

Mr. NADLER and Mr. McDERMOTT changed their vote from “nay” to “present.”

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 273 I was unavoidably detained by duties related to my investigation of Worldcom in a interview room without audible vote notification bells. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5011, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2003

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 462 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 462

*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. 5011) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes. 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 shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions of the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to reconsider with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. House Resolution 421 is laid on the table.

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

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), and I believe this is the first time we have done a rule together, welcome, pending which I yield myself such time

as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

On Wednesday, the Committee on Rules met and granted an open rule for the Military Construction Appropriations Act for the fiscal year 2003. H.R. 5011 recognizes the dedication and commitment of our troops by providing for their most basic needs, improved military facilities, including housing and medical.

Mr. Speaker, we must honor the most basic commitments we have made to the men and women of our Armed Forces. We must ensure reasonable quality of life to recruit and retain the best and the brightest to America's fighting forces. Most importantly, we must do all in our power to ensure a strong, able, dedicated American military, so that this Nation will be ever vigilant and ever prepared.

H.R. 5011 provides nearly \$1.2 billion for barracks and \$151 million for hospital and medical facilities for troops and their families. It also provides \$2.9 billion to operate and maintain existing housing units and \$1.3 billion for new housing units.

Military families also have a tremendous need for quality child care, especially single parents and families in which one or both parents may face lengthy deployments. To help meet this need, the bill provides \$18 million for child development centers.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fair and an open rule for consideration of the fiscal year 2003 military construction appropriations bill. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we have before us a fair and open rule for H.R. 5011, the military construction appropriations for fiscal year 2003. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, waives all points of order against consideration of the bill, allows for all germane amendments to be offered with priority accorded to those preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

This is a fair rule, and I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

I would like to express my appreciation for the work of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON), the chairman, and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Military Construction, along with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the Committee on Appropriations chairman, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member, for continuing the tradition of strong bipartisan support in the drafting of the military construction appropriations bill.

This is a very difficult year for the Committee on Appropriations, and I commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER) for bringing to this House a very fine bill, given the limited amount of funds allocated for military construction needs.

Mr. Speaker, the President's fiscal year 2003 request for military construction was \$1.6 billion, or 15 percent below the fiscal year 2002 enacted levels. However, included in the defense emergency response fund as part of the defense appropriations bill was approximately \$594 million worth of military construction projects. These projects were subsequently transferred over to the jurisdiction of the military construction request, resulting in the bill before us today. This combined request for military construction, therefore, now contains \$542 million more than the President requested but still remains \$522 million below last year's enacted levels.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is incumbent upon all of us, the administration and Congress alike, to ensure that our forces have appropriate operational and training facilities, maintenance and production facilities, and research and development facilities. Yet each of these categories face significant reductions in funding in this bill.

According to the Pentagon, 68 percent of the Department's facilities have serious deficiencies that might impede mission readiness or they are so deteriorated that they cannot support mission requirements. The current reductions in funding for construction in these facility categories mean that the rates at which buildings are renovated or replaced has just increased from 83 years to 150 years.

Mr. Speaker, I keep hearing that we are engaged in a long-term struggle against a global enemy. So I find it difficult to believe that while we can find the funds to increase the defense budget by \$48 billion, we cannot find the funds to bring our operational facilities up to standard.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that our uniformed men and women and their families deserve decent housing and accommodations, both here at home and abroad. We need to ensure that all personnel in all branches of service have a quality place to live and work, both at home and abroad; and I commend the committee for continuing to provide increased funding for dormitories in overseas construction; but again, through no fault of the committee, the funding provided does not come near to meeting the need. According to the Department of Defense, 180,000 of the 300,000 units of military housing are substandard. Mr. Speaker, this is a national scandal.

We also need to ensure that security is improved around all our military bases, installations and other sites both in the United States, its territories and abroad. I know that this is a

matter of deep concern for both the chairman and the ranking member. In last year's emergency supplemental in response to September 11 and in this bill, we have made progress in this area; but again, much more needs to be done and done quickly.

This is not the first time that this committee has lamented the shortfalls in funding for basic military construction priorities, but we now live in a changed world, Mr. Speaker. Poor facility conditions are not only unsafe, they hamper readiness and decrease troop retention. The events of September 11 require both the administration and the Congress to provide significantly greater funds for these purposes.

Clearly, the President's request for fiscal year 2003 was inadequate. Clearly, the committee has done as fine a job as anyone could in bringing forward a bill worthy of bipartisan support; but clearly, this Congress, in a bipartisan manner, must bring this urgent matter to the attention of the White House so that the next budget does not continue to ignore these significant national security needs. I know I speak for all my colleagues when I pledge that I will be happy to work with the chairman and the ranking member on any such initiative.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this rule and this bill.

