

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

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to put some very laudatory comments about the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) in the record, because this is his last time as a chairman maybe.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to my good friend from California, the Chairman of the Defense Appropriations Committee, Congressman JERRY LEWIS. Since joining the Defense Subcommittee, Congressman LEWIS has been one of the strongest supporters of our men and women in uniform that this Congress has ever known. As Chairman, he has guided the Subcommittee without partisanship or political agenda to ensure that our military remains the best military in the world. The Defense Department and the people of our great Nation owe JERRY LEWIS a debt of gratitude for his unyielding support and hard work. And for that, I salute him.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises today in support of the conference agreement on H.R. 4613, the Department of Defense (DoD) Appropriations Act for FY2005. This Member would like to thank the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), Chairman of the Subcommittee and the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) for their fine work on this important measure.

This Member is very pleased that several projects important to Nebraska and our nation are included in the conference report. First, the final agreement includes \$3.5 million for the University of Nebraska-Lincoln (UNL) for the Fibrinogen Bandages for Battlefield Wounds Project. This is a very innovative research and development initiative which shows great promise.

These funds will be used for biomedical tissue engineering research to develop inexpensive, safe and effective fibrinogen for use in bandages, foam and other medical devices. This source of fibrinogen, developed from recombinant proteins instead of human plasma, will remove the major obstacle to the development of an affordable fibrinogen bandage. This research will build on the Department of Defense's (DoD) \$20 million investment to produce fibrinogen from transgenic animals rather than human plasma and will create a safer, less expensive and abundant supply for bandages and medical devices. A cost-effective abundant fibrinogen supply will enable development of state-of-the-art bandages and medical devices, saving the lives of wounded soldiers and other trauma victims.

Second, this Member is pleased that \$2.5 million is included for another UNL research initiative on Advanced Materials for Mine Detection and Blast Mitigation. These funds will be used to support research on advanced materials for mine detection and blast mitigation that will help protect U.S. soldiers in all environments. This research, which focuses on remote mine detection and the development of materials for advanced composite armor and lightweight body armor and hardened structures, contributes to programs currently underway or envisioned at the U.S. Army Research Laboratory.

Using nanotechnology research will improve remote mine detection, biological threat detection, and body armor. This effort will increase protection and save lives of our soldiers fight-

ing the war on terrorism. UNL researchers have recently produced some of the most advanced nanofibers in the world, opening the possibility for the development of materials with entirely new characteristics. The University will work closely with the scientific staff at the Army Research Laboratory as they proceed with this research.

Third, this Member is encouraged that \$3 million was added for the Satellite Communications for Learning Act (SCOLA)/Defense Language Institute (DLI) Foreign Language Center. Furthermore, this Member very pleased by the successful establishment of a congressionally mandated research and development line within the Army's R&D aggregation. This change is critical for language skills development, maintenance and language learning throughout the DoD.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, this Member urges his colleagues to support H.R. 4613.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

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

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the conference report on H.R. 4613, and that I may include tabular material.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1900

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). Pursuant to House Resolution 732 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4837.

□ 1900

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4837) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes, with Mr. BEREUTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, July 20, 2004, all time for general debate had expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4837

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure functions administered by the Department of Defense, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes, namely:

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Army as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Army Corps of Engineers and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, and for construction and operation of facilities in support of the functions of the Commander in Chief, \$1,862,854,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided*, That of this amount, not to exceed \$140,554,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, and host nation support, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate of the determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, naval installations, facilities, and real property for the Navy and Marine Corps as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Naval Facilities Engineering Command and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, \$1,081,042,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided*, That of this amount, not to exceed \$93,284,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate of the determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Air Force as currently authorized by law, \$797,865,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided*, That of this amount, not to exceed \$165,367,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the

Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate of the determination and the reasons therefor.

**MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE-WIDE
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)**

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, installations, facilities, and real property for activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as currently authorized by law, \$718,837,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided*, That such amounts of this appropriation as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense may be transferred to such appropriations of the Department of Defense available for military construction or family housing as the Secretary may designate, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: *Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated, not to exceed \$63,482,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate of the determination and the reasons therefor.

**MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY NATIONAL
GUARD**

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Army National Guard, and contributions therefor, as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$394,100,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided*, That of this amount, not to exceed \$74,982,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate of the determination and the reasons therefor.

**MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR NATIONAL
GUARD**

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Air National Guard, and contributions therefor, as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$180,533,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided*, That of this amount, not to exceed \$20,433,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate of the determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Army Reserve as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$116,521,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided*, That of this amount, not to exceed \$13,413,000 shall be

available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate of the determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVAL RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the reserve components of the Navy and Marine Corps as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$30,955,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided*, That of this amount, not to exceed \$1,653,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate of the determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Air Force Reserve as authorized by chapter 1803 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$111,725,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided*, That of this amount, not to exceed \$8,612,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, and architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate of the determination and the reasons therefor.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

For the United States share of the cost of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program for the acquisition and construction of military facilities and installations (including international military headquarters) and for related expenses for the collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Area as authorized by section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, and Military Construction Authorization Acts, \$165,800,000, to remain available until expended.

FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

For expenses of family housing for the Army for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension, and alteration, as authorized by law, \$636,099,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009.

**FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND
MAINTENANCE, ARMY**

For expenses of family housing for the Army for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, \$926,507,000.

**FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, NAVY AND
MARINE CORPS**

For expenses of family housing for the Navy and Marine Corps for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension, and alteration, as authorized by law, \$139,107,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009.

**FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND
MAINTENANCE, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS**

For expenses of family housing for the Navy and Marine Corps for operation and

maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, \$696,304,000.

FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

For expenses of family housing for the Air Force for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension, and alteration, as authorized by law, \$846,959,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009.

**FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND
MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE**

For expenses of family housing for the Air Force for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, \$854,666,000.

**FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE-
WIDE**

For expenses of family housing for the activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension, and alteration, as authorized by law, \$49,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009.

**FAMILY HOUSING OPERATION AND
MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE**

For expenses of family housing for the activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) for operation and maintenance, leasing, and minor construction, as authorized by law, \$49,575,000.

**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FAMILY HOUSING
IMPROVEMENT FUND**

For the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund, \$2,500,000, to remain available until expended, for family housing initiatives undertaken pursuant to section 2883 of title 10, United States Code, providing alternative means of acquiring and improving military family housing and supporting facilities.

**CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION CONSTRUCTION,
DEFENSE-WIDE**

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses of construction, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the destruction of the United States stockpile of lethal chemical agents and munitions in accordance with the provisions of section 1412 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (50 U.S.C. 1521), and for the destruction of other chemical warfare materials that are not in the chemical weapon stockpile, as currently authorized by law, \$81,886,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided*, That such amounts of this appropriation as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense may be transferred to such appropriations of the Department of Defense available for military construction as the Secretary may designate, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation to which transferred.

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT

For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990 established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (10 U.S.C. 2687 note), \$246,116,000, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. None of the funds made available in this Act shall be expended for payments under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract for construction, where cost estimates exceed \$25,000, to be performed within the United

States, except Alaska, without the specific approval in writing of the Secretary of Defense setting forth the reasons therefor.

SEC. 102. Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for construction shall be available for hire of passenger motor vehicles.

SEC. 103. Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for construction may be used for advances to the Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, for the construction of access roads as authorized by section 210 of title 23, United States Code, when projects authorized therein are certified as important to the national defense by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 104. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to begin construction of new bases in the United States for which specific appropriations have not been made.

SEC. 105. None of the funds made available in this Act shall be used for purchase of land or land easements in excess of 100 percent of the value as determined by the Army Corps of Engineers or the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, except: (1) where there is a determination of value by a Federal court; (2) purchases negotiated by the Attorney General or his designee; (3) where the estimated value is less than \$25,000; or (4) as otherwise determined by the Secretary of Defense to be in the public interest.

SEC. 106. None of the funds made available in this Act shall be used to: (1) acquire land; (2) provide for site preparation; or (3) install utilities for any family housing, except housing for which funds have been made available in annual Military Construction Appropriations Acts.

SEC. 107. None of the funds made available in this Act for minor construction may be used to transfer or relocate any activity from one base or installation to another, without prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate.

SEC. 108. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the procurement of steel for any construction project or activity for which American steel producers, fabricators, and manufacturers have been denied the opportunity to compete for such steel procurement.

SEC. 109. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense for military construction or family housing during the current fiscal year may be used to pay real property taxes in any foreign nation.

SEC. 110. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to initiate a new installation overseas without prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate.

SEC. 111. None of the funds made available in this Act may be obligated for architect and engineer contracts estimated by the Government to exceed \$500,000 for projects to be accomplished in Japan, in any NATO member country, or in countries bordering the Arabian Sea, unless such contracts are awarded to United States firms or United States firms in joint venture with host nation firms.

SEC. 112. None of the funds made available in this Act for military construction in the United States territories and possessions in the Pacific and on Kwajalein Atoll, or in countries bordering the Arabian Sea, may be used to award any contract estimated by the Government to exceed \$1,000,000 to a foreign contractor: *Provided*, That this section shall not be applicable to contract awards for which the lowest responsive and responsible bid of a United States contractor exceeds the lowest responsive and responsible bid of a foreign contractor by greater than 20 percent: *Provided further*, That this section shall

not apply to contract awards for military construction on Kwajalein Atoll for which the lowest responsive and responsible bid is submitted by a Marshallese contractor.

SEC. 113. The Secretary of Defense is to inform the appropriate committees of Congress, including the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate, of the plans and scope of any proposed military exercise involving United States personnel 30 days prior to its occurring, if amounts expended for construction, either temporary or permanent, are anticipated to exceed \$100,000.

