trust for the Washoe Indian Tribe of Nevada and California.

S. 2789. An act to amend the Congressional Award Act to establish a Congressional Recognition for Excellence in Arts Education Board.

S. 3181. An act to establish the White House Commission on the National Moment of Remembrance, and for other purposes.

S. Con. Res. 138. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a day of peace and sharing should be established at the beginning of each year.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1936) ''An Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell or exchange all or part of certain administrative sites and other National Forest System land in the State of Oregon and use the proceeds derived from the sale or exchange for National Forest System purposes.''

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2915) ''An Act to make improvements in the operation and administration of the Federal courts, and for other purposes.''

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4577, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 7(c) of House rule XXII, I hereby notify the House of my intention tomorrow to offer, to demand an immediate vote on prescription drug relief for seniors, to offer the following motion to instruct House conferees on H.R. 4577, a bill making appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. DOGGETT moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 4577 be instructed, in resolving the differences between the two Houses on the funding level for program management in carrying out titles XI, XVIII, XIX, and XXI of the Social Security Act, to choose a level that reflects a requirement to prohibit, through the Secretary of Health and Human Services, any market exclusivity for a prescription drug manufactured by a pharmaceutical manufacturer if the manufacturer does not make available to individuals eligible for benefits under such title XVIII all prescription drugs manufactured by the manufacturer at the best available price (as defined in section 1927(c)(1)(C) of such Act) or at the lowest negotiated price paid to such manufacturer for such prescription drugs by any Federal agency or department.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4577, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 7(c) of House rule XXII, I hereby notify the House of my intention tomorrow to offer the following motion to instruct House conferees on H.R. 4577, a bill making appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. PALLONE moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 4577 be instructed, in resolving the differences between the two Houses on the funding level for program management in carrying out titles XI, XVIII, XIX, and XXI of the Social Security Act, to choose a level that reflects a requirement on Medicare+Choice organizations to offer Medicare+Choice plans under part C of such title XVIII for a minimum contract period of three years, and to maintain the benefits specified under the contract for the three years.

0930

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.J. Res. 118, making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 646, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 118) and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of House Joint Resolution 118 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 118

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 106–275 is further amended by striking the date specified in section 106(c) and inserting ''October 29, 2000''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 646, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, very briefly, this is another of those 1-day CRs, continuing resolutions, that are necessary because the President of the United States has refused to sign anything other than a 1-day continuing resolution. It does not make any other changes to the current CR; it just continues the appropriations process until midnight tomorrow night. I assume there will be some lengthy debate, as there was yesterday, on the last one-day CR, but we will get to a vote as soon as we can.

I would like to just briefly report that at the conclusion of business yesterday, we did resume negotiations with the other body and with White House representatives, and we made some progress. We will make more progress today, and we will make more progress on Sunday. If we could offer instructions to the conferees in the other body and instructions to the White House, the same as our colleagues want to offer instructions to the House conferees today and tomorrow, things might move along a lot more expeditiously. However, we only have the authority here to make nonbinding instructions to ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, there is more than the House involved in this process. I would just point out once again, as I have so many times before, the House did all of its appropriations business very early, and what is delaying the completion of the appropriations process today is not really appropriation issues. By far, the most part of the controversial issues that are out there have nothing to do with appropriations. They are philosophical in nature, they are political, and they are authorization issues as opposed to appropriation issues.

But, since appropriations bills are the bills that have to pass, they become very, very fertile vehicles for those who would like to add extraneous items to the appropriations bills.

Mr. Speaker, I guarantee my colleagues, we will get to the end of this process; we will conclude this business, and we will have Members home at least in time to vote on Election Day.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take 30 minutes. Let me simply say that the gentleman from Florida is right. We have to approve this resolution again to keep the government open.

I am concerned about two developments. Number one, early yesterday it appeared, in fact we were told, that the conference needed to be wrapped up by the end of the day yesterday so that we could have a bill on the floor immediately when we came back to the House on Monday or Tuesday. It will take about 2 days to go through all of the technicalities to do what is called a readout so that everybody's staff is sure of what every item is in that bill, so that at least somebody understands what each item is. So we were told that we should have all the work done Friday.

Then, after the meeting reconvened, we were given another schedule, which indicated, for instance, that we would not even be able to resolve the issue with respect to school construction until after the fate of the tax bill is resolved on Tuesday or so. That means that there is a high potential that we will be stuck here not just Tuesday, but Wednesday or Thursday, because if we are not going to be making those decisions until Tuesday, and if we have to go through the usual readout requirement, we could have a real problem.

In addition, as the gentleman from Florida says, I do not know exactly how many extraneous items there are on the bill at this point, but if we were to add all of them, many of which I would support if they were on individual pieces of legislation, but if we were to add all of them to this bill, this bill would wind up being longer than the Bible, the Talmud, the Koran, and add to it every comic book ever printed in the history of the United States. I think we would have results that were just about as silly as those comic books.

So there are going to be a lot of people who are disappointed, because we are being asked by authorization committee members on bill after bill after bill after bill to include this or that provision and some of them are very meritorious, and some of them would fit the needs of my district, some of them would fit the needs of some of others' districts, but we are going to have a very tough time producing a bill that is not the laughing stock of the Western world if we are not very disciplined in terms of what we wind up adding.

So I think we will see both the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and myself, and probably the two conferees from the Senate, rejecting dozens of provisions which we ourselves personally favor, simply trying to keep this bill to a manageable size. I would ask for the forbearance of each individual Member who has a hot idea about what ought to be included in the last minute.

