But, Mr. Speaker, we are here on a Saturday because they want to put politics before people. We have HMOs closing around this country. I had a gentleman write to me and said, ''You all are debating whether I can sue an HMO. I have been dropped by my third HMO which went under.''

Nursing homes are closing around this country, and the poor and elderly are being deprived of care because they want to put politics before people.

1145

It is sad, but I heard George W. Bush say the other day it is sort of a fitting end to the close of an era of contentiousness, an era of disgrace; that they, the American people, I think, want to put behind them. It is sad that we are here now, and they are using this as a last stage putting people behind politics. It is not about LIHEAP, it is not about people freezing to death, it is about changing the direction of this country.

They had their chance. I heard the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT), a Democrat, say they had 48 years, not mentioning the last 8 years, and they blew it. This is not about LIHEAP. It is about changing the direction of this country. It is about other issues at the last minute, like putting provisions in at the last minute to provide amnesty to millions of illegal aliens.

I was offended today when I heard someone say that we did not know on the Republican side about immigration. My grandparents were immigrants and they came in legally to this country, not illegally, and they worked in the factories of this country and they toiled. But if we throw in this provision to allow millions, we have cast aside our laws. What good are our laws? We might just as well tear up our laws and throw them away.

What does it mean to be an American if the President can cast aside the very basis for immigration. What made this country great is people coming here legally under the laws. So this is not about LIHEAP, this is not about low-energy assistance, it is about other greater issues.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 118. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1761. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to conserve and enhance the water supplies of the Lower Rio Grande Valley.

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 yield myself such time as I may consume to comment that it is interesting to note it was the Republicans first proposal, when they took charge here, to kill low-income energy assistance, the LIHEAP program.

Yes, it is about LIHEAP today and people being warm in this country, particularly in those areas of the country where it is cold, like the Northeast.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ).

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut for this motion. I rise in strong support of this motion.

I ask my colleagues, on behalf of millions of needy families, that we maintain the current funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, better known as LIHEAP. It is of critical importance to the families in my district and across the Nation.

Although current funding for the program is low, this conference report lowers it even further. I do not believe that any of my colleagues wants to be held responsible for a family or an elderly person living in the cold because they cannot afford heating this winter, especially in this prosperous country. The Republican majority has cut this program every year. While they are warm in their own homes they slash this program with cold hearts.

The purpose of LIHEAP is to help pay the winter heating bills of our most needy low-income and elderly individuals. Two-thirds make less than $8,000 a year. They are the poorest of the poor. Last year, this program helped 4.4 million households. Mr. Speaker, we are not just talking about comfort here, we are talking about the health and sometimes even the lives of some of our citizens. The Boston City Hospital reports that the number of clinically underweight children increases dramatically following the coldest months, and we all know the tragic stories each year about some elderly person dying in an unheated home.

LIHEAP is most crucial during the peak winter heating season when high energy bills eat up to 30 percent of a family's budget. And this winter, heating oil prices are expected to rise 20 to 40 percent, consuming even more of the average budget. Without LIHEAP, many low-income families and elderly people will have to choose between heating their homes and paying for food, medicine, and rent. I rise in strong support of this motion.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire about the time that remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 7 minutes remaining and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) has 9½ minutes remaining and the right to close.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to remind my friend, the gentleman from Florida who was here at the podium a few moments ago, that this issue is about energy policy and it is about people being cold and it is about people surviving this winter. That may not be true if one lives in Florida, but it is true for those living in New York or New Hampshire or Pennsylvania or Ohio or Wisconsin or Michigan. This is a critical issue for people in all those States. So it is important that we raise the level of LIHEAP funding.

I also want to express my appreciation to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, because, earlier this month, I asked for a request of $8 million to fund the continued operation of the President's initiated Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve, which is now funded. But I also want to say a couple of things about energy policy in this country and who is directing it at this moment, because that policy is being directed by the oil companies.

The three largest oil firms are currently reporting quarterly profits that double last year's earnings. Leading the way was Exxon-Mobil, which 3 months ago posted the largest quarterly profits ever for a U.S. corporation. It beat that record just a couple of days ago with the announcement that it had earned $4.3 billion in the third quarter. Chevron-Texaco, which announced last week that it will merge, and Conoco all reported that their profits have doubled just recently.