SEC. 114. Not more than 20 percent of the funds made available in this Act which are limited for obligation during the current fiscal year shall be obligated during the last 2 months of the fiscal year.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 115. Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for construction in prior years shall be available for construction authorized for each such military department by the authorizations enacted into law during the current session of Congress.

SEC. 116. For military construction or family housing projects that are being completed with funds otherwise expired or lapsed for obligation, expired or lapsed funds may be used to pay the cost of associated supervision, inspection, overhead, engineering and design on those projects and on subsequent claims, if any.

SEC. 117. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any funds appropriated to a military department or defense agency for the construction of military projects may be obligated for a military construction project or contract, or for any portion of such a project or contract, at any time before the end of the fourth fiscal year after the fiscal year for which funds for such project were appropriated if the funds obligated for such project: (1) are obligated from funds available for military construction projects; and (2) do not exceed the amount appropriated for such project, plus any amount by which the cost of such project is increased pursuant to law.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 118. During the 5-year period after appropriations available to the Department of Defense for military construction and family housing operation and maintenance and construction have expired for obligation, upon a determination that such appropriations will not be necessary for the liquidation of obligations or for making authorized adjustments to such appropriations for obligations incurred during the period of availability of such appropriations, unobligated balances of such appropriations may be transferred into the appropriation "Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Construction, Defense" to be merged with and to be available for the same time period and for the same purposes as the appropriation to which transferred.

SEC. 119. The Secretary of Defense is to provide the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate with an annual report by February 15, containing details of the specific actions proposed to be taken by the Department of Defense during the current fiscal year to encourage other member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Japan, Korea, and United States allies bordering the Arabian Sea to assume a greater share of the common defense burden of such nations and the United States.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 120. In addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense, proceeds deposited to the Department of Defense Base Closure Account established

by section 207(a)(1) of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (Public Law 100-526) pursuant to section 207(a)(2)(C) of such Act, may be transferred to the account established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (10 U.S.C. 2687 note), to be merged with, and to be available for the same purposes and the same time period as that account.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 121. Subject to 30 days prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate, such additional amounts as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense may be transferred to the Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement Fund from amounts appropriated for construction in "Family Housing" accounts, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same period of time as amounts appropriated directly to the Fund: *Provided*, That appropriations made available to the Fund shall be available to cover the costs, as defined in section 502(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of direct loans or loan guarantees issued by the Department of Defense pursuant to the provisions of subchapter IV of chapter 169, title 10, United States Code, pertaining to alternative means of acquiring and improving military family housing and supporting facilities.

SEC. 122. None of the funds made available in this Act may be obligated for Partnership for Peace Programs in the New Independent States of the former Soviet Union.

SEC. 123. (a) Not later than 60 days before issuing any solicitation for a contract with the private sector for military family housing the Secretary of the military department concerned shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate and the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and Senate the notice described in subsection (b).

(b)(1) A notice referred to in subsection (a) is a notice of any guarantee (including the making of mortgage or rental payments) proposed to be made by the Secretary to the private party under the contract involved in the event of—

(A) the closure or realignment of the installation for which housing is provided under the contract;

(B) a reduction in force of units stationed at such installation; or

(C) the extended deployment overseas of units stationed at such installation.

(2) Each notice under this subsection shall specify the nature of the guarantee involved and assess the extent and likelihood, if any, of the liability of the Federal Government with respect to the guarantee.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 124. In addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense, amounts may be transferred from the account established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (10 U.S.C. 2687 note), to the fund established by section 1013(d) of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 3374) to pay for expenses associated with the Homeowners Assistance Program. Any amounts transferred shall be merged with and be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the fund to which transferred.

SEC. 125. Notwithstanding this or any other provision of law, funds made available in this Act for operation and maintenance of family housing shall be the exclusive source of funds for repair and maintenance of all family housing units, including general or flag officer quarters: *Provided*, That not more

than \$20,000 per unit may be spent annually for the maintenance and repair of any general or flag officer quarters without 30 days advance notification to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate and Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and Senate, except that an after-the-fact notification shall be submitted if the limitation is exceeded solely due to costs associated with environmental remediation that could not be reasonably anticipated at the time of the budget submission: *Provided further*, That the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) is to report annually to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate all operations and maintenance expenditures for each individual general or flag officer quarters for the prior fiscal year.

SEC. 126. None of the funds made available in this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government, except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in, this Act or any other appropriation Act.

SEC. 127. None of the funds made available in this Act under the heading "North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program", and no funds appropriated for any fiscal year before fiscal year 2005 for that program that remain available for obligation, may be obligated or expended for the conduct of studies of missile defense.

SEC. 128. Whenever the Secretary of Defense or any other official of the Department of Defense is requested by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives to respond to a question or inquiry submitted by the chairman or another member of that subcommittee pursuant to a subcommittee hearing or other activity, the Secretary (or other official) shall respond to the request, in writing, within 21 days of the date on which the request is transmitted to the Secretary (or other official).

Mr. KNOLLENBERG (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 22, line 2 be considered as read, printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to this portion of the bill?

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring Members back up to date on what has happened on the legislation which we started considering yesterday.

This bill funds military construction, which includes a lot of quality of life programs for our military men and women and their families. The funding level is \$10 billion, and I am disappointed that the actual funding level is only a 1.6 percent increase over military construction last year, which after inflation is actually a real cut in military construction funding during a time of war.

I think that is inexcusable given our war in Afghanistan and Iraq. This bill

appropriates \$489 million below what we actually spent for military construction 2 years ago before the Iraqi war even began. And even worse, it is \$900 million below what President Bush said would be needed this year, just 12 months ago when he made that prediction.

Despite the fact that we are actually increasing military construction, not even enough funds to make up for inflation, we have 39,000 Army families living in inadequate housing, 34,000 Army barracks are inadequate, 70 percent of Army facilities are C-3 or C-4, which means they are mission impaired, 16,000 Navy and Marine Corps families live in inadequate housing, 31,000 Air Force families live in inadequate housing.

Given this inadequate allocation to address the real priority of military housing and construction and quality of life programs, I commend the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG). He has worked in a thorough and fair manner to take what is a wholly inadequate amount of funding for military construction and to spend that money as wisely and fairly and as carefully as possible, and I salute him in that effort.

The best thing about this bill, at least in this moment, is it prevents a looming crisis in military housing construction. That crisis is, if we do not allow an amendment passed by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) in this bill to stay in this bill, this November we are going to put a freeze immediately on 24,000 new military homes throughout the United States, and that will delay by another year homes for another 26,000 military families next year.

So we are going to basically either freeze or delay new housing for 50,000 military families across 22 States, even recognizing some of those families have loved ones serving in Iraq and Afghanistan.

To recap further, unfortunately yesterday the House leadership strong-armed an atrocious rule through this House, a rule that I consider to be a slap in the face of every military family in America, a rule that took 20 to 25 minutes of extra arm twisting so it could pass by one vote. That rule, pushed by the Speaker and the majority leader, will allow one Member out of 435 in this House in the next few moments to basically kill our effort to resolve the military housing crisis, and every Member of the House who voted on that rule knew exactly what was going to happen when they voted for it.

I find it unbelievable that the same House leadership that just 2 months ago on the day that the Armed Services bill put a cap on this bill at the same level that will force this crisis, on that very same day the House leadership supported a \$69 billion tax cut that will give Members of Congress a tax cut.

So here we are, the leadership is pushing tax cuts for Members of Con-

gress, they can find time to rename dozens of post offices, they can find the money to push the \$69 billion tax cut, but when it comes to protecting a promise of better housing for our military men and women and their families, the House leadership sadly and unfairly said, no, we cannot do that.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I want to commend the gentleman for his statements and for his effort this year. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) has gone all out working with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) to craft a solution here. I have supported his efforts and I have Fort Lewis, Washington, McChord Air Force Base, in fact, in Fort Lewis we have one of the RCI, the Residential Construction Initiatives. It has worked better than any project for housing in the history of the country. And that is why this is so destructive. And we are not talking about spending additional military construction dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) has expired.

(On request of Mr. DICKS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. EDWARDS was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. All we are saying is we are going to raise a limit by \$500 million so that these transactions can occur in a public-private partnership.

This is what we have always heard from the majority party is the right way to go, these public-private partnerships. Down in Fort Hood this is a great success.

Mr. EDWARDS. Six thousand new Army homes.

Mr. DICKS. I went out with General Soriano, the Commanding Officer at I CORPS. We went out and walked through these brand new houses being built under the Residential Construction Initiative. The wives of the sergeants were telling us this is the greatest thing that has ever happened in the Army.

I have been out there when these deployments occur, and one of the things the spouses say and one of the things the members of the services say when they are deployed is they worry about their family, they worry about the housing, they worry about health care, they worry about what is going to happen to their families while they are gone. I know from my years of experience, 26 years on the Subcommittee on Defense, 18 years on this subcommittee, that quality of life and having this new housing and getting it done in a timely way is crucial.

That is why the objection to this by the majority party to me is so unexplainable, because one thing we have always been good about in this

House is on a bipartisan basis rising above limitations, things of that nature, to get the job done for the men and women who are serving, and especially now when we are in a time of war, especially now when the services are stressed in a most difficult way, and with all these deployments. We are over-deployed.

We saw what the GAO said today. There is not enough money out there to properly deal with the problems we have got. So to pile this last thing on, this poke in the eye of the military families by not raising this limit, to me is one of the worst things that has happened in my 28 years in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) has expired.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his eloquent comments and his leadership and strong support for better quality housing for our families.

I want to summarize where we are. Basically, the same House leadership that said just 2 months ago on the same day we refused to increase the cap so 50,000 new military families over the next 2 years could get new housing, in the same day they push through a \$69 billion tax cut that is going to give me a \$2,000 tax break.

We could afford the tax break for Members of Congress but we could not afford to take care of our promise of better housing for military families.