No question, there are some that are emergencies, and we will have to try to act on them. But this is not going to be an easy weekend, and I would say that my only point of disagreement with the gentleman who spoke, and it is not a disagreement with the way he has tried to perform. The very first bills that he brought to the committee this year were bipartisan in nature.

The first three bills that came up in committee could have had this year and last year bipartisan support, but somewhere along the line we all became prisoners of a set of assumptions in the budget resolution that was passed by the House at the direction of the leadership, a set of assumptions which were highly unrealistic and did not at all reflect what, in fact, this Congress intended to spend on these items in the end. That, to me, is the real problem.

I just want to say as an institutionalist in this House, I know a lot of us, every time we come to the end of the session, start shooting at the Committee on Appropriations and saying, if only the appropriators could get this done, we would not be in this mess. I honestly believe, if we left it to the appropriators to decide the appropriations issues without extraneous pressures, we could have a deal on all of this stuff in about 3 hours. I really believe that. The problem is that lots of other things are intervening.

I would also note that the real problem we have is that when we start with a budget resolution which is not real, that means that we cannot produce real appropriation bills until the budget resolution does get real, and it has taken about 8 months to do that.

I will give one example. Lest I be accused of partisanship, I will give one example of how that occurred in the deep dark distant past, in 1981. In 1981, when the budget resolution was before us in the first Reagan year, the last item holding up the conference on that budget resolution was whether or not the agriculture number was real. To meet the targets in the Republican budget resolution, it was decided that we had to cut, I believe it was, $400 million out of agriculture. In order to get the votes to pass that, the grain State representatives were told that that money was going to come out of dairy, and the dairy State representatives were told that the money was going to come out of grain. So we had two false assumptions that were used to pass a number that was unreal.

That has occurred many times over on the budget resolution that this committee was forced to operate under this year, and that is why the first 10 months were essentially wasted. So now, our committee is being asked to perform an impossible act and correct 10 months of disingenuousness in about 2 weeks, and that is just almost impossible to do, especially when we are not being given free reign to make the choices that you know would solve the problem.

So I hope that we will have a cooperative spirit in the conference, but we are going to have to have some choices made that allow the conferees to actually make some choices, because yesterday, on three successive major items, when we tried to resolve them, we were told, ''Well, we do not have any authority to deal with that; that is going to be made by somebody else.'' If that is the case, it is going to take a lot longer than anybody wants, because the people who we expect to put the deal together, we are told, are not being given enough reign to actually make those choices.

That is the institutional problem that I see; and until it is dealt with, I am afraid that we may wind up getting stuck in the ditch, even though on the Committee on Appropriations, both sides would like to make a deal and get the blazes out of here and go home.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, we said earlier that we realized that President Clinton is signing concurrent resolutions for only 1 day at a time. If he were to sign a 3-day resolution yesterday, for example, we could all be in our districts, the appropriators on both sides of the aisle could be doing their respective work, and we could have come back here Monday or Tuesday.

I would like to put a question to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, if he would yield. I am told that one of the reasons the President has insisted on 1-day concurrent resolutions is his disagreement with the Republican majority regarding blanket amnesty being extended to hundreds of thousands of illegal aliens. Is this one of his reasons?

0945

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COBLE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have my own ideas as to why the President wants us here day after day, one day at a time, but I do not know for sure what his reason is.

However, on your question of amnesty, I would remind the gentleman, that during the development of the Commerce, Justice appropriations conference report, in the closing hours, the President did request a broad-based general amnesty for illegal aliens.

The House responded and the conference committee responded with a compromise that would provide amnesty for family reunification. Some of the families had already been granted citizenship, and this would allow them to unify their families. We did that in the Commerce, Justice bill.

We have been advised that the President is going to veto the Commerce, Justice appropriations bill, and one of the main reasons is because we did not give him the general broad-based amnesty that he requested.

Now, whether or not that becomes a major issue on the development of the Labor, HHS conference report, I am not really sure at this point. I think it is going to depend on what action he takes relative to the Commerce, Justice bill; and if he vetoes that, then we will have to determine how best to deal with that.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

With respect to the last question, Mr. Speaker, on the, Commerce, Justice, State bill, as I think most people understand, there are five major issues that are dividing the President and the Congress in my view. One of the most important is the privacy issue, the illegitimate use of Social Security numbers to allow anyone who uses the

Internet to invade the privacy of each and every American if they are shrewd enough on how to go about it. That is a very serious issue.

With respect to the immigration issue, it is important to understand that all the President is asking is that we provide the same rules for people who came from countries like Salvador as we provided at the request on two occasions of members of the majority party, for refugees from Nicaragua and several other Latin American countries. All of these people are here already.

There is not one additional person who would come into the United States. You have already made the decision to provide an easier way for people to stay in this country for those people, and we are simply asking that that same principle be applied to others. You are just as dead if you have been killed by the Salvadoran death squads, as you are if you were killed by the Sandanistas. And I think the President is on perfectly good ground.

We also have major environmental problems associated with that bill as I think everyone knows.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it, we are at gridlock. We are 3 weeks plus the date that we are supposed to adjourn this Congress, and we still have not really sat down to negotiate the differences between the White House and the Congress. And the Members on my side of the aisle, the Democratic side of the aisle, have been left out of most of the negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, the Baltimore Sun papers got it right, and let me quote if I might, Mr. Speaker, Republicans gridlock again in Congress. GOP leaders cannot strong-arm Clinton to get their way on tax cuts and budgets. Whatever happened to the fine art of compromise? It seems to have vanished within the lexicon of Republicans on Capitol Hill. The result is more gridlock in Washington as Republicans try to force their political agenda down President Clinton's throat. This tactic has repeatedly backfired on the GOP.

