

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week House Republicans voted to pass the fiscal year 2007 House budget resolution. I was pleased to support a reasonable budget that will fund our top priorities, continue our program policies, and increase accountability within Federal Government programs. I was especially pleased to see this budget will help cut the Federal deficit in half by 2009 without implementing any tax increases.

Yet, in keeping with their record of being the party of no, Democrats voted “no” on this budget. They voted “no” to even the smallest attempts on holding the line on spending, and they voted “no” to reforming outdated and ineffective government programs. You see, Democrats would rather just raise taxes on hardworking families.

Mr. Speaker, you can rest assured that House Republicans are going to continue to work to keep taxes low and maintain the pro-growth economic policies that have created 32 consecutive months of job growth. After all, if there is something we should all be saying “no” to, it is the Democrats’ tax and spend mentality.

REVEALING THE TRUTH

(Mr. EMANUEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, sometimes it takes a heated exchange to reveal the truth. People say things they would not normally say, or reflect their true thinking.

For instance, while debating the budget the other night, a member of the Republican leadership said, “If you earn \$40,000 a year and have a family of two, you don’t pay any taxes.” Well, that would be news to that middle-class family.

According to the Center of Budget and Policy Priorities, middle-class families paid an average of 13.6 percent of their income in Federal taxes in 2003. Additionally, these hardworking families pay State income taxes, property taxes, gasoline taxes, and sales taxes. If anything, middle-class families are paying too much in taxes.

But the truth serum clearly did not wear off, because the next day the same member of the Republican leadership sent out a press release titled “Fiscal Responsibility is Not an Option in This House.”

After 5 years of record budget deficits of \$3 trillion in new debt, for a total of \$9.6 trillion of debt, never were truer words spoken in that press release.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the truth about the Republican Congress has finally come out. Now the American people have a choice between leadership and the Republican Party that cuts taxes on the wealthy and leaves trillions of dollars of debt for the rest of us.

As Ronald Reagan once said, “Facts are a stubborn thing.” Mr. Speaker, it is time for a change. It is time for new priorities. It is time to give the people back their House.

HONORING CAMERON STAY

(Mr. PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a friend of mine, Cameron Stay, a friend from Henderson, Nevada. Cameron has been an inspiration for me. We had a chance to meet recently. He experienced a tragic motorcycle accident just a few months ago.

Cameron is a friend of Nevada and a friend of the country. He is a Green Valley High School graduate from Henderson, Nevada, in my district and has a college degree in criminal justice. He also was a firefighter with the BLM and with the Hotshots 777 group and worked for TAB Construction.

I mention Cameron today because he is an inspiration for me as a Member of Congress. As we look at issues ranging from world peace to education to health care to children and families, Cameron has been that inspiration for his courage, his enthusiasm, and his will to live a full life. He truly represents what this country is about; and today I would like to recognize Cameron and his mother, who is here today, Denise Olson and her husband, Stan, who are in the audience, and say thank you for sharing with us your son as an inspiration for us as Members of Congress.

SECURING OUR BORDERS

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on Monday night, President Bush demonstrated his commitment to securing our country. By placing thousands of National Guard troops on our borders, he will help decrease illegal border crossings, stop drug trafficking, and prevent terrorism. As a veteran of the National Guard, I know our troops are well prepared to assist temporarily with this critical mission.

In December, the House of Representatives passed legislation to prevent illegal crossings by addressing the hiring of illegals and gaining control of our borders.

As the House and Senate now work to find a long-term solution to America’s immigration problem, House Republicans will continue to fight to ensure securing our borders remains the first priority. We will resist any frivolous lawsuits and protect American families.

In conclusion, God bless our troops and I will never forget September 11.

CONGRATULATING LESLI McCOLLUM GOOCH

(Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, occasionally we have an opportunity to come to the floor to celebrate something. Lesli McCollum Gooch has been my legislative director for over 3 years. She began her service on Capitol Hill in the fall of 1999 as a Congressional Fellow for Marge Roukema of New Jersey. At the conclusion of the fellowship, Lesli served as Representative Roukema’s legislative director until the congresswoman retired at the end of the 107th Congress.

Lesli has been working on her Ph.D. for 10 years. She began working as a Graduate Fellow at Carl Albert Congressional Research and Study Center at the University of Oklahoma. In 1998, Lesli joined the University of Oklahoma’s Institute of Public Affairs. She received a Master’s in political science from the University of Oklahoma in 1999.

Leslie defended her dissertation on April 10, 2006, and graduated with her Doctorate of Philosophy degree on May 12, 2006.

Mr. Speaker, I will not call her “Doctor,” but do as I do, call her “Fudd” when you see her.

0915

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5385, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, MILITARY QUALITY OF LIFE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 821 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 821

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5385) making appropriations for the military quality of life functions of the Department of Defense, military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived except for title IV. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment

has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN). The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 821 is an open rule. It provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee. It waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. Under the rules of the House, the bill shall be read for amendment by paragraph. This rule waives points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI prohibiting unauthorized appropriations or legislative provisions in an appropriation bill, except as specified in the resolution. It authorizes the Chair to accord priority and recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and it provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 821 and the underlying bill, H.R. 5385, the Military Quality of Life and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2007.

First, I want to thank and recognize Chairman WALSH and Chairman LEWIS for all of the work they have put into this bill. The committee did a great job of staying within the framework of the President's budget request and ensuring the needs of our veterans, those currently serving and their families.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying bill totals \$136.1 billion, which is an increase of almost \$14 billion over last year's level, more than 10 percent. Of this \$136 billion, the bill provides \$41.4 billion in mandatory spending and \$94.7 billion in discretionary spending.

The bill provides \$77.9 billion for veterans' programs, marking approximately a 10 percent increase over the 2006 enacted level. Particularly important is the \$32.7 billion for veterans' medical services, 11 percent more than the 2006 enacted level and \$38 million above the President's request.

Additionally, the committee followed the recommendations of various veterans groups to make sure more funds are provided to meet the needs of veterans returning from combat in Iraq and Afghanistan. I must also empha-

size to the veterans back home in the 11th Congressional District of Georgia, northwest Georgia particularly, and all across this country, that this bill does not, I want to repeat, it does not contain any new fees for veterans' medical services or prescription drugs. It does, however, increase mandatory veterans' benefits by \$4.2 billion over the 2006 level.

So, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5385 also includes significant increases in funding to improve the lives of our veterans and their families. It provides an additional \$25 million to open a minimum of 10 new community based outpatient clinics and an additional \$20 million to make facility improvements to existing State veterans' homes.

Further, this bill increases basic medical research by \$13 million; and it includes an additional \$12 million to begin upgrades to VA medical research facilities nationwide.

In regards to military construction, this bill provides \$10.6 billion: \$5.6 billion for active duty construction, a billion dollars in construction for our reserve components, and \$4 billion for the construction of housing for our servicemembers and their families.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5385 provides \$21 billion, an increase of \$1 billion over current levels, to fund the health defense program allowing for the ongoing preparation of our brave soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines, while caring for their families back home.

