

small businesses everywhere are bearing the full weight of the Bush administration's failure to enact a meaningful energy policy.

On Monday, the President announced his most recent attempt to do something, and once again it is another insufficient and inadequate solution. This failed attempt at energy policy is a placebo. It is a fake solution to a very serious problem. There is a better way of doing things, and it begins with energy efficiency, developing renewable energy resources and moving away from fossil fuels.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY AND COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BALDWIN) laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, Committee on Science and Technology and Committee on Natural Resources:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 14, 2007.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: Pursuant to the passage by the House on Thursday, May 10, 2007 of H. Res. 393 "Election of Minority Members to Certain Standing Committees of the House," I have been elected to the Committee on Appropriations. Pursuant to my Conference's rules regarding service on certain select committees, I hereby resign from service on the following committees: Committee on Armed Services; Committee on Science and Technology; and Committee on Natural Resources. Thank you.

Sincerely,

KEN CALVERT (CA-44),
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1585, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 403 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 403

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. 1585) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2008, 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 except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and the amendments made in order by this

resolution and shall not exceed 90 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Armed Services now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI.

(b) Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution.

(c) Each amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report (except as specified in section 4 of this resolution), may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(d) All points of order against amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time for the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. The original proponent of an amendment included in such amendments en bloc may insert a statement in the Congressional Record immediately before the disposition of the amendments en bloc.

SEC. 4. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may recognize for consideration of any amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution out of the order printed, but not sooner than 30 minutes after the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services or a designee announces from the floor a request to that effect.

SEC. 5. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. 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.

SEC. 6. During consideration in the House of H.R. 1585 pursuant to this resolution, not

withstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

□ 1030

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, House Resolution 403 provides for consideration of H.R. 1585, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 under a structured rule. The rule provides 90 minutes of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services. The rule waives all points of order against the bill's consideration, except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The rule makes in order and provides appropriate waivers for 50 amendments. The rule also permits the Chair of the Committee on Armed Services or his designee to offer amendments not earlier disposed of en bloc and debated for 20 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the Chair and ranking member of the Armed Services Committee. The Chair of the Armed Services Committee also may request that amendments printed and ordered in the Rules Committee report be offered out of that order with appropriate notice on the floor.

Madam Speaker, today the new Congress, under Democratic leadership, will chart a new direction for a stronger and safer America through the adoption of the Defense authorization bill, H.R. 1585, and this rule. As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I am pleased to report that our committee, under the leadership of Chairman IKE SKELTON, passed the bill out of committee unanimously in a bipartisan way, 58-0.

The Defense bill provides \$648.6 billion to support our brave American men and women in uniform, but it does much more. The provisions in the bill would repair the damage done to America's national security by this White House by improving the readiness of our Armed Forces, requiring accountability from the White House in its

Iraq policy and making more strategic investments for the protection of the American people and our interests across the globe.

On readiness, we are going to take care of our troops and their families. We are going to fully fund the needs of our armed services. We are going to strengthen the National Guard and Reserves.

Here are a few details. We have authorized \$1.2 billion for body armor; \$2.5 billion for up-armored Humvees; \$1.2 billion for vehicle add-on armor; and \$509 million for the armored security vehicles. We are going to increase the end-strength of our armed services with 36,000 new soldiers in the Army, 9,000 new troops in the Marine Corps and 1,300 troops in the Army National Guard.

This bill authorizes \$4.5 billion to fund the anti-IED, improvised explosive device, efforts of the Joint Improved Explosive Device Defeat Organization.

In addition, Madam Speaker, although the President called for only a 3 percent pay raise for our brave men and women in uniform, we have gone far beyond that because we recognize the sacrifice that they are providing for the benefit of the American people, and we have provided a pay raise in this bill for our troops of 3.5 percent.

Inexplicably, in this time of conflict and war the Bush administration also proposed increases in health insurance premiums for our military retirees and troops under TRICARE and proposed cuts to active military medical services. We have blocked that measure. It is the wrong time for the White House to propose health insurance premium increases, when we are asking so much of our brave American men and women in uniform.

Madam Speaker, in this bill we have also included provisions that we passed last month, the Wounded Warrior Assistance Act, because we remain committed to seeing that our wounded servicemembers receive the best health care possible. Indeed, Madam Speaker, under that Wounded Warrior Assistance Act, we are answering the call of the American people. This new Congress is demanding, through this rule and through this legislation, that the executive branch move beyond the rhetoric of “support our troops” to concrete actions that sustain our brave men and women in uniform and their families by providing the quality health care they deserve when they return from the battlefield.

Supporting our troops does not mean that you simply salute and send them off to war, ask them to serve and sacrifice for our great country. But it also means that they are supported when they return home, their families are respected and our wounded warriors receive superior health care for their physical injuries and mental health care.

