

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A division of the question has been demanded.

The Chair will first put the question on the portion of the motion through the semicolon. The Chair will then put the question on the remaining portion.

Without objection, an electronic vote on the second portion may be a 5-minute vote, if following a 15-minute vote on the first portion.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first portion of the divided question.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 4577, be instructed to insist on the highest funding level possible for the Department of Education;

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the first portion of the divided motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The first portion of the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the second portion of the divided question.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 4577, be instructed to insist on disagreeing with provisions in the Senate amendment which denies the President's request for dedicated resources to reduce class sizes in the early grades and for local school construction and, instead, broadly expands the Title VI Education Block Grant with limited accountability in the use of funds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the second portion of the divided motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes 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 222, nays 201, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 484]

YEAS—222

Abercrombie	Blumenauer	Conyers
Ackerman	Bonior	Costello
Aderholt	Borski	Coyne
Allen	Boswell	Cramer
Andrews	Boucher	Crowley
Baca	Boyd	Cummings
Baird	Brady (PA)	Danner
Baldacci	Brown (FL)	Davis (FL)
Baldwin	Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)
Barcia	Capps	DeFazio
Barrett (WI)	Capuano	DeGette
Becerra	Cardin	Delahunt
Bentsen	Carson	DeLauro
Berkley	Clay	Deutsch
Berman	Clayton	Dicks
Berry	Clement	Dingell
Bishop	Clyburn	Dixon
Blagojevich	Condit	Doggett

Dooley	Lewis (GA)	Rangel
Doyle	Lipinski	Reyes
Edwards	LoBiondo	Rivers
Engel	Lofgren	Rodriguez
Eshoo	Lowe	Roemer
Etheridge	Lucas (KY)	Rothman
Evans	Luther	Roybal-Allard
Farr	Maloney (CT)	Rush
Fattah	Maloney (NY)	Salmon
Filner	Markey	Sanchez
Fletcher	Mascara	Sanders
Foley	Matsui	Sandlin
Forbes	McCarthy (MO)	Sawyer
Ford	McCarthy (NY)	Schakowsky
Frank (MA)	McDermott	Scott
Frost	McGovern	Serrano
Galleghy	McInnis	Shaw
Gejdenson	McIntyre	Sherman
Gephardt	McKinney	Sherwood
Gilman	McNulty	Shows
Gonzalez	Meehan	Sisisky
Gordon	Meek (FL)	Skelton
Green (TX)	Meeks (NY)	Slaughter
Gutierrez	Menendez	Smith (NJ)
Hall (OH)	Millender-	Smith (WA)
Hastings (FL)	McDonald	Snyder
Hill (IN)	Miller, George	Spratt
Hinchey	Minge	Stabenow
Hinojosa	Mink	Stark
Hoeffel	Moakley	Stenholm
Holden	Mollohan	Strickland
Holt	Moore	Stupak
Hoohey	Moran (VA)	Tanner
Hoyer	Morella	Tauscher
Inslee	Murtha	Taylor (MS)
Jackson (IL)	Nadler	Thompson (CA)
Jackson-Lee	Napolitano	Thompson (MS)
(TX)	Neal	Thurman
Jefferson	Ney	Tierney
John	Oberstar	Towns
Johnson (CT)	Obey	Turner
Johnson, E. B.	Olver	Udall (CO)
Kanjorski	Ortiz	Udall (NM)
Kaptur	Owens	Upton
Kelly	Pallone	Velazquez
Kennedy	Pascrell	Visclosky
Kildee	Pastor	Waters
Kilpatrick	Payne	Watt (NC)
Kind (WI)	Pelosi	Waxman
Klecza	Peterson (MN)	Weiner
Kucinich	Phelps	Wexler
LaFalce	Pickett	Weygand
Lampson	Pomeroy	Wise
Lantos	Price (NC)	Woolsey
Larson	Quinn	Wu
Lee	Rahall	Wynn
Levin	Ramstad	

