

young people in our country? What about them? What about the ones who simply want to grow up to help other people? What about the ones who have to defer their dreams? What about the ones who have to arrest their dreams and not be able to pursue them?

We spend just a phenomenal amount of time talking about No Child Left Behind, talking about educating our children, using our State and local and Federal funds to educate them, and then when they get to the point where they are qualified to go to nursing school, there are not enough resources for them.

The other thing I might add is that Coppin State has like a 99 percent passage on the State exam, 99 percent. So what that means is definitely we have five not going to nursing school, one going, and, again, those folks being left on the sidelines.

So I hope that the committee will continue to work on this because I want these young people to fulfill their dreams.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the distinguished gentleman Mr. CUMMINGS.

Let me conclude by thanking Congressman BOBBY RUSH, who has been a strong advocate for providing and helping with nursing in underserved areas.

And let me also conclude by indicating again my support by saying, Mr. Speaker, we have to balance what we do as we provide these valuable nurses through the extension of this bill in our areas, but we must also reach out and find a way to ensure that every young person, every individual, seeking an opportunity in our medical schools for physicians and as well nursing has that opportunity to serve America.

With that, again, I ask for support of H.R. 1285.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1285, a bill to amend the Nursing Relief for Disadvantaged Areas Act of 1999. In 1999, I sponsored the Nursing Relief for Disadvantaged Areas Act, formerly H.R. 441-P. L. No.: 106-95, to address an immediate nursing shortage in my district, the First Congressional District of Illinois. This legislation sunset last year in June of 2005.

Today, there are many areas in this country which are experiencing a scarcity of health professionals, some areas more than others. In 1999 when I sponsored this legislation there were only pocket areas that experienced a shortage of nurses, now there exists, a national shortage. This shortage unfortunately, exists in my district, the First Congressional District of Illinois.

The Englewood community, a poor, urban neighborhood with a high incidence of crime, is primarily served by St. Bernard's Hospital. This small community hospital's emergency room averages approximately 31,000 visits per year; 50% of their patients are Medicaid recipients and 35% receive Medicare.

Prior to the creation of a non-immigrant visa (H1-C) St. Bernard could not attract nurses into the Englewood area and was forced to hire temporary nurses to service its patients.

This resulted in St. Bernard nursing expenditures to increase in the millions. The Immigration Nursing Relief Act of 1989 created the H-1A visa program in order to allow foreign educated nurses to work in the United States. The rationale for the H1-A program, as acknowledged by the AFL-CIO, the American Nurses Association and others, was to address spot shortage areas.

My legislation merely seeks to close the gap created by the expiration of the H1-A program. H.R. 1285 simply extends the sunset provision in the Nursing Relief for Disadvantaged Areas Act to three years. It does not substantively change any language in the law, it still prescribes that any hospital which seeks to hire foreign nurses under these provisions must meet the following criteria: (1) be located in a Health Professional Shortage Area; (2) have at least 190 acute care beds; (3) have a Medicare population of 35 percent; and (4) have a Medicaid population of at least 28 percent.

As one who has always fought for the American worker, I can assure you that this proposal does not have a detrimental effect on American nurses. My legislation continues the cap on the number of new visas that may be issued each year. It also includes processing requirements that require employers to attest that the hiring of foreign nurses will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of registered nurses. The Secretary of Labor will oversee this process and provide penalties for non-compliance.

Health care is a basic human right. The hallmarks of civilized nations are health care, education, and democracy.

The state of health care is a grave concern in my district. Hospitals have closed. City health clinics are closing. Payments for Medicare and Medicaid have been cut back.

The legislation we must pass today is aimed at helping hospitals, like St. Bernard's, keep their doors open to the communities they serve. That said I would like to thank my colleagues Congressman SENSENBRENNER, Congressman HOSTETTLER, Congressman HYDE, Congressman CONYERS and Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON-LEE for their support and for recognizing the national and local importance of this bill. Again, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this legislation.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1285, which would amend the Nursing Relief for Disadvantaged Areas Act of 1999 by repealing a provision limiting the non-immigrant classification for nurses working in health professional shortage areas.

Nursing shortages continue to plague our country, especially our underserved areas like much of my district. A report released by the American Hospital Association (AHA) in April 2006 indicated that U.S. hospitals need approximately 118,000 Registered Nurses (RNs) just to fill current vacant positions. This is, nationwide, a vacancy rate of 8.5 percent. In November 2005, the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Monthly Labor Review, stated that more than 1.2 million new and replacement nurses will be needed by 2014. Even worse, the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) reported that approximately 30 states had RN shortages in 2000.