Exxon-Mobil's vice president is quoted as saying, ''We've got a lot of cash around here. It's coming in pretty fast. Flying through the door.'' So while Americans are struggling trying to pay their home heating bills and the gasoline bills to get back and forth to work, the energy companies are racking up records profits.

The oil companies are not using their profits to invest in new oil and gas exploration, which would ultimately lead to lower prices, decreased dependence on foreign oil, and greater stability in the market. Instead, what they are doing is using the profits to repurchase their stocks so that they can raise the stock price.

We ought to have the Committee on Commerce convene immediate hearings on the outrageous profits of the oil companies. That is a responsibility that we place on the other side of the aisle. Immediate hearings to determine what is going on.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

(Mrs. LOWEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the motion to instruct conferees to provide full funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program.

Before I make a few points, I just want to agree with my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), and I would encourage the FTC

to continue the investigation of the oil companies that are making record, record profits.

Secondly, with regard to points that were made by my good friends on the other side of the aisle, I think it is important that we emphasize that SPR is just being bid this month. It is going into circulation in November, and we do expect to see decreases in oil prices. But again I encourage the FTC to continue that investigation and to complete it as expeditiously as possible.

My colleagues, I want to thank my good friend, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for having this motion to instruct, because we know that LIHEAP is an absolutely essential program for the poor and elderly. When energy prices go up, low-income families and people on fixed incomes are hurt the most. This winter, energy prices are expected to be higher than ever. Stocks of home heating oil are at the lowest point in years, and the natural gas supply is also expected to tighten significantly this winter. This supply shortage will put prices up to twice that of last year.

For millions of families, this massive increase in energy prices will force them to choose between heat and food. We cannot stand by and watch people have to make this choice. My colleagues, if we have to be here on a Saturday to ensure that the numbers are adequate to serve these seniors, the elderly, the poor, then I am pleased to be here, because this is a critical, critical issue. In New York alone, 1.8 million families are eligible for LIHEAP assistance.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the amount of time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Connecticut has 5½ minutes remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, some really astonishing things have been said from the other side of the aisle. For example, that nothing has happened in the last 8 years; that we cannot accomplish things.

Fortunately, we are all, as Americans, better off today than we were 8 years ago; but on our side of the aisle we are concerned about people who have been left behind. This was in bills to all people living in Chicago that says, ''Winter is coming and natural gas bills could increase 50 percent or more.'' And on the back it says, ''If you need help with your heating bill, the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, LIHEAP, can help.'' And it says to ''call LIHEAP if you can't pay your bills.'' In Chicago, unlike programs in Florida, there are a lot of people like that.

We need to make sure that there are sufficient funds in that program. That is what this motion to instruct is about, and that is why I support it.

Just one final note. The reason that our gasoline prices were too high had nothing to do with the EPA. All of our hearings determined that. And now they are lower because the FTC began an investigation into the oil companies and their colleagues in this House.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER).

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

My predecessor, as a member from the First District of Massachusetts, Silvio Conte, a member of the other party, was one of the great figures of the 20th century in this House of Representatives and one of the great champions on behalf of the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program. I am very glad, on his behalf, to hear that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has agreed with the idea of $1.6 million; maybe whatever else the gentlewoman from Connecticut might be asking for on this program.

I urge the majority to get the Labor, Health and Education bill, which we passed originally in this House back in July, back to the floor so that we can finish our work. It is 4 weeks into the new fiscal year. This is the longest session in the history of the country in an election year, and the work is not done. We have not finished the appropriation bills for the year.

I would like to speak to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) on his comments about energy policy and remind him that on energy policy the majority in this Congress has obstructed both the short-term and the long-term effort to lower our dependence on foreign oil. In the short term, they thwarted every effort to require additional efficiency in the use of vehicles when half of all our oil is used for transportation and for vehicles in transportation.