The editorial goes on to say Republicans seem determined to send Mr. Clinton a take-it-or-leave-it tax cut plan that tilts benefits in favor of the well-to-do at a cost of $240 billion over 10 years. It would, for instance, give 58 billion in tax breaks to those able to buy long-term health care insurance, but it would not do what the President seeks to provide, care for 4 million uninsured parents at a fraction of the costs. Similarly, the Republican bill heavily favors HMOs, which have the political muscle over hospitals and nursing homes and restoring money cut by Congress in 1997. That is not fair, especially because nursing homes were devastated by the prior budget cuts.

There is room for compromise, but the GOP hard-liners will not budge. They want a partisan agenda enacted. Other Republicans think they can influence voters if they force the President to veto their tax cut bill. That is a poor way to run government. And I agree.

We should be sitting down and working together to try to resolve these differences. We should have done that 3 weeks ago, 4 weeks ago.

Now we are surprised that it is getting political when we are a little over a week before a national election? The reason why we are here day in and day out is because we need to break this gridlock by honest negotiations between all parties. And I urge my colleagues to do that.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to the statement of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), and I do not think he was talking about the appropriations bills, because for the appropriations bills, I think the minority would concede that we have worked together very well with them.

We have not kept them out of any meetings or any consideration of appropriations bills and appropriations issues. And the gentleman's original statement that we had not yet begun to negotiate, I would ask him to talk with his distinguished leader, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), because I cannot tell the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) how many hours and how many days we have spent negotiating with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) at the same table along with our subcommittee leadership and including the White House.

We have been honestly negotiating; and as I pointed out, the appropriations issues have basically all been negotiated. They have all been settled. It is the extraneous legislative-type, philosophical-type issues that are holding us up, not appropriations issues.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I would say that, Mr. Speaker, I have no complaints with the way the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has dealt with the appropriations Democrats. I think he has been perfectly fair. That does not mean that appropriations bills have been produced with Democratic input, as the gentleman knows, with respect to Justice-State. In the end, the decision was made by the majority leadership to simply put together a package on their own without further consultation with us.

It contained a number of provisions which the majority knew were nonstarters with us; and if we had been in the room when those decisions were made, I think we could have avoided the veto that is now going to occur.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, very frankly, the majority party has put a kinder, gentler face on what it has done over the last 8 months. That kinder, gentler, principled face is the face of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of our Committee, the Committee on Appropriations; and like the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), I have no quarrel with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) said the Democrats were not included in the appropriations process, in the Committee on Appropriations, in the Commerce, Justice, State.

I will say, on my committee, that the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and I dealt together openly. The shame of it was that the Republicans on the Committee on Appropriations were not always included in the appropriations negotiation. That is one of the problems, one of the significant problems.

Mr. Speaker, 9 days ago, the majority whip, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) came on this House floor and made some interesting and, I believe, incredible statements. He said this Congress, the 106th Congress, is one of the most productive Congresses in recent history. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELay) said that flipping through a document that apparently listed bills that were approved by this Congress and signed into law by President Clinton. I did not see that document, none of us did.

Mr. Speaker, there is one thing that I can tell my colleagues with certainty, there was no meaningful patients' bill of rights in it. There was no Medicare prescription drug benefit in it. There was no targeted tax relief in it. There was no real campaign finance reform in it; and there was no school modernization, class-size reduction, and teacher quality initiative in that document. No, not one of those pressing critical issues which show on my colleagues polls and our polls as being the Americans focus.

As a matter of fact, my colleague, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), has an ad running today on TV that I saw this morning that she is for patients' bill of rights, for school construction, for campaign finance reform; the only thing that ad lacked was a tag line of vote Democratic.

The bills that the majority in this Congress has refused to pass could go on and on.

Then, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) charged, and again I quote, ''We remain here today because some people simply will not support the principles of fiscal discipline.'' Hooey. I am pretty sure he was not talking about the Members on this side of the aisle, but now we know the truth.

Those are precisely the people who should have been listening. If nothing else, this do-nothing 106th Congress has finally debunked the myth of the free-spending Democrat and unmasked the fiscally irresponsible Republicans and who they are.

This majority has wasted the last 2 years trying to enact a tax scheme that would drain the entire projected budget surplus over the next decade and threatened to eat into that portion of the surplus set aside for Social Security and Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, now, they are loading up spending bills at funding level over and above what the President requested in his budget.

As the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), my good friend, pointed out earlier this week, the nine appropriations conference reports to date provide outlays that exceed the President's 2001 budget by $11.4 billion. None of them could pass. None of them could get to the President without the majority party's support.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) also noted that the 106th Congress is on track to increase spending on nondefense appropriations, and we ought to listen to this. We ought to listen to this figure, and I see the gentleman from Western Maryland, (Mr. BARRETT), my colleague, that the majority is going to pass, yes, the President can veto and my colleagues can say, gee, whiz, we could not get our way. I understand that.

Mr. Speaker, I am talking about what my colleagues are going to pass and send to him.

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) noted that the 106th Congress is on track to increase spending on nondefense appropriations at the fastest growth rate, 5.2 percent, since the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 was enacted. The House is going to pass, not the President is going to sign and propose, the House is going to pass the largest increase in domestic discretionary spending since 1974.

Since enactment of the Budget Act, nondefense appropriations have grown an average of 2.1 percent when Republicans controlled the House, and only 1.2 percent, half of that, per year when Democrats controlled the House. That does not comport with the facts that my colleagues would like to portray. Those are the facts, and my colleagues can check with your CBO on whether I am inaccurate.

So tell me, who needs a lecture on fiscal discipline? I do not think there is a soul in this House who does not understand why our budget process is broken down this year and why this eighth continuing resolution is necessary.

