

in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings or other audible conversation is in violation of the rules of the House.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

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

Mrs. LOWEY. 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 150, nays 159, not voting 123, as follows:

[Roll No. 573]

YEAS—150

Abercrombie	Hinchey	Nadler
Allen	Hinojosa	Napolitano
Baird	Hoefel	Oberstar
Baldacci	Holden	Obey
Baldwin	Holt	Olver
Barcia	Hooley	Ortiz
Barrett (WI)	Hoyer	Pallone
Berkley	Inslee	Pastor
Berman	Jackson (IL)	Payne
Berry	Jackson-Lee	Pelosi
Blumenauer	(TX)	Pomeroy
Bonior	Jefferson	Price (NC)
Borski	John	Quinn
Boswell	Johnson (CT)	Rahall
Boyd	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Brady (PA)	Jones (OH)	Reyes
Capps	Kildee	Rivers
Capuano	Kilpatrick	Rodriguez
Cardin	Kleczka	Roemer
Carson	Kucinich	Rothman
Clayton	Lampson	Roybal-Allard
Clement	Larson	Sanchez
Condit	Lee	Sanders
Conyers	Levin	Sandlin
Costello	Lewis (GA)	Schakowsky
Coyne	LoBiondo	Scott
Cramer	Lofgren	Serrano
Cummings	Lowey	Sherman
Davis (FL)	Lucas (KY)	Shows
DeFazio	Luther	Skelton
DeGette	Maloney (NY)	Slaughter
DeLauro	Markey	Snyder
Deutsch	Mascara	Stabenow
Dicks	Matsui	Stenholm
Dingell	McCarthy (NY)	Strickland
Dixon	McDermott	Tanner
Doggett	McGovern	Tauscher
Doyle	McKinney	Thompson (CA)
Engel	McNulty	Thurman
Eshoo	Meehan	Tierney
Etheridge	Meeks (NY)	Towns
Evans	Menendez	Turner
Farr	Millender	Udall (CO)
Fattah	McDonald	Udall (NM)
Filner	Miller, George	Velazquez
Forbes	Minge	Waters
Ford	Mink	Waxman
Gilman	Moakley	Weiner
Gonzalez	Mollohan	Woolsey
Hall (OH)	Moore	Wu
Hill (IN)	Moran (VA)	

NAYS—159

Aderholt	Bachus	Barrett (NE)
Archer	Baker	Bartlett
Army	Ballenger	Bass

Bereuter	Greenwood	Pryce (OH)
Biggett	Gutknecht	Regstad
Bilirakis	Hall (TX)	Regula
Bliley	Hansen	Reynolds
Blunt	Hastings (WA)	Riley
Boehkert	Hayes	Rogan
Boehner	Hayworth	Rogers
Bonilla	Herger	Rohrabacher
Bono	Hill (MT)	Royce
Brady (TX)	Hilleary	Ryan (WI)
Burr	Hobson	Ryun (KS)
Burton	Hoekstra	Salmon
Buyer	Horn	Sanford
Callahan	Hostettler	Saxton
Camp	Hunter	Scarborough
Canady	Hutchinson	Schaffer
Cannon	Isakson	Shadeegg
Castle	Istook	Sherwood
Chabot	Jenkins	Simpson
Chambliss	Johnson, Sam	Skeen
Chenoweth-Hage	Kelly	Smith (MI)
Coble	Knollenberg	Smith (NJ)
Combest	Largent	Smith (TX)
Cook	Latham	Smith (WA)
Cooksey	Leach	Souder
Cubin	Lewis (CA)	Spence
Cunningham	Lewis (KY)	Stearns
Deal	Linder	Stump
DeLay	Lucas (OK)	Sununu
DeMint	Manzullo	Sweeney
Doolittle	McCrery	Tauzin
Dreier	Mica	Terry
Ehrlich	Miller (FL)	Thomas
Emerson	Miller, Gary	Thornberry
English	Moran (KS)	Thune
Everett	Myrick	Tiahrt
Ewing	Nethercutt	Toomey
Foley	Ney	Trafficant
Frelinghuysen	Northup	Upton
Galleghy	Norwood	Vitter
Ganske	Nussle	Walden
Gekas	Ose	Walsh
Gibbons	Oxley	Wamp
Gilchrest	Packard	Weldon (PA)
Goode	Paul	Whitfield
Goodling	Pease	Wicker
Goss	Peterson (MN)	Wilson
Graham	Petri	Wolf
Granger	Pitts	Young (AK)
Green (WI)	Pombo	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—123

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

1356

Messrs. DEMINT, GILCHREST and GEKAS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I was not present during rollcall vote No. 572. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

Additionally, I was not present during rollcall vote No. 573. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote Nos. 570, 571, 572 and 573, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

ADJOURNMENT TO SUNDAY, OCTOBER 29, 2000

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 6 p.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

WHAT WE DO IN WASHINGTON DOES MATTER AND MATTERS A LOT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a great fiscal debate going on in this country and I felt I would use these 5 minutes to address some of the key points in that debate.

The governor from Texas has come up with a novel and dangerous argument, and that is that fiscal responsibility does not matter; that what goes on in Washington has had nothing to do with the prosperity that we currently enjoy.

Now I can understand why someone running against Washington would want to say that what we have done here over the last 8 years has nothing to do with the prosperity enjoyed in this country and the prosperity we hope to enjoy in the future, but that argument, however politically appealing, is a dangerous one, because once one argues that what goes on in Washington has nothing to do with the economy of the country then one grants a license to Democrats and Republicans to be fiscally irresponsible.