1200

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

Mr. ROEMER. I thank my good friend from Connecticut for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this should be a nonpartisan issue. This should be nonpartisan in that funding for low-income people helps not only New England but the Midwest and California and Florida. It helps not only with heating oil, it helps in the Midwest with natural gas. And it helps in a host of ways for nonpartisan concerns about the disabled, the poor and our seniors who have trouble paying these bills.

In my State of Indiana, we are already working on helping these people who are vulnerable pay what we know will be a gas bill, which cost $100 last winter, that will be $140 this winter. So getting full funding or more funding in this program will allow us in the State of Indiana to now purchase natural gas or heating oil at October prices rather than higher prices in November, December, January, and February. This makes good common sense for compassion for the poor, for the disabled, for senior citizens; and it makes good sense for our taxpayers in buying things now rather than knowing what the price we are going to pay for them later on.

I support the motion. I hope that we can work in a nonpartisan way before an election to help some of the most vulnerable people in society.

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

This is an appropriate time for me to make this closing statement because I just listened to my friend saying that this should be a nonpartisan issue. Amen. In fact, I think about an hour ago, I suggested to the gentlewoman when she offered her motion, we accept it. We agree. We have already put in here more money than the President asked for or that her side asked for. So we agree. It ought to be a nonpartisan issue. If they would let it be a nonpartisan issue, it would be.

What I cannot figure out is why in the world can you not take yes for an answer? We have agreed to this motion.

In the little time that I have, we have heard a lot of complaint from that side of the aisle about how long it takes to get this work done. Here is a perfect example of why it takes so long. They cannot take yes for an answer. Then if you give them a yes, and they do accept it, the next time you sit down together, they move the target. They move the goal post. At one point on the advance funding, we were at one level. The administration and the minority asked for a level. We went to that level. They went another level. We went to that level. Now they have another level. I do not know where they are going to end. Maybe she will tell me in her closing remarks exactly what their top number is going to be. We have accepted her motion to instruct the conferees.

There were a lot of complaints about oil company profits, and I think they make too much profit as well, and a lot of talking about price increases to the homeowner and to the motorist. Well, who sets the oil policy of this country? It is the President of the United States and the Vice President. What is the policy? It must not be a very good policy, if there is one, if prices continue to go up and up and up. Maybe because their Secretary of Energy said, and I am quoting him, we were asleep at the switch. An administration should not be asleep at the switch when it is dealing with something that has so much effect on each individual American's economy.

There is something else, though, really got me stirred up, and I do not like to be stirred up, I would rather be calm, but one of the speakers on that side of the aisle said that the Republicans cut LIHEAP. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is just not true. Republicans did not cut LIHEAP, and I am going to give you the example and I am going to

give you an exact number. In fiscal year 1996, there was a substantial amount of unobligated balances for that year and so we did rescind those, but they had not been spent. In 1997, the request was $1 billion. We as a Republican Congress appropriated $1 billion. In 1998, the request was $1 billion. The Republican Congress appropriated $1 billion. In 1999, the request was $1 billion, a very flat number coming from the administration. They never asked for these increases. But in 1999 again they asked for $1 billion. We upped it to $1.1 billion. In fiscal year 2000, they asked for $1.1 billion and, yes, we went $1.1 billion.

Now, tell me how the claim, the accusation, the political rhetoric that we cut LIHEAP has any truth or validity. It is just not true. And the American people who are the consumers ought to know this. This campaign rhetoric is okay on the campaign trail because candidates do sometimes get carried away with their facts and their figures. But in this House when we are doing the people's business, facts should be accurate. Facts should be facts. The people's business should come ahead of politics.