Without question, we are again in a tough budget year; and while the underlying bill may not be perfect, it does ensure that scarce resources are allocated in the most effective, efficient and responsible manner possible.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to this debate. I encourage my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me this time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. MATSUI asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, the rule before us will allow the House to consider the fiscal year 2007 Military Quality of Life and Veterans Administration Appropriations bill. All Members know that the support in this bill for military housing, for veterans' health care, and for retiree benefits is part of the promise we made to the men and women when they joined our Armed Forces.

As we consider this bill, there should be little disagreement over the tremendous demands being placed on the Veterans Administration and on the military construction accounts.

In 1995, the VA treated 2.6 million veterans and their families. By the end of this year, that number will have

more than doubled to an estimated 5.4 million people. This places additional stress on the many hospitals and the VA network. These World War II-era buildings are badly in need of upgrades at the cost of billions over the next 5 to 10 years.

It was for this reason, increased strain in time of war, that the Democrats have consistently criticized the administration's less-than-adequate funding for veterans and veterans' health care.

Last year, the administration admitted to accounting errors which underestimated the demand for veterans' services by \$3 billion in fiscal years 2005 and 2006. It turned out that the administration had failed to account for the new veterans, those returning from the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. After Democrats, the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans and many other veterans organizations expressed outrage, steps were taken retroactively to address the shortfall.

With that backdrop, this year's appropriations bill does increase veterans' medical services by \$2.6 billion over last year's amount. Unfortunately, it does so by employing a budget gimmick.

This year's shortsighted budget did not provide full funding to meet this Nation's veterans' health care needs in a time of war. So the Military Quality of Life Appropriations Subcommittee was forced to boost money for veterans using money originally designated for military housing and then pay for military housing by declaring that money emergency funding.

In truth, it was no emergency. It was simply a shell game that ignored the principle of shared sacrifice upon which our Nation has relied in every other time of war, except this one. These budget gimmicks should come as no surprise. Even to the casual observer, this majority has shown disregard for budget matters. After all, 3 years into the Iraq War, the administration and this majority continue to fund it with "emergency spending."

We are using a credit card to pay for war and sending the bill to our children and our grandchildren. Nonetheless, it must be noted that the only reason this bill comes close to meeting the health needs of so many veterans is because of this gimmick. And the bill pays for construction of some housing for military families, but again only because of this gimmick. Many Members on both sides of the aisle are frustrated with this approach.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government cannot go back on our responsibility to support our troops, assist their families, and continue our commitment to the veterans. This responsibility is particularly important in a time of war. With troops fighting the war in Iraq, they should not be the only ones to make sacrifices; they must be shared by all Americans. No loopholes for a select few, no kicking

the can down the road for another generation to deal with by way of increasing the national debt.

In cities and towns across America, our constituents notice when Congress uses these gimmicks. My local paper, in fact, hit on this very theme of sacrifice in time of war earlier this week, and I include for the RECORD an editorial from the Sacramento Bee. Its title says it all: "Where's the Sacrifice." I could not agree more.

[From the SACRAMENTO BEE, MAY 16, 2006]

WHERE'S THE SACRIFICE?

The Republican majority in Congress wants to go into the November elections bragging that they've cut taxes again. The House and Senate just extended record-high Bush tax cuts until 2010. They call it a political victory.

Will the American people really buy this one-note chant again?

It represents the triumph of rigid ideology over practical reality.

At a time of war, these members of Congress are demanding sacrifice only of the young people fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan. The tax cuts of 2001, 2002 and 2003 have given us record-high deficits and debt, driving this country into a financial mess political leaders are passing on to future generations.

The tax cutters rely on two fallacious arguments.

The first is the "starve the beast" idea. Tax cuts, the theory goes, will reduce government revenues and choke off government spending, making government smaller. Even conservative economists now reject that hypothesis. For example, economists William Niskanen and Peter Van Doren of the Cato Institute show convincingly that since 1981, for each one percentage point decline in tax revenues, federal spending increases by about one-half percent of GDP. Government spending grows because tax cuts make government look cheaper than it actually is, so people want more of it. A tax increase does a better job of reducing government because it forces people to pay for government services.

At least "starve the beast" proponents were honest in saying that tax cuts would reduce government revenues.

Today you have members of Congress actually saying the opposite: "Lower tax rates equal more federal revenue." The facts show otherwise. Bush tax cuts have contributed to revenues dropping in 2004 to the lowest level as a share of the U.S. economy since 1950. Where revenues typically have been 17 percent to 20 percent of the economy, in 2004 they were 16.3 percent, according to the Congressional Budget Office.

A CBO report, "Analyzing the Economic and Budgetary Effects of a 10 Percent Cut in Income Tax Rates," shows that a 10 percent cut in income tax rates lowers revenues by \$775 billion over 10 years.

So when tax cut proponents say that tax cuts benefit the Treasury, take it with a grain of salt.

The tax cut vote was a party line vote. Voters know whom to blame for the nation's financial mess come November.

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Quality of Life and Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for his leadership on getting this rule together and also to Chairman DREIER and the members of the Rules Committee for their help and support.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that we can be very proud of. After all, we are a Nation at war, and the way we treat our veterans of past wars is a very clear signal to our current active duty people as to how they will be treated in the future. And the commitments we have made in the past are being met in this bill.

One of the key issues always in the Military Quality of Life and Veterans Affairs Appropriations bill is veterans' medical care, the Veterans Health Administration. We have provided almost a 13 percent increase in veterans' medical care in this bill, a remarkable increase, although consistent with the last 6 or 7 years where we have dramatically ramped up funding.

No other budget within the Federal Government's entire purview has received the increases that the Veterans Health Administration has.

Clearly Congress, especially the House, establishes its priorities by the funds it provides, it allocates, it appropriates on the discretionary side of the budget. If that is any indication, our commitment to our Nation's veterans is the highest priority of the House of Representatives and indeed the Congress.

We have also provided additional resources for the benefits administration to make sure that we bring down the time frames that veterans are forced to wait until their benefits issues are resolved. We are working on reducing those delays.

We have also mandated that the Veterans Administration create a minimum of 10 new veterans' outreach clinics. This is part of the CARES Commission statement. People all over the country, veterans all over the country, are benefiting from these new veterans' clinics. The quality of health care has improved dramatically. We are getting to the veterans much sooner, and the process that they follow, they can be treated at the clinics or, if it is a more serious health issue, they can then be referred to the hospital.

□ 0930

But we are getting veterans into the system much sooner, and the view on the part of veterans and their service organizations is that this is a very important major improvement and breakthrough in veterans care. Additionally, we provided more money for mental health.