Now, the gentleman talked about a poke in the eye. The final poke in the eye is this is not the only bad news that the servicemen and women and veterans are going to hear today, because the same leadership that could support the tax cuts for Members of Congress could not find a way to improve housing and fund that program for military families, the most important effective housing improvement program for our military in our Nation's history. Guess what, in the Committee on Appropriations today we voted out a veterans' health care appropriations bill that basically, well, let me tell you what the National Commander of Disabled American Veterans says about it.

"To the veterans of this Nation it is incomprehensible that our government cannot afford to fund their medical care and benefits programs at a time it can afford generous tax cuts costing hundreds of billions of dollars more."

The American Legion, the DAV, the VFW all went on to say that the leadership-pushed veterans' health care bill today is going to cut, after inflation, real veterans' health care services by \$1.3 billion.

Now with the action of the leadership yesterday on the rule and one Member

of the House today, we will say to 50,000 military families, we will break our promise to you of better housing.

I think that is a terrible message for us to send our military families. While we go on a month long recess and vacation they are sitting there looking at veterans' health care cuts and frozen programs.

Mr. DICKS. Reclaiming my time, I want to say here is a situation where this does not cost extra money. All we are talking about is raising the limit. The Office of Management and Budget is for this. The Secretary of Defense is for this. The service Secretaries are for this. The Chiefs of Staff of each of the services are for this. I mean, the President is for this. And it would seem to me with all of that support and with the chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), who has been a tremendous leader on this, why is it that we cannot get this done? Why is it that we cannot take care of these people?

To me this is unexplainable.

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

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

Mr. EDWARDS. Let me put a face on these people.

We are talking about 1,194 military families at Elmendorf Air Force Base in Alaska will next year have their housing delayed. In New York at Fort Drum, 2,272 military families, many of whom had loved ones that had already served in Iraq, will have their housing program this year frozen. In Florida, Eglin and Hurlburt Air Force Bases 2,739 military families will have their housing promises broken. In Virginia 1,268 families at Langley. In Texas, Sheppard Air Force Base 1,288 families.

This is one more broken promise to our military families at a time when they are making incredible sacrifices to our country.

What it does, we talked about a 1.6 percent increase for military construction in this bill, but the truth is that once this objection is raised then that will not allow us to even spend that meager amount of funding for our housing program. So we could end up with an actual cut not only in veterans' health care during a time of war this year, we could end up with an actual cut in military construction during a time of war. That is unconscionable coming from a leadership that said we could afford to give Members of Congress a tax cut just 2 months ago.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the last word.

I want to have a colloquy between myself and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG).

Mr. Chairman, I would like to invite you to engage in a brief colloquy with me on an issue regarding Fort Hunter Liggett in California.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I would be happy to discuss Fort Hunter Liggett with the gentleman.

Mr. FARR. As the gentleman knows, Fort Hunter Liggett is today surrounded by U.S. Forest Service property.

□ 1915

In fact, prior to becoming a military base, most of the land was in the possession of the Forest Service, and another huge tract of land next door was owned by the famed Hearst family.

During the 1995 BRAC round, Fort Hunter Liggett was realigned and the cantonment area was excessed to the National Park Service. This means virtually all the functional buildings to support troop activities were given away, but all the land was retained by the military and put under the control of the Army Reserve.

The National Park Service, in preparation for accepting the cantonment area, studied its options with regard to management of this new property. In its report just released last month, the National Park Service labeled the land of Fort Hunter Liggett as "relatively unchanged landscape" from the time of the California's missionaries; as having "no equivalent" in terms of protected, undisturbed habitat; and as a "rarity" in its "representation of cultural and natural history."

However, because of the type of BRAC action at Fort Hunter Liggett, the land is not available to the Park Service and the Department of the Interior has indicated its reluctance to add such a huge tract of land to its inventory.

I guess, Mr. Chairman, what I am trying to say is that Fort Hunter Liggett, as active a military base as it is, still is a unique natural resource to our country; and it would be a shame to lose that resource should the base ever find itself nonessential to the military mission of our country.

While the Park Service, at this point anyway, seems disinclined to pursue further ownership of lands at Fort Hunter Liggett, the Forest Service is very interested.

Of course, no one is talking about giving anyone any land at Fort Hunter Liggett right now. It is a very active base, and I expect that it will merit strong support within the BRAC process for keeping it open and functioning.

But, Mr. Chairman, I wish to inquire if the gentleman is aware that the version of the Military Construction bill that is working its way through the other body does, in fact, contain the language addressing the issue of future land status at Fort Hunter Liggett.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I would reply to the gentleman that,

yes, I am aware of this language and that it tracks with the gentleman's desire to see the land preserved and conserved for future open, natural space by giving the U.S. Forest Service the right of first refusal for Fort Hunter Liggett lands at such time as the Army deems them surplus.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his response and his observation that I do desire to keep Fort Hunter Liggett as a natural resource if and when the military finds it is no longer essential to its mission; and I emphasize again to the chairman, only if and when the land is no longer essential to its military mission. I have no desire to close Fort Hunter Liggett as long as the Army finds it critical to its mission.

The chairman knows that I hoped to attach to the House bill we are debating right now language similar to that inserted on the other side, but in the interest of the House rules and jurisdictional matters, I chose not to.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield again, I am aware of the gentleman's deep interest in this issue and appreciate his flexibility in finding ways to address this issue.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I would ask one further question of the chairman. I would ask that the gentleman would work with me during the conference on this issue to retain language we all find agreeable that will keep the Forest Service as first in line to get Fort Hunter Liggett when and if it is excessed.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would further yield, I assure the gentleman that I will be more than happy to work with him in conference on this issue.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his leadership and cooperation and friendship.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it was not my intention to speak on this matter, but I am a little disconcerted about discussions that would suggest that anybody on either side of the aisle is interested in some way or another of placing a limit on the opportunity for our men and women who are serving us across the country by way of their housing or by way of their potential for income.

I did not speak extensively on the earlier bill, but within that bill we had funding, full funding for a pay adjustment for our troops. I believe that everybody here who knows this subject knows that the authorizing committee just the other day moved a separate bill that would lift the lid in terms of the housing challenges we are talking about.

It is not the intention of the Members of this House in any way, shape or form to do anything but support our troops. Indeed, the last bill that passed the House had a \$25 billion amendment as a part of its package that reflects our effort to make sure that money

upon the time that bill is signed is readily available to fight the war overseas, as well as to make sure that we are doing what is necessary to care for the families, the men and women who make up the strength of this Nation.

I must say that my colleague from the Committee on Appropriations knows full well that on both sides of the aisle we are committed to serving our troops. This is not a partisan question by any matter or means. It is very dangerous to our national security when people try to carry this to partisan levels, and so that is the only reason I am speaking today is because the House has worked beautifully in this connection. It was a bit disconcerting for me at least to hear what I considered to be rhetoric rather than substance.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, let me first say that I worked for 6 months on a bipartisan basis, talking to everyone from the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget; and the chairman of the authorizing committee to try to solve this in a bipartisan manner behind the scenes. At every step of the way for 6 months people said, well, it will get done, it will get done.

The problem is, we are about to take our August recess and it is not done.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman suggested that we are about to take the August recess; and thereby, I suppose, people are on vacation. I do not know about the gentleman, but I intend to go home and work and communicate to my constituents all of that which we are doing for the men and women who are serving us in this country. I mean, it is very, very important that we not suddenly decide this may be an issue whereby I can impact or give the impression that maybe one side is more holy than the other in terms of what we are trying to do for our troops. It is just the reverse. We have done our work well because we do so in an almost nonpartisan manner.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope as the gentleman is preparing to leave our body as my classmate and my dear friend, I hope that we will have a lot of time in the future to discuss the positive of this kind of discussion. In turn, all of us know that we serve our troops best when we take partisanship out of it.

Indeed, today, I am very proud of my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), for the work he has done here; and I hope we can move forward from this point and discuss his bill in terms of the real values that have been contributed here. So congratulations to my colleague, and I appreciate him giving me this time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply observe that no two people in this House

have worked harder to keep partisanship or any other illegitimate consideration out of this issue than have the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS). They have proceeded in tandem to try to produce concrete, as opposed to theoretical, results for the military families in this country who are deserving of a decent place to live.

But what we are being faced with is this: my mentor in this House, when I first came, was Dick Bolling from Missouri who for many years served this House in spectacular fashion on the Committee on Rules, and he often told me that the greatest enemy to true legislative progress was what he called "dung hill politics." By that he meant Members being more interested in preserving the jurisdiction of their committee or the narrow interest that was associated with a committee or subcommittee, rather than focusing on the broader interests of the American people who we are supposed to serve.

It seems to me that this discussion tonight is an example of what Dick Bolling was worried about because what we have going here, as I said yesterday, is a charade.

The gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Texas have brought to the floor a bill which provides concrete assurances that at least 24,000 more military families will receive decent housing; but apparently the Committee on the Budget is unhappy, at least the chairman of the Committee on the Budget is unhappy, with the way the committee has gone about this; and so he intends, as I understand it, shortly to exercise a point of order which will strike from this bill the Congress' ability to deliver that housing to those military families.

In order to create an impression that these families are not being hurt, it appears that what the House will now hide behind is a motion taken yesterday to try to increase the authorization for this program, which would have the result, if the bill was enacted into law, of accomplishing the very same thing that is being accomplished by this bill. The problem is the way this Congress works, there is absolutely no assurance that a free-standing, independent authorization bill will go anywhere in the other body; and that is why, if you want to preserve that housing for those members, it is essential to keep this language in this bill.

That is what the gentleman from Michigan has been trying to do. That is what the gentleman from Texas has been trying to do on a bipartisan basis, and we ought to be supporting that effort rather than finding technicalities as reasons to deep-six the very fine work that they have attempted to do.

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

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

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First, let me respond to the gentleman from California's (Mr. LEWIS) comments that both parties, every Member cares about our troops. I absolutely agree with that. In fact, let me repeat the statement I made on the floor yesterday on this subject, and I quote myself, "Every one of us, Democrat and Republican alike, genuinely respects the service and sacrifice of our troops and their families. No one should doubt that fact, but I strongly believe our budget priorities should better reflect that respect."