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

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me the time, and I would like to first congratulate her on her very strong commitment to our Nation's military and also for her ascension to the chairmanship of the very important Republican Study Committee, which is an entity within the Republican Conference that spends a great deal of time focused on the national security of the United States of America, and I believe she will provide stellar leadership there.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important measure. I had a lengthy conversation this morning with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Defense, Committee on Appropriations; and we were talking about our Nation's military forces, and we were reminded of the fact that we have an all-volunteer Army, all-volunteer military. And in light of that, it is very important for the United States Congress to provide the resources that will ensure that we attract the most capable individuals to serve in the military. It seems to me that one of the most important things for us to do is to make sure that in the area of military construction that we do just that.

I would like to join in congratulating my good friends, the gentleman from

Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), and the leadership of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER), for their strong leadership and dedication to this shared goal.

I appreciate the gentleman from Massachusetts' (Mr. MCGOVERN) comment about the fact that we continue to pursue this in a bipartisan way, and it is good to see this bipartisan sense here in this institution as we look at this important issue.

The numbers were outlined very well by our colleague from North Carolina. One issue that was not mentioned was the fact that there are resources in here to deal specifically with counterterrorism, and I saw that there is roughly \$582 million to deal specifically with that question, to ensure that as we proceed with military construction, that the safety and security of the men and women in uniform, as well as those families of theirs, are addressed.

So I believe that we have got a good measure here that is going to be brought forth under an open amendment process that will allow for the consideration of different ideas; but the fact that we have come together with strong agreement from both Democrats and Republicans is I think a great testimony to the success of the work of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER), who is the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee on Military Construction of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to support this open rule for the consideration of the military construction appropriations bill. Because of the leadership of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON), the chairman of this subcommittee, the underlying bill is a good bill developed in a bipartisan way, as he has always done in the years that he and I have served together in the positions of Chair and ranking member, respectively, of the committee; and I urge the Members to support this rule.

□ 1630

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to my friend and neighbor, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES).

(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, but first let me pay particular tribute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER), chairman and ranking member, who have a keen awareness of the need for

the best of military housing and also an aggressive posture towards pursuing and solving the problems that we have faced in the past, and I appreciate their support for that.

I rise in strong support of the rule that will allow for consideration of H.R. 5011, the Military Construction Appropriations bill for 2003. This bill provides over \$10 billion for military construction projects. Providing adequate housing and facilities for our men and women in uniform enables them to better do their job. Having safe and secure housing allows servicemen and women to know that their families are out of harm's way while they are deployed or serving our country overseas. This assurance is a key component of our Nation's military readiness, and today we take steps to further improve and also to modernize the housing and facilities for our military families.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to highlight a significant component of the MILCON Appropriations bill which will help all soldiers at Fort Bragg, North Carolina. Since I came to Congress, I have been working to secure funds for the Soldier Support Center at Fort Bragg. This center, to be named in honor of General Hugh Shelton, currently recovering from a spinal cord injury, will provide a one-stop in-and-out-processing facility for soldiers at Fort Bragg. Today we take the first step in providing the first half of the funding for this important resource for the epicenter of the universe, Fort Bragg, North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to providing funds for MILCON, I would also like to take this opportunity to highlight some of the innovative projects to leverage private capital that individual services are currently pursuing. At Fort Bragg in my district in North Carolina, the Army is getting under way with a project called Residential Community Initiative, or RCI. Through RCI, the Army has decided upon a private contractor to build several thousand homes on post and to renovate many, many others. This contractor was awarded a 50-year, multi-million dollar contract and will be responsible for the homes for the next 50 years. I am hopeful that this will create both improved housing for our soldiers and their families but also generate many economic opportunities for the greater Fayetteville community. This innovative way to use private capital to fix some of our most serious family housing problems will provide the best housing for our soldier, the best value for the taxpayer, and maximum benefit for our community.

The tragic events of September 11, 2001, have thrust our Nation's military into the spotlight and called to duty the brave men and women of the U.S. Armed Forces. Once again, U.S. citizens are rallying behind them in strong support of the harrowing mission that they have been called upon to perform. Our U.S. Congress has the duty and the

opportunity to pass the Military Construction Appropriations bill for 2003. Please join me in supporting this rule that enables us to provide the necessary facilities and security for these brave men and women who are protecting us and our country and our freedom. We are ever grateful.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for yielding me this time, and I want to urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time to congratulate the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON) on a very fine Military Construction bill. I particularly want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON) for his help in regards to a facility at the Naval Academy, that he has been very helpful in the new ethics center that will be constructed at the United States Naval Academy.

