



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146

WASHINGTON, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 28, 2000

No. 138

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord of history and Eternal God, tonight each one of us will take timepieces in hand and upon common agreement change time itself.

Help us to realize, Lord, that this simple and silent gesture, performed in the depths of darkness, is symbolic for the whole world.

We cannot stop the passage of time or slow down its relentless beat, but we can come together and measure differently, reading each passing hour with new consensus.

Forced by obvious limitations, we find a way to help one another through the darkest days.

Because of limited light, we adjust ourselves and allow each other another day for greater progress.

In each moment, let us seek first Your presence, acknowledge our own limitations, and seize the opportunity to serve Your people.

For You are the ever present One, now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote

on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. McNULTY. 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. 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 256, nays 60, answered "present" 1, not voting 115, as follows:

NOTICE—OCTOBER 23, 2000

A final issue of the Congressional Record for the 106th Congress, 2d Session, will be published on November 29, 2000, in order to permit Members to revise and extend their remarks.

All material for insertion must be signed by the Member and delivered to the respective offices of the Official Reporters of Debates (Room HT-60 or S-123 of the Capitol), Monday through Friday, between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. through November 28. The final issue will be dated November 29, 2000, and will be delivered on Friday, December 1, 2000.

None of the material printed in the final issue of the Congressional Record may contain subject matter, or relate to any event that occurred after the sine die date.

Senators' statements should also be submitted electronically, either on a disk to accompany the signed statement, or by e-mail to the Official Reporters of Debates at "Records@Reporters".

Members of the House of Representatives' statements may also be submitted electronically by e-mail, to accompany the signed statement, and formatted according to the instructions for the Extensions of Remarks template at <http://clerkhouse.house.gov>. The Official Reporters will transmit to GPO the template formatted electronic file only after receipt of, and authentication with, the hard copy, signed manuscript. Deliver statements to the Official Reporters in Room HT-60.

Members of Congress desiring to purchase reprints of material submitted for inclusion in the Congressional Record may do so by contacting the Congressional Printing Management Division, at the Government Printing Office, on 512-0224, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. daily.

By order of the Joint Committee on Printing.

WILLIAM M. THOMAS, *Chairman*.

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H11447

[Roll No. 570]

YEAS—256

Abercrombie	Goodling	Ortiz
Aderholt	Gordon	Ose
Archer	Goss	Oxley
Army	Graham	Packard
Baker	Granger	Paul
Ballenger	Green (TX)	Pease
Barrett (NE)	Green (WI)	Pelosi
Bartlett	Gutierrez	Petri
Bass	Hall (TX)	Phelps
Bereuter	Hansen	Pitts
Berkley	Hastings (WA)	Pomeroy
Berman	Hayes	Portman
Biggert	Hayworth	Price (NC)
Bilirakis	Hill (IN)	Quinn
Bliley	Hilleary	Rahall
Blumenauer	Hinojosa	Rangel
Blunt	Hobson	Regula
Boehrlert	Hoeffel	Reyes
Boehner	Hoekstra	Riley
Bonilla	Holden	Rivers
Bono	Horn	Rodriguez
Boswell	Hostettler	Roemer
Boyd	Houghton	Rohrabacher
Brady (TX)	Hoyer	Roukema
Bryant	Hunter	Royal-Allard
Burr	Hutchinson	Royce
Callahan	Hyde	Ryan (WI)
Calvert	Inslee	Ryun (KS)
Camp	Isakson	Salmon
Canady	Istook	Sanders
Cannon	Jackson (IL)	Sanford
Capps	Jenkins	Sawyer
Cardin	John	Saxton
Castle	Johnson (CT)	Scarborough
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Schakowsky
Chambliss	Jones (NC)	Scott
Chenoweth-Hage	Kelly	Sensenbrenner
Clayton	Kilpatrick	Serrano
Clement	Kind (WI)	Shadegg
Coble	Kingston	Sherman
Coburn	Klecza	Sherwood
Collins	Knollenberg	Shimkus
Combust	Kuykendall	Shows
Condit	LaHood	Simpson
Conyers	Lampson	Sisisky
Cook	Larson	Skeen
Cooksey	LaTourette	Skelton
Coyne	Leach	Smith (MI)
Cubin	Lee	Smith (NJ)
Cummings	Levin	Smith (TX)
Cunningham	Lewis (CA)	Smith (WA)
Davis (FL)	Lewis (GA)	Snyder
Deal	Lewis (KY)	Souder
DeGette	Linder	Spence
DeLauro	Lofgren	Stearns
DeLay	Lowey	Stump
DeMint	Lucas (KY)	Sununu
Deutsch	Lucas (OK)	Sweeney
Dicks	Luther	Tanner
Dingell	Maloney (CT)	Tauscher
Doggett	Maloney (NY)	Tauzin
Dooley	Mascara	Terry
Doyle	Matsui	Thomas
Dreier	McCarthy (NY)	Thornberry
Ehlers	McCrery	Thune
Emerson	McHugh	Thurman
Eshoo	McKinney	Tiahrt
Evans	Mica	Toomey
Everett	Millender-	Towns
Ewing	McDonald	Trafficant
Farr	Miller (FL)	Turner
Fletcher	Miller, Gary	Upton
Foley	Miller, George	Walden
Forbes	Minge	Walsh
Ford	Moakley	Wamp
Frost	Mollohan	Watkins
Gallely	Moore	Waxman
Gekas	Moran (VA)	Weiner
Gephardt	Murtha	Weldon (PA)
Gibbons	Myrick	Wexler
Gilchrest	Nadler	Whitfield
Gillmor	Napolitano	Wilson
Gilman	Ney	Wolf
Gonzalez	Northup	Woolsey
Goode	Norwood	Young (FL)
Goodlatte	Nussle	

NAYS—60

Allen	Capuano	Gejdenson
Bachus	Carson	Gutknecht
Baird	Costello	Hall (OH)
Baldacci	Cramer	Hill (MT)
Baldwin	DeFazio	Holt
Berry	English	Hooley
Borski	Etheridge	Jackson-Lee
Brady (PA)	Filner	(TX)

Jefferson	Olver	Strickland
Johnson, E. B.	Pallone	Stupak
Jones (OH)	Pascrell	Thompson (CA)
Kucinich	Pastor	Tierney
Latham	Peterson (MN)	Udall (CO)
LoBiondo	Ramstad	Udall (NM)
McDermott	Rogan	Velazquez
McGovern	Rothman	Waters
Paul	Sabo	Weller
McNulty	Sanchez	Wicker
Meeks (NY)	Schaffer	Wu
Moran (KS)	Slaughter	
Oberstar	Stenholm	
Obey		

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Tancredo

NOT VOTING—115

Ackerman	Fowler	Morella
Andrews	Frank (MA)	Neal
Baca	Franks (NJ)	Nethercutt
Barcia	Frelinghuysen	Owens
Barr	Ganske	Payne
Barrett (WI)	Greenwood	Peterson (PA)
Barton	Hastings (FL)	Pickering
Becerra	Hefley	Pickett
Bentsen	Herger	Pombo
Bilbray	Hilliard	Porter
Bishop	Hinchev	Pryce (OH)
Blagojevich	Hulshof	Radanovich
Bonior	Kanjorski	Reynolds
Boucher	Kaptur	Rogers
Brown (FL)	Kasich	Ros-Lehtinen
Brown (OH)	Kennedy	Rush
Burton	Kildee	Sandlin
Buyer	King (NY)	Sessions
Campbell	Klink	Shaw
Clay	Kolbe	Shays
Clyburn	LaFalce	Shuster
Cox	Lantos	Spratt
Crane	Largent	Stabenow
Crowley	Lazio	Stark
Danner	Lipinski	Talent
Davis (IL)	Manzullo	Taylor (MS)
Davis (VA)	Markey	Taylor (NC)
Delahunt	Martinez	Thompson (MS)
Diaz-Balart	McCarthy (MO)	Visclosky
Dickey	McCollum	Vitter
Dixon	McInnis	Watt (NC)
Doolittle	McIntosh	Watts (OK)
Duncan	McIntyre	Weldon (FL)
Dunn	McKeon	Weygand
Edwards	Meehan	Wise
Ehrlich	Meek (FL)	Wynn
Engel	Menendez	Young (AK)
Fattah	Metcalfe	
Fossella	Mink	

0925

So the Journal was approved.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PALLONE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 660. An act for the private relief of Ruth Hairston by waiver of a filing deadline for appeal from a ruling relating to her application for a survivor annuity.

H.R. 848. An act for the relief of Sepandan Farnia and Farbod Farnia.

H.R. 1235. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts with the Solano County Water Agency, California, to use Solano Project facilities for impounding, storage, and carriage of non-project water for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other beneficial purposes.

H.R. 2941. An act to establish the Las Cienegas National Conservation Area in the State of Arizona.

H.R. 3184. An act for the relief of Zohreh Farhang Ghahfarokhi.

H.R. 3388. An act to promote environmental restoration around the Lake Tahoe basin.

H.R. 3414. An act for the relief of Luis A. Leon-Molina, Ligia Padron, Juan Leon Padron, Rendy Leon Padron, Manuel Leon Padron, and Luis Leon Padron.

H.R. 3621. An act to provide for the post-humous promotion of William Clark of the Commonwealth of Virginia and the Commonwealth of Kentucky, co-leader of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, to the grade of captain in the Regular Army.

H.R. 4312. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of the suitability and feasibility of establishing an Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Area in the State of Connecticut and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4646. An act to designate certain National Forest System lands within the boundaries of the State of Virginia as wilderness areas.

H.R. 4794. An act to require the Secretary of the Interior to complete a resource study of the 600 mile route through Connecticut, Delaware, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Virginia, used by George Washington and General Rochambeau during the American Revolutionary War.

H.R. 5266. An act for the relief of Saeed Rezaei.

H.R. 5478. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire by donation suitable land to serve as the new location for the home of Alexander Hamilton, commonly known as the Hamilton Grange, and to authorize the relocation of the Hamilton Grange to the acquired land.

H. Con. Res. 408. Concurrent resolution expressing appreciation for the United States service members who were aboard the British transport HMT ROHNA when it sank, the families of these service members, and the rescuers of the HMT ROHNA's passengers and crew.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1444) "An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to plan, design, and construct fish screens, fish passage devices, and related features to mitigate adverse impacts associated with irrigation system water diversions by local governmental entities in the States of Oregon, Washington, Montana, Idaho, and California."

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2638. An act to adjust the boundaries of the Gulf Islands National Seashore to include Cat Island, Mississippi.

S. 2751. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land in the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit, Nevada, to the Secretary of the Interior, in

trust for the Washoe Indian Tribe of Nevada and California.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The form of the motion is as follows:

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

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

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

The form of the motion is as follows:

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

0930

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

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

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of House Joint Resolution 118 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 118

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

0945

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The editorial goes on to say Republicans seem determined to send Mr. Clinton a take-it-or-leave-it tax cut plan that tilts benefits in favor of the well-to-do at a cost of \$240 billion over 10 years. It would, for instance, give \$5 billion in tax breaks to those able to buy long-term health care insurance, but it would not do what the President seeks to provide, care for 4 million uninsured parents at a fraction of the costs. Similarly, the Republican bill heavily favors HMOs, which have the political muscle over hospitals and nursing homes and restoring money cut by Congress in 1997. That is not fair, especially because nursing homes were devastated by the prior budget cuts.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1000

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I see the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the Minority Whip on the floor. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) has gotten over \$2 million from the unions. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), \$1.7 million

from the unions. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), \$1.4 million. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), \$1.3 million from the unions. They want to continue giving the money to the unions that goes to Democrats campaigns.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Four.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In fact, one gentleman from Maryland came to the floor and actually said that we were in town because the

tax bill did not pass. They know that is not the truth. It is not the tax bill that is keeping us in town. While he can quote a newspaper whose editor obviously does not know how Congress works, I am a bit disappointed he does not know any better. I expect the President to sign that bill after the election is over, but we will see. But that is not what is keeping us here.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1015

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

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

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

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

In a few minutes we will hear about the importance of home heating oil in New York. And when we had that bill and, unfortunately, one of our Members missed a vote, he was roundly and routinely criticized by his opponent in

the New York Senate race for not having voted on that very important issue. So I would ask the next speaker, when we move into the next bill, to possibly explain to me why the President did not place an issue important to women at the same level of importance as he did the Chinese trade bill; why he did not choose to let women around America, who are of low-income stature, know that they now have a new option; and why he did not seem to think it was so important to let every woman in America know about this vital bill?