Those were my comments. Let me talk about partisanship.

It was the Republican leadership that shoved through a rule last night or on the floor yesterday that was done on a partisan basis. In fact, it was so partisan they had to leave the vote open an extra 20, 25 minutes to, on a partisan basis, force Republicans or convince Republicans to vote against their own interests in their own districts to support a rule that is allowing 50,000 military family housing to be put at risk.

Secondly, the Committee on the Budget, as I last recall, and I am a member of that committee, put together its budget on a partisan basis. That is where the partisanship came in, if it came in at all.

But to totally put to bed any idea that this is a partisan issue, I have letters.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has expired.

(On request of Mr. EDWARDS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. OBEY was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, the Air Force Association sent a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Rules asking them to not pass the rule that they did.

The Association of the U.S. Army, a letter signed by General Gordon Sullivan, former chief of staff for the Army, put in there that "RCI," the Army's housing program, "has a tremendous positive impact on quality of life for our soldiers."

"I would ask that you work to ensure the amendment" to protect housing "is protected by the Rules Committee and reaches the House floor."

The Military Officers Association of America asks that the House leadership not shove through a partisan rule that would be unfair to military families.

So did the National Military Family Association.

I do not think any of our colleagues would suggest that the Association of the U.S. Army and the Military Officers Association of America and these other military organizations are acting out of a partisan basis. This does not have anything to do with partisanship. It has to do with standing up for fairness for military families who are

making an incredible sacrifice for the American family during a time of war; and in doing so, I will not hesitate to stand up to the Republican leadership of this House which shoved through a rule that is going to allow this housing to be put at risk, and I will not hesitate to stand up to any Democrats who would hesitate in fully supporting military housing.

□ 1930

We all support our troops, but we have an opportunity by passing this bill without a point of order to do something tangible about it. Good intentions, goodwill do not provide better housing for 50,000 military families. Passing this bill, as we passed it out of committee in a bipartisan fashion, that is the way to make a difference for military families who are so deserving of this support.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I had a couple of amendments at the desk that I will not offer in favor of engaging in a colloquy with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG). The reason I offered those amendments is the Pentagon has a day care facility located on its campus that has capacity for over 200 children. After September 11, 2001, parents of those children were assured they would not have to be relocated. Now they are told without any real warning that they have 60 days to vacate. This is nearly 3 years after the attack on the Pentagon.

In Northern Virginia, there is a waiting list of 12 to 18 months at most of the day care facilities, so we offered an amendment to try to speed up the process of building a new day care facility at nearby Fort Myer. That is what this colloquy concerns because it is beyond me why the Pentagon would tell the parents that they have only 60 days to vacate.

They say they have information that the Pentagon might be more likely to be a target between now and Election Day. If that is the case, they need to evacuate them immediately. There is some suspicion as to the purpose, but I do not want to engage in that speculation. I want to do what we can as a legislative body to ensure there is an alternative site because I think most parents would agree that if they had an opportunity to sit down and talk with the decisionmakers at the Pentagon that it makes sense to begin to relocate the children.

Mr. Chairman, let me ask the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), I understand that the Pentagon, in response to the recent decision to close the day care facility at the Pentagon, has offered to expand and accelerate the planning and construction of the new day care facility at Fort Myer, but at the earliest will be able to start construction in October 2005; is that correct?

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct. It is my understanding that the Army has accelerated this project and will be in a position to award a contract in October 2005.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, does the Army have an updated estimate on how much this project will cost and when this project will be completed?

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. The Army estimates the project will cost approximately \$17 million. I do not know how long it will take to complete the facility, but the actions taken so far suggest to me that they will move it forward in an expeditious fashion.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, my concern is there may be a lack of coordination between the Army and the Washington Headquarters Services at the Department on how to proceed with the design, planning and construction of the new day care facility. To the gentleman's knowledge, is the Army working with the Washington Headquarters Service on moving forward with this timetable of October 2005?

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the Washington Headquarters Service is working with the Army to move this project forward and is prepared to provide the additional funding needed to expand the original project scope at Fort Myer to accommodate the children the gentleman speaks of from the Pentagon facility.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, it is my hope I can work closely with the gentleman from Michigan on ensuring that the Pentagon work quickly toward providing a completed alternative day care facility at Fort Myer as soon as possible. I would hope that in the meantime the Department dedicates all means necessary to find immediate interim solutions for the parents of the more than 100 children at the Pentagon today who are still without adequate child care options.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I will be happy to work with the gentleman to ensure the Department proceeds with this project as soon as possible. I just want to say I appreciate the discussions we have had and the gentleman's interest in bringing a resolution to this that will satisfy all of us. I commend the gentleman for this.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's assistance on this matter. My present concern remains how best to encourage the Pentagon to focus on providing interim day care service. I look forward to working with you to see if there is any assistance we could provide for interim solutions.

I want to recognize the fact that the gentleman from Northern Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce,

State, Justice, both of whom have constituents in this situation, as I do, and they have also worked very diligently on this. We appreciate the opportunity to work with the gentleman from Michigan.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 129. Section 2883(g)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking "\$850,000,000" and inserting "\$1,350,000,000". The amendment made by this section shall not be subject to scoring for purposes of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against section 129 of the bill because it violates clause 2 of rule XXI, which prohibits legislative language that directly amends existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the gentleman makes the point of order. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on this point of order.

I understand the gentleman is reserving a point of order because the provision in question is legislation, and therefore prohibited on an appropriations bill under clause 2 of rule XXI of the rules of the House. However, I would like to point out to the gentleman the reason why this provision is in the bill.

As the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services stated earlier, this provision is supported by the authorizing committee and it is not in a defense authorization bill because of an objection by the Committee on the Budget. So with the support of the authorizing committee, the Committee on Appropriations voted to include this provision in the military construction bill, and thus made a value judgment to address military families' lives and welfare.

Now I believe the gentleman agrees with this policy because yesterday he introduced a bill and it passed almost unanimously. However, that bill may not go anywhere and I do not think that we should be playing with people's livelihoods with promises that we cannot keep.

I would also point out that under the Army protocol, A-R-M-E-Y, this provision should not have been left exposed if the chairman of the authorizing committee does not object to the inclusion of this legislative provision in an appropriations bill. Only a piece of the language, which is directed at scorekeeping, is within the purview of the Committee on the Budget.

It is further regrettable that this provision is going to be stricken even though it is strongly supported by the administration and the House. It does not break the bank, as the chairman of the Committee on the Budget purports, or he would not have introduced a bill that does exactly the same thing yesterday.

I concede it is legislation and I concede it is subject to a point of order, but I also concede it is the right thing to do for our military families, and I believe the majority of the American people will agree with me.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to think about all of this before he insists on his point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other Members who wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I do.

Mr. Chairman, what a difference 1 hour makes. Less than 1 hour ago on this floor the House of Representatives passed a rule for the defense appropriations bill which waives all points of order against that bill, and yet because the House leadership instructed the Committee on Rules and twisted arms to force many Republican House members to vote on a bill that does not protect a point of order on this, because of that decision, inconsistent with a rule we just passed in this House by unanimous vote less than 60 minutes ago, because of that we are basically going to put at risk the most important military housing improvement program in American history, a program that does not only improve housing and show respect in a tangible way to men and women and families, to children who are making incredible sacrifices for our country, but a measure that is saving taxpayers billions of dollars by building these houses more efficiently.

In a House that ignores technicalities every single day to carry out priorities much less important than quality military housing for our families during a time of war, we are going to put this incredibly important program at risk.

Finally, I want to say this. Let us be clear, this is not today just an action of one person, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE). I respect the gentleman. He is a person of principle. I might disagree with the debate on fiscal responsibility when we voted 2 months ago for a \$69 billion tax cut that helps Members of Congress and today we cannot afford to take care of a few thousand military families' housing, but I do respect him. He is a person of deep principle.

This is not just an action of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE). This was an action which was allowed and encouraged by the House leadership by forcing an unfair rule through this House, a rule that was opposed by the Military Officers Association of America, the Association of the U.S. Army, the Air Force Association, and the National Military Family Association.

This action is also something that was allowed by 212 votes, a passage of that rule by one vote, 212 to 211. One Member changing his or her vote, and we could have prevented this tragedy from happening today.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge the gentleman to consider not recognizing the technicality raised here that will harm tens of thousands of military families during a time of war.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other Members who wish to be heard on the point of order?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, there have been a lot of speeches already, and I understand it is permissible to speak to the point of order, but many of these speeches are just repeats of what has been done and can be done in regular order in consideration of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I would insist on my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman raises a valid point. Members are to limit their remarks to relevant arguments on the point of order; the Chair has exercised some tolerance in that respect.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, it is important for us to respect the rules of the House, but sometimes the rules give Members powers to do things that they ought not do. Just because we have the power to do something does not necessarily mean that it is the right thing to do it. Sometimes it is important to exercise restraint. I think this is one of those cases.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) correctly points out that an hour ago we waived all points of order on a huge spending bill, many times more dollars than we have in this bill. There were many points of order that could have been lodged against this bill when it came from the Committee on Rules, but the House leadership chose to expose only one item in the bill to a point of order, and that is the item that would have delivered decent housing to 24,000 military families.

What the House did or what the majority did by adopting that rule is to say in effect that peace in the family was more important than the sure delivery of decent housing to 24,000 military families.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is unfortunate that the majority leadership has dictated to the House that it must allow this one provision to be eliminated, but there is not much we can do about it and I also unfortunately have to concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has heard from the chairman of the subcommittee, the ranking member of the subcommittee, and the ranking member of the full committee, and is prepared to rule on the point of order raised by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE).