The Republican majority insisted, not the appropriators, not the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations or the 13 cardinals, insisted on passing a phony budget resolution last spring that turned our appropriations process into a sham.

As The Washington Post stated, and I quote, ''The Republicans continue to insist on a make-believe fiscal policy. The familiar fable is that they can cut taxes, finance the boomers' old age and increase defense and selected other spending while maintaining fiscal discipline.''

Mr. Speaker, it cannot be done. It has not been done, and it is a shame.

1000

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, why do we have a loggerhead? Republican fault? Democrat fault? There is a very strong difference of opinion on who should control people's lives, either people or Washington, D.C.

The gentleman that just spoke in the well just talked about no Patients' Bill of Rights. Many of us feel that it is wrong, absolutely wrong to have unlimited lawsuits which would drive up health care costs and would force HMOs out of business. Many Americans like HMOs. Some do not. They have legitimate concerns on that side of the aisle and on our side of the aisle.

But then the liberal trial lawyers would go down and sue the small businesses that hire those HMOs or care providers in good faith, and it would hurt small business. That is why National Federation of Independent Business, Chamber of Commerce, Small Business Associations were opposed to it. There is a legitimate concern on our side of the aisle that it hurts the economy and hurts business. So, no, we did not support it.

School construction. We feel within the Labor-HHS bill, I serve on that subcommittee, that if we want to give school construction dollars, my colleagues want amnesty to 4 million illegals in the Commerce, State, Justice, we have got 43 million uninsured Americans. We agree that that is terrible. But, automatically, we are going to have 47 million uninsured Americans on health care. They petition their families, and now we are going to have over 50 million uninsured Americans. Think what that is going to do to the cost of health care. Think of what it is going to do to our overburdened schools.

So, yes, we have a difference of opinion. In the school construction, we feel that, if we give Federal dollars down to the schools for construction, then it ought to be bid between the unions and private enterprise so that we can get the best quality and the best amount of construction for our schools.

But my colleagues on the other side want only the union wage, the prevailing wage, which costs about 35 percent in some States down to 15 percent in some States. We are saying, let it be bid, let the schools keep the extra money for class size reduction, teacher pay, those kinds of issues. But my colleagues on the other side, the President is saying, no, I want it for the unions.

I see the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the Minority Whip on the floor. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) has gotten over $2 million from the unions. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), $1.7 million from the unions. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), $1.4 million. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), $1.3 million from the unions. They want to continue giving the money to the unions that goes to Democrats campaigns.

We are saying we want the money, not to go to the union bosses, but to go to the schools. There is a difference of opinion. I choose the schools over union bosses and campaigns.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is the second time that the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) has, in my view, questioned the motivation for Members' votes on the House floor. The use of innuendo may be clever, but it is not constructive. The gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) is a good man, and he ought to be able to do better than that.

Mr. Speaker, did the gentleman from California tell those gentlemen the he just named that he was going to use those names before he used them on the House floor, knowing they were in a Democratic caucus so they could not respond to him? Does he regard that as the gentlemanly thing to do?

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

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) was on the floor. I looked at him face to face.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, how many men did the gentleman from California name?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Four.

Mr. OBEY. Does the gentleman from California see all four of them on the House floor?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. They were, Mr. Speaker, two of them were.

Mr. OBEY. No, they were not. Two of them were in the caucus. One of them happens to be the caucus chairman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That is for the record, Mr. Speaker. That is right off the Web page.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would simply say, with all due respect, regardless of what the rules allow, I think it is simply not fair to raise individual Member's names on the floor and, through innuendo, question what their positions are without informing them ahead of time. I find it most unfortunate. In the case of the gentleman, I find it also to be habitual.

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

Mr. OBEY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Wisconsin was offended, I apologize. But the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) was on the floor.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California named the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST). He named a number of other people. It

seems to me that, if a Member is going to be attacked personally, that at least they are entitled to know that so that the TV audience does not get the impression that no response was given. The reason no response was given is because several of the gentlemen who were attacked were not even on the floor when the attack was made. I do not think that that suits the rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I was one of the people that the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) mentioned. He is right. I am proud of the fact that working men and women of America who are organized support me. They do so because they believe I support them. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

He moved in committee to strike provisions. We could build a lot of things a lot cheaper. But do my colleagues know, two Republicans, a gentleman named Davis and a gentleman named Bacon, two Republicans from New York said that they did not want cheap labor, scab labor, people who were brought in to work for wages that could not support themselves and their family? Two Republicans said that is not right. If we are going to spend public money, we ought to pay the people who build them fairly.

Now, we just passed a resolution, I will tell the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), some weeks ago about slave labor building this Capitol. It was much cheaper to do it that way, I will tell the gentleman from California, much cheaper; but it was wrong.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH).

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I have just got to say I am very encouraged about coming back to the 107th Congress, because it appears a new era of civility is dawning, because it seems to me, in the past 4 years, Members' names were thrown around all the time on this floor without advanced calling. In fact, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who was just offended, I believe, used the name of the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA). I will be talking to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) this morning to see if she got a postcard before that happened.

I understand why the Democrats are frustrated and upset. They got news last night that their Presidential candidate is down 13 percent. I would be upset, too. But they come to the floor, and they say that we have not done anything, and we have not passed anything this year.

In fact, one gentleman from Maryland came to the floor and actually said that we were in town because the tax bill did not pass. They know that is not the truth. It is not the tax bill that is keeping us in town. While he can quote a newspaper whose editor obviously does not know how Congress works, I am a bit disappointed he does not know any better. I expect the President to sign that bill after the election is over, but we will see. But that is not what is keeping us here.