Eight years ago a private fund-raising group began working with the Naval Academy and the Academy's Foundation to build a new ethics center and Jewish Chapel in Annapolis. While the Jewish Chapel facility will be entirely funded and endowed privately, the subcommittee's action reflects the fact that a significant portion of this new center will be used for an ethics center and a general Academy classroom, office, and common space.

Mr. Speaker, this will be a tremendous addition to the Naval Academy in Annapolis. It would not have been possible without the help of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON). I really want to take this time to thank him for his efforts on this behalf.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time we have remaining on this side, please?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 21½ minutes, and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) has 23 minutes.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) for yielding me this time on this very important rule on this very important bill. As she has pointed out, this is an open rule; and I would say to my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that since I became chairman of this committee, I have never, ever asked for anything other than an open rule so that Members would have an opportunity to be part of the appropriations process. So this is an open rule as we always ask for on all bills.

I had asked the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), I wanted to make a

few comments not only on the rule but on the bill, the defense bill that we moved earlier today under the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and the bill we moved this afternoon under the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON), chairman, and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER), ranking minority member, both very good bills. We had made a commitment to move the defense bill first. We have now done that. We now will be moving the Military Construction bill.

We are keeping our commitment on schedule, and so I wanted to take just a few minutes, besides mentioning the open rule, to mention the fact that this bill goes directly to the quality of life for America's men and women who serve in uniform. A lot of the money in this bill goes for housing for those who serve in the military.

I would suggest to my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that if they ever have an extra couple of hours, they might want to visit some military bases and look firsthand at some of the housing and where our troops are quartered; and I think they would come back here demanding even more money than this bill provides to provide decent housing for the military in those cases where the housing really is not all that good.

I think if one of us took our kids to a college or a university and we saw housing like some of our military live in, we would put them back in the car and take them back home. We would not let them live like we are requiring some of our military to live. So this bill goes a long way towards solving that problem.

But I must point out that there is a much longer way to go. There is still a lot of work that needs to be done.

I want to compliment again the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON) for the good work in producing this bill in a bipartisan fashion, along with the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER). They have done a really good job. I do not think there is any controversy to this bill whatsoever, and it should move quickly.

I just want to point out also that, on the defense bill that I did not speak on earlier today, trying to save time, that the staff and the chairman and the ranking member and the members of that subcommittee worked long, hard hours, days, nights. Oftentimes we hear that about the staff. But in the case of the chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), he was here on weekends, late at night; and he was here every step of the way. That is why the bill he produced, along with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), was such a good bill. It was really well-thought-out, and it does a good job for our Nation's defense.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be supportive of this rule; and I am very proud to be supportive of this good bill that adds considerably to the quality of life for our men and women who serve in our uniform.

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

has done an outstanding job on this good rule; and she has an interesting closing comment, I think, which I support enthusiastically when she makes it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in yielding me this time to speak on this bill.

I, too, would like to express my appreciation to the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER), and to our good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), who have been focusing on one aspect of the military construction budget which deals with the problem of unexploded ordnance, the bombs and shells and military toxins, that have been left over and littered across the landscape, really, of these 206 facilities across the country.

The subcommittee, for the first time as near as I can tell in history, focused on this issue. They brought people together from the various services, looked at the context of the problem, talked to the experts; and, for the first time, we are having an inventory of this problem. We are at a time when there are a number of bases around the country, it is no secret, that probably should be closed. There are a lot of reasons why we are not going ahead with that process.

One of the reasons, candidly, is that people are concerned about what they get stuck with when they are over. I think of what has happened with Fort Ord. Despite hundreds of millions of dollars and 11 years of work, we have not yet been able to quite put all those pieces together and finish the job.

What this subcommittee has done here today is the culmination of work that is going to make a difference not just cleaning up these sites, long overdue, it is going to help reorder the process within the Department of Defense so that, at a time when we are giving unprecedented sums of money to the Department of Defense, we will be able to take a little bit of it to be able to make sure that we are not leaving hazards for communities to deal with for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, one of the more important things is that not only are we going to be focusing the attention within the Department of Defense, but the technology that will be developed as we learn to do a better job cleaning up after ourselves is going to make a difference for the other over 2,000 sites across the country, in every State, in most of the congressional districts, that are represented here in this body. We are going to learn to do a better job.

Last but not least, it is going to have international implications. Because, sadly, Mr. Speaker, every single day we have children around the world who are killed from unexploded ordnance, the

legacy of what has happened in Africa, in the Balkans, and in Southeast Asia. With the help of the subcommittee in focusing on doing a better job, we are going to learn how to clean up that toxic legacy. It is going to make a difference not just with the men and women we have on our military bases, not just for the communities that are going to inherit lands that they can put in more productive uses, but I think it will make a difference for the quality of life for millions of people around the world.