There again, I want to suggest, we are fighting over something that we have agreed to. Why the accusations? Why the arguments? I have pointed out how we have gone above and beyond for this year and we are supporting this motion to instruct and we stayed with the administration's request in all of the years of the Republican Congress except one where we increased it. What is the argument? Is this a political argument? If it is a political argument, it belongs out on the campaign trail. It does not belong here in the people's House where we are here to do the people's business and put their business ahead of politics.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS. My understanding is that if in fact we have agreed to accept it, and there is a plea for nonpartisanship on the other side, that the nonpartisan vote would be a voice vote. But that if somebody calls for a recorded vote, that clearly could be indicated to be a partisan vote.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we support the motion to instruct. I would ask the Members to vote for it.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

It is wonderful to watch a deathbed conversion, because with regard to LIHEAP, the very fact of the matter is that over and over and over again the majority party has in fact opposed LIHEAP. Not only that, they have tried to abolish the Energy Department in 1995, they proposed to abolish LIHEAP and, furthermore, what they tried to do with LIHEAP is to really, in a very Scrooge-like plan, force millions of very low-income families to make the choice between food and heat.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. DELAURO. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. The very first rescission action the Republican Congress took when they took control is to try to cut LIHEAP, and the gentlewoman from Connecticut and I blocked it in the Committee on Appropriations. We beat you on that vote.

Ms. DELAURO. This is about LIHEAP today. It is about a continued activity of the majority to do in a program, to not properly fund it, not only in the year that we are, in forward-funding the money in the future. We are asking to fund this at its maximum, at $1.65 billion, because the folks who need this assistance all across this country have been sorely shortchanged by the majority.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Ms. DELAURO's motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 4577 with regard to the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP). LIHEAP is one of the most important funding programs that I have the privilege to vote on, as it provides our low income constituents with one of life's basic necessities—energy. As the winter months approach, and the temperatures drop, there must not be one reported death caused by our constituent's inability to pay for their heat. This program is especially important at a time when the American people are being forced to pay outrageous costs for energy. All to often, we hear that a constituent had to choose between eating and heating their home—that is unacceptable!

Mr. Speaker, LIHEAP was created as a result of the energy crisis of the late 1970's and early 1980's. Today, the exorbitant cost of energy is beyond the reach of too many of our hard working constituents. This program has proven its effectiveness in assisting low income families to stay warm during the winter, thereby reducing the risk of exposure to hypothermia, and in the warmer climates, by reducing the numbers of those who would succumb to ''heat stroke'' and heart failure, but for this program.

Mr. Speaker, the numbers, while estimated, reveals that almost 40% of the LIHEAP households have elderly members; more than 30% of the households have disabled members; 27% of these households include children who are under the age of six years old, and a further 27% are comprised of the working poor who have no access to other sources of government assistance.

In addition to assisting those who are forced to pay a high proportion of their household income on the high costs of energy, LIHEAP accomplishes something else, it allows our constituents to remain in their own homes, and to do so with dignity. It is heartening when I hear stories from my hard working constituents who tell me that before the assistance provided by LIHEAP, they were sleeping with jackets, gloves and hats and in sleeping bags, in order to keep warm.

Mr. Speaker, appropriately funding the LIHEAP program is the least we can do to protect our hard working constituents from the extreme temperatures of the summer and the winter; our constituents deserve no less.

Accordingly, I urge adoption of the proposal.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. I support the DeLauro motion to instruct and in support of the highest possible funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) program.

This vital program helps low-income households pay for home energy costs—including home heating costs in the winter and home cooling costs in the summer.

Every year, we see seniors die from the lack of air conditioning during a heat wave, or from the severe cold weather we've seen so much of recently. This could usually be prevented, if only these seniors could have afforded the cool air or heating assistance they needed.

Approximately 4.4 million of the most vulnerable households in this country depend on the LIHEAP program each year. And in the year 2000, 1.8 million families are eligible for LIHEAP assistance in New York State alone. And a significant portion of those receiving LIHEAP assistance are the elderly.

The LIHEAP program truly saves lives—by helping the frail elderly stay warm in the winter and cool in the summer. The LIHEAP program will be especially important this winter—which is predicted to be more harsh than last winter.

The GOP-controlled Congress has failed to put forward its own energy policy over the last six years—and has continuously voted down the energy proposals of President Clinton.

Now, there is growing concern over energy supply and costs. Indeed, the American Petroleum Institute is reporting home heating oil inventories 20% lower than last winter. Experts are predicting that a 30% increase in home heating costs this winter is now unavoidable.

