

or whether they were being honest in their representations, the fact of the matter is that a Member's view of a bill does in fact change in light of the action on a previous amendment or a motion to recommit or some other action that might occur.

So, as I said to the gentleman last week, the situation substantively changes. It may be the same bill, but it is a bill that has been subjected to an alternative amendment.

Then the Member who is opposed to the bill at that time without that amendment being considered, that amendment fails, the Member is put in a different position. He or she then has to make a judgment, do I support or oppose this bill as it now is and as I have failed to perfect it with an amendment.

So I suggest to the gentleman, who has now raised it a second time in a row, and I frankly thought it had been resolved, that he is wrong in his premise, he is wrong under the rules, and I would hope that we could put this behind us.

I would certainly hope, and the gentleman who chairs the Rules Committee is on his feet, that we could allow these amendments; that we could allow, as the gentleman so often when he was in the minority asked to have done, allow these amendments to be considered in a fair and open debate and subject them to a vote. So that in a democratic body, in the People's House, they could be voted on up or down.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman was fully within the rules and fully within his rights and did exactly the only thing that he was given the opportunity to do in order to raise an important issue in this democratic forum.

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

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is sort of interesting that, as I have stood here earlier this week during debate, I have had my intentions questioned by Members on the other side of the aisle throughout this week. Throughout hours of debate yesterday, people were questioning my intentions as we were looking at the issue of lobbying and ethics reform.

Having said that, I think it is very important to note that when we were in the minority, about which my friend is speaking, we were often denied even an opportunity to offer a motion to recommit on legislation. Time and time again that happened. When we won the majority in 1994, we provided a guarantee that members of the minority would be able to offer a motion to recommit.

We knew full well this opportunity would come forward, and Mr. LAHOOD was simply asking of the Chair whether or not under the precedents it is appropriate for a Member to stand up, state

their opposition to a measure that is about to be voted on, and then offer a motion to recommit. Those precedents were stated.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the Speaker indicated it was within the rules and within the precedents. In fact, the precedents were numerous times that Republicans rose and did exactly the same thing for exactly the same reasons.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 5018

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 5018.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR H.R. 5122, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules may meet the week of May 8 to grant a rule which could limit the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 5122, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007. The Committee on Armed Services ordered the bill reported on Wednesday, May 3, and is expected to file its report with the House on Friday, May 5.

Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies of the amendment and one copy of a brief explanation of the amendment to the Rules Committee up in room H-312 of the Capitol by 12 noon on Tuesday, May 9. Members should draft their amendments to the bill as ordered reported by the Committee on Armed Services, which will be available on the Web sites of both the Committees on Armed Services and Rules by Friday, May 5.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are drafted in the most appropriate format and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

□ 1445

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come. I yield to my friend, Mr. BOEHNER.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague for yielding.

Next week, Mr. Speaker, the House will convene on Tuesday at 12:30 for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will have several measures under suspension of the rules, a list of which will be sent to Members'

offices by the end of the week. Any votes on those measures on Tuesday will be rolled until 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday and the balance of the week, the House will likely consider H.R. 5122, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2007 from the Armed Services Committee. As Mr. DREIER just mentioned, the committee reported the bill yesterday, and I expect this to be considered on Wednesday and Thursday.

Now, there will be no votes next Friday, but Members should be aware that Thursday we could go well into the evening. And so while Friday is already scheduled for a day in session, I think we can complete our work on Thursday, and that will be our goal.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the majority leader for that information for our Members.

Mr. Leader, do you expect any energy bills on the floor next week dealing with any facet of the crisis that confronts our citizens?

Mr. BOEHNER. We expect that H.R. 5143, the hydrogen relief bill, which was reported by the Committee on Science, could be up next week. And we can expect additional energy votes in the coming weeks.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information.

Let me ask you further, Mr. Leader, do you expect the telecom bill to be ready for floor consideration next week?

Mr. BOEHNER. I would have hoped it would have been up this week, but there is a jurisdictional dispute that is being sorted out; and until it is, we are unable to schedule it for floor action.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information.

With respect to the budget, the fiscal year 2007 budget, we are now 3 weeks beyond the point when we should have had a conference report adopted under the rules. Yet we have not had the House version of the budget on the floor yet. Do you expect the budget to be on the floor anytime in the near future?

Mr. BOEHNER. I hope so.

Mr. HOYER. I know you hope so. But my question was, do you expect so?

Mr. BOEHNER. I hope so. We are continuing to work with our Members, some of whom want to spend more money, some of whom want to spend less money. And until we come to some resolution of those talks, I cannot give you any further information on when the budget resolution will be up.

Mr. HOYER. We hope that you can come to some agreement in the near term.

