There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.J. Res. 111, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2003

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the previous order of the House, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 111) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of House Joint Resolution 111 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 111

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of Government for fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. Such amounts as may be necessary under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2002 for continuing projects or activities including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees (not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution) which were conducted in fiscal year 2002, at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate, and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority was made available in the following appropriations Acts:

(1) the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2002;

(2) the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2002, notwithstanding section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, section 313 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103–236), and section 504(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414(a)(1));

(3) the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2002, notwithstanding section 504(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414(a)(1));

(4) the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 2002;

(5) the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2002, notwithstanding section 504(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414(a)(1));

(6) the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2002, notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91–672 and section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956;

(7) the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2002;

(8) the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2002;

(9) the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2002;

(10) the Military Construction Appropriations Act, 2002;

(11) the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2002;

(12) the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 2002; and

(13) the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2002.

SEC. 102. No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used for new production of items not funded for production in fiscal year 2002 or prior years, for the increase in production rates above those sustained with fiscal year 2002 funds, or to initiate, resume, or continue any project, activity, operation, or organization which are defined as any project, subproject, activity, budget activity, program element, and subprogram within a program element and for investment items are further defined as a P–1 line item in a budget activity within an appropriation account and an R–1 line item which includes a program element and subprogram element within an appropriation account, for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during fiscal year 2002: *Provided*, That no appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used to initiate multi-year procurements utilizing advance procurement funding for economic order quantity procurement unless specifically appropriated later.

SEC. 103. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner which would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 104. No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during fiscal year 2002.

SEC. 105. (a) For purposes of section 101, the term ''rate for operations not exceeding the current rate''—

(1) has the meaning given such term (including supplemental appropriations and rescissions) in the attachment to Office of Management and Budget Bulletin No. 01–10 entitled ''Apportionment of the Continuing Resolution(s) for Fiscal Year 2002'' and dated September 27, 2001, applied by substituting ''FY 2002'' for ''FY 2001'' each place it appears; but

(2) does not include any unobligated balance of funds appropriated in Public Law 107–38 and carried forward to fiscal year 2002, other than funds transferred by division B of Public Law 107–117.

(b) The appropriations Acts listed in section 101 shall be deemed to include supplemental appropriation laws enacted during fiscal year 2002.

SEC. 106. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any program, project, or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this joint resolution.

SEC. 107. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until (a) enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution, or (b) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act by both Houses without any provision for such project or activity, or (c) October 4, 2002, whichever first occurs.

SEC. 108. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 109. Appropriations and funds made available by or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in section 1513 of title 31, United States Code, but nothing herein shall be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds.

SEC. 110. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 107, for those programs that had high initial rates of operation or complete distribution of fiscal year 2002 appropriations at the beginning of that fiscal year because of distributions of funding to States, foreign countries, grantees or others, similar distributions of funds for fiscal year 2003 shall not be made and no grants shall be awarded for such programs funded by this resolution that would impinge on final funding prerogatives.

SEC. 111. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the joint resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 112. For the Overseas Private Investment Corporation Program account, for the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, at an annual rate not to exceed $19,000,000, to be derived by transfer from the Overseas Private Investment Corporation non-credit account, subject to section 107(c).

SEC. 113. Activities authorized by section 403(f) of Public Law 103–356, as amended by section 634 of Public Law 107–67, and activities authorized under the heading ''Treasury Franchise Fund'' in the Treasury Department Appropriations Act, 1997 (Public Law 104–208), as amended by section 120 of the Treasury Department Appropriations Act, 2001 (Public Law 106–554), may continue through the date specified in section 107(c) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 114. Activities authorized by title IV–A of the Social Security Act, and by sections 510, 1108(b), and 1925 of such Act, shall continue in the manner authorized for fiscal year 2002 through December 31, 2002 (notwithstanding section 1902(e)(1)(A) of such Act): *Provided*, That grants and payments may be made pursuant to this authority at the beginning of fiscal year 2003 for the first quarter of such year, at the level provided for such activities for the first quarter of fiscal year 2002: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding rule 3 of the Budget Scorekeeping Guidelines set forth in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference accompanying Conference Report 105–217, the provisions of this section that would have been estimated by the Office of Management and Budget as changing direct spending or receipts under section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 were they included in an Act other than an appropriations Act shall be treated as direct spending or receipts legislation, as appropriate, under section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, and by the Chairmen of the House and Senate Budget Committees, as appropriate, under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

SEC. 115. Activities authorized by section 1722A of title 38, United States Code may continue through the date specified in section 107(c) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 116. In addition to amounts made available in section 101 and subject to sections 107(c) and 108 of this joint resolution, such sums as may be necessary for contributions authorized by 10 U.S.C. 1111 for the

Uniformed Services of the Department of Defense, the Coast Guard, the Public Health Service, and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration are made available to accounts for the pay of members of such participating uniformed services, to be paid from such accounts into the Fund established under 10 U.S.C. 1111, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1116(c).

SEC. 117. None of the funds made available under this Act, or any other Act, shall be used by an Executive agency to implement any activity in violation of section 501 of title 44, United States Code.

SEC. 118. Collection and use of maintenance fees as authorized by section 4(i) and 4(k) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. Sec. 136a–1(i) and (k)) may continue through the date specified in section 107(c) of this joint resolution. Prohibitions against collecting ''other fees'' as described in section 4(i)(6) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136a–1(i)(6)) shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 107(c) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 119. Security service fees authorized under 49 U.S.C. 44940 shall be credited as offsetting collections and the maximum amount collected shall be used for providing security services authorized by that section: *Provided*, That the sum available from the General Fund shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 2003.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 1 hour.

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

(Mr. YOUNG of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before the House, H.J. Res. 111, is a continuing resolution, a CR, for fiscal year 2003, and it extends our spending profiles for four big days.

At midnight this coming Monday, the fiscal year ends. None of the appropriations bills has been sent to the President's desk, regardless of who is at fault. We have heard some discussion on that. We will probably hear more about that. But we need this legislation to continue operations of the Federal Government for the first 4 days of the new fiscal year.

As everyone is aware, the Committee on Appropriations continues to work on the fiscal year 2003 appropriations bills, despite the fact that we have no common budget with the other body. The collapse occurred because we had a breakdown in the budget process, not the appropriations process. The budget process stalled because the other body did not adopt a budget resolution. The House did. But because both Houses did not, we had no opportunity to come to conference and reach the same 302(a) number, the 302(a) number being the top number that we would both use in our appropriations process.

Anyway, despite all of that, we continued to produce bills, and we have a number of bills in the queue ready to go when we are given the approval to bring them to the House floor.

I will comment again that without a common 302(a) number, the top number, it is nearly impossible to have a common 302(b) number for the respective subcommittees of the House and the Senate appropriations committees. It is unfortunate that this is the case, because one of the fundamental responsibilities of Congress is the power of the purse. I emphasis ''responsibility.''

The guiding principles of checks and balances that the founders of our great Nation embodied in our Constitution is lost when the Congress does not complete its work with regard to government spending.

If I might indulge my colleagues in the House for just a moment by reading from Article I of the Constitution, it very simply says, ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.''

That is in our Constitution. Unless we do this, we are failing to uphold our basic constitutional responsibilities.

It is unfortunate that our budget process broke down at a critical time for our country when we are currently at war against terror and when the security of our homeland is at risk. I do not believe the people who wrote the Budget Act ever intended that budget debates would get in the way of our national security interests.

The House has passed five of the 13 appropriations bills. We are currently in conference with the Senate on two of those bills, the defense and military construction bills. We are waiting to appoint conferees on the legislative branch bill.

The Committee on Appropriations has reported four other bills that are awaiting floor action, and that is the appropriations bill for agriculture, energy and water, foreign operations and the District of Columbia. On Tuesday of next week we will conclude consideration of the transportation appropriations bill, and next week we also plan to report the VA–HUD bill from the Committee on Appropriations.

But until we get to the point where we can develop a common set of numbers between the House and the Senate for us to work with, it is important that the operations of our government agencies continue without any disruption, and that is what this legislation is about today.

Let me briefly describe the terms and conditions of the CR. It will continue all ongoing activities at current rates, including supplementals, under the same terms and conditions as fiscal year 2002. We have codified the term ''rate for operations not exceeding the current rate'' as defined in OMB Bulletin No. 01–10. As in past CRs, it does not allow new starts, and it allows for adjustment for one-time expenditures that occurred in fiscal year 2002. It restricts obligations on high initial spend-out programs so the annualized funding levels in this bill will not impinge on our final budget deliberations.

It includes eight funding or authorizing anomalies, of which six allow for the continuation of existing programs and fee collections that would otherwise expire. The remaining two provisions will ensure that executive agencies use the Government Printing Office when procuring government printing, as specified under current law and to ensure that funding for all of the uniformed services to support the accrual contribution for Medicare-eligible retiree health care is available.

After some of the discussion, Mr. Speaker, this may come as a surprise to some, but I believe the CR is noncontroversial, and I urge the House to move this legislation to the Senate quickly so that our government will continue to operate smoothly and efficiently and so that we can continue our work to finish our regular appropriations bills when we are able to do that.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST).

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

Mr. Speaker, I expect this short-term continuing resolution will pass the House by an overwhelming bipartisan majority. But make no mistake. When it does, it will represent an overwhelming bipartisan indictment of the failures of this Republican House of Representatives.

The fiscal year ends next week, and this Republican-controlled House has passed only five of the 13 appropriation bills. The gentleman who just spoke, the chairman of the committee, is an honorable man and his committee has been doing its work. His own leadership has prevented him from bringing the appropriation bills to the floor even though those bills have been reported out of his committee. Republican leaders have stopped even trying to do their work. They have given up on doing the most basic job Congress is elected to do, fund important initiatives in education, health care, and other key American priorities.

It is a shocking abdication of leadership, Mr. Speaker. America is suffering through the weakest economy in 50 years. Unemployment and the poverty rate are up while the stock market and retirement security is down. For too many Americans, the drop in the stock market has turned 401(k) plans into 201(k) plans, but while millions of Americans are busy looking for jobs, House Republicans refuse to do their jobs, the jobs they are getting paid to do.

What accounts for this shameful failure to lead, Mr. Speaker? Simply put, Republicans have put America in a huge deficit ditch, one that poses a

grave threat to Social Security and other priorities like education, prescription drugs, and homeland security, and now they refuse to pick up the shovels and dig their way out of it. We can see it most clearly on education. With much fanfare last year, Democrats and Republicans passed the No Child Left Behind Act, but now Republicans refuse to provide schools with the resources they need to carry out the reforms Congress mandated last year.

That is why the appropriations process is stuck in the House, Mr. Speaker. The majority of the House Republican Conference wants to gut resources for education and other priorities in the bill funding the Departments of Labor, Education, and Health and Human Services. But a few moderate Republicans are afraid to take that vote on the eve of the election.