My only concern is that it looks like there is a little less money than we had last year. At the rate we are going, it is going to take us in the neighborhood of 100 years or more to clean up after ourselves. I am hopeful in the course of the process, as we go through the conferring, there may be a possibility of putting the money behind it that is necessary.

It is not going to get any cheaper to clean up after ourselves. The liability and the problems are only going to grow over time. And, ironically, the more money we spend to do it right, it will drive down the unit cost, it is going to return the land to productive uses, and it will make the ultimate cleanup cheaper.

I appreciate deeply what the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER) have done and the committee has done, as well as the work of the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR). I am hopeful this body will get behind it to give the rest of the push that is needed to make sure we do the job right on the part of our military service and people around the world.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAN MILLER).

Mr. DAN MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and for the basic bill behind it, the military construction bill.

I happen to serve on the Subcommittee on Military Construction, and it is a pleasure to serve with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON), chairing that committee for the past 4 years, and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER), also. It is a bipartisan committee and a bipartisan bill.

My congressional district in Florida, beautiful area in southwest Florida, does not have any military facilities and does not really have any major military contractors, so I approach this bill not from my particular district but what is right for this country and right for our soldiers and what will keep the military strong and prepared, as it was for the events that developed after September 11.

I know that Chairman HOBSON in the past 4 years has been working hard to improve the quality of life. The key to being prepared, as we needed to be starting in September of last year, is to have a strong military but also a military that is committed and pre-

pared to go into action at any time; and key to that is the quality of life. That is something that we have been working on now for a number of years.

In my congressional district, we have lots of retired military people, a lot of veterans. A lot of them are World War II generation, or the Korean War generation, even World War I generation. But it is a different military today with the volunteer military. People do not live in the barracks with a hundred other soldiers. Nowadays, we need to have facilities for people to volunteer to be in the military and to be willing to stay and to serve, whether it is at Fort Bragg in North Carolina or in Naples or in Korea, or wherever we have our soldiers stationed around the world.

Quality of life is really critical in this job. As a businessman, before I came to the Congress, one of the things I learned is you need to keep your employees happy. You want to avoid a turnover in your employees. You want to have employees stay and not move on because of the cost of training people. If you can keep an employee for a number of years and keep that employee happy and contented, they will do a good job. And that is exactly what we need to do in the military, is to attract the good people and to provide an environment so that they feel proud and they are satisfied in their job.

□ 1645

So in the past few years, we have had success. Several years ago I went with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON) to Naples. We saw where 10,000 sailors are based in Naples, Italy, and the Sixth Fleet works out of there.

The facilities were in a volcano. We had to move our facilities to take our sailors out of this area. The facilities were almost World War II era. The fact is, they were not very good accommodations. It was cramped quarters. When sailors came ashore, they had to go back to the ship at night.

Over the past few years, we have been able to create the basic enlisted man's quarters. So instead of the sailors coming ashore and having to go to the ship at night and sleep in bunks, they were able to stay overnight in facilities with two people to a room.

We spent a lot of money on child development centers. We have them throughout the country at military facilities because we want to allow the families to be able to stay there with their children.

In Sicily, I saw facilities where instead of a barracks with 50 people in it, we had semi-private rooms like college dormitories. When I was in college, we had bathrooms down the hallway, but it is a different world today.

We have to provide facilities that will allow the military to be happy and their families satisfied in accommodations that are safe. Their children can go to a day care program, elementary and middle and secondary schools. That is what this bill is about, is pro-

viding the facilities for the quality of life.

It is also things like runways, the command and control centers. We do not see them because they are top secret, but we need to have places where our admirals and generals can control things that are going on in Afghanistan. I commend the chairman for putting together a very good bipartisan bill. I hope Members will support the bill.

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

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FREYLINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FREYLINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this rule and the 2003 MILCON appropriations bill. I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON) and the ranking member and their staff for their hard work. We know the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON) to be a driven man on this issue. And working with the ranking member, one thing we do know on the Committee on Appropriations is that both of those gentlemen, their staff and members of that subcommittee, have personally flown around this world and Nation visiting these Naval, Air and Army bases to see the working and living conditions of the people who put their lives on the line, of whom we are most appreciative.

They know, as all Members of Congress should know, that nearly 70 percent of the young people in the military today are in uniform or married, and their needs are great. This committee and the Chair and ranking member have been true advocates for decent and affordable housing for those in the military who cannot often afford decent housing. They have been in the forefront of supporting them.

They have also been in the forefront of promoting the expansion of day care centers so that those who are in the military, the men and women, can be on the front lines and make sure that their children are provided for in a very safe and clean environment with professionals looking after their youngsters.