In my state of Hawaii, the University of Hawaii (UH) reported in 2000 that we faced a nursing shortage of more than 1,000 reg-

istered nurses; this shortage is projected to increase to approximately 2,000 by 2010. Like most states, UH found Hawaii's nursing workforce tired and burnt out due to incredible stress, understaffing issues, and increased overtime without adequate support staff. What is clear from the data already collected coupled with existing information regarding retention is that a worsening shortage of nurses means a worsening shortage of quality care for patients.

These statistics and the trends and conclusions they reflect are nothing new, but what do we do about it? As one valuable initiative, in 1999 President Clinton signed into law P.L. 106-96, the Nursing Relief for Disadvantaged Areas Act. This law provided for foreign nurses to obtain temporary work visas to come to the U.S. and work in places experiencing a shortage of health professionals. By allowing experienced health professionals, particularly nurses, from countries such as the Philippines into medically shortage underserved communities, the law has contributed greatly to keeping hospitals open and, more importantly, providing quality care to patients who otherwise would have no other place to seek treatment.

Mr. Speaker, I fully support the goal of H.R. 1285 to extend this important legislation, the Nursing Relief for Disadvantaged Areas Act of 1999, for an additional three years. I look forward to working with my colleagues on this and other initiatives to ensure that Americans continue to receive the health care they deserve.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1285, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to extend for 3 years changes to requirements for admission of nonimmigrant nurses in health professional shortage areas made by the Nursing Relief for Disadvantaged Areas Act of 1999."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5631, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 877 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 877

*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. 5631) making appropriations for the Department of Defense 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. All points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. 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. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) is recognized for 1 hour.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days to revise and extend their remarks and insert tabular and extraneous material into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. 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, on Monday the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for consideration of the House report for H.R. 5631, the Department of Defense appropriations bill for the fiscal year 2007. Mr. Speaker, when the Rules Committee met, it granted an open rule, providing 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. It waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. For the purposes of amendment, the bill shall be read by paragraph. Additionally, this rule waives all points of order against provisions in the bill which fail to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI, and it authorizes the Chair to accord priority and recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule for H.R. 5631 and the under-

lying resolution. In past debates on defense appropriations, I have spoken of the four challenges I believe we must successfully address if we are to ensure the security of our country in the 21st Century. These challenges are, first, addressing the equipment and readiness needs created by the 1990s procurement holiday; second, transforming and adapting our forces to use the opportunities and meet the challenges posed by the new technologies of the information age; third, increasing the size and changing the force structure of our forces in order to have more available manpower for deployment and for combat operations; and, fourth, doing those things necessary to win the war on terror and succeed in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, the rule and the underlying legislation do much to meet these four challenges. The bill itself provides \$427.4 billion to meet the needs of our military. That is \$19.1 billion more than last year.

□ 1315

Speaking broadly, the bill provides \$84.9 billion for military personnel, \$120.5 billion for operations and maintenance, \$81.5 billion for procurement, \$75.3 billion for research and development and \$50 billion towards the cost of operations in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The procurement sections of the underlying bill do much to bring on line new weapons and replace worn-out equipment. I am particularly pleased to note the \$11 billion for naval shipbuilding and conversion, the \$2.9 billion for 42 F/A-22 aircraft and the \$500 million above the President's request for National Guard equipment needs. In addition, in light of developments in North Korea, the \$9 billion for ballistic missile defense is clearly a prudent expenditure. Additional funds are available to replace equipment lost in Iraq and Afghanistan.

On the personnel front, the end strength for the National Guard is funded at its full projected strength of 350,000. Moreover, all personnel receive a 2.2 percent across-the-board raise that the administration requested.

Mr. Speaker, we have a long way to go before we make up for the neglect of our military in the 1990s when we reduced our end strength levels and failed to replace and update weapons systems and bring on new weapons. The changing nature of technology poses real threats and opportunities. Moreover, our forces are involved in a tough fight against a vicious enemy in Afghanistan and Iraq. They require our continued support.

No one bill in and of itself can address all these challenges. However, the Appropriations Committee has brought us a bill that makes significant progress in all these areas.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, this is a bipartisan bill, carefully crafted by the chairman, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and the ranking member, Mr. SABO of Minnesota. Their professionalism and co-

operation in devising ways to meet the needs of our men and women in uniform is something to which we should all aspire. I particularly want to recognize Mr. SABO, who is leaving Congress after the completion of his current term, for his distinguished career of service to his district, his State and our country.

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

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

(Ms. MATSUI asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, passage of H. Res. 877 will allow the House to consider the fiscal year 2007 defense appropriations bill under an open rule. I would like to thank subcommittee Chair YOUNG and my good friend Ranking Member MURTHA for their hard work to craft a responsible bill for consideration by this House. It provides robust support to our troops stationed in Iraq and elsewhere around the globe. In particular, I would highlight the increased funding to test new jammers for IEDs and additional funds for troop body armor and Humvees.