Over the past week, Mr. Speaker, Republican leaders have turned the House floor into little more than a PR vehicle for the Republican Party. They have wasted time and taxpayers' dollars on numerous, meaningless resolutions. Mr. Speaker, Americans are facing real challenges right now. The economy is weak, prescription drug prices are still sky high, the budget is in deficit, and many Republicans want to privatize Social Security. It is time to quit playing politics. It is time to get back to doing the American people's business.

Free the Committee on Appropriations. Let them bring their bills to the floor. What is the leadership on that side afraid of?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to reserve my time for just another couple of minutes if the gentleman could proceed.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 14 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is a serious time for the country. In 2 years' time we have seen a record surplus go to record deficits, almost 2 million people more out of work today than there were a year ago, a year and a half ago. Economic growth is more anemic than at any time in 20 years. Corporate marauders have swindled investors and ruined workers' pension plans. The stock market has lost more than $4 trillion in value, and the price of health care and prescription drugs is skyrocketing. And almost nothing is being done about that by the American people's government.

We also are conducting a war against terrorism, and now we are considering taking on a new war against Iraq. In the midst of all of that, because of an unreal and incredibly mismanaged budget, this Congress has passed only one of 13 appropriation bills, and that means that 90 percent of our domestic budget is likely by the end of next week still to be unfunded.

□ 1715

Even the defense budget is not funded at this point; we hope it will be funded next week.

Under these circumstances we need to work together; we need a cooperative spirit. The last time we went to war against Iraq, President Bush, Sr., consulted broadly, he respected differences of opinion, he set the tone for cooperation between the U.S. and our allies, between the U.S. and the U.N., between the executive and legislative branches of government, between the Democrats and Republicans who serve in this Congress. The result was that we had a spirited debate which I had the privilege to chair at that time; and after the vote, we all came together, united in purpose and in spirit.

But this time the situation is sadly different, and this President is taking a much different approach at a time when we need to keep discussion on a high plane. We have seen the report in The Washington Post yesterday which questioned the concern of the Senate Democrats about national security. The kind of rhetoric that we saw emanating from the President on seven occasions is divisive when it should be unifying, it personalizes issues that ought to be substantive, and it weakens this country's ability to find consensus at a time when we need it badly.

Now, the White House issued a limp apology yesterday and said ''Oh, the President did not mean it; he was not talking about the Iraq debate, he was talking about homeland security.'' I would point out that when this President questions someone else's concern for national security because of their positions on homeland security issues, this is the same President who told me nose-to-nose in the White House that the bipartisan package that the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) and I were producing to buttress our homeland security programs after September 11 would be vetoed if we spent one dime more than the President had himself requested for homeland security.

This is the President who resisted our efforts to provide more money to the FBI so that we could end the disgraceful situation under which 50 percent of the FBI's computers could not even send a picture of a terrorist or a suspected terrorist to another FBI computer around the country.

This is the same President who resisted our efforts to add more funding for Canadian border security, when I stood in this well holding a traffic cone, saying that on many of the stations on the Canadian border, after they were closed at night, the only deterrent we had to terrorists crossing the border was a traffic cone. I am sure they were scared stiff of that.

This is the same President who resisted our efforts to strengthen funding for the Nunn-Lugar program to secure nuclear material in the former Soviet Union before it fell into terrorist hands.

This is the same President who resisted our efforts to add money above his budget request to protect our nuclear plants and to protect other sensitive Federal installations from terrorist attack.

Now, I have served with seven Presidents. I have never seen any President during all of that time, except Richard Nixon—the only President I ever saw use that kind of innuendo, questioning someone else's dedication to the security interests of this country was President Nixon.

The reason I am so passionate about this issue is because I get my dander up when people question any other public servant's commitment to this country's security interest. Because I come from the State of Joe McCarthy, and I saw how he denigrated the political debate in this country, and I think that no one ought to emulate that. Unfortunately, I think we have seen remarks that came pretty close.

I would also point out, it was not the other body of this Congress, if the President wants to know, it was not the other body that blocked funds that his own Secretary of Energy requested to protect the shipment of nuclear warheads down U.S. highways from terrorist attacks. Huge bipartisan majorities of this House and the other body approved those funds, but the President said no. It was not the other body of this Congress that blocked funds to bring the Federal Bureau of Investigation into the information age. Huge bipartisan majorities in both Houses of Congress approved those funds in the recent supplemental, but the President said no.

It was not the other body of this Congress that blocked funds to establish a global system of checking containerized cargo on cargo ships before they leave ports overseas rather than after they are on American soil in order to determine if they have radioactive material, chemical, or biological weapons, or other material that may be used to launch acts of terror. Huge bipartisan majorities in both Houses of Congress approved those funds, but the President said no. It was not the other body of this Congress that blocked funds to help the Immigration and Naturalization Service develop the analytical capability they needed to prioritize and track the thousands of illegal immigrants who were inside the United States and identify the ones that are likely to pose the greatest threat to the citizens of this country. Huge bipartisan majorities in both Houses of Congress approved those funds also, but the President said no.

It was not the other body of this Congress that blocked funds to help the National Weapons and Research Laboratories to make certain that they can defend themselves and their employees against cyberattacks and espionage conducted by terrorist organizations. Huge bipartisan majorities in both Houses of Congress approved those funds, but the President said no.

Despite all of that, I do not think we saw Democrats in either this body or the other body questioning the President's patriotism or his commitment

to national security. We took those differences to be honest differences. The President owes us and the other body the same courtesy.

We all have obligations of conscience, and we should respect them, including the President of the United States. And we have other obligations. Because this House has not met those obligations, we are here today with this continuing resolution. Because at this point, this House, if we can quit blaming somebody else for a change, this House, not the other body, this House has passed only five appropriation bills out of the 13 required to finish our business.

This chart demonstrates what has happened every year since 1988. The worst record during that period from 1988 through today, the worst record we had was in 1991 when the House only finished 10 of its 13 appropriation bills, and in 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 years, the House finished all of them. This year, the House has done virtually nothing of its appropriations work, and that is not the fault of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and it is not the fault of the Committee on Appropriations.

It is because there is an internal war in the majority party caucus over one bill, the Labor, Health and Education bill. The conservatives in the majority party caucus do not want to see any appropriation bill brought to this floor until the education budget is brought to this floor and passed at the President's level, and the Republican leadership's dilemma is that they know they do not have the votes for that in their own caucus. Because the moderates in the Republican caucus know that the President's budget is inadequate, and they do not want to go home having stopped the progress we have made on education over the last few years.

Now, I will say one thing for the President. He has had a lot of photo ops. He has been in elementary schools more often than students over the past year, posing for political holy pictures with children promoting the No Child Left Behind Education Act. We passed that with large bipartisan majorities, and what that act said is that we are going to reform the education programs and then we are going to fund them. Well, we reformed them. Where is the funding? Before that act passed, this Congress, over a 5-year period, virtually doubled support for public education. But what budget did the President send down to match his talk as he goes from schoolroom to schoolroom, trying to create the image that he is putting education first in this country? The President's education budget brings to a screaming halt the progress we have made in expanding education funding over the past 5 years. He puts a financial freeze on education when we look at it on a per-student basis. That is not what my constituents tell me they want when I go home.

The reason this continuing resolution is here is for only one reason: it is because the majority party does not want to have to vote on the President's education budget before the election. The only group that appears to want to vote on it are the conservatives in the Republican caucus. But the rest of the caucus does not want to have to vote on the President's budget because they know they would vote no, because the President's rhetoric is not matched by his actions.

Mr. Speaker, the President is not putting our money where our mouths are, and I call that posing for political holy pictures. As far as I can see, the Nation's schools are regarded as the number one photo op for the White House political staff and the number one target by the White House budget staff. I would like to know which of those two groups our friends in the majority party are actually going to be supporting. But this CR is here because they do not want to have to vote on that issue. They do not want to have to expose their own chaos and their own different vision in their own caucus.

So I want to make clear to the leadership in this House, I will vote for this resolution today, this short-term continuing resolution, because we have no option if we are going to keep the government open. But I will not vote for an extended continuing resolution. I will not vote for a continuing resolution that allows this body to push these issues off until after the election so they can have a collective Republican duck. I will not do that.

This House needs to finish its business. It needs to pass the Labor–HHS bill, it needs to pass the transportation bill, it needs to pass the budget for science, it needs to pass the budget for defense. In short, we need to meet our basic responsibilities.

When all we can do is produce five of these 13 bills and then somehow blame the other body for the fact that we have not even seen these bills come up here, that to me is a confession of institutional impotence and a demonstration of political incompetence; and neither one of them ought to make anybody very proud.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute. I do so, number one, to say that I agree with some of the things that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has said, and I disagree with some of the things that he has said. I do want to thank him for helping us bring this resolution to the floor today, because it is essential. We have to pass this resolution, or Monday night at midnight the government closes down. I do not want that to happen. There may be some around here that want it to happen, but I am not one of them. But anyway, I do appreciate the fact that we finally have got this resolution on the floor.

But I also want my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), to know that I am not going to try to respond in kind on any of the political issues that might be raised today, because my job and my responsibility today is to move this CR through the House, get it to the Senate, and get it to the President.

□ 1730

Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services and Education.

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding time to me.

I do not want to engage in the blame game; I just want to support the record that we have achieved in the past 6 years in terms of education. I think this is an outstanding record, and I must say, in fairness, that oftentimes or most of the time we have had the support of the minority party in doing this. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is ranking in our committee, and has been very supportive.

Title I, aid to disadvantaged students. I think the important part that I want to say is that the record in education has been to help those really in need of help. Let us take Title I. It is up 62 percent from 1996, from $6.37 billion to $10.35 billion, a good record for this body that we can all take pride in.

IDEA, special education grants. These are young people who need help. It is up by 224 percent. That is a remarkable increase over the past 6 or 8 years.

We have tripled the funding for Federal reading programs from $300 million to more than $900 million. This is what the President promised to do. I think he deserves credit for that.

We have increased the Federal teacher quality funds by 35 percent to help States and local communities to train, recruit, and retain quality public school teachers.

I might say here, and this is almost a crusade with me, we should get a good teacher in every classroom, because if we ask any group, do you have some teacher that in your life has made a difference, without hesitation hands go up. That is why it is so important that we can continue the programs that will help the States and local communities to get good teachers in every classroom. No child will be left behind if they have a quality teacher.

Pell grants. This is help to those from the low income to have an opportunity to get an additional education; it might be in a trade school, it might be in a college, a university, or whatever. We have increased them by 62 percent, from $2,470 to $4,000 in fiscal year 2002. That is a credit to this Congress, that it has recognized the importance of helping these young people.

