

□ 1100

The rule provides that the original proponent of an amendment included in such amendments en bloc may insert a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately before the disposition of the amendments en bloc.

The rule also allows the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to recognize for consideration any amendment printed in the report out of the order printed, but not sooner than 30 minutes after the Chairman of the Armed Services Committee or his designee announces from the floor a request to that effect. Lastly, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of this rule and the underlying legislation. Yesterday, I believe we had a good discussion about the importance of the underlying legislation, and the rule passed overwhelmingly. The same facts that were true yesterday remain so today.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly proud about the way the rules for the fiscal year 2007 National Defense Authorization Act have been structured. Let's have a minute to review the facts here. The underlying legislation had broad bipartisan agreement, passing the committee by a vote of 60-1.

Between the subcommittee and the full committee, the Armed Services Committee passed 75 amendments, 36 of those by Republican authors, 38 by Democrats, and one bipartisan amendment. Out of the 100 amendments submitted to the Rules Committee, we made 31 in order, 15 Republican, 13 Democrats and two bipartisan.

In addition, six amendments were incorporated into the manager's amendment.

Today, we may well hear that the amendment process was arbitrary and unfair, but the facts do not support the claims. This legislation proceeded through regular order. We will have a vigorous discussion today, and the amendments in order will allow either side to improve and perfect the defense authorization further.

As usual, minority rights are protected by allowing a motion to recommit with or without instructions. This process has been open, thorough and fair. While not every amendment was made in order, all were considered. Only nine of the 60-odd amendments that were not included were actually raised by the minority for consideration in the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I spoke about the importance of four long-term challenges relating to national security and how this bill addresses them. Additionally, I drew attention to the fact that our deployed servicemen and women rely on this legislation to directly support their efforts in our Global War on Terror.

Nothing said today will change these facts. Today is really the day we should be focused on uniting as Americans and supporting our troops in the

field. No one piece of legislation is ever perfect. Today is no exception. But today we have a very good piece of legislation that was crafted in a bipartisan way through regular order.

At the end of this debate, the House will have considered over 30 percent of all submitted amendments on the floor. The others were previously considered at the committee level. There are no irregularities here.

While we will no doubt have some spirited disagreements on some amendments, including some not brought to the floor, this bill is, at its core, an example of bipartisan cooperation and consensus.

The Members of the minority who serve on the House Armed Services Committee have praised the committee chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) for its inclusiveness and have said that the legislation we are considering today deserves to pass. When all is said and done, it will pass by an overwhelming bipartisan majority. That is something in which this House, the American people and, more importantly, our men and women in uniform can take pride.

Mr. Speaker, realizing the facts surrounding the fiscal year 2007 National Defense Authorization Act, I urge the support of the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, listening to my colleague's remarks, he certainly made it clear how proud he was of the bipartisanship in that committee. And so should we all be.

But all bipartisanship ended when this came to the Rules Committee. Of course it was an overwhelming vote. They have nine members, we have four. The tragedy here is that major amendments that Democrats wanted were not allowed to be heard today, very important things that we want to do.

For example, the ranking member, Mr. SKELTON, was denied an amendment. The minority whip, Mr. HOYER, was denied an amendment. And so, Mr. Speaker, through you, I want to ask Mr. COLE if he will grant me a unanimous consent request so that I can amend H. Res. 811 and add several important Democratic amendments not allowed under this restrictive rule.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, when Speaker HASTERT was in the chair, he said by unanimous consent that we can easily do this. The amendments we want to add back are: A Skelton amendment that helps military families with prescription drug costs; an Israel amendment that calls for religious sensitivity by our military chaplains; an important Hoyer amendment on alternative energy; a Capps amendment to be able to defend her district against a nongermane provision in the bill; and a McGovern amendment to close down the School of the Americas.

I ask if he will yield me that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield to the gentlewoman from New York for the purpose of a unanimous consent request?

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. No, Mr. Speaker, I do not. Those matters can be dealt with on a motion to recommit.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Then because of the unfairness of this and the importance of this, and because this country is at war, and because you have shut out major debate on this bill, I move the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman reserves her time. A motion to adjourn is not debatable.