I do want to compliment the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member. I think he set a very positive tone this morning. I thank him. But others coming to the floor saying we have done nothing this year is disappointing.

We heard the gentleman from Maryland say we passed no prescription drug benefit. That is not true. We did. In fact, while we were working on the bill, the Democrats exited that door right there because they could not have their way. The same thing goes with the Patients' Bill of Rights.

I disagree with the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM). I think HMOs should be sued. But do my colleagues know what, we sit down, we talk about it, we negotiate it, we do not try to make it an election year issue. But what do they do? They run away and say we have done nothing on the issue.

The same thing with education. We actually want to fund education just as much as Democrats. The difference is we want teachers, parents and educators and hometowns to make the decision how that money is spent instead of Washington lawyers, politicians and bureaucrats.

There is a difference, and we can talk these differences out. But one cannot have one's way all the time. I learned that. I have been here for 6 years, and the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) will tell you, I had a rough 2 or 3 years, because I thought it had to be my way or the highway. Well, I hope I have grown a little bit and understand the need to compromise.

Unfortunately, too many of our Democratic friends here today say we must have it our way or else the Republicans have done absolutely nothing over the past 2 years. That is not the case. One cannot have 100 percent of the pie.

Like George W. Bush says, and the reason why he is 13 points ahead, we need to change the way Washington works. We need to come together, make this institution work, and unite, not divide, not have Presidents flying to fund raisers across the country, not having Senators flying home whenever they feel like it, but people sitting down at the table.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) yield me 30 additional seconds?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, since I would acknowledge that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH) has in fact grown considerably during his time here, I yield him another minute.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I have grown. I thank the gentleman from Florida very much.

But now is the time for everybody to follow my example of growing, come together, let us sit down, talk this out. Again, I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, today. I thought that his comments were very positive, that the appropriators are willing to sit down, talk this out, do the people's business and go home and not use all this for election year issues.

So I thank the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) for the additional 30 seconds and for recognizing my amazing growth over the past 4 years.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the Chair advise us as to the time remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 18 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHRIST).

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, there is not much else I can add to what the other gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH) has just said in a very eloquent way.

But there has been a lot of discussion here this morning that the Republicans are responsible for gridlock, phony numbers, and partisan politics. All I will say to that is this Chamber does allow each Member to be a responsible advocate for what they believe. What that means is there is, fundamentally, opportunity for a difference of opinion. So gridlock is each of us having the freedom, as Members of Congress, as do all Americans, to express their heartfelt opinions.

It has also been said this morning that the Republicans are spending $11 billion over what the President requested. That is true, because we are spending more money for health care and more money for education. That is where the dollars should go, and that is where the dollars are directed.

Now, the third point I want to make is that some of us on our aisle have a difference of opinion from those on the other side of the aisle dealing with health care, more specifically dealing with Medicare.

The President wants the Federal Government to be entirely in charge of the Medicare program; that is, Medicare part A, Medicare part B, and probably a prescription drug program or any other +Choice programs for our senior citizens; for the Federal Government, through HCFA, to pay all those expenses.

Those on our side of the aisle want a mix of Federal Government participation and the private sector. We want

that mix, because when the baby boomers retire, we know that the Federal Government cannot sustain that program unless they increase the payroll taxes by about 500 percent. It is just not going to happen.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY).

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk about politics today, so I figured I would weigh in on an issue that is of extreme importance to women and one that I am very critical of the President over. I want to express my absolute outrage over President Clinton's decision to play politics with women's health.

1015

Early this month, the Breast and Cervical Cancer Treatment Act cleared the Congress and was sent to the President for his signature. This measure is critical because it covers the cost of treating low-income women who are screened through Federal programs and found to have breast or cervical cancer. Thousands upon thousands of low-income women in America are affected by this very, very important measure and President Clinton knows it. That is why he signed it into law yesterday.

Unlike so many other bills, however, he signed this one into law with no White House ceremony, no fanfare, not even a press release, apparently, even though he of all people knows that such ceremonies are the best way of getting the media attention to focus on this issue. This month is National Breast Cancer Awareness Month. It was a perfect opportunity for him to hold a ceremony to draw attention to a new option that will literally save thousands of lives. But he chose not to highlight it. And why? Because his wife is running for the Senate seat for New York against one of the main authors of the bill, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAZIO).

Apparently, the President did not want New York women to know that the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAZIO) has been instrumental in ensuring passage of something that may mean so much to so many of them. And, Mr. Speaker, I think the decision to play down the importance of this bill because of petty politics is one of the most awful things I have heard of.

Two weeks ago, the President invited Republicans and Democrats onto the White House lawn to celebrate the signing of the Chinese trade bill. I guess he invited all of us there for bipartisan cover in case something goes wrong with the Chinese trade pact. But not for women, not for women with breast cancer, not for women who need treatment will we have a ceremony of such lavish proportion.

In a few minutes we will hear about the importance of home heating oil in New York. And when we had that bill and, unfortunately, one of our Members missed a vote, he was roundly and routinely criticized by his opponent in the New York Senate race for not having voted on that very important issue. So I would ask the next speaker, when we move into the next bill, to possibly explain to me why the President did not place an issue important to women at the same level of importance as he did the Chinese trade bill; why he did not choose to let women around America, who are of low-income stature, know that they now have a new option; and why he did not seem to think it was so important to let every woman in America know about this vital bill?

Several of my friends have been stricken with breast cancer at very early ages in recent days, and I have been traumatized to watch them suffer through chemotherapy and lose their hair, while their families had to take care of their children, and it saddens me to think that while we are here in the waning hours of the 106th Congress that our President could not find it in his heart because of petty politics to have a bill signing that would bring to the attention of millions of Americans that, in fact, this Congress has acted on cervical and breast cancer.