Head Start, another program to help those who are less advantaged, we have increased it by 83 percent over the past 6 years. I think it is a record to be proud of.

We have increased Federal aid to America's Historically Black Colleges and Universities by 144 percent.

Mr. Speaker, we want to continue this record because I think education is the most important responsibility, in cooperation with the States and the local communities. We need to have an educated population if we want to compete in the world of tomorrow, if we want to give the people of this Nation an opportunity, the young people.

I would also like to point to the record in Health and Human Services. We have supported dislocated worker employment assistance. It grew by $271 million to $1.4 billion, again, helping those who need a helping hand.

Community health centers. They delivered needed medical services to over 10 million patients in fiscal year 2001, and it grew by 77 percent since fiscal year 1996.

Support for the Centers for Disease Control. We suddenly discovered after 9/11 how important the Centers for Disease Control were to this Nation, and they deal with infectious diseases. They are the traffic cop that stands between us and the incursion of many different types of diseases in our society. It grew by 400 percent; again, something that helps people all across the Nation.

The Centers for Disease Control's chronic disease prevention, it has grown by 178 percent.

Medical research by the National Institutes of Health: a commitment was made about 4 years ago or 5 years ago that we would double their budget. We have kept that commitment, and we would hope to do that again in this fiscal year. They have supported nearly 37,000 research projects. That is important. That is important to people, because out of those research projects will come cures, will come ways of helping individuals.

If Members could sit in the committee that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and myself are responsible for and listen to the testimony, they would realize how important it is to the people of this Nation, and parents with children that need help; people with Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, you name it, we have heard from them in our subcommittee, and we have tried to help by enhancing the programs of the National Institutes of Health and many others.

All I want to say to this body is that I think we have an excellent record we have accomplished on a bipartisan basis over the past several years, and particularly since the Republicans have had the responsibility for the programs as the majority party.

But in fairness, I also want to say, we have had help in getting this record accomplished. We would hope that we will have the same kind of help. We know that we cannot do everything, that the resources are not as great as they might have been 3 or 4 years ago.

I think one of the things we need to do is take a look at all the money we have poured into these programs and say, is it being spent wisely? Is it getting results? Is it producing value received to the taxpayers of this Nation? What we are trying to do in crafting these appropriations bills is to ensure that we are getting value received; that we are using the money wisely on behalf of the people who need the help.

I would reiterate again that these programs help all Americans. They are not limited to any single group. Illness strikes at all types in our socioeconomic strata.

Education is important, and we have had a real concern in making sure these programs serve the people. I think that is a record we can point to with pride, and I hope that we can work out appropriation bills that will continue this record of great service to the American people from every walk of life.

Under Republican leadership, America's proven education programs have thrived. In the past several years, Republicans have:

Increased Title I aid to disadvantaged students by 62 percent—from $6.37 billion in FY 96 to $10.35 billion in FY 02.

Increased special education grants to states (Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, or IDEA) by 224 percent—an increase far larger than under Democrat controlled Congresses.

Tripled funding for federal reading programs from $300 million to more than $900 million, as promised by President George W. Bush.

Increased federal teacher quality funds by 35 percent to help states and local communities train, recruit, and retain quality public school teachers.

Increased the maximum Pell Grant award by 62 percent—from $2,470 in FY 96 to $4,000 in FY 02.

Increased Head Start funding by 83 percent—from $3.569 billion in FY 96 to $6.538 billion in FY 02.

Increased federal aid to America's Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Historically Black Graduate Institutions, and Hispanic-Serving Institutions by 144 percent—from a combined total of $140 million in FY 96 to $341 million in FY 02.

Support for dislocated worker re-employment assistance grew $271 million, to nearly $1.4 billion since FY96;

Support for Community Health Centers, which delivered needed medical services to an estimated 10.5 million patients in FY2001, grew $587 million, or 77 percent, since FY96 helping CHCs serve 2.4 million more patients over six years;

Support for CDC's work in tracking, understanding and controlling new and re-emerging infectious agents grew $282 million, or over 400 percent since FY96.

Support for CDC's chronic disease prevention activities, in areas such as breast and cervical cancer prevention, diabetes control, and cardiovascular disease prevention, grew $479 million, or 178 percent, since FY96;

Support for medical research administered by the National Institutes of Health grew $11.5 billion, or 97 percent since FY96. NIH estimates that they will support nearly 37,000 research/project grants in FY2002, over 11,000 more than they supported in FY96;

Support for Head Start grew nearly $3 billion, or 83 percent, since FY96. During FY2002, the Administration estimates Head Start will serve over 100,000 more children aged 3 to 4 then it did in FY96; and

Support for helping low income Americans in meeting their heating costs through the LIHEAP program grew $1.1 billion, or 120 percent since FY96.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is certainly a friend of education and health care; but I would simply point out that the issue is not what we have done last year, it is what we are going to do next year.

We still have not seen a bill produced by the majority, and the President's budget for health care cuts back $1.4 billion in crucial health care programs outside of NIH. It essentially fails to provide anywhere near the support level that is needed for programs that help low-income students, for programs that help the handicapped, and for children who need help with second languages.

So there are going to be thousands of children, indeed, left behind by the President's budget, and we would like to correct that, but we cannot get the Republican majority to bring a bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA). I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) is a friend of education. Also, he is the chairman of our subcommittee.

What I think most of us feel on the Committee on Appropriations is our Republican colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations want positive investment in our country. They are not the problem, but the leadership of the Republican Party is the problem. Frankly, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget this year and in past years is the problem.

Now, let me tell my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, about education. The irony is that my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, would stand and say, look what we have done since 1995 on education. What we have done on education is, under the leadership of Bill Clinton, he said, I am not going to sign bills that underfund education.

What were those bills? Let me read them to the Members so in the future the Members will know, because I know if the gentleman knew this, he probably would not have made this representation.

The Republican bill offered to this House in 1996 was $5 billion under the President's request. That did not end up that way.

In 1997, the Republican bill offered $2.8 billion under the President.

In 1998, it was a Presidential election year. The Republican leadership, wanting to elect its own, came in with a bipartisan bill. It was just $191 million under the President. However, in the

next year, it was over half a billion dollars over the President.

In the year 2000, the Republican bill was $1.4 billion under the President; and in 2001, it was $2.9 billion under the President. By the way, the bills were not as harsh as the budget.

So, Mr. Speaker, yes, over the last 8 years we have been generous to education, and we have in fact said not only are we rhetorically going to leave no child behind, but we are going to fund programs to seek that end.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) put up a chart here, it is now over there, but essentially it shows 15 years of activities of the Committee on Appropriations, and more importantly, the House committee, in passing appropriation bills.

Over those 15 years, we have averaged 12.2 bills passed before the end of the fiscal year. That is a 93 percent average. That is an A. This year, we are at 38 percent. That is a miserable failure; not the responsibility of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations or the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) or the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) or others who chair the appropriations subcommittees, but it is the fault of a divisive leadership that wants to talk about being for programs but does not want to fund those programs; not only that, does not want to debate them on this floor.

This month of September we have not considered one appropriation bill on this floor, notwithstanding the fact that September 30 is at the door.

I, like the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), will vote for this continuing resolution, but like the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), I will also call to account those who put us in a position of being unable to debate the priorities of this Nation on this floor.

Like the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), I do not want my patriotism or concern for the security of this Nation to be called into question by this President, who is our leader and who ought to bring us together, not drive us apart.

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

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to respond to my dear friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER). I want to assure him that however politically engaged this might become this afternoon, that none of my speakers will attack any of the gentleman's leadership. We had a lot of disagreements with the gentleman's leadership, but we are not going to raise those today. We have a strong leadership on our side and they have accomplished a lot in this Congress.

We did hit a couple of roadblocks dealing with the budget process, and as the gentleman knows, we passed a budget. Whether the gentleman likes it or not, we passed a budget in the House. That did not happen in the other body.

Secondly, I wanted to point out to my friend that the only two bills that we have had a request from the other body to go to conference on are the defense bill and the military construction bill. We in fact are in conference aggressively coming to closure on those two bills. With the exception of Legislative Branch appropriations, we have not had a request from the other body to go to conference on any other appropriation bills, including the ones that we have already sent down there to them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my colleagues that in 1994, with a Democrat-controlled House, they passed an education bill $3 billion below President Clinton's request.

□ 1745

I have heard tonight, well, let us stop pointing fingers. That is all I have heard from the other side, every single speaker, pointing fingers. You know why? Well, the President took control of the issue of education.

I have talked to Democrat pollsters; they are upset because the Democrat numbers are down on Education. This President has shown that he cares about education. He focuses on education. And education spending is not everything.

I would like to submit this for the record. It is what Secretary Paige showed, the number of increases in education spending but yet test scores have baselined. The education plan is more than just spending. We have increased education dollars, but we have also given the State the flexibility to move those dollars around where parents and teachers can make those decisions.

My colleagues on the other side want line items and every item increased so that they can mandate exactly what is done in the States, the paperwork increases, the mandates, the union bureaucracy. And the President said no, I want to give the States the flexibility where parents and teachers can make those decisions.

They also demand accountability. And with the accountability he also gave the superintendents and the State legislatures the ability to move money around, not line item it and mandate it. A hundred thousand teachers? We need teachers, yes. But we also put money in for the quality of education and teachers.

We have passed prescription drugs, and tax relief for working families. My colleagues only attack, oh, it is a tax break for the rich. Some of them have not found a tax they do not want to increase. In 1993 they increased tax on the middle class after they said they were going to reduce it. They taxed Social Security. They actually taxed gas. And, remember, there was even a retroactive tax in there and you cut veterans' COLAs. You cut military COLAs, if you want to talk about history.

And I want to tell you, I would question somebody who used our military as White House waiters. I would question someone who would send our people into harm's way. I questioned a Republican President who sent our people over in Lebanon and let them sit there. But I sure question President Clinton on a lot of the things he did that in my estimation were not right.

Why are they doing this? Well, it is an election year, Mr. Speaker. Have you ever heard the name of James Carville and his colleagues? We have got the ''Carville Report.'' What does he recommend to his Democrat pollsters? For the Democrats to stick close to the President on the war because if they do not, the numbers will go down. But they also requested that the Senate hold up bills, because in a bad economy they can hang on to the Senate. They also said we can pass things here like tax relief but to blast the Republicans on these issues. And I think you have heard every speaker over here do that. And it is just not the case.

We have passed prescription drugs here. The Senate has not. We have passed homeland security. And I tell you, I would question somebody that holds up a homeland security bill insisting on union workers filling those billets instead of passing a homeland security bill. I think that is wrong. And I think it should be questioned.

I heard about border patrol. The gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) on this floor, when I first came, we fought to get more border patrol and we were turned down until we took the majority. And slowly in a bipartisan way in many cases, we got more border patrol to secure our borders.