The Chair finds that this provision directly amends existing law. The provision therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained, and the provision is stricken from the bill.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 130. The fitness center at Homestead Air Reserve Base, Florida, shall be known and designated as the "Sam Johnson Fitness Center". Any reference to such facility in any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States shall be considered to be a reference to the Sam Johnson Fitness Center.

□ 1945

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I would just like to announce to my colleagues today that there was a decision made by the Pentagon to move 3,900 troops to Fort Lewis, Washington, from Fort Polk, Louisiana, for a third Stryker Brigade. The reason I bring this up in the context of military construction is we have done a lot of military construction work at Fort Lewis, but we are going to have to do more. That is why the consequences of the decision just made here to me are so serious, because this RCI program that we have discussed which was started by this committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON) when he was chairman worked with all of us to try to further this program, and I believe that this is one of the most constructive programs that we have ever enacted.

I hope that, working together, the leadership of this Congress, we can figure out, if we cannot do it in the military construction bill, maybe we can figure out another way to do it. Maybe the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) can do it, as he mentioned yesterday, that he would take care of this in the conference on the authorization bill between the House and the Senate and help us find a way to work through this.

The reason I am so passionate about this program is because I have seen what it does out at Fort Lewis. In fact, with the help of the chairman, I am trying to get Fort Lewis and McChord Air Force Base, which are right adjacent to each other on I-5 in Tacoma, Washington, in my congressional district, along with ADAM SMITH, these two major bases, McChord has the C-17, and those two bases can cooperate in a joint RCI project. I am working with Assistant Secretary Gibbs, Assistant Secretary Prosch to try to get them to cooperate and work together as was done at Fort Dix with an Air Force base and an Army base there and worked out in a terrific joint venture.

I would just say to all of my colleagues, this is one of the best programs we have ever enacted because we use the housing allowance of the troops, that housing allowance goes to the company, and then the company goes out and does the financing and builds this new military housing. It is terribly popular with the troops. That is why as I see the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) on the floor, who have all worked on this, I just hope that we can continue to work together until the end of this Congress to figure out some way, maybe working with the

gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) in the authorization bill, to find a solution to this.

I think the overwhelming will here is to keep this program moving forward. We hope that by 2007 we can get rid of all of the backlog of housing that is substandard in all of the services. This is one of the goals of Secretary Rumsfeld and the service chiefs and the Secretaries of each of the services.

I want to compliment the chairman again. This year the chairman did something quite unique. He got the chief of staff of each of the services to come and testify before the committee because he wanted to drive home the point of how important military construction is. I commend the chairman for doing that. This is something that had not been done and there was some resistance, but I think once all the chiefs got there, they realized that this was a friendly committee, a committee that is trying to improve military housing, military construction, and that we would have a chance then to talk directly to the service chiefs on this important subject.

As mentioned by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), all of the outside groups that support military families have written letters in favor of this initiative. I hope even with the unfortunate decision of the Committee on Rules not to protect this provision which was crafted in a bipartisan basis, there has not been any partisanship here, but it is the duty of the minority to point out when the majority is not living up to its responsibilities.

In this case, I believe not protecting that amendment was a mistake on the part of the leadership in the majority party. It is our responsibility in the minority and in the highest standards of this House to point out when the majority makes a mistake. That is our duty in this legislative process. I hope again that we can pull together after this unfortunate incident and try to find a solution before this Congress is over. If we do, it will be one of the most important things accomplished in this Congress. I want to say again, this is supported by the President, OMB, the Secretary of Defense, and all the service chiefs.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the hour is late and I am not going to take much time, but I think we would all be remiss if we did not acknowledge that this fitness center is going to be named after one of our dear colleagues who was a real war hero, in my opinion. SAM JOHNSON was shot down in Vietnam and spent 7½ years in a Vietnamese prison camp, the Hanoi Hilton; and he suffered tremendously during that 7½-year period. I think it is very, very fitting that he be honored by naming this fitness center after him. In fact, if I had my way and I think my colleagues, we would probably name a couple of air bases in total after him because he is a wonderful guy and a great Congressman.

SAM, if you are listening, we sure love you, buddy.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, let me add my thoughts to those of my friend from Indiana (Mr. BURTON). What a great American SAM JOHNSON is. We cannot do enough to recognize his service. I appreciate that being included.

Just briefly, let me say that on the issue of military housing, I have got a plaque on my wall from the National Military Family Association for working with the families of our military. One of the great joys this year and the year before has been how all of the people in this body, men and women, Republicans and Democrats, have worked together so well with our chairman and the chairman of the full committee to address the issues of housing for our soldiers.

So as I have got that plaque on my wall, as I think about Fort Bragg and the epicenter of the universe and all those fine soldiers at Pope Air Force Base and around our country, I am just proud of our chairman and our Congress for working together across every imaginable line to do everything that we can to provide the best possible housing. We have done that. It is under way. I am extremely confident that we will find a way to make sure that that happens. I appreciate that. I appreciate our soldiers.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYES. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. I just want to say that my friend from North Carolina who so capably represents Fort Bragg, I, as he knows, have five military installations in my district that I am proud to represent. Tomorrow night, in fact, I am going to be at Fort Stewart talking to some of the soldiers. This is a program that does enjoy wide bipartisan support. We are going to keep working on this and find a way to make it happen.

We had lots of discussion in the appropriations committee. We could not quite come to a consensus of where to offset some money. I think there are a lot of programs out there that we should cut, reduce, eliminate, in order to provide adequate housing for our troops and the quality of life for our soldiers in general.

But the one thing to remember is we are in this position because of a technical change in the way the Congressional Budget Office has decided to score military housing. What they are doing is they charge all the money upfront, even though the private sector is paying for it. It is a paper entry. It is not a real dollar entry. I certainly respect what the Committee on the Budget is doing in trying to keep the integrity of the budget process going. I think it is very, very important that we all try to work through this thing. But if we are faced with this change in the scoring from the Congressional

Budget Office, I would like to see us find some waste, some duplication, and just some fat in the budget and come up with the money for our soldiers because I think it is so important.

I thank the gentleman for yielding. I have enjoyed working with him on various installation issues.

Mr. HAYES. Reclaiming my time, I could not agree more. We will find a way. It will be done. I thank our soldiers, sailors, airmen, Marines and Coasties.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to read into the RECORD the States and the specific military installations that have just had a guarantee of new housing for their military families taken away from them. Perhaps we will solve this another day. I have been trying to work for 6 months on a bipartisan basis to get this resolved. I am not sure this late in the Congress I have tremendous confidence that it will get resolved, but the real pity is that we could have resolved it today if the leadership had let go through the Committee on Rules the exact same rule we unanimously approved on the military appropriations bill just an hour ago.

The States that have just lost a chance because of this technicality that were allowed by the rule pushed by the leadership that will lose a guarantee to have new military housing for their service men and women are Alabama, Alaska, California, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, Virginia and Wyoming.

To add to the military installations I had already mentioned a few moments ago that will either have their housing frozen this year and, in fact, a promise broken to those military families or have their housing expected in 2006 to be delayed a year would include Fort Knox, Kentucky, 3,380 military families affected by this technical ruling. Fort Rucker in Alabama, 1,516 military families. Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, 1,580 military families. Keesler Air Force Base in Mississippi, 1,682 military families. New Mexico, Holloman Air Force Base, 1,440. Fort Gordon, Georgia, 872 families. Scott Air Force Base in Illinois, 475. MCB in Hawaii, Phase 1, 1,377 families will have their hopes for better housing dashed or delayed for a year or more. Camp Lejeune, an important Marine Corps installation in North Carolina, 838 families. In addition to an additional 3,516 families at Camp Lejeune that this year will have their new housing put on hold.

These are not just numbers and names, these are real men and women, real military families making unbelievable sacrifices in behalf of every family in this House and in our Nation that have just lost the opportunity because of an unfair rule opposed by numerous military organizations exer-

cised, as the gentleman had the right to exercise, just a moment ago a technicality to kill that dream of a new home.

It is a shame that dream has been killed today. I certainly urge those who perhaps did not want it to be taken care of today to work together, and I will pledge to work together in good faith with them to try to solve it in the months ahead, but there was no reason not to give this promise today to our military people. They do not ask to be delayed when they are asked to serve their country. When they are asked to go to combat, they go. When we had an opportunity to stand up for them, we should not have been AWOL. We should not have delayed. We should have taken action. That is what is the most shameful thing about what has happened today on this bill.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to have the opportunity to respond very briefly to the gentleman from Texas. First and foremost, he is a member of the Committee on the Budget. He has been working on this a long time, as many Members have. There are some challenges we are going to have to overcome, there is no question. I understand that there is some skepticism about the bill that was passed yesterday, but I would hope that the other body would recognize the fact that a bill that was passed with the unanimous support of the House of Representatives could be expedited and that we could send a very clear signal to our men and women in uniform as well as their families that are looking for housing, that are having to deal with in many instances, as the gentleman knows far better than I, substandard housing, that we could deal with this in a very expeditious manner, the way we did yesterday, in an appropriate way, in a legislative way, not in an extraordinary way.

I would hope that the other body would take this up as quickly and as expeditiously as the House of Representatives did. We can accomplish that. We can do it in a bipartisan way as it was done yesterday. And it can be on the President's desk in moments, without further action, without further ado, without having to make them wait or wonder.

The military construction bill that we are considering right now, its future, we could argue, is also uncertain, given the fact that just about every prognosticator of the appropriations process suggests that we will not be completing the appropriations process on time this year, either as 13 individual appropriation bills or even as an omnibus bill but that, in fact, we may have to live under a continuing resolution for some time.

So while there is uncertainty about military construction and other appropriation matters, there should not have to be concern or question about our military families and what needs to be

done as quickly as possible. It can be done expeditiously. It can be done using the vehicle that was passed yesterday by an overwhelming margin.