One of the real focuses of this subcommittee has been not only mental health, which it has been, but also the transition from active duty to veterans status. What we found is that because of the difficulties, very serious challenges to find a safe place for our soldiers in Afghanistan or in Iraq, many

of them are coming back with very serious mental health issues, post-traumatic stress disorder and other issues that have caused great stress on the soldier, sailor, airman, marine and their families, additionally, when they return.

One of the things that we will require is that all of our active duty people enter into a dialogue with our mental health professionals within the service while they are active in the field.

Currently, if a soldier has a concern about their mental health, or they are upset or they are depressed or they are anxious about things and they want to get some advice, they have to voluntarily go forward, step forward. People worry about a stigma. How does that affect my record in the future if I go and seek out help?

What we have stated, stipulated in this bill, is that every one of our active duty people will have, as part of their service, a regular routine of working with mental health professionals, psychiatrists, psychologists, counselors, so that there is no stigma, that everybody is in the mix. That way we think that our folks who are in very stressful situations, very dangerous situations, will be more at ease in how they go about getting this very important aspect of their health in order.

Additionally, this subcommittee is responsible for the defense health, TRICARE for Life, et cetera. While the increase is not as substantial as it is in veterans, it is a healthy increase. My view is that as we go forward into conference with the Senate, hopefully we will be able to add additional resources within the defense health portion of this budget to make sure that we are meeting needs.

Our subcommittee traveled last year to Europe. We visited Landstuhl hospital in Germany. It is truly remarkable the quality of care that our soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines are receiving there.

In the field, the Medevac units, the quality of care in the combat zone is beyond description. It is that good. In the history of war, there has never been health care like we are providing today. We can be very proud of that. But we have to make sure that the resources are there, that they are allocated to make sure that those needs are met.

One last point, and that is on the military construction, we have a lot of money in this bill to roll out the 2005 BRAC. The Army, which is very dependent upon this, asked us to get as much money forward as we could, so we did. That was a priority for us, Army is going through transformation, they are going through BRAC. We have people moving from Europe to the U.S., from one place in Asia to another, from places in Asia back to the U.S., and it is all part of this process.

We want to make sure that they had the resources up front so that they could get this moving and meet the commitments that they have made,

not only to us, to the taxpayers, but to the troops.

As I said at the outset, Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that we can all be very, very proud of. It has been a bill that we have worked very closely on in a bipartisan way with my opposite number on the Democratic side, Mr. EDWARDS, we have collaborated well.

I would like to, just again, thank the Rules Committee for the rule.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of representing over 40,000 soldiers from Texas who have fought for our country in Iraq. I have one of the larger veterans populations in America, and that is why I am grateful to have the privilege to work with Chairman WALSH in my position as ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Quality of Life and Veterans Affairs.

I will talk about the substance of the bill that will be on the floor in a few moments after the rule debate is over. But let me just list four reasons why I oppose this particular rule to bring our bill to the floor.

First, as I understand this rule, it could possibly leave as much as a half a billion dollars in vital military construction programs during a time of war at risk to a technical point of order on this floor. This whole issue evolved late last night, so perhaps someone could clarify this.

I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, Republican and Democratic alike, to not use such a technical budget question to put at risk critical infrastructure that is needed to support our troops during a time of war; whether they are serving here at home, or they are in Iraq, Afghanistan or elsewhere.

I don't understand why the Rules Committee, which on a daily basis, bill after bill after bill, bills that are far less important than supporting our veterans or military troops, military construction and defense health care, that the Rules Committee waives technical points of order on a routine basis. I am not sure if my understanding is correct why they didn't do the same for something as important as half a billion dollars investment in military infrastructure.

The second reason I oppose this rule and urge my colleagues to vote against this rule is that the Obey amendment was not allowed. The Obey amendment would have protected that \$500 million of military construction funding by paying for it, following the pay-as-you-go principle, rather than putting it under emergency spending, which could allow Members of this House potentially to strike that crucial funding.

Secondly, I was disappointed the Rules Committee refused to protect my amendment that I intended to bring on this bill today, that would have brought defense health care spending back up to the level that President

Bush said is needed this year to maintain the quality of care for our troops and our retirees that Mr. WALSH referenced, and that we all should have a right to be proud of.

As a consequence of that Rules Committee decision, we could end up passing this bill today at a funding level that is \$735 million below administration's designation of what is needed to maintain military health care quality this year. That could be a tragedy to have any risk of reducing military health care services, especially during the time of war.

The next reason I oppose this rule is that Congressman FARR's amendment was not protected. It was an amendment that was going to add \$1.8 billion to veterans programs, important veterans programs. I will talk later in cooperation with Chairman WALSH about what I think is good in this bill for veterans and some of the increases for veterans health care spending, which he and I and members of the committee all supported.

But Mr. FARR wanted to go a step further and say we should not be freezing VA research, health research dollars. He wanted to say it is not right to say to a combat veteran who is making \$29,000 a year, that you weren't wounded in combat, you haven't earned the right to get VA health care in a VA hospital because you are too wealthy.

That is kind of ironic, because just earlier this week, the House voted to give Lee Raymond, the just retired ExxonMobil CEO who got a \$400 million retirement package, gave him a \$2 million dividend. Mr. FARR wanted to say if we can give Mr. Lee Raymond of ExxonMobil and all of his hundreds of millions of dollars of platinum parachute retirement programs, a \$2 million dividend tax cut, shouldn't we be able to say to veterans making \$30- or \$35,000 a year, you too have earned the right to get VA health care, along with other veterans?

Mr. FARR wanted to have an amendment that enforced the law that we passed on a bipartisan basis in the late 1990s that said the VA shouldn't reduce the number of beds for veterans nursing home care.

These amendments don't take away any good things from the amendment of the bill, which I will talk about during the bill's debate. But my objection is with the Rules Committee setting one standard for unimportant bills that will, for partisan reasons, and unimportant reasons, will waive technical points of order on bills coming to this floor and do it routinely.

Yet when we come to amendments intended to try to guarantee military construction during a time of war, intended to try to help more veterans get better health care and nursing home care, the Rules Committee, on a partisan basis, said, no, we are not going to allow Democrats to have those kinds of amendments offered and protected on the floor.

For all of those reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule today.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, before yielding to my good friend from Texas, Judge CARTER, talking about concerns that he has, I want to make sure that all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle understand that the committee, for the first time ever, for the first time ever, used a veterans service organization's independent budget as a baseline for this fiscal 2007 funding, and essentially adopted the veterans' group recommendations to increase funds by 6.3 percent.

In regard to defense health, the defense health program is increased by \$1 billion over the last year. So the total funding of \$21 billion for defense health is the same as the budget request.

I want to also say, Mr. Speaker, that I had the distinct honor of traveling last summer with subcommittee chairman WALSH, as we visited some of our cemeteries in Europe, at Anzio and Normandy, our fallen soldiers in World War II and also Bella Woods, for the Marines that fell during World War I.

