIX of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(ii) redesignated as section 4913B; and

(iii) inserted after section 4913A, as added by subparagraph (B).

(D) FISCAL YEAR 1998.—Subsection (b) of section 3136 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85; 111 Stat. 2038) is—

(i) transferred to title XLIX of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(ii) inserted after section 4913B, as added by subparagraph (C); and

(iii) amended—

(I) by inserting before the text the following new section heading:

"SEC. 4913C. CONTINUATION OF PROCESSING, TREATMENT, AND DISPOSAL OF LEGACY NUCLEAR MATERIALS."; and

(II) by striking ''(b) REQUIREMENT FOR CONTINUING OPERATIONS AT SAVANNAH RIVER SITE.—''.

(E) FISCAL YEAR 1997.—Subsection (f) of section 3142 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201; 110 Stat. 2836) is—

(i) transferred to title XLIX of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(ii) inserted after section 4913C, as added by subparagraph (D); and

(iii) amended—

(I) by inserting before the text the following new section heading:

"SEC. 4913D. CONTINUATION OF PROCESSING, TREATMENT, AND DISPOSAL OF LEGACY NUCLEAR MATERIALS.";

(II) by striking ''(f) REQUIREMENT FOR CONTINUING OPERATIONS AT SAVANNAH RIVER SITE.—The Secretary'' and inserting ''The Secretary of Energy''; and

(III) by striking ''subsection (e)'' and inserting ''section 4912''.

(11) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR DECOMMISSIONING F–CANYON FACILITY.—Subsection (b) of section 3137 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–460) is—

(A) transferred to title XLIX of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(B) inserted after section 4913D, as added by paragraph (10)(E); and

(C) amended—

(i) by inserting before the text the following new section heading:

"SEC. 4914. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR DECOMMISSIONING F–CANYON FACILITY.";

(ii) by striking ''(b) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR DECOMMISSIONING F–CANYON FACILITY.—'';

(iii) by striking ''this or any other Act'' and inserting ''the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (as enacted into law by Public Law 106–398) or any other Act''; and

(iv) by striking ''the Secretary'' in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and inserting ''the Secretary of Energy''.

(12) DISPOSITION OF PLUTONIUM.—

(A) DISPOSITION OF WEAPONS USABLE PLUTONIUM.—Section 3182 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314; 116 Stat. 2747) is—

(i) transferred to title XLIX of division D of such Act, as amended by this subsection;

(ii) redesignated as section 4915; and

(iii) inserted after section 4914, as added by paragraph (11).

(B) DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS DEFENSE PLUTONIUM.—Section 3155 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107; 115 Stat. 1378) is—

(i) transferred to title XLIX of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection;

(ii) redesignated as section 4915A; and

(iii) inserted after section 4915, as added by subparagraph (A).

(13) SUBTITLE HEADING ON OTHER FACILITIES.—Title XLIX of division D of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, as amended by this subsection, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subtitle heading:

"Subtitle C—Other Facilities".

(14) PAYMENT OF COSTS OF OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF INFRASTRUCTURE AT NEVADA TEST SITE.—Section 3144 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201; 110 Stat. 2838) is—

(A) transferred to title XLIX of division D of such Act, as amended by this subsection;

(B) redesignated as section 4921; and

(C) inserted after the heading for subtitle C of such title, as added by paragraph (13).

(m) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Title XXXVI of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314; 116 Stat. 1756) is repealed.

(2) Subtitle E of title XXXI of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102–484; 42 U.S.C. 7274h et seq.) is repealed.

(3) Section 8905a(d)(5)(A) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 3143 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (42 U.S.C. 7274n)'' and inserting ''section 4421 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act''.

TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

SEC. 3201. AUTHORIZATION.

There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2004, $19,559,000 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 2004, the National Defense Stockpile Manager may obligate up to $69,701,000 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. REVISIONS TO OBJECTIVES FOR RECEIPTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000 DISPOSALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3402(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65; 113 Stat. 972; 59 U.S.C. 98d note) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (2); and

(2) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

''(3) $310,000,000 before the end of fiscal year 2008; and

''(4) $320,000,000 before the end of fiscal year 2009.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 2003, or the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever is later.

TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

SEC. 3401. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) AMOUNT.—There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Energy $16,500,000 for fiscal year 2004 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

Subtitle A—General Provisions

SEC. 3501. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Maritime Security Act of 2003''.

SEC. 3502. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) BULK CARGO.—The term ''bulk cargo'' means cargo that is loaded and carried in bulk without mark or count.

(2) CONTRACTOR.—The term ''contractor'' means an owner or operator of a vessel that enters into an operating agreement for the vessel with the Secretary under section 3512.

(3) FLEET.—The term ''Fleet'' means the Maritime Security Fleet established under section 3511(a).

(4) FOREIGN COMMERCE.—The term ''foreign commerce''—

(A) subject to subparagraph (B), means commerce or trade between the United States, its territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia, and a foreign country; and

(B) includes, in the case of liquid and dry bulk cargo carrying services, trading between foreign ports in accordance with normal commercial bulk shipping practices in such manner as will permit United States-documented vessels freely to compete with foreign-flag bulk carrying vessels in their operation or in competing for charters, subject to rules and regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Transportation pursuant to subtitle B or C.

(5) FORMER PARTICIPATING FLEET VESSEL.—The term ''former participating fleet vessel'' means—

(A) any vessel that—

(i) on October 1, 2005—

(I) will meet the requirements of paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4) of section 3511(c); and

(II) will be less than 25 years of age, or less than 30 years of age in the case of a LASH vessel; and

(ii) on December 31, 2003, is covered by an operating agreement under subtitle B of title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 App. U.S.C. 1187 et seq.); and

(B) any vessel that—

(i) is a replacement for a vessel described in subparagraph (A);

(ii) is controlled by the person that controls such replaced vessel;

(iii) is eligible to be included in the Fleet under section 3511(b);

(iv) is approved by the Secretary and the Secretary of Defense; and

(v) begins operation under an operating agreement under subtitle B by not later than the end of the 30-month period beginning on the date the operating agreement is entered into by the Secretary.

(6) LASH VESSEL.—The term ''LASH vessel'' means a lighter aboard ship vessel.

(7) PERSON.—The term ''person'' includes corporations, partnerships, and associations existing under or authorized by the laws of the United States, or any State, Territory, District, or possession thereof, or of any foreign country.

(8) PRODUCT TANK VESSEL.—The term ''product tank vessel'' means a double hulled tank vessel capable of carrying simultaneously more than 2 separated grades of refined petroleum products.

(9) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Transportation.

(10) UNITED STATES.—The term ''United States'' includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands.

(11) UNITED STATES-DOCUMENTED VESSEL.—The term ''United States-documented vessel'' means a vessel documented under chapter 121 of title 46, United States Code.

Subtitle B—Maritime Security Fleet

SEC. 3511. ESTABLISHMENT OF MARITIME SECURITY FLEET.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Transportation shall establish a fleet of active, militarily useful, privately owned vessels to meet national defense and other security requirements and maintain a United States presence in international commercial shipping. The Fleet shall consist of privately owned, United States-documented vessels for which there are in effect operating agreements under this subtitle, and shall be known as the Maritime Security Fleet.

(b) VESSEL ELIGIBILITY.—A vessel is eligible to be included in the Fleet if—

(1) the vessel meets the requirements of paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4) of subsection (c);

(2) the vessel is operated (or in the case of a vessel to be constructed, will be operated) in providing transportation in foreign commerce;

(3) the vessel is self-propelled and is—

(A) a roll-on/roll-off vessel with a carrying capacity of at least 80,000 square feet or 500 twenty-foot equivalent units and that is 15 years of age or less on the date the vessel is included in the Fleet;

(B) a tank vessel that is constructed in the United States after the date of the enactment of this subtitle;

(C) a tank vessel that is 10 years of age or less on the date the vessel is included in the Fleet;

(D) a LASH vessel that is 25 years of age or less on the date the vessel is included in the Fleet; or

(E) any other type of vessel that is 15 years of age or less on the date the vessel is included in the Fleet;

except that the Secretary of Transportation shall waive the application of an age restriction under this paragraph if the waiver is requested by the Secretary of Defense;

(4) the vessel is determined by the Secretary of Defense to be suitable for use by the United States for national defense or military purposes in time of war or national emergency; and

(5) the vessel—

(A) is a United States-documented vessel; or

(B) is not a United States-documented vessel, but—

(i) the owner of the vessel has demonstrated an intent to have the vessel documented under chapter 121 of title 46, United States Code, if it is included in the Fleet; and

(ii) at the time an operating agreement for the vessel is entered into under this subtitle, the vessel is eligible for documentation under chapter 121 of title 46, United States Code.

(c) REQUIREMENTS REGARDING CITIZENSHIP OF OWNERS AND CHARTERERS.—

(1) VESSEL OWNED AND OPERATED BY SECTION 2 CITIZENS.—A vessel meets the requirements of this paragraph if, during the period of an operating agreement under this subtitle that applies to the vessel, the vessel will be owned and operated by persons one or more persons that are citizens of the United States under section 2 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (46 App. U.S.C. 802).

(2) VESSEL OWNED BY SECTION 2 CITIZEN AND CHARTERED TO DOCUMENTATION CITIZEN.—A vessel meets the requirements of this paragraph if—

(A) during the period of an operating agreement under this subtitle that applies to the vessel, the vessel will be—

(i) owned by a person that is a citizen of the United States under section 2 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (46 App. U.S.C. 802); and

(ii) demise chartered to a person—

(I) that is eligible to document the vessel under chapter 121 of title 46, United States Code;

(II) the chairman of the board of directors, chief executive officer, and a majority of the members of the board of directors of which are citizens of the United States under section 2 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (46 App. U.S.C. 802), and are appointed and subjected to removal only upon approval by the Secretary; and

(III) that certifies that there are no treaties, statutes, regulations, or other laws that would prohibit the contractor for the vessel from performing its obligations under an operating agreement under this subtitle; and

(B) in the case of a vessel that will be chartered to a person that is owned or controlled by another person that is not a citizen of the United States under section 2 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (46 App. U.S.C. 802), the other person enters into an agreement with the Secretary not to influence the operation of the vessel in a manner that will adversely affect the interests of the United States.

(3) VESSEL OWNED AND OPERATED BY DEFENSE CONTRACTOR.—A vessel meets the requirements of this paragraph if, during the period of an operating agreement under this subtitle that applies to the vessel, the vessel will be owned and operated by one or more persons that—

(A) are eligible to document a vessel under chapter 121 of title 46, United States Code;

(B) operates or manages other United States-documented vessels for the Secretary of Defense, or charters other vessels to the Secretary of Defense;

(C) has entered into a Special Security Agreement for purposes of this paragraph with the Secretary of Defense;

(D) makes the certification described in paragraph (2)(A)(ii)(III); and

(E) in the case of a vessel described in paragraph (2)(B), enters into an agreement referred to in that paragraph.

(4) VESSEL OWNED BY DOCUMENTATION CITIZEN AND CHARTERED TO SECTION 2 CITIZEN.—A vessel meets the requirements of this paragraph if, during the period of an operating agreement under this subtitle that applies to the vessel, the vessel will be—

(A) owned by a person that is eligible to document a vessel under chapter 121 of title 46, United States Code; and

(B) demise chartered to a person that is a citizen of the United States under section 2 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (46 App. U.S.C. 802).

(d) REQUEST BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—The Secretary of Defense shall request the Secretary of Homeland Security to issue any waiver under the first section of Public Law 81–891 (64 Stat. 1120; 46 App. U.S.C. note prec. 3) that is necessary for purposes of this subtitle.

SEC. 3512. AWARD OF OPERATING AGREEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall require, as a condition of including any vessel in the Fleet, that the person that is the owner or charterer of the vessel for purposes of section 3511(c) enter into an operating agreement with the Secretary under this section.

(b) PROCEDURE FOR APPLICATIONS.—

(1) ACCEPTANCE OF APPLICATIONS.—Beginning no later than 30 days after the effective date of this subtitle, the Secretary shall accept applications for enrollment of vessels in the Fleet.

(2) ACTION ON APPLICATIONS.—Within 90 days after receipt of an application for enrollment of a vessel in the Fleet, the Secretary shall enter into an operating agreement with the applicant or provide in writing the reason for denial of that application.

(c) PRIORITY FOR AWARDING AGREEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Secretary shall enter into operating agreements according to the following priority:

(A) NEW TANK VESSELS.—First, for any tank vessel that—

(i) is constructed in the United States after the effective date of this subtitle;

(ii) is eligible to be included in the Fleet under section 3511(b); and

(iii) during the period of an operating agreement under this subtitle that applies to the vessel, will be owned and operated by one or more persons that are citizens of the United States under section 2 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (46 App. U.S.C. 802),

except that the Secretary shall not enter into operating agreements under this subparagraph for more than 5 such vessels.

(B) FORMER PARTICIPATING VESSELS.—Second, to the extent amounts are available after applying subparagraphs (A), for any former participating fleet vessel, except that the Secretary

shall not enter into operating agreements under this subparagraph for more than 47 vessels.

(C) CERTAIN VESSELS OPERATED BY SECTION 2 CITIZENS.—Third, to the extent amounts are available after applying subparagraphs (A) and (B), for any other vessel that is eligible to be included in the Fleet under section 3511(b), and that, during the period of an operating agreement under this subtitle that applies to the vessel, will be—

(i) owned and operated by one or more persons that are citizens of the United States under section 2 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (46 App. U.S.C. 802); or

(ii) owned by a person that is eligible to document the vessel under chapter 121 of title 46, United States Code, and operated by a person that is a citizen of the United States under section 2 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (46 App. U.S.C. 802).

(D) OTHER ELIGIBLE VESSELS.—Fourth, to the extent amounts are available after applying subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), for any other vessel that is eligible to be included in the Fleet under section 3511(b).

(2) REDUCTION IN NUMBER OF SLOTS FOR FORMER PARTICIPATING FLEET VESSELS.—The number in paragraph (1)(B) shall be reduced by 1—

(A) for each former participating fleet vessel for which an application for enrollment in the Fleet is not received by the Secretary within the 90-day period beginning on the effective date of this subtitle; and

(B) for each former participating fleet vessel for which an application for enrollment in the Fleet received by the Secretary is not approved by the Secretary of Defense within the 90-day period beginning on the date of such receipt.

(3) DISCRETION WITHIN PRIORITY.—The Secretary—

(A) subject to subparagraph (B), may award operating agreements within each priority under paragraph (1) as the Secretary considers appropriate; and

(B) shall award operating agreement within a priority—

(i) in accordance with operational requirements specified by the Secretary of Defense; and

(ii) subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense.

(4) TREATMENT OF TANK VESSEL TO BE REPLACED.—(A) For purposes of the application of paragraph (1)(A) with respect to the award of an operating agreement, the Secretary may treat an existing tank vessel that is eligible to be included in the Fleet under section 3511(b) as a vessel that is constructed in the United States after the effective date of this subtitle, if—

(i) a binding contract for construction in the United States of a replacement vessel to be operated under the operating agreement is executed by not later than 9 months after the first date amounts are available to carry out this subtitle; and

(ii) the replacement vessel is eligible to be included in the Fleet under section 3511(b).

(B) No payment under this subtitle may be made for an existing tank vessel for which an operating agreement is awarded under this paragraph after the earlier of—

(i) 4 years after the first date amounts are available to carry out this subtitle; or

(ii) the date of delivery of the replacement tank vessel.

(d) LIMITATION.—The Secretary may not award operating agreements under this subtitle that require payments under section 3515 for a fiscal year for more than 60 vessels.

SEC. 3513. EFFECTIVENESS OF OPERATING AGREEMENTS.

(a) EFFECTIVENESS, GENERALLY.—The Secretary may enter into an operating agreement under this subtitle for fiscal year 2006. Except as provided in subsection (b), the agreement shall be effective only for 1 fiscal year, but shall be renewable, subject to the availability of appropriations, for each subsequent fiscal year through the end of fiscal year 2015.

(b) VESSELS UNDER CHARTER TO U.S.—Unless an earlier date is requested by the applicant, the effective date for an operating agreement with respect to a vessel that is, on the date of entry into an operating agreement, on charter to the United States Government, other than a charter pursuant to an Emergency Preparedness Agreement under section 3516, shall be the expiration or termination date of the Government charter covering the vessel, or any earlier date the vessel is withdrawn from that charter.

(c) TERMINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the contractor with respect to an operating agreement fails to comply with the terms of the agreement—

(A) the Secretary shall terminate the operating agreement; and

(B) any budget authority obligated by the agreement shall be available to the Secretary to carry out this subtitle.

(2) EARLY TERMINATION.—An operating agreement under this subtitle shall terminate on a date specified by the contractor if the contractor notifies the Secretary, by not later than 60 days before the effective date of the termination, that the contractor intends to terminate the agreement.

(d) NONRENEWAL FOR LACK OF FUNDS.—

(1) NOTIFICATION OF CONGRESS.—If, by the first day of a fiscal year, sufficient funds have not been appropriated under the authority provided by this subtitle for that fiscal year, then the Secretary shall notify the Congress that operating agreements authorized under this subtitle for which sufficient funds are not available will not be renewed for that fiscal year if sufficient funds are not appropriated by the 60th day of that fiscal year.

(2) RELEASE OF VESSELS FROM OBLIGATIONS.—If funds are not appropriated under the authority provided by this subtitle for any fiscal year by the 60th day of that fiscal year, then each vessel covered by an operating agreement under this subtitle for which funds are not available—

(A) is thereby released from any further obligation under the operating agreement;

(B) the owner or operator of the vessel may transfer and register such vessel under a foreign registry that is acceptable to the Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of Defense, notwithstanding section 9 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (46 App. U.S.C. 808); and

(C) if section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 App. U.S.C. 1242) is applicable to such vessel after registration of the vessel under such a registry, then the vessel is available to be requisitioned by the Secretary of Transportation pursuant to section 902 of such Act.

SEC. 3514. OBLIGATIONS AND RIGHTS UNDER OPERATING AGREEMENTS.

(a) OPERATION OF VESSEL.—An operating agreement under this subtitle shall require that, during the period a vessel is operating under the agreement—

(1) the vessel—

(A) shall be operated exclusively in the foreign commerce or in mixed foreign commerce and domestic trade allowed under a registry endorsement issued under section 12105 of title 46, United States Code; and

(B) shall not otherwise be operated in the coastwise trade; and

(2) the vessel shall be documented under chapter 121 of title 46, United States Code.

(b) ANNUAL PAYMENTS BY SECRETARY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An operating agreement under this subtitle shall require, subject to the availability of appropriations, that the Secretary make a payment each fiscal year to the contractor in accordance with section 3515.

(2) OPERATING AGREEMENT IS OBLIGATION OF UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT.—An operating agreement under this subtitle constitutes a contractual obligation of the United States Government to pay the amounts provided for in the agreement to the extent of actual appropriations.

(c) DOCUMENTATION REQUIREMENT.—Each vessel covered by an operating agreement (including an agreement terminated under section 3513(c)(2)) shall remain documented under chapter 121 of title 46, United States Code, until the date the operating agreement would terminate according to its terms.

(d) NATIONAL SECURITY REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A contractor with respect to an operating agreement (including an agreement terminated under section 3513(c)(2)) shall continue to be bound by the provisions of section 3516 until the date the operating agreement would terminate according to its terms.

(2) EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS AGREEMENT.—All terms and conditions of an Emergency Preparedness Agreement entered into under section 3516 shall remain in effect until the date the operating agreement would terminate according to its terms, except that the terms of such Emergency Preparedness Agreement may be modified by the mutual consent of the contractor and the Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of Defense.

(e) TRANSFER OF OPERATING AGREEMENTS.—A contractor under an operating agreement may transfer the agreement (including all rights and obligations under the agreement) to any person that is eligible to enter into that operating agreement under this subtitle, if the transfer is approved by the Secretary and the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 3515. PAYMENTS.

(a) ANNUAL PAYMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, subject to the availability of appropriations and the other provisions of this section, shall pay to the contractor for an operating agreement, for each vessel that is covered by the operating agreement, an amount equal to—

(A) $2,600,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and

(B) such amount, not less than $2,600,000, for each fiscal year thereafter for which the agreement is in effect as the Secretary, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense, considers to be necessary to meet the operational requirements of the Secretary of Defense.

(2) TIMING.—The amount shall be paid in equal monthly installments at the end of each month. The amount shall not be reduced except as provided by this section.

(b) CERTIFICATION REQUIRED FOR PAYMENT.—As a condition of receiving payment under this section for a fiscal year for a vessel, the contractor for the vessel shall certify, in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary, that the vessel has been and will be operated in accordance with section 3514(a)(1) for at least 320 days in the fiscal year. Days during which the vessel is drydocked, surveyed, inspected, or repaired shall be considered days of operation for purposes of this subsection.

(c) LIMITATIONS.—The Secretary of Transportation shall not make any payment under this subtitle for a vessel with respect to any days for which the vessel is—

(1) under a charter to the United States Government, other than a charter pursuant to an Emergency Preparedness Agreement under section 3516;

(2) not operated or maintained in accordance with an operating agreement under this subtitle; or

(3) more than—

(A) 25 years of age, except as provided in subparagraph (B) or (C);

(B) 20 years of age, in the case of a tank vessel; or

(C) 30 years of age, in the case of a LASH vessel.

(d) REDUCTIONS IN PAYMENTS.—With respect to payments under this subtitle for a vessel covered by an operating agreement, the Secretary—

(1) except as provided in paragraph (2), shall not reduce any payment for the operation of the vessel to carry military or other preference cargoes under section 2631 of title 10, United States Code, the Act of March 26, 1934 (46 App. U.S.C.

1241–1), section 901(a), 901(b), or 901b of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 App. U.S.C. 1241(a), 1241(b), or 1241f), or any other cargo preference law of the United States;

(2) shall not make any payment for any day that the vessel is engaged in transporting more than 7,500 tons of civilian bulk preference cargoes pursuant to section 901(a), 901(b), or 901b of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 App. U.S.C. 1241(a), 1241(b), or 1241f), that is cargo; and

(3) shall make a pro rata reduction in payment for each day less than 320 in a fiscal year that the vessel is not operated in accordance with section 3514(a)(1), with days during which the vessel is drydocked or undergoing survey, inspection, or repair considered to be days on which the vessel is operated.

SEC. 3516. NATIONAL SECURITY REQUIREMENTS.

(a) EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS AGREEMENT REQUIRED.—The Secretary shall establish an Emergency Preparedness Program under this section that is approved by the Secretary of Defense. Under the program, the Secretary shall include in each operating agreement under this subtitle a requirement that the contractor enter into an Emergency Preparedness Agreement under this section with the Secretary. The Secretary shall negotiate and enter into an Emergency Preparedness Agreement with each contractor as promptly as practicable after the contractor has entered into an operating agreement under this subtitle.

(b) TERMS OF AGREEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An Emergency Preparedness Agreement under this section shall require that upon a request by the Secretary of Defense during time of war or national emergency, or whenever determined by the Secretary of Defense to be necessary for national security or contingency operation (as that term is defined in section 101 of title 10, United States Code), a contractor for a vessel covered by an operating agreement under this subtitle shall make available commercial transportation resources (including services).

(2) BASIC TERMS.—(A) The basic terms of the Emergency Preparedness Agreement shall be established (subject to subparagraph (B)) pursuant to consultations among the Secretary and the Secretary of Defense.

(B) In any Emergency Preparedness Agreement, the Secretary and a contractor may agree to additional or modifying terms appropriate to the contractor's circumstances if those terms have been approved by the Secretary of Defense.

(c) PARTICIPATION AFTER EXPIRATION OF OPERATING AGREEMENT.—Except as provided by section 3514(c), the Secretary may not require, through an Emergency Preparedness Agreement or operating agreement, that a contractor continue to participate in an Emergency Preparedness Agreement after the operating agreement with the contractor has expired according to its terms or is otherwise no longer in effect. After expiration of an Emergency Preparedness Agreement, a contractor may volunteer to continue to participate in such an agreement.

(d) RESOURCES MADE AVAILABLE.—The commercial transportation resources to be made available under an Emergency Preparedness Agreement shall include vessels or capacity in vessels, intermodal systems and equipment, terminal facilities, intermodal and management services, and other related services, or any agreed portion of such nonvessel resources for activation as the Secretary of Defense may determine to be necessary, seeking to minimize disruption of the contractor's service to commercial shippers.

(e) COMPENSATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall include in each Emergency Preparedness Agreement provisions approved by the Secretary of Defense under which the Secretary of Defense shall pay fair and reasonable compensation for all commercial transportation resources provided pursuant to this section.

(2) SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS.—Compensation under this subsection—

(A) shall not be less than the contractor's commercial market charges for like transportation resources;

(B) shall be fair and reasonable considering all circumstances;

(C) shall be provided from the time that a vessel or resource is required by the Secretary of Defense until the time that it is redelivered to the contractor and is available to reenter commercial service; and

(D) shall be in addition to and shall not in any way reflect amounts payable under section 3515.

(f) TEMPORARY REPLACEMENT VESSELS.—Notwithstanding section 2631 of title 10, United States Code, the Act of March 26, 1934 (46 App. U.S.C. 1241–1), section 901(a), 901(b), or 901b of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 App. U.S.C. 1241(a), 1241(b), or 1241f), or any other cargo preference law of the United States—

(1) a contractor may operate or employ in foreign commerce a foreign-flag vessel or foreign-flag vessel capacity as a temporary replacement for a United States-documented vessel or United States-documented vessel capacity that is activated by the Secretary of Defense under an Emergency Preparedness Agreement or under a primary Department of Defense-approved sealift readiness program; and

(2) such replacement vessel or vessel capacity shall be eligible during the replacement period to transport preference cargoes subject to section 2631 of title 10, United States Code, the Act of March 26, 1934 (46 App. U.S.C. 1241–1), and sections 901(a), 901(b), and 901b of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 App. U.S.C. 1241(a), 1241(b), and 1241b) to the same extent as the eligibility of the vessel or vessel capacity replaced.

(g) REDELIVERY AND LIABILITY OF U.S. FOR DAMAGES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—All commercial transportation resources activated under an Emergency Preparedness Agreement shall, upon termination of the period of activation, be redelivered to the contractor in the same good order and condition as when received, less ordinary wear and tear, or the Secretary of Defense shall fully compensate the contractor for any necessary repair or replacement.

(2) LIMITATION ON LIABILITY OF U.S.—Except as may be expressly agreed to in an Emergency Preparedness Agreement, or as otherwise provided by law, the Government shall not be liable for disruption of a contractor's commercial business or other consequential damages to a contractor arising from activation of commercial transportation resources under an Emergency Preparedness Agreement.

SEC. 3517. REGULATORY RELIEF.

(a) OPERATION IN FOREIGN COMMERCE.—A contractor for a vessel included in an operating agreement under this subtitle may operate the vessel in the foreign commerce of the United States without restriction.

(b) OTHER RESTRICTIONS.—The restrictions of section 901(b)(1) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 App. U.S.C. 1241(b)(1)) concerning the building, rebuilding, or documentation of a vessel in a foreign country shall not apply to a vessel for any day the operator of that vessel is receiving payments for operation of that vessel under an operating agreement under this subtitle.

SEC. 3518. SPECIAL RULE REGARDING AGE OF FORMER PARTICIPATING FLEET VESSEL.

Sections 3511(b)(3) and 3515(c)(3) shall not apply to a former participating fleet vessel described in section 3502(5)(A), during the 30-month period referred to in section 3502(5)(B)(v) with respect to the vessel, if the Secretary determines that the contractor for the vessel has entered into an arrangement to obtain and operate under the operating agreement for the former participating fleet vessel a replacement vessel that, upon commencement of such operation, will be eligible to be included in the Fleet under section 3511(b).

SEC. 3519. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated for payments under section 3515, to remain available until expended, $156,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 and 2007, and such sums as may be necessary for each fiscal year thereafter through fiscal year 2015.