Importantly, the bill also focuses significant resources toward rebuilding our military. This includes addressing the strain placed on our National Guard. Wisely, the committee provided funding to maintain the Guard's current force size. In addition, they provided critical resources to ensure these men and women have equipment necessary to accomplish their mission.

I appreciate the committee's intense focus to mitigate the effect Iraq has had on eroding our military readiness.

I would like to highlight a few provisions which I feel are particularly forward-thinking. Many Members, including myself, felt that the House missed an opportunity last week to engage in substantive debate with regard to our policies toward Iraq. For that reason, I am very pleased that this bill contains a real policy proposal. It clearly states that it is not the intent of the United States to build permanent bases in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, intentions matter. For too long this House has passed on opportunities to clarify our intentions in Iraq. Not only is such a statement in the best interest of our troops, but it is critical if we are to defeat the insurgency in Iraq. I would like to commend Mr. MURTHA for his leadership in bringing this issue to the House for consideration.

This bill also begins to bring funding for the Iraq war into the regular budget process. Since the start of the war, the majority leadership has been engaged in a shell game. We pass budget resolutions that pretend we are not at war, and in doing so, we ignore the idea of shared sacrifice.

Only a select few are paying for the costs of this war, the men and women

in uniform and their families, and those who rely on critical domestic programs which have been cut to finance the war.

Let us admit we have lost the principle of shared sacrifice. This bill will be a first step toward again embracing that idea. Commend the subcommittee for returning to this path.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, the bill made in order under this rule reaffirms our ironclad support for our men and women in uniform in two fundamental ways. This legislation upholds our part of a solemn pact to provide our Armed Forces with everything they require, and it fulfills our duty to act responsibly in our Nation's interests. I commend the committee for achieving both goals in one bill.

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

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3½ minutes to the gentlelady from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the rule as well as the underlying legislation.

We are a Nation engaged in a global war on terror, and it is critical that during this time we focus our spending on what we need to defeat our terrorist enemies. This bill does that. We have learned an awful lot during this conflict as to the vulnerability of our forces, and this bill addresses those vulnerabilities.

This bill allocates \$1.5 billion to test and field new jammers to counter improvised explosive devices, which have been such a deadly threat to our troops.

We also provide an additional \$725 million for other force protection equipment, such as body armor for our troops in the field.

This bill also fully funds the President's request for a 2.2 percent pay increase for the members of our armed services, a pay increase that is well, well deserved.

This bill also restores \$557 million to the Army Reserve and National Guard above the requested amount to reflect newly authorized troop levels. Our troops need to know that the Congress of the United States is working hard to recognize their needs and to address them forcefully.

This bill also allocates \$50 billion for ongoing operations in Iraq and in Afghanistan in hopes of avoiding future supplemental appropriation bills. We are at war, and it only makes sense to appropriate funds under regular order to pay for the cost of the war.

Mr. Speaker, the news today is that North Korea is threatening to launch a new ballistic missile which has the capability to reach our shores. It validates the inclusion of \$9 billion in this bill for our missile defense shield.

Back in the days of the Cold War, people used to call President Ronald

Reagan "crazy," or they called him a "warmonger" for even advocating missile defense. Well, today he doesn't look so crazy. Actually, today he looks visionary, and we need to do everything that we can to defend our citizens from terrorist states and rogue nations like North Korea who threaten world peace and stability.

The news today that our missile defense is on high alert in case of a launch is very good news, and the American people should know that we recognize threats to our security, and we will do all that we can to protect our Nation.

Also, Mr. Speaker, earmarks and various Member projects have come under question and scrutiny recently. This bill does the responsible thing by limiting those projects to \$5 billion, \$2.7 billion less than last year's bill. And for those projects that remain in the bill, every Member who advocates for a project or asked for an earmark should not be afraid to stand up on this floor to defend it.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you about one of those projects that I asked for in this bill which is centered at Selfridge Air National Guard Base in my district. As our Nation seeks alternatives for everyday energy needs, we also need alternatives for the military.

This bill provides \$2 million for the second phase of a project to turn waste into fuel and electricity. NextEnergy, a nonprofit alternative fuel research cooperative in the great State of Michigan, is working with the U.S. Army on this important project. This fuel would help run a generator that would produce high-quality electric energy that every military unit needs. This is a very important project to support our troops.

Mr. Speaker, this is a reasonable rule to manage an outstanding bill. It has the right priorities. And we need to make sure that our military remains the best trained, the best supported, the best equipped and the most lethal fighting force that the world has ever seen.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying legislation.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS).

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlelady for yielding. I am here to speak on the rule, because I know that there will be a great deal of pressure to fill up the agenda for speakers on the bill itself.

I am here to record what I call a fury footnote, F-U-R-Y. I am furious at the kind of Neanderthal, backward, primitive thinking reflected in the bill in one statement. There is one section of the bill which says, "National Defense Education Act, \$10 million." Ten million dollars, and they call it a National Defense Education Act; \$10 million for scholarships for science and engineering students.