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I quickly would like to say to my colleague who just spoke that I too share the gentleman's pain about what is hap-

pening to women with breast cancer or cervical cancer, being a cancer survivor. But I have a bill in this body, the Breast Cancer Patient Protection Act. This is a bipartisan bill, with 220 cosponsors, providing women with 48 hours of coverage in the hospital for a mastectomy, 24 hours for a lumpectomy, or a shorter time if doctor and patient decide that that should be the case.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1030

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

I am unapologetic when it comes to supporting higher wages for workers, higher COLAs for seniors and health coverage for workers with repetitive motion injury. I think that government needs to be a big enough umpire

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we deserve much better. Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

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

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

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

One of the big problems here is, though, that, as I have said before, there are three parties involved. There is the House of Representatives, there is the Senate, and there is the President of the United States. Now, sometime we run into these negotiations with the President, and we find that compromise is compromise only if it is his way. Compromise means everybody

gives a little, everybody gets a little and you try to come to a conclusion. In some cases the President has done this, but in other cases he has been stonewalling, and compromise is either his way or no way. In my opinion, that is not true compromise. That is not true negotiation. But, nevertheless, after we finish our work here on the floor today, the gentleman from Wisconsin and I are going to continue working with our counterparts in an attempt to reach the compromise on this one remaining appropriations bill where the appropriations issues have basically been decided. It is items that have nothing to do with appropriations that are holding up the compromise on that particular bill.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

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

[Roll No. 571]

YEAS—339

Abercrombie	Brady (PA)	Cunningham
Aderholt	Brady (TX)	Davis (FL)
Allen	Bryant	Davis (VA)
Archer	Burr	Deal
Armey	Burton	DeGette
Bachus	Buyer	DeLauro
Baker	Callahan	DeLay
Baldacci	Camp	DeMint
Baldwin	Canady	Deutsch
Ballenger	Cannon	Dicks
Barcia	Capps	Dixon
Barrett (NE)	Cardin	Doggett
Barrett (WI)	Carson	Dooley
Bartlett	Castle	Doolittle
Bass	Chabot	Doyle
Bereuter	Chambliss	Dreier
Berkley	Chenoweth-Hage	Edwards
Berman	Clayton	Ehlers
Berry	Clement	Ehrlich
Biggert	Coble	Emerson
Bilirakis	Coburn	Engel
Bliley	Collins	English
Blumenauer	Combest	Eshoo
Blunt	Condit	Etheridge
Boehkert	Conyers	Evans
Boehner	Cook	Everett
Bonilla	Cooksey	Ewing
Bonior	Costello	Farr
Bono	Coyne	Fattah
Borski	Cramer	Filner
Boswell	Cubin	Fletcher
Boyd	Cummings	Foley

Forbes	Linder	Roukema
Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo	Royal-Allard
Frost	Lofgren	Royce
Gallely	Lowey	Ryan (WI)
Gejdenson	Lucas (KY)	Ryan (KS)
Gekas	Lucas (OK)	Sabo
Gephardt	Luther	Salmon
Gibbons	Maloney (CT)	Sanchez
Gilchrest	Maloney (NY)	Sanders
Gilman	Manzullo	Sandlin
Gonzalez	Markey	Sanford
Goode	Mascara	Sawyer
Goodlatte	Matsui	Saxton
Goodling	McCarthy (NY)	Scarborough
Goss	McCrery	Schaffer
Graham	McDermott	Schakowsky
Granger	McGovern	Scott
Green (TX)	McHugh	Sensenbrenner
Green (WI)	McKinney	Serrano
Greenwood	McNulty	Shadegg
Gutierrez	Meehan	Sherman
Gutknecht	Meeks (NY)	Sherwood
Hall (OH)	Menendez	Shimkus
Hall (TX)	Mica	Shows
Hansen	Millender-	Simpson
Hastings (WA)	McDonald	Sisisky
Hayes	Miller (FL)	Skeen
Hayworth	Miller, Gary	Skelton
Herger	Minge	Slaughter
Hill (IN)	Mink	Smith (MI)
Hill (MT)	Moakley	Smith (NJ)
Hilleary	Mollohan	Smith (TX)
Hinchey	Moore	Smith (WA)
Hinojosa	Moran (KS)	Snyder
Hobson	Moran (VA)	Souder
Hoefel	Murtha	Spence
Hoekstra	Myrick	Stabenow
Holden	Nadler	Stearns
Holt	Napolitano	Stenholm
Hooley	Nethercutt	Strickland
Horn	Ney	Stump
Hostettler	Northup	Sununu
Houghton	Norwood	Sweeney
Hoyer	Nussle	Tancredo
Hunter	Oberstar	Tanner
Hutchinson	Obey	Tauscher
Hyde	Olver	Tauzin
Inslee	Ortiz	Terry
Isakson	Ose	Thomas
Istook	Oxley	Thompson (CA)
Jackson (IL)	Packard	Thornberry
Jackson-Lee	Pallone	Thune
(TX)	Pascarell	Thurman
Jefferson	Pastor	Tiahrt
Jenkins	Paul	Tierney
John	Payne	Toomey
Johnson (CT)	Pease	Towns
Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi	Trafficant
Johnson, Sam	Peterson (MN)	Turner
Jones (NC)	Petri	Udall (CO)
Jones (OH)	Phelps	Udall (NM)
Kelly	Pitts	Upton
Kildee	Pombo	Velazquez
Kilpatrick	Pomeroy	Vitter
Kind (WI)	Portman	Walden
Kingston	Price (NC)	Walsh
Klecza	Pryce (OH)	Wamp
Knollenberg	Quinn	Watkins
Kucinich	Rahall	Waxman
Kuykendall	Reamstad	Weiner
LaHood	Rangel	Weldon (PA)
Lampson	Regula	Weller
Largent	Reyes	Wexler
Larson	Reynolds	Whitfield
Latham	Riley	Wicker
LaTourette	Rivers	Wilson
Leach	Rodriguez	Wolf
Lee	Roemer	Woolsey
Levin	Rogan	Wu
Lewis (CA)	Rogers	Young (AK)
Lewis (GA)	Rohrabacher	Young (FL)
Lewis (KY)	Rothman	

NAYS—7

Baird	Dingell	Stupak
Capuano	Ford	
DeFazio	Miller, George	

NOT VOTING—86

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

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

1057

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

1100

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

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

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

number of households that receive LIHEAP assistance, due to a reduction in funding levels.

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

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

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

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

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

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

We have also provided an additional \$600 million in the fiscal year 2000 sup-

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

President did that. The second letter urged Congress to increase funding for LIHEAP by 50 percent, from \$1.1 billion to \$1.65 billion for both fiscal year 2001 and fiscal year 2002, and that is what we are discussing here right now.

The issue is one of priorities. There are people in the Congress who have voted for huge tax breaks for the richest 2 percent of the population. If people are prepared to vote for tax breaks for millionaires, we should be absolutely certain that no one in America goes cold this winter. Let us substantially increase funding for LIHEAP and ease the minds of elderly and lower-income Americans that this winter will not be a brutal one.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), who is chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

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

Mr. Speaker, I, of course, rise in support of the Low-Income Energy Assistance Program, LIHEAP, that provides badly needed Federal energy assistance to the poor through funds to the States, permits States to help low-income individuals pay home heating or cooling bills, and pay for the low-cost weatherization of their homes.

LIHEAP is a critical lifeline for low-income families, individuals with disabilities, and senior citizens. We have worked to ensure that the lifeline is strong enough to help those who are unable to afford the costs of heating their homes through the severe winter months and the costs of cooling their homes through the sweltering summer months.

In fiscal year 1999, 3.4 million households received help with their heating bills, and 748,000 households received winter crisis aid. In addition, cooling aid was provided to an estimated 480,000 households, summer crisis aid to 194,000 households, and weatherization assistance to 87,000 households.

It is important to keep in mind that the House already voted to appropriate \$1.4 billion for 2001; and as the chairman said, the appropriators have gone well above what the President has requested. We have done our duty.

Now, it is irresponsible, however, for this administration, for 8 years, to fail to develop a coherent energy policy that would have addressed these skyrocketing costs associated with continued reliance on foreign oil. Would it not have been more appropriate for our Democrat colleagues to join with us in calling on this administration to get its collective head out of the sand on our long-term energy needs? As good as LIHEAP is in providing assistance, it is needed because fuel costs are not kept in check. Our fuel costs have not been kept in check because this administration will not come to terms with the long-term energy problems we continue to face.

So, today we have before us a short-term fix for a very long-term problem.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute and 15 seconds for a question for the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, in the gentleman's remarks, did he say included in the appropriations bill, which I understand we have not come to a vote on that bill yet, but that there was the \$1.65 billion in forward-funding for the year 2002?

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, what I said was, and let me double-check that, we have agreed to advance-fund \$1.4 billion.

Ms. DELAURO. So that it is not the \$1.65 billion that would bring it up to the same level we are talking about?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. No, if the gentlewoman will again yield, it is \$1.4 billion. The President requested only \$1.1 billion, so we went \$300 million over the President's request.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, we are asking for 2001, and as I understand it, the gentleman said it was \$1.7 billion for the year 2001. That must have been something that just happened, because it was not at that level earlier. But I am talking about the year 2002 in forward-funding, it is \$1.4 billion.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will yield, that is correct; and this is the amount that the administration agreed to and the minority agreed to.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman said \$1.4 billion?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. DELAURO. Well, we are asking for \$1.6 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes and 10 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY).

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join the gentlewoman in calling on the Congress to appropriate \$1.65 billion this year and next year for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program.

Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues here today can tell us, there is a winter fuel crisis looming on the horizon; and we need to act, and we need to act immediately. With energy prices rising at record levels all over the Nation, we need to ensure that our most vulnerable citizens are able to get the heating oil that they need. The LIHEAP program helps seniors, helps working low-income families heat their homes in the winter and cool their homes in the summer.

Mr. Speaker, without this assistance, many Americans would be forced to choose between heating and eating. Mr. Speaker, no one should ever have to make that choice. Because of OPEC's production cuts, our oil stocks are 30 million barrels below what they were last year, and even last year's supply was much too little.

It is no surprise that as a result of that low stock that the prices are as high as they are.

Before senior citizens have to choose between buying groceries and paying their utility bills and before families discover that they cannot keep their children warm enough, my Republican colleagues need to act. For these people, heating their homes is not a luxury, Mr. Speaker. It is really a matter of life and death.

It is a tremendous program. It is a very important program, but it is woefully underfunded. For the past 3 years, we have funded LIHEAP at the same flat level; and, Mr. Speaker, as anyone in Massachusetts can tell my colleagues, that level has not kept pace with either inflation or fuel costs.

As a result, for the last 3 years, fewer and fewer eligible families have received assistance. If nothing changes, about 10 percent of the people who need help will get help. It is time this Congress acted to make sure people receive the LIHEAP help that they so desperately need, and I urge congressional appropriators to recognize how important LIHEAP is by including \$1.65 million in this fiscal year.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. ENGLISH).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise as a long-time strong supporter of the LIHEAP program to support this motion. LIHEAP, indeed, has been underfunded for many, many years, and it is an important priority for this year to put more funding into LIHEAP.

Let me reiterate the point that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has already made, under the President's budget, he had proposed only to fund LIHEAP to the tune of \$1.1 billion, plus \$300 million for emergency funding. The position that had been worked out on our side of the aisle with some collaboration was that instead, we would put in \$1.4 billion for the LIHEAP program, plus \$300 million for emergency funding.

Mr. Speaker, I think there is a strong case to be made for increasing beyond the \$1.4 billion. But let us understand what is really at work here. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) noted, one of the real problems here is that we have a failed energy policy in this country.

We are anticipating this winter that energy costs are going to go through the roof; and that is going to have a huge impact on low-income households, seniors and others are going to be forced to choose between heating and eating, as the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) noted. That is because not only have we underfunded LIHEAP, but also because we have not placed regulatory policies that are antiproduction.

We need to tackle this problem from a number of different directions. Yes, let us increase LIHEAP funding; but that in, itself, is no excuse for not having an energy policy in this country.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that one of the things that often does not come out in these debates is when people just make flat-out statements about energy policy in this country. The fact of the matter is, in 1995, the Republican majority in this body cut the weatherization programs by about 50 percent. They continually underfund any kind of research and development into energy alternatives, biomass, wind, solar, et cetera; and then come out and talk about an energy policy.

These are very, very big pieces of an energy policy, and which they have continuously, continuously undercut the President's request and other Members' request for these things.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCI).