We are going to improve the health care-mental health care for our wounded

warriors in this bill. We are going to tackle the bureaucracy that has blocked their access to health care. We are going to require expedited action, provide medical advocates, improve support services for families and really tackle the traumatic brain injuries and aid the polytrauma centers and VA hospitals across this country that are serving the most crucially wounded.

Madam Speaker, this bill also calls for greater accountability from the White House. In this bill, we are requiring more in-depth reports on operations in Iraq. We want to know what is truly happening on the ground with the Iraqi security forces.

There has been so much waste and fraud in contracting in Iraq and under this White House that we are not going to put up with it any longer. The Department of Defense, the Department of State, USAID, must have additional oversight of the multibillion dollar contracts that have been approved during this war in Iraq. We require reports on the proficiencies of the Iraqi Army, the police, and all security forces there.

To the credit of this Armed Services Committee, we have not forgotten about Afghanistan. In fact, in this bill, as an additional accountability measure, we have established an Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, as we cannot sanction the waste and fraud that has accompanied the administration’s Iraq reconstruction.

Madam Speaker, we are also going to be more strategic in the defense of our national security. Like I said, Afghanistan cannot be the forgotten war. In fact, in this bill we direct more attention to operations there, in addition to the Inspector General that will oversee the reconstruction efforts. This bill contains a detailed plan to achieve long-term stability in what has been an unstable country in Afghanistan for many years.

Madam Speaker, we will hear debate today about missile defense. Now, this bill provides great investment in the protection and missile defense of this country. It also reinvigorates the non-proliferation and threat reduction initiatives that have suffered under the Bush administration. We are going to refocus our efforts strategically on terrorism and the true threats to our national security.

I am very proud to say that the headquarters of Special Operations Command is located in my district in Tampa, Florida, at the McDill Air Force Base. This Defense bill, under Democratic leadership, not only fully funds our Special Operations Forces, but it went beyond the Bush administration’s budget request, and we have funded their five unfunded needs under the Bush proposal.

We have also authorized a 25 percent increase in Special Forces by the year 2013, because we recognize that we cannot rely solely any longer on the conventional threats to our country. We have got to be smarter, we have to be

more strategic, and the Democratic Defense bill authorizes the increase in Special Forces and also a new emphasis on indirect action.

Oftentimes, to win the hearts and minds, you don’t go in with guns blazing. In fact, you institute a smarter policy where you work with folks on the ground to prevent any terrorist initiative from ever developing. And this bill does that.

We have reinvested additional resources to improve education and analytical intelligence surveillance. We harness the science and technology innovation in this country by investing in information technology and other technologies to make sure that our troops on the ground have the best technology available across the globe.

Yes, Madam Speaker, this Defense bill charts a new direction for true readiness, accountability and more strategic investments to protect our national security.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 contains provisions that are important to our troops serving abroad, to our national security and to my constituents in central Washington. It authorizes more funding for force protection, including over \$4 billion for vehicles designed to protect our troops from improvised explosive devices, or IEDs, in Iraq.

This legislation includes the Wounded Warrior Act, which passed the House earlier this year, that would help address the challenges that face our recovering servicemembers and families. This bill also extends the language enacted last year to prevent TRICARE copay increases.

In addition to providing the authorization levels that our servicemembers need, I am pleased that the language was included that emphasizes congressional support for the National Nuclear Security Administration’s role in the 300 Area transition at the Hanford Nuclear Reservation in my district and specifically at the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory.

The National Nuclear Security Administration, the Department of Energy Office of Science and the Department of Homeland Security all signed a memorandum of understanding last year agreeing to funding commitments for this very important transition.

□ 1045

The committee has been helpful on this issue in the past, and I appreciate its continued support in Pacific Northwest National Laboratory’s 300 Area

transition. A successful transition at the lab will make it possible for nearly 1,000 scientists to continue their work and allow key national security related missions to continue.

Another issue that is an issue of great importance is the ongoing cleanup of the Department of Energy's Hanford nuclear site, which is a legacy going back to World War II. I am pleased this committee, like in recent years, has supported my request to authorize the full \$690 million needed for the waste treatment plant next year.

Construction of the waste treatment plan is a critical effort to clean up some of our Nation's most dangerous legacy nuclear waste. I am pleased this legislation recognizes the importance of this project.

In addition to authorizing the funding needed for cleanup at Hanford, I am pleased that we are working to address the concerns of Department of Energy nuclear site workers who suffered health effects from their work at government sites. This bill includes language similar to a bill I recently co-sponsored that extends and increases the scope of the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Ombudsman's Office so that it is still better to assist workers seeking compensation.

The Ombudsman's Office assists workers who have filed for compensation under this compensation program. These workers, Madam Speaker, played a vital role in our Nation's defense during the hot war and the Cold War. If it is found that their illness has been caused by their work, they deserve just and prompt compensation.

I am also pleased that funding is authorized to upgrade and expand the training range at the Yakima Training Center in my district. \$29 million will be used to increase the size of the training space, allow for urban operation training, and support the digital systems used by today's Stryker forces. The new range is expected to be completed by August 2009, and will provide critical training for our active duty and Reserve Army soldiers.