In addition, this is a committee that has worked hard to consolidate military operations around the world here domestically, as well as in foreign installations. Through that, they have lowered the maintenance and operating costs of military bases and saved the taxpayers an incredible amount of money.

Mr. Speaker, part of the job of this subcommittee, and while I do not serve on it, is their recognition that we need in this day and age after September to recognize the absolute safety and security of our military personnel, and in many cases they are living in housing arrangements in precarious situations, and this committee has worked very hard to address that need.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON) and the

ranking member for including funding in this and previous bills to complete the construction of the high-energy propellant facility at Picatinny Arsenal in my congressional district in New Jersey. This facility is needed to support the development of future weapons systems, include propellants, propellant charges and igniters, as well as support the development of new manufacturing technologies in a timely and cost-effective manner.

It is through this committee that this armament center known as Picatinny Arsenal, which provides 90 percent of the Army's lethality, has been able to put together a unified software engineering center bringing all of these talented men and women under one roof as well as upgrade something as basic as the electrical system of the base which had not been updated since World War II.

This committee's mission is important. It looks after the needs of our soldiers. This rule and this bill need our full support.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

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

Mr. Speaker, I, too, congratulate the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER), the ranking member, for the outstanding job they have done in crafting this bill.

I have enjoyed serving on the Subcommittee on Military Construction and the Subcommittee on Defense; and I feel very proud of the fact that today these two bills are going to pass the House overwhelmingly, and it is because of the good work of not only these two subcommittees, but the good work of the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) and the staff. We have outstanding staff on the Committee on Appropriations, particularly on military construction and defense. They should be commended for their good work. They work very effectively with the Members.

Mr. Speaker, I want to echo what has been said here. This is a bill that directly affects quality of life. In my area in the State of Washington, we have Fort Lewis where Army transformation is occurring. In this bill, there is a new barracks facility replaced at Fort Lewis. Also a new barracks facility at the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, and many other items of great importance.

Over the years, I have always believed if we keep these bases modern and updated and give the sailors and the civilian workers a quality place to work, it will certainly help us with retention of both our military personnel and our good civilian workers.

I wanted to rise and strongly urge passage of the rule and passage of this bill. This is a good bill which has been worked out on a purely bipartisan basis. I too commend the chairman and

the ranking member for their diligence in going all over the world to look at these facilities and to be able to give the members of the committee their best advice on what needs to be done at these facilities.

We have to remember, we still have kids in Korea. I have been there many times. We have worked hard to fix those facilities; but there is still work to be done at these bases around the world, and we need to continue to do it.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a member of this committee to speak in favor of the rule. But in doing so, I think it is necessary to point out for the record that the leadership of this committee, it is exceptional. It is truly bipartisan. It is led by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER). The committee is not just a numbers committee. This committee is changing the definition of what is often said about men and women in uniform about their quality of life.

We have dumped the old military style of designing and deciding what should be the appropriate size for a military living room or a military kitchen. We have turned this process into what all other communities do, and that is building to community standards.

The housing that we are building for the military now could win architectural awards, and the people who live in them are absolutely delighted that they can live in some of the prettiest homes in America, which are really built for community standards, where there is child care, where they can walk to work, if possible, and all of the other concepts that cities around this Nation are looking towards. We are letting the military lead the way, and it is being done by the leadership of this committee.

I stand here today in support of the rule and in support of the bill, but also in support of the attitude or the direction which this committee is taking to make sure that the quality of life for the military is an exemplary life for how all Americans can live, and that we do not in the future drive by military housing and military bases and say, oh, look at the way government builds its stuff. This is the kind of building and architecture that we are going to be proud of, and they are going to be proud to live in it. And if the welfare and morale of the men and women who are fighting for our country is upheld, I think their soldiering will be a lot better.

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

Mr. Speaker, all morning we have been extolling our patriotic values; but as our uniformed men and women know so well, there is a significant gap be-

tween our rhetoric and our actions. This House can no longer ignore the long-standing needs to repair, renovate, replace and build the operational facilities and housing needs necessary for a modern military charged with protecting the United States from the scourge of global terrorism.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and support H.R. 5011, and I call upon the administration to provide sufficient funding in the future to address these significant national security priorities.

As I said in the beginning, I want to commend all those involved in coming up with the bill. My only regret is the necessary funding that I think our uniformed men and women deserve, and what the American people expect us to provide to them, is not here; and hopefully we can work on that in the coming budget cycle.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the gentlewoman if she might explain the parliamentary procedure, this mystery motion, that the gentlewoman is about to offer as an addition to the rule that we are now talking about, military construction, which we are all in favor of. But I keep hearing rumors that we might suddenly be faced with a parliamentary situation where we are talking about increasing the debt ceiling. I yield to the gentlewoman for the purpose of explaining thoroughly to the body since there might not be any time to debate this.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, this is Senate 2578 to amend title 31 of the United States Code, and this is at the end of the resolution without an intervention of any point of order we would consider this; and this title 31 of the United States Code is to increase the public debt limit, and it would be considered as a bill as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except for 1 hour of debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and one motion to commit, and this has been shared with the minority.