So I plead, beg, and urge my colleague from Connecticut, who will occupy the next 45 minutes after we close debate, to join me in a chorus of urgency to tell the President of the United States, please, before the election day, sign the bill in a public ceremony, let Americans know the importance of this issue. After all, if I am not mistaken, it was his own mother that was stricken by breast cancer.

Too many women are dying in America, and we are sitting here on a Saturday hearing the story about how the Republicans have failed to pass landmark legislation. I voted for a patient's bill of rights. I voted for hate crimes legislation. I voted for a number of things that I think are bipartisan in nature and important to this country. But if we are going to hurl adjectives of blame at the other side of the aisle, we better stand up and be ready to take it; and we better let our President know that women deserve to be treated better than this.

The Chinese got a signing ceremony on the White House lawn with every major corporate fat cat in America. And we talk about campaign finance reform, look at the guest list that came to that even. Were women included in that event? Yes. But when it comes to women's health, I guess we should just let it go quietly; let us not make a commotion about it; let us protect the candidacy or future possibilities of a woman running for the Senate in New York.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this Chamber to stop arguing, and I urge the President to sign these bills and let us move on.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I quickly would like to say to my colleague who just spoke that I too share the gentleman's pain about what is happening to women with breast cancer or cervical cancer, being a cancer survivor. But I have a bill in this body, the Breast Cancer Patient Protection Act. This is a bipartisan bill, with 220 cosponsors, providing women with 48 hours of coverage in the hospital for a mastectomy, 24 hours for a lumpectomy, or a shorter time if doctor and patient decide that that should be the case.

The House leadership, the Republican leadership of this body, would not bring this bill to the floor. Let us not talk about caring about women in this institution.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I hope the public is paying close attention to this debate. I am sorry for using the name of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), but the gentleman is here, and so I thought I would confront him with this personally because the issue of illegal immigration means a lot to me and a lot to those people in California.

In fact, all over the United States people are upset with the fact that we have had this massive illegal flow of illegal immigrants into our country. What the President is suggesting is not as the gentleman suggested earlier. The point is that the gentleman is incorrect, or at least he has left an incorrect impression when he stated that the President's blanket amnesty demand on this body had something to do just with El Salvadorans and making things right.

No. The fact is that what the President is asking for is a blanket amnesty, an amnesty for millions of people who have been here illegally since 1986. That is what the President is holding us hostage for. All this other rhetoric about health care or about whatever issue we are here on, the surplus or education funds, just keep in mind that the President is demanding that we have millions of illegal aliens granted amnesty so they will be eligible for government benefits.

What does that mean? It means draining money that should be going perhaps to pay down the deficit or perhaps to bolster Social Security, perhaps to help the education of our own people, to provide health care for our own people. Instead, the President wants a blanket amnesty for millions of people, which will drain scarce resources from using it to help our own people, to using it to help people who have come here illegally. In so doing, we put out a welcome mat, a shining light above the door saying, come on in, anybody who can get here, we are going to give amnesty and all will be able to get all of the resources and money that should be going to help our own citizens; whether that would be women who need health care or anybody else who needs health care; or our young people who need education. Perhaps we could even give a little bit of

that money, and I know this does not sit very well on the other side of the aisle, a modest tax relief for our American people.

Instead, the President wants to grant a blanket amnesty for millions of illegal immigrants. This is a sin against our own people, and that is why he is keeping us here. That is the demand.

Let us remember this: the President of the United States vetoed welfare reform twice. Even though AL GORE is taking credit for welfare reform and the President takes credit for welfare reform, he vetoed it twice. What was the issue on which he vetoed it? I know what it was. It was whether or not noncitizens were going to be eligible for welfare. That is why the President vetoed that. Now he takes credit for all the welfare reform that we have had and the wonderful success that it has been.

Who is loyal to whom? Why are we here? The American people need to listen very closely.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds. One simple question. The people the President is concerned about have been in this country for 15 years. If the gentleman does not want these people who came from the countries they come from to get the same treatment that prior immigrants got, then the gentleman ought to stand on the floor and repeal the changes in the law that the gentleman's party helped push through in order to allow people from Nicaragua and other countries to get the same treatment the President is now asking for these people.

Does the gentleman really want to come here and repeal the law for those folks? If he does not, then he is not for equal justice.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), who would like to respond.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, this is a blanket amnesty being proposed by the President for people who came here after the conflict in Central America was totally over.

The fact is that we are talking about a blanket amnesty. We are not talking about something to make it fair for certain people in Latin America. No, we are talking about people who have come here from all over the world, thumbing their noses at the United States, and the President wants to give them all the benefits; education, health, all the money we should be using for our own people would go to providing those people the benefits.

It even dilutes our vote by having a blanket amnesty. Those millions of people who come here illegally will end up voting citizens, diluting even the substance of each American's vote. That is what the issue is.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds. The gentleman's comments are so far from the point that they do not even merit response.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the Chair advise how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 7 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 6 minutes 20 seconds remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time for a closing statement.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Well, Mr. Speaker, so much for trying to keep this debate low key this morning. I think both the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and I tried to do that; but I do not think we succeeded very well. No harm in trying.

All I would say in response to what I have heard is that I plead fully guilty in resisting the idea that American prosperity can only be expanded by further suppressing worker wages. In my view, when we try to disallow Davis-Bacon rules, that is what we do.