Madam Speaker, while H.R. 1585 is a good bill, it is not a perfect bill. This bill cuts nearly \$800 million in funding for a robust, layered ballistic missile defense system capable of intercepting missiles at all stages of flight. Despite recent missile tests in North Korea and the intelligence community's belief that within the next decade Iran will have missiles capable of reaching the United States, the Democrat majority of the House Armed Services Committee rejected a proposal to restore more than \$764 million to the Missile Defense Agency's budget. I don't believe now is the time to slow down the development of a strong missile defense system. As ballistic missile threats increase, we must be able to develop the capabilities necessary to protect ourselves.

This bill also cuts \$867 million from the Army's modernization program,

the Future Combat Systems, which helps keep our Armed Forces prepared for future combat scenarios. It is important to find new technologies to optimize information flow and combat systems in the future, but the severe cuts in this bill puts the modernization of the Army in jeopardy. This 1-year cut is greater than cuts in the last 3 years combined.

Congressman TODD AKIN from Missouri, the ranking Republican on the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, put forward an amendment to the Rules Committee last night to restore \$134 million for Future Combat Systems. But sadly, his amendment was rejected on a party-line vote by the Democrat-controlled Rules Committee.

Madam Speaker, a total of 135 amendments were allowed to be submitted to the Rules Committee for consideration, and this rule allows for consideration of 50 amendments on the floor today. I am deeply troubled that for the first time, the first time during my tenure in Congress and tenure on the Rules Committee, Members of Congress reported that they were actually prohibited, prohibited from submitting an amendment to the committee after the deadline.

Specifically, Congressman AKIN from Missouri and Congressman GINGREY from Georgia attempted to offer second-degree amendments to an amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD) concerning the morning-after pill.

These types of amendments by definition cannot be drafted until the text of the original amendment has been seen, and therefore, it was after the announced amendment deadline that each of those two Members, AKIN and GINGREY, attempted to submit their amendments. But the submission, the submission itself was denied by the Democrat majority.

While amendments to amendments are not the norm of the House, Members certainly have had the ability to offer such amendments to the Rules Committee, or at least they did, Madam Speaker, until this week.

So let me be clear. The Democrat leadership actually denied Members of Congress the opportunity to have their amendments presented and then denied by the committee because typically amendments that are offered late are denied. But they didn't even have the opportunity to submit them late.

All Members of Congress are elected to this body and they have the duty to represent their constituents through the legislative process. The manner in which these Members of Congress were treated was unnecessary. Madam Speaker, I certainly hope it never happens again.

I am also disappointed that the Democrat majority has chosen to go out of its way to be inconsistent and change the rules and definitions, leaving Members of Congress questioning what rules and norms they should follow. Demo-

crats on the Rules Committee have chosen to strictly enforce the amendment deadline on some occasions, but on others they have made amendments in order that were submitted past the deadline. They have changed the definition of rules, and for the first time in at least a decade they have outright rejected Members of Congress from submitting amendments to the Rules Committee for consideration.

Last year, the Speaker and Members of the current majority pledged that this Congress would be the most open Congress in history. However, on several occasions now the Rules Committee has literally closed the door on Members and denied them the opportunity to submit an amendment to the committee.

Madam Speaker, I remain optimistic. I tend to have that in my nature. But so far, I must say the new Democrat majority, so far their actions have spoken much, much louder than their words.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, when it comes to the Rules Committee, I think the record should reflect the true reality.

On this Defense bill, over 130 amendments were filed and reviewed in committee, and a record-breaking number of 50 amendments have been allowed on this bill today.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. CASTOR. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I would ask the gentlewoman, how many of those 135 amendments were second-degree amendments?

Ms. CASTOR. None.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. None. That is precisely my point.

My point is how can a Member offer a second-degree amendment until an amendment has been offered to which a Member could respond to.

So the gentlelady talks about 135 amendments. That tends to be somewhere near the norm for Defense authorization bills in the past. So there is nothing outside that norm. I thank the gentlelady for making the point. None of the 135 were second-degree amendments, and my remarks were specifically addressed to second-degree amendments.

Ms. CASTOR. I thank my colleague from the Rules Committee because he is aware, and anyone who attended that committee meeting would be aware, that certain second-degree amendments were in fact offered by the other side of the aisle and were debated and voted upon in committee.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. CASTOR. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. It is true we, the minority members of the

Rules Committee, offered secondary amendments, but they are secondary amendments, and we had asked unanimous consent of the full committee to break the order because they were denied to be submitted on regular order.

So while, yes, we offered them and they were defeated on a party-line vote, had they been offered, they would have had a notation that they were late and they probably would have been rejected.

My point is you broke from tradition. You broke from tradition by not allowing a Member to submit an amendment late. That is my whole point. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Ms. CASTOR. I thank the gentleman.