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for this resolution and for yielding me the time; and her leadership on these issues are greatly important as we address them on a national stage.

The first thing I would like to address is the issue about funding. The \$1.6 billion that is being discussed in this resolution and the \$1.4 billion that was forward funding leaves a gap of \$200 million, whether it was in the President's budget or it was in the negotiations or the discussions.

The reality is people are paying \$77 more per month higher than normal bills and, on average, are going to pay \$464 for the season because more people are asking for the assistance in Maine. 50,000 Maine households, 50,000 Maine families were given the help they needed to make ends meet. So the explosion in the numbers utilized, the cap agencies that have been trying to take the applications have a waiting list as long as you can see; and we are here not funding adequately to the level that we are funding this year.

Mr. Speaker, recognizing that, on average, families are going to be paying \$602 more for a heating season. In reference to an energy policy, I think it is highly ironic because every year the administration tries to raise the fuel efficiency standard in automobiles, there has always been a congressional earmark to prevent it from happening.

When we tried to establish a Northeast Heating Oil Reserve, the leadership on the other side did not support it, dragged their heels, and did not even give the President the authority to release from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. And I would argue, as a Northeasterner and many Northeasterners pay attention to fuel oil prices, it was almost reaching \$40 a barrel when the President announced he was going to release from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, and the prices are now \$31 or \$32 a barrel.

So the actions that the President and the administration have been able to take through executive action have had an impact. The amount of money that has gone for emergency assistance has been helpful. It is now Congress' part, yet again, to do its responsibility in adequately funding LIHEAP to make sure that not only forward funding but forward funding to the levels that are necessary, and anybody that does not think the prices are going to increase is just fooling themselves.

As a friend of mine used to say, they go up by telegraph but they come down by pony express; and if we do not recognize that we have to adequately fund it this year, then we are just fooling ourselves and putting it off for next year. I think together we should recognize that heating one's home, whether in Maine or anywhere else, is not a luxury.

At every level, local, State and Federal, public servants should take the steps that are necessary to ensure that not a single resident, not a single resident is left out in the cold, and we should complete our work here today on the House floor.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I take this additional time to say one of the reasons that it has taken us so much time to conclude these negotiations is they cannot take yes for an answer. We agreed to this motion to commit. I said we are at \$1.4 billion, which was the request of the minority and the President; and we agreed to the \$1.4 billion.

Now my colleagues are moving the goal post again. Now my colleagues are going to go to \$1.6 billion. We are going to agree to the \$1.6 billion. But then are my colleagues going to come back and go to \$1.8 billion and \$1.9 billion?

Why do we not do this all at one time and save the time for negotiation?

On gas prices, the great political move of releasing from our Strategic Petroleum Reserves was simply that, political, because, first of all, it was about worth a day and a half of our consumption in the United States.

But let me tell my colleagues what happened. The oil was sold to a company who bought the oil and then turned around with a nice big profit and sold it again before it got to the refinery and the consumer.

Now, how did that affect those of us who put gasoline in our vehicles? It did not affect me. And I do not think it affected anybody in this Chamber, because when I buy gas and the people in my neighborhood buy gas, the price of gasoline did not go down one penny since the release of the oil reserve, maybe others in other parts of the country have better news than that.

But I can tell my colleagues that my constituents did not save even a penny a gallon on the release, the political release, of that strategic fuel oil reserve.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), my distinguished colleague, the chairman

of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), my friend and colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for affording me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate him; and I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for working in a bipartisan way to deal with what has actually provided some relief for some people who have need.

I think this is Congress doing its thing. I think we are, in fact, rescuing the administration from some bad policy consequences that have taken place. I think it is good that the American people can look and see that here we are on a Saturday focusing on these kinds of problems and responding to them in a very, very positive way especially, I would also say, in a bipartisan way.

I think that one of the things that has been addressed slightly here, and I have heard a little so far in the debate on this about the underlying problem, heating oil is not something we have just discovered and the need for it and the need for it on an affordable basis.

We have debated for a long time how we go about providing affordable heating oil. Incidentally, coming from Florida, we are interested in low-cost energy as well because we have a lot of senior citizen who need to have some climate control. When it gets very hot in the summer, we have the reverse problem. And we actually do need to provide air conditioning for some of those folks, sadly enough we have death in this country during hot spells as we all know, and providing appropriate air conditioning is an equal cost.

I come from New England, so I understand the LIHEAP problem. But I live in Florida and proudly represent the southwest coast of Florida, the lower part of it; and I understand the other problem as well. We have to provide an answer for the whole problem. That gets us to the energy policy.

I honestly believe that we do not have a comprehensive consistent energy policy that works. I am afraid that if we had an energy policy, it would have been confounded by what is now a clearly failed foreign policy in the Middle East, I am sorry to say. I am sure we are all sorry to say that.

I know that the Secretary of Energy, Secretary Richardson, who is a fine man, a former colleague of ours, has gotten up and announced that the administration was indeed caught asleep at the switch on their energy policy. I think I am using his words, maybe it was caught napping or asleep or something. But anyway, he basically said they had been inattentive. They had not done their job, and he is right.

I noticed that there was some talk about the release of the surplus and the

impact on the marketplace. I think from the cards and letters and talking to the people I talk to and representing the people I represent, nobody noticed that we had any relief at the gas pump.

I think my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) is right, if there was any relief, we sure did not see it. I do not know who else did.

Apparently, it did not help the people with the LIHEAP heating cost problem in New England much either. Actually, the amount of energy involved was a day and a half use, a day and a half of consumption. So that was a gesture, that was not a solution.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it is worth noting that just yesterday, Saddam Hussein manipulated the oil market price again; and that has a bigger consequence than anything that the executive branch has done so far to solve the oil crisis and the LIHEAP concerns that we are talking about here this morning.

Now, most Americans when they go out in the morning, they want to turn the key in their car; and they want their car to start. I know that the candidate of choice from our friends across the aisle is suggesting that somehow when we turn our car key that our car is going to come running into life and start and take us to work on some kind of new magic technology that has not been invented yet, so that we are not going to need oil and gas and internal combustion engines.

Well, that is fine, but I have to go to work today and tomorrow and the next day; and that magic technology is not here. Until it is here, thank you, we need to find affordable oil.

Mr. Speaker, we have talked about what happened in places like Chicago, how the regulations of the EPA confounded the price of gasoline, how the infrastructure failure and the refineries failed to be able to provide for the marketplace demand. All of these kinds of things have come together and we are not talking about that. We are talking about, there is a problem, Government handout.

I think the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) was on a correct path, when he suggested that if \$1.4 billion is not enough, then \$1.6 billion, \$1.8 billion. Where does this end? This ends in providing socialized, free oil for everybody in America. Great idea.

They tried it in Russia, the most corrupt systematic problem of the Soviet command marketplace was probably the gas pump and it still is. So that is not the solution.

We need an energy policy; and I hope our friends across the aisle will help us encourage the next administration, whichever side it is on, of developing a good energy policy. I would point out I think those who are aware of the oil and gas industry might be able to do better with an energy policy, and I would suggest that America might be well served by having some people who know about energy making decisions about energy.

Mr. Speaker, the other point that is sort of curious to me is that I have heard some talk about people being in the pocket of oil and gas. Oil and gas is what we need. That is what we are out there trying to find right now.

1130

If there is anybody that doubts it, do not go to the gas station when one runs out of gas. Wait for the next solution to one's car. Then see how far down the road one gets.

So I am very happy that this has come forward. I think we need to find a realistic underlying solution to energy policy. In the meantime, it is entirely appropriate that Congress, in a bipartisan way with Republican leadership, is providing relief. I congratulate the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I think this all sounds well and good, and it is very nice and a very nice speech. But let us take a look at the facts. Since the 1980s, there has been unprecedented attack on energy conservation programs by the United States Republican Party.

Reagan-Bush repeatedly proposed to zero out energy efficiency and renewable energy programs. Quite frankly, it is their legacy, shortsighted energy policy that has put the gas pump prices as high as they are today. My colleagues refused to invest in energy independence. This year alone, Republicans cut renewable energy research \$106 million below the President's request in the Energy and Water bill; it was \$211 million in the President's request for energy research in the Interior bill.

I mentioned before 50 percent cut in the important weatherization assistance programs. Not too long ago, 35 Republicans last year, including the major leaders of their party, wanted to cut and abolish the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

I might add that this was one of the first Republican proposals on energy policy when they took the majority was to kill the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Programs, the same families that are trying to pay for their heating bills and their cooling bills which they talk about today. They also wanted to count LIHEAP payments as income for the purposes of determining assistance on their food stamps.

They have not been for an energy policy. They have not been for the LIHEAP program. So the speeches sound nice, but the facts are there.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for this

motion. I want to urge my colleagues to support it.

But I want to say a few words about energy policy. I keep constantly hearing from the other side of the aisle, and I say this more in sorrow than in anger, that this country needs an energy policy. The simple fact of the matter is we have an energy policy. That energy policy is the energy policy that was crafted by Mr. Reagan, by Mr. Bush, and by a group of Republican Presidents, with the support of their Republican colleagues in this Chamber and in the other Chamber.

The simple fact of the matter is, it is a free market policy. It is one which says, let the market go to whatever levels that it will go to, to rise or to fall, without government interference. That is the energy policy of the United States.

To implement that energy policy, which I think is probably, in good part, unwise, my Republican colleagues have sought at different times to cut money for SPR, to sell off SPR. It has shown itself in budget and appropriation actions led by my Republican colleagues.

They have also opposed energy conservation measures, the use of alternative fuels and programs which would enable this country to move, not in absolute terms totally towards independence, but at least in good part.

It should be noted that it is not long back that my Republican colleagues were criticizing SPR as taking oil out of one hole in the ground and putting it in another hole in the ground.

More recently, they have come out and have criticized SPR and have tried to cut back on it. They have tried to sell it off. They reduced the amount of money which we have put into this thing. They have generally been critical of that program.

Having said this, the policy is there. It is a policy that was crafted by Reagan, by Bush, and by their Republican colleagues up here. It is a policy which does not consider the good needs and the important concerns of this country, to have a ready supply of emergency oil available through SPR. It is also a policy which does not consider the need to have conservation measures in place functioning and working.

My Republican colleagues over there have consistently sought to prevent this country from having fuel efficiency standards for appliances, for refrigerators, for water heaters, for air conditioners. The curious thing about that opposition is that it was done in opposition to the policies that were stressed by that industry, which recognizes, not only their social responsibility to have a good energy use in the appliances which they create, but also that the country needs that kind of thing because it is necessary for the conservation of energy and for the readiness of the United States in times of crisis.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to join others in giving credit to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentlewoman from Connecticut for really, in effect, working together to see that the purpose of this resolution has been achieved. I think that everybody is clear that this particular item will come out of the conference. So our effort here today to instruct the conferees will have incredible success, Mr. Speaker, since we know that this has already been done.

But we have to be here today for some purpose as we wait for the President to come back from California, maybe in Florida next, but we are waiting for him to come back from California now. We are waiting for White House negotiators to reengage. We have to be here, so we may as well be here to talk about some issue.

I have the highest, highest regard for the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL). It has been an honor to be able to serve with him on the Committee on Commerce, to see his great understanding of the rules and traditions of the House, and to try to, just by watching him, learn from some of that understanding of what we do and how we do it.

I am sure he is also aware that we have not had a Republican President for the last 8 years. So how the energy policy of the country is still reflective of that is a surprise to me.

But I was also surprised when the Department of Energy could not secure our nuclear codes. I was surprised when they could not maintain our most important and critical security information. So maybe I am just here to be surprised.

I think taxpayers, voters, people who are at the gas pump understand that a Department of Energy that cannot watch those two briefcases is likely not to have its eye very closely on the price at the gasoline pump. That is what has happened there.

While we are here, though, talking about issues that are already accomplished in terms of the additional money for LIHEAP, it is going to happen, I would like to take just a minute to talk about something that has not been done yet; and that is to encourage the President when he does return from California, and he does get the tax bill we passed this week, to sign that tax bill.

That tax bill is likely to be, I would almost bet will be the last opportunity we have in this Congress to vote on tax relief, in all likelihood the last opportunity we have to vote on Medicare adjustments. How this President could let that tax bill go unsigned and even, in fact, veto the bill would be something hard for the American people to understand.

The message we got on Tuesday, interestingly, did not use the word veto. In fact, it carefully did not use the

word veto. When the bill was ready to be voted on on Wednesday, we get another letter that says, like all tax relief, it is just somehow not quite good enough. They were for all for these tax cuts in theory, but they are never for a single one of these tax cuts in practice.