It was just 5 short years ago that this Republican Congress took over and voted to zero out funding for LIHEAP in the House-passed Labor-HHS bill. Thankfully, after a vigorous protest by Democrats and a presidential veto, money was restored. But this was a dangerous lesson for all of us. We simply cannot trust the Republican Congress to stand up for low income seniors.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on the DeLauro motion.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I support the motion to instruct.

Right now, as the autumn leaves are falling, is an excellent time to emphasize the importance of LIHEAP specifically. But we also need to focus on this country's overall energy situation.

We have all heard the statistics:

Domestic crude oil stocks are at a 24-year low, which is translating into significant price increases in propane, kerosene and other forms of heating fuels.

Natural gas prices have increased by 40-50% over the past year, and with low storage levels, increased used of natural gas for electric generation, and higher industrial use, we can only expect higher prices to come.

Meanwhile, gasoline prices remain high—a reality that constitutes to highlight our dependence on foreign oil. Today we are importing significantly more oil than we did during the energy crisis in the 1970s.

So putting enough money into funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program—or LIHEAP—is critical for low-income families this winter.

In September, I urged the President to release $4 million in emergency LIHEAP funding for Colorado. Shortly after that, he did release emergency funds—something for which all Coloradans should be appreciative.

But that action by the President needs to be followed by Congressional action. We need to increase the overall LIHEAP funding for fiscal 2001. Remember, two-thirds of LIHEAP households have incomes of less than $8,000 per year and even with the assistance, the average LIHEAP family spends over 18 percent of its income on home energy costs, compared with 6.7 percent for all households.

So, in a time of higher fuel prices we need to act to make sure our low-income senior citizens and children need not be forced to be cold or to choose between heating and eating.

But beyond that, there is a broader question to consider—how can we avoid these energy crises in the future?

What should not be focused just on the short-term issue of oil prices. We also need to be addressing the core problem: our continued excessive dependence on petroleum.

We need to be actively and strongly promoting alternative energy and increasing our energy efficiency. We need to do it for the environment—and also because it promotes our national security and strengthens our economy.

By promoting these alternatives, we're making one of our most valuable investments in America's future. These investments can stimulate the private sector, and jobs, reduce our reliance on imported oil, and improve our air and water quality.

So I urge adoption of this motion, for increased support for LIHEAP, and I urge all of us to work together to strengthen our national commitment to clean energy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

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

Ms. DELAURO. 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 305, nays 18, not voting 109, as follows:

[Roll No. 572]

YEAS—305

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Allen
Armey
Bachus
Baird
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)
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Camp
Canady
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clayton
Clement
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
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
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E.B.
Jones (OH)
Kelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Larson
Latham
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pastor
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
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Shadegg
Sherman
Sherwood
Shows
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—18

Archer
Cannon
Coble
Deal
Doolittle
Hostettler
Johnson, Sam
Largent
Linder
Miller (FL)
Paul
Rohrabacher
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Toomey

NOT VOTING—109

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Barr
Barton
Becerra
Bentsen
Bilbray
Bishop
Blagojevich
Boucher
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Calvert
Campbell
Clay
Clyburn
Cox
Crane
Crowley
Danner
Davis (IL)
Delahunt
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gillmor
Gordon
Green (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hilliard
Houghton
Hulshof
Hyde
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Klink
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaFalce
Lantos
LaTourette
Lazio
Lipinski
Maloney (CT)
Martinez
McCarthy (MO)
McCollum
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Meek (FL)
Metcalf
Mollohan
Morella
Neal
Owens
Pascrell
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pickett
Porter
Radanovich
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Rush
Sawyer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Talent
Tancredo
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thompson (MS)
Visclosky
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Weygand
Wise
Wynn

1228

Mr. GILCHREST and Mrs. JONES of Ohio changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. 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:

Mrs. LOWEY 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 disagreeing with provisions in the Senate amendment which denies the President's request for dedicated resources to reduce class sizes in the early grades and for local school construction and, instead, broadly expands the Title VI Education Block Grant with limited accountability in the use of funds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

1230

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

Mr. Speaker, it is truly unfortunate that we even have to debate the importance of these issues. Members from the other side of the aisle say that education is their number one priority.