□ 1700

Mr. STENHOLM. If I understood, this would be another one of the rules that provides for no debate and no discussion, no amendments. Debate for 1 hour, but no amendments.

Mrs. MYRICK. No, it provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. STENHOLM. I misspoke. But if Members on this side would have an

amendment of which we believe would be a better way to proceed regarding increasing the debt limit, which many of us are prepared to give the President what he has asked for as a clean debt ceiling increase, but we have a little different idea about how that ought to be done. But I understand the gentleman's rule that will be coming will again preclude Members on the minority side from having an opportunity to amend; is that correct?

Mrs. MYRICK. This is providing a straight up and down vote.

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

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

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding. I would just like to clarify this. Over the last several weeks, we have had many of my friends on the other side of the aisle join with us in saying it is very important for us to as quickly as possible take action to increase the debt ceiling. The procedure which has just been outlined by my friend from Charlotte would in fact allow for the full hour of consideration and the Members of the minority will have an opportunity to offer a motion to recommit.

Mr. STENHOLM. But no amendment.

Mr. DREIER. No, there would not be an amendment. This would be a standard procedure as would have come forth from the Committee on Ways and Means. So I think it is a very appropriate one. And I think that we should try and move just as expeditiously as possible on this.

Mr. STENHOLM. Looking at the rule, it says that there will be 1 hour of debate and one motion to commit. Commit to what?

Mrs. MYRICK. It is to commit it back to committee.

Mr. STENHOLM. So it is not a motion to recommit?

Mrs. MYRICK. It is to commit it back to the Senate, because the House would be acting on the Senate bill.

Mr. STENHOLM. Then just about the time I think that I have seen every most unusual political circumstance on this floor, we get another one that is real interesting in this regard. But if I understand the gentleman from California correctly, this provides for a clean increase of \$450 billion in the debt ceiling, so all who vote for this are voting to borrow an additional \$450 billion clean. It is not going to be added to the military construction. It is a simple take-up of the Senate bill; and if 218 Members vote to borrow that money, it is clean.

Mr. DREIER. If the gentleman will yield, I think that my friend is among those who has advocated an increase in the debt ceiling. I may be wrong on that.

Mr. STENHOLM. No, the gentleman is correct; but not in the manner in which the gentleman is proposing.

Mr. DREIER. Let me say, if the gentleman would continue to yield, that this is the second manner in which we

have proposed this. We have already passed language out of here that would allow for conferees in the supplemental appropriations bill to consider increasing the debt ceiling, and now we have come up with a second procedure. People have said that they want to have this done just as quickly as possible. I do not know if it would be possible for us to put into place a procedure that would satisfy my friend, but we share the same goal.

Mr. STENHOLM. Reclaiming my time, I think you are getting very close to satisfying me.

Mr. DREIER. Great. That is reassuring.

Mr. STENHOLM. But I would say to the gentleman that I would feel a whole lot better about the procedure if you allowed the Moore-Spratt bill as a substitute amendment so that we might have a true expression; and then after we have had that true expression, then I certainly would intend to join with the majority in seeing that we do not bring our country to the edge of default. My problem is with the procedure, but it sounds to me like you are getting there.

Mr. DREIER. If my friend will yield further, I just want to express my appreciation for his understanding of our desire to find a procedure around which we can just as quickly as possible do something that we both want to do and that is ensure that we do not see a default and go ahead and have us pay our bills.

Mr. STENHOLM. With all due respect, I understand why you are doing what you are doing. I continue to be extremely disappointed in the lack of consideration for minority views in this body. The last time I got into this exchange, I was reminded that at one time I was in the majority. And I would remind my friends on that side when we were in the majority I often sided with you on fairness. This again is not a fair rule, but I understand the rule of majority; and I appreciate the time and clarification because, as I understand it, we were about to vote on this with no debate, no discussion, there was going to be a lot of confusion regarding this; but now I think more people will have a little better understanding of the confusion.

Mr. DREIER. I appreciate my friend's kind words.

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

I would urge that Members who are trying to follow what is going on right here on the floor right now to vote "no" on the previous question on the amendment and resolution so that we have an opportunity to be able to amend the rule and be able to bring up the Spratt-Moore-Stenholm alternative on the debt limit so we could actually have a debate and we can do this right.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. MYRICK

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. MYRICK:

At the end of the resolution add the following:

SEC. 3. That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (S. 2578) to amend title 31 of the United States Code to increase the public debt limit. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to commit.