Now, my colleagues may call that big labor bosses, but I call that hard-working construction workers in towns like Wausau and Stevens Point and Superior and Park Falls and Wisconsin Rapids who work physically a whole lot harder than anybody in this Chamber that I am looking at right now, whose bodies wear out a whole lot faster than the bodies of anybody I am looking at right now in this Chamber. Lots of folks wearing suits, very comfortable on comfortable salaries, lecturing unions about how they ought to keep their wages down for their members because they are too inflationary. What a joke. What a joke.

I also make no apology whatsoever about wanting to be able to hold HMOs accountable in a court of law if they take actions or require doctors to take actions that injure patients. The rules, as they stand now, say that if a doctor in an HMO follows the rules of that HMO, he can get sued, he can get hung out to dry. But the guy who sets the rules, the board that sets the rules in the HMO, they cannot be sued under many, many of those same circumstances. Why should the guy following the rules get stuck with the lawsuit while the guy who makes the rules gets off scot-free if somebody's health is damaged or if their life is ended?

1030

There are a lot of good HMOs in this country, but everybody ought to be held accountable in a court of law when it is required for the sake of elemental justice. That does not have a whole lot to do with the continuing resolution because most of the remarks I have heard on those subjects did not have anything to do with the continuing resolution. But I did want to make clear those two points.

I am unapologetic when it comes to supporting higher wages for workers, higher COLAs for seniors and health coverage for workers with repetitive motion injury. I think that government needs to be a big enough umpire to get between Mike Piazza and Roger Clemens in the economy. And the problem is that in the economy, workers usually are not as big and as powerful as the institutions they are up against. We are supposed to be here to help make certain that government is an umpire with enough powers to at least provide an even playing field for those workers. If you want to oppose the Labor-H bill and hold up the Labor-H bill because of our concern on issues like that, be my guest. That again says more about you than it does about us.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the distinguished minority whip.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, people are all over the country, if they are up on a Saturday morning and not doing their chores, are watching us here, some of them, anyway, on C–SPAN and asking themselves, well, why are you meeting on a Saturday morning? I would like to offer a brief explanation.

We are here because instead of addressing the issues and the real needs of American families, reducing school class size, making prescription drugs available and affordable through Medicare, passing a strong Patients' Bill of Rights, the Republican majority instead made a conscious decision not to do these things. They have not done the work of functioning and making the government work by passing the appropriate money bills. We are almost a month past the deadline for having done that. Instead of behaving as legislators, they have opted to become unlegislators. As the Washington Post put it, instead of being a Congress, this has been an un-Congress, a body that ''for 2 years has mainly pretended to deal with issues it has systematically avoided.''

That is why today we are faced with the need to pass the eighth stopgap measure just to keep the government from shutting down. This is not to say the Republican majority has not had any priorities. Just ask their friends at the HMOs. The Republican leadership is trying to give them a $30 billion subsidy. Never mind that the HMOs have abandoned literally millions of Americans. Never mind that hospitals and nursing homes and hospices are getting shortchanged in the process.

Then again what do you expect? The HMOs did give almost $5 million to the Republicans in just the first half of this year alone in campaign contributions.

Let me remind my colleagues something else from an editorial that appeared today in the morning's Baltimore Sun, and I quote:

''Whatever happened to the fine art of compromise? It seems to have vanished from the lexicon of Republicans on Capitol Hill. The result is more gridlock in Washington, as Republicans try to force their political agenda down President Clinton's throat.'' The Baltimore Sun.

The editorial continues: ''There's room for compromise, but GOP hardliners won't budge.''

It has been said that, in a democracy, people get the kind of government they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, we deserve much better.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I listened carefully to my friend's statement that was just made on the floor as to why we are here, and he mentioned a number of continuing resolutions. Well, the reason we are here today, Saturday, and the reason that we have an excessive number of continuing resolutions is simply because the President of the United States would only permit us to do one continuing resolution for one day at a time. Had he been a little more reasonable, we could have done a continuing resolution until Monday night or Tuesday night and then the appropriators who are involved in the negotiations with the White House could have had the weekend undisturbed to do those negotiations rather than spending all of our time here on the floor Saturday and probably tomorrow, Sunday. That is why we are here today.

Are there differences? Of course there are differences. That is why we have the two different parties involved. There are major philosophical differences between the two parties. If there were not differences, we would probably only have one party, or no party. But compromise, when we have a very evenly divided House, a very evenly divided Senate both controlled by one party and the White House, the President of another party, is essential.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I have spent a lot of time together. In fact, I think our families are keeping score and have decided that he and I are spending more time with each other than we are at home with our families. But that is okay. That is what we were hired to do. I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for the willingness that he shows to compromise as we approach these difficult issues.

One of the big problems here is, though, that, as I have said before, there are three parties involved. There is the House of Representatives, there is the Senate, and there is the President of the United States. Now, sometime we run into these negotiations with the President, and we find that compromise is compromise only if it is his way. Compromise means everybody gives a little, everybody gets a little and you try to come to a conclusion. In some cases the President has done this, but in other cases he has been stonewalling, and compromise is either his way or no way. In my opinion, that is not true compromise. That is not true negotiation. But, nevertheless, after we finish our work here on the floor today, the gentleman from Wisconsin and I are going to continue working with our counterparts in an attempt to reach the compromise on this one remaining appropriations bill where the appropriations issues have basically been decided. It is items that have nothing to do with appropriations that are holding up the compromise on that particular bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The joint resolution is considered as having been read for amendment.