The fact remains over 135 amendments were submitted on time to the Rules Committee, and a record-breaking number of 50 amendments are being allowed and made in order on this Defense bill.

I think it is also important to respond to the claims that missile defense is not funded through this bill. Indeed, that is incorrect. The record should reflect that only in Washington can a program be provided and funded with billions and billions of dollars for numerous decades; and then say, oh, we are suffering. In fact, that is not the case.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding me this time, and acknowledge her leadership on this rule, as well as the leadership of the gentleman from Washington, for having the kind of debate we should have on the floor of the House.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule and the bill. I want to applaud Chairman SKELTON for his leadership in guiding the bill to the floor today, and also acknowledge Ranking Member HUNTER and our expert staff on the committee.

I want to particularly acknowledge the way in which Chairman SKELTON worked with me on important items for Colorado, including limits on how the Army can pursue possible expansion of the Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site.

Others include funding a new squadron operations facility for the Colorado Air National Guard; promoting an agreement between the Air Force and the City of Pueblo about flight operations at the Pueblo airport; urging the Defense Department to use on-site disposal of chemical weapons stockpiled at the Pueblo Chemical Depot; asking the Army to track pilots who train at the High Altitude Aviation Training School in Eagle, Colorado; and naming a housing facility at Fort Carson in honor of our former colleague, Joel Hefley.

I am also pleased that the committee adopted two of my amendments, including one to repeal a provision adopted last year that makes it easier for

the President to federalize the National Guard for domestic law enforcement purposes during emergencies. By repealing this, my amendment restores the role of the Governors with regard to this subject.

Madam Speaker, the bill rightly focuses on our military's readiness needs. After 5 years at war, both the active duty and the Reserve forces are stretched to their limits. The bill will provide what is needed to respond, including a substantial Strategic Readiness Fund and additional funds for National Guard equipment and training.

It enlarges the Army and the Marine Corps, consistent with the Tauscher-Udall Army expansion bill in the last Congress, and it will provide a 3.5 percent across-the-board pay raise for servicemembers, boost funding for the Defense Health Program, prohibit increasing TRICARE and pharmacy user fees, and establish a Traumatic Brain Injury Initiative to allow emerging technologies and treatments to compete for funding.

Madam Speaker, this is an excellent bill, a carefully drafted and bipartisan bill, and I urge its passage.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE).

Mr. GOODE. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. I was surprised and chagrined when I looked over the long list of 50 amendments and saw missing from that list the Troops on the Border amendment which had been made in order for the 10 past years.

As you may recall, Troops on the Border would authorize our Armed Forces to combat illegal immigration, drug smugglers and potential terrorists. It would be optional for the troops to be used, but it would be a message to illegal aliens, those involved in the illegal drug trade, and those who would wreak harm on our country that we would use those troops where necessary to defend our borders.

Let me tell you just a minute about the history of this amendment. Between 1997 and 2001, it was offered five times by a Democrat and adopted by this body. I have had the honor for the past 5 years to offer the amendment, and it was adopted by the body each of those 5 years.

This bill would be much stronger and would send a message that we are serious about border security if this amendment had been made in order. I hope we will reject the rule for its failure to stand up for the integrity of our border.

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Florida for yielding me this time, and also for your effective leadership on the House Rules Committee.

□ 1100

Also, let me just acknowledge and thank our chairman of the House

Armed Services Committee, Chairman SKELTON, for his dedication to the brave men and women who are serving in the Armed Forces and also to our national security.

I believe in this bill, Madam Speaker, that we should be taking meaningful steps to end the occupation of Iraq and to bring our troops home. Iraq is in a civil war, and our occupation only inflames the insurgency and puts our troops in harm's way. The facts on the ground betray the administration's empty rhetoric.

A majority of the American people support withdrawal from Iraq, and here we have a chance to press the issue further. We need enforceable timetables for withdrawal from Iraq, and we must hold this administration accountable.

Also, I am disappointed that the amendment which Congresswoman WOOLSEY and I offered was not made in order. Our amendment basically would have just simply required the President to present a plan for withdrawal and execute complete withdrawal within 6 months. It recognizes that there is no military solution to this civil war.

The bottom line is that we must continue to demand that the President end the occupation and bring our troops home, and we must do so at every opportunity.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS), a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Madam Speaker, since mankind took up arms against his fellow human beings, every offensive weapon has been countered by a defensive weapon. The spear brought the shield. The sword spawned the suit of armor. Bullets brought heavier armor, and each succeeding advancement in offensive weapons has brought a defensive response wherein mankind hopes to buy a little more time.

Yet, today, when we are 60 years into the nuclear age and mankind faces the most dangerous weapons in the history of humanity, there is in this moment a debate in the United States Congress as to whether or not the United States of America should fully pursue defending its citizens against nuclear missiles.

Madam Speaker, the Rumsfeld Commission report stated that North Korea has developed a missile with a range of 10,000 kilometers, "placing at risk western U.S. territory in an arc extending northwest from Phoenix, Arizona, to Madison, Wisconsin."