To see the compassion of Chairman WALSH and what he and our colleagues that served, that have the honor of serving on his committee, on both sides of the aisle, was a moving, moving experience for me. I know how important the work of this subcommittee is.

I commend Members on both sides of the aisle for their hard work in bringing this good budget. I wish we could do more, but I think the compassion is there on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to rise to say that one of the great blessings in my life that has been bestowed upon me is that I have been given a district now where we have almost 50,000 of the people who stand on the wall and defend our Nation, Fort Hood, Texas.

It has made me realize the real duty that we have to the American soldier, the American military personnel. Being on this subcommittee and being able to try to do what is good for these men and women who give their duty, honor, to our Nation every day, is a great blessing to me personally.

This bill that we have got here today is an honest attempt, within the resources, to do a great job for our military. I think, quite frankly, we have done a great job.

I would urge, and I listened to what Mr. EDWARDS had to say. Mr. EDWARDS and I worked together. He also is a very good friend of Fort Hood.

I would urge my colleagues, as they look at, as we proceed in this debate, that they, first and foremost, keep in mind that soldier, sailor, airman and marine, that stand on the wall every day and defend this Nation's freedom. As they look for technical challenges and other things that may occur, hopefully, will be corrected, that they will take that soldier's best interest in mind first.

This is, if there is a piece of legislation that goes to the Congress at any time, that thinks about the individual guy carrying a rifle, this is it.

□ 0945

If we can, we have to; and we must make sure they have the best health care, the best living facilities, the best facilities on post, the best equipment, the best that we can give them. I think we have done our very best to do that, and so I rise to speak on behalf of the American soldier and ask this House to keep the American soldier in mind in this debate.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas to respond to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, let me make two comments.

First, let me say I fully associate myself with the views expressed by my friend and colleague, the Representative of Fort Hood, Mr. CARTER. We all should consider our troops as the number one priority in whatever decisions are made today. That is far more important than any technical budget issue that can be brought up, especially during a time of war.

In terms of the gentleman from Georgia, he said that this budget provides the same amount of funding, in so many words, for defense health care as requested by the administration. I think if the gentleman will look more carefully into the budget request, what he will find is that, in addition to the appropriated funds, the administration had proposed an additional \$735 million in fees that I hope this Congress will clearly, vociferously oppose.

Our subcommittee certainly didn't endorse those fee increases. Those fee increases would put a 200 percent health insurance premium on men and women who have served our military for 20 and 30 years. But as a consequence of Congress not having made the decision and, in fact, the Armed Services Committee having passed a bill recently saying that we will not increase those fees, in effect, this bill will fund defense health care this year by \$735 million less than President Bush said was needed to maintain our quality health care system for our troops and for our military retirees.

That is why I had hoped the Rules Committee in all of its wisdom would have been willing to do what it does on a regular basis, to protect my \$735 million amendment to get defense health care spending back where President Bush says it needs to be, to protect my amendment from a technical budget point of order. Unfortunately, the Rules Committee chose to weigh in on the side of budget technicalities that it ignores on a regular basis and didn't weigh in on the side of protecting our present quality of defense health care for our troops.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas, the minority member of the subcommittee, I very much

respect. I very much respect the work that he has done.

I mentioned that trip last summer. Of course, Representative EDWARDS was a part of that. Representative CARTER, my good friend from Texas, was also a part of that trip when we visited those military cemeteries and looked at MILCON construction in Europe and the importance of all these things we do.

I agree with what the gentleman said in regard to the administration proposing to increase fees for our military retirees under age 65, certain categories of veterans in copays and deductibles, to be able to raise, I think he mentioned the figure of 700 and something million dollars. He was opposed to it, the subcommittee was opposed to it, the entire committee was opposed to it, and we rejected it as we did last year when the administration wanted to do that.

I commend him, and I commend the chairman and the entire committee for their work in regard to that. We are not really in any disagreement in regard to the points that he just made, and I commend him for his work.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I am not even going to talk about the fact that on this side of the aisle we feel that this bill is short by at least \$1.8 billion in providing the kind of health and medical care that we think ought to be provided for our veterans.

But I want to talk about two other problems in the bill. Because this bill, first of all, continues the fiction that somehow it is likely, or desirable, that \$735 million in additional fees will be laid onto our retired military. I do not believe that that should happen, and I do not believe that will happen. And if it doesn't, then this bill has a \$735 million hole that it is going to have to fill.

Secondly, this bill has a very interesting budget gimmick that essentially allows this bill to come to the floor \$500 million above the budget resolution that was adopted just 2 nights ago by the Republican majority.

Here is what happened. The administration sent down in the military construction bill their request to move ahead with about 310 military infrastructure projects. What the committee did was to designate 20 of those projects, and there is nothing emergency about those projects, but they need to proceed. What the committee did was essentially to take 20 of those projects and simply label the expenditures for those projects as being emergency.

Why did they do that? Because it then made room in the bill for the committee to add projects of their own totaling \$507 million. So that is a \$507 million gimmick which allows this bill to come to the floor in reality \$507 mil-

lion above the Republican budget resolution.

As a result of the rule which is now being brought to the floor, there will be several choices that people will have to make. Members will now be free to strike the emergency designation for those projects. If they do, then the bill has to be taken off the floor because it exceeds the budget cap, unless the committee itself moves to simply take all of those projects out of the bill. As a result, if those projects are taken out of the bill, we then have a hole in the administration request. If they aren't taken out of the bill, then we, in effect, are \$507 million above the budget that the Republicans pledged their loyalty to just 2 days ago. And in addition to that, down the line you are still going to have to find \$735 million to make up for the fiction that there is some possibility in this place that those additional fees ought to be laid on our retired military.

I think this is another quaint example of the majority party fealty to their own budget resolution and we are forced to encounter these ridiculous budgetary gimmicks because the majority party refused to fix the problem. I offered an amendment in committee to try to fix the problem, at least to fix the problem of the \$507 million. I simply suggested that we support an amendment which would cut the size of the tax cut for people making a million dollars, and they are going to get a \$114,000 tax cut this year. We simply suggested that if you can cut the size of that \$114,000 tax cut by 1,400 bucks, you could pay on the square, without any gimmicks, for that \$507 million.

That is what we should have done. But the majority party thought that it was more important to deliver a \$114,000 tax cut to millionaires than it was to play straight with the budget process and to play straight with their own budget resolution and to play straight with the American people.

Very interesting. Very interesting.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers at this time, so I will reserve the balance of my time for the purpose of closing.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentlewoman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, am sad that we don't have maximum flexibility under the way the rule is structured to speak to the needs of American veterans; and I will vote against it. But I hope that we can spend this time also focusing on some broader issues.

Luckily, there is a provision that will permit me to provide an amendment today to help with the cleanup of the vast toxic legacy that America faces in every State of the Union from unexploded munitions and military toxins, from training exercises, from old military depots, from having shells lobbed by generations of cadets at West

Point that have been in the Storm King Forest. Every State in the Union, over 3,000 sites, have been identified as areas that need cleanup.