The fact is that what we do in Washington does matter, and matters a lot.

1400

True, the lion's share of the credit belongs to hard-working men and women around this country who, through industry and innovation, have built this economy. But our people were hard-working in the late 1980s and the early 1990s, and yet we suffered with high unemployment in an unsuccessful economy, because we had huge deficits. It is the fiscal responsibility that the President has brought to our Federal Government that has added the one additional element which, with the hard work of the American people, has led to our prosperity.

The second fallacy that we have heard from the Governor of Texas is his statement over and over again that his plan will provide tax relief to all Americans who pay taxes. The facts are otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, some 15 million Americans pay Federal FICA tax that is pulled out of their wages every time, every paycheck; and yet they will receive no, no tax relief under Governor Bush's proposal. Those 15 million Americans who pay FICA taxes to the Federal Government, but do not owe income tax because they are earning the minimum wage, because they are not earning very much, because they are trying to support a family on incomes of \$15,000 and \$20,000 a year, these low-income taxpayers get nothing from the Governor of Texas. Yet, he does provide 43 percent of his tax benefit to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans.

This leads me to the third fallacy, and that is his statement that he will provide only \$223 billion, only \$223 billion to the richest 1 percent of Americans. The problem here is fuzzy fiscal figures, because that \$223 billion leaves out the effect of the repeal of the estate tax. The Governor will often talk about how he wants to eliminate the estate tax, but will leave out from his budget the fiscal effect of that repeal. The estate tax will be bringing in \$50 billion a year, \$500 billion over 10 years, and so the governor's tax reduction for those in the wealthiest 1 percent is not \$223 billion over 10 years, but over \$700 billion over 10 years.

That is why it is true when we point out that the governor would provide more tax relief to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans than everything he proposes to spend to improve our health care system, strengthen Medicare, strengthen our military, and improve education combined.

Mr. Speaker, the choice is clear. On one hand, we can have fiscal responsibility, economic expansion, reduction and eventual elimination of the national debt, and moderate tax cuts for working families, all combined with important investments in education, Medicare, military preparedness, and our health care system. On the other hand, we could choose to provide \$700

billion of tax relief over the next 10 years to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the choice before America could never be more stark.

#### SHALLOW RHETORIC UNDERMINES CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I did not get over in time to speak on the motion to instruct conferees, but I think it is time for a reality check with the other side.

We heard a lot of rhetoric, unfortunately, about the education debate on our plan versus the President's plan and how Republicans do not care about the condition of our schools. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the fact that I am one of the few who actually is a classroom teacher in this body. In fact, I spent 7 years teaching in the inner city schools in and around Philadelphia. In fact, I helped to run a chapter 1 program for 3 of those years.

I want to remind my friends on the other side that for the 7 years that I taught, I taught in a portable classroom; two trailers bolted together without adequate heat, without adequate air-conditioning, 32 children in a self-contained environment, in a portable classroom. Guess who was in charge of the government when I taught? It was a Democrat President, a Democrat House and a Democrat Senate. Where was the concern for those of us who were teaching in portable classrooms in inner cities back then when my colleagues controlled the whole ballgame? Where were their efforts to deal with school modernization? Where were their efforts to increase funds for school construction? I was there on the front line teaching in that portable classroom with 32 kids that were challenged in an environment that was very difficult.

Now, I will remind my colleagues on the other side of one further fact. The first 2 years that President Clinton was in office, the Democrats controlled the House and they controlled the Senate. They could have passed any bill they wanted, and we could not stop it. They had all of the votes. We could not have stopped any issue that they wanted to address for the American people.

I find it a little questionable that in the first 2 years of Clinton's administration, when the Democrats controlled the entire ball game, there was no bill for school construction. There was no rhetoric down here on the floor about the need to deal with kids. There was no concern about the people teaching in portable classrooms like I did for 7 years. There was no concern about falling ceilings. What are they telling us? All that occurred within the last 5 years?

The fact is, this is nothing more than political rhetoric. The first 2 years that the Democrats controlled the House and the Senate and the White House when they could have done anything they wanted, they did not even propose a bill to deal with school construction. This Congress has. With a bipartisan piece of legislation that we are going to pass, and hopefully this President will sign, we will do what a responsible Congress could have done 7 years ago, and that is deal with the issue of the need for modernization of our schools.

So I bring up this reality check, Mr. Speaker, because unlike most of my friends who are attorneys who never taught in the classroom, I taught in the classroom for 7 years. I know what it is like to teach in a portable classroom with 2 trailers bolted together, with kids who cannot go outside because when you open the door, the cold is right there. My point is I think a lot of what we heard today is nothing more than shallow rhetoric.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HILL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.)

#### DEMOCRATS DEMONSTRATE SERIOUS COMMITMENT TO EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to address this issue earlier today, but I came over and after the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) spoke just a minute ago, I felt it incumbent to do so. I too was a classroom teacher. I taught for 9 years, I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, 2 more than he did, and I have lived in those classrooms and even had the experiences of the roof falling in, only this was not a roof, it was only a blind that fell and cut my face. We had to evacuate students from classrooms in my building because the walls leaked so badly that the kids could not sit in there because there was so much water.

Granted, that was a couple of decades back. I thought we had pretty much addressed all of that stuff.

Interestingly enough, my daughter today teaches sixth grade math, in Beaumont, Texas, the same school district in which I taught. She has children who do not have chairs in her classroom. They will fix it. They are in portable buildings right now. They are making the repairs in the regular school building.

The problem is that so many school districts do not have the ability to take care of these problems today, and