SEC. 3520. AMENDMENT TO SHIPPING ACT, 1916.

Section 9 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (46 App. U.S.C. 808) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) Notwithstanding subsection (c)(2), the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, or any contract entered into with the Secretary of Transportation under that Act, a vessel may be placed under a foreign registry, without approval of the Secretary, if—

''(1)(A) the Secretary, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense, determines that at least one replacement vessel of like capability and of a capacity that is equivalent or greater, as measured by deadweight tons, gross tons, or container equivalent units, as appropriate, is documented under chapter 121 of title 46, United States Code, by the owner of the vessel placed under the foreign registry; and

''(B) the replacement vessel is not more than 10 years of age on the date of that documentation; and

''(2) an operating agreement covering the vessel under the Maritime Security Act of 2003 has expired.''.

SEC. 3521. REGULATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of Defense may each prescribe rules as necessary to carry out this subtitle and the amendments made by this subtitle.

(b) INTERIM RULES.—The Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of Defense may each prescribe interim rules necessary to carry out this subtitle and the amendments made by this subtitle. For this purpose, the Secretaries are excepted from compliance with the notice and comment requirements of section 553 of title 5, United States Code. All interim rules prescribed under the authority of this subsection that are not earlier superseded by final rules shall expire no later than 270 days after the effective date of this subtitle.

SEC. 3522. REPEALS AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) REPEALS.—The following provisions are repealed:

(1) Subtitle B of title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 App. U.S.C. 1187 et seq.).

(2) Section 804 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 App. U.S.C. 1222).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 12102(d)(4) of title 46, United States Code, is amended by inserting ''or section 3511(b) of the Maritime Security Act of 2003'' after ''Merchant Marine Act, 1936''.

SEC. 3523. EFFECTIVE DATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), this subtitle shall take effect October 1, 2004.

(b) REPEALS AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 3522 shall take effect October 1, 2005.

(c) REGULATIONS.—Section 3521 and this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

Subtitle C—National Defense Tank Vessel Construction Assistance

SEC. 3531. NATIONAL DEFENSE TANK VESSEL CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM.

The Secretary of Transportation shall establish a program for the provision of financial assistance for the construction in the United States of a fleet of up to 5 privately owned product tank vessels—

(1) to be operated in commercial service in foreign commerce; and

(2) to be available for national defense purposes in time of war or national emergency pursuant to an Emergency Preparedness Plan approved by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to section 3533(e) of this subtitle.

SEC. 3532. APPLICATION PROCEDURE. –

(a) REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS.—Within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this subtitle, and on an as-needed basis thereafter, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall publish in the Federal Register a request for competitive proposals for the construction of new product tank vessels necessary to meet the commercial and national security needs of the United States and to be built with assistance under this subtitle.

(b) QUALIFICATION.—Any citizen of the United States or any shipyard in the United States may submit a proposal to the Secretary of Transportation for purposes of constructing a product tank vessel with assistance under this subtitle.

(c) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense, may enter into an agreement with the submitter of a proposal for assistance under this subtitle if the Secretary determines that—

(1) the plans and specifications call for construction of a new product tank vessel of not less than 35,000 deadweight tons and not greater than 60,000 deadweight tons, that—

(A) will meet the requirements of foreign commerce;

(B) is capable of carrying militarily useful petroleum products, and will be suitable for national defense or military purposes in time of war, national emergency, or other military contingency; and

(C) will meet the construction standards necessary to be documented under the laws of the United States;

(2) the shipyard in which the vessel will be constructed has the necessary capacity and expertise to successfully construct the proposed number and type of product tank vessels in a reasonable period of time as determined by the Secretary of Transportation, taking into consideration the recent prior commercial shipbuilding history of the proposed shipyard in delivering a vessel or series of vessels on time and in accordance with the contract price and specifications; and

(3) the person proposed to be the operator of the proposed vessel possesses the ability, experience, financial resources, and any other qualifications determined to be necessary by the Secretary for the operation and maintenance of the vessel.

(d) PRIORITY.—The Secretary—

(1) subject to paragraph (2), shall give priority consideration to a proposal submitted by a person that is a citizen of the United States under section 2 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (46 App. U.S.C. 802); and

(2) may give priority to consideration of proposals that provide the best value to the Government, taking into consideration—

(A) the costs of vessel construction; and

(B) the commercial and national security needs of the United States.

SEC. 3533. AWARD OF ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If after review of a proposal, the Secretary determines that the proposal fulfills the requirements under this subtitle, the Secretary may enter into a contract with the proposed purchaser and the proposed shipyard for the construction of a product tank vessel with assistance under this subtitle.

(b) AMOUNT OF ASSISTANCE.—The contract shall provide that the Secretary shall pay, subject to the availability of appropriations, up to 75 percent of the actual construction cost of the vessel, but in no case more than $50,000,000 per vessel.

(c) CONSTRUCTION IN UNITED STATES.—A contract under this section shall require that construction of a vessel with assistance under this subtitle shall be performed in a shipyard in the United States.

(d) DOCUMENTATION OF VESSEL.—

(1) CONTRACT REQUIREMENT.—A contract under this section shall require that, upon delivery of a vessel constructed with assistance under the contract, the vessel shall be documented under chapter 121 of title 46, United States Code with a registry endorsement only.

(2) RESTRICTION ON COASTWISE ENDORSEMENT.—A vessel constructed with assistance under this subtitle shall not be eligible for a certificate of documentation with a coastwise endorsement.

(3) AUTHORITY TO REFLAG NOT APPLICABLE.—Section 9(e) of the Shipping Act, 1916, (46 App. U.S.C. 808(e)) shall not apply to a vessel constructed with assistance under this subtitle.

(e) EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS AGREEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A contract under this section shall require that the person who will be the operator of a vessel constructed with assistance under the contract shall enter into an Emergency Preparedness Agreement for the vessel under section 3516.

(2) TREATMENT AS CONTRACTOR.—For purposes of the application, under paragraph (1), of section 3516 to a vessel constructed with assistance under this subtitle, the term ''contractor'' as used in section 3516 means the person who will be the operator of a vessel constructed with assistance under this subtitle.

(f) ADDITIONAL TERMS.—The Secretary shall incorporate in the contract the requirements set forth in this subtitle, and may incorporate in the contract any additional terms the Secretary considers necessary.

SEC. 3534. PRIORITY FOR TITLE XI ASSISTANCE.

Section 1103 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 App. U.S.C. 1273) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(i) PRIORITY.—In guaranteeing and entering commitments to guarantee under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to guarantees and commitments for vessels that are otherwise eligible for a guarantee under this section and that are constructed with assistance under subtitle C of the Maritime Security Act of 2003.''.

SEC. 3535. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this subtitle a total of $250,000,000 for fiscal years after fiscal year 2004.

Subtitle D—Maritime Administration Authorization

SEC. 3541. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR MARITIME ADMINISTRATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2004, to be available without fiscal year limitation if so provided in appropriations Acts, for the use of the Department of Transportation for the Maritime Administration as follows:

(1) For expenses necessary for operations and training activities, $104,400,000, of which $13,000,000 is for capital improvements at the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

(2) For expenses under the loan guarantee program authorized by title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 App. U.S.C. 1271 et seq.), $39,498,000, of which—

(A) $35,000,000 is for the cost (as defined in section 502(5) of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661a(5))) of loan guarantees under the program; and

(B) $4,498,000 is for administrative expenses related to loan guarantee commitments under the program.

(3) For expenses to dispose of obsolete vessels in the National Defense Reserve Fleet, $20,000,000.

SEC. 3542. AUTHORITY TO CONVEY VESSEL USS HOIST (ARS–40).

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other law, the Secretary of Transportation may convey the right, title, and interest of the United States Government in and to the vessel USS HOIST (ARS–40), to the Last Patrol Museum, located in Toledo, Ohio (a not-for-profit corporation, in this section referred to as the ''recipient''), for use as a military museum, if—

(1) the recipient agrees to use the vessel as a nonprofit military museum;

(2) the vessel is not used for commercial transportation purposes;

(3) the recipient agrees to make the vessel available to the Government when the Secretary requires use of the vessel by the Government;

(4) the recipient agrees that when the recipient no longer requires the vessel for use as a military museum—

(A) the recipient will, at the discretion of the Secretary, reconvey the vessel to the Government in good condition except for ordinary wear and tear; or

(B) if the Board of Trustees of the recipient has decided to dissolve the recipient according to the laws of the State of New York, then—

(i) the recipient shall distribute the vessel, as an asset of the recipient, to a person that has been determined exempt from taxation under the provisions of section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code, or to the Federal Government or a State or local government for a public purpose; and

(ii) the vessel shall be disposed of by a court of competent jurisdiction of the county in which the principal office of the recipient is located, for such purposes as the court shall determine, or to such organizations as the court shall determine are organized exclusively for public purposes;

(5) the recipient agrees to hold the Government harmless for any claims arising from exposure to asbestos, polychlorinated biphenyls, or lead paint after conveyance of the vessel, except for claims arising from use by the Government under paragraph (3) or (4); and

(6) the recipient has available, for use to restore the vessel, in the form of cash, liquid assets, or a written loan commitment, financial resources of at least $100,000.

(b) DELIVERY OF VESSEL.—If a conveyance is made under this section, the Secretary shall deliver the vessel at the place where the vessel is located on the date of enactment of this Act, in its present condition, and without cost to the Government.

(c) OTHER UNNEEDED EQUIPMENT.—The Secretary may also convey any unneeded equipment from other vessels in the National Defense Reserve Fleet in order to restore the USS HOIST (ARS–40) to museum quality.

(d) RETENTION OF VESSEL IN NDRF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall retain in the National Defense Reserve Fleet the vessel authorized to be conveyed under subsection (a), until the earlier of—

(A) 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(B) the date of conveyance of the vessel under subsection (a).

(2) LIMITATION.—Paragraph (1) does not require the Secretary to retain the vessel in the National Defense Reserve Fleet if the Secretary determines that retention of the vessel in the fleet will pose an unacceptable risk to the marine environment.

Amend the title so as to read: ''A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2004 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.''.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is in order except those printed in House Report 108–120 or those made in order by a subsequent order of the House.

Each amendment printed in the report shall be offered only in the order printed, except as specified in section 2 of the resolution, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, debatable for the time specified, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, except that the chairman and ranking minority member each may offer one pro forma amendment for the purpose of further debate on any pending amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

The Chairman of the Committee of Whole may recognize for consideration of any amendment 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 108–120.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 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. 1 offered by Mr. HUNTER:

Page 34, line 15, strike the first period.

Page 90, line 17, insert open quotation marks before ''subparagraph''.

Page 99, line 7, strike the open quotation marks.

Page 125, line 5, strike ''551'' and insert ''991''.

Page 136, beginning on line 4, strike ''chapter'' and insert ''subchapter''.

Strike section 617(b)(2) (page 165, line 19, through the matter following line 6 on page 166) and insert the following:

(2) The heading of such section, and the item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 40 of such title, are each amended by striking the sixth word.

Page 210, line 12, strike the single open and close quotation marks and insert double open and close quotation marks.

Page 213, line 25, insert ''of such section'' after ''Subsection (c)''.

Page 219, beginning on line 18, strike ''the end''.

Page 220, line 8, strike ''adding at the end'' and insert ''inserting after the item relating to section 2435''.

Page 227, line 5, strike ''(d)'' and insert ''(d)(3)''.

Page 229, line 14, strike ''**Unites**'' and insert ''**United**''.

Page 231, line 14, strike ''Department of'' and all that follows through ''amounts'' on line 15 and insert ''Department of Defense such amounts''.

Page 231, line 18, strike ''; and'' and insert a period.

Page 231, strike lines 19 and 20.

Page 232, in the matter after line 16, strike ''Unites'' and insert ''United''.

In section 1012(b)(1) (page 253, line 13), insert ''the end of such subsection'' after ''through''.

In section 1014(b)(1) (page 257, line 2), strike ''this title'' and insert ''title XXXV''.

Page 262, line 20, insert a one-em dash after the period.

Page 264, line 11, strike ''2216(a)'' and insert ''2216(i)''.

Page 264, line 15, insert ''(1)'' before ''Not later than''.

Page 271, line 11, strike ''striking 'by''.

Page 275, line 19, strike ''2868'' and insert ''2868(a)''.

In section 1031(d), strike paragraph (2) (page 290, lines 13-15) and insert the following:

(2) Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize the Secretary to acquire, lease, construct, improve, renovate, remodel, repair, operate, or maintain facilities having general utility.

Page 299, line 6, strike ''after section 425'' and insert ''at the end of subchapter I (after the section added by section 805(b)(1) of this Act)''.

Page 299, line 8, strike ''**426**'' and insert ''**427**''.

Page 301, line 20, after ''at the end'' insert ''(after the item added by section 805(b)(2) of this Act''.

Page 301, in the matter after line 21, strike ''426'' and insert ''427''.

Page 303, beginning on line 11, strike ''such subchapter'' and insert ''subchapter I of such chapter''.

In section 1045(a)(7), strike ''7503(d)'' (page 310, line 16) and insert ''7305(d)''.

In section 1045(e), strike ''819'' (page 311, line 25) and insert ''819(a)''.

In section 317, strike subsection (a) (page 59, lines 18 through 21) and redesignate subsequent subsections accordingly.

In section 318, strike subsection (a) (page 61, lines 3 through 18) and insert the following new subsection:

(a) DEFINITION OF HARASSMENT FOR MILITARY READINESS ACTIVITIES.—Section 3(18) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1362(18)) is amended by striking subparagraphs (B) and (C) and inserting the following new subparagraphs:

''(B) In the case of a military readiness activity (as defined in section 315(f) of Public Law 107–314; 16 U.S.C. 703 note), the term 'harassment' means—

''(i) any act that injures or has the significant potential to injure a marine mammal or marine mammal stock in the wild; or

''(ii) any act that disturbs or is likely to disturb a marine mammal or marine mammal stock in the wild by causing disruption of natural behavioral patterns, including, but not limited to, migration, surfacing, nursing, breeding, feeding, or sheltering, to a point where such behavioral patterns are abandoned or significantly altered.

''(C) The term 'Level A harassment' means harassment described in subparagraph (A)(i) or, in the case of a military readiness activity, harassment described in subparagraph (B)(i).

''(D) The term 'Level B harassment' means harassment described in subparagraph (A)(ii) or, in the case of a military readiness activity, harassment described in subparagraph (B)(ii).''.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 245, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

□ 1615

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BEREUTER). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RAHALL. Who controls the time in opposition?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A Member in opposition to the amendment.

Does the gentleman claim that time?

Mr. RAHALL. I so claim that time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) will be recognized in opposition.

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

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

This amendment makes a number of technical corrections that were provided by the Office of Legislative Counsel. It also clarifies several technical points that were raised after the report was filed. For example, on page 290, I have added language to make it clear that the re-leasing of office space will continue to be handled by GSA.

Beyond those corrections that I have described, the amendment also contains the walkback that the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) just described with respect to the Endangered Species Act on DOD bases, saying simply that the Endangered Species Act changes are limited to the Department of Defense and that, in fact, the definition of endangered species is walked back to the language that was described by DOD when it was sent to us.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is eminently reasonable. I just pointed out a few minutes ago, with the four overlaps for the Pendleton Marine base, where American Marines practice dying for this country and they can only utilize at this time a very small portion of that 17-mile red beach because there are animals that need to be protected on that beach. Once you overlay the estuarine areas, the gnatcatcher areas and a number of other areas that have now been designated for lockout to the military or controlled use, you have an extremely diminished base in terms of training. So those very fine people that we have sent to the Middle East to carry out American foreign policy are seeing a diminished training area in the United States.

And that is across the board, Mr. Chairman. You can go to Camp Lejeune, where they now have to employ 80 biologists just to try to move these areas around, or any of the other bases, Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, and you will see that some of them are diminished up to 70, 80 percent, locked out, where the military is locked out of their own base and cannot use it for training.

This is a balance, Mr. Chairman. It is a balance that passed on a bipartisan basis, in fact, in fuller measure than what we have here out of the Committee on Resources. So I think it is absolutely appropriate that this walkback, where now only the Department of Defense is going to be able to receive this treatment, is manifested.

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I do rise in opposition to the Hunter amendment.

I think at this point in time there is some clarification needed as to the situation that we are in. Many Members may well be confused.

First, this same amendment was filed by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) before the Committee on Rules; and for reasons only known on the other side of the aisle in their internal machinations, it is now in order under the gentleman from California's name. We have all of 10 minutes to debate what are truly far-reaching changes to environmental law under this rule.

In fact, the amendment does make one important improvement in the language originally reported by the Committee on Resources. It strikes extraneous language that would have gutted a key provision of the Endangered Species Act. In this one case, the administration did not even request or support the language. But make no mistake about it, the rest of the Hunter amendment leaves intact all the exemptions and changes sought by the DOD, and I think that is worth repeating. It leaves intact all the exemptions and changes to the Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act that the Pentagon wants. All those exemptions and changes will remain in the bill if the current Hunter amendment is adopted.

And there is one added bonus, a special bonus here. That is a special endangered species exemption that applies to only one Arizona base which is described by the Arizona Republic as a ''silly rider'' that is not even necessary. That, too, is left intact by the Hunter amendment.

Simply put, the environmental exemptions which would be codified by the Hunter amendment are overbroad and unjustified. As a May 15 article in the Chicago Tribune stated, the bill language now before us would grant the Department of Defense exemptions which would ''apply to all military facilities, including golf courses, irrigated gardens and swimming pools.'' For those of us who have spoken out against the military exemptions, this is unacceptable. The American people respect and support our military, but they do not believe nor do I believe that the Pentagon should be held unaccountable or exempt from the laws which apply to all of us.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and I proposed a substitute that would have addressed DOD concerns about future readiness activities in an environmentally responsible manner. That amendment was supported by many major environmental organizations. But because of the Republican rule that is now being jammed down our throats, we have no opportunity to consider the Rahall-Dingell amendment. It is only the Hunter amendment, take it or leave it, which forces us to vote to endorse the military exemptions to get rid of one extraneous ESA rider.

I urge Members to vote ''no'' on the Hunter amendment.

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

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

I would just say this. With respect to Marine Mammal, I think the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) described it best. This is a commonsense amendment. I have not met a single environmentalist who does not agree with this. That says that if you have a seal sitting on a buoy and a Navy ship goes by, if the seal even looks up, he is, according to at least one biologist in the Department of Fish and Wildlife, potentially disturbed. If you potentially disturb a seal, you cannot undertake that particular military activity.

What we are losing, Mr. Chairman, is our ability to practice our sonar capability and our new sonar equipment. That means life and death for the kids who are underneath the water in those submarines whose lives depend on being able to hear the enemy submarine before it hears them and destroys them.

So I would just say to my colleague and to all my colleagues, most of this language is what we passed with a big vote last year on a bipartisan basis. It is absolutely reasonable. It has been walked back to DOD. I would just recommend, take ''yes'' for an answer.

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

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

I would just respond to the gentleman from California as we have responded numerous times today during this debate. There are exemptions in current law that the DOD can exercise whenever it finds conditions where national security warrants such exemptions to any environmental laws. To this date, in all reports that we have asked for, we have not seen where DOD has asked to utilize the current exemptions allowed under current law.

As we all know, our forces did a tremendous job in Iraq. We on this side of the aisle support our troops as strongly as those on the other side of the aisle, as strongly as all Americans do, and we praise the very effective job that they did. And we would add that they did it under current law.

The briefings that I have had, the briefings that I have attended for all Members of Congress, even the briefing I had with General Franks in Dohar a month or so ago, none of those briefings listed any problems that our military had with current law or the exemptions that they have to use under current law that would have in any way endangered our commanders or our military in their preparations of our troops for combat readiness, as they have been so well trained.

I say the current language works. That is what we should recognize has served our military so well and allowed them to be the great force that they are.

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON).

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

The amendment that we are debating is, I think, a pretty commonsense amendment. The military, DOD, came to us and said, we need some limited relief from the Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act. This gives them essentially what they want without going outside or further than they requested. And so it seems to me that this is a good, commonsense amendment. I commend the gentleman from Colorado for bringing it forward.

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

In conclusion, I would state that I am supported in this effort by the ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the gentleman from Michigan, the dean of the House. I am also supported by a number of other ranking members on our side of the aisle. The gentleman from Missouri has already made his views firmly known before this body, and he is our respected ranking member on the Committee on Armed Forces, the authorizing committee. I would just say that this issue is too important to leave all critical habitat designations as subject to the whims and caprices of the Secretary. I would urge the defeat of the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, there is no exemption for the Marine Mammal Act, so that is one reason why it has not been sought. I would just say there is one endangered species that this provision protects and that is the 19-year-old Marine or soldier or airman who needs adequate training and right now is seeing his training areas diminished by conservationism and environmentalism. Let us give conservation and environmentalism a good name and let us balance those two important goals with another goal which is keeping our men and women in uniform alive when they are in combat.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. 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. RAHALL. 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.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 108–120.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 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. 2 offered by Mr. GOODE:

At the end of title X (page ___, after line ___), 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, 2005.''.

(b) COMMENCEMENT OF TRAINING PROGRAM.—The training program required by subsection (b) of section 374a of title 10, United States Code, 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 245, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) 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.

This amendment is called the troops on the border amendment. This amendment would authorize the use of troops on the borders of the United States if the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security, after consultation, felt it was needed for our national security, if it was needed to curtail illegal immigration, if it was needed to curtail the flow of illegal drugs into our country.

We saw just a few weeks ago the tragedy that occurred when 19 illegal immigrants died from suffocation. If we had had troops on the border or this legislation if it had been passed and they were worried about troops being on our border, it would have been a message not to attempt something so dangerous. Having troops on our borders would save lives and would be an enhancement to our security and our safety.

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

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

I understand the gentleman from Virginia's concern. I understand also the need to increase enforcement along our borders to protect against terrorism and against drug trafficking.

Mr. Chairman, I spent more than 26 years in Federal law enforcement on the border between the United States and Mexico. I was on the front line of our Nation's war on drugs and against terrorism. I know how difficult it is to secure our Nation's border, and I know the need for additional resources. However, I rise in opposition to this amendment because it is simply the wrong solution to our current problems along our border. This amendment will send our military personnel to our borders at a time when they are already stretched thin in Iraq, Afghanistan, the Philippines, and over 100 countries around the world.

□ 1630

We cannot and should not ask our military personnel to patrol our borders. We need our military to be at their best. Patrolling our borders against illegal immigration has minimal military value and detracts from training with war-fighting equipment for war-fighting missions. It will lead to decreased military training which reduces unit readiness levels and overall combat effectiveness of our Armed Forces. I may not agree with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE) today, but I know that he wants to do what is right for our country. I would therefore ask him now to join with me and find a way to place additional law enforcement personnel on the border, not military personnel.

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

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, may I make a parliamentary inquiry first?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BEREUTER). The gentleman is recognized for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, if I need 2 minutes, can I yield back 1 minute? I do not want to take away from the total time. I just need 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Yes. The gentleman may yield back 1 minute or whatever time remains.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment from the gentleman from Virginia, troops on the border. This amendment addresses a national security issue, and it also addresses an economic issue. To my good friends, and they are my good friends, on the other side, the American people want those who want to come to this country by the legal process to come, and they are welcome; but we must remember this country is at war. That war started on September 11 of 2001, and last year we had about 1 million people come to this country illegally, and I agree with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE).

And maybe the gentleman from Texas's idea is good that we could find a middle ground on this issue, but I will say this, that the people that I have a chance to talk to and to represent are saying to me this Congress and this government, this administration need to do a better job of protecting our borders; and it does not

matter if the borders are America and Canada or America and Mexico. We are talking about this Nation being at war, and we have to do a better job. And I think this amendment that has been proposed is an answer to a real problem; and if this is one way to force an answer, then this amendment is good.

I will say in closing that I have read numerous polls in the last 3 years on this issue, and the American people have said, and said in loud numbers, meaning 80 percent, 85 percent, that we want to see the borders of this great Nation secured. So I compliment the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE), and I am going to support this amendment, and I am going to encourage my friends to support this amendment because the American people want our borders to be secure.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time. And, again, God bless America.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), ranking member on the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to speak against this amendment. I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) for his commitment to our national defense and for his position of strengthening our law enforcement community. He comes from a great background and understands this issue better than anyone in this body.

Among all the reasons the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) gives to oppose this amendment, the one I feel strongly about is the overstretching of our troops. I am convinced that we are stretching the young men and young women far past their capacity; and to put them on the border where we have border patrols who are doing an excellent job there I think is just gilding the lily and pushing it too far. We have American troops all over the world; and I see that some of them, frankly, are getting worn out. National Guard and Reserves are called up and this would only exacerbate a very difficult situation. The Northern Command exists to support the request from civil authorities, but our troops should not substitute for our police. And I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me this time.

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON).

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman from Virginia's amendment. As we stand here today, we are under this enhanced threat level of attack from terrorists, and it seems to me that this amendment and the provisions of this amendment are absolutely essential to give our Department of Defense and our Commander in Chief the option of using our military forces to secure our border if it becomes necessary. And while the Department of Defense may help other Federal agencies, this amendment simply reinforces the primary role of the armed services to protect the homeland.

The newest combat command, Northern Command, is involved in this very issue. The statutory language supporting North Com's efforts to reinforce the Department of Homeland Security and to set training and policy ground rules is extremely helpful. The authority is only in effect for 1 year and is essentially a pilot program. In other words, let us put this in place and see how it works. If it causes problems, we will know, and we will not renew it. But I do not see problems occurring, and I think it is a test that we ought to run.

The use of this authority will allow North Com to better integrate active forces and National Guard forces into homeland defense plans, a commonsense approach and one that I commend the gentleman from Virginia for bringing forward.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, can I inquire how much time we have remaining.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) has 7 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE) has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ), who, like me, is an individual who enforced the laws along the border.

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

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that we have dealt with on a yearly basis, and on a yearly basis the Department of Defense tells us that they do not support this amendment. We have to be realistic. I was in law enforcement like my friend here. When one is in law enforcement, one is trained to do a certain mission, a certain skill. The military people who serve in the military, I think there was a group of very senior members who went to Iraq and some of the complaints of our troops there were we were not supposed to be police officers, we were trained to kill. And that is what they do.

So by putting troops on the border, this is not going to alleviate matters any. We need to put people who are trained to do a certain job, a certain skill to deal with people, and this is why we have the border patrol. If my colleagues feel by adding more border patrol officers on the border this is going to help, why not give them the money to do that? They are trained exactly. We have a training center where we pay millions of dollars to operate to train them adequately. Why do we not do that? We have 120-or-some thousand more troops stationed around the world. Can my colleagues imagine what this is going to do to our readiness by giving them a different mission to train on a different skill? This is absurd.

I think that we need to do something, but putting troops on the border is not going to answer the problem that we have. I think that we should focus and put our energy on people that are trained to do the job, and I urge my friends to defeat this amendment.

Mr. GOODE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

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

Every nation on the face of the Earth uses their military for the purpose of defense and uses their military on their borders for that very purpose. We are unique in that we have chosen over the years to avoid that use of the military, but the time has come for us to rethink this. The time has come for us to use our military in a way that every other country uses their military, to protect and defend their own borders. It is true, I have heard so often from Members of the other side, that we have our military spread all over the world. Undeniably true. And intriguingly and almost ironically in many of the places where we have our military stationed, they are stationed for the purposes of defending borders. We are defending borders in Korea. We are defending borders in Kosovo. We are defending borders in Afghanistan with our troops. Yet we refuse to use our troops to defend our borders. Is that not peculiar, to say the least? Is it not ironic at least?

The issue of the training, let me relate a story that happened to me. I had the opportunity to visit the northern border about a year and a half ago, not too far from Bonner's Ferry, Idaho. There was an exercise at the time underway. One hundred Marines were on the border working in conjunction with the border patrol and the Forest Service. This was a 2-week exercise, just to see what we could do, what actually we could do to help improve border security by using the military. It was a fascinating experiment, and I hope the gentlemen who have raised the issue of training so often would pay close attention here because it was an experience that I think they should all observe.