It is sad to watch the things that are going on tonight because as a group we have done so many things. This President is a caring President. I want to tell you, he has brought credibility, he has brought character to the White House that was not there before. Is it not nice to see a President who can actually look at his wife and say, I love you and mean it?

The economy is growing. It is growing by 3 percent. Alan Greenspan said that the economy has grown by 1.5 percent because of tax relief for working families. My colleagues say it is just for the rich; it is an election year.

Inflation is low. Interest is low. But yet there is not confidence in the market. The Senate has not passed the Employee Protection Act that would protect them from cases of Enron and WorldCom. We need to pass that bill, to bring that confidence up. And that has not been passed by the other body; and I think that is wrong.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, the speaker has just violated the rules of the House with regard to references to the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The characterizing of the Senate inaction is not in order.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, they have not passed the bill that should be in order. They have not passed the bill.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, the point of order I raised was not when the gentleman referred to inaction, but when the gentleman characterized that inaction and gave a value judgment to the inaction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct. The gentleman in the well will proceed in order.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I do not believe I have done that, Mr. Speaker.

But I will tell you, an energy bill is critical. The Senate has not passed that bill. An economic stimulus package is critical which helps us in education. The Senate has not passed that bill.

The Senate according to the Carville memo did not pass its budget, not mine. Why? Because they can offer a trillion dollars in a prescription drugs program.

MR. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished whip.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding me time and for his great leadership on behalf of America's families. I also commend the distinguished Chair of the Committee on Appropriations for his leadership and the two of them for bringing this continuing resolution to the floor.

The sadness of it all, though, is that the continuing resolution is needed at all. For the weeks that we have come back here from the summer August break, this Congress has been in session from Tuesday night until Thursday afternoon. We have had plenty of time if we had worked a full week to do the people's business, to pass the appropriations bills that are our responsibility by the end of this fiscal year and the start of the new one.

Instead, we are here passing a short-term continuing resolution, and there will be another one and there will be another one because this House has ignored the needs of the American people, the needs for a growing economy, for prescription drug benefits, for access to quality health care, for educating our children; and that is the point on which I would like to focus.

I rise on behalf of America's children who deserve every opportunity we can give them and on behalf of their parents who deserve to know just where the parties really stand as opposed to what they say they stand for.

Nowhere is the contrast between Republican rhetoric and Republican reality so stark as in the oft-repeated promise to ''leave no child behind.''

The reality is that the Republicans want to cut our investment in education to a level far below what is authorized in the Leave No Child Behind Act, $7 billion less of an investment than that which was promised by the President. Despite countless Presidential photo ops and despite the little red school house built outside the Department of Education at massive tax payer expense, I might add, the reality is that the Republican Party plans to leave millions of children behind.

The fact is that the Republicans do not want to debate appropriations bills because they do not want the public to see that their education budget would underfund the No Child Left Behind Act, which the President heralded as his great achievement by $7.2 billion, and that is the President's recommendation and that is why some Republicans will hold up this bill from coming to the floor.

The President's education budget stops in its tracks 6 years of steady progress in Federal support to local schools, dead in its tracks. The investments in education under this budget are down to less than 1 percent. How are we going to grow our economy if we will not grow our investment in public education?

There is no tax cut you can name or benefit or credit or anything that you could name that grows the economy more than investing in education. There is nothing that is more dynamic to the budget than investing in education. We are not only doing a disservice to the children, we are doing a disservice to the taxpayers. There is nothing you can name that would grow the economy more than investing in education.

All the research, Mr. Speaker, tells us that children do better in smaller classes and, indeed, they do better in smaller schools. And yet the Republicans want to freeze funding for these cost-effective programs. What they have in the budget is enough to provide, for example, after-school programs to only 8 percent of the 15.2 million low-income children who could benefit from them.

I refer you to this chart. Look at this. We are gaining in enlightenment. We are giving after-school guidance for children. It is good for their education. It is good for their health. It is good for their future. And here we come into this budget and take a downturn in after-school programs for America's children. This is really, really a tragedy. We cannot turn our backs on the millions of children who just last year we were promising to rescue, and we cannot turn our backs on the economic future of our great country. When we make a decision in this body we should think of America's children. We should think of growing our economy. There is a commonality of interest.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), who is the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce and who authored the outstanding education bill last year, H.R. 1.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, the rhetoric we are hearing from our friends across the aisle is not about children. This is all about politics. And when it comes to education funding or any other kind of funding, our Democrat friends this year have no budget, no plan, and no credibility.

Now let us just look at the facts. In the House the Democrats voted against the President's budget but did not even offer an alternative of their own. In the Senate they even failed to pass any budget at all. The first time since 1974 that has happened.

Now, let us take a look at what columnist David Broder wrote recently: ''When the House is debating its budget resolution,'' Broder wrote, ''the Democrats proposed no alternative of their own.'' He went on to say, ''Rather than fake it, House Democrats just punted,'' Broder wrote. ''The resolution is designed to be the clearest statement of a party's policy priorities, and as long as they are silent the Democrats cannot be part of a serious political debate.''

I think David Broder is right.

So I say to my Democrat friends, if you are going to stand here today and say you are for additional education spending, you better be prepared to tell the American people how you plan to get there. Fortunately, President Bush has given us a budget this year that continues to make education a priority even in the face of war and economic turmoil.

As you can see by this chart, President Bush's budget this year proposes far more for education than the last budgets proposed and signed by President Clinton. In fact, Federal funding for education has more than doubled over the past 6 years. Discretionary appropriations for the Department of Education have climbed from $23 billion in fiscal year 1996 to $49 billion this year, an increase of 113 percent.

Now, as you can see by this chart, special education, the Republican budget provides for another billion dollars' increase in special education grants to the States, and calls for full funding of IDEA over the next 10 years. This is almost a 300 percent increase over the last 7 years.

Democrats did not offer a budget to help children with special needs. They have no budget. They have no plan, and they have no solution.

Now, let us look at title I for a moment. For disadvantaged students in school, the Republican budget provides for a billion dollars' increase in title I grants. Now this is on top of the $1.6 billion increase that we passed and was signed into law earlier this year. These resources are focused in on high-poverty schools and kids who are in poor

neighborhoods who need our help. Democrats have not offered a budget to help low-income school districts or kids. They have no budget. They have no plan and they have no solution.

Now, here is something else to consider. As this chart shows, under the first 2 years of President Bush's Presidency, we will have seen greater increases in title I funding than in the previous 7 years combined.

□ 1800

The last 2 years of the President's budget, last year and this year, are greater increases than in the last 7 years under the previous President.

Let us not forget about teachers, the people responsible for our kids in the classroom. For teachers, the Republican budget provides $2.85 billion, matching the historic increase the President signed into law last year. This is a 38 percent increase over the last Clinton budget.

Democrats have offered no budget to help America's schoolteachers. They have no plan, they have no budget and they have no solution. Despite the twin challenges of war and economic recovery, the President's budget this year expands funding for all of our educational priorities, and so I say to my friends on the other side, if they have got a better plan, why do they not show us?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes. The previous speaker leaves a false impression in the House because of his constant reference to budget resolutions rather than appropriations. Budget resolutions do not provide one dime for students. Appropriations bills do.

The fact is despite the fact that the President of the United States made a big thing out of being for the No Child Left Behind authorization bill, there will be hundreds of thousands of children left behind under the budget that he proposed, which does not in any way match that original legislation. Example: Special education, the budget he proposed this year is one-half billion dollars below what it would have to be to meet the promises of the Individuals with Disabilities Act.

In Title I, they are $4.6 billion below where they would have to be in order to meet the promised funding level under the No Child Left Behind Act, and even the small $1 billion increase in that package is paid for by cuts in other programs that affect the very same children who need help the most, and then you have in addition the President cutting the comprehensive school reform program by 24 percent, eliminating the smaller schools appropriations.

So then if you take the children who are most at risk, because they have difficulty with languages, this budget on a pupil basis provides a 10 percent real reduction in programs to help children who have trouble with the English language. No child left behind, it sounds nice. Why do you not back it up with your money?

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

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman is so proud of that which he has done in his budget and his bill, why does he not bring the appropriations bill to the floor? Why does it languish for the last 8 months in committee? Why do they say to me we do not have the votes for the bill on our side of the aisle if what he says is so true?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, let me respond to my colleagues and say that we worked closely together in a bipartisan way to produce the No Child Left Behind Act, and it was truly the most bipartisan bill this Congress has produced, and I am proud of my relationship with my good friend the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), who worked closely with me and all of my colleagues to produce it.

We put huge increases in place last year, and my colleagues have to understand that the increases that are in this year's budget are on top of the increases in last year's budget. We have offered a budget. We have a plan. My colleagues have no plan. They brought no budget to the floor. They are ducking and hiding from the issues how.

Now where is the bill? The fact is we have a plan. We have a budget. Show us yours. We have not seen it yet.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), a strong member of the strong leadership team in the House.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I greatly appreciate the gentleman from Florida's work and what he has been able to accomplish, and I understand the dilemma that he is facing, and I can answer the question where is the bill.

You cannot reconcile with an addict. The Senate did not pass a budget. Therefore, they are spending with addiction. They are addicts. They are spending like I have never seen before. When we have a budget that we have to adhere to in the House, you cannot reconcile.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). Members will avoid improper references to the Senate during this debate.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that.

When you try to reconcile a bill against with having a budget, it cannot be reconciled with a bill that has increased spending with abandon. It is amazing, Mr. Speaker, that they do not understand that.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) will avoid improper references to the Senate.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, this surge of aggression from the other side of the aisle is simply the bitter fruit of a strategy to stymie, frustrate and defeat fiscal discipline at every turn. My colleagues from the other party are infuriated.

Mr. Speaker, I am speaking about Members of this House.

My colleagues from the other party for this House are infuriated that our Republican House majority is a dike holding back waves upon waves of new Democrat nonsecurity spending. That is not how it used to be around here. They ache to restore the tax and spend policies that robbed the Social Security Trust Fund for decade after decade after decade after decade when the Democrats controlled this Congress.

The Democrats ran the House and they fueled an irresponsible culture of spending that drove America's books deep, deep, deep into the red. They spent with abandon. They spent without restraint. They spent blindly. They spent more than the country could bear. They ignored the economic damage that their spending lust had created. They balanced their budgets on the backs of future generations.

The other party understands that they have to raise taxes to fund the huge new spending programs that their big spending caucus demanded. Our Republican insistence on lowering, not raising, taxes makes them livid. They complain that lowering taxes causes the deficit, and one made mention that Reagan's tax cut in the eighties created the deficit. For every dollar, revenues actually went up after that tax cut. The problem is for every dollar of new revenues coming in they spent two dollars.