In this Defense authorization bill, the Democrats cut nearly \$800 million from missile defense. This prompted me to offer six amendments before the Rules Committee last night, but under this rule, Madam Speaker, only one has been made in order; and whether or not it will be adopted still remains to be seen. However, under the rule, one Democrat amendment that was made in order was one to cut missile defense another \$1 billion.

Madam Speaker, if we truly build a layered missile defense system that may one day call on us to apologize to the American people for building a defensive system that proved unnecessary, that I can go home and live with. But God save us from the day when we will have to apologize to the American people for failing to build a system that could have protected them from the unspeakable nightmare of missiles turning American cities into nuclear flames.

Madam Speaker, if we build it, maybe they will not come.

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We did have a debate over missile defense in the Armed Services Committee, but at the end of the day, recall we had a unanimous vote, 58–0, bipartisan vote, to send this bill to the floor.

I would offer, there is no debate. We must protect this great country from nuclear threats, missile threats; and in fact, this bill does that.

We have provided \$1.4 billion for Patriot PAC-3 and MEADS. These funds will be used to purchase additional interceptors, upgrade remaining firing units' configuration, continue the development of the MEADS program and purchase equipment for two additional Patriot battalions.

The committee also authorized \$1.1 billion for Aegis BMD, an increase of \$78 million above the budget request from the White House. These funds will be used to continue and expand the fielding of Standard Missile-3, improve the discrimination capabilities of the Aegis SPY1 radar, and continue the joint development with Japan of the SM-3 Block IIA missile.

We have authorized \$2.3 billion for ground-based missile defense.

The committee supports THAAD and authorizes \$858 million to continue the purchase of two THAAD firing units. So to come to the floor and say that missile defense is not provided for in this bill is incorrect.

What we are facing, though, is because of this war in Iraq, we have growing needs for the troops on the ground. So our committee made the decision that the troops on the ground come first; that they will have the body armor, they will have the MRAP vehicles, the mine-resistant vehicles, because that is the priority today. Tough decisions, but our troops come first on the ground.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON).

Mr. MATHESON. Madam Speaker, the Department of Energy and the Department of Defense have been proposing the development of a new nuclear warhead under the Reliable Replacement Warhead program, and they are also proposing an ambitious nuclear weapons complex modernization proposal called Complex 2030. And the bill we are going to be voting on today provides funding for those activities.

This is a multibillion dollar agenda, and it's being proposed, in my opinion, in a policy vacuum without any administration statement on the national security environment that the future nuclear deterrent is designed to address.

The lack of any definitive analysis or strategic assessment defining the agenda of future nuclear stockpiles makes it impossible for Congress to weigh the relative merits of investing the billions of taxpayer dollars in new nuclear weapon production activities when the United States is facing the other challenge of having too large a stockpile as a legacy from the Cold War.

Now, the argument for the Reliable Replacement Warhead program started out with a concern that was most frequently expressed, at least was about, the expected lifetimes of the plutonium pits, which are the nuclear core of our existing nuclear weapons. At the time, their projected life span was 45–60 years, and with some of our arsenal having entered the force in the 1970s and 1980s, there would be a cause for concern.

However, just a few months ago, we received a new study performed by the independent JASON panel, a highly respected body often consulted on technical issues. That study, using data compiled by the nuclear weapons labs, shows that all the plutonium pits in our existing weapons have life spans of at least 85 years, and most are good for 100 years or more. The labs themselves agree with the studies. So, it seems there isn't a threat to the reliability of our current nuclear warheads.

So I think we need to be careful. This bill, while funding was reduced somewhat on the Reliable Replacement Warhead program, I think we need to be careful about going down a path that we may not need to go down.

In conclusion, we should be careful not to hurry down a path when the reliable plutonium pit is no longer an issue. Should we be in a hurry to go down a path when the history of the Department of Energy includes a long list of cancelled and over-budget projects that were started before the objective was thoroughly thought through and understood? We should not make that mistake with the Nation's nuclear weapons complex or the decisions to begin building new nuclear weapons.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN), a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. AKIN. Madam Speaker, the rule that we are considering does not allow a very critical amendment which we voted on in committee. Several of the votes that were most important in committee were not done in a bipartisan way. They were strict party-line votes. This was one of those. One was missile defense; the other is the modernization program for the Army.

The modernization program for the Army that I am talking about was cut

by 25 percent, a massive slash in that particular program. What that program does is, it provides the first major modernization program in the last 40 years for the Army. What the program does is, it provides real-time online information, networking, a whole group of different sensors, satellites and individuals on the field, tanks, unmanned aerial vehicles, pulling all that information together to give us accurate and timely information in the battlefield.

Now, anybody who's studied military warfare will tell you that if you just had this piece of information or that piece of information, the tide of battle would have shifted, and so this whole system is designed to provide that information for our warfighters. It has been slashed 25 percent. It is called Future Combat Systems.