Mr. BOEHNER. I do too.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Leader, the tax reconciliation conference and the pension conference, we have heard something about the tax reconciliation conference perhaps having reached agreement.

Can you tell me the status of those two conferences and when we might expect to consider the tax reconciliation

conference and/or the pension conference?

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, there is a tentative agreement on the tax reconciliation bill between the House and the Senate, tentative to an agreement on a second bill that would consider the extender items, issues that clearly would not fit within the tax reconciliation bill. There is no agreement on that second bill, and so all of this is still under discussion.

There was a meeting of the principals, both Democrat and Republican, members of the conference on pensions last night. We are continuing to work on that, and it is my hope in the next several weeks that both of those issues will be ready for floor action.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. I am glad. I did not know that the principals had met. I know you and I had had a discussion previously about the conference meeting with all of the conferees present, or at least both sides present, both the Democratic side and the Republican side, the majority side present as well. We hope that occurs. The leader said that would occur. We appreciate that.

Clearly you and I in particular, and I know you in particular, are very concerned about the pension conference. You have spent a lot of time working on that piece of legislation, know it well. Clearly many, many people in America, many businesses, many individuals are very focused on that, are very concerned about the status of their pensions.

So we are hopeful that particular bill can move in a positive way in the near term.

Mr. BOEHNER. I think the gentleman realizes that I have spent about 6 years trying to bring real pension reform to protect American working men and women's pensions. And the House and Senate have acted. There have been several months of conversations that have yielded, frankly, little results.

Now, I remain very optimistic that there will be a bill, but some of the principals involved are also involved in the tax reconciliation and the tax extenders conference which is complicating a lot of the discussions on the pension bill.

But I do expect, over the next couple of weeks, a lot of this to be sorted out.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the leader. I know that all of us hope that the leader's optimism is justified by results. I thank the gentlemen.

Mr. BOEHNER. The glass is always half full.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for not singing today.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 796) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 796

Resolved, That the following named Member be and is hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE.—Ms. Matsui.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RULES OF THE HOUSE

(Mr. LAHOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to notify the House and you, Mr. Speaker, that when the rules are violated, when it is very clear that the rules are violated, I intend, on a regular basis, to make note of that for the record.

I take the point that the gentleman from Maryland makes. And he and I talked about it. And I take the point that I have talked to the Parliamentarian about this. I think his point is a good point. I think if there are Members who feel that they didn't get an opportunity to offer an amendment, or to have their say on a bill, then maybe we ought to change the motion to recommit to an opportunity for any Democrat Member to stand up and offer an amendment on the bill.

But my point is, we have rules. And we are being criticized and lectured to every day around here about the fact that people don't like the way the Rules Committee operates, or about the rules. And my point is, if we have rules, we should abide by them. All Members should.

So I want the Members of the House, and I want you, Mr. Speaker, to know that I am going to continue to pursue this. But I am also going to pursue, at the beginning of the next session, a way to change the rules to reflect an opportunity for the minority party to have their say on a bill.

But until that happens, I believe we should follow the rules. I have no doubt that the gentleman from Maryland, who is a man of the House and understands the rules, would want us to abide by the rules.

I will be happy to yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to assure him that when we are in the majority next January, we are going to consider very carefully your proposal. The fact of the matter is that when I said both Republicans and Democrats have pursued this procedure, and when the Chair has ruled that they are acting within the rules, as the Chair has now done both times that the gentleman raised the issue, that we will understand, and perhaps better than we did in 1994, having served in the minority now for 12 years, we will better understand the frustration that is engendered by the failure to give to the minority its full

opportunity to place on the floor and have debated fully and having a vote on an alternative that they believe is superior to the bill offered by the majority.

We better understand that frustration, but I will tell you that the gentleman from California, the chairman of your Rules Committee, rose and said he complained bitterly as a member of the minority. You remember that. I remember that. We have been here for some period of time. We understand that frustration.

But we also understand that repeatedly members of your party pursued the same process and were, as our members have been, held to have been in order. And for you to repeatedly raise this, raises, I tell my friend, and he is my friend, it raises the issue of the integrity of the Member making the order.

We believe it is within the rules. We have been ruled in order. I think that continuing to pursue this simply raises the motivation of the Member. I know you don't believe that. I know you are not raising that. That is not your intent. But it seems to me that is its effect.

I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would hope we could resolve this and move on.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, my final point is this: when I raise this point of order, in no way do I impugn the motives of any Member. I have respect for every Member here, and I think Members know that.

And I do. They are freely elected. They can come to the floor. My point is, we have rules. We should abide by them. When we don't, I am going to raise a point. I thank the Chair.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 8, 2006, AND HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, MAY 9, 2006

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, May 9, 2006, for morning hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.