I hope the President carefully rethinks that, looks at the pension modernization and things that relate to both pensions held by union members, the 415 issue, small businesses that really are hampered today in offering pension protection to their associates and employees. This bill opens the door for small business to be able to compete with big business in offering pensions.

It expands the IRA amounts in a way that begins to catch IRA contributions up with what has happened since IRAs were first enacted. In terms of Medicare, there is tremendous help for seniors in Medicare, more help for rural hospitals, more help for rural nursing homes, long-term care. Tax credits are given in this bill and should be extended to the American people. The Medicare provisions lower out-of-pocket costs. They put more doctors in emergency rooms, more ambulances in rural areas.

I hope the President reconsiders his veto threat, looks at this bill again, and gives the kind of relief and kind of Medicare assistance this bill gives.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire as to the time remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 11 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) has 14 minutes remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) who was speaking, it might be interesting to note that just last year voted to abolish Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Someone who was concerned about our national security ought to be concerned about the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for bringing this to our attention.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the original intent of their instruction was to talk about LIHEAP. We have gone far afield and I am going to join the field. But I must say that it was a bipartisan coalition of us who pushed very hard to get the President of the United States to open up SPR and give up some of the reserve because those of us who live in the Northeast had gone through a very bad winter last year and this year looked bad. We had seen people have to go into shelters because they could not afford to heat their houses and pay for food. We do not want to see that happening again.

There was almost a panic starting to set in. Whatever one may think about

the release, it worked, obviously he did not release enough to see us through the winter. We did not want him to. It did have the effect of making the OPEC countries reduce the price of oil. It has been beneficial, and I again thank him for doing that.

Now, with talking about the alternative fuels and lack of energy policy, I agree we surely do not have one.

I remember the golden age of exploration, under Jimmy Carter's administration, when we talked about hydro-power, geothermal power, wave power, wind power, photo power, photovoltaic cells, and the grand daddy of them all, fusion. We were really intent in the United States to making sure that we would not forever be dependent on foreign oil.

But that came to a screeching halt in 1980 with Reagan, and we went back to the old way of allowing oil companies to do what they would with us and, as a previous speakers said, let market forces have their will with us.

I appreciate the bipartisan support that we have from the Northeast. I understand that in Florida they have some problems with weather. But they do not know what it is like when people are freezing.

My city of Rochester last year had more snow than any city in the Northeast of comparable size. If we want to have an energy policy in this country, we have got to get back to putting a little money in for some research and development, or we will have this debate forever.

But there is no doubt and history shows that the Reagan administration killed renewable energy resources and money for research.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, this debate on Saturday is not about people freezing to death or support for or against LIHEAP. Republicans are for providing energy assistance to low-income, disabled, the poor, elderly. There is no debate about that question here today.

We are here on Saturday because the other side is in desperate straits. They are trying to bail out their failing Presidential campaign, their congressional failing campaigns across the country, because the American people have finally said that we have had enough. We have had enough of the partisanship from the other side of using this arena and putting politics before people.

This is not about low energy assistance. It is a great program. It is a program that has grown from \$50 million during the energy crisis, I believe, of the 1970s to a \$1 billion program. It is a little bit of difference about helping people, making certain that the program works.

Even the President of the United States, I remember, presented us with budgets that proposed some trimming, some economy in this program. But we are for providing assistance to the poor and the disabled.

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

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

1145

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

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

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

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

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Just one final note. The reason that our gasoline prices were too high had

nothing to do with the EPA. All of our hearings determined that. And now they are lower because the FTC began an investigation into the oil companies and their colleagues in this House.

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

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

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

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

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

1200

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

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

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

In my State of Indiana, we are already working on helping these people who are vulnerable pay what we know will be a gas bill, which cost \$100 last winter, that will be \$140 this winter. So getting full funding or more funding in this program will allow us in the State of Indiana to now purchase natural gas or heating oil at October prices rather than higher prices in November, De-

ember, January, and February. This makes good common sense for compassion for the poor, for the disabled, for senior citizens; and it makes good sense for our taxpayers in buying things now rather than knowing what the price we are going to pay for them later on.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Accordingly, I urge adoption of the proposal.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

We have all heard the statistics:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 305, nays 18, not voting 109, as follows:

[Roll No. 572]

YEAS—305

Abercrombie	Biggart	Camp
Aderholt	Bilirakis	Canady
Allen	Bliley	Capps
Armey	Blumenauer	Capuano
Bachus	Blunt	Cardin
Baird	Boehlert	Carson
Baker	Boehner	Castle
Baldacci	Bonilla	Chabot
Baldwin	Bonior	Chambliss
Ballenger	Bono	Chenoweth-Hage
Barcia	Borski	Clayton
Barrett (NE)	Boswell	Clement
Barrett (WI)	Boyd	Coburn
Bartlett	Brady (PA)	Collins
Bass	Brady (TX)	Combest
Bereuter	Burr	Condit
Berkley	Burton	Conyers
Berman	Buyer	Cook
Berry	Callahan	Cooksey

Costello	Jenkins	Rahall
Coyne	John	Ramstad
Cramer	Johnson (CT)	Rangel
Cubin	Johnson, E.B.	Regula
Cummings	Jones (OH)	Reyes
Cunningham	Kelly	Reynolds
Davis (FL)	Kildee	Riley
Davis (VA)	Kilpatrick	Rivers
DeFazio	Kingston	Rodriguez
DeGette	Klecza	Roemer
DeLauro	Knollenberg	Rogan
DeLay	Kucinich	Rogers
DeMint	LaHood	Rothman
Deutsch	Lampson	Roybal-Allard
Dicks	Larson	Ryan (WI)
Dingell	Latham	Ryun (KS)
Dixon	Leach	Sabo
Doggett	Lee	Sanchez
Dooley	Levin	Sanders
Doyle	Lewis (CA)	Sandlin
Dreier	Lewis (GA)	Saxton
Ehrlich	Lewis (KY)	Scarborough
Emerson	LoBiondo	Schaffer
Engel	Lofgren	Schakowsky
English	Lowe	Scott
Eshoo	Lucas (KY)	Serrano
Etheridge	Lucas (OK)	Shadegg
Evans	Luther	Sherman
Everett	Maloney (NY)	Sherwood
Ewing	Manzullo	Shows
Farr	Markey	Sisisky
Fattah	Mascara	Skeen
Filner	Matsui	Skelton
Fletcher	McCarthy (NY)	Slaughter
Foley	McCrery	Smith (NJ)
Forbes	McDermott	Smith (TX)
Ford	McGovern	Smith (WA)
Frelinghuysen	McKinney	Snyder
Galleghy	McNulty	Souder
Ganske	Meehan	Spence
Gekas	Meeks (NY)	Stabenow
Gibbons	Menendez	Stearns
Gilchrest	Mica	Stenholm
Gilman	Millender-	Strickland
Gonzalez	McDonald	Stump
Goode	Miller, Gary	Sununu
Goodlatte	Miller, George	Sweeney
Goodling	Minge	Tanner
Goss	Mink	Tauscher
Graham	Moakley	Tauzin
Granger	Moore	Terry
Green (WI)	Moran (KS)	Thomas
Greenwood	Moran (VA)	Thompson (CA)
Gutierrez	Murtha	Thornberry
Gutknecht	Myrick	Thune
Hall (OH)	Nadler	Thurman
Hall (TX)	Napolitano	Tiahrt
Hansen	Nethercutt	Tierney
Hastings (WA)	Ney	Towns
Hayes	Northup	Trafficant
Hayworth	Norwood	Turner
Herger	Nussle	Udall (CO)
Hill (IN)	Oberstar	Udall (NM)
Hill (MT)	Obey	Upton
Hilleary	Olver	Velazquez
Hinchee	Ortiz	Vitter
Hinojosa	Ose	Walden
Hobson	Oxley	Walsh
Hoeffel	Packard	Wamp
Hoekstra	Pallone	Waters
Holden	Pastor	Waxman
Holt	Payne	Weiner
Hooley	Pease	Weldon (PA)
Horn	Pelosi	Wexler
Hoyer	Peterson (MN)	Whitfield
Hunter	Petri	Wicker
Hutchinson	Phelps	Wilson
Inslee	Pitts	Wolf
Isakson	Pombo	Woolsey
Istook	Pomeroy	Wu
Jackson (IL)	Portman	Young (AK)
Jackson-Lee	Price (NC)	Young (FL)
(TX)	Pryce (OH)	
Jefferson	Quinn	

NAYS—18

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

NOT VOTING—109

Ackerman	Becerra	Boucher
Andrews	Bentsen	Brown (FL)
Baca	Bilbray	Brown (OH)
Barr	Bishop	Bryant
Barton	Blagojevich	Calvert

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

1228

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

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

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

1230

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

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

Then why has it been necessary for Members from this side of the aisle to fight to preserve our investment in class size reduction and finally begin our investment in local school construction?

It has been 4 years since I conducted a survey of New York City schools and found that one in every four schools held classes in hallways, gymnasiums, bathrooms and janitors' closets. Two-thirds of these schools had substandard building features, such as roofs, walls and floors. I repeat, this was 4 years ago; and despite the outpouring of support from both sides of the aisle, Congress has not provided even one cent to alleviate overcrowding, and improve the physical condition of our schools. In fact, 2 days ago, when we considered the tax bill, we had the opportunity to include the bipartisan Rangel-Johnson school modernization bond proposal, and we did not.

We in our local communities have an obligation to all children. We make the decisions locally and pay the taxes locally, but we as a Nation have an important role as well: to use Federal resources to encourage excellent programs, to jump start local investment, and to support national priorities.

That is why I firmly believe that Congress must join with the President to support school modernization and smaller class sizes. We know that smaller class sizes means better learning for students and less disciplinary problems for teachers. By continuing our efforts to hire more teachers in the critical early grades, we can offer 2.9 million more children the benefits of more personal instruction and will see the results in their academic performance.

We need to fix the shameful state of too many American schools. School enrollment is skyrocketing. We will need at least 2,400 new public schools by the year 2003 to accommodate rising enrollments and to relieve overcrowding. Our modernization needs are no less pressing. High-speed modems and the wiring to support them is no longer a luxury; yet we still have Pokemon-generation kids in classrooms straight out of Charles Dickens with their asbestos-filled ceilings and coal stoves. It would be laughable, I say to my colleagues, if it was not so disgraceful.

In fact, the National Education Association estimates that the unmet school modernization needs in American schools total over \$300 billion; and that is on top of what school districts and States are already spending. This problem is just too big for local and State officials to handle alone.

Simply stated, we need dedicated programs to help local schools reduce class size and modernize their buildings. These are national problems that demand a national response. The Federal Government has a responsibility, I say to my colleagues, to ensure that public education is more than a promise, and our students cannot learn when they are stacked on top of each

other and the walls are literally crumbling around them.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this motion.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, at the beginning, I would say that we are not going to support this motion to instruct as we did the last one. Even considering the fact that we supported the last one, there was more political rhetoric that came from the other side than in most campaign meetings. So I suspect that is going to be the same this time because we are not going to support this motion to instruct.

Mr. Speaker, there are major differences between the political parties. One of the big major differences is that one party believes that all of the power should be centralized in Washington, that whoever works in the bureaucracy here is smarter than anybody else in the country. That is not our party, Mr. Speaker. Not yours and not mine. That is their party.

We believe that States and local communities and the people in those States and local communities have a right to make decisions for themselves. That is one of the major differences between the two parties.

Now, when the Constitution was first written, and we have all applauded the Framers of the Constitution so many times, they originally created a Constitution that created a very powerful central government. They gave all of the power of the government to the Federal Government. But then they realized they had made a mistake and they created what? The first 10 amendments to the Constitution, the Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights that protected the people's rights as individuals, that protected the rights of the States as individual States of a union, and what we are trying to do is to maintain what the Framers intended with the Bill of Rights, and that is to protect the rights of the people in our communities to make decisions for themselves, except in those cases where the Federal Government is the only agency that is able to deal with things such as national defense, such as Social Security, such as Medicare, things of this nature.

Education has become a large issue; and believe me, we support education. In fact, in this legislation that we are debating here and negotiating, my colleagues will find that we have provided more money in that bill than the President of the United States asked for.