Pursuant to House Resolution 646, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 339, nays 7, not voting 86, as follows:

[Roll No. 571]

YEAS—339

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Allen
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clayton
Clement
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaHood
Lampson
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Phelps
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—7

Baird
Capuano
DeFazio
Dingell
Ford
Miller, George
Stupak

NOT VOTING—86

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Barr
Barton
Becerra
Bentsen
Bilbray
Bishop
Blagojevich
Boucher
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Calvert
Campbell
Clay
Clyburn
Cox
Crane
Crowley
Danner
Davis (IL)
Delahunt
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Duncan
Dunn
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)

Franks (NJ)	Martinez	Sessions
Ganske	McCarthy (MO)	Shaw
Gillmor	McCollum	Shays
Gordon	McInnis	Shuster
Hastings (FL)	McIntosh	Spratt
Hefley	McIntyre	Stark
Hilliard	McKeon	Talent
Hulshof	Meek (FL)	Taylor (MS)
Kanjorski	Metcalf	Taylor (NC)
Kaptur	Morella	Thompson (MS)
Kasich	Neal	Visclosky
Kennedy	Owens	Waters
King (NY)	Peterson (PA)	Watt (NC)
Klink	Pickering	Watts (OK)
Kolbe	Pickett	Weldon (FL)
LaFalce	Porter	Weygand
Lantos	Radanovich	Wise
Lazio	Ros-Lehtinen	Wynn
Lipinski	Rush	

1057

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4577, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer the motion to instruct that I presented yesterday pursuant to clause 7(c) of rule XXII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. DELAURO moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 4577, be instructed to insist on the highest funding level possible for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program in FY 2001 and FY 2002.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) each will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

1100

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

Mr. Speaker, we had a very cold winter this past winter, and not only people in my community, but people all across this country, seniors and working families, saw their budgets stretched to the limit, making choices between food and heat and rent and heat and other kinds of cruel choices that they should not have to make.

Last winter, the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, LIHEAP, provided critical assistance to low-income families facing skyrocketing home heating oil prices. Eligible families were able to receive assistance and to defray high heating costs. LIHEAP has proven to be one of the most important safety nets that this government offers to low-income families. However, this program is chronically underfunded. Since 1995, there has been approximately a 35 percent drop in the number of households that receive LIHEAP assistance, due to a reduction in funding levels.

Mr. Speaker, winter is just around the corner. These same groups are confronted again with high energy prices. Home heating oil prices are projected to rise an estimated 50 percent, and natural gas is expected to increase 40 percent. Winter bills are likely to increase $290 more than last winter, which was the warmest on record.

When the average recipient is the poorest of the poor, those averaging a household income of less than $10,000 per year, these costs are unconscionable. Households are forced to pay high energy costs, will be forced to reduce those budgets again, for food, for medicine and other household necessities. Current funding levels will not sustain the large rise in energy costs. As a result, additional LIHEAP funds are needed to allow the program to purchase the same amount of home energy as was purchased last year.

As elected officials, we do not have the ability to manipulate weather projections to prevent a harsh winter, though we kind of think we can do whatever we would like to do. We are in a position, however, where we can use the offices that we have to increase funding for a proven program that will provide one of the most basic needs. The President did the right thing a month ago by releasing $400 million in emergency LIHEAP funds. I urge my colleagues to do the same: fund LIHEAP at an adequate level to make sure that those vulnerable groups have the means to keep themselves warm this winter and next; funded at the level of $550 million and also, that we forward-fund for $1.6 billion for the year 2002.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise the gentlewoman that we do intend to support this motion to instruct, but before we get to that point and actually formally accept it, I wanted to point out that we have already agreed to fund the LIHEAP program above the President's request, not only for this year, but for next year as well. The LIHEAP program was fully funded in the preliminary conference agreement at the President's requested level of $1.1 billion for fiscal year 2001, plus an additional $300 million for any emergency that might develop. With recent negotiations, we added another $300 million to this program, bringing the total funding for fiscal year 2001 to $1.7 billion. We have agreed to advance-fund another $1.4 billion for fiscal year 2002, so that States will be able to adequately plan for next year. The President requested only $1.1 billion for next year, so we again are above the President's request.

We have also provided an additional $600 million in the fiscal year 2000 supplemental bill this past spring, the same amount requested by the President for emergency spending in this program for this year because of the recent increases in fuel prices. So we have really gone above and beyond the President's request; but we understand the importance of this program, and we do not want any to suffer through the winter without adequate heat, and we are not going to allow that to happen.

I might also say that there are some States where an extremely hot summer also causes severe problems, and deaths occur because of excessive heat, and we are not going to allow that to happen. We are also going to provide cooling assistance for those people who are exposed to that type of temperature fluctuation.

So the gentlewoman and I, I think, are together on this; and I think both sides of the aisle are together on this, so we are more than happy to accept her motion to instruct.

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

I thank the gentleman; and I might just add that that while, in fact, the President did put in $1.1 billion, there are a number of us who also spoke not only with the majority party here, but also with the President about increasing those dollars, because of the fact that, particularly those of us who in the Northeast and some other places where we have extremely cold winters, that, in fact, what we needed to do was to see those numbers increased.

The other reason why we have moved in this direction is because, in fact, over the years, this program has been dreadfully undercut in terms of costs, and there has also been the reluctance to forward-fund to the following year, which is critically important in order for us to move forward.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and I thank her for bringing forth this very, very important resolution.

It is no secret that in this country we are facing a major energy crisis. It is no secret that the price of home heating oil, propane, kerosene, natural gas has been increasing very, very substantially. It is also no secret that we are the richest country in the history of the world, and that it would be an absolute outrage if any senior citizen, if any low-income American went cold this winter or had to take funds from their food budget in order to pay the heating bill. This is America, and elderly people should not go cold or should not go hungry.

Last month, I authored two letters signed by over 100 Members of Congress, including 20 Republicans, and the first letter urged the President to immediately release $400 million in emergency LIHEAP funding to deal with the energy crisis we are currently facing, and I am grateful that the