I want to say I appreciate what Mr. WALSH, Mr. EDWARDS and Mr. FARR have done with this important military quality of life committee in starting to focus on this. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, the real problem is that Congress has been missing in action when it comes to cleaning up this toxic legacy.

I had a Member of this body yesterday tell me, well, we really don't need to put more money in it. He wasn't sure that it was worth it. Let's just have barbed wire around them, keep people out and save the money for things that are more important. This is a Member that I deeply respect but who betrayed a tragic lack of understanding of exactly the scope and magnitude of this problem and what would be the benefit of handling it properly.

I could tell this gentleman that there were dozens of cases where innocent civilians, in some cases children, have been killed because bombs have turned up in the back of a subdivision that people have just walked away from. Or the gentleman rototilling his yard in Five Points, Texas, rototilling up a bomb. Or three times since I have been in Congress we have had to pull firefighters out of forest fires because bombs were exploding, generated by the heat.

Now these are not things that we can simply walk away from. There are areas where munitions break down over time and the toxic leaks into the groundwater which creates a larger problem.

There is also the notion that there are 10 million, 20 million, 30 million acres or more, nobody knows exactly how much, polluted or potentially polluted that is not available for hunting and fishing, that is not available for redevelopment, for housing, for industrial use, to be put back on the tax rolls.

Ultimately, this is a responsibility that the Department of Defense and the Federal Government is going to have to assume. Putting up barbed wire and walking away doesn't solve the problem.

But one of the things that I would hope would focus attention by Members of this assembly is not just the long-term benefits, not just cleaning it up, not just returning it to productive use but think about who is at risk, because it is our soldiers, their families, the employees of these bases and their neighbors that are most at risk.

□ 1000

What is to be solved by kicking the can down the road and ignoring it?

Last, but by no means least, if we get the technology right that will enable us to find out whether it is a hubcap or a 105-millimeter shell that is buried under the ground, that just doesn't help us clean up these 3,000 sites in the United States. That same technology

would save the lives of our soldiers right now who are at risk every day in Iraq from roadside bombs, from land mines. That is how I lost my first constituent in Iraq, was a young man killed by a land mine.

By Congress continuing to be missing in action not taking a significant step to clean up this toxic explosive legacy, we are not just putting at risk the environment, we are not just putting at risk children who are playing in subdivisions or firefighters who will fight in the next forest fire where there are bombs and toxic legacy, they are putting at risk our soldiers, our men and women overseas who won't benefit from the techniques and the technology.

I appreciate what the subcommittee has done trying to train the attention. It is time for this body to step up and agitate to make their job a little harder and for our friends on the Appropriations Committee in Defense appropriations to invest in doing this right.

I oppose the rule. I look forward to bringing an amendment later in the debate to be able to at least put a little bit of money to deal with the problem in other parts of the United States now.

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

I thank the gentleman for his passion on this issue and the very clear presentation that he made. I want to remind him and my colleagues that I think we authorized an additional \$250 million in the Defense Authorization Bill of 2007 which we passed last week.

In regard to specifically, he mentioned about the technology that could be used for ferreting out improvised explosive devices, and he mentioned, of course, that the first soldier from his district was killed by one of those devices. And I know that Members on both sides of the aisle have certainly experienced that. This particular Member from the 11th of Georgia has experienced it as well. So it is an important issue, and it is clear that we are doing everything we can to try to defend against these cowardly attacks of improvised explosive devices.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time for purposes of closing.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers. I understand the gentleman has no additional speakers.

Mr. GINGREY. I have no additional speakers.

Ms. MATSUI. Then I will proceed to my closing.

Mr. Speaker, I will be asking Members for a "no" vote on the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will amend the rule so we can consider three important amendments that were not included in this rule. These amendments will help fix the funding shortfalls in this bill.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of these amendments and extraneous materials immediately prior to the vote.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. MATSUI. The first amendment by Ranking Member OBEY would pay for the \$507 million cost for 20 routine military construction projects instead of designating them as "emergency spending" so that the funding would not count against the bill's allocation.

The Obey amendment pays for the 20 projects by reducing the tax cuts for people making more than \$1 million a year by \$1,400 or 1 percent.

The second amendment by subcommittee Ranking Member EDWARDS provides the \$735 million needed to fully fund the Defense Health Program throughout the next year. The cost of the amendment is offset by reducing by 2 percent the tax cut for those making over \$1 million annually.

The third amendment by Representative FARR, would increase veterans health care by \$1.82 billion and pay for it by reducing the average tax cut for those with incomes above \$1 million a year by about \$5,000, leaving them with \$109,025.

Mr. Speaker, these amendments together will help us meet the obligations we have to the members of our military, our veterans and their families. This Nation made a promise to those serving in the military that they would receive quality health care in return for their valiant service to this country, and now that wounded soldiers are returning to their homes, they deserve the best medical treatment and care available.

We can fix this today if we allow these amendments to be considered on the floor. But the only way that will happen is if we defeat the previous question.

I want to assure my colleagues that a "no" vote will not prevent us from considering the Military Quality of Life Veterans Appropriations bill under an open rule. But a "no" vote will allow us to vote on these important amendments.

Vote "no" on the previous question.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I would again like to thank Subcommittee Chairman WALSH, ranking minority member EDWARDS, and Chairman LEWIS for leading the committee in the production and shepherding of this bill.

We can never do enough for our veterans. I think we all want to, but understand that this bill represents a victory for our serviceman and women in all stages of service, from recruitment to retirement.

I encourage my colleagues to support this rule and underlying bill. And so I rise, again, in support of the rule, and as I say, in support of the underlying bill in recognition of its importance to the men and women who have and will continue to serve and protect America. Our servicemen and women put their lives on the line each and every day and we have a responsibility to support

them in any and every way possible as they make these significant sacrifices for the safety and security of this great Nation. We must provide them with everything that they need, not only to succeed in their military duty, but also to enjoy the quality of life that they and their families so much deserve.

Again, Mr. Speaker, with spending totaling \$94.7 billion, this bill includes significant increases to the veterans medical care and benefits, military construction and the Defense Health Care Program. I encourage, then, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support both this rule and the underlying bill for the sake of those who spend their lives defending ours.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I could not be present today because of a family medical emergency and I would like to submit this statement for the RECORD in opposition to the previous question and H. Res. 821, the rule providing for consideration of the FY2007 Military Quality of Life appropriations bill (H.R. 5385).

The Veterans' Administration has treated more than 144,000 returning veterans from Operations Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom, and nearly 30,000 veterans are waiting in line for their first appointment—nearly double the number last year. However, funding for veterans and military retiree health care has barely kept pace with the increasing demand. As a result our young men and women will return home from Iraq and Afghanistan to a health care system that is struggling to take care of current veterans—let alone new ones.