The major difference between us, and other speakers will go into this in more detail, but the major difference is who decides how the money is spent. Their side thinks that Washington should decide it all for people in my community, people in his community, people in others' communities; and we disagree with that. We believe that the needs

are different in different parts of the country. We understand that there are some school districts where they need more schools and construction is important. We also understand that there are some places in the country where they need more teachers, or they need more special education, or they need more technology, some computers, some laboratories. We understand that the needs are different. They are not all alike in every community in this Nation. Our approach is to give those communities the opportunity to make the decisions on what they will do with the money that we will provide through the block grant.

Mr. Speaker, for years and years in this country of ours, people opposed Federal aid to education, and the reason that I heard from my constituents and many of my colleagues heard from their constituents, is that they were not opposed to the Federal Government being interested in education, but they did not want the Federal strings that came from Washington. They did not want the strings that came with Federal aid. They preferred to go it on their own, which they do 95 percent of the time anyway, with local and State funds.

However, now we are talking about more involvement on the part of the Federal Government from the standpoint of centralized education from their side than from the standpoint of a block grant as far as we are concerned. We think we are on the right side, and that is the position that we have taken; and that is the position we are going to stand by, and that is the position we are going to support today by opposing this motion to instruct.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 60 seconds to respond to the gentleman from Florida, my good friend, the chairman of the committee, to make it very clear that our position is that this Congress builds highways, bridges, and responds to emergencies.

When I began with this issue in 1996, we had a \$112 billion emergency. It is now a \$300 billion emergency. We believe that we can assist local governments by lowering their property taxes and responding to these emergencies, and then support the Rangel-Johnson bipartisan bill that will also help local governments, because they make the decisions, we help with the financing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), my good colleague and my friend on the committee.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her leadership in championing this issue over the years, the issue of school construction.

Anyone who is a parent or anyone who has been a child, so that includes all of us, is familiar with the expression, the children are listening. Indeed, the children do listen. They hear us telling them that education is key to

their personal fulfillment and their success in life, that they must apply themselves in school so that they can succeed; and yet we send these same children a different message when we send them to schools that are dilapidated, that are not even capable of being wired for the future and are very, very un conducive to study.

What do children think if we say this is a value, it is very important that you get a good education and by the way, we are placing a very low value on it when it comes to the place in which we want you to study. We spend money, the taxpayers' money here on research that we all herald as important, and that research tells us that children do better in smaller classes and indeed, that they do better in smaller schools, Mr. Speaker.

The distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) has documented the need very clearly, a growing need, more than doubled since 1996 for these improvements, these modernizations, or these replacements of these schools. How can the Republican majority ignore the scientific basis, which we fund and support and praise, about children needing smaller classes and doing much better in those circumstances, by not insisting that the funds that we put aside for school construction and modernization, for smaller classes, not be used for that purpose?

So I commend the gentlewoman for her motion, and I urge my colleagues to support it, because, Mr. Speaker, the children are listening. Let us not send them a confused message.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support Representative LOWEY'S Motion to Instruct the Labor-HHS Appropriations Conferees to support the Democratic initiative on school construction. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership has continually refused to support vital funding to help local communities reduce class size at public schools.

America's schools are teaching more students than ever before and generally, our schools work for most students. However, we can improve our public schools by focusing our efforts on underperforming schools and low-income areas with ongoing problems. We can overcome this significant problem—the infrastructure and facilities at our schools require modernization and investment.

WHAT IS THE NEED?

Today, school enrollments are higher than ever, with a record 53.2 million children enrolled in our schools. By 2008, another million students will be in America's schools.

By 2003, to meet rising student enrollments, America will need another 2,400 new schools.

The average American public school is 42 years old. After 40 years, school buildings begin to deteriorate rapidly and repair costs soon exceed the costs to construct new schools.

According to the GAO report "School Facilities: The Condition of America's Schools", one-third of all schools need extensive repairs or replacement.

WHAT WOULD IT COST TO ADDRESS THESE CONDITIONS?

According to a 1996 GAO report, it would cost \$112 billion to repair our schools. Accord-

ing to a 2000 National Education Association report, it would cost \$322 billion to repair our schools.

WOULD IT HELP?

Smaller class sizes are important because studies demonstrate that reduced class size leads to more individual attention and increased accountability.

We know that this investment in school construction would benefit our schools, our teachers, and most importantly our children. I have heard personal stories about: teachers teaching in converted bathrooms; students eating lunch in shifts starting at 9:45 due to overcrowding; leaky roofs and exposed lead paint leading to health and safety hazards.

These conditions are intolerable, Mr. Speaker. I rise to support the Motion to Instruct and urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Motion.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we will attempt to stay within our time limits that we were assigned.

I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), who is not only an educator in his own right, but is chairman of the committee responsible for authorizing educational issues.

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

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, this is a very curious motion to instruct. In fact, it is the most curious motion to instruct I have seen in 26 years.

Why? Well, first of all, it was originally drafted and submitted to this body on September 19. That is right, September 19, 5 weeks ago. At that time we had not begun the negotiations with the White House or our friends in the minority party on what the final appropriations agreement would include or not include. At this point, to instruct the House and Senate conferees in the Labor-HHS-Education appropriation bills on issues that have already been thoroughly discussed and tentatively agreed to, and in other instances totally agreed to, just does not make sense.

Mr. Speaker, this motion is irrelevant given the status of our negotiations; and as such, I oppose the gentlewoman's motion, as should anyone who is working in good faith to successfully conclude work on the bill.

I want to thank Members of both parties and the White House representatives for working tirelessly the last 9 days, including last Saturday and Sunday, day and night, to fashion an agreement in which Members from both parties can take pride. It is my hope that when our work is complete, we will continue funding to assist schools in their efforts to reduce class size with qualified teachers.

As I tried to point out to the President when he came up with this idea, which was political more than anything else, 100,000 teachers for 15,000 school districts and 1 million classrooms; and I said, if we do not have quality people to put in there, it will not matter. I do not care how we reduce the teacher-student ratio. And

guess what? The first 30 percent that were hired, the first 30 percent that were hired under this new program were not qualified.

1245

Where did they go? They went to the same school districts that already had 30 percent, 40 percent, and 50 percent of unqualified teachers already where they needed the very best teachers.

Again, I tried to point out unless we put the horse before the cart, that is what is going to happen.

Last year we negotiated it, and I think it came out well, because what we said last year was that 25 percent of the money could be used to improve the quality of the teachers they presently have. Now, does not that make sense? Why would I hire someone who is not qualified, rather than train someone who is already in the system who shows great potential?

We said 25 percent of the money can be used for that purpose, but we said if we have 10 percent or more of unqualified teachers, and at the time we were negotiating I was using a city not too far from Pennsylvania, where they had 50 percent unqualified teachers, we said you can use 100 percent of your money to improve the teachers that you presently have. That was agreed upon. That makes sense.

I am pleased to say that we have been able to reach that same agreement this particular year, and all schools with a high priority of teachers that are not qualified will have the flexibility to use that 100 percent to improve the existing teachers.

Now, it has taken the administration to realize the fallacy of reducing class size by ignoring teacher quality all of this time. I am so pleased, as I told the negotiators as soon as we started, I am so glad that here for the last year and a half down Pennsylvania Avenue the word is quality, quality, quality, quality, because people on the committee, of which I chair, the Committee on Education and the Workforce are tired of hearing that word, too, I am sure.

That is the most important part about class-size reduction, having a quality teacher, the most important element as to whether a child succeeds or not is that classroom teacher next to the parent.

We have made some progress on the issue of school construction. As I said, we have met for 9 straight days and nights. I made it clear to the administration that State and local flexibility must be a component of Federal funding for classroom modernization and renovation. It is important to see a significant portion of the funding available for other pressing needs.

Again, who knows better? We or the local district? I believe it is the local district. Again, I go back and point out that had we stepped up to the plate with the 40 percent that we said would come with special ed, 40 percent of the per pupil cost throughout this country that we would send, Los Angeles alone

would have received more than \$90 million extra every year.

Multiple that by 25, that sounds like a good bit of maintenance money to me to prevent schools from crumbling. New York City would have gotten \$160 million extra every year. But we never meet those needs, we just say we will go on and create something new, some other mandate, and forget about what it was we promised to these very people.

What happened? They had to use their money. They had to use State money, and they had to use local money to meet our mandate. So they could not do the kinds of things they needed to do in school maintenance. The primary responsibility for construction, certainly, remains at the local level.

Mr. Speaker, I point out again that this motion to instruct conferees at this particular time is irrelevant and it certainly is not constructive when we had the kind of negotiations that are going on at the present time that I hope will be completed in the very near future.

Let the conferees do their job. They are making real headway.

Let me point out one other thing. I think it is very important. Education technology, they have already indicated they will provide \$2 million more than the President asked for.

Education for the disadvantaged they have said, you will get \$50 million more than the President asked for.

Impact aid, you will get \$258 million more than the President asked for.

Special ed, you will get \$1 billion more than the President asked for.

Education for homeless children, you will get \$2.3 million more than the President asked for.

Rehabilitation services, you will get \$20 million more than the President asked for.

Vocational and adult education, you will get \$5 million more than the President asked for.

Student financial aid, you will get \$300 million more than the President asked for.

Historically black colleges, you will get \$60 million more than the President asked for.

The Hispanic-serving institutions, you get \$6 million more than the President asked for.

TRIO, so important in higher ed, you will get \$35 million more than the President asked for.

Higher Ed, you will get \$20 million more than the President asked for.

Department of Education, \$600 million.

In a bipartisan fashion, I believe they have done a good job, and I believe they are continuing to do that. I certainly do not believe my colleagues should interfere at this particular time and try to instruct conferees, who in a bipartisan fashion with the help of the White House are doing a pretty fine job in bringing this to a final positive goal that both sides will be very pleased with.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Members are reminded that the use of personal electronic communication devices are prohibited on the Floor of the House. Members are to disable wireless telephones before entering the Chamber.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), my friend, who has served so well in education, that I would hope that the leadership would fund the teacher quality initiative, because I know of our mutual interest in training our teachers.

I would like to acknowledge to the group that the President's reduction in class-size initiative has reduced the average size of a class by five, which has made a real difference in teaching young people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), my good friend.

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, what kind of message do we send our children when their community and when this Nation boasts new, elegant shopping malls and new expensive sports stadiums while our kids are forced to learn in overcrowded, crumbling schools?

I support the Lowey motion to instruct because we cannot expect our children to get a first-rate education in second-rate and third-rate school buildings.

Mr. Speaker, a recent GAO study found that 60 percent of our Nation's schools need at least one major repair or they need replacement. It is time to show our children that their school is equally as important as a new mall or a new stadium. It is time to show our children that they are important.

We must vote for the Lowey motion. It is a vote that makes our children, 25 percent of our population but 100 percent of our future, our highest priority.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY), a distinguished leader in education, a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), my colleague, for bringing this issue.

I live on Long Island, and everybody thinks everyone on Long Island is rich. Let me tell my colleagues all of my schools are over 50 years old. A lot of my schools have boilers that are over 100 years old. What does that have to do with it?

We are sending a message to our children that we do not care about them to modernize our schools. I bring it as a health care issue. I have high rates of asthma among my young children be-

cause of the conditions of our schools. We here in Congress have to make a full commitment all the way around.

We have to make sure our schools are the best schools for our children to be in. I have been in schools where they are teaching our children with disabilities out in the hallway.

I can tell my colleagues personally, if you have learning disabilities, you have to have a quiet setting, not somewhere where you are hearing everything out in the background. People with hearing problems are being taught in hallways and closets. The bathrooms, I am telling my colleagues, it is horrible.

This is what we are supposed to be doing. This is the money that we should be giving to our children. Mr. Speaker, I wish everyone will vote for this motion. We have to take education seriously.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ), my colleague who is a distinguished leader on education.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Lowey motion to instruct. School construction is an issue with broad bipartisan support.

This week, we had the opportunity to pass the President's school construction bill. It would reduce class sizes in early grades, hire 20,000 new teachers, raise student achievement and make urgent safety and help repairs in 5,000 schools in low-income areas. Instead, Republicans did their own version, a watered-down version, that postponed any school construction for up to 4 years and did little for our needed schools.

I want to remind my colleagues, it is one thing to play games with sham legislation here in Congress. It is another thing to send a child to school in the boiler room or a broom closet or the hallway of a broken-down school, like we in New York and too many other communities Nationwide. Too often, those affected are at-risk children living in minority neighborhoods.

This is not the way to treat our most precious resource, the young people who will follow in our footsteps in this great institution.

Mr. Speaker, I support and I urge my colleagues to support this motion to instruct.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's work and I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), our education chairman.

I have the greatest respect for the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and for the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), and I want to take two comments they made and try and bring this to fact and reality.