The other party understands that and has a single all-consuming ambition, separating the taxpayers from more of their hard-earned dollars and swelling the size of government with waves of new spending, waves and waves of new spending.

The Democrat House leadership embraced the decision by the other body to proceed with no governing fiscal oversight called a budget. They attempted to do the same thing here, but unfortunately for the big spenders, the House of Representatives passed a budget. Let us shift our attention away from the specific points at issue. Let us consider things in the realm of the theoretical.

For any theoretical elective body, the decision to proceed forward without a governing budget would be foolhardy and grossly irresponsible. It would be a blunder of rank stupidity and extreme fiscal wantonness for any conceivable legislative body to rashly conclude it could sustain fiscal discipline without a guiding and governing budget.

Our House Republican majority brought America back into the black. We brought back fiscal discipline. We

even started paying down the debt. We are working with the President to hold the line on excessive nonsecurity spending, we are holding firm, and we are motivated by an undeniable truism: The dollars that Washington spends belong to the taxpayers. We respect their hard work. We appreciate the taxpayers' ability to spend their own money better than Washington, D.C., and we are extremely hostile to any scheme that would separate a single taxpayer from any additional dollar.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle see 180 degrees differently. The truth is the House Republicans are completing America's business and we are doing it responsibly within a fiscal framework that preserves fiscal freedom.

The hostility directed against us today flows from the bitter hunger pains of an insatiable appetite for new wasteful spending.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have just been told by the majority party whip that he is holding back an ocean wave of spending. Well, what is it that he is holding back? What is he using his hammer to hold back in his own caucus? He is using his hammer in order to prevent this House from voting on the education and health appropriations bill. He has his ideological views and he has assessed the votes in his own caucus and he has decided he does not even have the votes in his own caucus to squeeze down education as much as the President wants to do in his own budget.

If The Hammer, as he is known on that side of the aisle, if the gentleman is so confident that he can prevail, then why do you not allow the committee to bring up the Labor-Health-Education bill? I wrote to the Speaker and I said, Mr. Speaker, you have got a fight between your conservatives and your moderates and so you are hung up and so you do not want to bring a bill up because you cannot guarantee an outcome, why do you not simply bring the bill to the floor and let us let the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) offer the President's budget, which he tried to do, let your Republican caucus offer any other alternative they want, and then let us offer an alternative we want and let us see which package wins? The reason you will not bring the Education bill to the floor is because you know you cannot win it.

It is also because you know that your Members desperately want to avoid voting on the President's Education budget before the election. Why? Because in the last 5 years, we have delivered on average a 13 percent increase for education each year, and now you want to freeze it. Now you want to freeze it and your moderate Members know that that will not fly with the American people. It will not do any good for America's kids. It will not help build America's future, and it will not help you in the election.

Bring the bill out. That is what we are asking.

As for the Senate being responsible, the fact is that 90 percent of the domestic budget has not passed, and that is no fault of the Senate. You have only produced on this floor the smallest of the domestic appropriation bills and only the Treasury-Post Office bill has become law.

We are going to have a conference on Defense next week but you have abdicated your responsibility. The gentleman from Texas, I say to you, you have abdicated the responsibility as majority party whip to do the Nation's business. You say you have completed the Nation's business. Then why is it that 90 percent of the domestic appropriations are being bottled up by the majority party? Why do you not do your duty and bring those bills to the floor?

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would like to remind Members to please avoid improper references to the Senate.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 29½ minutes, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 29 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), my distinguished colleague.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

One item that has been lost in this debate, which is truly important, I think one of the proudest moments in this House of Representatives was in 1996, when we passed a welfare reform bill. As a result of that, almost 3 million kids are now out of poverty. Millions and millions of people who otherwise would be on the welfare roll are on the payroll, and the welfare rolls in this country have been reduced by 60 percent, and that is why at the same time we are reducing poverty among kids. What greater accomplishment have we had?

That bill runs out the end of this month.

□ 1815

There will be no welfare and welfare reform can be forgotten. The $4.8 billion in child care will no longer be there. Four months ago on the floor of this House, we passed the extension. The Senate has not.

Part of this bill is to extend welfare reform so that the checks will continue to go out. The child care will continue to be there, the job training will still be there, and all of the good things that we passed in 1996 will remain with us. But it is going to be absolutely vital that we pass this continuing resolution because this would extend it for 3 months into next year. That is tremendously important because if we do not, there will be no checks going out.

The prediction that was made in 1996 when we passed welfare reform would come true and the poverty levels would skyrocket, the job training and all of the good that we did would be undone. The Senate has not acted on this most important piece of legislation, and it is one that I think all Members in one degree or another can support.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the House for passing welfare reform, and also urge that all Members tonight vote for this continuing resolution so that all the good that we did in 1996 is not lost.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON).

(Mr. JACKSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I intend to support the continuing resolution that is before us today, but I must say that the administration's budget proposal in this body has not lived up to the commitment that we made to leave no child behind.

Yesterday, the Census Bureau stated that the proportion of Americans living in poverty rose significantly last year, increasing for the first time in 8 years. At the same time, the Bureau said that the income of middle-class households fell for the first time since the last recession ended, in 1991. In the last 2 years, 2 million more Americans have lost their jobs, and economic growth is at an anemic 1 percent, the slowest growth in over 50 years.

What has been the House's answer to this: Tax cuts, the ability to find another $100–200 billion for a possible war in Iraq.

A strong economy depends on a strong workforce, and that means educating all Americans and providing them with skills they need to be productive workers. Some Members of Congress seem to have a single focus, and that is keeping America strong abroad. But we have a dual responsibility, keeping America strong abroad and also keeping America strong at home. Education is the key to keeping America strong at home, and that is why I think we must finish our work here before we adjourn for the elections in November.

The title I program provides funds for school districts to help disadvantaged children obtain a high-quality education, and at a minimum, to achieve proficiency on challenging academic achievement standards established by the States.

The President's request for title I education is $4.56 billion below the $16 billion he supported and Congress supported in the Leave No Child Behind Act. The administration refused to request funding for title I school improvements funds, and last year over 8,600 schools, 10 percent across the country, were identified as failing to meet the State standards. With the additional funds promised by the Leave No Child Behind Act, school districts would have been able to hire an additional 92,000 title I teachers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support this continuing resolution, but let us also focus on the need to fully fund education for our children.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, there is a sinkhole on the Capitol, not over here, but over there, a giant growing sinkhole. It is particularly hazardous to judicial nominees, to presidential appointees, and to presidential ideas or initiatives in general. It is very hazardous to legislation, hazardous to the budget. In fact, the only thing that seems to get through this giant sinkhole are memos from Barbra Streisand; but that is an improvement, I would say, over contacting Eleanor Roosevelt, as we were doing a couple of years ago to get our instructions.

Now, this sinkhole ate up the budget this year. There is no budget. Where there is no budget, every day is Christmas.

I have four wonderful children. I love my children, like just every Democrat and Republican here. We all love our kids, but my kids have all kinds of ideas about how I ought to be spending my money. For birthdays, they want a golf cart, Jetskis, CDs, and if they are older, they want a car. None of them quite wanted the pair of tennis shoes that I bought and wrapped so carefully. The reality is, they think I am a U.S. Senator, and every day is Christmas when we do not have a budget.

So here we are forced to pass a continuing resolution because we cannot deal with some group that does not have a budget. That is bad enough, but here are some other bills. We are at war. As I speak, as we sit here, we have troops in Afghanistan and Pakistan and all over the Middle East, and yet we cannot get a homeland security bill passed. We cannot get faith-based initiatives passed. The House has passed 51 bills which have not been passed by the other body. There is no bipartisan Patient Protection Act. There is no human cloning bill. I can understand that because some of them do not want more of us, and a lot of us do not want more of them. Maybe that one I can understand their hesitancy.

They have not passed Personal Responsibility, Work, and Family Promotion Act, or welfare reform. We had 14 million people on welfare 3 years ago.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The gentleman from Georgia will suspend.

Members must avoid improper references to the other body. That is the rule of the House.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that. Now there is no doubt who I am referring to; and that same other body has not passed the Child Custody Protection Act, the Internet Freedom and Broadband Deployment Act, the Small Business Interest Checking Act, the Sudan Peace Act, the Coral Reef and Coastal Marine Conservation Act, the Rail Passenger Disaster Family Assistance Act, the Medicare Regulatory and Contracting Reform Act, the Two Strikes and You're Out Child Protection Act, the Anti-Hoax Terrorism Act, the Class Action Fairness Act, the True American Heroes Act, the Jobs for Veterans Act, the Social Security Benefit Enhancement for Women Act, the Child Sex Crimes Wiretapping Act.

Mr. Speaker, all this stuff the House has passed, 51 pieces of legislation which languish in this giant sinkhole on the other side of the Capitol. It is disgraceful.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds Members not to characterize action or inaction in the other body.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is not the other body that has prevented this House from bringing out the Labor-Health and Education budget, or the Science budget, or the Housing or Transportation budget. It is the fact that the majority caucus is wrapped around the axle because they cannot get an agreement on any approach that will bring those bills to the floor and allow them to pass them. That is what the problem is.

Now we have an effort to shift the blame somewhere else. I guess that is the normal course of action around here. That does not make it right.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I love this House of Representatives, but I do not like us when we do not do our work. The reason we are here tonight is because we have not done our work. We have not passed the 13 appropriation bills in this body, and we would have all of the complaints in the world had we done our work. We have not done our work.

It is amazing the speeches I have heard defending the budget and the fact that we do not have a budget on this side of the aisle. Some of us did. We were denied an opportunity to debate it on the House floor. Some of us had a budget. We did not like the budget that has now given us $317 billion of new deficits.

Conveniently, the majority whip came on the floor and talked about 10 years ago. What about right now? We are here tonight discussing a budget that has given us $317 billion of new deficits and will spend Social Security trust funds for the next 10 years. Forget the last 40, worry about today. That is when we can do something about it. The other side is in the majority.

Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel with the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) or the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE), but the gentleman from Texas who stood down here a moment ago and made that eloquent speech of untruths reminded me of the Will Rogers quote when he said, ''It ain't people's ignorance that bothers me so much, it's them knowing so much that ain't so is the problem.''

Mr. Speaker, we talk about the Reagan tax cuts. I was here. For the 12 years of Reagan-Bush, never did the big spending Democratic Congress, other than 1 year, spend more than Presidents Reagan and Bush asked us to spend; and yet, conveniently, the rhetoric tonight says it was us that did it.

Conveniently, we are letting some of the real budget rules that allowed us to do some good things on budget expire September 30, and the same leadership that comes down and makes the speeches they made a moment ago are directly responsible for allowing pay-go to expire, to allow discretionary caps to expire.