One hundred Marines on the border trying to control in this case about 100 miles of border. And they brought with them three UAVs, unmanned aerial vehicles, and two radar facilities. And in the use of these radar facilities and the UAVs, they were able to actually stop, while I was there, four people who were attempting to come across on all-terrain vehicles carrying 400 pounds of drugs; and a light plane was intercepted using those two radar stations. The interesting thing is that when I was talking to the commander of the Marine detachment who was there subsequent to this experience, he said, This was the best training we have ever had. This was the best training we have

ever had. He said we were operating in a realtime environment. There were real bad guys we were trying to stop coming across this border, and this is the roughest terrain we have ever operated in.

So when we are talking about the use of the military, when we are talking about training exercises and how if we were actually to employ the military on the border that this would somehow or other detract from their own training activities, I would say it is just the opposite. Talk to the Marines. Ask them about whether or not this was not what I have just described, the ''best training activity'' they have ever had.

I completely support those folks who have indicated a desire to put more resources into the border patrol. Absolutely, no problem at all as far as I am concerned. I would vote for it in a heartbeat. I would encourage all of my colleagues to do exactly the same thing. The reality is this, that even if tomorrow we doubled or tripled the amount of people and resources that we would devote to the border patrol, just the process of getting them trained online and ready to work would be so long and so cumbersome that frankly it seems to me that this alternative, the use of the military when necessary to augment, no one is suggesting and certainly my friend from Virginia is not suggesting that this be the place for the military forever, but they could augment the services of the border patrol. They could provide the technical capabilities, the unmanned vehicles, the radar stations and all the rest, as I say, that the military can bring with them and be benefited by in the process.

It seems like a very symbiotic relationship that we can actually use the military and the border patrol in conjunction with each other to accomplish the goal of a safe, secure border, a border that would in fact in reality, a secure border, have helped prevent the kind of horrible events that we have been witnessing recently.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair would advise that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) has 5 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE) has 1½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) has the right to close.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The Goode amendment is bad, and I will tell the Members that evaluation comes from those folks who represent the Texas and the California border. I represent all of the California-Mexico border. One of my crossings is the busiest border crossing in the entire world. In the various border crossings in my district, a quarter of a million people per day cross the border legally.

□ 1645

So I think I have some experience with border crossings. And, yes, we have to get better control of our border, and we have reorganized our government and established a Department of Homeland Security to do just that, and we hope they will get the proper resources to do that.

Yes, we have a lot to do, but it is not arming the border that is the answer. As has been pointed out, we have the best military in the world. We just proved it in Iraq. They are trained to kill.

I will tell Members, the people who live in my district, 55 percent of whom are Americans of Mexican descent, do not like this idea. They are worried about the idea.

I would say to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), the kind of training mission that the gentleman mentioned actually killed an American citizen of Mexican descent, an 18-year-old, ironically, who wanted to be a Marine. It was an accident. He could not tell the illegal from the legal. That is what we want to make sure does not happen on the border with Mexico.

I want to remind my friends, Mexico is a friendly nation. I do not think they have made any attempts at invasion since the Alamo. So this proposal would make a very fragile relationship right now even worse, and that is not what we ought to be doing.

If you want to help us control the border, all you folks from North Carolina and Virginia and Colorado and New Jersey, give us some technology. Ninety-five percent of the people who cross every day in my district cross frequently. With technology we can give them smart cards, they can cross the border, and we can focus our attention on the illegal crossings. This is the wrong way to go.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ).

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a bad idea, and I will tell you why. We are proud of our military. They are over in 100 countries throughout the world, from Iraq to Afghanistan to Philippines to South Korea, and they are overextended. We cannot afford to send our military personnel to the border.

The ones who are responsible for that is the new Department of Homeland Security. The idea of military presence on the border is not a new idea. We have had that, and it has been devastating.

In 1997, a Marine anti-drug patrol shot to death a young man, Esquiel Hernandez. You tell Mrs. Hernandez if that was the right thing to do, to have Marines down there, when this young man was in high school, taking care of his goats on the border. He was shot by a Marine. The child was an American citizen.

In addition to that, our number one and number two trading partners are Canada and Mexico. If you are a terrorist, one of the things you want to do, you want to distract and make sure the economy goes into disruption.

This is not the way to do it. We need to make sure that we continue to work with our friends, both in Mexico and Canada, and this is the wrong way and the wrong approach to take.

Now is the crucial time for us to work with Mexico and Canada. These two countries are our partners. We have to be secure and make sure that Canada is secure and that Mexico is secure in order for us to be secure. And we have got to continue to make that effort. We live in a culture where we interact on the border, and I live on the border. I am not in Colorado with the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

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

Mr. Chairman, that was a tragedy about the shooting of the 18-year-old young man, Mr. Hernandez, who was shepherding his family's goats. But let me tell you a little bit more about the story. He had a .22 rifle. He fired twice at the Marines and was aiming to fire a third time, and only then was fire returned and, regrettably, he was killed with a single shot.

We need to pass this amendment today. We need to send a message to the illegal drug traffickers, hey, we are going to have the authority to put troops on the border. We need to send a message to illegal aliens coming into this country that we are going to put troops on the its border and stop it. And to those terrorists who are in Mexico, such as that reported by the Washington Times that al Qaeda is there, we need to send them a message: We are going to stop you at the border; you are not getting in.

Let us put troops on the border and vote yes for this amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, in closing, let me clear the record. When the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE) talks about the young man that fired off at the Marines, he did not know what he was firing at. They were operating in a covert and camouflaged situation, and he did not know what they were. So he did fire a shot at them. But the important thing there is one life lost in an ill-conceived policy is one life too many.

When they talk about the authority that the President needs to be able to do that, he has that authority already in several different parts of our law. When he talks about the value of training for our military, I would remind my colleagues, the military in Baghdad pleaded with us and said, look, we trained for combat. We have won this war. Get us out of here. We are not cops, we are not infrastructure protectors, we are not policemen. Get us out of here. We trained for combat. That is their role.

Secondly, you do not want to subject border communities to marshal law.

You talk about sending a message? The message that you are sending is this, that we are thinking of our military as expendable. We are willing to send them to the border, where they may become legally liable should they shoot another Esquiel on the border. They are legally liable.

Secondly, they are trained for combat. You cannot expect our military to change hats, one for combat and one for civil law enforcement.

We deserve better. We can do better. Let us give the resources to Federal agencies that are responsible for this kind of duty and not subject our military and abuse our military.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Goode amendment.

The United States is battling the forces of international terrorism. This amendment hurts this battle by reallocating resources that already exist in our border patrols.

The Department of Defense opposes this bill. Why? Because it is not intended to secure our border, it is intended to affect immigration and to intimidate the millions of Mexican-Americans and Latinos that live in our Nation's border region.

Let us remember little Ezequiel Hernandez who was shot dead by Marine snipers while he was herding his goats.

I am deeply concerned that by placing combat ready troops at our borders, our borders will become a war zone. Our Nation will be perceived, and rightly so, to be engaging in a war against Latino immigrants. This is nothing new.

We must take urgent measures to protect our Nation, but we cannot do so at the expense of our values, traditions, and freedoms. We cannot do so at the expense of ending what little goodwill exists with our border neighbors.

Our challenge is to keep out terrorists who want to destroy this country while welcoming the newcomers who want to help build it. Putting troops on the border will not make our borders safer. Putting troops on the border only guarantees more accidental deaths of Latinos like little Ezequiel. This child deserved to grow up, graduate from school, marry, have children, and live a long fruitful life. He definitely did not deserve to be shot dead.

It is certain that others like little Ezequiel will die if we pass this thin-veiled anti-immigrant amendment.

Military personnel are not trained for border patrolling they are trained for war and combat. They are not trained to be sensitive to civil liberties. They are trained to fight terrorists and we need to let them do their job—abroad. The U.S. military does not police civilian populations lest we forget the lessons of history from the Soviet Union and its satellite nations.

If we really want to secure our borders, we should increase funding for local law enforcement. We should not divert funds and shift the focus away from the war on terror. Our enemies are terrorists, not immigrants.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BEREUTER). All time for debate has expired.

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.

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 offered by Mr. HUNTER; and

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. GOODE.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for the second electronic vote.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 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 pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 252, noes 175, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 205]

AYES—252

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bereuter
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carson (OK)
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Collins
Combest
Cooper
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
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
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Janklow
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Manzullo
Marshall
Matheson
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Souder
Stearns
Stenholm
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Upton
Vitter
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—175

Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Ballance
Becerra
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Case
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Costello
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hinchey
Hoeffel
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kleczka
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Majette
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky

Walden (OR)
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—7

Abercrombie
Burr
Gephardt
Hinojosa
LaTourette
Lewis (GA)
Sweeney

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) (during the vote). Members are reminded that there are less than 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1714

Mr. OWENS and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the next vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 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 CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 250, noes 179, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 206]

AYES—250

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Collins
Combest
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Doolittle
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
Engel
English
Etheridge
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Janklow
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Majette
Manzullo
Marshall
Matheson
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Udall (CO)
Upton
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—179

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Ballance
Becerra
Bell
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Buyer
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Tom
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gonzalez
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hill
Hinchey
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Houghton
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lynch
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
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
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Simmons
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Stark
Stenholm
Stupak
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tierney
Towns
Turner (TX)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Wilson (NM)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—5

Gephardt
Hinojosa
Lewis (GA)
Rothman
Sweeney

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) (during the vote). Members are advised that there are less than 2 minutes left to record their vote.

□ 1723

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to speak out of order for 1 minute.)

INFORMING MEMBERS OF PAGE RECEPTION

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Chairman, I want to remind all Members that the page reception is occurring as we speak down in the Members' dining room. If you have a page here in this class, if you would get down to the Members' dining room and make sure you say hi to them. If you are a Member that has developed a good relationship with pages and want to make sure you say farewell, that is going on now as we speak.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 108–120.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. LORETTA SANCHEZ OF CALIFORNIA

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam 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 Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California:

At the end of title VII (page 196, after line 12), add the following new section:

SEC. 708. 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 245, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ).

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today I offer an amendment about freedom, safety and choice. Members of

the Armed Services are entitled to a quality of life equal to that of the Nation they are pledged to defend. Whether you are pro-life or pro-choice, agree or disagree with the merits of reproductive freedom, the facts remain, the women of the United States have a constitutional right to reproductive services. So why would we choose to place an overseas female soldier or military dependent into a subclass of citizenship?

Currently, servicewomen may fly back to the United States to obtain reproductive services but only after they have authorization from commanding officers and can find a space on a military transport. If your daughter, wife, sister or friend had to make a tough reproductive choice and were stationed overseas, do you believe that as adult women they should be required to disclose this information to their commanding officer? Would you want to put her on the plane alone? Our servicewomen and dependents deserve better.

My amendment allows military personnel and their dependents serving overseas to use their private funds to obtain safe, legal abortion services in overseas military hospitals. No Federal funds would be used. This amendment will only affect United States military facilities overseas, and my amendment will 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.

Vote for the rights of our servicewomen and dependents abroad. Vote for the Sanchez amendment.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Madam Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the Sanchez amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Under this amendment, abortions could be performed in military medical facilities outside of the United States for any reason. Self-funded abortions would no longer be limited to cases in which the life of the mother is in danger or in cases of rape or incest.

□ 1730

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) stated the reason for offering this amendment is that female servicemembers and dependents overseas are denied equal access to health care, effectively putting their lives and health in harm's way, and that simply is wrong. In overseas countries where safe and legal abortions are not available, servicemembers and their dependents have the option of using space-available travel for returning to the United States or traveling to another overseas country for the purpose of obtaining an abortion.

Additionally, DOD doctors are still required to obey the abortion laws of the countries where they are providing services. Thus, if this amendment became law, they still could not perform abortions in these locations where abortion is restricted or is not permitted. In such cases, pregnant women would be able, as they are now, to travel to a nearby country or back to the United States on a military flight or on a space-available basis.

Ask any military doctor if they joined up to perform abortions, and they will simply say they entered to save lives. Congress should not take a step towards putting these doctors in a position of taking the most innocent of human life. There is no demonstrated need to increase the number of abortion procedures at military installations. 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 in the defense authorization fight, and I encourage my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) and the original sponsor of this bill way back when.

Ms. HARMAN. Madam Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time, and I commend her for her leadership on this very important issue.

Madam Chairman, as communities across the Nation begin to welcome home members of our Armed Forces who served in Afghanistan and Iraq, and to honor those who continue to serve in our ongoing war on terrorism, we are, at the same time, turning America's brave servicewomen into second-class citizens. So long as this Congress continues a policy that fails to afford servicewomen their constitutional right to comprehensive health care, regardless of where they serve, we continue to do them serious harm.

Since 1989, and except for 2 years early in the Clinton administration, Congress has barred a woman's access to necessary health care services at overseas bases, even when paid for by their own funds. When I served on the Committee on Armed Services, way back when, I sponsored this same amendment to restore the rights of servicewomen serving overseas. And before me, our colleague, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), courageously fought this battle.

I have long believed that the current policy is unconstitutional and, if challenged, would be overturned as a violation of Roe v. Wade. In practical terms, the policy exposes our servicewomen serving in austere locations overseas to unsanitary and unsafe medical facilities, and it requires that a woman violate her right to privacy by requiring that she secure permission from a superior officer to travel back to the United States to terminate an unwanted pregnancy, a requirement that violates her rights under Roe v. Wade.

Today, this body has another opportunity to right this obvious wrong. As the sponsor pointed out, we do not ask that the Federal Government pay for abortions overseas. Women who want this procedure will have to pay for it. Nor do we compel medical professionals to provide the procedure. There is a conscience clause. As servicewomen and female dependents deploy abroad, it is time to send the right message. As they protect our constitutional rights to life and liberty, we need to protect theirs.

Vote for the Sanchez-Harman-DeLauro amendment.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE).

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. We have had issues that come up which I call perennials. Year after year they come up and, fortunately, in my opinion, this one keeps failing every year. I am glad that the House rejected this amendment in 2002, 2001, 2000, 1999, 1998, 1997, and 1996.

Whenever this amendment is brought up, the word ''choice'' is always brought into the conversation. I would urge my colleagues to respect the choices of the American taxpayers. The men and women that get up and go to work every day and pay their taxes in this country have spoken very clearly that they do not want their tax dollars used to provide abortions.

Military treatment centers, the very centers that are funded by these American taxpayers who get up and go to work every day and pay their taxes, should be used and dedicated for the healing and nurturing of human life, not taking the life of the most vulnerable of all human beings, the unborn child.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER), one of my colleagues on the Committee on Armed Services.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Madam Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time, and I rise to express my support for the Sanchez amendment.

This amendment would provide equal access to women in the military who are serving overseas. Currently, women who have volunteered to serve our country and female military dependents are denied their legally guaranteed right to choose simply because they are stationed overseas. All military women, including those deployed overseas, should be able to depend on their base hospitals for all of their health care needs.

A repeal of the current ban on personally funded abortions would allow women access to the same range and

quality of reproductive health care available in the United States. Most importantly, the Sanchez amendment would allow our servicewomen privacy in making this important personal decision. Under current law, military women must either go off base or must ask their commander for time off to travel back to the United States.

Madam Chairman, I hope we can support this amendment and ensure that American women stationed overseas are afforded the same basic rights as women at home. I urge my colleagues to support this critical amendment.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

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

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise today in strong opposition to the Sanchez amendment.

Current law prevents military facilities located overseas from performing abortions. This amendment would reverse this ban and allow facilities tasked with saving and preserving the lives of our military personnel to literally becoming abortion clinics.

Madam Chairman, I am sure that most of my colleagues are aware that the House has rejected this exact same amendment during committee and floor consideration of the defense authorization bill in each of the last 7 years. This body has acted wisely on this misguided amendment and for good reason.

I oppose this amendment not only as a member of the House Committee on Armed Services that is strongly committed to our national defense, but also as an OB-GYN physician of almost 30 years. In my career practicing medicine, I have delivered over 5,000 babies, and I remain steadfastly committed to pro-life principles.

Again, the primary mission of the military treatment center is to heal and protect human life, but this amendment seeks to overturn this mission and convert these facilities into providers of abortion instead.

Madam Chairman, I urge my colleagues to protect the sanctity of human life and oppose this Sanchez amendment.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS), another member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the Sanchez amendment.

As a mother and military spouse who lived overseas during the Vietnam War, my heart breaks when I read about the experiences of American military women who are left on their own to seek reproductive health services in a foreign country. As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I am moved to change the law and offer these servicewomen safe medical care for services they are even willing to pay for.

One woman wrote to me the following after being turned away at her base: ''The military expects nothing less than the best from its soldiers, and I expect the best medical care in return. If this is how I will continue to be treated as a military servicemember by my country and its leaders, however, I want no part of it.''

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Sanchez amendment.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. This is now the ninth time I have risen to speak against this amendment.

I practiced medicine in the Army for 6 years before I was elected to the House of Representatives, and I was in the Army when President Reagan initially made his executive order stating that we would no longer do abortions in military hospitals. We in the medical care community in the military were very pleased with this.

I have talked to a lot of nurses and a lot of doctors about this issue, and many of them are pro-life and they say they were very glad it was removed, but many of them are actually pro-choice but they all say the same thing to me. They say they are pro-choice, but I would never do an abortion. They say they are pro-choice, but I would never assist in an abortion. And they were all very, very happy to get this out of the military medical facilities.

This would be a step in the wrong direction. It would be bad for morale. And I wholeheartedly concur with the comments of my physician colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Sanchez amendment. Over the last few months, we have voiced our support for the troops many, many times. Tax relief, loan forgiveness, and resolutions of support are well and good. But I know of no better way to demonstrate our real support for our troops than by 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 reproductive choice and reproductive health while being stationed abroad.

We routinely ask servicewomen to put their lives on the line in defense of our country and our country's ideals. That is why we must not require them to put their lives on the line when seeking constitutionally protected reproductive services. Please join me in supporting our troops by supporting the Sanchez amendment.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Madam Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN) has 10 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS).

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Over the last 30 years, abortion on demand has left 42 million separate scars on the soul of America. Madam Chairman, every time one took place, a mother's heart was never quite the same, a nameless little baby died a tragic and lonely death, and all of the gifts that child might have brought to this world were lost forever.

Madam Chairman, there are many lying out in the field of Arlington today that died for a basic principle, and that is the basic principle that we are here for today, which is to compile amendments and laws that will protect the innocent from those that would desecrate their rights and their lives.

Madam Chairman, if we turn military clinics and hospitals into abortion clinics, we dishonor their memory; and we say to the world that we do not have the insight to find better ways to help mothers than killing their children for them.

Madam Chairman, I hope we will defeat this amendment.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Chairman, the gentleman from Kansas said not to worry, our servicewomen can exercise their full right of reproductive services that are legal here at home, because all they have to do is either get space available on an airplane or go to another country in the region where abortion is legal.

□ 1745

Well, what do you say to the courageous servicewomen in Iraq who might be pregnant who might not have known they were pregnant when they left? Space available, that is not enough for them. If we are forcing them into a second trimester abortion, the health risks are much higher.

So where are they going to go? Saudi Arabia? Iran? This is disrespectful to our fighting women all around the world.

The problem is even greater now when we have servicewomen in large numbers deployed all around the world in regions where abortion is not safe and legal. So I challenge my colleagues who even consider voting against this amendment to look into the eyes of these servicewomen and say to them that they can fight for me, they can die

for me, but they cannot make their own reproductive health choices.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Sanchez amendment which would force military medical facilities to provide abortions. In recent months, we have witnessed the courage and bravery of our men and women of our Armed Forces, and they have risked their lives in the war on terror and the war in Iraq. They have risked their lives in order to preserve and extend the right to life and liberty at home and abroad.

U.S. military personnel aboard the USS Comfort and in other U.S. military medical facilities have extended hope and healing to the wounded. How do we repay them? How do we thank them for their sacrifice and selflessness? The Sanchez amendment would repay them by forcing military medical personnel to be complicit in the taking of human life. It would divert precious medical resources such as staff time, equipment and facilities away from the front lines of battle. The Sanchez amendment would promote bad medicine and the poor use of scarce taxpayer dollars.

Abortion is the most violent form of death known to mankind, death by decapitation, dismemberment, a horrible, horrific death. We should defeat the Sanchez amendment.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, I would remind Members there is a clause that doctors do not have to perform these services if they are opposed to them. We are not making medical personnel do something that they are opposed to or do not believe in.

Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. KIRK. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her amendment and support it. American uniformed women stationed overseas depend on base hospitals for their medical care, often situated in areas where local facilities are inadequate. We have over 100,000 American women in uniform now on active duty with spouses and dependents who depend on those base hospitals.

Just 3 years ago, I served as a Navy air crewman at the Insurlik Air Base in Adona, Turkey. The thought of sending one of my female colleagues to the Turkish hospital in downtown Adona for her medical care rather than in the American base hospital where they would understand her own language is an anathema to me.

Women who serve in our Armed Forces and wear the uniform should have the same rights as women in our country, and that is a basic principle we stand for. I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI).

Mr. RENZI. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. Our military's primary responsibility is to defend American lives in every capacity. Therefore, military hospitals should not be turned into abortion clinics. This amendment would corrupt the mission of our military by using military hospitals, built also by pro-life American taxpayers, for the purposes of performing abortions.

Many military doctors and nurses have already made it clear they will refuse to perform abortions. Therefore, those doctors who exercise their conscience clause would force the military to go look for, search, hire, and transport civilian abortionists onto military bases and hospitals overseas. In the past, our military has not given its war fighters enough pay raises, and now we are forced to debate whether or not to use defense dollars to search for civilian abortionists in foreign countries.

This amendment is a misguided attempt to insert the pro-abortion agenda into a piece of legislation that is instrumental to the defense of our Nation. Reject this amendment to alter the purpose and obligations and traditions of our military hospitals. Reject this amendment and allow military doctors to save lives on the battlefield, rather than abort them in military hospitals.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to remind my colleagues that no public funds are used under this amendment. The individual who wishes to have an abortion would have to pay from her own funds.

Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

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

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Chairman, I strongly urge a ''yes'' vote for the Sanchez amendment which will protect women's health and rights overseas.

War has just ended in Iraq and Afghanistan, yet we still have many servicewomen overseas who are risking their lives to protect our lives and our rights as U.S. citizens. One of those rights is a woman's right to choose, but women serving effectively lose this constitutional right at U.S. military bases where they literally cannot even pay for this medical procedure with their own money.

A male member of the Armed Services needing medical attention receives the best, but a female member needing a specific medical procedure must return to the United States, often at great expense, or go to a foreign hospital which may be unsanitary and dangerous. This is absolutely wrong. After over 200 anti-choice votes, this is yet another one.

Madam Chairman, I place in the RECORD a list of distinguished organizations that have come out in support of protecting women's rights overseas.

College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists; The American Association of University Women; National Women's Law Center; American Medical Women's Association; Physicians for Reproductive Choice and Health; The Bipartisan Pro-Choice Caucus; Planned Parenthood; and NARAL.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his outstanding leadership on this issue.

Madam Chairman, nine out of ten hospitals in the United States adamantly refuse to abort unborn children, and the trend is for hospitals to divest themselves of abortion.

It is outrageous that, as hospitals in our country repudiate abortion, the Sanchez amendment seeks to turn our overseas military hospitals into abortion mills. With all due respect to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ), the amendment she offers will result in babies being brutally killed by abortion and will force pro-life Americans to facilitate and to subsidize the slaughter of innocent children.

We do not want any part of that carnage, and when President Clinton in the previous administration sought to impose this kind of activity upon our military not a single military doctor in our overseas hospitals wanted to be a part of it. They had to look outside the system because they were pro-life, and they wanted to nurture and care for, provide maternal health care, prenatal health care, not the killing of those babies.

Madam Chairman, let us be clear. Abortion is violence against children. Some abortion methods dismember and rip apart the fragile bodies of children. Other methods chemically poison children. Abortionists turn children's bodies into burned corpses, a direct result of the caustic effect of salt poisoning and other methods of chemical abortions.

I would say to my colleagues, there is absolutely nothing benign or curing or nurturing about abortion. It is violence. It is gruesome. And yet the apologists sanitize the awful deed with soothing, misleading rhetoric. Abortion methods are particularly ugly because, under the guise of choice, they turn baby girls and baby boys into dead baby girls and dead baby boys.

We have had enough loss of innocent life. Reject the Sanchez amendment.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Sanchez amendment and want to commend and thank the gentlewoman for her tireless fight for the rights of all women, including women serving in our military.

It is absurd that we must come to the floor annually to fight to repeal this unfair and discriminatory policy of denying servicewomen and female military dependents from using their own money for abortions at overseas military hospitals. At a time when many servicewomen are overseas serving in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere, this policy is extremely cruel.

We support our troops, yet we deny women serving in our Armed Forces access to vital reproductive health services. How patriotic is this? Military women should be able to depend on their base hospitals for all of their health care services. A repeal of the current law ban on privately funded abortions would allow women access to the same range and quality of medical care available in our own country. That is why I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Sanchez amendment.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

I oppose the Sanchez amendment. This is one of the nights in my life that I regret that I am not a woman. I am just another white, middle-aged Republican rising to speak on the issue of abortion. But I know I speak tonight for millions of American women who cherish the right to life, who believe that abortion, as I do, is morally wrong and choose not to see their taxpayer dollars, directly or indirectly, subsidize or promote abortion at home or abroad.

It truly is what we are about tonight. For while I oppose abortion, and we have heard passionate eloquence on the pro-life message, I oppose the Sanchez amendment because it is morally wrong to force millions of American men and women who oppose abortion at home to finance it abroad. Now the amendment of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) seems to acknowledge this sensitivity and the fact that surveys show the overwhelming majority of Americans, even if they support the right to an abortion, do not believe that taxpayer money should be used to fund it.

In fact, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) just said, in correcting my colleague from Arizona, that no public funds will be used specifically for abortion, but what is obvious to anyone who would understand this process is that while perhaps the act is not funded by the taxpayer, the hospital is, the search for a physician is, the infrastructure where the act would be conducted is. Therefore, taxpayer dollars will indirectly fund abortion at military bases overseas. This is in violation of a basic principle that you do not force millions of Americans who find the procedure of abortion morally wrong to pay for it with their tax dollars in a coercive manner.

If it is wrong to fund abortions directly with taxpayer dollars, it is wrong to do it indirectly as well. So I rise in opposition to the Sanchez amendment because we ought not to do indirectly what we would not be willing to do on this floor directly. America should continue, our military bases should continue, in the disposition of American taxpayer resources to choose life.

□ 1800

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is quite obvious to me that my colleague who just spoke has not recently received any type of a bill from a hospital, because if he would see that, he would understand that even right down to the last vitamin or pill that is administered in a hospital, you are charged when you are there. So the cost of this would be borne by the woman and her family.

Madam Chairman, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON), a tireless fighter with respect to women's reproductive issues.

(Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Sanchez amendment. This is not about abortion. I know people differ as to whether they would have an abortion or anyone in their family would have an abortion. This is not about that. There is no State in our entire Nation that bans the right for women in America to choose to have a termination of a pregnancy. Not one. It is a legal medical procedure that is available to women in America if they are stationed in America. The idea that we would deny our servicewomen this right because they are stationed abroad. Have you ever walked through a Chinese hospital? I have. Do you want a wife or a daughter to have to be hospitalized to have a procedure in a hospital whose sanitary conditions are scandalous and whose people are poorly trained? That is wrong. Our servicemen and women should have access to the same legal bundle of medical procedures abroad as they have here. This is not a matter of taxpayer dollars, either. They have to pay for it. And it is costly. Your daughter gets date-raped by a young soldier. You want her in that military hospital, high quality, if she needs that pregnancy terminated. This is cruel, it is wrong, it is unequal; and it is not about abortion. I support the Sanchez amendment.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Let me just respond a little bit to some of the comments that have been made. If there is rape and incest involved, there is access to an abortion overseas. I want to clarify that for the record.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN).