Why is that important? First of all, it means you've got to go all the way back to the drawing board with this program, changing all the time schedules. It is tremendously complex.

The second thing is that this program really is the forerunner for things that will be used by the Marines and the Navy. The Navy calls it more network centric warfare, but the concept, the software, will be the same.

Now, we are denied an opportunity to try to restore some funding to the Army's first major modernization program in 40 years. The result is that our sons and daughters will have to pay the price. My own sons will have to pay the price because we have not gotten the information that is absolutely critical to our warfighter there at the time that we need to do it.

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think it is also very important for the record to reflect that the Army is fully funded in its needs. Indeed, \$13.6 billion are authorized through this Defense bill to fully address the equipment reset of the Army.

What has happened, because of the war in Iraq and in Afghanistan, and we all know this, but readiness of our Armed Forces has suffered. Indeed, the Army Chief of Staff testified before the Armed Services Committee that the escalation of the war creates a terrible strategic risk for this country.

If there was any other threat from across the globe that threatened our national security, it would be very difficult for us to respond because all of the equipment, all of the trucks, the Humvees, are there in Iraq. When the units are deployed and go over to Iraq, they are not able to bring the equipment back.

This was highlighted recently in the State of Kansas with these terrible tornados, when the governor of Kansas told us directly that they were not able to respond as quickly. I'll tell you, coming from the State of Florida, at the beginning of the hurricane season, this is an issue.

We have also had to make these tough decisions about equipping our

warriors on the ground with the equipment that they need.

The Army came forward during their budget discussion in Armed Services and said our most critical need are these mine-resistant ambush vehicles that have the armor to withstand the IEDs that has caused so much death and destruction. The Bush administration did not have a funding plan for those MRAP vehicles. So what do we do?

We have got to provide the troops on the ground with the equipment they need to stay safe and survive. Does that mean that some other programs that aren't as tested and aren't as proven get a slight cut? Yes, it does. Yes, it does, because that is a priority, protecting the troops on the ground today.

Mr. TIAHRT. Madam Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. CASTOR. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. TIAHRT. Madam Speaker, being the gentleman from Kansas here, I would like to address the mention of the Kansas National Guard.

I was in Greensburg, Kansas, where the tornado occurred, four times since it has occurred and on Saturday the day after the tornado occurred, General Tod Bunning, the Adjutant General of Kansas, said he had all the equipment needed to respond to emergencies in Kansas. This was restated by him again on Monday and again Wednesday when the President visited.

So the Army National Guard in Kansas has plenty of equipment to respond to emergencies, and to reference that it does not have the equipment would be a mischaracterization of the facts in Kansas.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman and before I reserve the balance of my time, on the future combat systems, so the record is clear, only in Washington can you provide \$2.8 billion to a program and then say that's not enough.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER), the ranking member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. BUYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am coming to the floor deeply disappointed that the Rules Committee has denied two amendments that would have protected veterans. We in the VA maintain a national formulary based on a system of deep discounts on prescription drugs through a system of price controls, and we maintain this national formulary. We're able to do that because we are able to purchase drugs at 76 percent of the non-Federal average manufacturing price.

□ 1115

It is a price control. But what is happening? The onslaught of the Democrat

majority against pharmaceutical manufacturers continues. They want now to extend the price controls, VA pricing, now into DOD.

All I asked for was an amendment. The amendment would have asked for a certification from the Secretary of Defense to this Congress that their ambition to do this would not increase prices on our veterans.

The VA national formulary amounts to about 1 percent of the pharmaceutical marketplace. The more we extend these price controls, whether it goes into the DOD TRICARE pharmacy, they even want to extend it into Medicare. As you do that, we continue to cost shift.

I am deeply disappointed that the Democrat majority would make this onslaught, not just against pharmaceutical manufacturers, that gets their political juices going, but in the meantime they are going to smack veterans right in the face. It is very disappointing. Now, it is a simple amendment, and they should have made it in order.

There was a second amendment. The second amendment that I asked to be in order, that was also denied, was that I asked that with regard to this provision, whereby the Secretary of Defense may now be able to deny a drug being placed on the TRICARE formulary, if they do not offer the Federal pricing schedule, I asked that, with regard to this provision the Secretary shall not be able to exclude from the pharmacy benefits program any pharmaceutical agent that the Pharmacy and Therapeutics Committee determines to be clinically effective or that the patient or the provider demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Pharmacy and Therapeutics Committee that it is clinically necessary. That's denied also.

I am stunned. I am stunned. But let's be very clear, America, what is happening. This is a socialist policy. You say oh, my gosh, STEVE, don't use the word "socialist." No, this is a socialist policy. A socialist policy is one of price controls. Why do we say we do that with regard to veterans? Because we say in the VA there is no greater classification of people in our society that we should be able to give these deep discounts to than our disabled veterans.

