homeland against intercontinental ballistic missiles. It is clear that North Korea was using these missiles for coercion and intimidation, and I would ask that we neutralize their ability to do that and bring critical protection to Americans and our homeland by fully supporting the GMB system we currently have.

Now, I would yield to the chairman if he has any thoughts.

Mr. MURTHA. I appreciate what the gentleman is saying. We don't know where the cuts would come from, whether they're critical research or not, and I would ask the gentleman, we're just as concerned as you are about missile defense. We're trying to make sure we have the adequate amount, and in conference, we will take another look at it.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, in sincere and due respect, if the concern were as great as mine, this $97.2 million would not have been cut.

I move the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. MURTHA. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. INSLEE

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. INSLEE:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to waive or modify regulations promulgated under chapter 43, 71, 75, or 77 of title 5, United States Code.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MURTHA. If the gentleman would yield, we have no problem with the amendment.

Mr. INSLEE. Thank you. I just note Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. JONES and I are offering this amendment to protect our civil workers, and thanks to the Chair for his consideration of this issue.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment to defund the National Security Personnel System, NSPS.

The Comptroller General of the United States, David Walker, and the staff at the Government Accounting Office, GAO has analyzed the development of NSPS. In published reports and testimony before Congress, Mr. Walker has criticized the manner in which the Department of Defense, DOD, has failed to effectively manage the design and implementation of NSPS.

On July 16, 2007 GAO released a report supporting Defense unions' contention that DOD has been underestimating the cost of implementing NSPS. According to the report, GAO found that DOD's November 2005 estimate that it will cost $158 million to implement NSPS "does not include the full cost that the department expects to incur as a result of implementing the new system."

The report also concluded that the total amount of funds the department spent on NSPS during fiscal years 2005 and 2006 cannot be determined because DOD has not established an effective oversight mechanism to ensure that all these costs are fully captured. Because of this extreme mismanagement, we will never know how much DOD spent trying to implement NSPS, although the total amount likely runs into the billions of dollars.

For this, and many other reasons, Congress should not provide funding for the implementation of this misguided endeavor.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to join my colleagues Representative JAY INSLEE and Representative WALTER JONES in offering this important bipartisan amendment today.

Our Federal workforce is comprised of hardworking public servants who deserve respect on the job and fairness in matters of personnel. Over the past several years, it has become increasingly clear that the Defense Department's alternative human resources regime known as the National Security Personnel System (NSPS) provides neither—and therefore should not be supported in this legislation.

The NSPS was originally authorized in the FY 2004 Defense authorization bill at the request of the political leadership in the Pentagon with the understanding that the new authority would be exercised consistent with congressional intent and in consultation with the legitimate representatives of the Nation's 700,000 DoD workforce. For all intents and purposes, that hasn't happened. The Pentagon has, for example, ignored Congress' requirement that an independent entity arbitrate certain disputes between management and labor. And DoD has brushed aside provisions mandating the use of a merit system protection board with independent judgment.

As a consequence, the NSPS has been mired in lawsuits, and this House has now acted twice to curtail the program: first, by passing an essentially identical limitation amendment by voice vote during consideration of last year's Defense appropriations bill; and second, by effectively eliminating authority for the NSPS in this year's Defense authorization legislation. If that weren't enough, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) recently reported that it couldn't even figure out how much money the Defense Department was actually spending on the NSPS because "DoD has not established an effective oversight mechanism to ensure that all these costs are fully captured."

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues' support for this amendment.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. CASTLE

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment pertaining to leave.

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point or order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania reserves a point of order.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 16 offered by Mr. CASTLE:

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

SEC. 8110. Funds made available under title II of this Act shall be used to credit each member of the Armed Forces, including each member of a reserve component, with one additional day of leave for every month of the member's most recent previous deployment in a combat zone.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I'm informed that the point of order will probably be upheld here, but I would like to make this point before I withdraw the amendment.

Today, all members of the Armed Forces, including those serving in the Guard and Reserves, receive two-and-a-half days of leave time per month, regardless of whether they're deployed in Iraq or back in the U.S. or at their home base.

My amendment would simply credit soldiers one additional day of leave time for every month that they are deployed in a combat zone, and this could be used when they return Stateside. We learned this from speaking to a soldier in particular by e-mail and to soldiers more specifically about it, and realized that with some of the mental health problems which are going on, the extra leave time, not time on standby but actual leave time, would be good as far as our soldiers are concerned, and so decided we wanted to push it.

We tried to do it in the Tauscher bill a couple of days ago, and unfortunately, the Rules Committee did not accept it. And I tried to put it in this Defense appropriations bill, and I realize it might have limitations as far as the point of order is concerned.

But I think it's an important question, and I just wanted to appeal to the chairman and to the ranking member to consider this perhaps in conference, perhaps at some other time, perhaps somebody else can borrow it. I just believe it's something we ought to be thinking about doing for our soldiers who have been called back on a fairly repetitive rotating basis. In my judgment, they would benefit from this extra leave time.