□ 2000

I would hope that other Members will not try any further delaying tactics for our men and women in uniform. I would hope that we can pass that bill as quickly as possible in the other body, that it will not be delayed, that it would enjoy the same kind of bipartisan support that we have here.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Appropriations Act, 2005".

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend Chairman KNOLLENBERG and the Military Construction Appropriations Subcommittee Staff once again for their hard work and efforts to produce an excellent bill for us to consider here today.

The importance of our willingness here in Congress to immediately and effectively take care of the needs of our men and women in the Armed Services, and to look after their families, certainly goes without saying. It does not matter whether they are located here at home protecting our homeland security, or whether they are directly in harm's way while serving abroad to serve their country. We must support them in every way that we possibly can.

This legislation represents a vital and immediate need for our troops and their families—to provide adequate and improved facilities for training and equipment; to provide better housing for these brave men and women, and their families, who unselfishly protect our national interests on a daily basis; to provide quality of life improvements such as chapels, child development centers, schools, and fitness centers; to better equip our hospitals and medical and dental facilities; for public safety and security here in our local communities; and to ensure the continued strength, construction and development of our overseas bases and our weapons systems that protect American interests.

The sacrifice that these men and women have made to this Nation demands our attention and steadfast support to help them do the job that they have chosen to do, and to better their lives in any way that we can find. Many of you are concerned that this bill contains an increase on the cap on Federal contributions to the Military Housing Privatization program from \$850 Million to \$1.3 Billion in this Fiscal Year. This money is urgently needed to fully fund family housing construction and maintenance, and to eliminate inadequate housing that our troops must live in. This funding directly supports two bases in my home State of Alabama, at Redstone and at Fort Rucker, and I want to rise in support of the men and women serving there.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to thank the Chairman for an excellent bill, and to urge its passage to fully support these men and women in our Armed Services.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this bill to provide for military construction in Fiscal Year 2005.

At a time when our Armed Forces are attempting to streamline and transform their operations, this bill provides crucial funding to

upgrade, maintain and construct the facilities necessary for this process.

One project of particular interest to me, and which I requested funds for, is a Houston Armed Forces Reserve Center, however, this project was not earmarked in the House bill.

The proposed facility will be designed for both Texas Army National Guard units and Marine Corps Reserve units.

Several existing National Guard facilities will either be vacated by this relocation, or remain-

ing units will be closer to their required space authorizations.

The vacated facilities will reduce the average age of existing facilities and lessen maintenance backlogs.

This facility will have a direct impact on soldier readiness by providing proper authorized space to conduct indoor training, reduce driving distances for a majority of the soldiers re-

siding in Houston, and provide modern facilities support for soldiers.

Additionally, this facility is in line with the military's goal of creating joint-use bases.

While the House bill did not provide an earmark for funding this project, I am hopeful that our appropriators will see fit to include this request in the conference report.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I submit the following for the RECORD:

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FY 2005 (H.R. 4837)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Enacted	FY 2005 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Military construction, Army.....	1,448,239	1,771,285	1,862,854	+414,615	+91,569
Rescissions.....	-183,615	---	---	+183,615	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-106).....	162,100	---	---	-162,100	---
Total.....	1,426,724	1,771,285	1,862,854	+436,130	+91,569
Military construction, Navy.....	1,238,458	1,060,455	1,081,042	-157,416	+20,587
Rescissions.....	-45,622	---	---	+45,622	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-106).....	45,530	---	---	-45,530	---
Total.....	1,238,366	1,060,455	1,081,042	-157,324	+20,587
Military construction, Air Force.....	1,067,751	663,964	797,865	-269,886	+133,901
Rescission.....	-23,000	---	---	+23,000	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-106).....	292,550	---	---	-292,550	---
Total.....	1,337,301	663,964	797,865	-539,436	+133,901
Military construction, Defense-wide.....	653,656	709,337	718,837	+65,181	+9,500
Rescission.....	-72,309	---	---	+72,309	---
Total.....	581,347	709,337	718,837	+137,490	+9,500
Total, Active components.....	4,583,738	4,205,041	4,460,598	-123,140	+255,557
Military construction, Army National Guard.....	311,592	295,657	394,100	+82,508	+98,443
Military construction, Air National Guard.....	222,908	127,368	180,533	-42,375	+53,165
Military construction, Army Reserve.....	88,451	87,070	116,521	+28,070	+29,451
Military construction, Naval Reserve.....	45,498	25,285	30,955	-14,543	+5,670
Military construction, Air Force Reserve.....	62,032	84,556	111,725	+49,693	+27,169
Total, Reserve components.....	730,481	619,936	833,834	+103,353	+213,898
Total, Military construction.....	5,314,219	4,824,977	5,294,432	-19,787	+469,455
Appropriations.....	(5,138,585)	(4,824,977)	(5,294,432)	(+155,847)	(+469,455)
Rescissions.....	(-324,546)	---	---	(+324,546)	---
North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program.....	169,300	165,800	165,800	-3,500	---
Rescission.....	-8,000	---	---	+8,000	---
Total.....	161,300	165,800	165,800	+4,500	---
Family housing construction, Army.....	383,591	636,099	636,099	+252,508	---
Rescission.....	-94,151	---	---	+94,151	---
Total.....	289,440	636,099	636,099	+346,659	---
Family housing operation and maintenance, Army.....	1,033,026	928,907	926,507	-106,519	-2,400
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-106).....	11,420	---	---	-11,420	---
Total.....	1,044,446	928,907	926,507	-117,939	-2,400
Family housing construction, Navy and Marine Corps....	184,193	139,107	139,107	-45,086	---
Rescission.....	-40,508	---	---	+40,508	---
Total.....	143,685	139,107	139,107	-4,578	---
Family housing operation and maintenance, Navy and Marine Corps.....	835,078	704,504	696,304	-138,774	-8,200
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-106).....	6,280	---	---	-6,280	---
Total.....	841,358	704,504	696,304	-145,054	-8,200
Family housing construction, Air Force.....	657,065	846,959	846,959	+189,894	---
Rescission.....	-19,347	---	---	+19,347	---
Total.....	637,718	846,959	846,959	+209,241	---

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FY 2005 (H.R. 4837)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Enacted	FY 2005 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Family housing operation and maintenance, Air Force...	816,074	863,896	854,666	+38,592	-9,230
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-106).....	6,981	---	---	-6,981	---
Total.....	823,055	863,896	854,666	+31,611	-9,230
Family housing construction, Defense-wide.....	350	49	49	-301	---
Family housing operation and maintenance, Defense-wide	49,440	49,575	49,575	+135	---
Department of Defense Family Housing Improvement					
Fund.....	300	2,500	2,500	+2,200	---
Rescission.....	-9,692	---	---	+9,692	---
Total.....	-9,392	2,500	2,500	+11,892	---
Total, Family housing.....	3,820,100	4,171,596	4,151,766	+331,666	-19,830
Chemical demilitarization construction, Defense.....	119,815	81,886	81,886	-37,929	---
Base realignment and closure account.....	370,427	246,116	246,116	-124,311	---
General provision (sec. 118).....	55,000	63,000	63,000	+8,000	---
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority.....	9,840,861	9,553,375	10,003,000	+162,139	+449,625
Appropriations.....	(9,812,244)	(9,553,375)	(10,003,000)	(+190,756)	(+449,625)
Emergency appropriations.....	(524,861)	---	---	(-524,861)	---
Rescissions.....	(-496,244)	---	---	(+496,244)	---

1/ The amount provided in this bill is \$1,205 million above the 302(b) suballocation due to a Congressional Budget Office (CBO) interpretation of the scoring of section 129. This section does not actually appropriate funds; appropriated amounts in this bill are within the 302(b) suballocation. The Committee is working with concerned parties to address CBO's scoring interpretation.

The CHAIRMAN. Having reached the end of the legislation, if there are no further amendments, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CAMP) having assumed the chair, Mr. BEREUTER, Chairman 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. 4837) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 732, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. OBEY. Unless the motion is adopted, Mr. Speaker, yes.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Obey moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 4837, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the bill forthwith with the following amendment:

"SEC. 129. Section 2883(g)(1) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking '\$850,000,000' and inserting '\$1,300,000,000'."

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the motion to recommit because it violates Section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, what this amendment attempts to do is to restore the language just stricken by the gentleman. If the gentleman insists on his point of order, then obviously once again the House will have missed an opportunity to provide housing for these 24,000 military families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair will rule.

The Chair finds that the instructions contained in the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) propose to amend existing law. The instructions, therefore, constitute legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI. The Chair also finds that the amendment contemplated by the motion to recommit proposes pending in excess of the pertinent allocation therefore under Section 302(b) of the Budget Act, as asserted by the point of order of the gentleman from Iowa.

The point of order is sustained, and the motion to recommit is not in order.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a subsequent motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman remain opposed to the bill?

Mr. OBEY. Unless the motion is adopted, Mr. Speaker, yes.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Obey moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 4837, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the bill promptly with an amendment increasing from \$850,000,000 to \$1,300,000,000 the limitation on military family housing privatization programs in 10 U.S.C. 2883(g)(1).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is recognized for 5 minutes on his motion.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, this is the last opportunity the House will have to do the right thing for 24,000 military families.

This motion to recommit instructs the Committee on Appropriations to report the bill back with the cap lifted by \$500 million for a total of \$1.35 billion. This does not incur any additional costs. It simply allows existing funds and other assets to be used for privatization.

The problem seems to be, as Members have pointed out, that CBO wants to charge these privately raised funds against the budget allocation, which does not make any sense to anyone who lives in the real world. Any Member who has visited a military base and seen family housing knows this is a real need. Raising the cap enjoys broad support on both sides of the aisle and the White House.

I urge Members to join in support of this motion to recommit and give military families the decent housing they deserve.

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

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

Just a few minutes ago my colleagues on the other side of the aisle said we should work together in the days and months ahead to try to ensure the promise to our military families of better housing. I suggest we start right now, and it would be very simple, and we can send a clear message out to our families who have loved ones in harm's way that right now we are going to guarantee them the quality housing they are expecting.