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Chairman, the proposal, of course, before us as we have heard is basically going to turn our overseas military medical facilities into abortion clinics. The point has been made that we allow abortions in 50 States, but it is also clear that we only allow abortions in one out of 10 hospitals. Yet with this particular amendment, we are going to force our military hospitals to perform these abortions. This was tried before in 1993 to 1996 under President Clinton's policies, and it was rather unsuccessful.

First of all, it was very hard to find obstetricians and gynecologists stationed overseas who wanted to perform the abortions in the first place. Very, very few abortions were actually conducted. Part of that is because there are laws against abortion in many foreign countries, and so even there we would not be able to do the abortion.

Now there is the idea, or the inference, that there is some necessity for these abortions in military hospitals. But the necessity does not exist. This is something that can be done as an elective procedure. It can be done by people coming to our country.

I would urge my colleagues to vote in opposition to the amendment.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ 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, I come to the floor because men need to come to the floor and say that it is time to end the second-class treatment of the proud women who are serving in our Armed Forces. This is fundamentally a debate about freedom. Because in America, the U.S. Supreme Court has said women have the freedom to make this decision. And women are treated as second-class citizens by saying they may have that freedom when they are in the United States, but once they leave our shores to serve us, to fight for the very freedoms that we stand for in America, they lose that freedom right.

My good friend from Kansas has suggested that they are free to fly to Afghanistan for this procedure. That is a great irony. Because when a man goes in for reproductive services, he can get a vasectomy in his military hospital in Germany. That is fine. But we are asking our sisters and our wives and our daughters who serve proudly in the Army and the Navy and the Air Force to fly to Afghanistan, a place that we just went to war to try to serve women to free them from the Taliban. This is a freedom matter, and we ought to support this amendment.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, if I could clarify the record just briefly, I am not suggesting, nor is anyone else, that they have to fly to Afghanistan, but they have the opportunity to return to this country on a space-available situation. I do not want to see our military installations turned into abortion clinics. I urge a strong ''no'' in opposition to the Sanchez amendment.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I close by reminding my colleagues that this is a bipartisan issue. We have Planned Parenthood, NARAL, the College of OB-GYN physicians who support this amendment. I would like to close finally with a voice from a woman who found herself in this situation while stationed in the Army in Germany. She says:

''I chose to fly back to the States because I did not trust foreign doctors. It cost me over $800 for the trip. It would have cost me more, but I went by military hop. Plus the $300 for the abortion, not counting the fact that I had to use my vacation time. Luckily my trip was approved in time for me to get back before I reached the end of my first trimester. I can remember thinking at the time how unfair it was that I had to resort to these drastic measures. Had I been in the States, it would have not been an issue. I can remember being resentful of my fellow male comrades who were able to have vasectomies paid for by the military in Germany and yet I had to use my leave time and my own funds to fly back to the U.S. for what is also a reproductive choice. Women in the military are denied their right to control their reproductive process while abroad, although men in the military enjoy the same rights abroad as they do in the States.''

She says, ''I believe it is time that the women of this country enjoy the same rights their male counterparts enjoy, for that is what I think I was fighting for when I was stationed there.''

Support the Sanchez amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Sanchez amendment, which would allow military women and dependents stationed overseas to obtain abortion services with their own money. I want to thank my colleague LORETTA SANCHEZ for her fine work on this important issue.

Over 100,000 women live on American military bases abroad. These women risk their lives and security to protect our great and powerful nation. These women work to protect the freedoms of our country. And yet, these women—for the past eight 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. Chairman, 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 a model of democracy at work, rather than an example 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 they are opposed to, 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.

Mr. Chairman, as our Nation works to preserve our freedoms 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 Sanchez amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. OSE). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ).

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ 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 (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 108–120.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MRS. TAUSCHER

Mrs. TAUSCHER. 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 Mrs. TAUSCHER:

At the end of subtitle A of title II (page 30, after line 7), insert the following new section:

SEC. 2___. FUNDING REDUCTIONS AND INCREASES.

(a) INCREASE.—The amount provided in section 201 for research, development, test, and evaluation is hereby increased by $21,000,000, of which—

(1) $5,000,000 shall be available for Program Element 0603910D8Z, strategic capability modernization;

(2) $6,000,000 shall be available for Program Element 0602602F, conventional munitions; and

(3) $10,000,000 shall be available for Program Element 0603601F, conventional weapons technology.

(b) REDUCTION.—The amount provided in section 3101 for stockpile research and development is hereby reduced by $21,000,000, of which—

(1) $15,000,000 shall be derived from the feasibility and cost study of the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator; and

(2) $6,000,000 shall be derived from advanced concepts initiative activities.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 245, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EVERETT) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER).

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

Mr. Chairman, I am offering an amendment that addresses a dangerous nuclear policy provision in the defense bill. This amendment cuts $21 million for the robust nuclear Earth penetrator, known as the RNEP, and for new nuclear weapons and redirects that money toward improving our conventional capability to defeat hard and deeply buried targets. As we do this debate today, our military does not have a requirement for nuclear bunker busters. They do, however, need funds for several programs the Pentagon is pursuing to improve our ability to get at hardened targets with conventional weapons.

My amendment would provide additional funding to these critical conventional initiatives without taking the United States down a dangerous road that seeks to find new uses for nuclear weapons and crosses the line from strategic deterrent to offensive use. There are several reasons not to develop an RNEP. Here are just five:

First, it will produce massive collateral damage; second, even the most powerful nuclear weapons cannot destroy bunkers at a certain depth; third, if a bunker is filled with chemical and biological agents, it is only common sense to keep them underground rather than blow them up and spread them all over the place in a mushroom cloud; fourth, an RNEP will cause massive casualties. Detonated in an urban area, it would kill tens of thousands of civilians. Last, developing nuclear bunker busters would undermine decades of work by the United States to prevent nonnuclear states from getting nuclear weapons and encourage nuclear states to reduce their stockpiles.

Until we have exhausted all conventional means to defeat hardened targets and the military service produces a current requirement for an RNEP, it would be irresponsible for Congress to jump the gun and promote new uses for nuclear weapons. Let us learn from history. Nearly half a century ago, President Eisenhower rejected the Council of Advisers who wanted a new variety of nuclear weapons that they said would allow the United States to fight a winnable nuclear war. Eisenhower responded: ''You can't have that kind of war. There just aren't enough bulldozers to scrape the bodies off the streets.''

As we have seen in Afghanistan and Iraq, conventional weapons can do the job. There is no scientific, military, or strategic reason to go nuclear at this time and every reason not to. I urge my colleagues to support the Tauscher amendment.

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

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON), a member of the committee.

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, my colleague from California has made a strong argument for unilateral nuclear disarmament. But what she has not made is a good argument for stopping our robust nuclear Earth penetrator program. Nuclear weapons are useful because they are unusable. That is the nature of the nuclear deterrent. And the reason that we are pursuing these studies and why we should reject the Tauscher amendment is because deterrence is the center of what nuclear weapons are all about; it is not because we are changing the way we plan to fight wars. Nuclear weapons are horrible things. Warfare is a horrible thing. But we must maintain the nuclear deterrent so that we can avoid those conflicts.

We have been reducing our nuclear stockpile in this country over the last 10 years, and we will continue to. We signed the Moscow treaty which will bring our stockpile down to levels that we have not seen since the 1950s. We have stopped advanced development and research over the last 10 years and at the same time North Korea, Iran, Iraq, and Russia have continued their weapons development programs. Our unwillingness to research these weapons has not stopped anybody from developing them themselves.

Our potential enemies are burrowing in. They are putting their command and control centers, the people with their fingers on the trigger, in hard and deeply buried bunkers. For deterrence to work, we have to hold at risk those things which our potential enemies value and that means holding hard and deeply buried targets at risk. They are out of reach of conventional weapons. They are out of reach of current nuclear weapons. The robust nuclear Earth penetrator program does not create a new nuclear weapon. It is only intended to explore whether you can encase a weapon in order to allow it to penetrate before it explodes so that you can hold that target at risk and continue to deter the use of weapons of mass destruction against America or its allies.

The base bill includes $280 million for work in conventional weapons against hard and deeply buried targets and only $15 million for these programs in advanced development and for the robust nuclear Earth penetrator program. The advanced concepts program I think is even more important. President Putin announced last week and confirmed what all of us have suspected for some time: the Russians are developing a new generation of nuclear weapons. It is up to the United States to avoid being surprised. That means to constantly study what other nations are doing so that we have a good idea of what is going on.

□ 1815

When I was much younger than I am today, someone gave me a copy of a letter. It was from the archives from President Roosevelt. It was from Albert Einstein. It was a letter advising President Roosevelt that in the course of the last 4 months, it has been made probable that it may become possible to set up a nuclear chain reaction in a large mass of uranium by which vast amounts of power and large quantities of new radium-like elements would be generated. How history would be so different if America had decided that we should not think about the unthinkable. We must continue to maintain our weapons of mass destruction program so that we can never be subject to surprise.

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

Unfortunately, my colleague from New Mexico, in an attempt to advance her ''more nukes is better than any nukes at all'' argument, has decided to degrade our existing nuclear weapons deterrent and kind of posit that for some reason there are people out there that actually do not believe that we have the most reliable, credible, and safe nuclear deterrent in the world. The truth is we do. We know we do, and we do not need new nuclear weapons to do what we know conventional weapons can do, and we certainly do not need them in a tactical battlefield environment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), who is the cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

The bunkers which the Republicans want to drop these nuclear bombs on are in the middle of Baghdad. They are in the middle of P'yongyang in North Korea. These bombs, these nuclear bombs, are bigger and more powerful than the bombs we dropped on Hiroshima. We are like those that would preach temperance from a barstool. We cannot tell the other countries in the world that nuclear weapons are unusable if we are at the same time saying that one can use them, that one can be successful and that one can win if one drops nuclear weapons in the middle of the most densely populated cities in the world.

We just brought Iraq to its knees in 3 weeks using conventional weapons. The signal the Republicans are sending is that nuclear weapons are usable and they are usable in the middle of cities where bunkers are being built. And they are wrong, and it is immoral for our country to be taking this step.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains on this side?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. OSE). The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EVERETT) has 6 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER) has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), a very learned member of this committee who has great knowledge on this subject.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I do not understand this amendment because we reached a compromise on the floor of the House last year, and it was not as my colleagues said, Republicans. In fact, I have the vote here. It was 243 to 172. The last time I checked, there are not 243 Republicans in this House. And that very carefully crafted amendment that we passed was an amendment that was crafted by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and by others that said we should be allowed to continue to do research.

My colleague makes it out as if we want to automatically build some kind of Earth penetrator and that we are some kind of Darth Vaders. The fact is anyone who has studied the Ministry of Atomic Energy and has watched the career of Mr. Mikhailov, who used to be the director of that agency, when he left that agency, he came back as the number two person, and we put on the record in committee from Mr. Mikhailov's own mouth that his job was to develop a whole new class of small atomic munitions that are nuclear.

If we follow through on the logic of those like my friend from Massachusetts, we cannot even research what the Russians are building. That has nothing to do with what we want to build. We cannot even research the small weapons the Russians have said publicly they are building. That is outrageous. That is outrageously stupid.

This is not about whether or not we are going to nuke underground. It is whether or not we allow our scientists to have the ability to do research. The amendment last year which I was able to broker with our side that did not want it said we have to have very tightly defined limits, and we did that. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) was the cosponsor of that. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) told me in committee he would support that language, and I take him at his word.

This amendment takes all the money from being able to do that research. One cannot do research without money. The proponents of this amendment say we can do this with conventional weapons. We are spending in this bill $279.6 million for conventional weapons in this area. We take away the only money left, which is 15 million; and we say to the scientists the carefully crafted amendment that we did last year in a bipartisan manner on the floor is okay, they are allowed; but we are not going to give them any money. We are not going to give them any money. We are going to take the money away. Cut me a break. Then say

that. Say you want to prohibit the research. Do not say you allow the research with the amendment that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) agreed to last year, which I think some of the Members at least supported. I would assume the gentlewoman did support that amendment.

Did the gentlewoman support it last year?

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I would. But it was about the low-yield weapons, not about the RNEP.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Not about the RNEP. Okay.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. So this is apples and oranges.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the point is the gentlewoman has tried to also find the middle ground. And I think not to allow this research by taking the money away is a mistake because, in fact, the Russian Ministry of Atomic Energy has announced publicly they are researching this area, and so have other entities, other countries. North Korea is doing a nuclear program. Therefore, I would strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and continue to support the bipartisan compromise last year reinforced by our actions in committee.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the full committee ranking member.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, this is an era of increased concern about weapons of mass destruction. This amendment includes a very prudent approach for enhancing our Nation's ability to hold at risk deeply buried targets. Additional investments in conventional research and conventional development are needed, particularly in the areas of improved targeting and improved planning. Smart fuses, guidance technology, that is what this amendment proposes.

Mr. Chairman, I have spoken with professionals in both our scientific and national security communities, including B–2 bomber pilots, and I have learned one truth: the key to defeating hard deeply buried targets lies more in accuracy and penetration rather than the inherent explosive capability. That is why I think it is prudent to adopt this amendment, continue research on the conventional as opposed to the nuclear.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Chairman, I understand that this side has the right to close?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. I think I do. It is my amendment, I think, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair is informed the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EVERETT) has the right to close.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, if it is my amendment, why would the other side have the right to close?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The manager of the bill is in opposition to the amendment and has the right to close.

Mr. EVERETT. How much time remains on each side?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EVERETT) has 3 minutes. The gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER) has 4½ minutes.

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

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, the House approved a war on Iraq because proponents said they were building weapons of mass destruction. Now this same House is on the verge of approving money for the United States to forward new nuclear weapons. How can we look ourselves in the mirror? America should have more honor than that. Simply put, nuclear weapons do not mean greater security, and smaller nuclear weapons do not mean guaranteed safety. These are the delusions that will ultimately lead our country and our world into nuclear destruction. These are the ultimate weapons of mass destruction. The Cold War is over, but the world still balances on the edge of an atomic cliff. Vote for the Tauscher amendment. Make sure we do not fall over the edge.

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

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

I rise in strong support of the Tauscher-Markey amendment. I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership. This Nation does not need to be leading the world in the development of new forms of nuclear weapons. We just do not need to do that. We need to be leading the way in nonproliferation. Nuclear weapons are not simply one more tool at the President's disposal. They are the foremost most fearsome and most destructive force ever invented, and the proliferation of these weapons of incredible mass destruction make us less secure each and every day.

How do we support the elimination of weapons of mass destruction in foreign countries such as Iraq, yet continue to develop them in our own country? Something is really wrong with this picture. We all believe in national security. We all believe in a strong and effective national defense. But building nuclear weapons is not the answer. I urge the Members to support the Tauscher-Markey amendment.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN).

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Tauscher-Markey amendment.

As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capability, I know that the threat of weapons of mass destruction is real. In Iraq this country's military demonstrated that it can get the job done effectively against heavily defended bunkers and other targets without the use of nuclear weapons. As we negotiate and persuade other nations around the world not to develop nuclear weapons, our credibility is damaged and undermined when we pursue new types of these weapons for our own arsenals. We should improve our conventional capability to defend hard and buried targets around the world as opposed to traveling down this dangerous path towards increased dependence on nuclear weapons. It does not make sense.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, last October I voted for the Bush resolution on Iraq. The reason I did is the President said he wanted to stop Saddam Hussein from obtaining a nuclear weapon, that we were going to stop him and anyone else in the world from the capacity to develop nuclear weapons. The message the Republicans are sending to the world today is that nuclear weapons are usable. If the Russians send nuclear weapons to the United States, shoot them at us, every Trident submarine we have has up to 100 nuclear weapons on it. Russia will be destroyed in 1 day. But if we use one nuclear weapon in Baghdad, in Damascus, in P'yongyang, we will send a signal to dozens of countries in the world that nuclear weapons are usable, and that will destroy our moral and political credibility to end the spread of weapons of mass destruction, especially nuclear weapons, on this planet. This is the most important vote we are going to have, and I urge an ''aye'' vote on the Tauscher amendment so that we fulfill the commitment of those who voted on the resolution to support a war with Iraq in order to stop the spread of nuclear weapons.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, can I ask how much time I have.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 30 seconds.

□ 1830

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

Mr. Chairman, we know that the scientific and military community have said consistently that there are three things needed to defeat deeply hardened and buried targets. They are intelligence, precision targeting and Special Operations forces. They never said

the word ''nuclear.'' There is no need for us to rush to judgment. There certainly is no reason for us to provide money for something that the military has not asked for.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Tauscher amendment, to make sure we move the money from nuclear weapons to conventional weapons so we can defeat these targets.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, what has not been mentioned is this takes $6 million away from the Advanced Concepts Initiative, one of our few remaining weapon systems with designers with actual test experience left. Keeping this money in there will give them time to train a new generation of designers before they retire.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, let me begin by making two points as completely clear as I can:

Number one, it is not a choice between attacking hardened targets with a conventional or a nuclear capability. There is nearly $300 million in this bill to explore conventional capabilities. The question is, should we explore other options as well? So it is false to say there is a choice.

Secondly, this bill does not authorize any kind of new nuclear weapon. That has to be for future Congresses and future administrations to consider. What this bill does is try to remove firewalls which prevent us from even exploring whether a different kind of nuclear weapon can help make us safer. Those who advance this amendment say we do not even want to think about it, do not even consider the possibilities.

It seems to me that if anyone is going to rush to judgment, as the gentlewoman from California said, it would be those who support this amendment, that say under no circumstances are we ever going to have any kind of nuclear deterrent, other than what we had during the Cold War.

The challenge, Mr. Chairman, is that all we have now are nuclear weapons that were specifically designed to deal with Soviet Union targets, and there is a real question about whether a number of folks in the world would take that kind of nuclear deterrent seriously, whether we would ever use the kind of weapons the gentleman from Massachusetts was discussing on a much more limited, smaller kind of target.

The point is not, hopefully, that we would ever use them. The question is people know we would never use these big weapons, and, therefore, they do not take our credibility seriously. That makes the world more dangerous.

It is an interesting line of argument to say that we make the world safer when we tie our hands behind our back, that the problem is with the United States, and that if we would just set a good example, the Saddam Husseins and the Kim Jong Ils and even the Putins would fall right in line, that the United States is the problem.

We have heard that line of argument before, and I would suggest that history has proven it wrong time and time again. The problem is not American strength. The problem is not the United States having additional options. We are not the problem. Peace comes when America is strong and when America has additional options. This bill gives us the ability to at least start to explore those options, and this amendment should be rejected.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment for two reasons. Conventional precision guided munitions are a better technical solution than the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator for hardened and deeply buried targets, and because the fallout, both figurative and literal, from the use of nuclear weapons will make the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator an expensive showpiece rather than a usable weapon. If we start this program it is more likely to be simply A BUST, rather than RO-BUST.

I've had the opportunity to visit this Spring with the 509th Bomb Wing at Whiteman Air Force Base. The 509th operates the 21 B–2 bombers that constitute the most advanced and effective weapons in the United States military arsenal. These were the pilots who were assigned the mission in Iraq to attack the very kinds of targets we are discussing today, hardened and deeply buried targets. I can tell you that the 509th today can attack, disable, and destroy, these targets. The 509th employs a penetrating version of the JDAM, as well as a 5000 lb. bunker buster. These weapons already beat the ground penetration capability of any nuclear weapon in our arsenal, and new capabilities will do even more. The B–2 will soon be able to employ the EGBU–28 bunker buster thanks to support in Congress to field this capability. And advanced research of binary warhead weapons and the use of conventional highly energetic materials will yield even more effective approaches for conventional alternatives.

Indeed, the Tauscher amendment would add funding to three program elements of the Air Force and OSD R&D budgets which are working on just these conventional ground penetration approaches. I believe these conventional capabilities offer technical solutions not just equal to, but superior to those offered by even so-called ''low-yield'' nuclear approaches.

Vote for the Tauscher amendment and support the development of weapons our military can really use.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. OSE). All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER).

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

Mrs. TAUSCHER. 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. TAUSCHER) will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 108–120.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. HOEFFEL

Mr. HOEFFEL. 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. HOEFFEL:

At the end of title X (page 333, after line 21), insert the following new section:

SEC. ___. REPORT CONCERNING STRATEGIC NUCLEAR WARHEADS DISMANTLED PURSUANT TO THE TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION ON STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE REDUCTIONS.

Not later than 60 days after the exchange of instruments of ratification of the Treaty Between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Strategic Offensive Reductions or 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever occurs last, and on February 15 of each subsequent year, the President shall submit to Congress a report concerning any strategic nuclear warheads dismantled within the boundaries of the treaty during the preceding calendar year and any such warheads to be dismantled in that calendar year, pursuant to such treaty. During the one-year period beginning on the date of the exchange of instruments of ratification of such treaty, any such report shall not include information concerning any dismantling of warheads during the preceding calendar year.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) and a Member opposed each will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, but I will not oppose the amendment. We will accept the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EVERETT) will be recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) is recognized.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer this amendment to require the President to make an annual report to Congress and to the American people on the number of nuclear warheads that are dismantled each year by either the Americans or by the Russians under the terms of the Moscow Treaty.

Mr. Chairman, one of the most pressing issues we face is the question of nuclear nonproliferation. A year ago, Presidents Bush and Putin signed the Moscow Treaty, the Treaty on Strategic Defensive Reductions. It is a good treaty and is good for this country. It is only three pages long, however, quite a change from the 900-page START treaties of prior negotiations.

It does not establish a timetable for implementation. It lacks verification. But the most striking change that I think we need to address is that there

is no requirement that the warheads that are reduced from the 5,000 or 6,000 that each side currently possesses down to 1,700 or 2,000, there is no requirement that those warheads be dismantled. They could be retired, put into a closet someplace and brought back on a moment's notice.

I think it is in the best interests of this country that those warheads be dismantled and that the President make an annual report to the Congress on how many of those warheads are being dismantled, both by this country and by the other side, so that Congress can, through that mechanism, verify the progress and verify that the disarmament is occurring.

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

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve my time.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), a leader in nonproliferation issues.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to use that 1 minute to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) for his amendment and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EVERETT), because we clearly have a meeting of the minds here that there should be an ongoing accounting of what is going on in the area of dismantling of these weapons in the former Soviet Union.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) I think has put his finger on a very real defect that exists in the current system. By ensuring that there will be an accounting scheme that is put into place, I think that we are going to be able to much more quickly advance the goal of nuclear nonproliferation.

I thank the gentleman for making his very important amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman for his kind comments and simply close by in turn thanking the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EVERETT) and the majority side and majority staff for their cooperation on this amendment and for their cooperation on this issue. I am glad that there is bipartisan agreement, and I salute the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EVERETT) and thank him for his cooperation.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I would just simply point out, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania recognized in his statement, that the treaty does not require this actual dismantling to take place, only that they are removed from deployment.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 108–120.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. GOSS

Mr. GOSS. 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. GOSS:

At the end of title XII (page 384, after line 3), insert the following new section:

SEC. ___. REPORT ON ACTIONS THAT COULD BE TAKEN REGARDING COUNTRIES THAT INITIATE CERTAIN LEGAL ACTIONS AGAINST UNITED STATES OFFICIALS.

(a) FINDING.—Congress finds that actions for or on behalf of a foreign government that constitute attempts to commence legal proceedings against, or attempts to compel the appearance of or production of documents from, any current or former official or employee of the United States or member of the Armed Forces of the United States relating to the performance of official duties constitutes a threat to the ability of the United States to take necessary and timely military action.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on appropriate steps that could be taken by the Department of Defense (including restrictions on military travel and limitations on military support and exchange programs) to respond to any action by a foreign government described in subsection (a).

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant House Resolution 245, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does any Member seek the time in opposition?

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition. As far as I know, there is no opposition.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 10 minutes.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS).

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

Mr. Chairman, we are living in a world that we all know has been transformed very dramatically by the threat of rogue states, terrorist organizations, and Lord knows we are definitely aware of it today.

There are new costs involved in everyday life and new cautions we must heed to keep Americans safe. This is the reality of life today.

One thing that must remain constant is our ability to ensure that our soldiers, our diplomats, our public officials, no matter whether they are in uniform or not, no matter where they are located, they must serve under the honorable and meaningful protection of the flag of the United States of America.

This protection is currently threatened by any country that allows U.S. citizens to be tried for alleged war crimes and alleged crimes against humanity. These cases, coming under the so-called concept of ''universal jurisdiction,'' are cases that are usually filed in support of radical anti-Americanism for strictly political reasons that can create, unfortunately, serious obstacles for our officials to go about the conduct of their proper official business overseas.

From the perspective of our national security, the United States cannot afford to have our military commanders hindered while accomplishing the actions we ask of them necessary to ensure the safety of Americans. For example, our General Tommy Franks, of whom we are so proud, commander of our military forces in Iraq, has now a ridiculous lawsuit filed against him that alleges violations of international law.

Should the Belgium court system, where this case is filed, decide to try this case, General Franks risks being unable to travel to Brussels, the location of NATO headquarters, due to the threat of prosecution.

This amendment calls for a quick study by DOD to report to Congress on appropriate actions that could be taken when any country provides for and encourages extra-legal actions against United States officials doing their proper business under some type of so-called ''universal jurisdiction.''

We are not about to compromise our sovereignty, especially for our fighting forces protecting our freedoms on the battlefields overseas, nor should we tolerate or award the abuse of other nations' judicial systems in order to create obstacles for our troops and officials. American officials safeguarding our liberties on foreign soil must know that they can count on the rights that we as American citizens hold dear to be able to accomplish what we are asking them to undertake.

This would seem to be a frivolous matter, except it has been picked up by the press around the world and is becoming somewhat of a celebrated case.

I now am going to quote from BBC news that says, ''The action against General Franks is likely to be a test of recent revisions to the law in Brussels following high-profile cases brought against the Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon and the former U.S. President George Bush, Sr.''

BBC goes on to say that the plaintiff in the case, the lawyer who is running for political office, I would point out, has told reporters, ''General Franks is responsible as commander-in-chief for the way some of his men acted on the ground. For instance, the use of cluster bombs on civilian areas is a war crime.''

I think that everybody would agree with that, but there is no proof. It is an allegation, and, of course, it is an outrage, because General Franks did no such thing.

The quote goes on to say that the suit also names Marine Lt. Colonel

Brian McCoy, who is accused of categorizing the ambulances as legitimate targets because he suspected them of harboring gunmen, so said, I guess, AFP, in this case Agency French Press.

□ 1845

When we start taking a look at the notoriety that these allegations are bringing to our honorable men and women in uniform overseas, we can see that we are beginning to have a problem.

Going back further to how this happened, we look to some of the press, and I am now quoting from the Seattle Press Intelligencer: ''In response to a global groundswell of demand discernible only to the Belgians, the Belgians awarded themselves the power to try anyone for war crimes committed anywhere.'' That is what we are confronting. ''Franks is charged with the bombing of civilians, indiscriminate shooting by U.S. troops, and the failure to stop looting. McCoy is charged with ordering troops to fire on ambulances.''

These are charges that are being waved about, as I say, in the press, both at home and internationally, without any kind of responsible person standing up and saying that this is hogwash and absurd; and it is time that happened. I think the best way to do it is this amendment.

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

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from Florida, we have examined the amendment. I find no objection to it. As far as I know, there is no opposition to it.

Mr. GOSS. I thank the distinguished gentleman. I would certainly hope there is support for it.

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

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, let me say that I am so glad that the distinguished chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has brought this amendment, because this goes to the very heart of the purpose of our operation in Iraq, the honor with which we conducted this operation, the integrity of our leadership, and what I would call perhaps a backbiting response from certain elements in the international community, and, lastly, an appropriate response from the United States, which is suggested by the gentleman.