First of all, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) said that the children of America are listening. Well, I doubt if many of them are right now, but I hope they all are and I hope their parents are as well because Mrs. LOWEY made one statement of fact that is absolutely correct and then bundled around it the delusions that many are trying to portray on this floor as a lack of commitment on one side or the other to education when, in fact, I would submit to my colleagues that both sides are committed to it.

The gentlewoman's fact that was correct was that there is an unfunded need in America of \$303 billion for classroom construction; that is absolutely the exact number published in the report she cited. What she did not tell my colleagues is that the President's proposal to solve that is \$1.3 billion in the appropriations act, which is three-tenths of 1 percent and would take 35 years of annual appropriations just to meet today's need, if there was no other need in the future.

The fact of the matter is, our difference is let us do something that is meaningful and within our scope. Let us not try and lead an illusion that we are going to fix every stairwell or replace every school. The negotiators right now have said, let us agree on school construction, let us agree on it to do those Federally mandated things, such as IDEA, asbestos removal, health safety and welfare of our children. That is what they are negotiating right there.

We are not talking about building and replacing every school in America. We are talking about an illusion in this motion that we would do that when we cannot.

The reason I say illusion is because the distinguished lady from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) said this would give property tax relief to her constituents. Property taxes are what schools are built upon in the local level. If we ever pass the false hope that we can build the schools America needs, the demand of which is greater than our surplus today, then there would never be a local bond issue passed, and American education would be a travesty.

Secondly, on school size and classroom size. Last year, the Republicans and the Democrats agreed on classroom size reduction. It is in the budget now. It just simply says that we must also have trained teachers in the classroom, not just teachers in the classroom.

On this Wednesday, Secretary Riley and our committee and many Members on the floor on the other side heard it. When asked the question, are there 100,000 trained and certified unemployed teachers to be hired; well, no, there are not. There are many that need training to be brought up to date, which is why last year's agreement was to be able to use the funds to hire new teachers or to train teachers that exist at the local level who are not certified.

We are on the cusp, the negotiators are right now. We are on the cusp right now. We agreed basically on classroom size reduction that was done last year and redone this year. We are now about to agree on what is meaningful in construction but also doable in construction.

If the children are listening and the parents are listening, Democrats and Republicans are this close to making a real solution and a meaningful contribution to education.

But this motion portends that we can do what they know we cannot, that we would make a false promise to the American people; and that would be wrong for us to do in a motion, just as well as it would be wrong for us lead people to believe we could do it in a budget.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Members are reminded that remarks in the House are to be directed to the Chair, and not to other persons outside the Chamber.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to briefly respond to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON). We are talking about an emergency \$1.3 billion to respond to the emergency that is out there because this Congress has not acted in spite of the crumbling schools. Then we would like to pass the bipartisan Rangel-Johnson bill that would provide tax relief for the local government, which is a tax bill that would provide for the tax on the bonds that will be issued by the local government.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to the remarks made initially by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON). Both spoke very rationally. They spoke to the point. I wish we could have more of that kind of debate.

But there is a difference, I tell the gentleman from Georgia, and it is a significant difference. It is a substantive difference. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), when he made his presentation, said that the difference between us is that we want Washington to decide and they want the LEAs to decide, the local education agencies to decide. Because it is their proposition, effectively, that the money that they have included in is not targeted for school construction, indeed, not targeted, per se, for teachers, but is a revenue-sharing program. That is essentially the flexibility. I am sorry that you grimace.

But the fact of the matter is the rhetoric on their side has continually been that the locals can decide. Some

people may need classrooms. Some may need additional teachers. But some may need computers. Some may need recreational facilities. They will have the flexibility.

Now, I suggest to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) that he is correct that this amendment will not solve the classroom shortage in America. No amendment could do that. No bill in one year could do that.

What this amendment, however, seeks to say, I tell the gentleman, is that we at the Federal level have identified two very significant critical problems. One, we do not have sufficient classrooms in America to house the swelling number of students in America. Two, we do not have sufficient teachers, quality teachers to teach those children.

There are other problems in America. But as we do on so many of the educational programs that my colleagues referenced and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) in particular referenced, we say there is a problem here. We are going to put some dollars. LEA, if one wants to solve the problem here, are the dollars to do it.

That is the difference between us. We do not want to turn this \$1.5 billion into simply a grab bag. It is for emergencies that exist in school construction and safety.

The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) is exactly correct. The gentleman ignored the tax component of this, which spends \$5 billion or \$6 billion to leverage five times that or 500 percent times that, five times that to \$25 billion in bonds that can be issued by local governments.

Now, who decides to hire the teachers? The local government. Who decides whether to build the schools? The local government. The Federal Government does not make that selection, nor does it demand that the local governments do that.

To that extent, I suggest to my colleagues that, when they represent that we want government at the Federal level to decide, that is a misrepresentation and not useful for this debate. The issue really is whether or not we have a targeted sum or we have a general sum. The general sum clearly, I tell the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), will not solve the school construction problem or the teacher problem.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for helping me make the case that I set out to make a few minutes ago, partially helping make that case I would say.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

quality public education in the United States of America.

As I was sitting here, Mr. Speaker, listening to the debate and hearing the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman GOODLING) of the Committee on Education and the Workforce speaking, it occurred to me that he has worked an entire lifetime for education in the United States of America. This may be one of the last speeches that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman GOODLING) will be able to make on the floor of the House with regard to education.

I salute him for an entire career devoted to quality public education, flexibility at the local level, and the absence of Federal mandates. That is really the difference in philosophy that we are talking about here on the floor of this House on this Saturday afternoon.

I have two children in public schools in Mississippi. I support public education. I have a record of supporting public education, not only in this Congress, but also when I was a State legislator. We all support quality public education, and there is not a Member within the sound of my voice this afternoon in the House of Representatives or in the other body that does not support better school facilities and better school construction. We would all like to have better school buildings all across the United States of America.

The question is, how can we as a Nation get the job done. This points out the difference in philosophy. Regardless of what the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the previous speaker, said, there is a strong difference in the way we would approach this bill.

Now, my friends on the Democratic side see a need somewhere in the United States of America, and they immediately see a Washington, D.C. Federal solution to the problem. We on the other hand, particularly when it comes to education, when we see an education problem, we try to find out how best to solve that problem at the local level and how to provide the flexibility and authority to local governments to solve those problems.

Now, as the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) pointed out, and as the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) pointed out, there are over \$300 billion in school construction needs right now. Those needs, undoubtedly, will go up. She terms them an emergency. The President's proposal would fund only a very, very small percentage of those problems.

But what if we start out this year at \$1.5 billion, Mr. Speaker? What will that program look like with all the Federal bureaucracy and all of the regulations that it will entail, what will it look like in 5 years? I say we can expect a Federal program of about \$15 billion in 5 years. A few years later, we might have a program of \$150 billion. That is the way it always works.

I implore my colleagues to vote against this motion today. If there is

any notion left of local control over school construction decisions, we will oppose this motion. Let us provide more flexibility for education at the local level.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE), someone who really knows about this issue because he was the former superintendent of schools in North Carolina.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting, as I listen to the debate today, this is the same debate that I heard over 4 years ago when I decided to run for this body, because I was so disgusted as a State superintendent at a Republican leadership that was going to abolish the Department of Education, reduce school lunches, and the list is long. That would have directly impacted in the most negative of ways the children of this country.

Now we are saying we do not really need to put in school construction. We will do this; we will do that. Let me explain to my colleagues very quickly, if I may, because the Republican leadership's tactic, in my opinion, may have changed. But their cynical game is the same. Back then, the revolutionaries wanted to do all the things I have talked about.

Today they continue to play politics by blocking what I think is a bipartisan piece of legislation to build schools. Bottom line, \$25 billion will build schools. Local units will determine where it is. All we do is pay the interest.

Let me tell my colleagues what one of the House leadership Members said yesterday. We are winning the education debate. That is not my words. They are published in today's RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, let me say this loud and clear. Our children are too important to fall victim to partisan politics. Bottom line, the quality of education that we provide our children today will literally determine the future of the kind of Nation that we are going to have in the 21st century. This is not a game.

Despite the cynical politics the Republican leadership is talking about, this is about our children. The stakes are high. I say let us pass it. I support this.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Lowey motion. It is long past time for this Congress to do the right thing on school construction. Four years ago, I sought this office because I was sick and tired of watching Republican politicians in Washington playing politics with our children's future. The Republican leadership's tactics may have changed, but their cynical game is still the same. Back then, the Republican revolutionaries were trying to cut school lunches, slash student loans and shut down the entire Education Department. Today, they continue to play politics by blocking our bipartisan school construction bill because their goal is partisan politics. The House Republican Leader yesterday said, "we are winning the education debate."

Mr. Speaker, let me say this loud and clear: our children are too important to fall victim to

partisan politics. The quality of the education we provide our children today will literally determine the kind of nation we will become in the 21st century. This is not a game, despite the cynical politics of the Republican leaders. This is about what kind of future our children are going to have in this country. The stakes could not be higher. Right now, we have a crisis in this country. Throughout America children are stuffed into overcrowded classrooms, trapped in run-down schools and stuck in makeshift trailers. We in this Congress have an opportunity and a responsibility about this crisis by passing meaningful school construction legislation for our children. I call on the Republican leadership to call off their partisan tactics and pass the bipartisan school construction bill—now.

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

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to say we are not talking about construction, we are talking about maintenance and renovation. It would really be a joke if we were talking about construction at \$1.3 billion.

I also want to compliment North Carolina in the last 4 years. In the last 4 years, North Carolina has made dramatic steps forward in their public education system. In the last 4 years, they did not come to Washington and ask them to do it for them or tell them how to do it either.

But I would hope that we start thinking more in terms of quality and not quantity. I would hope we would start thinking in terms of results and not process.

My colleagues talk about flexibility and the whole idea of pupil-teacher ratio. Let me give my colleagues one example how something that looked good went awry. In the very next school district to my school district, they got two teachers federally financed. Their ability to finance their own system is much greater than the one that I live in, which I pay \$4,000 school tax. So I do not mind paying my income tax to help the city of York. But it does not make sense that I am buying two teachers when I am already paying in my own district far more school tax than they are paying in the district where they are more affluent.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) use her time. I think she has considerably more time left than I do.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), our gracious chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Johnson-Rangel bill. It is a bipartisan bill that provides a tax credit to deal with the school districts we have been discussing this morning and the school construction problem. It is a bill that preserves local control to school districts to decide how to spend the money.

Now, we all say we are for aid with school construction, with money which is the subject of the motion to instruct, and the tax credit. But we need to get serious about this because the devil is now in the details.

What I want to highlight to my colleagues is the fear I have that, in the final appropriations bill, there either will be nothing on school construction for tax credits, or there will be the language that we voted on the other day, which I find extremely unacceptable because it does two things that I think insult the intelligence of anyone that supports school construction aid.

The first thing is the arbitrage issue, which says to a school district that, if they borrow money to build schools and they hold that money for 3 or 4 years, they get a benefit in a tax credit. No school district is going to borrow money to build schools and let it sit there 3 or 4 years.

The second is, we have created a brand-new program called Private Activity Bonds for School Districts. In my district, building schools is a public responsibility, not a private activity. We need to do it the right way through the Johnson-Rangel bill.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL).

(Mr. Udall of New Mexico asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) for her leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the motion of the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) to instruct conferees on dedicated funding for class size reduction and school renovation.

The school classroom size reduction program is helping the schools in my home State of New Mexico. Of the \$9.6 million that was awarded to New Mexico school districts, 87 percent was used to hire an additional 230 teachers, 9 percent for professional development, 2 percent for administration, and 2 percent for recruiting and training of teachers.

These are dollars that are targeted and managed at the local level. This is not about Washington versus local control. This program supports local school districts to hire teachers. The locals do the hiring.

1315

The locals do the hiring. We are for the locals and for local control and local control management of our schools.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the motion of the gentlewoman from New York to instruct conferees on dedicated funding for Class Size Reduction and School Renovation.

The Classroom Size Reduction Program is helping the schools in my home state of New Mexico.

The amount awarded to my state for the 1999-2000 school year was \$9.6 million.

Depending on the amount of funds received by the school district, funds could be used to recruit, hire, and train certified teachers and be used for professional development.

Of the \$9.6 million that was awarded to New Mexico school districts, 87 percent was used to hire an additional 230 teachers, 9 percent for professional development, 2 percent for administration, and 2 percent for recruiting and training of teachers. These are dollars targeted and managed at the local level.