Let me make out one relevant point tonight when we talk about spending, as so many Members on the other side of the aisle keep talking about Democratic spending, the difference between the House and the Senate; the difference we are talking about on the appropriators is $9 billion. That is the difference that has kept the leadership from bringing the 13 appropriation bills to the floor of the House and letting the House work its will.

We should at least keep the spending caps in. I feel kind of ridiculous arguing for that because we have ignored them all year, but if the other side had enforced the pay-go rules, we would have never passed the budget because we could not have passed the budget. Increasing the debt ceiling for our country was passed at midnight because the majority party did not want to stand up and acknowledge the fact that as they talk about paying down the debt and deficit elimination, the debt is going up. We are going to have to do it again, under the budget that everybody over on the other side is bragging about. If they are bragging about it, spend the appropriation bills out and pass them; but do not keep complaining about somebody else's fault. This House has not done its work. It is not the minority party's fault; it is the majority party's fault.

As a child, I always knew that if I started criticizing some trait about one of my playmates, Mother would soon be talking about ''your own plank.'' Her shorthand reference was to the scripture which warns against pointing out the ''speck'' in someone else's eye when there was a huge ''plank'' in your own. I think we could use my mother on the House floor these days. There has been a lot of rhetoric about what the other chamber has not done but not much attention to some of our own shortcomings right here in the House. One of those shortcomings—the failure to renew budget enforcement rules—is very near and dear to my heart and, after years of defending those rules, I cannot remain silent today.

Circumstances have changed dramatically since we passed the Republican budget last year. The projections turned out to be too optimistic, revenues are much lower than expected, and we face tremendous new expenses for homeland defense and the war on terrorism and a possible war with Iraq.

Now that those projections have proven to be nothing more than empty hopes and unfulfilled promises, some of us think we should look honestly at our economic situation rather than continuing to view the world through faulty rose colored glasses. But the leadership on the other side of the aisle refuses to consider any adjustments to their budget policies.

At the very least, we should take action to make sure we don't dig the deficit hole still deeper. Instead, the Republican leadership is allowing the existing budget enforcement rules which impose some fiscal discipline on Congress to expire.

Over the previous decade, the budget enforcement rules were one of the more successful tools for establishing fiscal discipline and helping bring about budget surpluses. These rules set limits on the amount of discretionary spending Congress can approve and prohibited legislation which would have increased the deficit.

When these rules expire five days from now, there will be no limits on spending and no restrictions on the ability of Congress to pass legislation which makes the deficit even worse.

Considering spending bills during a lame duck session after the election without any rules imposing budget discipline is a recipe for runaway spending and higher debt.

Unless we renew our budget discipline, Congress will continue to find ways to pass more legislation that puts still more red ink on the national ledger.

Alternatively, enforceable spending limits would serve as a fiscal guardrail to help keep our spending within our means.

Federal Reserve Board Chairman Alan Greenspan told the Budget Committee that "Failing to preserve (budget enforcement rules) would be a grave mistake . . . the bottom line is that if we do not preserve the budget rules and reaffirm our commitment to fiscal responsibility, years of hard effort could be squandered.

Leon Panetta, who served as Chairman of the House Budget Committee and Bill Frenzel, the former Ranking Republican on the Budget Committee wrote a letter on behalf of the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget warning that: "The expiration of Budget Enforcement Act constraints on spending and revenue legislation is an open invitation to fiscal irresponsibility and an embarrassment to all that care about the budget process. . . . To let them expire now would send a terrible signal to an economy that is struggling for stability."

The Concord Coalition has warned that allowing budget enforcement rules to expire is "an open invitation to fiscal chaos."

Despite these warnings about the harm that could be done to the federal budget and the economy if we allow these rules to expire, the House leadership has resisted any efforts to extend these rules.

In my book, that's a mighty big "plank" in the House's eye.

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

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this continuing resolution so that America's critical welfare reform programs and support for low-income families can continue. Welfare reform should not be forced to be part of this discussion today. The House passed a 5-year welfare reform extension bill this May. Fourteen of my colleagues across the aisle joined us in approving that bill. Now more than 4 months later, the Senate has still failed to act.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

The gentleman from California is reminded to avoid improper references to the other body.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, if it were not for this continuing resolution, the greatly successful 1996 welfare reforms would expire just 4 days from now. What makes this prolonged lack of action so frustrating is that welfare reform has helped literally millions of families achieve remarkable progress in the last 6 years.

□ 1830

The 1996 welfare reforms were the greatest social policy change success story in history. The success is indisputable. Nearly 3 million children have left poverty. Employment by mothers most likely to go on welfare rose by 40 percent. Welfare caseloads fell by 9 million.

The continuing resolution before us extends for 3 months the important welfare programs depended upon by millions of low-income families. We should not have to be here today extending welfare programs, but the other body has failed to act; so we have no other choice. I encourage my colleagues to support this continuing resolution so millions of low-income families can continue to be supported in their efforts to work and support their families.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The Chair reminds the Members again that characterizing Senate inaction is not appropriate and is against our rules.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I am going to confess our inferiority. We have been here denouncing this continuing resolution, but we are not as good at denouncing continuing resolutions as some of the great figures in America's past.

I was here when Ronald Reagan really talked about a continuing resolution, when he said Congress should not send another one of these, when he belittled a continuing resolution of 5 days and 8 days and 9 days, then denounced the fact that Congress had passed none of the appropriations bills. That was Ronald Reagan holding up that continuing resolution as an example of government at its worst. How the Republican Party has fallen away from that ideal. Ronald Reagan was the one who said let us get the people's work done in time to avoid a foot race with Santa Claus. Santa Claus has gained on the Republican Party since he left.

The Republican Party is usually quite respectful of Ronald Reagan. Why this great falling away from the teachings of President Reagan to which they are usually so obedient? Do the Members know why? I hope Members listened to the speech from the chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services and Education, who boasted about increased government spending, and then heard the speech from the majority whip, who denounced all those people who boast about increased government spending. That is the problem when the chairman of the Appropriations subcommittee gives a speech which is in fact denounced by the majority whip. That is why the bill cannot come up.

Let us be clear. There is no rule, there is no principle, there is no Constitution, there is nothing that interferes with this House bringing something up, and Members can violate the rules by denouncing the Senate all they want. It is irrelevant to anything except their disrespect for the rules of this House. It has nothing to do with whether or not we vote on bills. Indeed, they are illogical by their own rules because they ultimately boast about passing some appropriations bills and then complain that some mystical force has kept them from passing the others.

The fact is that rarely, rarely do I have to dissent even mildly from the gentleman from Wisconsin who has been such a magnificent articulator on this issue, but he said the problem is a fight between the moderates and the conservatives of the Republican Party. He knows that is a fight between Mike Tyson and Grandma Moses. The moderates in the Republican Party are lucky if they get the water cooler turned on. It is not the moderates. Here is the problem: it is the Republicans who voted for a tax cut, and then we had Afghanistan and Iraq and homeland security, and we now have demands on expenditures that are greater than the revenues.

I will pay tribute to those like the majority whip in his fervor and venom against government spending. He is prepared to bring government spending down to the level that would be consistent with the tax cut, but the other Republicans want to have it both ways. They want to vote for a tax cut, which reduces government revenue; and then they do not want to vote for a bill that would bring down the spending. So that is why we do not have the bill. We do not have the Health and Human Services bill or the HUD bill because they cannot admit how much they have made it impossible for the government to spend responsibly.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON), who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time, and I feel compelled to share a few words in this debate tonight.

I have dealt with budgets all my life. For 26 years I operated a business and I had a budget. In the family I had a budget. For 19 years I was in State government and we passed a budget every year. For 10 years I was a State appropriator; so I was very involved in the State budget. It had taken me a while since my 6 years in Washington to figure out our process because it is a lot more complicated, and I have often wondered why it was so complicated. But we all know the basic principles, that the House has to pass a budget and the Senate has to pass a budget, and we have to bring that together. And the process that I have learned to understand is the budget first is the framework of how much money we should spend. The Senate figures out how much money, and then we reconcile that figure and then we are all working off of the same spending plan. We only argue about how we spend it.

This is the first time that process has fallen apart. Our friends have not played in this process and so they have no rules of conduct, they have no limits on spending, so their proposals from the figures I have when you use the budget gimmicks of advance spending is up to close to $15 billion above the President's proposal.

We have had the war on terrorism; we had the rebuilding of our defenses. We have a stellar record of spending in the last few years for education which increased education spending 132 percent.

It seems to me it is the year that we both need to have a proposal that limits spending because we have a war to fight, we have our defenses to rebuild; and if we do not have some rules of spending, we will have deficits as long as we are around. The debate is about do we want to have deficits forever, or do we want to have deficits temporarily and get past deficit spending back to budgets that are surpluses? That is the big argument. If the other body plays by no rules and we have no way to reconcile how much money we are going to spend together, we can never reconcile our appropriation bills at the end of the process, in my view. That is pretty simple adding up the numbers.

So we now have a process where we have rules, they have no rules. We have a limit on how much we will spend so we can get beyond deficit spending down the road. They have taken the rules away so they can spend for anything they want to spend no matter what it costs so it will sound good for the election. Their process is about electing people. It is not about having our budget process work so the American people can know that we have been a little cautious in our spending because we have a war to fight and so that we can bring realism back to our budget process in the future and we can get back to surpluses where this country needs to be.

I rise tonight to say that it is time for these two bodies to reconcile their differences and get down to a budget process that has rules for both bodies.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For the benefit of the Members, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 18 minutes and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 21 minutes.

The Chair again reminds Members to please not characterize the actions of the Senate.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I would simply like to say to the gentleman who just spoke, the worst thing that can happen in this town is when we believe our own baloney, and the fact is I have just heard a lot of it.

We hear speech after speech from the majority side of the aisle saying, It's them thar other guys on the other side of the Capitol what's caused this problem.

That is really not the problem. The problem can be summed up in a quote from Shakespeare: ''The fault, dear Brutus, lies not in our stars but in ourselves.''

I would say to my friends in the majority, you are in the majority. Act like it. Bring the bill to the floor. If you have got the votes, you have got the votes. If you do not, we will reach some other result. But do not stymie the Congress into paralysis and then govern by continuing resolution because you do not have the courage of your convictions. Bring the bills up and see whether the majority whip or other factions in the caucus win. The only reason the majority whip does not want to bring the bill up is because he knows he does not have the votes in his own caucus. I dare him to bring the Labor-Health-Education bill up. I dare him to put the President's budget on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I have never heard such a sad, duplicitous argument from my colleagues on the other side as this one of why they cannot get their work done, why they cannot do the job that they were elected to do. They come out here and suggest that somehow it is everyone else's fault, but the fault lies within the Republican caucus.