But then what does the Democrat majority want to do? They want to take these deep discounts then and give them into TRICARE, give them into the Medicare prescription drug program. They want to continue to use price controls.

What happens when you do that? Not only do you cost shift, but you also have a dulling effect on research and development that hurts, that hurts this country. I am deeply disappointed that these amendments were denied.

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague from the Armed Services Committee, Ms. GIFFORDS of Arizona.

Ms. GIFFORDS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to highlight a very important issue facing our Nation that is addressed in this legislation, mental health care for our troops. The mental health implications of extended and repeated combat tours in Iraq and Afghanistan are now only beginning to be understood.

Among Vietnam-era veterans, the lifetime rate of PTSD, sometimes taking decades to appear, is 30 percent. According to the VA, the current rate for Iraq and Afghanistan veterans is already 20 percent. The mental health needs of the generation of combat veterans that we are creating will face this country for decades to come.

We must realize that the nature and scope of warfare has changed, bringing a new level of stress to combat deployments that is fundamentally new. Even in the Green Zone of Baghdad soldiers are repeatedly attacked and regularly attacked.

The troops must cope with ongoing severe stress for months to come. Experts tell us that extended periods of stress like this, with no way to alleviate it, create the conditions where PTSD is most likely to develop.

According to a recent report in the New England Journal of Medicine, 95 percent of troops in Army and Marine units report having been shot at during their deployment, and 95 percent report seeing dead bodies, 89 percent report being ambushed or attacked. One in five is currently suffering from depression, anxiety or stress while deployed. Twenty percent are now facing marital problems, including divorce or legal separation from their spouse. The after-effect of these extended and highly stressful combat deployments will continue to affect their families, the military and our communities for many, many years to come.

I believe that we need to shift towards preventive care. What we know from our experience is that PTSD not being treated can start a downward tragic cycle of addiction, isolation and despair. This bill improves a mental health training for military case managers working with outpatient facilities like Walter Reed so they can identify problems early.

This way we can help provide treatment before returning servicemen are discharged and left to fend for themselves. This bill also creates critical new funding to best identify practices. Mental health is critical for our troops, and I am very interested in passing this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to highlight a very important issue facing this country that is addressed in this legislation: mental health care for our troops. The mental health implications of extended, and repeated combat tours in Iraq and Afghanistan are now only beginning to be understood.

Among Vietnam-era veterans, the lifetime rate of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder, sometimes taking decades to appear, is about 30 percent. According to the VA, the current rate for Iraq and Afghanistan veterans is already 20 percent.

The mental health needs of the generation of combat veterans that we are creating will face this country for decades to come. We must realize that the nature and scope of warfare has changed, bringing a level of stress to combat deployments that is fundamentally new.

Even the Green Zone in Baghdad is attacked regularly, and the lives of troops stationed there are literally at risk every single day of their deployments. The troops must cope with ongoing, severe stress for months on end. Experts tell us that extended periods of stress like this, with no way to alleviate it, create the conditions where PTSD is most likely to develop.

According to a recent report in the New England Journal of Medicine, 95 percent of troops in Army and Marine units report having been shot at during their deployment, and 95 percent report seeing dead bodies. Eighty-nine percent reported being ambushed or attacked.

One in five is suffering from depression, anxiety or stress while deployed. Twenty percent face marital problems including divorce or legal separation from their spouse.

The after-effect of extended and highly stressful combat deployments continues to affect military communities and families long after the service member has returned home.

I believe the most important shift is to move toward preventative care. What we know from decades of experience is that PTSD, left untreated, can begin a tragic downward spiral of addiction, isolation and despair.

This bill improves the mental health training for military case managers working with outpatients at facilities like Walter Reed, so they can identify potential problems early. This way, we can help provide treatment before returning servicemen are discharged and left to fend for themselves.

It authorizes critical new funding to identify best practices and build up our clinical knowledge of PTSD and how best to treat it. And it creates a mechanism to improve the transition from the DoD health system into the VA system, so that service members will not fall through the cracks.

Not every American chooses to wear the uniform and serve this country. Not every family stays up lonely nights and waits for a father, husband, mother, wife, or child to come home. Not everyone hears the call of their country and says 'send me.' But for those who do, we owe it to be there for them when they get back.

I will be proud to vote for this legislation that supports our troops and brings a new focus on critical mental health issues.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlelady from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON).

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Madam Speaker, the Democrat leadership has blocked several important amendments on this bill, and I will oppose this rule. But there is one that they block that makes absolutely no sense, and it really calls into question the priorities of the majority on the Rules Committee.

There are 2 million women in this country's history who have served in uniform. All of them have been volunteers, and I was one of them. I am the only woman veteran serving in the United States Congress.

One in seven Americans serving in Iraq or Afghanistan are women, and the challenges that they face when they come home are often different than their male counterparts, particularly when accessing health care from both DOD facilities and VA facilities. Many women veterans don't even call themselves veterans and don't know that they are eligible for care, and care is not always available that is appropriate for women in the VA system.