So I think that the gentleman's amendment is right on point, and I will work with my partner, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), to see to it that this amendment becomes law.

Mr. GOSS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I am most thankful to the distinguished chairman of the committee for that statement. I would advise Members that I think this is an issue that most Members would like to be heard on, so while I am relatively certain we could win this vote now tonight, I am going to ask for a recorded vote tomorrow when the appropriate moment comes.

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. OSE). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS).

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

Mr. GOSS. 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 Florida (Mr. GOSS) will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 108–120.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. GOSS

Mr. GOSS. 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. 7 offered by Mr. GOSS:

At the end of title XII (page 384, after line 3), insert the following new section:

SEC. ___. ASSESSMENT AND REPORT CONCERNING THE LOCATION OF NATO HEADQUARTERS.

(a) ASSESSMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall conduct a full and complete assessment of costs to the United States associated with the location of the headquarters of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in Brussels, Belgium, and the costs and benefits of relocating that headquarters to a suitable location in another NATO member country, including those nations invited to join NATO at the Prague summit in 2002. The Secretary shall conduct such assessment in consultation with the Secretary of State.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report of the findings of the assessment under subsection (a).

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 245, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, we all understand the geopolitical climate has changed tremendously in the last couple of years. Ruthless dictatorships have come and gone, democratic nations have continued to thrive, and many challenges continue to confront us.

Many challenges have been met by the United States with the help of steadfast allies in coalitions and steadfast allies in NATO. As the global evolution continues, it is prudent to pose some topical questions, particularly as we are doing this defense authorization bill.

One of those topical questions should be, is NATO now headquartered in the correct place? Is it located in a centralized area both conducive and friendly to all members of NATO?

It is the responsibility of Congress to conduct necessary oversight in this matter. NATO is expanding its membership to include seven countries from Eastern and Central Europe. This, of course, is in addition to the inclusions of Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic a few years ago. I would say that Members of this body have been very instrumental in assisting for the growth and enlargement of NATO to become an even more meaningful organization doing even more meaningful things today.

I think all of this reflects the burgeoning wave of democracy and freedom that is actually sweeping through that region. Those folks are looking to us for leadership and assistance in their defense, and NATO understands this trend. So the question arises, would a more centralized location of NATO headquarters enhance NATO's effectiveness?

NATO's mission is also adapting to the current geopolitical conditions. NATO is in fact a peacekeeper. Its capabilities are a great asset to us and to others, and a more centralized headquarters might indeed facilitate the shifting tasks that NATO is undertaking.

Let me be clear: NATO is a vital, integral component of our global security system. It must continue to function with strength and effectiveness in this century. I am a very big proponent of NATO. I am a member of the House NATO Parliamentarians Group. I have been many, many times to those meetings across the pond.

Our group is masterfully led by our colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER). It is bipartisan. It is a wonderful reflection of the United States of America and the working relationship with our allies on important and, in fact, critical national security problems; and it is carried out brilliantly through the NATO parliamentarians organization, of which the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) is currently the president.

So this is not about NATO; it is about the best location for NATO under the circumstances of the time. This amendment simply calls for a study by DOD of the costs associated with the current location of NATO's headquarters and the potential costs and benefits of relocating the headquarters to another location in Europe.

This study should reflect the geopolitical realities that exist today, including especially the need to economize on our military overhead and our military and administrative costs, and reduce those where possible, and, of course, get rid of as much red tape as is possible.

So there are a bunch of reasons to talk about centralizing NATO headquarters, with the encouragement of stability and democratic government

in Eastern Europe not the least among them.

There is also, of course, the matter of the ''universal jurisdiction'' law problem in Belgium that we have recently spoken about that has an unnecessarily chilling impact on military hospitality. I am sorry to say that.

I note that even General Myers has gotten up, and I would quote from the Chicago Sun-Times: ''General Richard Myers, chief of the U.S. General Staff, intervened in the argument with Belgium,'' it has gotten to that level, ''after American officials expressed fears that the Belgian war crimes laws would expose NATO officers to the risk of arrest.'' This is a serious problem, and, of course, totally unnecessary.

I think the question we should ask that the chairman of the committee and I have talked about is are we getting the best bang for the buck from Brussels? I think that it is time for DOD to take a look at that. Remember, NATO was supposed to start in Paris. It did not fit in Paris, so it ended up in Brussels. Maybe it does not fit in Brussels today and it should end up somewhere else. This is what this is about.

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

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman bringing this amendment to the floor. I think his question is right on point: Are we getting the best bang for the buck in Brussels? We are getting something in Brussels, but it is not effective leadership. I think he has asked a question that has to be answered.

In fact, I have an amendment coming up here shortly that asks the President to evaluate our total footprint in Europe with an eye towards perhaps replacing that footprint.

I have been looking at some of the cost of living and also the hospitality of other nations. One of those new nations is a nation that helped the United States in Iraq, Poland. Poland has a cost of living that is much lower than that in Brussels, so presumably our people, uniformed and nonuniformed, who live there will be able to live better on military pay than they do in Brussels. It would not be bad, I think, for military folks to be in an environment, which they would be in Poland, with a nation that has just stood side by side with us on a battlefield in the world.

There are no words as eloquent as actions. The actions of that force, and it was not a big force, but it was about 200 special operators that participated in Iraq, impressed me greatly and I think would impress the President.

The other aspect of this, since the gentleman has opened this debate and this issue, is I am going to bring up the fact in my amendment that we have 72,400 American uniformed personnel in Germany. We did an entire hearing on this footprint. There is nobody on the other side of the Fulda Gap with a tank. In the old days, there were dozens of divisions of Warsaw Pact military units on the other side of the Fulda Gap. That is why we had a heavy military presence in Germany. That presence is not there now.

So this is a second question, but not totally unlike the question the gentleman is asking, because whereas we might want to move out of Brussels for altogether different purposes than moving out of Germany, the receptivity of other nations at alternate sites is a major issue with both amendments.

Once again, we are putting some money in the bill for doing some preliminary military work, things like runways and things like that, in Poland and Bulgaria and Romania, three of the nations from what Don Rumsfeld called, maybe with justification, the new Europe.

I want to thank the gentleman for his contribution. Let me tell the gentleman, I would certainly, and I want to hear what my ranking member has to say, because he is such an expert in these areas, but I think this is an excellent amendment.

Mr. GOSS. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

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

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I think, frankly, this is a good amendment, for two reasons.

The first is it calls for an assessment by the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, because this is a diplomatic as well as a military organization.

Secondly, it would be up to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to make any final decision, but information such as cost that this amendment is aimed at I think is good information. So I find myself in agreement with it.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank both distinguished leaders of the very important Committee on Armed Services for their support and understanding of these amendments.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 108–120.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. SAXTON

Mr. SAXTON. 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. 8 offered by Mr. SAXTON:

At the end of subtitle B of title V (page 91, after line 16), insert the following new section:

SEC. 514. REPEAL OF REQUIRED GRADE OF DEFENSE ATTACHÉ IN FRANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 714 of title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 41 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 714.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 245, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON).

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

This amendment will repeal the statutory requirement that an officer in our Armed Forces, in order to be selected for assignment as the Defense Attaché to France, must hold the rank of brigadier general, or, in the case of a Navy officer, rear admiral lower half.

The Department of Defense included the repeal of this requirement as part of their budget request for fiscal year 2004, and there is no justification for continuing this statutory mandate, in my opinion.

The adoption of this amendment will not prevent our military attaché in Paris from being a brigadier general or a rear admiral; rather, it will only remove the requirement that they be of that rank. It will permit the Department of Defense greater flexibility in making their decisions to assign officers to that position.

Most importantly, adoption of this amendment will end the unnecessary requirement that our military attaché to France be of a higher rank than our military attachés everywhere else in the world. The United States has 135 defense attaché positions in our embassies around the world. Of those 135, only three, those of France, Russia, and China, are officers that hold the rank of brigadier general or rear admiral.

Our attaché to France is the only military attaché whose rank is mandated by law in title 10. Accordingly, France is the exception to the rule. The requirement that our military attaché to France be a brigadier general is not consistent with our military attachés to other nations.

□ 1900

Today I believe we all need to question whether it is appropriate to mandate that our military attaché to France be of a higher rank than everywhere else in the world.

Under President Jacques Chirac, France actively opposed the United States and our allies in the recent war with Iraq. The French government used all of its influence to prevent the removal of Saddam Hussein from power and hindered our efforts to enforce United Nations Security Council Resolutions that required the removal of weapons of mass destruction from his possession. By doing so, France failed to accept its responsibilities and deliberately acted counter to the national security interests of the United States. In NATO, France does not fully participate in the Organization's integrated

military command, yet we require that our military attaché to Paris be of a higher rank than all of our attachés in NATO member countries. We thus provide France with a status not in line with its NATO responsibilities.

I find it entirely inappropriate that we have mandated that our military attaché to France be a higher rank than military attachés to nations such as Great Britain, who never balked at fighting side by side with us in our war on terrorism.

As the position of defense attaché to France is now vacant, the repeal of the statute would have no impact on an incumbent, and this is the perfect opportunity to bring consistency to our military attaché postings.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for this amendment.

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

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

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

It not only makes the law consistent with the rest of the statutes regarding the qualifications for an attaché which should have been done some time ago, I think it also sends a message to that country regarding recent activities insofar as expectations and friendship go. I must tell you how disappointed I am in that country regarding that. But, nevertheless, this does bring in line the law as it applies to all other attachés in all other countries, and I think it is an excellent amendment.

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

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to add my commendations to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), one of the absolute finest members of this great Committee on Armed Services and a guy who cares a lot about the fighting forces of the United States and also cares a lot about countries who stand with us in times of difficulty; and I think his amendment is right on point.

I understand this amendment has a message beyond the message of conforming with similar situations in other countries around the world. There is perhaps a message to Paris here. I think it is an appropriate one as I add my commendation to the gentleman and I strongly support this amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. OSE). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON).

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

Mr. SAXTON. 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 New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 108–120.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 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. 9 offered by Mr. HUNTER:

At the end of title XII (page 384, after line 3), insert the following new section:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON REDEPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES FORCES IN EUROPE

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

(1) In March 1999, in its initial round of expansion, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) admitted Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary to the Alliance.

(2) At the Prague Summit on November 21–22, 2002, the NATO heads of state and government invited the countries of Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia to join the Alliance.

(3) The countries admitted in the initial round of expansion referred to in paragraph (1) and the seven new invitee nations referred to in paragraph (2) will in combination significantly alter the nature of the Alliance.

(4) During the first 50 years of the Alliance, NATO materially contributed to the security and stability of Western Europe, brining peace and prosperity to the member nations.

(5) The expansion of NATO is an opportunity to assist the invitee nations in gaining the capabilities to ensure peace, prosperity, and democracy for themselves during the next 50 years of the Alliance.

(6) The military structure and mission of NATO has changed, no longer being focused on the threat of a Soviet invasion, but evolving to handle new missions in the area of crisis management, peacekeeping, and peace-support in the Euro-Atlantic area of operations.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—In light of the findings in subsection (a), it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the expansion of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Alliance and the evolution of the military mission of that Alliance requires a fundamental reevaluation of the current posture of United States forces stationed in Europe; and

(2) the President should—

(A) initiate a reevaluation referred to in paragraph (1); and

(B) in carrying out such a reevaluation, consider a military posture that takes maximum advantage of basing and training opportunities in the newly admitted and invitee states referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively, of subsection (a).

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 245, 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, I rise today to ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

As we stand here, the strategic landscape facing the United States is a lot different than it was just a couple of years ago. After September 11, 2001, we embarked on a global war on terrorism, and since that day we have engaged in two successful campaigns in Afghanistan and Iraq. In doing so, we removed one of the major contingencies that served as a basis for force planning during most of the 1990s.

In the wake of these events, it is clear that we need to evaluate our military posture. Across the globe, and particularly in Europe, we remain deployed much as we were at the end of the Cold War and, in some instances, much the same as at the end of World War II. The time has come to adapt our global posture in order to meet the challenges of new era, not to meet those of an era gone by.

Earlier this year, General Jones, the commanding general of U.S. European command, outlined his thoughts regarding the change of our nature and presence in Europe from a garrison force to what he called an expeditionary force. Under this concept, U.S. military units would rotate overseas on a periodic basis, rather than be permanently stationed in Europe. Our bases in Europe would become in General Jones' words ''lily pads,'' bases from which our forces would deploy to crisis areas around the world.

Based on this idea, the committee held a hearing in February to explore this changing nature of our posture in NATO. It became clear that NATO will continue to change. No longer postured to defend Western Europe against the Soviet threat, NATO is evolving to a force that will undertake contingency operations both inside and outside Europe. At the same time, NATO's membership continues to grow and the admission of many former Warsaw Pact nations has moved the borders of the alliance further east and south. We have to recognize those changes within NATO and take appropriate action to ensure our contribution remains relevant.

As a result of that hearing and General Jones' initiative, I offer this amendment today. It simply states it is the sense of Congress, in light of the changing nature of NATO and the strategic landscape worldwide, that the President should reevaluate our posture in Europe and take maximum advantage of any basing and training opportunities among NATO's newly joined and invitee states in Eastern Europe.

I urge my colleagues to send a message to the administration and to our current and future NATO allies that we understand the changing nature of the alliance and stand in strong support of the alliance as it faces the challenges of the 21st century.

Mr. Chairman, in the previous amendments we have talked about this a little. My partner on this committee, the ranking member, the distinguished

gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), has some very eloquent and wise thoughts on this issue.

We have had a hearing on our footprint in Germany, the 72,400 uniformed personnel in Germany, about 55,000 of whom are Army personnel; and we have also looked at the fact that American personnel can live much less expensively in places like Poland.

Mr. Chairman, from my own perspective, I will never forget that at a time when we had a dwindling list of allies who wanted to participate side by side with our young Americans who were laying their lives on the line in the Iraq conflicts, Poland sent a contingent of some 200 special operators into that theater and served with us in battle. I think it would be very appropriate, in fact, this committee has seen fit to place some money for military expenditures, for some early preliminary work in Poland, Bulgaria and Romania; and I think that we should certainly look at this Europe, this new Europe that Secretary Rumsfeld talks about in terms of the changing requirements that we have and the resultant changing strategic posture of the United States in Europe.

Mr. Chairman, I would offer this amendment. I look forward to comments from the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON).

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. Chairman, I know of no opposition to the amendment. I personally endorse it and support it.

Times have changed. Situations have changed. But I think one fact that is very important is the fact that NATO is an ongoing, successful organization, and it has recently expanded, and we should take advantage of that expansion and the friendship that is growing as a result of the new members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

This amendment requires a reevaluation of the current posture of American forces in Europe. It is designed only for the American forces, and it calls for a reevaluation.

I think there are a number of things we could and should consider. To begin with, I think it is important for us to remember that stationing troops in Germany is a very positive thing and that we should not rush to judgment just to move troops from Germany. But having said that, I think it is a good idea to take a look at the eastern countries. Poland, our chairman mentioned, and to their great credit, side by side, they have their special forces there, theirs with ours, in Iraq. Consequently, I think we should take advantage of that new-found friendship and that new-found military cooperation with that country and, of course, others in the region that are new to the NATO organizations.

Consider the entire picture, not being prejudiced one way or the other, but, A, take advantage of the new friends and those that are willing to help us; B, remember our old obligations and the admonitions of some that we should keep a strong footprint in Germany.

With that, I fully agree with the chairman's amendment, and I intend to support it, and I thank him for offering it at this time.

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. No further amendments being in order, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT) having assumed the chair, Mr. OSE, 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. 1588) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2004 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2004, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). The Chair announces the proceedings will resume tomorrow on the motions to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1683 and H.R. 1257, originally considered yesterday.

□ 1915

VACATING ADOPTION OF SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 46, AMENDING SAID CONCURRENT RESOLUTION, AND ADOPTING CONCURRENT RESOLUTION AS SO AMENDED

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the action of the House adopting Senate Concurrent Resolution 46 be vacated to the end that the House hereby amend the concurrent resolution by striking ''Secretary of the Senate'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''Clerk of the House'' and adopt the concurrent resolution, as so amended.

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

There was no objection.

CONGRESSIONAL SPEEDWAY CAUCUS

(Ms. CARSON of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce the formation of the Congressional Speedway Caucus. Races like the Indianapolis 500, the Daytona 500 and the Southern 500 have become American institutions.

Hundreds of companies and thousands of individuals strive to make these spectacles of speed some of the most exciting events in the world. However, they are beginning to face unique challenges in the post-9/11 world. With some of the speedways in America hosting the largest spectator events in the country, they are already starting to express concern about homeland security needs and how they can better protect the hundreds of thousands of race fans who come to their raceways.

I have one of the greatest events, Mr. Speaker, in my district, the Indianapolis 500 Speedway Race, which is coming up next Sunday. We have 32 Members of Congress who have speedways within their congressional districts. Twenty-two of these have already agreed to be members of this exciting caucus.

I would encourage those with or without speedways in their districts to join the caucus to better represent all of the fans across the world who come to our district who come to this country to enjoy this spectator sport and try to resolve some of the impending issues of these speedways.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert the names of all of the members of the Speedway Caucus who have stepped forward and joined this unique opportunity. They are as follows:

Rep. Virgil Goode (R–VA).
Rep. Charles Bass (R–NH).
Rep. Sue Myrick (R–KS).
Rep. Dennis Moore (R–KS).
Rep. Robin Hayes (R–NC).
Rep. Mike McIntyre (D–NC).
Rep. Dan Burton (R–IN).
Rep. John Spratt (D–SC).
Rep. Lincoln Davis (D–TN).
Rep. Bill Lipinski (D–IL).
Rep. Amo Houghton (R–NY).
Rep. Ken Lucas (D–KY).
Rep. Mike Oxley (R–OH).
Rep. Mike Pence (R–IN).
Rep. Bob Etheridge (D–NC).
Rep. Cass Ballenger (R–NC).
Rep. Nick Smith (R–MI).
Rep. Paul Kanjorski (D–PA).
Rep. Dennis Cardoza (D–CA).
Rep. Chris Chocola (R–IN).
Rep. J. Gresham Barrett (R–SC).
Rep. Harold Ford, Jr. (D–TN).
Rep. Jim Gibbons (R–NV).
Rep. Fred Upton (R–MI).
Rep. Mac Collins (R–GA).
Rep. Robert Scott (D–VA).
Rep. Jerry Costello (D–IL).
Rep. Ed Pastor (D–AZ).
Rep. Jim Copper (D–TN).
Rep. John Tanner (D–TN).
Rep. Patrick Toomey (R–PA).
Rep. Shelley Berkley (D–NV).
Rep. Rob Simmons (R–CT).

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 South Dakota (Mr. JANKLOW) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JANKLOW 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 Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE 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 Texas (Mr. CULBERSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CULBERSON 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.)

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE TARGETS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE IN GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS SUBMITTED BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD targets for the elimination of waste, fraud and abuse in Government programs under the authority of Section 301 of H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2004 (H. Rept. 108–71).

Section 301 of the budget resolution requires House and Senate authorizing committees to submit findings to the Committees on the Budget that provide for the elimination of waste, fraud and abuse in programs under their jurisdiction. The level of savings to be achieved by each committee was left unspecified in the budget resolution; the Chairmen of the Committees on the Budget were directed to submit those levels of savings for publication in the RECORD subsequent to adoption of the budget resolution.

The following savings targets, which are consistent with the level of savings expected from Senate authorizing committees, represent the minimum expectations for cost reductions derived from the improvement of economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of programs within the jurisdiction of each House committee. The publication of these targets does not represent a level of programmatic reductions (''cuts'') mandated by the Committees on the Budget, but rather a recommendation that the committees of jurisdiction find efficiencies equal to 1 percent of the net cost of the programs within their jurisdiction through the elimination of waste, fraud, and abuse.

TARGETS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, FRAUD AND ABUSE UNDER SECTION 301 OF THE BUDGET RESOLUTION BY HOUSE AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE

[By fiscal year, in billions of dollars]

	2004	2004–08	2004–13	Total mandatory spending in budget resolution
Agriculture:				
BA	−0.495	−2.572	−5.254	525.250
Outlays	−0.455	−2.396	−4.945	494.464
Armed Services:				
BA	−0.779	−4.202	−9.179	918.038
Outlays	−0.777	−4.195	−9.165	916.462
Education and the Workforce:				
BA	−0.205	−1.144	−2.513	251.767
Outlays	−0.197	−1.103	−2.431	243.590
Energy and Commerce:				
BA	−1.802	−10.583	−26.512	2,649.002
Outlays	−1.815	−10.594	−26.523	2,650.184
Financial Services:				
BA	−0.072	−0.380	−0.751	75.044
Outlays	−0.018	−0.061	−0.095	2.817
Government Reform:				
BA	−0.827	−4.496	−9.998	999.817
Outlays	0.812	−4.423	−9.859	985.880
House Administration:				
BA	−0.002	−0.010	−0.020	2.112
Outlays	−0.004	−0.012	−0.024	2.334
International Relations:				
BA	−0.100	−0.599	−1.289	128.893
Outlays	−0.119	−0.563	−1.181	118.132
Judiciary:				
BA	−0.072	−0.319	−0.652	65.225
Outlays	−0.065	−0.319	−0.644	64.444
Resources:				
BA	−0.033	−0.158	−0.314	32.724
Outlays	−0.030	−0.149	−0.297	30.646
Science:				
BA	—	—	—	0.341
Outlays	−0.001	−0.003	−0.003	0.513
Small Business:				
BA	—	—	—	0.006
Outlays	—	—	—	n.a.
Transportation and Infrastructure:				
BA	−0.491	−2.689	−5.484	640.539
Outlays	−0.143	−0.763	−1.578	157.850
Veterans' Affairs:				
BA	−0.342	−1.833	−3.864	386.551
Outlays	−0.340	−1.825	−3.850	384.941
Ways and Means:				
BA	−5.495	−30.411	−71.339	7,616.989
Outlays	−5.517	−30.467	−71.428	7,625.699
Total:				
BA	−10.715	−59.396	−137.169	14,292.298
Outlays	−10.293	−56.873	−132.023	13,677.880

Note.—Section 301(c) of H. Con. Res. 95 does not include the House Select Committee on Intelligence.
''—'' means less than $500,000.

I look forward to working with House committees in the future development of legislative initiatives to ensure the delivery of Government programs in the most cost-effective manner.

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

(Mr. LIPINSKI 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.)

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

(Mr. SHERMAN 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 the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her 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. FILNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FILNER 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 Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DOGGETT 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 Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. EDWARDS 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 Texas (Mr. FROST) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FROST 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 Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GREEN of Texas 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 Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. RODRIGUEZ 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 Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. STRICKLAND 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 North Carolina (Mr. BALLANCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BALLANCE 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 Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IMMIGRATION AND AMNESTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to discuss a topic not unfamiliar to those who know that I have a passion for and an interest in the issue of immigration and immigration reform. Tonight, I wanted to specifically refer to a proposal that has made its way forward and that has a number of interesting aspects.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, over the last couple of years anyway, there have been attempts on the floor of the House here where many people have tried to advance the cause and idea of amnesty for people who are living here in the United States illegally. It is something we have done before, something we did in the mid-1980s, and it has proven to be disastrous from a variety of standpoints.

You may recall that as a result of amnesty for millions of people living here illegally, millions more people came illegally. Of course, this is only logical. It is not surprising whatsoever that if you tell someone that they can enter the United States without going through the legal process, without going through the expense and waiting in line, and that if they do that they will be rewarded for that activity; that we will provide you with all of the benefits of those people who did wait in line, well, then, of course, people will not wait in line. It is pretty logical.

Nobody really, I think, is too surprised by the fact that when I do travel to the border and I talk to the border patrol, they always say, I hope you guys up there will stop using the word ''amnesty.'' Because every time you even utter the word, the flood I am trying to stop down here, with the sieve that you have given me, turns into a tidal wave. And, of course, it would always do so.

Now, we have been successful, those of us who have been opposed to the continuation, or an expansion, of this concept of amnesty, expansion of what is bureaucratically and legalistically referred to as 245(i), those opposed to 245(i) expansion have been successful in stopping it from actually occurring. It came through the House here, and it did pass the House by one vote but failed in the Senate. Actually, it failed because Senator BYRD put a hold on the bill and it did not come up.

There is little sentiment in the Congress of the United States for this concept. The President has pushed it, but there is little sentiment for it here. And, frankly, I doubt that there is going to be a major effort to push it again through this Congress. There may be, but I think that we would be able to stop it.

So what has happened as a result of the fact that those people who want open borders, those people who want to reward people for having come into the United States illegally? I mean, what do they do next, I guess is the question. Well, what they do next is to try to attain the same goal only in a different venue. Instead of coming through the Congress with a bill to create an amnesty for people who are living here illegally and rewarding people for violating our law, a new strategy has been hit upon.

Now, this strategy is a strategy that has been employed by other governments, but in this case specifically, the government of Mexico, and maybe I should say other coconspirators in the United States, people who are in league with them, who believe that we should abandon our borders and provide no barrier whatsoever to the movement of people, ideas, goods and services. But the Mexican Government has decided to use something to achieve the same goal that they could not achieve by coming through the Congress, and that is the use of a card, an ID. It is referred to as the matricula consular.

The matricula consular is an identification card that is given to nationals of any country by their own government. It is not unique to Mexico, and Mexico has actually been using them for a long, long, long time. What has changed in the last year and a half or so is that Mexico has decided to go big time into this particular kind of endeavor, that is to say, to distribute as many of these Mexican identification cards as possible to Mexican nationals living in the United States.

Now, again, my colleagues might say, well, so what? What has that got to do with amnesty? Well, here is the deal. Everyone realizes, everyone realizes, that there is only one purpose for this card. There is really only one reason why someone would need this card in the United States, and that is if you are here illegally. It is a passport for illegal aliens. We know there are between 13 and 20 million people living in this country illegally, the vast majority being Mexican nationals. So the Mexican Government has already distributed, by their own count, about 1.4 million of these ID cards in the United States.

Now, as I say, they have the right to do that. No one is suggesting that Mexico cannot give an ID card to their nationals living anywhere. But what is peculiar about this whole thing is that they then went to their consular offices throughout the United States and they said, your job, if you are a Mexican consular official, is to go out into the States for which you have some responsibility and begin to lobby those States and begin to lobby the cities, the counties, the police departments to get those entities to accept this card from anyone who presents it for a valid form of identification.

And this has been enormously successful. They have been successful in

getting police departments all over the country to say yes to this idea, to accept the matricula card. They have been successful in getting States to go along with it. California is in the process of actually passing legislation to force their cities and counties to accept this ID, an ID that is given by a foreign government to a foreign national living here illegally.

It immediately sets up a lot of questions, of course. The first one that would come to mind is how many immigration systems are we running in the United States? There is one that supposedly we have some responsibility for here and we say who can come and who can go. Now, we know that people ignore it quite routinely; but, nonetheless, we have a whole system of immigration law that we are supposed to be enforcing. Then there is another system of immigration law that is developing out there, in this case the States are employing it, and counties and police departments. They are doing it on their own.

These States and local agencies are saying, well, we do not care if you are here illegally, we are going to give you our passport. We are going to accept this card from you and say that that is your passport for anything you want to obtain in the United States, for anything that a legal resident may be able to obtain: a driver's license, certain other benefits. And, in fact, beyond that, they are asking for cities and counties to extend social service benefits to people who carry this card, and police departments are to adhere to this card.

Now, let me just tell you what that sets up. We arrested someone in Colorado not too long ago that had seven matricula consular cards with their face on it, but with seven different names. There is absolutely nothing, absolutely nothing, that we can rely on to suggest that these cards are in fact valid forms of ID. For $28 and a photocopy of your Mexican birth certificate, which of course can be created quite easily on a computer, you can go to the Mexican consulate, and it does not matter what you say your name is, it does not matter what you look like, it could be a person that looks completely anglo, it just does not matter, and you go in and say who you are, you present this birth certificate, and for $28 you will get yourself a new identity.