Here is a report that recently came out. I don't know whether it went to all of the offices of all of the Members of Congress. Maybe because I am on the Education and Workforce Committee, I got five copies. It is called "Rising Above the Gathering Storm."

The report is published by the National Academy of Sciences, the National Academy of Engineering and the Institute of Medicine.

The impetus for this book, the oversight for this book, the push for this book came from our own STEM Caucus, Senate and House Members together pushing to get a realistic evaluation of where we are in terms of education for engineering and science in order to keep our economic advantage in the world and remain leaders, and that means leaders also in the area of the military as well.

The National Defense Education Act was one of the first efforts of that kind put forth by the government in 1957 and 1958 as a result of the reaction to Sputnik. Some of you are not old enough to remember Sputnik. When the Russians put Sputnik up, it said they had a rocket capability which frightened us, because that rocket capability that you had to have to go into the upper atmosphere was enough, of course, for an intercontinental ballistic missile also. So we got busy, and the National Defense Education Act followed that.

The National Defense Education Act in 1958 dollars was given about half a billion dollars, \$500 million. It did not limit itself to a few scholarships to science and engineering students. It provided money for laboratories in high schools, money for libraries, purchase of science books. It went right across the board, in 1958, when we were really not into large amounts of expenditures for domestic programs.

What flowed from the National Defense Education Act was later on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Higher Education Assistance Act which took its place, but still there is a deficit.

The deficit was indicated when I first came to Congress by a report called "A Nation at Risk." A Nation at Risk was commissioned by President Ronald Reagan. "A Nation at Risk" made the same recommendations being made now all these years later in this "Rising Above the Gathering Storm."

The fact that there are people in the Defense Department who see \$10 million as being significant, that there are people on the Appropriations Committee, the fact that we have that kind of backward, Neanderthal, primitive thinking about education and its role in our military defense is appalling.

I suppose I should not be furious and angry, I should be weeping that such a great Nation with such great minds would place education on such a low level.

We need to go across the board, and we need to appropriate billions for a new National Defense Education Act or

a National Homeland Security Mobilization Act, which reaches beyond just the military and understands that in addition to scientists, we need some people who know how to interpret the Arabic language. We need some people who know how to interpret other Middle Eastern languages, we need people who understand cultures that we are at war with.

Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to pause and take a hard look at our conception of what it means to defend our country in terms of education.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

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

□ 1330

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the underlying bill, and from the outset I want to commend Chairman YOUNG of Florida and the ranking member, Mr. MURTHA of Pennsylvania, for their leadership on this bipartisan bill and for all they do each and every day for our military and their families.

As my colleagues have noted, H.R. 5631 includes over \$427 billion in discretionary funding, including an additional \$50 billion provided in what is called the very critical Bridge Fund to support ongoing operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. Over 90 percent of this funding will go to the Army and Marine units that are taking the fight directly to our enemies in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, our committee's allocation is \$4 billion below the President's request. This presented the committee with some significant challenges. We looked carefully at programs in the President's budget, and we made selected reductions. We also recommended less funding for programs encountering technological problems and developmental delays. With many competing challenges facing our military as we prosecute the global war on terror, this was not an easy task; but we believe we made appropriate choices to allow us to deter our enemies and yet enhance the high-intensity combat capability of our forces.

Mr. Speaker, as we consider this important legislation, we must remain mindful that our troops in Afghanistan and Iraq, mind you all volunteers, regular military, Guard, and Reserve, are literally on the battlefield as we speak, brave men and women fighting a new kind of war where everybody literally is on the front line. As we all know, the Army and Marines are carrying the brunt of the battle in Iraq and Afghanistan, with an unprecedented level of partnership by their Guard and Reserve components, and young men and women from the Air Force and Navy stand with them. Their service and dedication on the battlefields of these

countries are making our Nation safer from terrorists who seek to do us and other freedom-loving nations harm.

Make no mistake, our success in Iraq is hugely important. Our enemies in Iraq are thinking enemies; they are adaptable and would like nothing better than to see us withdraw prematurely, set arbitrary dates for withdrawal, and then come back after our departure to reinstall another despot or regime even more oppressive, more fanatical, and more horrendous and more dangerous than the last.

The bottom line is that we should never forget that the soldiers we support through this appropriations bill have freed nearly 50 million people in Iraq and Afghanistan from killer regimes where protest and dissent were answered by killing fields and genocide, where women were denied basic freedoms, education, health care, and the vote.

Of course, the loss of any young soldier is heartbreaking; so are the deaths of innocent civilians killed by roadside and vehicle-borne bombs, or suicide bombers. We are dealing with Saddam loyalists, jihadists, imported terrorists, and domestic criminals who play by no rules and do not hesitate to bomb Iraqi weddings, mosques, funerals, and gatherings of children, school children as a common tactic.