While the bill before us today is certainly an improvement over last year's bill, it still underfunds critical programs and services that our veterans and military retirees rely on. For instance, even as the Defense Authorization Bill (H.R. 5122) we passed last week rightfully rejected the President's plan to increase fees for military retirees, this bill still falls \$735 million short of the level needed to ensure that military retirees do not face having their TRICARE fees doubled or tripled. In addition, this bill uses a budgeting gimmick to designate \$507 million for 20 military construction projects as emergency spending so that the committee could keep the overall total under the bill's allocation level—jeopardizing this critical funding by leaving it vulnerable to procedural points of order that could strip it from this bill. Finally, this bill provides \$25.4 billion for veteran's medical services—\$2.6 billion more than last year, but still \$400 million below the recommendation of the Independent Budget and \$2.8 billion below the level recommended by the House Veterans Affairs Committee Democrats.

Unfortunately, Democratic amendments to address these shortcomings were rejected by Republicans on the Appropriations Committee and are blocked from being considered here today by this rule. These pragmatic measures would have made this a stronger bill that fulfills our promise to our military retirees and veterans. I urge the defeat of the previous question and this rule so that we can debate critical amendments to ensure that veterans and military retirees get the timely, quality, and affordable health care they deserve.

The material previously referred to by Ms. MATSUI is as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION STATEMENT H. RES. 821—
RULE FOR H.R. 5385 FY06 MILITARY QUALITY
OF LIFE—VA APPROPRIATIONS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, it shall be in order to consider the amendments printed in section 3, which may be offered only in the order specified, may be offered only by the Member designated or a designee, shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to amendment except pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived.

SEC. 3. The amendments referred to in section 2 are as follows:

(a) Amendment to be offered by Representative OBEY of Wisconsin.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 5385, AS REPORTED
OFFERED BY MR. OBEY OF WISCONSIN

Page 58, line 20, strike "2011:" and all that follows through line 25 and insert "2011:."

Page 59, line 4, strike "2011:" and all that follows through line 9 and insert "2011:."

Page 59, line 13, strike "2011:" and all that follows through line 18 and insert "2011:."

Page 59, line 22, strike "2011:" and all that follows through page 60, line 2, and insert "2011:."

Page 60, line 6, strike "2011:" and all that follows through line 11 and insert "2011:."

Page 60, line 15, strike "2011:" and all that follows through line 20 and insert "2011:."

At the end of title IV (page 60, after line 20), insert the following new section:

SEC. 401. In the case of taxpayers with income in excess of \$1,000,000, for the calendar year beginning in 2007, the amount of tax reduction resulting from the enactment of Public Laws 107-16, 108-27, and 108-311 shall be reduced by 1.23 percent.

(b) Amendment to be offered by Representative Edwards of Texas

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 5385, AS REPORTED
OFFERED BY MR. EDWARDS OF TEXAS

Page 19, line 8, strike "\$21,065,163,000" and insert "\$21,800,163,000".

Page 19, line 9, strike "\$20,218,205,000" and insert "\$20,953,205,000".

At the end of title I (page 35, after line 2), insert the following new section:

SEC. 136. In the case of taxpayers with income in excess of \$1,000,000, for the calendar year beginning in 2007, the amount of tax reduction resulting from the enactment of Public Laws 107-16, 108-27, and 108-311 shall be reduced by 1.78 percent.

(c) Amendment to be offered by Representative Farr of California

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 5385, AS REPORTED
OFFERED BY MR. FARR OF CALIFORNIA

Page 39, line 22, strike "\$25,412,000,000" and insert "\$26,875,000,000".

Page 41, line 1, strike "\$3,277,000,000" and insert "\$3,390,000,000".

Page 42, line 2, strike "\$412,000,000" and insert "\$460,000,000".

Page 42, line 14, strike "\$1,480,764,000" and insert "\$1,553,764,000".

Page 44, line 21, strike "\$69,499,000" and insert "\$77,499,000".

Page 45, line 13, strike "\$283,670,000" and insert "\$399,000,000".

At the end of title II (page 56, after line 8), insert the following new section:

SEC. 223. In the case of taxpayers with income in excess of \$1,000,000, for the calendar year beginning in 2007, the amount of tax reduction resulting from the enactment of

Public Laws 107-16, 108-27, and 108-311 shall be reduced by 4.4 percent.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 211, nays 186, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 173]

YEAS—211

Aderholt	Gallegly	Mica
Akin	Garrett (NJ)	Miller (FL)
Alexander	Gerlach	Miller (MI)
Bachus	Gibbons	Miller, Gary
Baker	Gilchrest	Moran (KS)
Barrett (SC)	Gillmor	Murphy
Bartlett (MD)	Gingrey	Myrick
Barton (TX)	Goode	Neugebauer
Bass	Goodlatte	Ney
Biggert	Granger	Northup
Bilirakis	Graves	Norwood
Bishop (UT)	Green (WI)	Nunes
Blackburn	Gutknecht	Nussle
Blunt	Hall	Osborne
Boehlert	Harris	Otter
Boehner	Hart	Oxley
Bonilla	Hastings (WA)	Paul
Bono	Hayes	Pence
Boozman	Hayworth	Peterson (PA)
Boustany	Hefley	Petri
Bradley (NH)	Hensarling	Pickering
Brady (TX)	Hergert	Pitts
Brown (SC)	Hobson	Poe
Brown-Waite,	Hoekstra	Pombo
Ginny	Hostettler	Porter
Burgess	Hulshof	Price (GA)
Burton (IN)	Hunter	Pryce (OH)
Buyer	Hyde	Putnam
Calvert	Inglis (SC)	Radanovich
Camp (MI)	Issa	Ramstad
Campbell (CA)	Istook	Regula
Cannon	Jenkins	Rehberg
Cantor	Jindal	Reichert
Capito	Johnson (CT)	Renzi
Carter	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (AL)
Castle	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (KY)
Chabot	Jones (NC)	Rohrabacher
Chocola	Keller	Ros-Lehtinen
Coble	Kelly	Royce
Cole (OK)	Kennedy (MN)	Ryan (WI)
Conaway	King (IA)	Ryun (KS)
Crenshaw	King (NY)	Saxton
Culberson	Kingston	Schwarz (MI)
Davis, Jo Ann	Kirk	Sensenbrenner
Davis, Tom	Kline	Sessions
Deal (GA)	Knollenberg	Shadegg
DeLay	Kolbe	Shaw
Dent	Kuhl (NY)	Shays
Diaz-Balart, M.	LaHood	Sherwood
Doolittle	Latham	Shimkus
Drake	LaTourette	Shuster
Dreier	Lewis (CA)	Simmons
Duncan	Lewis (KY)	Simpson
Ehlers	Linder	Smith (NJ)
Emerson	LoBiondo	Smith (TX)
Everett	Lucas	Sodrel
Feeney	Lungren, Daniel	Souder
Ferguson	E.	Stearns
Fitzpatrick (PA)	Mack	Sullivan
Flake	Marchant	Sweeney
Foley	McCaul (TX)	Tancredo
Forbes	McCotter	Taylor (NC)
Fortenberry	McHenry	Terry
Fox	McHugh	Thornberry
Franks (AZ)	McKeon	Tiahrt
Frelinghuysen	McMorris	Tiberi