As you can see Mr. Speaker the Class Size Reduction program has had a huge amount of success in my state and district—as I'm sure it has in my fellow colleagues' states and districts.

In the area of School Construction in my State: 69% of schools report at least one inadequate building feature (e.g., roof, plumbing, electrical, etc.) 75% of schools report at least one unsatisfactory environmental factor (e.g., air quality, heating, lighting, etc.)

Enrollment in New Mexico increased 12.3% over the last decade. And current estimates indicate that my state faces a \$1.8 billion cost for school modernization, including \$1.4 billion for infrastructure and \$340 million for technology needs.

By supporting the President's request for \$1.3 billion for grants and loans for emergency renovations—Schools in New Mexico and across the country would be able to compete for funds allocated to the state to assist them in their school construction needs.

Mr. Speaker, when we talk about education we need not think of the politics which divides this chamber and polarizes our work. When we talk about education we need to think about our teachers who teach in over crowded classrooms.

We need to think about our students who are being taught in crumbling classrooms and schools.

We need to think about these current problems—And we need to act now, and act today by supporting the President's education agenda and supporting our nation's teachers and students. Our students and their families, and our country cannot afford anything less.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, in Greenfield, Massachusetts, a town of 20,000 people, the middle school was closed because walls were literally crumbling, threatening the safety of students. Now the middle school students are crammed into the town's overcrowded high school which has leaking roofs.

Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago, the majority passed a bill that assigned \$2.5 billion over 5 years for school construction bonds to build and repair schools. In the very same bill they assigned \$18 billion, seven times as much, in business tax cuts over the same 5 years. Those business tax cuts included increasing the business tax deduction for meals from 50 to 70 percent and repealing several taxes on producers and marketers of alcoholic beverages. Remember, the three-martini lunches? That is a very clear picture of wrong priorities.

This is October 28. We are 4 weeks into the fiscal year, CR number eight,

and our work is not done. This is the longest session in the history of the Nation.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), a leader on the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentlewoman from New York, for yielding me this time. I also want to commend the Chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, who I have served with for the last several years, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

I rise in support of a partnership between the Federal level and our local communities to help on reducing class size, to help with discipline in the classroom, to help with parental involvement, to help with quality teachers.

Something that I have worked with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS) on and with several Democrats and Republicans is to try to move and transition to teaching people with math and science and technological experience from mid-career positions into the classroom. That transition to teaching, to provide those people with expertise from Main Street into the classrooms, will help us in our local communities decide what to do about the challenges of educating all of our children. It is local accountability, it is local flexibility, but it is putting emphasis on quality teaching. I hope that this Congress will act in a bipartisan way on that.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for this initiative; and, frankly, I think the Baltimore Sun is right, this is a Republican gridlock. Because any parent in America who can say to me that they have not seen crumbling school buildings or overcrowded school buildings are probably not looking at the Nation's schools in the last 10 to 15 years.

What we are suggesting, Mr. Speaker, is that we have a crisis, similar to the Marshall Plan after World War II. We need to confront schools on a national level to rebuild them. What we are trying to say is that this budget and appropriation bills that have been put forward by the Republicans do not address the crisis and the emergency.

This is not a game. This is a serious effort to ensure that we leave here with local communities having tax credits and incentives to put the money directly on rebuilding the schools. It is plain and simple. That is why we are here on Saturday. That is why we will be here on Sunday. And that is why we will be here throughout the time, because we need to do the right thing.

I want to see children in safe, secure, well-heated and proper schools. Mr.

Speaker, let us do the right thing together.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FORD).

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have heard all my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, particularly the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, tout some of the successes of the committee. I serve on that committee and am glad to serve under his leadership, but I might add that some of the successes that we tout we have not seen them signed into law. I think the chairman would admit that he has had difficulty with some of these even on his side.

I heard the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) talk about how close we are and how sad it is that we cannot close that gap. He mentions that we are perhaps promoting something false on this side. There is nothing false about kids learning in closets, there is nothing false about children learning in bathrooms, there is nothing false about children learning in trailers connected to their schools.

If we can find \$.25 trillion a year to help build roads and highways and bridges; if we can find Federal dollars to build prisons, then we ought to be able to find some dollars to build schools for children. The only quota that my friends on the other side of the aisle support, and I have many friends on that side of the aisle and do not mean to cast aspersions, is the quota to raise the number of foreign workers we allow into our nation to hold down jobs which we cannot produce enough people in our country to do that.

Let us pass this motion and do right by our children. I look forward to working with both chairmen to get this done.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, to advise my dear friend from New York that I will be yielding to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) in just a minute, and then I will reserve the balance of my time so I can have a closing statement prior to the time the gentlewoman makes her statement.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to thank the chairman and to advise him that I believe I have two more brief speeches.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), but I just wanted the gentlewoman to know in advance what my plan was.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time.

I have listened with great interest and with, sadly, some misgivings to the tone of this debate. Let me start with a point of agreement. My friend from North Carolina and my neighbor from New Mexico said this is not a game. They are exactly right. How sad it is,

then, that such partisan invective is brought into this debate.

As the father of two children in the Cave Creek Unified School District in Arizona, I have a firsthand knowledge of the challenges teachers face in the classroom, of the special challenges of growth in that school district, of the bond issue that will be on the ballot in a few short days. I heard the litany of challenges outlined on this side. I would not take issue with the reality of the need that is there. But I am compelled to point out the fact to my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that just 2 days ago we empowered local districts with over \$16 billion to deal with a variety of projects.

My friend from Pennsylvania, under his leadership, we have moved for the full Federal component of funding for children with special needs, a promise made nearly a quarter century ago that was left unfulfilled.

There reaches a point, my colleagues, when we must put people before politics. Join with us in the broad goals of empowering local districts, parents in the homes, teachers in the classroom, leaders in the communities, and give them the latitude they need.

Sadly, I must ask my colleagues to reject this motion to instruct and deal with the reality and come together in an agreement that is good for every child in this country.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentlewoman from New York has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

(Mrs. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, just 2 weeks ago, in the City of Cleveland, at a high school called East High School, the roof fell in. I called the Department of Education and said, "Is there emergency money at the Federal level to assist my public school in a situation like this?" Sadly, it was reported that there was none.

In Ohio, the Supreme Court has determined that the way in which schools are funded throughout Ohio is unconstitutional. It is done by way of property tax. So that means that in one city in Ohio \$2,000 is spent on education per capita, but in another city in Ohio \$15,000 is spent on each child per capita.

I ask my colleagues to vote for this motion to instruct because our schools need funding and assistance.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

I want to rise in support of this very important motion to instruct. Over the last year, I have taken the opportunity to visit every school in my district,

and I have seen students trying to learn in hallways, in bathrooms, in closets, and cafeterias. It is time to do something to help our local school districts.

This is not about the Federal Government stepping in and telling local school districts what to do, it is about working in partnership with our school districts all over the country, whether they be in rural or urban or suburban or fast-growing districts.

I urge this body to support the motion to instruct. There is nothing more important we can do for our future and for our children.

I rise today in support of the School Construction Motion to Instruct Conferees, because I believe the last days of this Congress present us with a clear choice. We can help communities hire 100,000 new teachers, reduce class size, and modernize schools or we can pass block grants that don't ensure that a single new teacher will be hired or a single classroom built.

My district, the Second Congressional District of Colorado, is a microcosm of the American West. It is urban, suburban and rural, high growth and unspoiled mountain communities. For all of my districts diversity of terrain and community size, it is a district of crumbling schools.

Since coming to Congress last year, I have traveled to every high school in my district. I can tell you there are far too many kids crammed in classrooms of 30 or more and far too many students trying to work in modular or temporary spaces like trailers. One High School I visited (one of the newer schools) is already surpassing its growth projections. High Schools built in the 1970s and designed for graduating classes of 200–300 students, now face numbers that are two and three times that.

I am not happy to be here on a Saturday morning, nearly a month into the fiscal year, to encourage the Majority to make good on their stated goal of improving education. I would rather be at home with my family, among my constituents, but I am here because a firm commitment to school modernization and construction is needed nationwide. With this vote we can send a message to the Majority that it is time to target funds to build much needed new schools and to rebuild our crumbling schools.

While time is running short, I believe there is still time to do right by our nation's children.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York, my good friend, for yielding me this time. We represent similar areas in New York, Bronx County, Westchester County; and we know there are problems with schools in those counties.

We need to hire 100,000 new teachers. We want to get our schools' classes down in size so there are no more than 18 students per class. We will need to build new schools, hire 100,000 teachers and fix and repair crumbling school buildings.

I am the father of three children. I am a former teacher; my wife is a former teacher, I was a guidance counselor. There is nothing more important

to the future of this Nation than to get our class sizes down. Any parent knows that the less children there are in a classroom the more the children can learn and get personalized attention.

So I support this instruction for conferees. I think we should move in a bipartisan fashion to fund our schools, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this.

Again, we need 100,000 teachers, we need to build new schools, and fix and repair crumbling school buildings.

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

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

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. One point I would like to make to the gentleman that said there was no money for her schools is that the Department of Education's books have been unauditible. In one year, one year, they have over \$100 million of student loans they cannot even account for. All of the agencies need to be digitalized so that they can at least track the funds.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from New York for bringing up this issue because this is a good debate. We need to be discussing this issue.

I heard some things on that side that I agreed with. In fact, I heard one of my colleagues on the other side say that this should be a partnership. Mr. Speaker, I agree, this should be a partnership. That is where both partners have equal enjoyment of the authority and the jurisdiction. But under the motion to instruct, I just have the feeling and I am really convinced that this would be a one-sided partnership with the Federal Government being by far the most senior partner.

Now, that really disturbs me, and the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) just made the case that the Department of Education could not account for \$100 million worth of student loans last year and could not audit their accounts. Now, I do not think I want that educational department running the school districts in Pinellas County, Florida, where I have the privilege of representing the teachers and the students and the parents. But we will soon vote on this issue, and we are going to decide whether or not we want the Federal Government and Federal aid with all kinds of strings on it to our local systems.

But I want to make this as a closing argument. We believe strongly in education, and the money that we have already agreed to provide is in excess of what the President requested.

1330

Let me say that again, Mr. Speaker. The money that we are agreeing to provide as we speak today is in excess of what the President of the United States asked for. As we negotiate the final agreement on this appropriations

bill, I am convinced that that number will be even higher. So we are not arguing about the dollars. What we are arguing about is who controls the dollars. Our position is that the dollars should be controlled by the people in the school districts, where they know what their needs are far better than the Department of Education or some other bureaucracy here in Washington, D.C.

And then I want to say this, Mr. Speaker. I have spent a lot of my time in the Congress, my assignment being national defense, national security, intelligence, and I am proud of the fact that we have a tremendous military capability. We have the best kids serving in our uniforms. They are all not kids but the vast majority of them are. I have visited with almost every one of the sailors aboard the U.S.S. *Cole* who were injured. I visited with them as they came home, I visited with them in the hospital, I even visited with some of them in their ambulances. They are kids. But they provide a strong national defense.

We do not have the largest Army by a long shot. There are five or six other countries with a much larger army than we have. In Desert Storm we had 18 divisions. Today we only have 10. That is a tremendous downsizing which I do not agree with. But we have a technological advantage. We have created superior technology, superior weapons systems, and we have smart young people who are able to handle these defense systems. That is important, because without a strong national security, most of these other things we argue about would not even be arguable. In fact, without a strong national security, this Congress probably would not even be here; we would not exist. Some dictator would be running this country.

The point is, Mr. Speaker, that without a good, strong, effective educational system, we could not develop the technology that we have developed, that is super, that is better than any other in the world. There are still others out there that have nuclear weapons and have all kinds of threats they could pose to the United States. But we have the great technology, and we have the young men and women who are able to handle, to manage, to administer that technology. If we do not maintain and continue to improve our educational systems, the ability to defend this country deteriorates as we allow our educational systems to deteriorate.

We believe in a strong education. We are determined to provide for a strong and effective education. But we understand that when we are dealing with K-12 and local educational communities and local schools and local teachers, that the decisions on whether they need new schools or whether they need more new teachers or whether they need special education, whether they need more books, whether they need computers, those needs should be de-

termined in the school district, by the people who know what their needs are, not by the Department of Education in Washington, D.C. who cannot even account for \$100 million worth of student loans this last year.