I find it rather interesting on the eve of the time when so many in this House are so anxious to send our troops into harm's way to establish democracy and defend democracy, they are so afraid of democracy on the floor of the House of Representatives. Bring the bill out and let us vote. Somebody will win and somebody will lose. It may be a bipartisan coalition of moderates and Democrats or right-wing conservatives and conservative Democrats, I do not know. But bring the health and human services appropriations bill to the floor and let us vote. That is democracy.

This is supposed to be the most democratic of all places on the face of the Earth, and you want to manage it because you are afraid to be accountable for your votes. It was not too long ago when the President of the United States said when he signed the No Child Left Behind education reform that I had the honor of working with him on, along with the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce (Chairman BOEHNER), he said to the American public and he said to every audience as we flew around the country as he had multiple signings, if you will, he said, This is the way Washington should work. This is the way Washington should work.

The basic tenet of that bill at the request of the President of the United States was accountability. That bill holds State offices of education accountable, school districts accountable, chief State school officers accountable, teachers accountable. But now we have the Republican caucus, rather than bring out the funding for that bill, seeking to duck the accountability for the savage cuts that are going to happen if we kick this all over to March.

This is not theoretical. My colleagues in California on both sides of the aisle know that in the middle of March, if we have not done this bill, tens of thousands of teachers in California will get pink-slipped, their lives will be disrupted, school budgets will be disrupted. Most of these local governments and school districts will start the budgetary process in January; and by March, April and May they will be deep into their budget. But there will be no education budget. There will be no education budget allowing for the additional billion dollars for special education on which we have bipartisan agreement. There will be no education budget for the 350,000 additional title I children, the children in most desperate need of this money to get a decent education in this country. There will be no education budget for them. There will be no education budget for 350,000 children with disabilities.

Can you not see it in your heart to bring this budget to do your work to carry out the promise of the President of the United States, the promise of this Congress to the parents and to the children of this Nation that there would be a new day for education, there would be a system of standards and goals and accomplishments and, more importantly than anything, of accountability to the children and to the parents?

When? When will this Republican caucus get the courage and the pride to do the Nation's business?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

□ 1845

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the audacity of the House Republican leadership in blocking the entire Federal budget in order to spare the President embarrassment and to cater to their most extreme right-wing members goes beyond anything I have ever seen or experienced in this body.

I was amazed in July when the House leadership caved in to the Conservative Action Team, putting the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill in jeopardy. I wondered, how are Republican leaders going to pass this bill within the President's inadequate numbers? How would we get past this bill to the rest of the appropriations agenda before the new fiscal year began?

But, Mr. Speaker, it never occurred to me that Republican leaders would simply disregard the start of the new fiscal year and let the entire budget come crashing down, all to appease the most right-wing members of their caucus.

It is equally amazing that the President and his OMB Director are complicit in this strategy, apparently, or perhaps it is a lack of strategy, for in fact this is irresponsibility and dereliction of duty on a monumental scale.

What I never dreamed would happen has indeed happened, and the continuing resolution we are voting on today, covering not one bill or two, but the entire discretionary budget, is a monument to an extraordinary failure of leadership and responsibility.

This institutional breakdown is fraught with real consequences for real people. The No Child Left Behind Act, for example, was signed by the President amid great bipartisan fanfare in January. Yet, just weeks later, the President submitted a fiscal year 2003 budget that would cut the very education programs authorized in the new law. A continuing resolution will stall education funding and negate the effects of No Child Left Behind while the Bush budget would actually take us backwards.

The Bush budget reduces by 82 percent promised support for needy schools and students. Instead of increasing funding to help school districts meet the mandate that all teachers be highly qualified, the President's budget cuts teacher quality funding by 4 percent, eliminating training for 18,000 teachers.

Instead of providing increased support for after school centers to increase enrollment by 580,000, the President's budget would actually force 50,000 children to be eliminated from programs that provide safe places to learn after school.

Mr. Speaker, the House leadership has allowed a willful group of right-wingers to hold the entire budget process to their ideological agenda. This budgetary breakdown is a disaster, not only for this institution, but for the people we represent.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting on the floor now for hours, as many of you have as well. I do not relish saying the following, but I think that we have hit one of our all-time lows.

This is the House of Representatives, the place of the people. We are the political descendants, every single one of us, of this man here, George Washington, of Lafayette, of Lincoln, of Kennedy, of Reagan, of all of them. What has come of us, that we have descended into this?

I say to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), I respect you. You are a gentleman. You are a decent man. I respect the mainstream Republicans who have to deal with this nonsense daily by the only wing that dominates your party now, the right wing.

But the right wing is the wrong wing. The people of this country deserve to have their families taken care of by us. That is why we ran. We said to our respective constituents, whether they were Republicans, Democrats, Independents, we want to fulfill the dream of America for you.

Now, whether we agree or disagree about the approaches, we have the collective responsibility to bring the vehicles to this floor, and a continuing resolution means that there has been a collapse, a collapse of leadership.

I do not want to think of what Lincoln would say about the Republican whip and what he said. He is too busy hating Democrats. What about loving our country and moving an agenda forward?

I feel ashamed tonight. I feel ashamed that there is not enough leadership. Where is the Speaker? Where is the majority leader? We can do better than this. We can do better than this, and the American people will hold us accountable. This is a sad evening.

I will vote for the resolution, so the government does not shut down.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I am so honored to serve in the people's House and have taken such great pride in my service here over the past 12 years. I will soon be casting my last vote in this historic Chamber, and I remember casting my first 12 years ago on whether or not to go to war in the Persian Gulf. Members sat attentive, listening, applauding one another, Republican and Democrat. Whether or not they agreed with the Member's position, there was respect and comity.

Now, when this Chamber should be united, when that respect should be at an all time high, when we should be productive and working into the night, we are questioning one another's patriotism and calling one another names.

What is happening to this great institution? That night we went into the night, we worked for days. We did the people's work. Now we work 2 days. We cannot bring a housing bill to the floor, we cannot bring an education bill to the floor, we cannot have the great debates that this body has had over centuries.

Why can we not rise to the occasion, rather than putting this great body into reverse and going backwards at one of the most momentous and important times in our Nation's history? Let us pull together and work together and bring glory and hope to what Abraham Lincoln said was the last best hope of mankind. Let us come together and work together in a bipartisan way and do the people's work.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY).

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you, I am reminded of the coffee shop breakfast table where I ate breakfast every morning for 27 years. We have a motto, ''Often wrong, but never in doubt.''

It is a sad day, as previous speakers, have mentioned. We are Americans. We can do better. We can do anything. All we have to do is work together and do the right thing.

The facts are we have got more people in poverty now than we had 2 years ago. Middle income has gone down. The debt is $440 billion greater. The American people continue to get robbed every time they go to the drugstore by the criminal acts of the prescription drug manufacturers.

We have spent all of the Social Security and Medicare trust funds. It is all gone. We collected that money with a promise to the American people that we would take it and it would be there to pay your benefits when your time came. It is all gone. Those are facts. You cannot hide from them. You cannot make up something else. You cannot blame it on somebody else. That is the way it is.

It is also a fact, as I said in the beginning, that we are Americans. We can do better. This is a shameful event in the history of this House.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PHELPS).

Mr. PHELPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for allowing me the time to speak on this very important subject.

That we are asked to vote on a continuing resolution to continue something implies that which is in progress to reach a reasonable end, a resolve. I remember my father saying, ''Don't start a job you can't finish.'' Well, that is what we are doing, if we are not careful. It is my hope that we can come together and resolve the differences before we throw in the towel.

I am not a quitter. I want to do everything possible that we can to come to a positive end.

Circumstances have changed drastically since we enacted the budget last year, the Republican budget last year. The projections turned out to be too optimistic. Revenues are much lower than expected, and we face tremendous new expenses for homeland defense and the war on terrorism and a possible war with Iraq.

But we have got to acknowledge that there is a problem. New situations call for new solutions. Do not point fingers at each other and say it will work itself out. We came here to do a job, the greatest deliberative body in the world, to debate the very differences that we have. Maybe it is about unions in one respect and business in another, but that is why we came here. Can we not as reasonable people reach a resolve on behalf of the American people, whom we are going to ask in a few days to reelect us? It is shameful if we cannot.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, like every one of you, I love my country, but I do not think we serve our country when we lie to the people who sent us here.

In the past month I have heard no one less than the Speaker of this House and the majority whip tell the American people we are paying down the debt. A question I pose to the both of you, if that is so, then why did this body schedule a vote in the wee hours of the morning when our constituents slept to raise the debt limit over $6 trillion? If that is so, why is our Nation $440 billion deeper in debt than 1 year ago today, and en route within the next week to have the single largest increase in our Nation's debt in one fiscal year?

Mr. Speaker, we have to pass this resolution tonight. But I want to very much commend the people in that party and the people in this party who are working with our budget chairman to try to rein in spending, because not one of you would go buy a car and say, ''Let my kids pay for it.'' Not one of you would go buy a house and say, ''By the way, I don't care what it costs, let my kids pay for it.'' That is precisely what you are doing.

By the way, it was a Republican House, a Republican Senate and a Republican President who signed the budget bill last year. Please do not tell me and please do not tell the people I represent that somehow your magical budget is going to solve that, because it was your budget that put us $440 billion deeper in debt in the past 12 months.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

□ 1900

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, while American servicemen and women are fighting the war against terrorism in Afghanistan tonight, and preparing for possible war against Iraq, it seems to me that the House could at least extend its present 3-day work week in order to keep from undermining the education of military schoolchildren. By not passing our education appropriation bill and by relying on this continuing resolution, this bill will basically prevent hundreds of millions of Federal dollars from going in November to public schools that have large numbers of military schoolchildren in them.

How can the House leadership explain to soldiers fighting 7 days a week in Afghanistan that the House cannot pass an education appropriations bill important to their children's education because that might just require Members of Congress to work more than 3 days a week? If the top Republican leadership has time to campaign in my district in Texas this weekend, then surely they can find time to schedule more than a 3-day work week in the House so that we can pass an education appropriations bill that is vital to thousands of Army parents in my district.

We have an obligation, Democrat and Republican alike in this House, to pass appropriation bills. That is our responsibility, Mr. Speaker, even if it requires more than a 3-day work week. We owe it to our military children and to their parents who sacrifice so much for our Nation to put this continuing resolution aside, get back to work, and pass an education appropriation bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, after 6 years on the Committee on the Budget, I am amazed at the debate I have heard tonight. I did not realize just how powerful that committee is. In the 6 years I have been on that committee, I have seen Members of the other party in this body and the other body waive the pay-go rules, waive the spending cap rules to accomplish whatever goal they want. But tonight, tonight we hear, because we do not have a budget resolution of both bodies, we cannot bring appropriations bills to the House floor.

