

ought to make that call and maybe we should not rush into more bad judgments like Cecil Field.

Last year, this House by over a 100-vote margin passed the 2-year delay to BRAC. Now we have even more troops coming home from Korea and Iraq. We have agreed finally to grow the Army and the Marine Corps. Where are we going to put these folks if we are closing bases? And how many more mistakes like Cecil Field are we going to rush into just for the sake of doing something, even if it is wrong?

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment, and I rise in support of it.

We could go through a list of all of the problems that will be created, but let me just paint a picture here. At Fort Monmouth in New Jersey, there are really the best people in the world, mostly civilians, engineers, scientists, procurement specialists, providing communications, surveillance, tracking friendly forces and unfriendly forces, providing equipment, services, software that men and women in the field in Iraq and Afghanistan need and use every day. Thousands of jobs will be sent elsewhere.

Now picture this: A commander in Iraq places an emergency call back to the U.S. The insurgents have changed the electronics in the roadside bombs, the IED devices, and they need new electronics to detect and disarm them. The reply, "I am sorry, that guy does not work here anymore. We are in the middle of realignment and we have not hired his replacement yet."

Repeated 5,000 times, "That guy does not work here anymore," that is what is at stake here. The gentleman from Arkansas says there is never a good time, there are no bad bases; this is a terrible time.

I can talk about the economic impact of moving jobs away from Fort Monmouth or to some other place. That is not the point. There are soldiers in the field. We are to look after their safety and effectiveness. The Secretary of the Army himself said before the BRAC Commission this past week that they have concerns whether those civilians, those experts with security clearance, with advanced degrees, with specialties, will make the move. How many years of reduced capability can we tolerate while we have men and women in the field?

This is a terrible time to proceed. Let us admit that we have gotten off on the wrong track, slow it down and look after the interests of the people in the field.

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman

from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) 2 minutes.

(Mr. UDALL of New Mexico asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I thank the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY) for his hard work on this important issue and support the amendment today.

This amendment simply postpones the implementation of the Pentagon's BRAC recommendations until we have a more thorough inventory of our military assets and priorities. This is entirely appropriate and necessary, considering the number of operations our Armed Forces are currently engaged in around the world.

As we have heard, we are at war. I have great concern about the Pentagon's ability to adequately assess our needs and assets while there are so many soldiers abroad and while the Pentagon awaits recommendations and reviews pertaining to almost all of its branches of service.

My concern about the Pentagon's ability to adequately assess their needs is further heightened by their recommendation to close Cannon Air Force Base. This recommendation demonstrates to me that they have failed to adequately collect and interpret the facts. Cannon Air Force Base is the home of the 27th Fighter Wing and offers the Air Force and its pilots unrestricted air space and bombing ranges in which to train just off the runways. This is a rarity in today's Air Force as more and more bases experience increasing encroachment. Cannon has zero encroachment.

In addition, the Pentagon did not take into account the New Mexico Training Initiative, which is expected to be approved soon. This initiative would make Cannon's air space wider and taller and allow for training at supersonic speeds, another rarity today.

If we lose this air space, we lose it forever. I urge my colleagues to support the Bradley-Herseth amendment.

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD).

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Bradley amendment. I do not believe that the Department of Defense's BRAC recommendations were based on facts and future threats, and I believe this amendment is critical to ensuring that we understand the security environment in which we are making BRAC decisions.

The Department of Defense's recommendations continue an irrational and dangerous assault on New England that would leave it as an undefended region of our Nation.

□ 1800

The proposals would close the best performing shipyard in the country, Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, a facility that actually saves the Navy money by

completing its work ahead of schedule and under budget. They would realign Brunswick Naval Air Station, the last active military airfield in the Northeast, despite being described as critical to our national security by the Department of Defense. And they would close one of the most cost-efficient and innovative facilities in the Defense Finance and Accounting Service system located in Limestone, Maine.

Worst of all, the BRAC Commission and the affected communities do not even have the detailed information used by the Department of Defense to formulate their proposal. The delay by DOD in releasing the data to the BRAC Commission and local communities is an outrage. It calls into question the credibility of the process. And from reviewing the limited information that DOD has submitted, it turns out that some of the data used by DOD is actually inaccurate. BRAC is not an experiment for testing theories. Once we lose these assets, we cannot bring them back.

Mr. Chairman, our national security is at stake. We must move cautiously when we use these facts to justify our actions, and we must allow the critical actions outlined in this amendment to take place to make sure we understand our future threats before we close any of our key military assets.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, let me say that I very much support the Bradley amendment. At a time when American troops are dying on a daily basis in Iraq, we simply cannot afford to disrupt the military framework that our soldiers rely on every day to help them in their mission and to keep them alive.

I want to say last week I listened to the BRAC hearings and I saw the commissioners ask many questions related to the fact that our military are now in combat. The Pentagon could not answer many of the more important questions that were asked by the BRAC commissioners. This was not the case in previous BRAC rounds. I have been here since 1988, and I have now been through three or four BRAC rounds. The fact of the matter is there were many unanswered questions regarding the future of our military, and it is simply not the right time to be shutting down military facilities here at home. If you listened to the BRAC last week and you listened to the questions, you could see why in fact the Bradley amendment makes sense.

I want to mention one thing about my base, Fort Monmouth, that was