Since we are engaged in the global war on terrorism with Afghanistan and Iraq being countries of conflict and violence, our soldiers and marines and others in the military need every possible advantage. This legislation provides our fighting men and women with the resources they need to be more deployable, more agile, more flexible, more interoperable, and more lethal in the execution of their missions. It provides for better training, better equipment, better weapons.

Of course, our bill supports the troops by providing a pay increase, enhanced life insurance coverage, and housing allowances. Mr. Speaker, I also welcome increased funding for research and development in this bill. Our bill exceeds the President's budget by \$2.2 billion so we can speed important new technology from the drawing board to the laboratory, to the test bed, and into the arsenal of our warfighters.

My colleagues, the global war on terror will not be short. It will require deep and enduring commitment. And looking down the road, we face many potential threats and we cannot know what lies ahead, but this appropriations bill will give us the resources to do the job and to support our young men and women who do that job of liberty each and every day.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentlewoman from California for her leadership, for yielding, and for her work on the Rules Committee. Her fairness in seeking appropriate rules does not go unnoticed, and I want to

thank her for fighting for fairness in this whole process.

As the daughter of a veteran of two wars, first let me just express my profound respect and admiration for our brave young men and women serving our Nation around the world and on the ground in Iraq.

I also rise to convey my appreciation for the hard work and the dedication of the distinguished ranking member of the defense subcommittee, Mr. MURTHA, and the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. OBEY. They have both been champions for a significant provision in this bill, one that would ensure that we are not establishing permanent military bases in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, the American people do not want an open-ended war and occupation in Iraq. Congress must be on record supporting this, and the administration must level with the American people regarding their long-term desires and designs with regard to Iraq.

My colleague, Mr. ALLEN, and I offered an identical provision to the war supplemental bill this past March; but in a gross abuse of power, the Republican majority stripped it in conference. We must ensure that the no permanent bases in this bill remains and not be gutted.

While I support this provision, I also believe this bill could be improved in many ways. First, this bill does not address the waste, fraud, and abuse in Pentagon spending. GAO has identified cost savings which, if implemented, could save billions of tax dollars. This budget should not be off limits to spending cuts, especially where funds are misspent. Also, this bill continues to fund the unnecessary war in Iraq without demanding accountability from this administration.

In a larger sense, Mr. Speaker, I believe that our Nation is best defended by funding priorities that truly make our Nation and the world safer. I am disappointed that this \$427 billion bill continues to fund Cold War-era weaponry for a threat that doesn't exist. We must focus our security spending on threats that we face today. By getting rid of outmoded weapons systems programs, we can not only make the much needed investment in ensuring health care for all of our children, improving our public schools, ending our dependence on foreign oil, but also improve our Homeland Security, where of course we must focus because the real threat involves possible attacks, and we need to protect our homeland.

That is why I have joined with my colleague Congresswoman LYNN WOOLSEY in introducing H.R. 4898, the Common Sense Budget Act. This bill shows how we can reduce our defense budget by \$60 billion without diminishing our ability to protect our Nation by putting resources into areas where real threats exist, by protecting our ports, protecting our transit systems, real homeland security. So we must get our funding priorities right. The challenge is clear. We must, quite frankly, put

some common sense into our defense spending.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume just briefly to offer a different perspective, if I may.

I would argue that we don't spend too much on defense, we spend far too little. Frankly, by historical measures, we spend less now than at any time since 1940. In 1960, at the height of the Cold War, we were spending roughly 50 percent of the entire Federal budget, roughly 9 percent of our gross national product on defense. By 1980, that was down to 33 percent of the Federal budget and 6 percent of the gross national product. Today, it is about 17 or 18 percent of the total budget, only about 4 percent, actually slightly less than that, of the gross national product.

I would argue we steadily decreased our expenditure even in a time of danger, and frankly that is a tribute to the professionalism and the skill of our military and the focus on trying to deliver the best service as reasonably priced as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule for fiscal year 2007 Department of Defense Appropriations Act and the underlying legislation. I would like to commend Chairmen LEWIS and YOUNG, as well as the ranking member and the staff of the Defense Committee and subcommittee for their tireless effort in support of our soldiers, our sailors, airmen, and marines who are bravely defending us at home and abroad.

Mr. Speaker, this bill most importantly meets the immediate needs of our warfighters who are fighting and winning the global war on terror. It is a good bill that provides funding for many important programs which are our military's top priorities.

Not the least of these, Mr. Speaker, is F-22 Raptor. I am particularly delighted for the work the Appropriations Committee has done to fund the F-22 program this year. The full funding of 20 planes will go a long way toward providing stability for the program and ensuring that America maintains air dominance for the foreseeable future.