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

In conclusion, this is a good rule and it is a very good bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). 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.

There will be 5-minute votes on the amendment and on the resolution after this vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 210, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 274]

YEAS—221

Aderholt	Cooksey	Goodlatte
Akin	Cox	Goss
Armey	Crane	Graham
Bachus	Crenshaw	Granger
Baker	Cubin	Graves
Ballenger	Culberson	Green (WI)
Barr	Cunningham	Greenwood
Bartlett	Davis, Jo Ann	Grucci
Barton	Davis, Tom	Gutknecht
Bass	Deal	Hansen
Bereuter	DeLay	Hart
Biggert	DeMint	Hastings (WA)
Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart	Hayes
Blunt	Doolittle	Hayworth
Boehlert	Dreier	Hefley
Boehner	Duncan	Heger
Bonilla	Dunn	Hilleary
Bono	Ehlers	Hobson
Boozman	Ehrlich	Hoekstra
Brady (TX)	Emerson	Horn
Brown (SC)	English	Hostettler
Bryant	Everett	Houghton
Burr	Ferguson	Hulshof
Burton	Flake	Hunter
Buyer	Fletcher	Hyde
Callahan	Foley	Isakson
Calvert	Forbes	Issa
Camp	Fossella	Istook
Cannon	Frelinghuysen	Jenkins
Cantor	Galleghy	Johnson (CT)
Capito	Ganske	Johnson (IL)
Castle	Gekas	Johnson, Sam
Chabot	Gibbons	Jones (NC)
Chambliss	Gilchrest	Keller
Coble	Gillmor	Kelly
Collins	Gilman	Kennedy (MN)
Combest	Goode	Kerns



Mink Rivers Stenholm  
 Mollohan Rodriguez Strickland  
 Moore Roemer Stupak  
 Moran (VA) Ross Tanner  
 Murtha Rothman Tauscher  
 Nadler Roybal-Allard Taylor (MS)  
 Napolitano Rush Thompson (CA)  
 Neal Sabo Thompson (MS)  
 Oberstar Sanchez Thurman  
 Obey Sanders Tierney  
 Oliver Sandlin Towns  
 Ortiz Sawyer Turner  
 Owens Schakowsky Udall (CO)  
 Pallone Schiff Udall (NM)  
 Pascrell Scott Velazquez  
 Pastor Serrano Visclosky  
 Payne Sherman Waters  
 Pelosi Shows Watson (CA)  
 Peterson (MN) Skelton Watt (NC)  
 Phelps Slaughter Waxman  
 Pomeroy Smith (WA) Weiner  
 Price (NC) Snyder Wexler  
 Rahall Solis Woolsey  
 Rangel Spratt Wu  
 Reyes Stark Wynn

NOT VOTING—4

Engel Roukema  
 Fossella Trafficant

□ 1743

So the amendment was agreed to.  
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.  
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.  
 The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.  
 Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.  
 The yeas and nays were ordered.  
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were yeas 269, nays 160, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 276]

YEAS—269

Aderholt Cox Gordon  
 Akin Crane Goss  
 Armeey Crenshaw Graham  
 Bachus Cubin Granger  
 Baker Culberson Graves  
 Ballenger Cummings Green (WI)  
 Barr Cunningham Greenwood  
 Bartlett Davis (CA) Rucci  
 Barton Davis, Jo Ann Gutknecht  
 Bass Davis, Tom Hall (TX)  
 Bereuter Deal Hansen  
 Berkley DeLay Hart  
 Biggert DeMint Hastings (FL)  
 Billirakis Deutsch Hastings (WA)  
 Bishop Diaz-Balart Hayes  
 Blunt Dicks Hayworth  
 Boehlert Doollittle Hefley  
 Boehner Dreier Herger  
 Bonilla Duncan Hilleary  
 Bono Dunn Hobson  
 Boozman Ehlers Hoekstra  
 Brady (TX) Ehrlich Horn  
 Brown (SC) Emerson Hostettler  
 Bryant English Houghton  
 Burr Etheridge Hoyer  
 Burton Everett Hulshof  
 Buyer Ferguson Hunter  
 Calahan Flake Hyde  
 Calvert Fletcher Isakson  
 Camp Foley Issa  
 Cannon Forbes Istook  
 Cantor Fossella Jenkins  
 Capito Frelinghuysen Johnson (CT)  
 Capps Frost Johnson (IL)  
 Cardin Gallegly Johnson, E. B.  
 Castle Ganske Johnson, Sam  
 Chabot Gekas Jones (NC)  
 Chambliss Gibbons Keller  
 Clement Gilchrest Kelly  
 Coble Gillmor Kennedy (MN)  
 Collins Kerns  
 Combest Goode Kilpatrick  
 Cooksey Goodlatte King (NY)