I offered an amendment that was noncontroversial, and it wasn't even particularly aggressive. All it said was that we should have a bipartisan commission to make some recommendations to us to get a group of people together, including women veterans, to make recommendations to this House on how we can make this system better for women veterans so they can get the health care that they need, and all of us have seen the problems that women veterans are facing.

The amendment wasn't made in order.

Now, I know, like everyone else, that time on the floor is limited, and we can't do everything. But I would note that an amendment was made in order for a study in Ms. SLAUGHTER's district, the chairwoman of the Rules Committee, for a plan for Niagara Air Reserve Base in her district. So we have got time on the floor to have an amendment for a study for Ms. SLAUGHTER, but 2 million women veterans don't count as much.

So I would ask my colleague here from Florida, who is here defending the decision of the Rules Committee, why did you, in your committee, think it was more important to allow an amendment for a study of Niagara Air Reserve Base in Ms. SLAUGHTER's district and to turn your back on 2 million women veterans?

I yield 30 seconds to get an answer from the Rules Committee. Why is the Niagara Air Reserve Base study more important than helping 2 million women veterans get their health care? You didn't rule my amendment in order. What's your excuse?

Ms. CASTOR. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

We did have, in over 5 months of the Armed Services Committee, many opportunities to hear from Members across the aisle. I question why this wasn't brought up before the committee at that time.

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. I am not, as the gentlewoman knows, I am not a member of the Armed Services Committee. This is my opportunity to offer the amendment, and you have set your priorities.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

Mr. BUYER. Madam Speaker, I am so upset that the Democrat majority has denied my amendments. I am trying to protect America's veterans.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. BUYER. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 161, nays 253, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 350]	YEAS—161	
Aderholt	Flake	Mica
Akin	Fossella	Miller (MI)
Alexander	Foxx	Miller, Gary
Bachmann	Franks (AZ)	Myrick
Bachus	Frelinghuysen	Neugebauer
Baker	Galligan	Nunes
Barrett (SC)	Garrett (NJ)	Pastor
Bartlett (MD)	Gerlach	Paul
Barton (TX)	Gilchrest	Pearce
Biggert	Gingrey	Pence
Bilbray	Gohmert	Pitts
Bilirakis	Goode	Porter
Bishop (UT)	Goodlatte	Price (GA)
Blackburn	Granger	Pryce (OH)
Boehner	Graves	Putnam
Bonner	Hall (TX)	Radanovich
Bono	Hastert	Regula
Brady (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Rehberg
Brown-Waite,	Hayes	Reichert
Ginny	Heller	Renzi
Buchanan	Hensarling	Reynolds
Burgess	Hobson	Rogers (AL)
Burton (IN)	Hoekstra	Rogers (KY)
Buyer	Hooley	Rogers (MI)
Calvert	Hulshof	Rohrabacher
Camp (MI)	Inglis (SC)	Ros-Lehtinen
Campbell (CA)	Issa	Roskam
Cannon	Jindal	Royce
Cantor	Johnson (IL)	Ryan (WI)
Capito	Johnson, Sam	Sali
Carter	Jordan	Schmidt
Castle	King (IA)	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	King (NY)	Sessions
Coble	Kingston	Shadegg
Cole (OK)	Kirk	Shimkus
Conaway	Kline (MN)	Smith (NE)
Crenshaw	Knollenberg	Smith (NJ)
Culberson	Kuhl (NY)	Shuster
Davis (KY)	LaHood	Simpson
Davis, David	Lamborn	Smith (TX)
Davis, Tom	Latham	Tancredo
Deal (GA)	LaTourette	Thornberry
Dent	Lewis (CA)	Tiahrt
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lewis (KY)	Upton
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lucas	Walberg
Doolittle	Lungren, Daniel	Wamp
Dreier	E.	Westmoreland
Duncan	Mack	Whitfield
Ehlers	Manzullo	Wilson (NM)
Emerson	Marchant	Wilson (SC)
English (PA)	McCarthy (CA)	Wolf
Everett	McCaul (TX)	Young (AK)
Fallin	McCotter	
Feeney	McHenry	
Ferguson	McKeon	
	NAYS—253	
Ackerman	Blunt	Carney
Allen	Boozman	Castor
Altman	Boren	Chandler
Andrews	Boswell	Clarke
Arcuri	Boucher	Clay
Baca	Boustany	Cleaver
Baird	Boyd (FL)	Clyburn
Baldwin	Boysda (KS)	Cohen
Barrow	Brady (PA)	Conyers
Bean	Braley (IA)	Cooper
Becerra	Brown (SC)	Costa
Berkley	Brown, Corrine	Costello
Berman	Butterfield	Courtney
Berry	Capps	Cramer
Bishop (GA)	Capuano	Crowley
Bishop (NY)	Cardoza	Cuellar
Blumenauer	Carnahan	Cummings