NAYS—201

Archer	Crane	Hayes
Armey	Cubin	Hayworth
Bachus	Cunningham	Hefley
Baker	Davis (VA)	Herger
Ballenger	Deal	Hill (MT)
Barr	DeLay	Hilleary
Barrett (NE)	DeMint	Hobson
Bartlett	Diaz-Balart	Hoekstra
Barton	Doolittle	Horn
Bass	Dreier	Hostettler
Bereuter	Duncan	Houghton
Biggett	Dunn	Hulshof
Bilbray	Ehlers	Hunter
Bilirakis	Ehrlich	Hutchinson
Billey	Emerson	Hyde
Blunt	English	Isakson
Boehlert	Everett	Istook
Boehner	Ewing	Jenkins
Bonilla	Fossella	Johnson, Sam
Bono	Fowler	Jones (NC)
Brady (TX)	Franks (NJ)	Kasich
Bryant	Frelinghuysen	King (NY)
Burr	Ganske	Kingston
Buyer	Callahan	Knollenberg
Calvert	Gekas	Kolbe
Camp	Gibbons	Kuykendall
Canady	Gilchrest	LaHood
Cannon	Gillmor	Largent
Castle	Goode	Latham
Chabot	Goodlatte	LaTourette
Chambliss	Goodling	Leach
Chenoweth-Hage	Goss	Lewis (CA)
Coble	Graham	Lewis (KY)
Coburn	Granger	Linder
Collins	Green (WI)	Lucas (OK)
Combest	Greenwood	Manzullo
Cook	Gutknecht	Martinez
Cooksey	Hall (TX)	McCollum
Cox	Hansen	McCrery
	Hastings (WA)	McHugh

McKeon	Rogan	Sweeney
Metcalf	Rogers	Talent
Mica	Rohrabacher	Tancredo
Miller (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Tauzin
Miller, Gary	Roukema	Taylor (NC)
Moran (KS)	Royce	Terry
Myrick	Ryan (WI)	Thomas
Northup	Ryun (KS)	Thornberry
Norwood	Sanford	Thune
Nussle	Saxton	Tiahrt
Ose	Scarborough	Toomey
Oxley	Schaffer	Trafficant
Packard	Sensenbrenner	Vitter
Paul	Sessions	Walden
Pease	Shadegg	Walsh
Peterson (PA)	Shays	Wamp
Petri	Shimkus	Watkins
Pickering	Shuster	Watts (OK)
Pitts	Simpson	Weldon (FL)
Pombo	Skeen	Weldon (PA)
Porter	Smith (MI)	Weller
Portman	Smith (TX)	Whitfield
Pryce (OH)	Souder	Wicker
Radanovich	Spence	Wilson
Regula	Stearns	Wolf
Reynolds	Stump	Young (AK)
Riley	Sununu	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Burton	Klink	Sabo
Campbell	Lazio	Vento
Hilliard	McIntosh	
Jones (OH)	Nethercutt	

□ 1421

Messrs. CHABOT, GUTKNECHT, GILCHREST, PICKERING, WELLER, YOUNG of Alaska and METCALF changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. SNYDER, GILMAN, BARCIA, GALLEGLY and ADERHOLT changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the second portion of the divided motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Without objection, two motions to reconsider are laid on the table.

There was no objection.

LISTEN TO SCIENTIFIC EXPERTS;  
NOT FEAR PROFITEERS

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the American taxpayer is making a considerable investment in research through the spending of Congress and the President. Part of the research that I am particularly interested in is the basic plant genome research.

Current sequencing efforts on the Arabidopsis plant has allowed us to understand the plant gene and our ability to modify plants, with the potential of tremendously helping mankind throughout the world. We now have the ability to select one or two or a few genes, whose characteristics have been determined, and incorporate those genes into another plant to improve the nutrient digestibility, to improve the vitamins, to improve the needed minerals, to create the disease immunization values of that particular food product.

We are now faced with what I call fear profiteers that are spreading the word of fear to stymie research. My

message this morning is that we have to rely on scientific information as we pursue our scientific endeavors and not allow emotion and fear profiteers to determine the destiny of research and scientific achievement in this country.

Mr. Speaker, the payoffs from plant genome research will depend in large part on our ability to capture and apply the benefits from it. Congress should support the goals of the plant genome research. The National Plant Genome Initiative is a well-managed public asset that represents a wise use of taxpayer dollars.

Current sequencing efforts on Arabidopsis thaliana have improved immeasurably our understanding of the genomics of a typical flowering plant. The shift in emphasis from gene sequencing to functional genomics is the logical next step that should provide the intellectual basis for new varieties of commercially-important crops and other plants.

NSF, the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), and the other participants in the plant genome program have done a credible job of making the results of the research it funds available to other researchers and the private sector. Partnerships among universities participating in the program, agricultural experiment stations, and private-sector companies also have been developed.

These efforts should be encouraged further, and more formal structures concentrating research efforts in plant genomics, plant breeding, and agricultural extension should be considered to attract increased private sector participation and get new varieties to the field sooner. To that end, I would hope that the plant genome and gene expression centers pilot program authorized in H.R. 3500, through its matching-funds requirement, will be used by NSF to encourage greater participation of other federal agencies, particularly USDA, and the private sector in accelerating the development of enhanced food crops, particularly those that provide nutritional or health benefits to consumers, and for alternative uses of agricultural crops.