Kingston Paul  
 Kirk Pelosi  
 Knollenberg Pence  
 Kolbe Peterson (PA)  
 LaHood Petri  
 Lantos Pickering  
 Larson (CT) Pitts  
 Latham Platts  
 LaTourette Pombo  
 Leach Pomeroy  
 Lewis (CA) Portman  
 Lewis (KY) Price (NC)  
 Linder Pryce (OH)  
 LoBiondo Putnam  
 Lofgren Quinn  
 Lucas (KY) Radanovich  
 Lucas (OK) Ramstad  
 Maloney (CT) Regula  
 Maloney (NY) Rehberg  
 Manzullo Reyes  
 McCarthy (MO) Reynolds  
 McCrery Riley  
 McHugh Rodriguez  
 McInnis Rogers (KY)  
 McKeon Rogers (MI)  
 McKinney Rohrabacher  
 Mica Ros-Lehtinen  
 Miller, Dan Royce  
 Miller, Gary Ryan (WI)  
 Miller, Jeff Ryun (KS)  
 Mollohan Sabo  
 Moran (KS) Sandlin  
 Morella Saxton  
 Murtha Schaffer  
 Myrick Schiff  
 Nadler Schrock  
 Nethercutt Scott  
 Ney Sensenbrenner  
 Northup Sessions  
 Norwood Shadegg  
 Nussle Shaw  
 Ortiz Shays  
 Osborne Sherwood  
 Ose Shimkus  
 Otter Shuster  
 Oxley Simmons  
 Pastor Simpson

NAYS—160

Abercrombie Ford McGovern  
 Ackerman Frank McIntyre  
 Allen Gephardt McNulty  
 Andrews Gonzalez Meehan  
 Baird Green (TX) Meek (FL)  
 Baldacci Gutierrez Meeks (NY)  
 Baldwin Hall (OH) Menendez  
 Barcia Harman Millender-  
 Barrett Hill McDonald  
 Becerra Hilliard Miller, George  
 Bentsen Hinchey Mink  
 Berman Hinojosa Moore  
 Berry Hoeffel Moran (VA)  
 Blagojevich Holden Napolitano  
 Blumenauer Holt Neal  
 Bonior Honda Oberstar  
 Borski Hooley Obey  
 Boswell Inslee Olver  
 Boucher Israel Owens  
 Boyd Jackson (IL) Pallone  
 Brady (PA) Jackson-Lee Pascrell  
 Brown (FL) (TX) Payne  
 Brown (OH) Jefferson Peterson (MN)  
 Capuano John Phelp  
 Carson (IN) Jones (OH) Rahall  
 Carson (OK) Kanjorski Rangel  
 Clay Kaptur Rivers  
 Clayton Kennedy (RI) Roemer  
 Clyburn Kildee Ross  
 Condit Kind (WI) Rothman  
 Conyers Kleczka Roybal-Allard  
 Costello Kucinich Rush  
 Coyne LaFalce Sanchez  
 Cramer Lampson Sanders  
 Crowley Langevin Sawyer  
 Davis (FL) Larsen (WA) Schakowsky  
 Davis (IL) Lee Serrano  
 DeFazio Levin Sherman  
 DeGette Lewis (GA) Shows  
 Delahunt Lipinski Skelton  
 DeLauro Lowey Smith (WA)  
 Dingell Luther Solis  
 Doggett Lynch Stark  
 Dooley Markey Strickland  
 Doyle Mascara Stupak  
 Edwards Matheson Tauscher  
 Eshoo Matsui Taylor (MS)  
 Evans McCarthy (NY) Thompson (CA)  
 Farr McCollum Thompson (MS)  
 Filner McDermott Thurman

Tierney Visclosky Waxman  
 Towns Waters Wexler  
 Turner Watson (CA) Woolsey  
 Velazquez Watt (NC) Wu

NOT VOTING—5

Baca Fattah  
 Engel Roukema Traficant

□ 1756

Messrs. ISRAEL, LUTHER and MENENDEZ and Ms. SANCHEZ changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”  
 Mr. PASTOR changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”  
 So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.  
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.  
 A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 5011 and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.  
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?  
 There was no objection.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2003

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 462 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. 5011.

□ 1757

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. 5011) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes, with Mr. GILLMOR in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.  
 The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON).

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

Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to present the House recommendation for the military construction appropriations bill for fiscal year 2003. This legislation provides funds for many types of construction projects on military installations here in the United States and abroad. Projects range from barracks and housing to urban assault training ranges and runways.