The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 68, noes 336, answered “present” 1, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 138]

AYES—68

Ackerman	Frank (MA)	Obey
Allen	Grijalva	Oliver
Baird	Hastings (FL)	Otter
Berkley	Honda	Owens
Berman	Israel	Pascarell
Berry	Jackson-Lee	Pastor
Blumenauer	(TX)	Pelosi
Boehlert	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Brown, Corrine	Jones (OH)	Sabo
Capps	Lantos	Sánchez, Linda
Capuano	Larsen (WA)	T.
Carson	Lee	Schakowsky
Case	Lewis (GA)	Sllaughter
Clay	Lowey	Solis
Cleaver	Lynch	Stupak
Conyers	Maloney	Taylor (MS)
Costa	Markey	Towns
Crowley	McDermott	Velázquez
DeGette	McNulty	Wasserman
Delahunt	Miller (NC)	Schultz
Dingell	Miller, George	Waters
Doggett	Nadler	Watson
Engel	Napolitano	Waxman
Filner	Neal (MA)	

NOES—336

Abercrombie	Boehner	Cantor
Aderholt	Bonilla	Capito
Akin	Bonner	Cardin
Alexander	Bono	Carnahan
Andrews	Boozman	Carter
Baca	Boren	Castle
Bachus	Boswell	Chabot
Baker	Boucher	Chandler
Baldwin	Boustany	Chocola
Barrett (SC)	Boyd	Clyburn
Barrow	Bradley (NH)	Coble
Bartlett (MD)	Brady (PA)	Cole (OK)
Barton (TX)	Brady (TX)	Conaway
Bass	Brown (OH)	Cooper
Bean	Brown (SC)	Costello
Beauprez	Brown-Waite,	Cramer
Becerra	Ginny	Crenshaw
Biggart	Burgess	Cubin
Bilirakis	Burton (IN)	Cuellar
Bishop (GA)	Butterfield	Culberson
Bishop (NY)	Calvert	Cummings
Bishop (UT)	Camp (MI)	Davis (AL)
Blackburn	Campbell (CA)	Davis (CA)
Blunt	Cannon	Davis (FL)

Davis (KY)	Kelly	Pryce (OH)
Davis (TN)	Kennedy (MN)	Putnam
Davis, Jo Ann	Kildee	Radanovich
Davis, Tom	Kilpatrick (MI)	Rahall
Deal (GA)	Kind	Ramstad
DeFazio	King (IA)	Rangel
DeLauro	King (NY)	Regula
Dent	Kingston	Rehberg
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kirk	Reichert
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kline	Renzi
Dicks	Kolbe	Reyes
Doolittle	Kucinich	Reynolds
Doyle	Kuhl (NY)	Rogers (AL)
Drake	LaHood	Rogers (KY)
Dreier	Langevin	Rogers (MI)
Duncan	Larson (CT)	Rohrabacher
Edwards	Latham	Ros-Lehtinen
Ehlers	LaTourette	Ross
Emanuel	Leach	Rothman
Emerson	Levin	Roybal-Allard
English (PA)	Lewis (CA)	Royce
Eshoo	Lewis (KY)	Ruppersberger
Etheridge	Linder	Ryan (OH)
Everett	LoBiondo	Ryan (WI)
Farr	Lofgren, Zoe	Ryun (KS)
Fattah	Lucas	Salazar
Ferguson	Lungren, Daniel	Sanders
Fitzpatrick (PA)	E.	Schiff
Flake	Manzullo	Schmidt
Foley	Marchant	Schwartz (PA)
Forbes	Marshall	Schwarz (MI)
Fossella	Matheson	Scott (GA)
Fox	Matsui	Scott (VA)
Franks (AZ)	McCarthy	Sensenbrenner
Frelinghuysen	McCaul (TX)	Serrano
Gallegly	McCollum (MN)	Sessions
Garrett (NJ)	McCotter	Shadegg
Gerlach	McCrery	Shaw
Gibbons	McGovern	Shays
Gilchrest	McHenry	Sherman
Gillmor	McHugh	Sherwood
Gingrey	McIntyre	Shimkus
Gohmert	McKeon	Shuster
Gonzalez	McKinney	Simmons
Goode	McMorris	Skelton
Goodlatte	Meehan	Smith (NJ)
Gordon	Meek (FL)	Smith (WA)
Granger	Meeke (NY)	Snyder
Graves	Melancon	Sodrel
Green (WI)	Mica	Spratt
Green, Al	Michaud	Stark
Green, Gene	Millender	Stearns
Gutierrez	McDonald	Strickland
Gutknecht	Miller (FL)	Sullivan
Hall	Miller (MI)	Sweeney
Harman	Miller, Gary	Tancredo
Harris	Mollohan	Tanner
Hart	Moore (KS)	Tauscher
Hastings (WA)	Moore (WI)	Taylor (NC)
Hayes	Moran (KS)	Terry
Hayworth	Murphy	Thomas
Hefley	Murtha	Thompson (CA)
Hensarling	Musgrave	Thompson (MS)
Herger	Myrick	Thornberry
Herseth	Neugebauer	Tiahrt
Higgins	Ney	Tiberi
Hinojosa	Northup	Tierney
Hobson	Norwood	Turner
Hoekstra	Nunes	Udall (CO)
Holden	Nussle	Udall (NM)
Holt	Oberstar	Upton
Hooley	Ortiz	Van Hollen
Hostettler	Osborne	Visclosky
Hoyer	Pallone	Walden (OR)
Hulshof	Paul	Walsh
Hunter	Payne	Wamp
Inglis (SC)	Pearce	Watt
Inslie	Pence	Weiner
Issa	Peterson (MN)	Weldon (PA)
Jackson (IL)	Peterson (PA)	Weller
Jenkins	Petri	Westmoreland
Jindal	Pickering	Wexler
Johnson (CT)	Pitts	Wicker
Johnson (IL)	Platts	Wilson (NM)
Johnson, Sam	Poe	Wilson (SC)
Jones (NC)	Pomeroy	Wolf
Kanjorski	Porter	Wu
Kaptur	Price (GA)	Young (AK)
Keller	Price (NC)	Young (FL)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Lipinski