All we need to do is take basically the exact same language that the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) put together in the bill he wrote yesterday and passed yesterday, which, by the way, was an example of what the leadership in this House can do when it wants to do something. Let us just adopt that same language in the gentleman from Wisconsin's (Mr. OBEY) motion to recommit. It is the same language. What is the difference?

I tell the Members what the difference would be. If we would work together on a bipartisan basis right now not to object to this, we can send an important message to our troops out there and their loved ones that we are going to support them with better housing, especially during this time of war.

The language is the same. The gentleman's bill, H.R. 4879, that we passed yesterday that he talked about says we strike the number \$850 million and insert \$1.350 billion. The gentleman from Wisconsin's (Mr. OBEY) motion to recommit that is now before the floor says let us go from \$850 million to \$1.3 billion on the limitation of military housing privatization programs. What is the difference?

Let us work together right now. Let us do the right thing. Let us not let a technicality prevent us from doing the right thing for tens of thousands of military families. We can do it together. We do not have to wait a week, a month, and the possibilities of what might or might not happen then. We can do it right now. I urge this House to do so.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, to those who would cite the action taken by the House yesterday on the authorization bill, I would simply say that was not a substantive fix. That was a political fix, which is going nowhere because there is no assurance whatsoever that that bill will pass. This bill is a must-pass vehicle. That is why this provision ought to be attached to this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair wishes to clarify that the first motion to recommit, which was ruled out of order, violated section 302(f) of the Budget Act, as asserted by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE).

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit, very reluctantly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I agree wholeheartedly with the substance of what he is saying because we have been down that road so many times and had those discussions. The problem is I do not want to stop this bill from moving forward, and that is exactly what we would be doing as much as taking on a risk that we are not clear about what the resolution will be.

This motion would require the bill to go back to committee and would slow down the many important programs that we are trying to help. For this reason alone I must oppose this motion.

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, obviously I support the gentleman's opposition to the motion. Let me just point out as

well in support of his opposition that not only would it delay the military construction bill by sending it back to committee, because of the fact that we are going on recess as an example, it would postpone a decision about this because the gentleman, interestingly enough, complained about a technicality earlier. There is a technicality in this motion that Members need to be aware about. It is the words "promptly," and "promptly" means when we get around to it a little bit later, not forthwith, which means right away.

What we did yesterday is more than promptly. It happened yesterday. It is over in the Senate. They can take advantage of that opportunity and pass that bill immediately, not in some form later on.

So I appreciate the gentleman's opposing this method even though I know his heart may not be in it as much as mine has to be in this instance.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I appreciate what the gentleman said. I also take it from what he just said that he is going to be a player in this process as we go forward.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I have been a player in this process from the very beginning. And as I did yesterday, I intend to be do whatever I can to help move this issue along in its proper form and in the proper manner.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, could we come to the conclusion that it would resolve the problem and also eliminate the cap?

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I guess the gentleman could take that from the fact that I wrote the bill yesterday even though I know there were some who may have been surprised by that. I do not think there is a Member in this body that opposes housing for military families. We just need to do it in the right way.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, let us make every effort to do just that.

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

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

Let me simply point out to the gentleman from Iowa that the bill that the gentleman from Iowa is suggesting that we focus on is the bill that is going nowhere for the next 6 weeks either. The only difference between this bill and the bill that the gentleman is now purportedly supporting is that this bill will after the summer recess go somewhere. The bill the gentleman supported yesterday is going nowhere. That is a big difference to military families.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. OBEY. 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 clauses 8 and 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit H.R. 4837 will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 4837; adoption of the conference report to accompany H.R. 4613; motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Con. Res. 469; motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Con. Res. 467; motion to instruct on H.R. 1308.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 201, nays 217, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 416]

YEAS—201

Abercrombie	Gonzalez	Millender-
Alexander	Gordon	McDonald
Allen	Green (TX)	Miller (NC)
Andrews	Grijalva	Miller, George
Baca	Gutierrez	Mollohan
Baird	Harman	Moore
Baldwin	Hastings (FL)	Moran (VA)
Becerra	Herseth	Murtha
Bell	Hill	Nadler
Berkley	Hinchey	Napolitano
Berman	Hinojosa	Neal (MA)
Berry	Hoeffel	Oberstar
Bishop (GA)	Holden	Obey
Bishop (NY)	Holt	Oliver
Blumenauer	Honda	Ortiz
Boswell	Hookey (OR)	Owens
Boucher	Hoyer	Pallone
Boyd	Inlee	Pascarell
Brady (PA)	Israel	Pastor
Brown (OH)	Jackson (IL)	Payne
Brown, Corrine	Jackson-Lee	Pelosi
Butterfield	(TX)	Peterson (MN)
Capps	Jefferson	Pomeroy
Capuano	John	Price (NC)
Cardin	Johnson, E. B.	Rahall
Cardoza	Jones (NC)	Rangel
Carson (OK)	Jones (OH)	Reyes
Case	Kanjorski	Rodriguez
Chandler	Kaptur	Ross
Clyburn	Kennedy (RI)	Rothman
Conyers	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Cooper	Kilpatrick	Ruppersberger
Costello	Kind	Rush
Cramer	Kleczka	Ryan (OH)
Crowley	Lampson	Sabo
Cummings	Langevin	Sanchez, Linda
Davis (AL)	Lantos	T.
Davis (CA)	Larsen (WA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Davis (FL)	Larson (CT)	Sanders
Davis (IL)	Lee	Sandlin
Davis (TN)	Levin	Schakowsky
DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Schiff
DeGette	Lipinski	Scott (GA)
Delahunt	Lofgren	Scott (VA)
DeLauro	Lucas (KY)	Serrano
Deutsch	Lynch	Sherman
Dicks	Majette	Skelton
Dingell	Maloney	Slaughter
Doggett	Markey	Smith (WA)
Dooley (CA)	Marshall	Snyder
Doyle	Matheson	Solis
Edwards	Matsui	Spratt
Emanuel	McCarthy (MO)	Stark
Engel	McCarthy (NY)	Stenholm
Eshoo	McCollum	Strickland
Etheridge	McDermott	Stupak
Evans	McGovern	Tanner
Farr	McIntyre	Tauscher
Fattah	McNulty	Taylor (MS)
Filner	Meek (FL)	Thompson (CA)
Ford	Menendez	Thompson (MS)
Frank (MA)	Michaud	Tierney
Frost		Towns

Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky

Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler

Wilson (NM)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NAYS—217

Aderholt	Gerlach	Osborne
Akin	Gibbons	Ose
Bachus	Gilchrest	Otter
Baker	Gillmor	Oxley
Ballenger	Gingrey	Pearce
Barrett (SC)	Goode	Pence
Bartlett (MD)	Goodlatte	Peterson (PA)
Barton (TX)	Goss	Petri
Bass	Granger	Pickering
Beauprez	Graves	Pitts
Bereuter	Green (WI)	Platts
Biggart	Gutknecht	Pombo
Bilirakis	Hall	Porter
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Portman
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)	Pryce (OH)
Blunt	Hayes	Putnam
Boehlert	Hayworth	Radanovich
Boehner	Hefley	Ramstad
Bonilla	Hensarling	Regula
Bonner	Herger	Rehberg
Bono	Hobson	Renzi
Boozman	Hoekstra	Reynolds
Bradley (NH)	Hostettler	Rogers (AL)
Brady (TX)	Houghton	Rogers (KY)
Brown (SC)	Hulshof	Rogers (MI)
Brown-Waite,	Hunter	Ros-Lehtinen
Ginny	Hyde	Royce
Burgess	Isakson	Ryan (WI)
Burns	Issa	Ryun (KS)
Burr	Istook	Saxton
Burton (IN)	Jenkins	Schrock
Buyer	Johnson (CT)	Sensenbrenner
Calvert	Johnson (IL)	Sessions
Camp	Johnson, Sam	Shadegg
Cannon	Keller	Shaw
Cantor	Kelly	Shays
Capito	Kennedy (MN)	Sherwood
Carter	King (IA)	Shimkus
Castle	King (NY)	Shuster
Chabot	Kingston	Simmons
Chocola	Kline	Simpson
Coble	Knollenberg	Smith (MI)
Cole	Kolbe	Smith (NJ)
Cox	LaHood	Smith (TX)
Crane	Latham	Souder
Crenshaw	LaTourette	Stearns
Cubin	Leach	Sullivan
Cunningham	Lewis (CA)	Sweeney
Davis, Jo Ann	Lewis (NY)	Tancred
Davis, Tom	Linder	Tauzin
Deal (GA)	LoBiondo	Taylor (NC)
DeLay	Lucas (OK)	Terry
DeMint	Manzullo	Thomas
Diaz-Balart, L.	McCotter	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart, M.	McCrery	Tiahrt
Doolittle	McHugh	Tiberi
Dreier	McInnis	Toomey
Duncan	McKeon	Turner (OH)
Dunn	Mica	Upton
Ehlers	Miller (FL)	Vitter
Emerson	Miller (MI)	Walden (OR)
English	Miller, Gary	Walsh
Everett	Moran (KS)	Wamp
Feeney	Murphy	Weldon (FL)
Ferguson	Musgrave	Weldon (PA)
Flake	Myrick	Weller
Foley	Nethercutt	Whitfield
Forbes	Neugebauer	Wicker
Fossella	Ney	Wilson (SC)
Franks (AZ)	Northup	Wolf
Frelinghuysen	Norwood	Young (AK)
Gallegly	Nunes	Young (FL)
Garrett (NJ)	Nussle	

NOT VOTING—16

Ackerman	Greenwood	Meeks (NY)
Carson (IN)	Hart	Paul
Clay	Kirk	Quinn
Collins	Kucinich	Rohrabacher
Culberson	Lowey	
Gephardt	Meehan	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMP) (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 2038