In light of emerging military threats globally, the F-22 will continue to increase in significance, as it is the world's most capable fighter. I therefore wholeheartedly agree with the Department of Defense that the F-22 should be fully funded on a multi-year contract basis, and that the procurement life of the program should be extended beyond fiscal year 2009.

Further, Mr. Speaker, during this time of conflict as we fight the global war on terror, the United States must, without question, continue to modernize and strengthen our ability to support our men and women in harm's way. Maintaining our Nation's airlift capabilities is critical to this mission,

and I would like to applaud the committee for their recognition of this in funding 9 C-130Js and the C-5 modernization.

Today, the C-130J is the most modern military transport in service. Both United States and allied C-130Js are exceeding expectations in Iraq and Afghanistan. The KC-130Js have been deployed continuously to Iraq dating to February of 2005, and their unprecedented capability, reliability, and maintainability have been impressive. Over the past year of deployment, the C and the KC-130J mission capable rates have been between 89 and 93 percent, which is more than a 50 percent improvement over legacy aircraft. Similarly, the C-5 has also proven its ability to provide critical support. While the C-5 fleet has flown less than 25 percent of all cargo missions in operations in Afghanistan and Iraq, they delivered nearly 50 percent of all cargo to our troops on the ground. Clearly, the C-5 has demonstrated its effectiveness, and therefore further modernization of a C-5 fleet is imperative.

The funds for C-5 AMP modernization will be used to make critical upgrades of the cockpits with modern avionics and flight instrumentation that meet both Air Force and congressional mandated standards.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, the funds allocated for the C-5 RERP program modernization will be used to replace old engines and systems with newer ones. These replacements represent significant improvements to the aircraft, making them even more reliable and easier to maintain.

Again, Mr. Speaker, this bill does a remarkable job in addressing a wide scope of issues that are vitally important to our armed services. I would like to again thank the chairmen and ranking members of the respective committee and subcommittee for their hard work on this bill. I urge support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers. I would like to inquire of the gentleman whether he has any additional speakers.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. I too have no additional speakers. I am prepared to close.

Ms. MATSUI. I am prepared to close. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized to close for her side.

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

Mr. Speaker, the fiscal year 2007 defense appropriations bill is critical to our warfighters, to our national security, and to our long-term strategic interests. It reaffirms the unwavering commitment all Members have for Armed Forces now more than ever.

Once again, I thank Chairman YOUNG and Ranking Member MURTHA for their hard work in crafting an excellent bill that will allow our Nation to achieve these goals.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, today in closing I again want to draw attention of the Members to the strength of the underlying legislation, H.R. 5631. This legislation accomplishes much in terms of funding our current operations in Iraq and Afghanistan and the global war on terror, while setting the military on the path of further transformation to meet the new challenges of the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, it must also be noted that this legislation would not have been possible without much hard work on the part of the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Ranking Member MURTHA), the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS), and all the members on both sides of the aisle of the defense appropriations subcommittee and the full Appropriations Committee. The appropriators have given us a genuinely excellent and bipartisan bill. It does not shrink from making the hard decisions regarding the funding of the current and the future force. This is never an easy task, and it is even harder during a time of war.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time for Members to vote on the rule and the underlying legislation.

□ 1345

I readily admit that no bill, including this legislation, is perfect. That is the reason why we reauthorize and appropriate for the Department of Defense on an annual basis. Moreover, we deal with ongoing contingencies through emergency supplemental appropriations when and as required. This legislation takes critical steps toward fulfilling the current and future needs. It is a building block toward creating a stronger military tomorrow and an essential element in funding our troops in the field today.

Therefore, I once again urge my colleagues to support the rule and underlying bill.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of House Resolution 877 will be followed by 5-minute votes on suspending the rules and agreeing to H. Res. 731 and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 5228.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 400, nays 18, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 292]