So it is not just people who are living in the United States illegally who are benefited by this; but it is also, of course, people who are felons. They may be legal United States residents, but they have a desire to change their identity. This is a great way to do it, and people are doing it in great numbers.

Now, this has started another set of discussions going, and specifically there are parts of the Federal Government that are interested in trying to address this issue, namely Homeland Defense. Because not too long ago, in California, a Federal office building in San Francisco began to accept the matricula consular as a valid form of ID for someone wanting to gain entrance to the Federal building.

□ 1930

This was done as a result of the insistence of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), and there were a number of repercussions to this, I should say. In fact, there was such an outcry and enough people concerned that a Federal building in the United States was allowing entrance into that building by someone who presented an identification card that our government did not give them, a foreign government did.

So GSA, which is the government landlord, decided to put this whole thing on hold while they did a study of the whole concept of using the matricula for ID purposes, and a working group started. It was really housed originally in the Department of Homeland Security, and they were charged with the development of a draft proposal. They completed that not too long ago.

I happen to have been able to see a copy of that proposal. It was interesting in that it talked about the very dangerous repercussions to allowing Federal government agencies to accept the matricula consular as a form of identification because, of course, you cannot just regulate this to one country. You cannot just say you will only accept the matricula consular from Mexico. Right now, there are five other countries that are using this form of identification for their illegals living in the United States, one of them Poland.

This is something many countries are looking at. If a country is not looking at it, a lot of terrorists are looking at it, a lot of people who are figuring out a way to become part of the American mainstream, to get into American society. They are looking for a passport into American society, something that allows them to open bank accounts, get a driver's license, your library card, and anything else that a regular citizen of this country would be able to do.

So terrorists have a strong incentive to see how this thing unfolds. So at certain points in time we could certainly see governments of a lot of foreign countries providing these matricula consular to their nationals who in turn would use them in the United States because the law says the government accepts them, and the law in your particular city or State says you can do so.

Banks became very involved with this whole thing and started encouraging people to open accounts in their bank. Wells Fargo Bank and Citibank, Bank America, all of these banks saw a huge potential there, a niche market. They call them the unbanked. What they mean is the illegal alien living in the United States and looking to open an account. I do not blame the banks for seeing this as a true profit center. They are completely able to do that.

But what is interesting is not too long ago we passed something called the PATRIOT Act here, and we made it difficult, supposedly, for people to do things and supposedly difficult for banks to do things that would allow people to use bogus accounts to transfer money because we recognize that is something that terrorist organizations do. So the banks, even without any sort of legal imprimatur, if you will, to allow them to do this, went ahead and started accepting the matricula consular to open accounts.

Well, the Treasury Department last week promulgated rules in response to the PATRIOT Act. Now this is the great irony here. The PATRIOT Act demanded that the banks do something to make it more secure, to make the whole process more secure when people open an account so we really know who these people are and we can track the money flow if we have to. That is the part of the PATRIOT Act that banks were responding to.

So what did they do? The Treasury Department, recognizing that this was happening in the banking industry and that banks were making millions of dollars off of the ''unbanked'' community, the Treasury of the United States, in response to the PATRIOT Act, promulgated rules saying, in fact, that banks could accept the matricula consular. This is amazing, and it is I think something that we should all be concerned about. I think that certainly we are going to try to bring this to the attention of the House in a short time by filing a request for a resolution, a joint resolution to stop the implementation of these regulations.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about here is something that is being used to avoid the law. We passed a law in this Congress saying that the only way that you can come into this country is through a certain process and that if you do not do that you are in violation of the law. But how hypocritical is it to then say, however, if you get here, we are going to ignore the fact that you chose this particular route and we are going to give you access to every single amenity that this country has to offer, including the right to vote which is being pressed.

There are cities not too far from where we are tonight in Maryland and in Connecticut, along the East Coast especially, that call themselves sanctuary cities, and they allow people to vote in elections even if these people are not citizens of the United States. Even if they are not even legal aliens, they allow them to vote if they can show residency. If they can show them a utility bill, they can vote.

What the end result of all of this is, if we give people the ability to obtain all of the benefits of citizenship without ever being a citizen, then of course the whole concept of citizenship is meaningless. That is the end result of

things like this matricula consular activity or movement. We have to deal with it. We may not think that is important, and it becomes esoteric for some. You say matricula consular, and they do not care. It is a strange concept. We are just going to let somebody else deal with.

Luckily, some States are dealing with it: Colorado, Iowa, Tennessee, and Arizona have all introduced laws to abolish or to stop their State and/or any entity in their State from accepting the matricula consular. That is, of course, what I believe this government should do.

I hope that we will follow carefully this issue, and I hope that we will support either my bill or the bill of the gentleman from California (Mr. GALLEGLY). Either one of these two bills are designed to put a stop to this movement, at least at the Federal level, and I hope we can do that.

We endanger homeland security by allowing these cards to be accepted. We establish a precedent that says, even if you violate our laws, we will not do anything to you. You can come here and have all of the benefits. What a slap in the face that is to every other citizen who has done it the right way, everyone who has waited in line, paid the price both emotionally and monetarily, to get to the United States. What a slap in the face it is to them to say it does not matter. All you have to do is jump the line, come in and you will be rewarded the exact same way that someone who did it the right way is rewarded.

So this is an attack on our sovereignty. This is an attack on citizenship itself, and it certainly sets up a very dangerous situation in these very trying days.

We went recently to Code Orange, and that means that we are even more fearful of an attack by a terrorist organization. We are taking more steps to try to prevent it.

What is fascinating to me is everything we do is designed to stop someone from committing an act, committing a terrorist act once they get here, but very little is designed to stop them from getting here to begin with. Hence, our open border policy invites terrorists into the country, and then we scurry around trying to stop them. We say we are not going to defend our own borders. We suggest that in doing something like making a secure border that there would be repercussions, that there would be political and cultural repercussions to it. Other countries, Mexico in particular, would not like it if we put military on our border to defend against people coming in here illegally, so we do not do it.

What a bizarre concept that we will let other countries and vocal minorities inside our own country stop us from defending our own people. The one responsibility we have in this Nation, the one responsibility we have in this House is to protect the people and the property of the United States of America, and we shirk that responsibility because we are afraid of those political ramifications.

Well, there will be other ramifications to open borders: successful terrorist attacks. Those are ramifications of open borders. People will die in this country as a result of that kind of behavior on our part. Our almost guilt-driven sort of compulsion to move this concept called multi-culturalism to where it permeates every aspect of our culture and society, we must make sure that we do nothing, say nothing that would make anyone else upset with us, any other country or culture. We have to be so careful about that that we disregard our own security measures. That is what we are really trying to deal with here, is what it means to be an American and what it means to defend the concept of being an American.

There are so many aspects of this particular problem and issue. There are political and economic and social ramifications of open border policies, and I touched a little bit on what I consider to be the national security implications of open borders, but there are many others. One that I wanted to talk about a little tonight is the economic impact of massive immigration of low-skilled, low-wage people, both legal and illegal immigration.

For many years, the old adage dealt with the fact that massive immigration translated into economic opportunity and economic power and growth. It turns out, study after study is now showing us, like so many other things that we believed to be true at one time or another, that is a myth. Massive immigration of low-skilled, low-wage people does not in fact create wealth, except for a few.

Specifically, those people who actually hire low-skilled, low-wage people and pay them low wages, it does provide for them a certain degree of profit. But for the rest of us, for the taxpayers of the country, massive immigration of low-wage, low-skilled workers creates a cost, a cost for housing, a cost for roads, hospitals, infrastructure costs which come about as a result of population growth. There is absolutely no way that the number of people coming here and taking those jobs, a lot of which of course are paid for sort of under the table in cash and we do not see any sort of cash revenues, but even those who come here and file fake Social Security numbers or get a tax identification number from the Internal Revenue Service and pay some taxes end up being a significant cost to the United States.

First of all, they pay little or no income taxes.

Secondly, they consume a great deal in terms of infrastructure costs.

Now there is another aspect. You have to admit, it is kind of a clever strategy.

□ 1945

There is a provision of our law called Earned Income Tax Credit that says if you do not make enough money during the course of a year, we will in turn give you extra dollars back to sort of make up for that low-wage kind of poverty cycle in which you may be stuck. This has already been identified by GAO and other studies as being one of the most fraud-ridden government programs. Billions of dollars every year are sent out to people who falsify documents in order to obtain their Earned Income Tax Credit.

It is not just American citizens who have figured this out and figured out a way to scam the taxpayers of the United States. It has become a big business for people who are here illegally.

Not too long ago, I had the opportunity to be observing the situation on the border in Arizona. We went through an area where there were a number of these things called pickup sites. Pickup sites are places in which illegal immigrants gather for the purpose of being picked up like these folks, the unfortunate folks in Victoria, Texas. They were picked up at a certain location by a big truck, in this case a semi, and driven into the interior of the United States.

These pickup sites, these places where all these folks gather, are all around the American Southwest. They become trash heaps after a while because, after a while, literally thousands of people will actually gather there. They throw everything around. They throw their trash and their water bottles and everything else out there.

We were walking through one of these pickup sites not too far from Douglas, Arizona. I looked down, and I saw this, actually this copy of an IRS tax return document enclosed, it says. I picked it up, because this was an odd thing to be there in the trash pile in a place where only illegal aliens gather.

This particular form is an Earned Income Tax Credit form that was filed by Mr. and Mrs. Delgado, Mr. Delgado who is here apparently illegally. As I say, this is a place, a site for people who are here illegally. Mr. Delgado claimed that he paid $64.12 in total Federal income tax, and he claimed $3,581 in Earned Income Tax Credit.

We know this is happening. We also know, as a matter of fact, that the IRS is so interested in making sure that even if you are here illegally that you benefit by your status that if you have used a fake Social Security number to get the job you have because you are here illegally and file an income tax form with a request for an Earned Income Tax Credit, the IRS will actually send you back a letter that says, your Social Security number is inaccurate. So, therefore, we have assigned you a tax identification number, and here is your check. Here is your Earned Income Tax Credit.

It is a great scam. As I say, millions of American citizens take advantage of the lax enforcement procedures attendant to Earned Income Tax Credit, and so do illegal aliens by the thousands,

maybe by the hundreds of thousands. We are really not sure, but it is certainly something that we know happens and happens a lot.

So when we talk about the costs of illegal immigration into the United States, we have to really and truly consider the fact that these costs are more than just the jobs that are taken.

Let us talk about the jobs issue for just a moment. We passed a bill in the House. It has gone to the Senate. It is going to come back to us in the form of a conference report, perhaps. There is a great deal of attention being paid to this particular piece of legislation. It started out and it was referred to as a tax cut bill. I still think of it as that, but we now talk about it as a jobs creation package, because the purpose of it is to stimulate the economy, to provide more dollars for employers to hire more people, to invest in their own plant and equipment. And I believe it will.

I certainly supported the legislation. It is interesting to me to note that various economists come in and tell us how many jobs will be created by the different levels of tax cuts that we propose. It is several hundred thousand for this one, 100 and some thousand jobs for this one. I always think to myself, there are between 13 and 20 million jobs we could create instantaneously for American citizens, and that is, of course, we could deport people who are living here illegally, which is exactly what we should do.

That is what should happen to someone who is here illegally. They should be deported. Anyone who hires someone who is here illegally should be fined. There is a law that says you cannot hire people who are here illegally. We all know that it goes on constantly, and we all know for the most part everybody sort of turns a blind eye to it.

It is fascinating that we spend an enormous amount of time, energy and resources in the discussion of exactly how many jobs we need to create by tax cuts, and again I am all for it, but we ignore the fact that there are millions of Americans who are looking for work and they are looking for work in places where the jobs have been taken by people who are here illegally.

I hear all the time about people who are here taking jobs that only they would take, that no other American would take, that no citizen would take. Maybe those jobs really exist. Maybe all of the American citizens out of work from whom I hear, by the way, are people who really would not go do the hard labor that is done by illegal immigrants.

I suggest that it is not true. I suggest, and there is plenty of anecdotal evidence to lead me to the conclusion that, in fact, Americans are ready, willing and quite able to take the jobs that are being held, low-skilled, low-wage worker jobs that are being held by illegals.

As evidence of that, I can remember an article that appeared in the Rocky Mountain News, oh, several months ago now. It was about a restaurant in Denver called the Luna Restaurant. It is a Mexican restaurant. I have had occasion to visit and had a great meal there a couple of times. The article in the paper, interestingly, was about an ad that had been placed by the restaurant in the paper, an ad for a waiter, a $3-an-hour waiter, the type of job that we are always told no American would do. The reason that that ad turned into a story in the paper is because the Luna Restaurant received 600 applicants in one day for that job. Maybe, it is possible, of course, that all 600 people who applied were illegal aliens and that every American citizen who looked at that ad said, no, that is below me. I'm not going to apply for that job.

It is really not within the realm of possibility. I really do not think it happened, Mr. Speaker. I really believe that a lot of the people who applied for that job were American citizens, lived here all their lives or came here legally and I think should have had the first shot at that job, frankly.

But let us say that there is that need out there for low-skilled, low-wage workers and that need cannot be supplied by American citizens, that we have all become too spoiled.

Let us go to the next level of unemployment that we face in this country. It is called the high-tech industry. We all know, especially Members from California recognize fully well the enormous change that has occurred in that industry, the shake-out in the industry, if you will, the number of firms that have gone under and the many, many thousands and thousands, in fact, millions of people who have been thrown out of work in that industry. Several live in my neighborhood. Thousands live in my district.

We run a program in this country, an immigration program referred to as H1B. H1B immigrants are different in many respects than other people we let into the country legally in that we say that these folks have skills that are so unique that we will give a certain amount, in this case 150,000 a year, of these particular H1B visas because these are given to people with certain skills, high-tech skills that we again, quote, can't find Americans that would qualify.

We have had this program operating for, oh, 5 or 6 years, I think, longer than that; and every year we have been bringing in 100-, 150,000 of these folks. They do not go home. They are supposed to go home when their job ends or after a certain period of time, but they do not go home. The INS tells us that they have absolutely no idea how many are still here but probably close to 90 percent of everybody who ever came. So we have well over 1 million people in the United States today who have come here with an H1B visa. That is a visa that allows them to displace an American worker.

Because even though the law is supposed to prevent someone from coming in here and replacing an American worker and paying this newcomer less money than the American would be paid, it happens all the time. Everybody knows it. Everybody knows that the employer will look for that individual, and these people have skills. They are competent for the most part. I am not saying they are not. So the employer gets somebody that they can get to work for less, and the American worker gets the unemployment line.

What is happening to the H1B visa? Are we going to abolish it? Not on your life. I certainly have a bill that would significantly reduce the numbers. I have no great hope that that bill will be heard or ever come to the floor. Why not, I guess I would ask? I do ask that question. Why not? What is there about our economy today, how many people are out there looking for a job who have all the skills necessary to be placed in that high-tech industry but, of course, their job has been taken by someone who is not an American citizen with an H1B visa? They are, some of them, here legally. Many of them have, of course, overstayed their visa and are now here illegally but they are still employed and still taking jobs away from American workers. Yet no one discusses that issue when we talk about jobs creation. I just wonder why.

I really know why. I just rhetorically wonder why we do not talk about it. There is an economic price to pay for massive immigration into the country.

I hope in the near future that we will get the courage in this body to actually engage in a debate, a full-blown debate on this concept of open borders. I would love to have a bill before us that says you have two choices, America. You either abolish the borders, take down the ports of entry, take back the Border Patrol and abandon it, let people do what libertarians in both this House and even in the administration want, and that is to have the free flow of goods and services and people without being impeded by borders.

That is one picture that people have. It is bizarre to me, but it is a picture that people have about what the world should look like in this century, a world without borders. I would very much like to have a debate as to whether or not that is the world we wish to live in, that is the future of this country, or a country that secures its borders by every means possible. Those are the two choices we really have. Because anything in between that leads us to where we are today. It leads us to a situation where you call something illegal, people can actually be arrested for violating the law, they seldom are, but they could be, but we all know that we do not really enforce the law that much, so we entice a lot of people to come into the United States illegally.

It is partially our fault. It is this government's fault that things like the incident in Victoria, Texas, occurred. Nineteen people die in the back of a trailer, one small child. Of course, hundreds of people are dead in the deserts

of America, in the Southwest. Hundreds of people die every year coming into this country. They do not do so quite as dramatically. We do not find them all in one place. We find bodies scattered throughout the Southwest and deserts, but this is what happens.

Also, on our side, people, of course, die in the defense of those borders.

□ 2000

Park rangers die. Border patrolmen die. This is a dangerous place to be. And yet we entice this movement of people by making it very or relatively easy to come into the country, yet still illegal. So people pay coyotes, people who bring them into the country; and they will pay them $1,000 or $1,500 to coming into the United States, and the coyotes will then oftentimes take advantage of the people. They are oftentimes robbed of their life's savings, the people coming across. The women are raped. They are thrown into the desert and they die.

It is a horrible situation on the border, and today we passed an amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 that allowed the President of the United States, in fact, encouraged the President of the United States to place troops on the border. We passed that bill here before and it has always failed over on the Senate side. We will see what happens this year. But I suggest that that is exactly what we have to have in order to prevent the kinds of things that we see on the border, both to protect our own people, border patrol, the Forest Service personnel, park rangers, to protect them and also to protect and stop people from coming into this country illegally and, in fact, protecting them from some very bad things that could happen to them. So it is a lax border policy that encourages people to come and events like Victoria, Texas, to occur.

The other thing is that the Nation itself has to make a decision as to exactly what it wants to do, what kind of a policy it wants to have, whether or not we truly, as I say, want borders or we do not. Because if we make the decision that we want borders, then there are a whole bunch of other decisions that follow after that. How are we going to defend them? Are we going to make them secure? What are we going to do to people who violate our borders by coming in illegally? These are all very difficult questions, but they are questions this Nation has to begin to deal with because there are major implications to massive immigration combined with this cult of multiculturalism that permeates our society. It is a very dangerous combination. Massive immigration and the cult of multiculturalism. The country needs to make that kind of decision. It has to engage in that kind of debate.

It would be great, I think, if a Presidential candidate would enter into that debate, would bring it to the focus and the attention of the Nation and make people, all people running for office at every level, talk about how they feel about this issue, whether or not secure borders mean anything, whether or not massive immigration is an acceptable activity today, and whether or not we are going to have porous borders especially in light of the terrorist threat that exists in this country.

Let them explain to their constituency why open borders is a good idea. Let them explain why massive immigration even just in terms of the numbers anymore is justified. Let us talk about what is the need of this country. Is it for millions of low-skilled, low-wage workers every year? Is that what we need? If it is, okay, that is the kind of immigration policy we establish. We say, here is how many people can come into the country. Here are the skills that we need, that our country needs to make us a better country, to make the people living here have a better quality of life. That is what a rational immigration policy is.

Or, as I say, abandon the border. Forget the whole charade that we call immigration and immigration law because when we operate the kind of system that we are operating now, all we do is put people in harm's way. All we do is put our border patrol people and the people trying to come across that border illegally into very dangerous situations; but in fact we do not accomplish any of the goals that should be established for immigration. So if we do not believe in it, if we think that this is not a legitimate goal for the United States, if it is not a legitimate function of the government to say who comes and who goes, then just abandon the border. Defend that to the population. Go out to their constituents and explain to them this is their concept of America, an America where borders are no longer relevant, they are anachronisms and new maps should be drawn up that erase the borders. Go ahead and explain that because that is exactly where we are headed. We are heading there in a de facto way, not in a legal sense; but that is exactly where we are heading.

And as I say, Mr. Speaker, I believe there are major implications to that, and they deserve to be debated. And maybe I am 180 degrees off center here. Maybe I am completely wrong about my concerns with regard to open borders. But at least does it not deserve an honest debate in a very public forum and at the highest levels? Is it not an appropriate thing for Presidential candidates to discuss?

I would love to see, really, a very thorough discussion among the candidates running for both the Democratic primary and I wish the President of the United States would discuss it to a greater extent than he does. I would like to know exactly where all of these candidates stand, and so would people of this country, so would Americans like to know where their representatives stand on this issue. Today it is not all that clear because we can sort of take a powder on this by saying we have got this immigration policy and we will let them do their job but knowing full well that it is a total abject failure and that it is the worst of all possible worlds. It is a place into which we have put people who are, as I say, in great danger, and yet they actually are defending something we do not believe to be of great value, and, that is, the border.

I went down to Ajo, Arizona, not too long ago to attend a funeral, a funeral for a gentleman by the name of Kris Eggle. Kris Eggle was 28 years old. He was a park ranger. He was killed not too far from Ajo. He was killed by two illegal aliens who had come into the United States as part of a drug deal that went bad in Mexico. They had killed four people there. They came across the border. They confronted Mr. Eggle and killed him. And I went there with Mr. Eggle's father, and we stood at the very spot where Kris was killed, and this had been the fourth time that the father had visited that particular location. And that was hard even for me, and I cannot imagine how difficult it was for Mr. Eggle. But he does it, he said, and he will continue to go there to draw attention to the plight of the border, to draw attention to the fact that we have people like his son down there in great jeopardy but truly without the intent of having them defend our borders or else we would do what is necessary to protect them and the border. But we are fearful of it because there are political obstacles, political and cultural as Governor Ridge told us. When we asked him why we did not put troops on the border, he said there are political and cultural problems there. That is true. There are no two ways about it. It is an honest statement, an honest reflection. But I would suggest that it is not a good enough reason for not defending our own borders.

There are other very significant implications to massive immigration combined with the cult of multiculturalism, and I can save them for another evening. But I do want to encourage all of us, Mr. Speaker, to become acquainted with this matricula consular, this card that is being handed out. I want us to become acquainted with it because it is something that could be used to achieve the goal that we were able to block here sometime ago, and that is creating amnesty for everybody in this country illegally. It could be used eventually essentially to destroy the whole concept of citizenship. That is what it is designed to do, and it will do if we allow it to. So although I know the issue is somewhat esoteric and people become a little glazed over when we talk about things like matricula consular, it is nonetheless important, important for us to understand, important for our constituents to understand. So, therefore, I will continue to raise that issue as long as it is necessary.

AMERICAN PARITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to 67 of my colleagues who have cosponsored my bill, the American Parity Act. They join me in supporting a funding boost for health care, education, and public safety by the same amount we have pledged to rebuild Iraq.

We are in the process now of beginning to spend down the $1.7 billion we have dedicated to the housing, the education, the health care, and the infrastructure of rebuilding Iraq; and yet here at home our schools are closing, athletic programs are shut down, summer school activities are being shut down, hospitals are not being able to provide the health care they need, projects for economic growth and economic investment in local communities are being delayed. Yet we are in the process of being about to rebuild Iraq.

Let me give an example. The other day I pulled an RFP from USAID. Two million dollars has already been designated for Iraq and another $70 million will be spent next year for desks, computers and supplies. Schools in Basra and Umm Qasr have already been given kits containing enough supplies for every student for the next year.

Yet here in America 59,000 kids will be eliminated from Head Start. Our teachers in our schools must buy books and supplies out of their own wages and then eventually maybe get a tax credit or be reimbursed later on. Up to $94 million is now today being spent to give 13 million Iraqis, half the population, universal health care and maternity care for 100 percent of the population in Iraq. Yet Medicaid will be cut; 14 million Americans will be denied access to health care in this country. Up to $680 million will now be spent over the next year and a half repairing six airports in Iraq, 100 hospitals, and 6,000 schools. Another $5 million is pledged to complete the only deep water port in Umm Qasr, Iraq. Yet we are cutting housing here in America. We are cutting our ability to invest in local infrastructure. In fact, the Corps of Engineers is facing a cut of 10 percent in its budget. Chicago will be directly affected in the projects there.

I will support the reconstruction in Iraq, as others in this Chamber have. Yet I will not support the deinvestment in America. When President Kennedy said we will bear any burden, pay any price, he did not mean it would come at the expense of the American Dream here at home. We can only be strong overseas as long as we come together and are strong here at home.

In the last 2 years, 2.5 million Americans have lost their jobs. Five million Americans have lost their health care. Nearly $1 trillion worth of corporate assets have been foreclosed on, and 2 million Americans have walked out of the middle class into poverty. Those are the economic facts that our country faces.

I do not think when the American people said that they were willing to do what they needed to do in Iraq that it would come at the expense of their unity, their dreams, and their security here at home. The children of Iraq should not be provided a safer, more secure and more generous future than the one we are welcoming our GIs home to. The GIs who fought there, the people here that support the reconstruction in Iraq, who are paying for the reconstruction of Iraq, deserve the type of education, health care, and housing and economic investment that we envision for Iraq's future.

□ 2015

I believe that we are on the wrong road when it comes to balancing our priorities. The American people have proven over the last 50 years that they will be a very generous people, willing to help others on their path to a more democratic and more healthy and more economically promising future. But they will not do it and pay that price when they think their dreams for their children, the security of their communities, are less than what they are providing for other people. Nor should they.

Again, I will support, as others will, the reconstruction of Iraq but not the deconstruction of America. So I am pleased I have the support of my colleagues, 67 of them, for the American Parity Act. I will continually come down to the floor to talk about what we are doing in Iraq as it compares to what we are doing here at home, because the American people I think expect us to not only have our commitment to Iraq but to fulfill our commitment to them here at home.

They cannot have 59,000 American children kicked out of Head Start, yet the children of Basra be supported by the American people for a full year of great education. We cannot have 14 million Americans kicked out without healthcare from Medicaid, yet have 13 million Iraqis get universal health care. Those are the not the choices we should be providing, and we should not have it be an either/or, and that is the choices the American people are facing today.

UNCOVERING A GOVERNMENT COVERUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SANDLIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, as you know, we are here tonight to discuss a very chilling issue, the intentional destruction of evidence by a government agency and the subsequent stonewalling and coverup by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, as has been discussed here previously, Members of the Texas State Legislature recently properly excused themselves from the floor of the Texas statehouse in order to break a quorum, a proper procedure provided for by the House rules and by the Constitution. This angered partisan Republican interests in Washington, and thereafter the Homeland Security Department, charged with fighting terrorism in this country, used Federal Government assets for political purposes, trying to track the plane of former Democratic Speaker of the House Pete Laney.

Embarrassingly, Secretary Tom Ridge and the Department of Homeland Security has now been forced to admit that they have an audiotape and a transcript of communications between Homeland Security and Texas law enforcement; and, despite that admission they were forced to make, the Department of Homeland Security has said they will not release the tape, thus taking part in this improper coverup.

This morning, further disturbing news came out of Austin, the State's capital. As I mentioned earlier, there is an admission of communication between Homeland Security and law enforcement in Texas. When the Department of Public Safety learned that inquiries were being made to obtain this information, they went into high gear, presumably at the direction of higher-ups, because, Mr. Speaker, as we were all shocked and dismayed to learn, the information held by the Department of Public Safety was intentionally destroyed, another part of the coverup.

Here is the quote from the DPS Commander of Special Crime Service, Tony Marshall, in an e-mail uncovered by the Fort Worth Star Telegram under an open records request. The DPS got caught with this e-mail. ''Any notes, correspondence, photos, et cetera, that were obtained pursuant to the absconded House of Representatives members should be destroyed immediately. No copies are to be kept.''

In an attempt to cover up this coverup, DPS exacerbated the problem with this statement. ''This is why DPS destroyed the records. We are prohibited under the Code of Federal Regulations, 28 CFR part 23, from keeping intelligence information that is not related to criminal conduct or activity,'' and it goes on.

There are only two problems with that statement. First, it simply is not true. Nothing in the regulations suggests, demands or requires the destruction of evidence. Secondly, it is improper and in violation of the law to collect this information in the first place.

You see, as with most cover-ups, they failed to tell you the whole story, and each new story makes the last story worse, because the truth is the very regulation that the DPS incorrectly cites as the reason to destroy this evidence states that there must be ''a reasonable suspicion that the individual is

engaged in criminal conduct or activity as a condition precedent to entering this information in the data bank in the first place.''