Turner	Weldon (FL)
Upton	Weldon (PA)
Walden (OR)	Weller
Walsh	Westmoreland
Wamp	Whitfield

NAYS—186

Abercrombie	Green, Al
Ackerman	Green, Gene
Allen	Grijalva
Baca	Gutierrez
Baird	Harman
Baldwin	Hastings (FL)
Barrow	Herseth
Bean	Higgins
Becerra	Hinchey
Berkley	Hinojosa
Berman	Holden
Berry	Holt
Bishop (NY)	Honda
Blumenauer	Hooley
Boren	Hoyer
Boswell	Inslee
Boucher	Israel
Boyd	Jackson (IL)
Brady (PA)	Jackson-Lee
Brown (OH)	(TX)
Brown, Corrine	Jefferson
Butterfield	Johnson, E. B.
Capps	Jones (OH)
Capuano	Kanjorski
Cardin	Kaptur
Caro	Kildee
Cardoza	Kilpatrick (MI)
Carmahan	Kind
Carson	Kucinich
Case	Langevin
Chandler	Lantos
Chandler	Larsen (WA)
Clay	Lee
Cleaver	Levin
Clyburn	Lipinski
Conyers	Lofgren, Zoe
Cooper	Lowey
Costa	Lucas
Costello	Lynch
Cramer	Maloney
Crowley	Markey
Cuellar	Marshall
Cummings	Matheson
Davis (AL)	Matsui
Davis (CA)	McCarthy
Davis (IL)	McCollum (MN)
Davis (TN)	McDermott
DeFazio	McGovern
DeGette	McIntyre
DeLahunt	McNulty
DeLauro	Meehan
Dicks	Meek (FL)
Dingell	Meeke (NY)
Doggett	Melancon
Doyle	Michaud
Edwards	Millender-
Emanuel	McDonald
Engel	Miller (NC)
Eshoo	Miller, George
Etheridge	Mollohan
Farr	Moore (KS)
Filner	Moore (WI)
Ford	Murtha
Frank (MA)	Nadler
Gonzalez	Napolitano
Gordon	

NOT VOTING—35

Andrews	Gohmert
Beauprez	Kennedy (RI)
Bishop (GA)	Larson (CT)
Bonner	Leach
Cubin	Lewis (GA)
Davis (FL)	Manzullo
Davis (KY)	McCrery
Diaz-Balart, L.	McKinney
English (PA)	Moran (VA)
Evans	Musgrave
Fattah	Pearce
Fossella	

Wicker	Wilson (NM)
Wilson (NM)	Wilson (SC)
Wilson (SC)	Wolf
Wolf	Young (FL)

Neal (MA)	Obey
Obey	Olver
Olver	Ortiz
Ortiz	Owens
Owens	Pallone
Pallone	Pascrell
Pascrell	Pastor
Pastor	Payne
Payne	Pelosi
Pelosi	Peterson (MN)
Peterson (MN)	Pomeroy
Pomeroy	Price (NC)
Price (NC)	Rahall
Rahall	Rangel
Rangel	Reyes
Reyes	Ross
Ross	Rothman
Rothman	Roybal-Allard
Roybal-Allard	Ruppersberger
Ruppersberger	Rush
Rush	Ryan (OH)
Ryan (OH)	Sabo
Sabo	Salazar
Salazar	Sánchez, Linda
Sánchez, Linda	T.
T.	Sanchez, Loretta
Sanchez, Loretta	Schakowsky
Schakowsky	Schiff
Schiff	Schwartz (PA)
Schwartz (PA)	Scott (GA)
Scott (GA)	Scott (VA)
Scott (VA)	Serrano
Serrano	Sherman
Sherman	Skelton
Skelton	Slaughter
Slaughter	Snyder
Snyder	Solis
Solis	Spratt
Spratt	Tanner
Tanner	Tauscher
Tauscher	Taylor (MS)
Taylor (MS)	Thompson (CA)
Thompson (CA)	Thompson (MS)
Thompson (MS)	Tierney
Tierney	Towns
Towns	Udall (CO)
Udall (CO)	Udall (NM)
Udall (NM)	Van Hollen
Van Hollen	Velázquez
Velázquez	Visclosky
Visclosky	Wasserman
Wasserman	Schultz
Schultz	Waters
Waters	Watson
Watson	Watt
Watt	Waxman
Waxman	Weiner
Weiner	Wexler
Wexler	Woolsey
Woolsey	Wu
Wu	Wynn

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 216, noes 187, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 174]

AYES—216

Abercrombie	Gilchrest	Norwood
Aderholt	Gillmor	Nunes
Akin	Gingrey	Nussle
Alexander	Goode	Osborne
Bachus	Goodlatte	Otter
Baker	Granger	Oxley
Barrett (SC)	Graves	Paul
Bartlett (MD)	Green (WI)	Pence
Barton (TX)	Gutknecht	Peterson (PA)
Bass	Hall	Petri
Biggert	Harris	Pickering
Bilirakis	Hart	Pitts
Bishop (UT)	Hastings (WA)	Poe
Blackburn	Hayes	Pombo
Blunt	Hayworth	Porter
Boehlert	Hefley	Price (GA)
Boehner	Hensarling	Pryce (OH)
Bonilla	Hergert	Putnam
Bono	Hobson	Radanovich
Boozman	Hoekstra	Ramstad
Boustany	Hostettler	Regula
Bradley (NH)	Hulshof	Rehberg
Brady (TX)	Hunter	Reichert
Brown (SC)	Hyde	Renzi
Brown-Waite,	Inglis (SC)	Rogers (AL)
Ginny	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Burgess	Istook	Rogers (MI)
Burton (IN)	Jenkins	Rohrabacher
Buyer	Jindal	Ros-Lehtinen
Calvert	Johnson (CT)	Royce
Camp (MI)	Johnson (IL)	Ryan (WI)
Campbell (CA)	Johnson, Sam	Ryun (KS)
Cannon	Jones (NC)	Saxton
Cantor	Keller	Schwarz (MI)
Capito	Kelly	Sensenbrenner
Carter	Kennedy (MN)	Sessions
Castle	King (IA)	Shadegg
Chabot	King (NY)	Shaw
Chocola	Kingston	Shays
Coble	Kirk	Sherwood
Cole (OK)	Kline	Shimkus
Conaway	Knollenberg	Shuster
Crenshaw	Kolbe	Simmons
Culberson	Kuhl (NY)	Simpson
Davis, Jo Ann	LaHood	Smith (NJ)
Davis, Tom	Latham	Smith (TX)
Deal (GA)	LaTourette	Sodrel
DeLay	Leach	Souder
Dent	Lewis (CA)	Stearns
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lewis (KY)	Sullivan
Doolittle	Linder	Sweeney
Drake	LoBiondo	Tancredo
Dreier	Lucas	Taylor (NC)
Duncan	Lungren, Daniel	Terry
Ehlers	E.	Thornberry
Emerson	Mack	Tiahrt
Everett	Marchant	Tiberi
Feeney	McCaul (TX)	Turner
Ferguson	McCotter	Upton
Fitzpatrick (PA)	McHenry	Walden (OR)
Flake	McHugh	Walsh
Foley	McKeon	Wamp
Forbes	McMorris	Weldon (FL)
Fortenberry	Mica	Weldon (PA)
Fox	Miller (FL)	Weller
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)	Westmoreland
Frelinghuysen	Miller, Gary	Whitfield
Gallely	Moran (KS)	Wicker
Garrett (NJ)	Murphy	Wilson (NM)
Gerlach	Myrick	Wilson (SC)
Gibbons	Neugebauer	Wolf
	Ney	Young (FL)
	Northup	