## YEAS—400

Abercrombie DeLauro Jones (NC)  
 Ackerman Dent Jones (OH)  
 Aderholt Diaz-Balart, L. Kanjorski  
 Akin Diaz-Balart, M. Kaptur  
 Alexander Dicks Keller  
 Allen Dingell Kelly  
 Andrews Doggett Kennedy (MN)  
 Baca Doolittle Kennedy (RI)  
 Bachus Doyle Kildee  
 Baird Drake Kilpatrick (MI)  
 Baker Dreier Kind  
 Baldwin Duncan King (IA)  
 Barrett (SC) Edwards King (NY)  
 Barrow Ehlers Kingston  
 Bartlett (MD) Emanuel Kirk  
 Barton (TX) Emerson Kline  
 Bass Engel Knollenberg  
 Bean English (PA) Kolbe  
 Beauprez Eshoo Kuhl (NY)  
 Berkley Etheridge LaHood  
 Berman Everett Langevin  
 Berry Farr Lantos  
 Biggert Fattah Larsen (WA)  
 Bilbray Feeney Larson (CT)  
 Bilirakis Ferguson Latham  
 Bishop (GA) Filner LaTourette  
 Bishop (NY) Fitzpatrick (PA) Leach  
 Bishop (UT) Flake Levin  
 Blackburn Foley Lewis (CA)  
 Blumenauer Forbes Lewis (KY)  
 Blunt Fortenberry Linder  
 Boehlert Fossella Lipinski  
 Boehner Foxx LoBiondo  
 Bonilla Frank (MA) Lofgren, Zoe  
 Bonner Franks (AZ) Lowey  
 Bono Frelinghuysen Lucas  
 Boozman Gallegly Lungren, Daniel  
 Boren Garrett (NJ) E.  
 Boswell Gerlach Lynch  
 Boucher Gibbons Mack  
 Boustany Gilchrest Maloney  
 Boyd Gillmor Manzullo  
 Bradley (NH) Gingrey Marchant  
 Brady (PA) Gohmert Markey  
 Brown (OH) Gonzalez Marshall  
 Brown (SC) Goode Matheson  
 Brown, Corrine Goodlatte Matsui  
 Brown-Waite, Gordon McCarthy  
 Ginny Granger McCaul (TX)  
 Burgess Graves McCollum (MN)  
 Burton (IN) Green (WI) McCotter  
 Butterfield Green, Al McCreery  
 Buyer Green, Gene McGovern  
 Calvert Grijalva McHenry  
 Camp (MI) Gutierrez McHugh  
 Campbell (CA) Gutknecht McIntyre  
 Cantor Hall McKeon  
 Capito Harman McMorris  
 Capps Harris McNulty  
 Capuano Hart Meek (FL)  
 Cardin Hastings (FL) Meeks (NY)  
 Cardoza Hastings (WA) Melancon  
 Carnahan Hayes Mica  
 Carson Hayworth Michaud  
 Carter Hefley Millender-  
 Case Hensarling McDonald  
 Castle Herger Miller (FL)  
 Chabot Herseth Miller (MI)  
 Chandler Higgins Miller (NC)  
 Chocola Hinchey Miller, Gary  
 Clay Hinojosa Miller, George  
 Cleaver Hobson Mollohan  
 Clyburn Hoekstra Moore (KS)  
 Coble Holden Moore (WI)  
 Cole (OK) Holt Moran (KS)  
 Conaway Honda Moran (VA)  
 Cooper Hooley Murphy  
 Costa Hostettler Murtha  
 Cramer Hoyer Musgrave  
 Crenshaw Hulshof Myrick  
 Crowley Hyde Neal (MA)  
 Cubin Inglis (SC) Neugebauer  
 Cuellar Inslee Ney  
 Culberson Israel Northup  
 Cummings Issa Norwood  
 Davis (AL) Istook Nunes  
 Davis (CA) Jackson (IL) Oberstar  
 Davis (IL) Jackson-Lee  
 Davis (KY) (TX) Obey  
 Davis (TN) Jefferson Ortiz  
 Davis, Jo Ann Jenkins Osborne  
 Davis, Tom Jindal Otter  
 Deal (GA) Johnson (CT) Oxley  
 DeFazio Johnson (IL) Pallone  
 DeGette Johnson, E. B. Pascrell  
 Delahunt Johnson, Sam Pastor

Paul Ryun (KS) Tauscher  
 Payne Sabo Taylor (NC)  
 Pearce Salazar Terry  
 Pelosi Sanchez, Linda Thomas  
 Pence T. Thompson (CA)  
 Peterson (MN) Sanchez, Loretta Thompson (MS)  
 Peterson (PA) Sanders  
 Petri Saxton Thornberry  
 Pickering Schiff  
 Pitts Schmidt Tierney  
 Platts Schwartz (PA) Udall (CO)  
 Poe Schwarz (MI) Upton  
 Pombo Scott (GA) Van Hollen  
 Pomeroy Scott (VA) Velázquez  
 Porter Sensenbrenner Visclosky  
 Price (GA) Serrano Walden (OR)  
 Price (NC) Sessions Walsh  
 Pryce (OH) Shadegg Wamp  
 Putnam Shaw Wasserman  
 Radanovich Shays Sherman  
 Rahall Sherman Schultz  
 Ramstad Sherwood Waters  
 Regula Shimkus Watt  
 Rehberg Simmons Waxman  
 Reichert Simpson Weiner  
 Renzi Skelton Weldon (FL)  
 Reyes Slaughter Weldon (PA)  
 Reynolds Smith (NJ) Weller  
 Rogers (AL) Smith (TX) Westmoreland  
 Rogers (KY) Smith (WA) Wexler  
 Rogers (MI) Snyder Whitfield  
 Rohrabacher Solis Wicker  
 Ros-Lehtinen Souder Wilson (NM)  
 Ross Spratt Wilson (SC)  
 Rothman Stearns Wolf  
 Roybal-Allard Stupak Wu  
 Royce Sullivan Wynne  
 Rush Sweeney Young (AK)  
 Ryan (OH) Tancredo Young (FL)  
 Ryan (WI) Tanner