Please join me this Thursday at a press and staff briefing on biotechnology and "Fear Profiteers." A timely discussion of the importance of sound science in policy approaches to biotechnology, other areas of science and case studies of organizations and businesses that sow health scares to reap membership and/or monetary gain. September 21, 2000, 11:30–12:30 p.m., 1302 Longworth Building, Representative NICK SMITH (R-MI); Fred Smith, Competitive Enterprise Institute; Bonner Cohen, Ph.D., Lexington Institute; Alex Avery, Hudson Institute; Emceed by Steve Milloy, Publisher of junkscience.com.

#### PERMANENT NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS WITH CHINA

(Mr. PASCRELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my deep disappointment that the Senate has approved permanent normal trade relations with China, which the President will soon sign.

Contrary to the cheers heard from private industry, this is not a moment

of celebration for millions of hard-working American men and women. In fact, American workers in specific industries are watching their jobs disappear. We have sacrificed their livelihood on the altar of trade with China. These are working people who will soon see their jobs exported overseas. In New Jersey, we will lose 22,000 jobs over the next 10 years.

Upon enactment of PNTR, the United States is caving in to pressure from private industry and turning a blind eye to the Chinese Government's flagrant shortcomings. I did not vote for PNTR when it was considered in the House because an affirmative vote was one that would legitimize the actions of a government known for terrorizing its citizens, disallowing free speech and religion, and for breaking every trade agreement they have made with the United States.

Increased trade with China will not force the reform and democracy in their deeply flawed government. We have given them a pink slip, our workers, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my deep concern and disappointment that the Senate has approved Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China, which the President will soon sign into law.

Contrary to the cheers heard from private industry, this is not a moment of celebration for millions of hard working American men and women who will get the short end of the stick. PNTR is a bad deal for the United States and its people.

I am ashamed to tell the men and women in my district, the Eighth Congressional District of New Jersey, that this bill passed Congress. These are working people, who will soon see their jobs exported overseas. New Jersey will lose over 22 thousand jobs over the next ten years upon enactment of this bill.

Furthermore, upon enactment of PNTR, the United States is caving in to pressure from private industry and turning a blind eye to the Chinese government's flagrant shortcomings.

I did not vote for China PNTR when it was considered in the House because an affirmative vote was one that would legitimize the actions of a government known for terrorizing its citizens, disallowing free speech and religion, and for breaking every trade agreement with the United States.

Increased trade with China will not foster reform and democracy in their deeply flawed government. Instead, it will lead America into trade deficits, as has been proven in normal trade relations agreements in the past. Most importantly, I am disappointed that the American worker was not well represented in this Congress.

Instead of ensuring that hard working American families are secure in their jobs so that they can put food on their table, clothes on their backs, and pay their mortgage, the Congress has just handed them a pink slip.

I applaud the attempts of some of my colleagues in the Senate who tried to offer remedies to this flawed bill, but were rebuffed with each and every attempt. I was disappointed that constructive amendments—amendments dealing with labor standards, human rights, weapons technology and policy toward Taiwan—were rejected. I try to remain optimistic

about the prospects for our future. But I am continually discouraged from optimism when I watch the textile industry in my district vanish before my very eyes.

How can the workers in my District be optimistic when they are looking for work in trades that will no longer be based in the United States? Right before the House took the vote on China PNTR, workers in my district held a rally against passage. The site? A textile company that had closed down because jobs have been exported overseas slowly, but surely.

Workers, businessmen, students and veterans were all in attendance at the rally, united against this trade policy that will be enacted soon after I speak here today. The opposition I stood with that day was a broad coalition of patriots. They would like us to export our values before our jobs.

This trade agreement is nothing more than corporate welfare. We are paving the way for multinational corporations to exploit low-wage workers without fear of human rights violations for working conditions.

After all, workers in China are not protected by their government. There are no unions, no freedoms, no whistle-blowing, no legal recourse for inhumane conditions, no freedom of speech . . . the list goes on and on.

I will never surrender my moral compass, and that the only thing I want to be permanent between the United States and China is a commitment to freedom. I vehemently oppose the passage of China PNTR, and will continue to fight on behalf of American laborers in the future. God bless America.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

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

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

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. METCALF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. STRICKLAND addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. CANADY of Florida addressed the House. His remarks will appear