NOES—187

Ackerman	Barrow	Berry
Allen	Bean	Bishop (NY)
Baca	Becerra	Blumenauer
Baird	Berkley	Boren
Baldwin	Berman	Boswell

□ 1034

Mr. RANGEL changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

Boucher	Holt	Owens
Boyd	Honda	Pallone
Brady (PA)	Hooley	Pascarell
Brown (OH)	Hoyer	Pastor
Brown, Corrine	Inslee	Payne
Butterfield	Israel	Pelosi
Capps	Jackson (IL)	Peterson (MN)
Capuano	Jackson-Lee	Pomeroy
Cardin	(TX)	Price (NC)
Cardoza	Jefferson	Rahall
Carnahan	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Carson	Jones (OH)	Reyes
Case	Kanjorski	Ross
Chandler	Kaptur	Rothman
Clay	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Cleaver	Kilpatrick (MI)	Ruppersberger
Clyburn	Kind	Rush
Conyers	Kucinich	Ryan (OH)
Cooper	Langevin	Sabo
Costa	Lantos	Salazar
Costello	Larsen (WA)	Sánchez, Linda
Cramer	Lee	T.
Crowley	Levin	Sánchez, Loretta
Cuellar	Lipinski	Schakowsky
Cummings	Lofgren, Zoe	Schiff
Davis (AL)	Lowe	Schwartz (PA)
Davis (CA)	Lynch	Scott (GA)
Davis (IL)	Maloney	Scott (VA)
Davis (TN)	Markey	Serrano
DeFazio	Marshall	Sherman
DeGette	Matheson	Skelton
Delahunt	Matsui	Slaughter
DeLauro	McCarthy	Snyder
Dicks	McCollum (MN)	Solis
Dingell	McDermott	Spratt
Doggett	McGovern	Tanner
Doyle	McIntyre	Tauscher
Edwards	McKinney	Taylor (MS)
Emanuel	McNulty	Thompson (CA)
Engel	Meehan	Thompson (MS)
Eshoo	Meek (FL)	Tierney
Etheridge	Meeke (NY)	Towns
Farr	Melancon	Udall (CO)
Filner	Michaud	Udall (NM)
Ford	Millender-	Udall (NM)
Frank (MA)	McDonald	Van Hollen
Gonzalez	Miller (NC)	Velázquez
Gordon	Miller, George	Vislosky
Green, Al	Mollohan	Wasserman
Green, Gene	Moore (KS)	Schultz
Grijalva	Moore (WI)	Waters
Gutierrez	Murtha	Watson
Harman	Nadler	Watt
Hastings (FL)	Napolitano	Waxman
Hereth	Neal (MA)	Weiner
Higgins	Oberstar	Wexler
Hinche	Obey	Woolsey
Hinojosa	Olver	Wu
Holden	Ortiz	Wynn

NOT VOTING—29

Andrews	Gohmert	Reynolds
Beauprez	Kennedy (RI)	Sanders
Bishop (GA)	Larson (CT)	Schmidt
Bonner	Lewis (GA)	Smith (WA)
Cubin	Manzullo	Stark
Davis (FL)	McCrery	Strickland
Davis (KY)	Moran (VA)	Stupak
English (PA)	Musgrave	Thomas
Evans	Pearce	Young (AK)
Pattah	Platts	

□ 1043

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, I was unavoidably detained and missed two rollcall votes.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote No. 173, On Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 821, the Rule for H.R. 5385; and "aye" on rollcall vote No. 174, On Adoption of the Rule for H.R. 5385.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 193. An act to increase the penalties for violations by television and radio broadcasters of the prohibitions against transmission of obscene, indecent, and profane language.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill (H.R. 1499) "An Act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow members of the Armed Forces serving in a combat zone to make contributions to their individual retirement plans even if the compensation on which such contribution is based is excluded from gross income, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that pursuant to section 1928a-1928d of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators to the Senate Delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, during the 109th Congress:

The Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY).

The Senator from Colorado (Mr. AL-LARD).

The Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS).

The Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH).

The Senator from Minnesota (Mr. COLEMAN).

The message also announced that pursuant to section 1928a-1928d of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators as members of the Senate Delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, during the 109th Congress:

The Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY).

The Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5385, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1045

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, MILITARY QUALITY OF LIFE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN). Pursuant to House Resolu-

tion 821 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 5385.

□ 1045

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5385) making appropriations for the military quality of life functions of the Department of Defense, military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, with Mr. SHIMKUS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, today I am proud to present the Fiscal Year 2007 Military Quality of Life and Veterans Affairs and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for consideration of the House.

The Appropriations Committee has dedicated to providing a suitable quality of life for our servicemen and women from recruitment through retirement. I believe this bill is fiscally responsible, while improving the quality of life for our all-volunteer force throughout their military careers and beyond. It also builds upon initiatives begun last year to get the Defense Department and the Department of Veterans Affairs to be more cooperative and expand synergies that exist between them.

The bill totals \$136.1 billion. It stays within our discretionary allocation of \$94.7 billion, which is \$824 million below the budget request. But, more importantly, the bill is \$8.5 billion over last year's level after adjusting VA medical services for contingency funding.

The increases above last year are in four areas: veterans medical care, active duty military medical care, housing allowances for military families, and the first year of major construction for the new BRAC round recommendations.

Mr. Chairman, the bill continues to improve military health care and recommends \$21 billion for fiscal year 2007 for the defense health program. This is a sizeable increase of \$1 billion above last year's level and represents more than a 40 percent increase in this budget since fiscal year 2003.

For veterans medical care, the bill recommends \$25.4 billion, a \$2.9 billion increase, or 12.7 percent, over last year's level. This program has increased \$7.6 billion, or 43 percent, since