## NAYS—18

Becerra Lynch Stark  
 Conyers McKinney Taylor (MS)  
 Costello Meehan Towns  
 Kucinich Owens Udall (NM)  
 Lee Rangel Watson  
 Lewis (GA) Schakowsky Woolsey

## NOT VOTING—14

Brady (TX) Hunter Shuster  
 Cannon Nadler Sodrel  
 Davis (FL) Napolitano Strickland  
 Evans Nussle Turner  
 Ford Ruppertsberger

□ 1412

Mr. McDERMOTT and Mr. TOWNS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. BERRY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ROSS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Messrs. CLYBURN, JEFFERSON, PAYNE, and CLEAVER changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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.

Stated for:

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 292, I missed this vote due to attending Maryland State Delegate John Arnick's Funeral. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 20, 2006, I was absent due to a family obligation. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 292, agreeing to H. Res. 877—Providing for the consideration of H.R. 5631, Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2007.

COMMENDING THE PATRIOT  
 GUARD RIDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FEENEY). The pending business is the

question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 731, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. DRAKE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 731, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 0, answered “present” 2, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 293]

## YEAS—418

Abercrombie	Coble	Graves
Ackerman	Cole (OK)	Green (WI)
Aderholt	Conaway	Green, Al
Akin	Conyers	Green, Gene
Alexander	Cooper	Grijalva
Allen	Costa	Gutierrez
Andrews	Costello	Gutknecht
Baca	Cramer	Hall
Bachus	Crenshaw	Harman
Baird	Crowley	Harris
Baker	Cubin	Hart
Baldwin	Cuellar	Hastings (FL)
Barrett (SC)	Culberson	Hastings (WA)
Barrow	Cummings	Hayes
Bartlett (MD)	Davis (AL)	Hayworth
Barton (TX)	Davis (CA)	Hefley
Bass	Davis (IL)	Hensarling
Bean	Davis (KY)	Herger
Beauprez	Davis (TN)	Herseth
Becerra	Davis, Jo Ann	Higgins
Berkley	Davis, Tom	Hinchee
Berman	Deal (GA)	Hinojosa
Berry	DeFazio	Hobson
Biggert	DeGette	Hoekstra
Bilbray	Delahunt	Holden
Bilirakis	DeLauro	Holt
Bishop (GA)	Dent	Honda
Bishop (NY)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hooley
Bishop (UT)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hostettler
Blackburn	Dicks	Hoyer
Blumenauer	Dingell	Hulshof
Blunt	Doggett	Hyde
Boehlert	Doolittle	Inglis (SC)
Boehner	Doyle	Inslee
Bonilla	Drake	Israel
Bonner	Dreier	Issa
Bono	Duncan	Istook
Boozman	Edwards	Jackson (IL)
Boren	Ehlers	Jackson-Lee
Boswell	Emanuel	(TX)
Boucher	Emerson	Jefferson
Boustany	Engel	Jenkins
Boyd	English (PA)	Jindal
Bradley (NH)	Eshoo	Johnson (CT)
Brady (PA)	Etheridge	Johnson (IL)
Brown (OH)	Everett	Johnson, E. B.
Brown (SC)	Farr	Johnson, Sam
Brown, Corrine	Fattah	Jones (NC)
Brown-Waite,	Feeney	Jones (OH)
Ginny	Ferguson	Kanjorski
Burgess	Filner	Kaptur
Burton (IN)	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Keller
Butterfield	Flake	Kelly
Buyer	Foley	Kennedy (MN)
Calvert	Forbes	Kennedy (RI)
Camp (MI)	Fortenberry	Kildee
Campbell (CA)	Fossella	Kilpatrick (MI)
Cantor	Foxx	Kind
Capito	Frank (MA)	King (IA)
Capps	Franks (AZ)	King (NY)
Capuano	Frelinghuysen	Kingston
Cardin	Gallegly	Kirk
Cardoza	Garrett (NJ)	Kline
Carnahan	Gerlach	Knollenberg
Carson	Gibbons	Knollenberg
Carter	Gilchrest	Kucinich
Case	Gillmor	Kuhl (NY)
Castle	Gingrey	LaHood
Chabot	Gohmert	Langevin
Chandler	Gonzalez	Lantos
Chocola	Goode	Larsen (WA)
Clay	Goodlatte	Larson (CT)
Cleaver	Gordon	Latham
Clyburn	Granger	LaTourette