

support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY), despite the compelling testimony offered by a number of Members about the fact that we still have a lot of information outlying that should come to us within the upcoming months, within the year, including the Quadrennial Defense Review, that would actually help the BRAC commissioners to evaluate the DOD's recommendations for those installations that they have submitted on a list for recommendations of closure and realignment.

But the Jones amendment says, okay, if we are not going to do that, if we are not going to postpone the BRAC rounds to get all of the information from the overseas base closures, from the QDR, getting troops home from Iraq and Afghanistan, dealing with the maritime issues, dealing with homeland defense and civil support directives, then let us at least say in fairness and for a process that should be open and transparent as opposed to emulating litigation discovery processes here, give us the information as Members of Congress, the task force and the communities, the commissioners now that are supposed to be evaluating these recommendations.

How can we expect them to do that in a process that is supposed to be open and transparent, when piecemeal by piecemeal the Department of Defense is releasing this information as opposed to releasing it in a more comprehensive way, as was done in the last BRAC round in 1995?

Let me give an example. Last night right before we voted on the Bradley amendment, we received word, the offices for South Dakota here and over in the Senate and in the community of Rapid City, that the Department of Defense had just released some additional information.

Here we thought we have what we need to start assessing and evaluating these recommendations. Most of this information had already been released. We have less than 10 percent of what we need. Less than 10 percent of what we need, just a couple of weeks out from our regional hearing to begin evaluating what drove the Department of Defense's evaluation to rank Ellsworth Air Force Base the way they did, and how they applied the criteria.

We cannot make our case, and there are people in Rapid City, South Dakota, with the task force in support of Ellsworth Air Force Base that have been working for years in anticipation of this day, and we are not willing to slow this process down enough to get adequate and comprehensive information from the Department of Defense?

It is clear that either they were so under the gun to meet the deadline of May 13 that they did not adequately plan or have enough time to determine what it was that was going to have to be classified or declassified before releasing the information, either in the aggregate or installation by installation.

If the reason for that is primarily for national security reasons because we are at war, that justifies slowing this process down at least a little bit so the Department of Defense is forced to release this information that we have had in past BRAC rounds so it is in fairness to the communities and really faithful to the BRAC process which is to be open and transparent and allow communities to make their best case before the commissioners prior to the site reviews, prior to the regional hearings.

I encourage my colleagues, while Members may have had reservations last night, to postpone the BRAC round awaiting all of the other information. Can we not at least slow it down enough to ensure that the Department of Defense is accountable to each and every one of us and our constituents and our military installations to get that information to ensure a fair, open, and transparent process? I hope Members will agree and support the Jones amendment.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I just wanted to comment on what the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH) said. In the last BRAC round in 1995, we had all of the information to back up the Pentagon's recommendations within a few days. It is almost 2 weeks now since the base closure list came out. I think it was the Friday before last.

As the gentlewoman mentioned, we are still lacking most of the background information for these recommendations.

For example, in the case of Fort Monmouth, which is represented by me and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), the recommendation says that to close Fort Monmouth and move it would cost \$822 million and that over the next 6 years, annually, there would be a savings of about \$143 million.

We do not have the background information that the Pentagon used to make those kinds of number-crunching decisions. The number-crunchers have not given us that kind of information. How are we supposed to prepare for a site visit next week, or regional hearings in early July, without having that information?

It is simply inappropriate, and it certainly has not been the case in the past. I have been through three previous BRAC rounds, and that was never the case. That is why the Jones amendment is so important. And particularly when the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) references military value, this is all about military value.

In the case of Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, we are an electronics and communications command for the Army. We basically back up the soldier in the field with equipment that is electronic or related communications. Our point that we have been trying to make is if you close Fort Monmouth over the next few years, that commander in the

field who might need some communications or electronics equipment in the next few days or the next few weeks will not have access to it because Fort Monmouth is in the process of moving and people will not be available to do what is necessary for the soldier in the field.

How can the Pentagon make recommendations and not take that into mind? We have no indication of how they address that issue because we do not have the backup data. That is why this amendment is important. I urge my colleagues on a bipartisan basis to support it.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to elaborate very briefly on the preceding remarks. We are talking about a time when men and women are risking their lives in the field, facing roadside bombs and mortar fire from insurgents. They need help and support from back here in the United States, from our bases, from places such as, as my colleague from New Jersey was talking about, Fort Monmouth, for example.

We are not looking so much for the data on what is the implication of base closing and realignment on local economies. We are looking for the data on how the Pentagon intends to provide for the needs of the men and women in the field today, tomorrow and next year, how they will make up for any loss of capability that results from realignment and transfer of personnel.

In order to have a conscientious evaluation of what is being proposed here, we need the data. It is as simple as that. I applaud the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) for offering this amendment and demanding that we get the information that we need to do our job.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TIAHRT

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TIAHRT:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to promulgate regulations without consideration of the effect of such regulations on the competitiveness of American businesses.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) reserves a point of order.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, in this legislation, the Military Quality of Life and VA appropriations, much of the work, especially for construction and maintenance, are governed by rules and regulations. A good example of the problem this can create occurred in Wichita, Kansas, not too long ago