Why is it that we can have an ongoing conference on the defense bill and the military construction bill but, somehow, we cannot even bring the Labor-HHS-Education bill to the floor, we cannot bring the science bill or the housing bill or any of those other bills, because the majority whip tells us, if we bring them to the floor, then we will have to go to conference and then the spending will go up?

But we are already in conference on other bills. It seems rather illogical to this Member that if we can do it on some bills, why we cannot do it on other bills.

What it is, Mr. Speaker, is that there is a small cadre in the House on the Republican side that are the last to realize that the economic program of this administration has been a failure, and rather than leaving us in surplus, we have wiped out over $5 trillion in surplus value, including that in the Social Security and Medicare trust funds. They are the last ones to realize it. The American people and the majority in the House and the Senate long ago did. We ought to bring those bills to the floor and finish our work for the American people.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is irresponsible for Congress to put off doing the people's business; it is irresponsible for the Republican majority to continue to ignore America's unmet needs, particularly our commitment to educating our children. From Head Start to teacher's pay, America's children, teachers and schools are being severely shortchanged by President Bush's budget and the majority's inaction. Mr. Speaker, 18,000 fewer teachers being trained, 33,000 fewer children in after-school programs, zero funds for repairing our crumbling schools, and only 9 months ago, we heard so much talk about how Congress and the administration would leave no child behind.

But now, with the smallest proposed increase in education since 1996, the President and the Republican majority are doing just that. Leaving our children behind is what happens when we underfund education by $7.2 billion.

This year programs funded under the No Child Left Behind Act are cut by $87 million, no additional resources to purchase books, to invest in teacher training. The President does take a lot of photographs with young children. When it comes to early childhood learning, we have heard soaring rhetoric, but not much else. Nowhere in the Bush budget does the Republican rhetoric ring more hollow. They have cut the Even Start program, supporting projects that combine early childhood education for children and literacy training for parents. By gutting Even Start, we leave whole families behind.

What we need to do is to stop taking pictures with children and provide them with the tools they need in order that they might succeed.

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

Mr. Speaker, under the rules of the House, the gentleman from Florida has the right to close; he still has a lot of time remaining, and so much may be said which we will not be able to respond to. But having said that, let me simply say that I think every Member of the House wishes the chairman well. He is being honored tonight for his leadership on bone marrow research, and I hope we do not tie him up too late here so that he can receive that award. I want to congratulate him for it. I think all of us in the House know

that he deserves it, and his mother will be proud.

Let me also say, Mr. Speaker, we are simply here because this resolution will extend the ability of the government to function until October 4. It is then my understanding there is another plan to move us to October 11; and then after that, evidently, an effort will be made to move us past the election. I want the majority leadership to understand, I will not vote for a resolution that moves us past the election without doing our duty to pass the education bill, to pass the science bill, to pass the other appropriation bills that this House has a duty to pass. We should not sneak out of town before we have done our duty, especially our duty by the children of America.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House leadership to take the time afforded by this resolution to face up to their responsibilities to bring the Labor-Health-Education bill to the floor, as well as the other bills, so that the House can finish its business.

When we finish our business, then we can squawk about the other body. Until then, we have no claim in the world to do so.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, anyone observing our debate this evening would think that we were engaged in some great political activity and that this bill on the floor was going to affect the politics of this body.

The fact of the matter is, we are only talking about a 4-day CR, and I would suggest that maybe some of us should save our ammunition for next week, because we are going to have to go through this all again next week, probably.

As far as it being a CR, someone might get the idea that it is a sinister development or a sneaky procedure. Except for the year that the gentleman from Wisconsin chaired the Committee on Appropriations, we have used CRs around here forever. So this is not something that is new; it has been used before, a number of times, many times.

But as strange as it might seem from all of this debate, this really is a bipartisan bill that we are debating here tonight. It is bipartisan because the gentleman from Wisconsin has worked closely with us to fashion this bill, and I do not want to get in trouble here with the rules of the House, but as well as the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in the other body, and the ranking Republican member of the other body; we all worked together to fashion this nonpartisan, bipartisan continuing resolution.

As I said, we are probably going to have to do this again next week, so if my colleagues have some other ammunition that they want to throw out, save it. Although I think everything that needs to be said has probably already been said, but let us see.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman very, very briefly, because I have said there would be no other speakers.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would tell my friend from Wisconsin, if I was fighting in combat, I would want to fight against the best MiG driver there is; and as a political opponent and a friend, I think we have fought against one of the best MiG drivers here on the floor tonight, and I salute the gentleman.

I would just like to answer, and I do not think they will be controversial, two questions real quick. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) asked how can we increase the debt. If you inherit a debt that is $5 trillion and you nearly spend $1 billion a day on just the interest of the debt, it grows. You can pay down $490 billion; but if it grows over the years, over $1 billion a day, it is going to get bigger.

The other thing I would say is to my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), whom I am very proud of as a colleague in California, who worked on the education bill, but I would ask him to take a look at what Governor Gray Davis is doing to education in California where every single district is being cut millions of dollars because of the energy crisis that was mismanaged.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Again, Mr. Speaker, this is a continuing resolution to keep the government funded until October 4, which is 4 days into the fiscal year. It is a bipartisan bill, and I would urge that we vote it quickly, send it down to the other body so that we can get it to the President's desk.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that we have not been able to deal meaningfully with the appropriations process. The fiscal year ends in a few more days and we have not completed our appropriations work. Indeed, we have barely begun. The Republican part has a split between its conservative and its more conservative members, which is keeping the remaining appropriations bills from being brought to the House floor for debate and action.

The funding of our federal departments and program is one of the most important jobs of Congress. We must honor our commitments to defend our country, educate our children, and protect the environment. I am willing to support this short-term continuing resolution. However, we must, sooner rather than later, face up to the consequences of a massive tax cut, more demands for security, and the impact of the wasteful farm bill, and get on with the job the American people expect of us.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take this opportunity to express my strong opposition to the idea of a long-term continuing resolution.

My colleagues, what have we done over the last few weeks? We've passed resolutions critical of the other body. Day by day, however, the start of the fiscal year approaches and the possibility looms that our inaction on the Labor-HHS bill will be felt in classrooms throughout American and by every school-age kid.

The House Republican leadership ought to stop pointing the finger at the Senate, and start crafting appropriations bills that are palatable to their own party.

Last year we passed and the President signed into law the landmark reauthorization of the ESEA, which calls for substantial increases in funding to ensure a quality education for every American child. The No Child Left Behind Act marked a new federal commitment to the education of our children.

It seems, unfortunately, that the Republican Leadership suddenly forgot everything it said as soon as we passed this bill.

The new ESEA law promised to provide school districts with 40% of the nation's average per pupil expenditure for each low-income student. Title I funding already does not meet the overwhelming need across the country, particularly in urban school districts, but ESEA was a step in the right direction.

The Republican budget, however, provides a mere $1 billion increase in Title I funding. This funding level is $16.7 billion below ''full'' funding for Title I under the new education law. Not only does this increase come on the backs of other programs, but it does not even keep up with inflation.

In New York City alone, only 30% of eligible low-income students were served by Title I in the last school year. This means that 326,000 students are being left behind. Under the Republican budget, even with the $1 billion increase, 256,000 eligible students will still miss out.

The failure to provide adequate Title I dollars runs counter to the historic No Child Left Behind Act, which promised to provide greater federal assistance to those schools serving the highest concentration of poor students. Regardless of location, the costs of educating children are similar in all schools. Under the Republicans' education spending bill, children will continue to be deprived of critical academic services.

Now it is the number one victim of Republican delays and intra-party squabbles.

Democrats will not allow after-school, teacher training, and school construction programs be put aside and underfunded until the spring of next year. Clearly, education must remain a recession-proof priority.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, although I support this continuing resolution, I want to sound a warning to my colleagues.

Last year, many of us proudly went to the White House and stood with the President as he signed the No Child Left Behind Act. That bill instituted many needed reforms and authorized additional funding to help poor and disadvantaged children.

I was very disappointed when the President's Fiscal Year 2003 budget did not provide the money necessary to fulfill the promise of that historic bill. Yet today we are heading down a path that will be even more tragic.

No matter how inadequate the President's budget, it at least provided some minimal increases to several critical programs. If in the next few weeks, however, we agree to a long-term continuing resolution, even those scant increases will be gone.

What does this mean to our children? It means that states with sizeable Hispanic student populations like Texas, California, New

York and Florida will lose almost $2 billion in funding for Title I.

California, Texas, New York, Arizona, New Mexico and Illinois will lose $63 million just under the English Language Acquisition State Grants program. This program serves 950,000 limited-English proficient and immigrant children. These are the children who need the most help, yet we will be denying them access to education they deserve.

If we pass a long-term CR will be freezing funding for TRIO, GEAR-UP, Migrant Education, drop-out prevention, and the College Assistance Migrant Programs. All of these programs heavily impact Hispanic students nationwide. A long-term CR will leave thousands of Hispanic children behind.

We do not need a long-term continuing resolution, we need a fully funded education appropriations bill for all the children in this country. I urge my colleagues to take heed.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). All time for debate has expired.

The joint resolution is considered read for amendment, and pursuant to the order of the House of today, 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 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 370, nays 1, not voting 61, as follows:

[Roll No. 423]

YEAS—370

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boozman
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Lynch
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller, Dan
Miller, George
Miller, Jeff
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Osborne
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins (OK)
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NAYS—1

DeFazio

NOT VOTING—61

Armey
Bachus
Baker
Barcia
Bereuter
Berman
Bilirakis
Boehlert
Bonior
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Cardin
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Deal
Delahunt
Dooley
Ehrlich
Everett
Gallegly
Green (TX)
Hilleary
Hinojosa
Hoekstra
Houghton
Israel
Issa
Istook
Keller
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
LaHood
LaTourette
Maloney (NY)
McCarthy (MO)
McCrery
McDermott
McInnis
Meek (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mink
Murtha
Ortiz
Otter
Paul
Quinn
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Sandlin
Sawyer
Shadegg
Simpson
Slaughter
Stump
Thompson (CA)
Thurman
Visclosky
Young (AK)

□ 1935

Ms. CARSON of Indiana changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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.

Stated for:

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 423, H.J. Res. 111, continuing Appropriations for FY03 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from votes this afternoon so that I could be in New York to keep an appointment at my daughter's school. Were I here I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall Vote 420, on a Motion to Recommit H.R. 4600 with Instructions: ''yea''; rollcall Vote 421, on Passing H.R. 4600: ''nay''; rollcall Vote 422, on Passing the Conference Report to Accompany H.R. 2215: ''yea''; and rollcall Vote 423, on Passing H.J. Res. 111: ''yea''.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H. Con. Res. 483 Concurrent Resolution directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make technical corrections in the enrollment of the bill H.R. 1646.

The message also announced, that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1646) An Act to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal years 2002 and 2003, and for other purposes.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purposes of inquiring