In other words, to even collect this information, there must be a reasonable allegation that a crime has been committed.

This data is for tracking criminals. The regulation specifically mentions crimes such as drug trafficking, loan sharking, trafficking in stolen property, gambling, extortion, smuggling, bribery, corruption.

Homeland Security and DPS, in one of their many stories, claimed that they were merely looking for a plane that they thought was missing or may have crashed. Now, of course that is not true either. But missing planes are located through the FAA and law enforcement, not by using criminal databases improperly in violation of the law.

Oh, what a tangled web we weave when first we practice to deceive.

Homeland Security, produce the tapes. Homeland Security, produce the transcripts. Department of Public Safety, do the same.

We respect DPS in Texas. They are a great agency. We know they were not doing it independently. They were doing it at the direction of others. They were following orders.

You know, Sharon Watkins blew the whistle on Enron. Arthur Andersen got caught shredding documents. Cover-ups just do not work.

Is this a serious problem, or is it just a third-rate burglary, as we learned about in our history lessons? Mr. Speaker, only time will tell.

DEMOCRATIC TEXAS LEGISLATORS TRUE HEROES

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

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to follow up with what the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SANDLIN) was talking about with the people that decided to stand up against such an egregious process, where they felt left out and had no recourse in Texas but to go away from the legislative process long enough to slow things down and let it cool off. Because none of us like to be excluded from the development of legislation.

There it affected many different kinds of legislation. It had to do with school finance reform. It had to do with what we have been talking about as redistricting. But the redistricting issue was just one small piece of it. It by itself was an egregious process, where people literally were locked out of the capital building in the State and not allowed to attend hearings.

We do not have a closed government in the United States of America, whether it is at the Federal level, whether it is in the State of Texas or any other State in this Nation. We have fought, we have died, we have shed blood to have a government that is open, where we are free, where we can do the kinds of things that we believe in.

So when legislators are pushed to the point where they have to take extraordinary measures to get their message across, they ought to be treated as heroes, the heroes that I certainly believe that they are.

I found it interesting the other night, Saturday night, the weekend of Armed Forces Day, a gentleman came up to me at an event where I was speaking about Armed Forces and the wonderful military people who have sacrificed themselves, their families and sometimes their lives fighting for the freedom of those of us in the United States to make sure that our government is free.

This gentleman came up and thanked me, or praised me, I guess, for not being a Member of the Texas legislature and not having gone off to Ardmore, Oklahoma. I said, ''David, I must strongly disagree with what you are saying.'' I said, ''I do so largely because I look at you and see the commitment that you made to the United States of America by being willing to put on that uniform and to go and potentially sacrifice your life for my freedoms, for what I believe in for my government.'' I said, ''But, you know, we can lose our government from within as well as from without, and we have to be vigilant in making sure that the process that we set up is one that all of the people of our country can be comfortable with, can trust, can believe in, and know that our interests are going to be addressed.''

So here we have recently sent men and women of this Nation off to fight in a country that is far, far away from us, and it was the same ideals that we are talking about that they went off to another area.

The Armed Forces answered our call, and some of them gave their lives to free the people of Iraq. So we went to war in Iraq to free a people from a government that abused its powers.

Iraqis were unable to question the actions of Saddam Hussein. So are we unable to question the actions of the leaders of the State of Texas. That is wrong. We were successful in Iraq with a war, but now the abuse of power is happening right here at home, by the most unlikely of agencies in the United States Government, the Department of Homeland Security.

Secretary Tom Ridge has stonewalled efforts by Members of Congress and the press to learn why the Department of Homeland Security used its equipment to track down former house Speaker Pete Laney's airplane to find the Texas Democrats who went to Oklahoma in opposition of an unfair, unconstitutional redistricting plan. That is repressive government. We sent our military to bring free and open government to another Nation. We need to do the same in the United States of America.

On the day that we called for an investigation of these happenings in Texas, the Department of Public Safety ordered documents regarding the misuse of Federal law enforcement for political purposes to be destroyed. Secretary Tom Ridge and the Texas DPS have failed to answer questions about their involvement and what happened exactly. They are trying to cover up an abuse of power.

Our Nation is facing a Code Orange level of terrorist alert. The resources of the Department of Homeland Security should be focused on that. Instead, they were ordered to skirt Federal statutes and had their manpower diverted for purely political purposes.

In this country, the people have a right to question the actions of their government, and the government has a responsibility to its citizens to be forthright and to give them an answer. This is an abuse of power of the most egregious kind.

It is time for Secretary Ridge to turn over the tapes, open up our government, tell the people in the United States of America what we are doing, and please do not pass on the divisiveness of the United States House of Representatives to the State of Texas.

EXTEND UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, at the end of this month, millions of unemployed Americans will begin to lose their benefits under the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation program. In my State, the State of California, 150,000 people will run out of benefits and still not have a job on May 31. Congress needs to act to extend these benefits.

During a recession, unemployment insurance is one of the most efficient ways to help Americans and to keep the economy moving. Unemployment insurance puts cash in the hands of people who need it most, people who will spend the money on rent and groceries, rather than put it in the bank.

Unemployment insurance is cost-effective. Unlike the Republican budget, the Federal Unemployment Insurance Trust Fund currently has a surplus of more than $21 billion. That money can easily meet the needs of America's unemployed until we can get the economy moving again.

Instead, the President and the Republican Party have spent their time and energy trying to pass tax cuts for wealthy investors. This House has passed a tax cut totaling more than $500 billion. That is money that will not go to unemployed working families but, instead, to the President's wealthy political supporters. In fact, if we were to take all the money that the Republicans have set aside for their tax cut, we could create high-paying jobs for all

the 1.7 million Americans who have been laid off since the President's last economic plan in 2001.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the President and his economic team have managed our economy miserably. Now is not the time to trust the President again when he says he has a jobs plan. Let us act to extend unemployment insurance and make sure that American families can get back on their feet.

□ 2030

UNEMPLOYMENT IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, tonight the Congressional Black Caucus comes together to address this House because we are very concerned about many Americans who may be watching us at this very moment who do not have a job. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, there are about 8.8 or 8.9 million of them. We come to talk about them because we want them, Mr. Speaker, to know that we care about them, and we care about what happens to their families.

Mr. Speaker, the temporary Federal unemployment benefits program that we passed not very long ago will expire on May 31. In just 10 days, Mr. Speaker, thousands of Americans will lose their unemployment benefits, and then approximately 80,000 more will lose their benefits weekly.

Since the beginning of President Bush's administration, our economy has lost over 2.5 million jobs. Mr. Speaker, that is a lot of jobs, 2.5 million. We must understand that these are not just numbers or some statistical phenomenon that I am talking about. These are real, everyday Americans who have lost their jobs and who, after next week, will not be able to feed their children, pay their bills, or provide for their most basic needs.

Mr. Speaker, I speak with my constituents every day, since my district is close to Washington and I commute to and from Baltimore on a daily basis. The constituents I represent are very, very worried, as are millions of Americans around the country.

Last Monday morning, any commuter driving near my Baltimore office would have noticed a long line at around 8 o'clock in the morning curling around the building called the Fifth Regiment Armory.

From the appearance of the line, one could have easily thought it was a group of music fans waiting in line to buy tickets to some concert. However, this was not the case at all. These individuals were in line to attend my Seventh District Job Fair that I host in Baltimore every year. They got up early to meet with 50 regional employers who have vacancies despite a rough economy.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that normally we would have 120 employers, but the fact is that many employers said that they have no jobs to give.

One of the other things we were trying to get, Mr. Speaker, was employers who offered health insurance benefits. Many of the employers who had participated in the past said that they had to drop those benefits because of the economy, so we ended up with 50 employers.

Throughout the day, my job fair brought about 3,000 job seekers to meet with these employers. But compared with recent years, most of the people who attended the job fair this year were there because they had been laid off.

In the past, when I would interview people throughout the day in the job fair, I would often find that they were people who had a job who were just merely trying to get a better job, or they were people who had two jobs and they were trying to get a job that paid enough money so they would only have one job, or it was someone who was in a situation where they had no health benefits and they were trying to get a job with health benefits.

Ninety percent of the people that I interviewed said something to the effect that they got laid off from a job that they never, ever expected to be laid off from. They went on to say that they anticipated that they would be out of work for a few weeks, and many of them had been out of work for 5, 6, 7 months.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that this scene that I witnessed and this testimony that I heard last week at my job fair is not unique. I would not be surprised if other job fairs had record attendance, as mine did, and that people were saying the same kinds of things.

My point, Mr. Speaker, is that when presented with opportunities, Americans want to work. When presented with the opportunity, they want to work. But until the economy turns around and people can find work, Mr. Speaker, unemployment benefits are all these Americans have to make ends meet.

So I ask Members to join us in calling upon every Member of this Congress to demand that they join us in passing H.R. 1652, the Unemployment Benefits Extension Act, that I have joined my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), in cosponsoring.

This bill, H.R. 1652, would extend the Temporary Federal Unemployment Insurance Program by 6 months and would extend the number of additional weeks of Federal unemployment benefits from 13 weeks to 26 weeks.

This Congress must take action as soon as possible. The American people have a right to ask whether President Bush and our Republican colleagues in Congress will help the millions of Americans whose benefits will expire on May 31.

I might add a footnote, Mr. Speaker, that the new numbers will come out on June 6. At that time, we anticipate that the numbers will be even higher, somewhere in the area of 3 million jobs having been lost since President Bush became President.

The fact is that the Republican majority refused to include any extension of benefits in the tax bill that passed the House, and the majority has shown no signs that they will extend unemployment insurance before it expires. I should add, Mr. Speaker, that we are proposing to help American workers who are out of jobs through no fault of their own. They want to work. Extending unemployment benefits is a proven strategy for stimulating our economy.

The Republicans seem, Mr. Speaker, to have decided that, instead of helping unemployed workers, they should give the average millionaire nearly $100,000 in tax breaks. Something is simply wrong with that picture. I hope that we who are privileged to serve the people of America in this Congress of the United States of America will change that harsh and unproductive picture by passing H.R. 1652.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, let me be very clear. Ending unemployment compensation does not provide incentive for Americans to find invisible jobs. Instead, extending unemployment compensation increases demand for goods and services and serves to create real jobs for those Americans who are able and willing to work.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am troubled when some people begin to compare unemployment compensation to an entitlement. Is it not the government's responsibility to provide these benefits when the economy is weak? Was the unemployment trust fund not established to accomplish this very purpose, to cushion the financial blow to average Americans during times of recession and joblessness? Mr. Speaker, the answer to both questions is a resounding yes.

It gives me great honor and great privilege, Mr. Speaker, to recognize my colleague, the gentlewoman from the great State of California (Ms. LEE), who has consistently synchronized her conscience with her conduct. She has consistently made it clear that she stands up for the people who cannot stand up for themselves, stands up for those who may be down and out, and stands up for those who think that they are not being heard. But tonight she stands up for so many people who are unemployed, who simply want to work.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, first let me thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and our Chair of the Congressional Black Caucus for his kind and humbling remarks, and for his leadership on each and every issue that we are faced with here in our great country. I just want to thank him again for his consistent leadership and also for ensuring that we have an opportunity to talk to America every now and then on the issues that are burning, and actually what the realities are of what we are doing here and what we are not doing. I thank the gentleman for allowing our caucus and other Members of Congress to really speak truth to power.

Mr. Speaker, first, let me just say how grave my concerns are about this Bush administration's economic policy and how it will truly devastate American families. We see a strategy at work in the Bush budget and in the tax cuts for the wealthy that are really at its center. And, yes, to me it looks like class warfare. That is what it looks like.

At the end of this month, we are going to see the devastating effects of the Bush economic strategy with the expiration of the unemployment insurance program. On the last day of this month, the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Program will expire. It is going to expire, even though we Democrats have pushed for an extension of this program, and for an additional 13 weeks of benefits, for a total of 26 weeks of Federal extended unemployment benefits both to workers who have already exhausted their benefits and to workers who will be laid off in the coming months.

Without this extension, an estimated 80,000 unemployed workers nationwide each week, that is 80,000 each week, will lose their benefits. That is hard to imagine. The number is so high because we are at a record level of unemployment; and we are, to be quite frank, in a jobs depression. In the last 3 months, the economy has lost 500,000 jobs. Since the beginning of President Bush's Presidency, the economy has lost 2.5 million private sector jobs. That is quite an accomplishment.

In fact, unless President Bush somehow adds 2.5 million jobs in the next few months, he will be, I believe, the first President since they started actually keeping labor records who has failed to net a single job. In an economy that has historically been the strongest in the world, the President has not been able to net one job. That is pretty pitiful.

In my congressional district, we have over 75,000 unemployed workers. Beginning June 1, an estimated 1,400 workers will lose unemployment benefits each week. That is just in my congressional district, the 9th Congressional District of California. That number will be on top of the 10,000 workers in the region who have already lost their benefits. These are horrible numbers. Yet in spite of the fact that families are struggling to pay rent and buy food, the President and the Republicans have done nothing, and I mean nothing, to help these workers.

They claim to have an economic stimulus package, but for them, economic stimulus means tax cuts. If you have lots of capital gains, then of course you will like the Bush tax cuts. If you are one of the wealthiest Americans, then of course, yes, you, too, will like the Bush tax cuts.

Members cannot tell me that in a tax package of almost $550 billion there is not enough money to extend unemployment benefits to people who do not have dividends or capital gains, but are just trying to basically pay their rents, buy groceries, and take care of their families.

For the life of me, I am trying to figure out how does a tax cut benefit someone who is not working. Democrats tried to extend unemployment benefits to help American workers, but the Republican leadership explicitly rejected it. They needed to save money for their wealthy friends. They needed to save money for their friends who run corporations.

In a pool of $550 billion, they did not have the money for the people who are looking for work each and every day in a job market where three people on the average are applying for one single job vacancy, three people.

□ 2045

They did not have money for the real people of America. That is going to mean tens of thousands of workers across America are going to find it even more difficult just to survive. Do we not care about the economic security of those who are not rich?

In my district, 27,000 workers will lose unemployment benefits in the coming months. The Republicans do not even realize that unemployment insurance may actually be an economic stimulus. One study estimate that 13 additional weeks of benefits would provide an estimated $150 million of stimulus to the regional economy.

Stimulating the economy really, though, has not been a hallmark for Republicans except when it comes to adding to the wealth of those Americans who are already wealthy. The wealthy people of America do not need dividend cuts. But the unemployed of America desperately need some help, just a little help to ensure that they and their families can survive an economy that they really, quite frankly, are not responsible for.

Now what happens when people are desperate because they do not have a job, nor unemployment benefits? Children go hungry, foreclosures increase, more people become homeless, emergency rooms in our already stressed public hospitals systems become more taxed, domestic violence increases and, of course, as we are witnessing in California, there is an increase in the crime rate.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me call your attention to the unemployment rates as of this last April. The white population had an unemployment rate of about 6 percent. The Latino unemployment rate was about 7.5 percent. And the African-American unemployment rate is about 10.9, close to 11 percent. Now when you look at the massive budget cuts coupled with these high rates of unemployment and no job creation efforts on the horizon and no extension of unemployment benefits, what is the message, quite frankly, what is the message that you are sending to people of color? Do they matter? Or is it only the wealthy who are the ones that this administration is looking out for?

The facts speak for themselves, Mr. Speaker. So let us extend unemployment benefits for American workers and let us do it now. We must pass H.R. 1652, and I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) for yielding and for allowing us this opportunity to wake up, America.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for her statement. One of the things that you said that I found so very interesting when you were talking about all of these people losing their jobs, 2.7 million since President Bush has come in to office, but one of the things that is so interesting, too, is we are very concerned about health care. A lot of these jobs that folks are losing had health insurance benefits that accompanied them, and so then we got a lot of people who have no insurance.

Ms. LEE. I thank the gentleman for raising that. Because here in our country we have approximately 44 million uninsured, and that number is rising as a result of the 2.5, 2.7 million unemployed. Universal health care has got to be our goal in terms of any health care reform. But, in the meantime, what do we do to help those who are just struggling from day to day, who have no jobs, who have no unemployment insurance?

Once again, we go back to our public hospital system and see individuals, families sitting in waiting rooms for health care when, in fact, they have no place to go; and this is unconscionable in the wealthiest and most powerful country in the world.

Let me just finally say our country, rightfully so, is helping to develop a universal health care system for Iraq. What about a universal health care system for the people of America, Mr. Speaker?

I think that perhaps again during this crisis maybe those who have not supported universal health care will now understand that working men and women, middle-class individuals need universal health care as a result of this unfortunate situation which our government and this administration has placed them in.

Mr. CUMMINGS. One of the things that I notice in talking to our mayor

and talking to city officials, we have discovered that crime seems to go up when unemployment is high; and I guess it is kind of a logical correlation. You would hope it would not be, but it is. People when they are pushed against the wall, I think, are sometimes forced to do things they might not normally do because the basic instinct of people is to survive. Sadly, we have seen that in our city where people lose their jobs.

I guess this is another factor that comes to play there, a lot of people do not realize how significant a job is. A job helps you to do for your family. If someone has got a child or got a family, they want to be able to take care of their family when the little girl comes home and says, Mommy, we are going on a class trip, something as simple as that, and mommy has to say I cannot afford that $5 or that $7 for that class trip. All of that kind of stuff is painful.

I have not even gotten into things like food and shelter, things that are basic needs. But that has to wear on folks. And that is the toll that we, I guess, a lot of people do not think about it. We think about the economic side, but we do not think about the wear and tear on people.

Again, one of the things about having a job is that it gives people a sense of worth because they feel as if they are contributing. So we do not know how all of those factors come together to really be quite harmful not only to the individuals, but certainly if you got mommy and daddy in a bad mood trying to figure out how they will make ends meet, I am sure that does not make for a happy and consistently healthy household.

Ms. LEE. The gentleman raised a very good point. I think if you look around your country now and you look at the crime rates, and I, unfortunately, have to site California. The increase has been 28 percent, I think. There is a direct correlation between the unemployment rate and the escalation in the crime rate. Desperate people do desperate things.

As a professional psychiatric social worker, I have seen what depression and what the lack of self-worth and the lack of self-esteem prompt people to do, oftentimes unconsciously. Again, desperate people do desperate things.

Look at our young people. You just look at, first of all, low-income individuals who now as a result of not having any unemployment insurance, coupled with the cuts that are taking place in the school districts with afterschool programs, what is going to happen to these young kids who need afterschool programs as a result of having nowhere to go after school because their parents are out trying to find a job, trying to survive?

You layer all of these cuts on top of no money and on top of not having a job and little hope because there are very few job opportunities because we have not created the investment in our infrastructure and we have not created an investment in housing construction. We have not created an investment to increase job opportunities. So, once again, on top of all of these very dismal circumstances and reactions, then you have no hope. And what happens when people have no hope?

It is very hard for me and for many of us here. I know for those of us who are Democrats and those of us on the Congressional Black Caucus, it pushes us against the wall in terms of what do we do next.

How do we be a real advocate to create these jobs that people need because their life, their world is based around their self-esteem and their sense of dignity which involves a job, a good-paying job with benefits as central to their existence?

Mr. CUMMINGS. One of the recent reports that came out showed that when you increase those unemployment benefits, for every dollar you are bringing in $1.73 to stimulate the economy because that money is circulating. I found that very interesting, because I was just talking to people in my neighborhood.

When I visit the barber or visit the local grocery stores or small grocery stores in my neighborhood and talk to the shoe repair people, I kind of try to get a feel for how business is. And you would think that a lot of times people do not realize how when people are not working it effects almost everybody. There is such a chain. It is like a chain with a lot of links. If a person is not working, that means he may not be getting a haircut. That means the barber will not go and do certain things.

One of the things that was interesting, most of the people I have talked to over the last 3 or 4 months told me business was down. One of the things they say is that they can almost predict how much business they will have based upon the season of the year. It may be small restaurants or whatever, but they said that they have been seeing their charts are going down, down, down with regards to income, which means that they are having to lay off a lot of people.

Ms. LEE. For the life of me, I do not quite understand why the Republicans do not see the connection between having money in one's pocket, whether it is through a job or the unemployment insurance, how that does not effect an economic stimulus thrust. When you spend money, you stimulate the economy. Some of us may not believe in consumerism, but this is America and people buy stuff. I mean, they buy stuff all the time. If you do not have any money, you cannot buy anything; and buying stuff, whatever it is, leads to economic recovery.

So extending unemployment benefits allows people to have money in their pockets to not only buy food and take care of their families but also buy what they need to survive which, of course, in the private sector helps increase, well, it may not be a profit margin right now but just may keep businesses from going out of business, especially in our neighborhoods which really are dependent on that type of commerce.

Mr. CUMMINGS. One of the things that I always admired about the United States is how whenever there was tragedy in any part of the country, be it a tornado or be it problems, big fires or whatever, Americans have a sense that we want to rally to that part of our country that has a problem.

FEMA is out there whenever we have a disaster, and we want that to happen because we want all Americans to be strong. And here we have a situation where we have many Americans who are suffering.

It is one thing to have an idea of how you are going to make ends meet, but when you are sitting there and you are trying to figure out how are you going to pay these bills, I mean, to me that is a situation that is a state of emergency, too, because people still have to feed their children. They still have to buy tennis shoes. They still have to do the things that they do from day to day. So you would think that when this whole unemployment insurance law came into effect, it came into effect basically to try to deal with situations where people were out of work through no fault of their own.

As a matter of fact, if you look at the entire structure and the regulations that go with unemployment insurance, that is basically what it goes to, people who are out of work because of no fault of their own. So here we have this emergency situation, people who fit the category, it just so happens that we have an economy that is on the downstroke and not doing very well, and so with that same sense of rescue that FEMA does, I would hope that we would do the same thing.

But the fact is that time is running out. That is why we are here tonight, trying to say to this Congress that there are people who are suffering and who are in a state of emergency.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, we all recognize our national security needs in our country and rise to the occasion and appropriate money for all kinds of efforts to ensure national security. Well, I believe that the economic security of every man, woman and child is very critical to our overall national security. We must have a stable, healthy population in our country. Otherwise, our country becomes vulnerable from within. People become restless, people have no hope, as I said earlier, and it is very important that we provide just this minimal extension of unemployment insurance benefits just to let them know we care during these very volatile times.

Here we passed, well, not with my vote, but passed an $80 billion supplemental. Again, $80 billion is a lot of money. I think we should find $80 billion to help those who are unemployed. We found it a couple of months ago. I think we can find it now. I think it is very important to show the American

people that we care about their security here.

We must also remember these young women who, because of the Welfare to Work initiative and welfare reform which some of us agree with, some of us do not agree with, bottom line is time limits are running out. They are hopefully still working, but many are not because of the economy. Many were working two jobs and three jobs with no benefits.

□ 2100

Now their unemployment compensation is running out. Well, under the very awful welfare reform law, they run up against 5 years and they cannot even go back and apply for public assistance. So what do they do? What does a young woman do with two or three kids? They cannot even go back to try to get a safety net provided for a couple of months.

So this lack of attention to the American people, to our people, to women, to children, to average everyday working men and women, this lack of attention, I think, is very wrong and it is immoral. I believe that our country is beginning to see the real hypocrisy in many of our policies and how the Republicans can continue to look out for those who are privileged, yet for those who are struggling, cannot seem to really figure out what to do or will not do the right thing, when in fact Democrats consistently have put forward proposals to help lift everyone up.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for joining me and joining our caucus, the Congressional Black Caucus, in addressing these issues.

So often I think people would ask the question: Why is it that members of the Congressional Black Caucus and other members of our party would take the time to speak up on these issues? I guess they would wonder, is there any hope? I believe that we have no choice.

When we see people who are down and out and going through problems, we have no choice but to speak up for them. The fact is that their tax dollars, the $80 billion that the gentlewoman talked about a few moments ago, the downpayment on the Iraq war, the same people that are unemployed today, those were their tax dollars that were used for the Iraq war. Their tax dollars are the same ones that our President says that he is going to rebuild all of the schools and educational facilities over there in Iraq. They are the same tax dollars. Their same tax dollars are providing universal health care in Iraq. Their same tax dollars that they paid are going to create an election system that will, I am sure, rival the one that we might have in this country.

They are merely saying, okay, if we can do all of that with our tax dollars, then why can I not be rescued when I am drowning because I do not have a job, through no fault of my own; and if I could work, I would work, and I would continuously and happily contribute to our economy and pay my taxes?

It is very painful when we think about it. So that is why we stand here and stand up for folks, because we know that there are many Americans who are saying, well, that makes sense, and they need a voice. So that is why we are here.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his very eloquent and very passionate statement, because I believe that Americans are beginning to see the hypocrisy and the discrepancy and the disparities in all of the Republican policies, and especially as it relates to tax policy.

The gentleman raised the fact that working people should have a right to some of the benefits in our country because they contribute immensely to the workings of government and to the society; yet they are the ones who never see those benefits. And if we are true to our country, true to our flag, true to our Constitution, then we need to work each and every day to ensure that liberty and justice for all prevails, because certainly, right now, there are millions of Americans out there who are wondering why they have been left out of this great American Dream.

Mr. CUMMINGS. The gentlewoman and I have been here so often when our colleagues cite all kinds of passages from the Bible and talk about how we are supposed to do for our brothers and sisters. It makes me wonder sometimes whether we are reading the same document when it comes to folks that are having the problems that they are having. This whole idea of unemployment benefits, even if we did not see it as a moral issue, if we put that aside and say I just want to deal with the economics, the economics would tell us that this is good for America.

So I thank the gentlewoman, and I thank other members of the Congressional Black Caucus who have submitted statements. We know that there are many Americans who are depending on us to continue to stand, and we will stand.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman; and once again I urge my colleagues tonight, if they happened to have seen this discussion, to support H.R. 1652. And if no one from the House is listening, let us hope that America is listening; and I am urging our country to wake up, get in touch with the United States Congress and say, let us pass H.R. 1652 on behalf of those very noble working men and women who deserve an extension of their unemployment insurance benefits.

Mr. CUMMINGS. As I close, Mr. Speaker, I would just say that I visited a school the other day, and I was thinking about the little children who were standing up and putting their little hands to their hearts. I would say probably a third of these children had parents who were unemployed. As I watched them put their little hands up to their little hearts, these little first graders, and say, ''I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America,'' and go on and say, ''one Nation under God, indivisible,'' that every time we get to the ''one Nation'' piece, it makes me on the one hand feel very proud that this is one Nation, but on the other hand I feel sad that one Nation applies in certain instances; but when it comes to the weak in that Nation, suddenly we go our separate ways.

So we have a lot of people hurting, and the question is: What will we do to help them?

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the real ''shock and awe'' is what's happening to American workers.

The House of Representatives passed an extension of unemployment insurance benefits on January 27th for almost 3 million unemployed American workers. At that time I stated that the legislation is, albeit a small one, step in the right direction. However, I was supportive of a much stronger unemployment compensation extension, one that would have provided benefits to an additional 1 million American workers whose benefits have expired.

Specifically, on December 28th, 800,000 Americans lost their extended unemployment benefits. The Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation (TEUC) program ended on December 28th because the President and House Republicans rejected Democratic pleas to extend the TEUC program with a compromise bill that the Senate had passed unanimously.

I was in full support of the House Democrats' comprehensive unemployment benefits bill introduced by Representative RANGEL. This bill would have reestablished and expanded the Federal extended unemployment benefits program. Most importantly, it would have guaranteed all jobless workers at least 26 weeks of extended benefits.

Unfortunately, the House GOP leadership refused to allow a vote on this Democratic bill. Instead, they only allowed members to vote on their bill, which provides an extension of only 13 weeks of extended unemployment benefits, with no extension to workers whose benefits have already expired.

Mr. Speaker, the Dallas-For Worth's 100 biggest employers shave eliminated about 41,000 jobs in the last two years, according to the Dallas Morning News' Annual Top 100 Employers ranking. The big employers have been hit especially hard because they include a high proportion of technology and telecom companies. More than a third of the region's total job losses at employers of all sizes were in technology, according to one estimate. And the long-suffering industry has shown no signs of rebounding .