NOT VOTING—27

Buyer	Feeney	Istook
Cardoza	Ford	Jefferson
Davis (IL)	Fortenberry	Kennedy (RI)
DeLay	Hinchey	Knollenberg
Evans	Hyde	Mack

Moran (VA)	Saxton	Weldon (FL)
Oxley	Simpson	Whitfield
Pombo	Smith (TX)	Woolsey
Sanchez, Loretta	Souder	Wynn

□ 1128

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 138 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall no. 138 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, on May 11, 2006, I was absent for the following procedural votes. Had I been present, I would have voted:

Rollcall No. 137, on motion to adjourn, "nay";

Rollcall No. 138, on motion to adjourn, "nay."

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5122, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members that Mr. COLE of Oklahoma has 24 minutes remaining and Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York has 28 minutes remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, every day the thousands of men and women who are based in the United States and elsewhere protect our borders, defend our national security, and ensure our peace of mind. Many of them have been deployed around the world, to Iraq and elsewhere. They have performed their duties with honor and I want them to know that we have the highest regard and respect for them.

□ 1130

The men and women of our Armed Forces have entered into a sacred covenant with this Nation. They have pledged to place their lives on the line for us, and in return, we have promised to give them the tools they need to fulfill their promise and the respect worthy of someone willing to make the ultimate sacrifice for this country.

The underlying legislation for this rule represents the embodiment of our commitment to the troops, and while I know the overall bill enjoys bipartisan support, including mine, I must point out that this morning I believe the leadership of this body has betrayed that covenant.

It seems that just 1 week after passing a so-called reform bill with no teeth, the majority is back to their same old tricks, arrogantly preventing debate and consideration of critical measures that improve the bill and the lives of the people serving this Nation.

They even prevented the distinguished ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. SKELTON, from offering an amendment to his own defense bill. The Skelton amendment would have prevented the copays for medication for our military and their families from going up, which they will if this bill is passed without the Skelton amendment, but the Republican leadership refused to make it in order.

For those Americans who are not familiar with the Rules Committee, and I expect that is most of them, and how it works, what that effectively means is that a select few in the Republican leadership have decided what the entire Congress and the entire Nation and what the men and women in uniform will get. They decided that on their own, without even a vote on the House floor, without the debate and consideration of this full body.

Given the rhetoric we hear on this floor every day about the troops and how important they are, I feel compelled to ask my friends in the majority to justify how in less than 24 hours after they approved \$70 billion in tax cuts for the wealthy, how they could refuse to allow us to even consider a measure to improve the health care of our troops and their families. We owe our troops more respect than this.

It is for similar reasons that many of my Democratic colleagues and I are concerned with section 590 of this bill. The section removes a long-standing requirement in our military code that requires chaplains to exhibit a level of tolerance, compassion and understanding towards the religious diversity of the soldiers to whom they administer counsel. Can you imagine that, Mr. Speaker? We are taking away the idea that they should serve with tolerance, compassion and understanding; it was too inflammatory.

I should say, Mr. Speaker, that I am confident our chaplains have both the sense and the respect for their fellow soldiers to do this and to do it willingly. But why would this majority lower that standard and expect anything less from our chaplains, as they clearly do?

We have soldiers of every faith and no faith fighting for us under the American flag. They all deserve our respect, particularly in moments of great despair or need. Is this majority so arrogant as to suggest that they should micromanage how a chaplain administers faith on a battlefield? I can think of few things more offensive or absurd.

My friend, Mr. ISRAEL, offered an amendment to the bill that would have corrected the problem, restoring the requirement that all chaplains demonstrate sensitivity, respect and tolerance, but Mr. ISRAEL's amendment was tossed out the window, along with common sense on this issue. It has been forbidden by the leadership from even being considered on the floor today.

As was an amendment from Representatives TIERNEY and LEACH which