Messrs. YOUNG of Alaska, BURGESS, TURNER of Ohio, TAUZIN, BURNS, COLE, and Mrs. MYRICK changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 1, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 417]

YEAS—420

Abercrombie	Cole	Gordon
Aderholt	Cooper	Goss
Akin	Costello	Granger
Alexander	Cox	Graves
Allen	Cramer	Green (TX)
Andrews	Crane	Green (WI)
Baca	Crenshaw	Grijalva
Bachus	Crowley	Gutierrez
Baird	Cubin	Gutknecht
Baker	Culberson	Hall
Baldwin	Cummings	Harman
Ballenger	Cunningham	Harris
Barkley (SC)	Davis (AL)	Hart
Bartlett (MD)	Davis (CA)	Hastings (FL)
Barton (TX)	Davis (FL)	Hastings (WA)
Bass	Davis (IL)	Hayes
Beauprez	Davis (TN)	Hayworth
Becerra	Davis, Jo Ann	Hefley
Bell	Davis, Tom	Hensarling
Bereuter	Deal (GA)	Herger
Berkley	DeFazio	Herseth
Berman	DeGette	Hill
Berry	Delahunt	Hinchey
Biggart	DeLauro	Hinojosa
Bilirakis	DeLay	Hobson
Bishop (GA)	DeMint	Hoefel
Bishop (NY)	Deutsch	Hoekstra
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Holden
Blackburn	Diaz-Balart, M.	Holt
Blumenauer	Dicks	Honda
Blunt	Dingell	Hooley (OR)
Boehlert	Doggett	Hostettler
Boehner	Dooley (CA)	Hoyer
Bonilla	Doolittle	Hulshof
Bonner	Doyle	Hunter
Bono	Dreier	Hyde
Boozman	Duncan	Inslee
Boswell	Dunn	Isakson
Boucher	Edwards	Israel
Boyd	Ehlers	Issa
Bradley (NH)	Emanuel	Istook
Brady (PA)	Emerson	Jackson (IL)
Brady (TX)	Engel	Jackson-Lee
Brown (OH)	English	(TX)
Brown (SC)	Eshoo	Jefferson
Brown, Corrine	Etheridge	Jenkins
Brown-Waite,	Evans	John
Ginny	Everett	Johnson (CT)
Burgess	Farr	Johnson (IL)
Burns	Fattah	Johnson, E. B.
Burr	Feeney	Johnson, Sam
Burton (IN)	Ferguson	Jones (NC)
Butterfield	Filner	Jones (OH)
Buyer	Flake	Kanjorski
Calvert	Foley	Kaptur
Camp	Forbes	Keller
Cannon	Ford	Kelly
Cantor	Fossella	Kennedy (MN)
Capito	Frank (MA)	Kennedy (RI)
Capps	Franks (AZ)	Kildee
Capuano	Frelinghuysen	Kilpatrick
Cardin	Frost	Kind
Cardoza	Gallely	King (IA)
Carson (OK)	Garrett (NJ)	King (NY)
Carter	Gerlach	Kingston
Case	Gibbons	Kleczka
Castle	Gilchrest	Kline
Chabot	Gillmor	Knollenberg
Chandler	Gingrey	Kolbe
Chocola	Gonzalez	Kucinich
Clyburn	Goode	LaHood
Coble	Goodlatte	

Lampson	Oliver	Shimkus
Langevin	Ortiz	Shuster
Lantos	Osborne	Simmons
Larsen (WA)	Ose	Simpson
Larson (CT)	Otter	Skelton
Latham	Owens	Slaughter
LaTourette	Oxley	Smith (MI)
Leach	Pallone	Smith (NJ)
Lee	Pascarell	Smith (TX)
Levin	Pastor	Smith (WA)
Lewis (CA)	Payne	Snyder
Lewis (GA)	Pearce	Solis
Lewis (KY)	Pelosi	Souder
Linder	Pence	Spratt
Lipinski	Peterson (MN)	Stark
LoBiondo	Peterson (PA)	Stearns
Lofgren	Petri	Stenholm
Lucas (KY)	Pickering	Strickland
Lucas (OK)	Pitts	Stupak
Lynch	Platts	Sullivan
Majette	Pombo	Sweeney
Maloney	Pomeroy	Tancredo
Manzullo	Porter	Tanner
Markley	Portman	Tauscher
Marshall	Price (NC)	Tauzin
Matheson	Pryce (OH)	Taylor (MS)
Matsui	Putnam	Taylor (NC)
McCarthy (MO)	Radanovich	Terry
McCarthy (NY)	Rahall	Thomas
McCollum	Ramstad	Thompson (CA)
McCotter	Rangel	Thompson (MS)
McCrery	Regula	Thornberry
McDermott	Rehberg	Tiahrt
McGovern	Renzi	Tiberi
McHugh	Reyes	Tierney
McInnis	Reynolds	Toomey
McIntyre	Rodriguez	Towns
McKeon	Rogers (AL)	Turner (OH)
McNulty	Rogers (KY)	Turner (TX)
Meek (FL)	Rogers (MI)	Udall
Meeks (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen	Udall (NM)
Menendez	Ross	Upton
Mica	Rothman	Van Hollen
Michaud	Roybal-Allard	Velázquez
Millender-	Royce	Visclosky
McDonald	Ruppersberger	Vitter
Miller (FL)	Rush	Walden (OR)
Miller (MI)	Ryan (OH)	Walsh
Miller (NC)	Ryan (WI)	Wamp
Miller, Gary	Ryun (KS)	Waters
Miller, George	Sabo	Watson
Mollohan	Sánchez, Linda	Watt
Moore	T.	Waxman
Moran (KS)	Sanchez, Loretta	Weiner
Moran (VA)	Sanders	Weldon (FL)
Murphy	Sandlin	Weldon (PA)
Murtha	Saxton	Weller
Musgrave	Schakowsky	Wexler
Myrick	Schiff	Whitfield
Nadler	Schrock	Wicker
Napolitano	Scott (GA)	Wilson (NM)
Neal (MA)	Scott (VA)	Wilson (SC)
Nethercutt	Sensenbrenner	Wolf
Serrano	Sessions	Woolsey
Ney	Shadegg	Wu
Northup	Shaw	Wynn
Norwood	Shays	Young (AK)
Nunes	Sherman	Young (FL)
Nussle	Sherwood	
Oberstar		

NAYS—1

Obey

NOT VOTING—13

Ackerman	Gephardt	Paul
Carson (IN)	Greenwood	Quinn
Clay	Kirk	Rohrabacher
Collins	Lowey	
Conyers	Meehan	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 2046

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4613, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of agreeing to the conference report on the bill, H.R. 4613.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 12, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 418]

YEAS—410

Abercrombie	Cramer	Harman
Aderholt	Crane	Harris
Akin	Crenshaw	Hart
Alexander	Crowley	Hastings (FL)
Allen	Cubin	Hastings (WA)
Andrews	Culberson	Hayes
Baca	Cummings	Hayworth
Bachus	Cunningham	Hefley
Baird	Davis (AL)	Hensarling
Baker	Davis (CA)	Herger
Baldwin	Davis (FL)	Herseth
Ballenger	Davis (IL)	Hill
Barrett (SC)	Davis (TN)	Hinchey
Bartlett (MD)	Davis, Jo Ann	Hinojosa
Barton (TX)	Davis, Tom	Hobson
Bass	Deal (GA)	Hoefel
Beauprez	DeFazio	Hoekstra
Becerra	DeGette	Holden
Bell	Delahunt	Holt
Bereuter	DeLauro	Honda
Berkley	DeLay	Hooley (OR)
Berman	DeMint	Hostettler
Berry	Deutsch	Houghton
Biggart	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hoyer
Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hulshof
Bishop (GA)	Dicks	Hunter
Bishop (NY)	Dingell	Hyde
Bishop (UT)	Doggett	Inslee
Blackburn	Dooley (CA)	Isakson
Blumenauer	Doolittle	Israel
Blunt	Doyle	Issa
Boehlert	Dreier	Istook
Boehner	Duncan	Jackson (IL)
Bonilla	Dunn	Jackson-Lee
Bonner	Edwards	(TX)
Bono	Ehlers	Jefferson
Boozman	Emanuel	Jenkins
Boswell	Emerson	John
Boucher	Engel	Johnson (CT)
Boyd	English	Johnson (IL)
Bradley (NH)	Eshoo	Johnson, E. B.
Brady (PA)	Etheridge	Johnson, Sam
Brady (TX)	Evans	Jones (NC)
Brown (OH)	Everett	Jones (OH)
Brown (SC)	Farr	Kanjorski
Brown, Corrine	Fattah	Kaptur
Brown-Waite,	Feeney	Keller
Ginny	Filner	Kelly
Burgess	Flake	Kennedy (MN)
Burns	Foley	Kennedy (RI)
Burr	Forbes	Kildee
Burton (IN)	Ford	Kilpatrick
Butterfield	Fossella	Kind
Buyer	Frank (MA)	King (IA)
Calvert	Franks (AZ)	King (NY)
Camp	Frelinghuysen	Kingston
Cannon	Frost	Kleczka
Cantor	Gallely	Kline
Capito	Garrett (NJ)	Knollenberg
Capps	Gerlach	Kolbe
Capuano	Gibbons	LaHood
Cardin	Gilchrest	Lampson
Cardoza	Gillmor	Langevin
Carson (OK)	Gingrey	Lantos
Carter	Gonzalez	Larsen (WA)
Case	Goode	Larson (CT)
Castle	Goodlatte	Latham
Chabot	Gordon	LaTourette
Chandler	Goss	Leach
Chocola	Granger	Levin
Clyburn	Graves	Lewis (CA)
Coble	Green (TX)	Lewis (KY)
Cole	Green (WI)	Linder
Cooper	Gutierrez	Lipinski
Costello	Gutknecht	LoBiondo
Cox	Hall	Lofgren