To make matters worse, my District's biggest local employer, AMR Corp., parent company of American Airlines Inc., expects to shed thousands more jobs in coming months in an effort to keep the company solvent. The airline cut 3,000 jobs in the last year and this month began notifying 7,100 unionized workers that their jobs would be cut under the new concessionary contracts approved by the unions. Dallas-based Greyhound Lines Inc., the nation's largest operator of passenger buses and number 78 on this year's list, lost

about 200 employees. And the cuts may not be over.

In the last three years alone, of the 105,000 jobs lost in the Dallas area, 30,000 to 40,000 were probably in information technology. And it's taking longer than ever for those unemployed workers to find new jobs.

Such figures stand in sharp contrast to February 2001, when unemployment in Dallas was 4.2 percent. In unemployment figures released recently, the nation's jobless rate had reached 6 percent, matching December's eight-year high. More than 500,000 Americans have lost their jobs in the last three months alone.

Mr. Speaker, we will need to provide meaningful assistance to workers by passing health care relief for those who have lost their coverage along with their jobs. This Congress should stay here, extend unemployment benefits for at least an additional 13 weeks, and tackle the serious problem of how we are going to put America back to work. These are the kinds of real benefits that we owe American families.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, we have only three more days to provide an extension of unemployment benefits before millions of hard working men and women lose their only remaining way to put food on the table.

Congress created the temporary extension of unemployment benefits last year in response to continuing poor economic performance. The need has only increased since then!

The total job loss in the Bush economy has risen to a staggering 2.5 million private jobs since the President took office.

Instead of doling tax cuts to the wealthy and allowing corporations to steal their employee's pensions, our government should be granting another extension of unemployment benefits.

These are benefits that millions of Americans are depending on to pay for groceries, utilities, and rent.

The unemployment rate is now at 6 percent, and still climbing. In many states, like California, the rate is even higher. Yet, many of these hard working Americans have already exhausted their unemployment insurance (UI) benefits.

Americans are finding themselves without jobs!

Without health insurance!!

The only thing they are finding is a growing sense of frustration, despair, and fear of their government.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my disappointment at the administration's and the Republican Congress' economic policy, a policy that leaves the working class and our nation's minorities behind.

We need an extension of unemployment benefits now!

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, during the Republican Presidential Primaries of 1980, George Bush, Sr. referred to Ronald Reagan's proposed economic policy as ''voodoo economics.'' At the time, the economy was in the throws of a recession with a stubborn 5 to 6 percent unemployment rate; and millions of Americans were out of work. Predicated on the ludicrous dogma of ''supply side economics''—which has since been thoroughly discredited—President Reagan's job-creation policy entailed a massive tax cut overwhelmingly benefitting the wealthy; and the effect were to purportedly ''trickle down'' to the unemployed. During those 1980 primary debates, Mr. Bush, Sr. was correct in referring to President Reagan's policies as ''voodoo economics.'' His tax-cut was not successful in creating new jobs, but in creating massive budget deficits and an appalling gap between the rich and the poor.

Fast forward 23 years, and it seems that our current President should heed the advice of his father. For once again the Republicans have responded to our recession and high unemployment rate with voodoo economics. Once again, their magic elixir is an indefensible, obscene tax cut for millionaires that will provide negligible relief for the working class and will have minimal impact on job creation. Yet once again they strenuously assert that their plan will create jobs and bring relief to millions of working class Americans. If only this Congress would listen to the elder Mr. Bush.

The American economy has lost 2.7 million jobs since President Bush came to office. The current national unemployment rate is 6 percent. 8.8 million Americans are unemployed, 2 million of which have been unemployed for over 6 months. In just the last three months, 500,000 more Americans have lost their jobs. In my home state of Illinois, the unemployment rate is 6.6 percent and rising. We have lost at least 108,700 jobs since 2001, and over 422,000 Illinois citizens are out of work. My home city of Chicago has been hit particularly hard, and my congressional district on the south side of Chicago has been hit even harder.

These are not abstract numbers. While the country club millionaires who will benefit from the GOP tax cuts probably do not walk the streets of Chicago and witness the extreme poverty and hardship that come with high unemployment, I stand here on the floor of the House of Representatives, with my colleagues from the Congressional Black Caucus, to tell this Congress that the pain from unemployment is acute, and it is real.

The President and the Republican Congress seem to callously treat joblessness and economic hardship as some sort of unavoidable condition that can be exploited to justify their policies that blatantly benefit the wealthy. While this is a harsh indictment, what other conclusion can one come to? After all, the facts are quite clear: in the face of widespread financial misery whereby millions of Americans are out of work and millions more are teetering the brink of unemployment, the President and Congress do not choose to extend unemployment benefits to those Americans who actually feel the pain of unemployment; they do not choose to adequately equip states with the financial resources necessary to relieve the ancillary hardships that stem from unemployment (such a crime as lack of health insurance); they do not even choose to offer significant tax-relief to working-class and middle-income Americans who are the actual taxpayers losing their jobs.

No: President Bush and this Congress choose to address this issue by passing a $550 billion tax cut that overwhelmingly benefits the wealthy and the very people who are in the least need of help; and then try to call it a ''job creation bill.'' The sheer absurdity of this tax-cutting policy, on its face, suggests that the Republican-controlled Congress is disingenuous and is not truly serious about addressing the despair of joblessness. Instead, the President and this Congress have chosen to simply make the rich even richer; and simply cloak their policies under the guise of ''job creation'' (which is the latest marketing spin to come from the White House justifying its elitist tax cut.)

For how could one possibly believe and defend the assertion that the President's tax-cut package will actually create jobs? All of the evidence overwhelmingly points to the contrary. According to Congress's very own analysis the Republican tax-cut proposal—notwithstanding their vehement assertions otherwise—will not substantially kick-start the economy and crate jobs. Both the Congressional budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation has proffered detailed studies that show this tax-cut package will have virtually no sustainable effect on unemployment. If they choose not to believe their own analyses, Congress should listen to other credible sources: Federal Reserve Chairman, Alan Greenspan, Nobel Prize economists and financial titans such as Warren Buffet have said that the Republican tax-cut plan will do nothing to create new jobs. Thus, if one takes the Republicans at their word and believes that they are sincerely trying to help working class Americans with this tax cut package, then one must inevitably come to the conclusion that their choice of policy is borne from sheer myopia or even stupidity.

In reality, however, it's easy to see what's really going on: the Republican tax-cut plan is geared towards granting tax relief to wealthy Americans and has little if anything to do with job creation. As ten Noble Prize winning economists put it: ''Regardless of how one views the specifics of the Bush plan, there is wide agreement that its purpose is a permanent change in the tax structure and not the creation of jobs and growth in the near term.''

Thus, we here in Congress still have a lot of work to do. Along with the President, we have to enact real and sincere policies to create jobs and bring economic relief to millions of Americans. The citizens of Illinois—the citizens in my district on the south side of chicago—deserve a responsive President and Congress that are serious about addressing the hardships of unemployment. The legislative solutions are not elusive. This is not rocket science. Congress should extend benefits to millions of unemployed Americans who will soon see their benefits expire and be left with no income. We should authorize and appropriate substantial funds to the states who are financially strapped and can no longer deliver some basic services to their citizens.

We must enact targeted and responsible fiscal stimulus that will kick start sustainable economic growth unencumbered by future budget deficits. Not only are these policy prescriptions the compassionate thing to do, they are the smart, economically-sound thing to do.

I urge this Congress to act now. Working class men and women are depending on us.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, this evening I implore my fellow colleagues to invest in our American families. The issue of this country's economic growth and stability is before us yet again, and it appears as if we are about to worsen the situation.

We first failed our American families by approving a budget that neglects the economic and social needs of this country's citizens. This Congress also ensured that future generations will be burdened with debt as well.

We must not fail our American families again. The Members of Congress have the opportunity to extend unemployment benefits as such benefits expire on May 31, 2003. We must do so.

Our African American families have fared the worst during this economic crisis. The unemployment rate for African Americans is almost 11 percent at 10.9 percent. This rate is twice that of whites. In February, the number of unemployed African Americans totaled 1.7 million.

Every Member of Congress is witnessing firsthand the toll that this economy is taking on our constituents. Not one state is unaffected by this issue. The unemployment rate in Michigan is 6.7 percent. The unemployment rate in Detroit is 7.2 percent. This particular statistic has more than doubled since the last Administration. In November of 2000, the unemployment rate in Detroit was at 3.0 percent.

The budget resolution approved last month guarantees that this country has not yet seen the worst of these unemployment statistics for my District, our community, and the entire country as well.

The Administration claims that the approved budget will create 190,000 jobs. Is the Administration to be commended for creating 190,000 jobs? This number equates to less than the number of jobs that were lost during February and March of this year. During those months, 477,000 jobs were lost.

How are we to alleviate this economic downturn when we fail to provide employment opportunities for this country's citizens? How can we then fail to give those hard-working Americans, who have been laid off with no job prospects in sight, sustenance during these hard times.

While I have highlighted the unemployment statistics within the African American community and Michigan, let me make it clear—this is not a Black issue or a Michigan issue. This is an issue that affects all Americans and as such, we must extend the Temporary Emergency Unemployment Compensation Program (TEUC).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to address the rising unemployment in our country. Since President Bush took office, 2.7 million people—538,000 in the past three months—have lost their jobs. The unemployment rate now stands at 8.8 million people, 6 percent, the highest level in more than 10 years. California, which has bourne the brunt of the economic downturn has nearly 1.2 million people out of work. In my home city of Los Angeles, our unemployment rate is almost 6.5 percent.

The President and his party will say that it isn't their fault. They will say that this recession started well before the President was sworn into office. That clearly is not true, even if it were, the President's policies have only made the problem worse. By advocating tax cuts to solve every problem, President Bush has avoided taking any type of leadership role in solving this problem. The President, so far, has prescribed tax cuts as his sole cure for budget surpluses, budget deficits, the energy crisis, the war on terrorism and heaven knows what else. It is clear that this is part of a calculated strategy on the part of this Administration to starve domestic health and social programs to meet our peoples' needs: Programs like S-Chip, Head Start, public housing. Unfortunately, this list goes on and on.

Meanwhile, our nation's workers are out of work, out of options and out of benefits. Nationwide, an estimated 2.1 million workers—80,000 a week—will exhaust their regular unemployment benefits over the next five months. In California, 150,400 workers will exhaust their unemployment benefits by the end of May. But, while Congress can find the time to pass two multi-trillion tax cuts to benefit the wealthy, those who need it least, it can not find the time to extend unemployment benefits for workers whose benefits have been exhausted, those who need it most.

Extending unemployment benefits is the simplest and most effective way we can improve this economy. A recent study by Economy.com found that each dollar dedicated to extending unemployment benefits would boost the economy by $1.73. However, the same study found that the centerpiece of the GOP package, the dividend tax cut, would be the least efficient in stimulating the economy. Each dollar dedicated to reducing the taxation of dividends would boost the economy by only 9 cents.

But the President continues to advocate tax cuts. As if this failed policy will now miraculously work. It did not work in 2001 and it will not work in 2003. After passage of the largest tax cut in US history—$1.3 trillion—the economy lost 1.7 million jobs. The Republicans call their plan a ''jobs and economic growth'' bill. Yet, study after study—from the Congressional Budget Office to Economy.com to the editorial pages of the country's leading papers—show that it is anything but a job and growth plan. The bill the Republicans have drafted will have no stimulus effect on the economy, nor will it create jobs.

The Democrats, on the other hand, have developed a strong and balanced policy that will create over a million jobs this year alone. Importantly, the Democrats put money in the hands of the unemployed through the extension of unemployment benefits and tax breaks that help the middle class. It also provides desperately needed help to the States who are struggling under the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression. Under the Republicans' plan, mind you, economists expect the states' financial crisis to worsen.

About the only thing that this bill does is explode the deficit. Less than two years after President Clinton left office, we find ourselves in record deficits and an exploding national debt. President Bush promised when he came into office that the would pay off the debt, not too quickly though. He was concerned about the repercussions of paying off the debt too quickly.

So what did this president do? Well, he certainly didn't pay off the debt. Instead, he increased the national debt by $1.5 trillion over the next ten years. As if this was not bad enough, the debt subject to statutory limit, which at the beginning of this Administration was $5.7 trillion, is now projected to reach more than $12 trillion by the end of 2013, all thanks to Republican policies.

I close, Mr. Speaker, wondering when we will throw away these policies of yesteryear and start doing something of substance? People are hurting. They don't need cheerleading or Horatio Algers stories about how, if they work hard, they, too, can become millionaires. They need our help. When are we going to stop pretending that tax cuts are the cure all for the nation's problems and begin doing meaningful work that will put our constituents to work and not burden our children with trillions in debt. When will we return to funding health, education and social service programs to meet the needs of our people. I hope soon, Mr. Speaker.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2345

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DREIER) at 11 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1588, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108–122) on the resolution (H. Res. 247) providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1588) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2004 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2004, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2185, UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AMENDMENTS OF 2003

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108–123) on the resolution (H. Res. 248) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2185) to extend the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108–124) on the resolution (H. Res. 249) waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which

was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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. SKELTON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. HINCHEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SHERMAN, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DOGGETT, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. EDWARDS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. FROST, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. RODRIGUEZ, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SANDLIN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. STRICKLAND, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BALLANCE, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. NUSSLE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. CULBERSON, for 5 minutes, May 22.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. LAMPSON, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. WATSON, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 22, 2003, 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:

2320. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — [alpha]-Hydro-[omega]-Hydroxypoly (oxythylene) C8-C18-A1kyl Ether Citrates, Poly(oxyethylene) content is 4-12 moles Tolerance Exemption [OPP-2003-0023; FRL-7290-8] received April 28, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2321. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Bifenthrin; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2002-0358; FRL-7304-4] received April 28, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2322. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Mefenpyr-Diethyl; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2003-0077; FRL-7297-9] received April 28, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2323. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pyraflufen-ethyl; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2003-0110; FRL-7300-9] received April 28, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2324. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Health Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Evaluation of the Tricare Program FY 2003 Report to Congress, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1073 note; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2325. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Health Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report entitled, ''Health Information Privacy Regulation''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2326. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Twenty-Fifth Annual Report to Congress on the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1692m; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2327. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's FY 2002 Performance Report for the Prescription Drug User Fee Act of 1992, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 379g note; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2328. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Notice of Withdrawal of October 2, 2002, Attainment Date Extension, Determination of Nonattainment as of November 15, 1999, and Reclassification of the Baton Rouge Ozone Nonattainment Area [LA-58-1-7522; FRL-7487-4] received April 28, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2329. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans Florida: Revision to Jacksonville, Florida Ozone Air Quality Maintenance Plan [FL-88-200227(a); FRL-7486-7] received April 28, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2330. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans: Revisions to the Alabama State Implementation Plan [AL-060-200320(a); FRL-7487-1] received April 28, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2331. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD); Idaho and Oregon [OR-03-004a and ID-03-001a; FRL-7487-2] received April 28, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2332. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Minnesota: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [FRL-7486-4] received April 28, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2333. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on the activities of the Multinational Force and Observers (MFO) and certain financial information concerning U.S. Government participation in that organization, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3425; to the Committee on International Relations.

2334. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed Manufacturing License Agreement with South Africa [Transmittal No. DDTC 18-03], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

2335. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed Manufacturing License Agreement with Germany [Transmittal No. DDTC 009-03], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d) and 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

2336. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report required by Section 204 of the United States Macau Policy Act, covering the period from April 2, 2001, to April 1, 2002; to the Committee on International Relations.

2337. A letter from the Secretary to the Council, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of Council Resolution 15-86, ''Sense of the Council on Maintaining Open Spaces for Demonstrations in the District of Columbia Emergency Resolution of 2003,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2338. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2339. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on agency programs undertaken in support of Public Law 103-172, the Federal Employees Clean Air Incentives Act; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2340. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2341. A letter from the Director, Financial Services, Library of Congress, transmitting the United States Capitol Preservation Commission Annual Report for the fiscal years ended September 30, 2002; to the Committee on House Administration.

2342. A letter from the Clerk of the Court, United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, transmitting the Court's summary order for USA v. Santiago, et al; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2343. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Guidelines on Awarding Section 319 Grants to Indi an Tribes in FY 2003 — received April 28, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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. HUNTER: Committee on Armed Services. Supplemental report on H.R. 1588. A bill

to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2004 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2004, and for other purposes (Rept. 108–106, Pt. 2).

Mr. BOEHNER: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 1170. A bill to protect children and their parents from being coerced into administering psychotropic medication in order to attend school, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 108–121). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. MYRICK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 247. Resolution providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1588) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2004 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2004, and for other purposes (Rept. 108–122). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 248. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2185) to extend the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Rept. 108–123). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. REYNOLDS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 249. Resolution waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules (Rept. 108–124). 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. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

H.R. 2178. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the status of professional employer organizations and to promote and protect the interests of professional employer organizations, their customers, and workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAKER (for himself, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. OSE, and Mrs. KELLY):

H.R. 2179. A bill to enhance the authority of the Securities and Exchange Commission to investigate, punish, and deter securities laws violations, and to improve its ability to return funds to defrauded investors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. WOLF, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HONDA, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SABO, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. STARK, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. DUNCAN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WEINER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. DICKS, Mr. FORD, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. COLE, Mr. WATT, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. STEARNS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. OLVER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. GORDON, Mrs. BONO, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. AKIN, Mr. FARR, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HOLT, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. WYNN, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. FROST, Mr. BELL, Mr. REYES, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BACA, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. LEE, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. TIERNEY):

H.R. 2180. A bill to amend titles 23 and 49, United States Code, concerning length and weight limitations for vehicles operating on Federal-aid highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PENCE:

H.R. 2181. A bill to amend the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to enhance the ability of oilseed producers to use oilseed base acres for the production of fruits and vegetables; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FERGUSON (for himself and Mr. HOYER):

H.R. 2182. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under part B for medically necessary dental procedures; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. FORBES:

H.R. 2183. A bill to establish a digital and wireless network technology program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. DOGGETT (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FROST, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. STARK, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 2184. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent corporations from exploiting tax treaties to evade taxation of United States income and to prevent manipulation of transfer prices by deflection of income to tax havens; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DUNN (for herself, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. QUINN, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. CASTLE, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. WALSH, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. WELLER, and Mr. NETHERCUTT):

H.R. 2185. A bill to extend the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. BORDALLO (for herself and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN):

H.R. 2186. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to cover over to a possession of the United States whose income tax laws mirror such Code the refundable portions of the child tax credit and earned income tax credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 2187. A bill to update the supplemental security income program, and to increase incentives for working, saving, and pursuing an education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLISH:

H.R. 2188. A bill to provide for additional benefits under the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002, to extend the Federal unemployment benefits system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KANJORSKI:

H.R. 2189. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to assist homeowners with properties contaminated by leaking underground storage tanks in moving from such properties on a temporary or permanent basis by authorizing the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to guarantee loans to such homeowners; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. MCCRERY:

H.R. 2190. A bill to expand the use of Capital Construction Funds to expand the United States maritime industry and promote construction by domestic shipbuilders; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. MORAN of Virginia (for himself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WYNN, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 2191. A bill to amend section 8339(p) of title 5, United States Code, to clarify the method for computing certain annuities under the Civil Service Retirement System which are based on part-time service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. OBERSTAR:

H.R. 2192. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Surface Transportation Board, to enhance railroad competition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. OSE (for himself, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. JANKLOW, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. LEWIS of California, and Mr. SCHROCK):

H.R. 2193. A bill to provide funding for port security enhancements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. POMEROY (for himself and Mr. OSBORNE):

H.R. 2194. A bill to reward the hard work and risk of individuals who choose to live in and help preserve America's small, rural towns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Agriculture, 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. REGULA (for himself, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. MATSUI):

H.R. 2195. A bill to provide for additional space and resources for national collections held by the Smithsonian Institution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on 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. ROHRABACHER:

H.R. 2196. A bill to improve the quality, availability, diversity, personal privacy, and innovation of health care in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Government Reform, and Energy and Commerce, 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. RYAN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. STRICKLAND, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 2197. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for Department of Defense funding of continuation of health benefits plan coverage for certain Reserves called or ordered to active duty and their dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Education and the Workforce, and Ways and Means, 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. SCOTT of Georgia (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. WAMP):

H.R. 2198. A bill to provide funding for student loan repayment for public attorneys; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 2199. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a voluntary program for limiting maximum out-of-pocket expenditures for beneficiaries under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Ms. SOLIS):

H.R. 2200. A bill to require Federal agencies to develop and implement policies and practices that promote environmental justice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, 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. UDALL of Colorado:

H.R. 2201. A bill to authorize the establishment of a national database for purposes of identifying, locating, and cataloging the many memorials and permanent tributes to America's veterans; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, 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. WELDON of Florida:

H.R. 2202. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the ratable inclusion of citrus canker tree payments over a period of 10 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MUSGRAVE (for herself, Mr. HALL, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. VITTER):

H.J. Res. 56. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to marriage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H. Con. Res. 187. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued by the United States Postal Service honoring Hattie McDaniel, and that the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee should recommend to the Postmaster General that such a stamp be issued; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. SHAW:

H. Con. Res. 188. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued by the United States Postal Service in honor of Marjory Stoneman Douglas, and that the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee should recommend to the Postmaster General that such a stamp be issued; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. EHLERS):

H. Con. Res. 189. Concurrent resolution celebrating the 50th anniversary of the International Geophysical Year (IGY) and supporting an International Geophysical Year-2 (IGY-2) in 2007-08; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. ALLEN:

H. Res. 246. A resolution commemorating the 53rd anniversary of Senator Margaret Chase Smith's ''Declaration of Conscience'' speech in which she defended the American rights to free speech and dissent; to the Committee on Government Reform.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 7: Mr. MOLLOHAN and Mr. DOOLEY of California.

H.R. 20: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 36: Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 40: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 52: Mr. NETHERCUTT and Ms. HART.

H.R. 105: Mr. BELL.

H.R. 111: Ms. MAJETTE, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.

H.R. 218: Mr. NETHERCUTT and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 240: Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 303: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 391: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

H.R. 463: Mr. ETHERIDGE and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 466: Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 527: Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 580: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 589: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.

H.R. 591: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 594: Mr. BECERRA, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 624: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 643: Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 660: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 713: Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 745: Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

H.R. 781: Mr. FORD and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 784: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 785: Mr. HONDA, Mr. HOBSON, and Mr. MCINNIS.

H.R. 786: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 792: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina and Mr. TOOMEY.

H.R. 809: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 811: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.

H.R. 817: Ms. BALDWIN and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

H.R. 830: Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 839: Mr. HAYES, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. WALSH, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. HALL, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. PAUL, Mr. FROST, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. TURNER of Texas, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. BEREUTER, Ms. HARMAN, and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 857: Mr. MARKEY and Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 876: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 879: Mr. HOEKSTRA.

H.R. 880: Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 887: Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 898: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. BERRY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BOYD, Mr. HALL, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 914: Mr. CALVERT, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, and Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 919: Mr. HALL, Mr. CASE, and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 927: Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. CANNON, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. DAVIS of Florida.

H.R. 973: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 976: Mr. MEEKS of New York and Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire.

H.R. 1007: Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 1008: Mr. BOOZMAN.

H.R. 1038: Mr. RADANOVICH.

H.R. 1046: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

H.R. 1077: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1083: Mr. SANDERS, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. SNYDER.

H.R. 1101: Mr. BELL.

H.R. 1102: Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 1103: Mr. CANNON.

H.R. 1110: Mr. BELL and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 1115: Mr. KELLER, Mr. PENCE, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 1117: Mr. VITTER.

H.R. 1118: Mr. BELL.

H.R. 1119: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

H.R. 1122: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 1123: Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 1137: Mr. CHOCOLA.

H.R. 1157: Mr. KIND, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1162: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1168: Mr. GOODE.

H.R. 1170: Mr. MURPHY.

H.R. 1179: Mrs. EMERSON and Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.

H.R. 1191: Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 1196: : Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 1209: Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. SNYDER.

H.R. 1225: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1229: Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 1243: Mr. MEEKS of New York and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1244: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1251: Mr. CRENSHAW and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1264: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. SANDLIN.

H.R. 1267: Mr. EVANS, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

H.R. 1276: Mr. DAVIS of Florida and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1279: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 1295: Mr. BACA, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. REYES.

H.R. 1301: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. HEFLEY.

H.R. 1305: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 1316: Mr. RAMSTAD and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1334: Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 1336: Mr. HERGER, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 1340: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 1351: Mr. REYES, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 1385: Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. MAJETTE, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. WYNN, Mr. TOOMEY, and Ms. HARMAN.

H.R. 1388: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 1428: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 1464: Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 1470: Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 1472: Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 1479: Ms. KILPATRICK and Mr. VITTER.

H.R. 1482: Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 1489: Mr. HAYES, Mrs. EMERSON, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. OTTER, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. JANKLOW, and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 1500: Mr. DICKS.

H.R. 1523: Mr. BURR.

H.R. 1530: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. GORDON, Mr. TIBERI, and Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 1532: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. HOBSON, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. DELAURO, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 1535: Mr. MATSUI and Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 1553: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.

H.R. 1563: Mr. FARR, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. WATSON, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 1635: Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 1652: Mr. EVANS, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1662: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.

H.R. 1689: Mr. DEUTSCH and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1700: Mr. MURPHY.

H.R. 1708: Mr. OXLEY.

H.R. 1723: Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 1725: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 1734: Mr. PICKERING and Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 1736: Ms. NORTON, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WYNN, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mr. GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1746: Mr. WALSH and Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 1755: Mr. FORBES and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 1767: Mr. SMITH of Michigan and Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 1769: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. QUINN, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. BALLENGER.

H.R. 1776: Mr. JANKLOW.

H.R. 1778: Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 1799: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1819: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1886: Mr. WYNN and Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 1901: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 1910: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. FORD, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, and Mr. EMANUEL.

H.R. 1912: Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 1914: Mr. FROST, Mr. CRANE, and Mr. SKELTON.

H.R. 1926: Mr. GOODE, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. FEENEY.

H.R. 1951: Mr. STRICKLAND and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1981: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 1999: Mr. BERRY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. HOLT, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 2023: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 2028: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. FLETCHER, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. QUINN, and Mr. VITTER.

H.R. 2030: Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 2038: Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 2045: Mr. TURNER of Texas.

H.R. 2074: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 2075: Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Ms. HARRIS.

H.R. 2077: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 2090: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 2123: Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. COOPER, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2125: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 2133: Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 2157: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BALLANCE, Mr. BELL, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. BONO, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. HOLT, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. LEE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. MCNULTY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OWENS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SOLIS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEINER, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 2169: Mr. EVANS and Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 2172: Mr. EHLERS and Mr. QUINN.

H.R. 2176: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.J. Res. 4: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MCCRERY, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.

H.J. Res. 36: Mr. WU, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. LEACH.

H. Con. Res. 39: Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H. Con. Res. 76: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H. Con. Res. 78: Mr. WATT.

H. Con. Res. 93: Mr. OSE.

H. Con. Res. 111: Mr. DOGGETT.

H. Con. Res. 114: Ms. CARSON of Indiana and Ms. GRANGER.

H. Con. Res. 116: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.

H. Con. Res. 151: Mr. OWENS.

H. Con. Res. 155: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. MOORE.

H. Con. Res. 164: Mr. BLUNT and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H. Con. Res. 178: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mrs. CAPPS.

H. Con. Res. 185: Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. OWENS, Mr. QUINN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. WALSH, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GORDON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. FOLEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. FROST, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. WAMP, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. DUNN, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. TERRY.

H. Res. 45: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H. Res. 118: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H. Res. 136: Mr. BOSWELL.

H. Res. 167: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H. Res. 193: Mr. GALLEGLY and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H. Res. 199: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

H. Res. 218: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H. Res. 237: Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H. Res. 242: Mr. MCCOTTER.