I hope we reject this motion to instruct the conferees. Let the conferees continue on the track that we are on now, which is providing more money for education but guaranteeing that local people, local teachers, local taxpayers, local parents will have control over how that money is spent.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this motion to instruct.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

Mr. TIERNEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot let go unanswered the comments of the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) and the chairman about the Department of Education, who, when they had some difficulty in one of their audits, responded more quickly than any other agency I can remember in righting that ship.

It is amazing for people that do not want to get partisan, they neglect to note the fact that the Department of Defense financial statements for 1998 were less timely than ever and a record \$1.7 trillion of unsupported adjustments were identified by auditors. The same was true roughly in the following year. They do not ask for the Department of Defense to be closed down, but both the Texas platform of the Republican Party and this party on the other side of the aisle is in favor of closing the Department of Education. They should be ashamed of raising an issue like that.

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

My good friend and colleagues on the other side of the aisle have been doing a lot of talking during this campaign about education. We hear about how important education is. Yet they want to close down the Department of Education. I want to make it very clear. I have visited schools all over this country. I have seen young people who have to work in the shiny corporations because they do not have computers at their desk. There are wires hanging out of windows. Vandals will cut them at night. There are youngsters who have to run from one side of the building to the other side of the building because it is raining. The schools are crumbling.

In 1996, the problem was \$112 billion. Now it is \$300 billion. If we can build roads, bridges, highways, prisons, then while we are assisting our local governments, we can provide the emergency aid to rebuild our schools. Our children deserve no less.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The Chair reminds all persons

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

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 150, nays 159, not voting 123, as follows:

[Roll No. 573]

YEAS—150

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

NAYS—159

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

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

NOT VOTING—123

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

1356

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

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

ADJOURNMENT TO SUNDAY, OCTOBER 29, 2000

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

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

WHAT WE DO IN WASHINGTON DOES MATTER AND MATTERS A LOT

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

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

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

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

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

1400

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SHALLOW RHETORIC UNDERMINES CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

DEMOCRATS DEMONSTRATE SERIOUS COMMITMENT TO EDUCATION

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

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

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

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

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

it is incumbent upon this United States House of Representatives to try to help create the type of innovative financing to help school districts take care of themselves at home. In our State, there is a limit on how much one can raise in property taxes from a property taxpayer.

I was a county school tax assessor collector also for a while following the time that I taught, and I know that they have difficulty raising those dollars. I know what it is like to be a taxpayer, a property taxpayer at home and not be able to pay or afford to pay all of the taxes that we have to try to accomplish the many things that we have to do within our schools to keep our children learning and give them the opportunity to be good productive citizens and not end up either victimizing somebody or being victims themselves or going to jail.

Mr. Speaker, we have not made the right commitment, and that is what this debate is all about. Obviously, we all want to see our schools better. When are we going to make it the priority and do it? Our colleagues on the Republican side clearly have not done that.

Our own State of Texas has a plan in the Republican platform for its State to abolish the U.S. Department of Education. That to me does not speak to a commitment to make education better in this country.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, I too listened to the other speaker and I too am I classroom teacher. I taught for 9 years, middle school math, in a very poor, rural area.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, that is what my daughter teaches.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, I too worked in one of those places that nobody wants to talk about, those portables. But I say to the gentleman, I am tired of hearing on this floor about how we controlled the House and we controlled the Senate for those first 2 years with the presidency. We were paying down a debt. There was no money. There could be no discussion about these issues. And on top of that, we had our States, because at that time I was in the State Senate in the 1980s, and this country was going through a recession. There was no money in the States to deal with these problems. So these things just went up and up and up.

Now, they want to come and say well, you did not do anything about it. Well, this is the first time we have had any surpluses to even be able to talk about it, and now what we are trying to talk about is \$25 billion to do school construction, and the rest of the K through 3 program where we have been putting teachers.

I am also tired of hearing about how we are taking this away from the local level, it is their issue, they ought to be

able to control it. Ask them to go look in their State legislatures. How many of them have adopted the goal to make K through 3 education top priority in reducing class size? How many States in this country are doing after-school programs? How many of these? In fact, just 2 years ago, when this whole school construction came up, our State legislature was having to call a special session to deal with the issue of school construction.

Yes, we are talking about it now because we have an opportunity to talk about it.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me this time.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the gentlewoman's comments.

It is clear, there is a difference in commitment to this issue. The Democrats indeed want to attempt to make a real difference, and I hope that instead of asking, as the gentlewoman well stated, instead of asking the question, where were you while we were in control, well, why has there not been some commitment, some effort to truly explain what the Republican commitment is while they have been in control of this House of Representatives in the last several years. I think we are doing so, and we are doing so in a responsible manner; and I hope that with our continued push that we will achieve that.

IMPROVING HEALTH CARE FOR AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my Democratic colleagues who have joined me on the floor today for this Special Order hour. We are here this afternoon on a beautiful fall day, here in this House Chamber, trying to urge this Congress not to adjourn for the year until we finish the job of meeting the health care needs of America's families.

Democrats in the House have worked for the entire 2-year session of this Congress to give America's families a strong Patients' Bill of Rights to ensure that you and your family make your health care along with your doctor, rather than having some insurance clerk who has never had a day of medical training, decide the treatment that you need. We have worked to make sure that when you are ill and when you are fighting for your life, that you do not have to also fight your insurance company to get the help that you need.

Democrats in this Congress have been united also in the fight to give a prescription drug benefit to our senior citizens. We have worked for an optional part D under Medicare to guarantee that our seniors will never again

have to make the choice between buying groceries and paying the rent or filling their prescriptions. And the Democrats in this Congress are united in our efforts to protect Americans' access to quality health care. We are fighting as we speak during the ongoing negotiations in the closing days of this Congress to answer the pleas from our hospitals, from our home health care providers, from our nursing homes and our other health care providers that we must strengthen Medicare, because many of us know that we have Medicare-dependent hospitals that will close their doors if Congress fails to get this job done.

1415

Home health agencies have already closed by the thousands and our teaching hospitals are no longer able to pursue teachers, research, and indigent care due to lack of funding.

The American people have a right to know where this Republican-controlled Congress has failed to lead and failed to solve these pressing problems that confront every American family.

They have a right to know who is on their side, and they have a right to know who is fighting for them. The answer is all too clear. The Republican-controlled Congress has become the special-interest-controlled Congress. The powerful special interests are in the driver's seat, and the public interests are in the backseat.

On these three critical issues, patient protection, prescription drugs and protecting Medicare, the Republicans have danced to the tune of the big insurance companies and the big prescription drug manufacturers.

On patient protection, the powerful insurance industry has fought in every State legislature and in this Congress to defeat meaningful patient rights. I carried the first patient protection legislation in the country when I was a State senator in Texas. The State Senate there and the State House voted almost unanimously in favor of a bipartisan patient protection bill. That bill was vetoed by Governor Bush, and he vetoed it after the legislature had adjourned when we had no opportunity to override.

Fortunately, the legislature came back in the next session 2 years later and passed almost the identical package in four parts, and Governor Bush signed three, but let the fourth, regarding accountability of HMOs, become law without his signature.

Fortunately, we have patient protection in many of our States, but we know that we must also pass a Federal bill to be sure that all patients under all plans are covered with these protections.

Early in this session of Congress, this House passed a strong patients' bill of rights with near unanimous support from Democrats and the courageous support of Republican Members, like the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr.

NORWOOD), only to see the bill watered down in the Senate and now languish in a conference committee with no action.

I ask the American people, who is on your side? Who is fighting for you? On prescription drugs, Democrats have united in support of a voluntary universal prescription drug benefit under Medicare, but our Republican friends have joined with the pharmaceutical industry to defeat our plan.

The pharmaceutical industry created a front group called Citizens for Better Medicare, if you can imagine, and spent millions of dollars in advertising across this country to say to the American people that private insurance can take care of the problem of prescription drugs for our seniors.

We know that Medicare is the system that our seniors trust, and we know that the big pharmaceutical manufacturers do not want a prescription drug benefit under Medicare because they know if Medicare is in the business of helping our seniors get prescription drugs, Medicare is not going to pay the same high prices that our seniors are having to pay every day when they walk in their local retail pharmacies.

Our Republican friends even introduced and passed a bill on the floor of this House authorizing insurance companies to offer prescription drug-only plans to seniors when even the president of Blue Cross and Blue Shield testified to this Congress that the plan was neither workable nor affordable for our senior citizens.

Well, that plan backed by the Republican leadership and by the big pharmaceutical companies never has become the law fortunately; but still we have been unable to pass a prescription drug benefit under Medicare.

Democrats want to update Medicare to make it consistent with the times, because we know that prescription drugs are now a big part of all of our health care costs.

It is time to end the pharmaceutical manufacturers' practice of charging America's seniors the highest prices paid anywhere in the world for prescription drugs. I ask the American people, who is on your side? Who is fighting for you?

Finally, when we look at what is happening today, this week, in this Congress, when we are fighting to increase funding for Medicare to save our hospitals and our health care providers, the Republicans put forth a bill and passed it on the floor of this House, which the President has pledged, fortunately, to veto, that dedicates 40 percent of the increase in funding directly to the insurance company HMOs with no guarantee that any of that money will ever get to our hospitals, our health care providers, or our senior citizens on Medicare.

Why with only 15 percent of America's seniors living in an area where they even have access to a Medicare HMO plan would the Republican leadership give 40 percent of the increase in

funding to the insurance industry? I ask the American people, who is on your side? Who is fighting for you?

We, Democrats, have gathered on the floor today to talk about these issues, and it is a pleasure for me to yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN), one of the best and hardest working Members of this Congress. The gentlewoman has worked on prescription drugs for seniors as long as any of us, and I am proud to yield time to her to discuss these important issues.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate those words from the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), but I would dare say that the gentleman and other Members of this Congress feel passionately about this health care issue as the gentleman so eloquently described in your opening remarks.

I think the gentleman is right, we are on their side.

I just want to go over some things, because the gentleman mentioned about a piece of legislation that potentially is going to be vetoed, if it ever gets to the President, I understand we may not get it there, but the fact of the matter is, two things I would say to the gentleman. I just received a letter October 20 from a gentleman, and he has also sent me some additional information on what is happening with his Medicare choice program, but it is very interesting. In the middle of his letter he says the medication providers made it tough to live up to these standards and something must be done to save the senior citizen, as well as the poor and middle-class citizens who cannot afford these high prices of medication.

Mr. Speaker, he went on to say, when I was in the Marine Corps in World War II, we were taught how to survive. But what is happening to us now with this health care system and prescriptions does not afford or teach us the liberty of surviving.

What I think caused him to send this letter to me was the letter that he just received from his Medicare choice program. Now, remembering the gentleman just said what was just passed was about \$8 billion or more that will go to these Medicare choice programs, even one of them getting about a 3 percent increase, before this bill was even voted on, before they even knew what potentially would be the outcome, this is what they wrote to him, the name of the plan is changing in 2001 as shown in the table below. So-and-so's premium will no longer be offered in 2001. You will be automatically enrolled in this particular plan instead. I am not going to mention names. If after reviewing the benefit changes, you decide that this plan is not acceptable, you may wish to receive information about a valued plan available in your area.

This is how it goes. They have a chart. I would have blown up this chart, because I think it is very interesting. It is these kinds of phone calls and letters I am getting.

Benefit, monthly plan premium, 2000, \$19; 2001, \$179, from \$19 to \$179. Out-

patient, physician specialist services, \$10 office visit copayment; \$15 office visit copayment, 2001. Outpatient hospital, \$20 in 2000; \$35 in 2001. Inpatient, no copayment; \$1,000, 2001, \$200 per day, limit 3 copayments per year. Inpatient hospital care, nonnetwork facility, no copayment; 2001, \$500 copayment per admission. Mental health, no copayment; 2001, \$200 per day, limit 3 copayment per year. Prescription drug, \$1,000 on outpatient prescription drug benefit, maximum benefit \$1,000, annual maximum for brand name drugs, the amount applied towards the benefit maximum was calculated as follows, the usual and customary price of the medication or the average wholesale price, whatever is less, plus the dispensing fee, minus your copayment. That is what happens in 2000. 2001, \$50 monthly maximum for brand name drugs, the amount applied to the benefit maximum is the amount that this company pays for the drugs.

Now, they are going to get a 3 percent, only covering about 15 percent by the way of the entire population, which is 40 percent of this entire package, and they are already sending out these notices saying that they are going to go from \$19 to \$179 and every other expense they have is also out of pocket expense going up. That is what I received.

Now, have we addressed this? We tried to address this. It was not going to make any difference. This is what they already said. By the way, on the back page, it says if you want to know you can opt out of this. I mean, these people are not going to have any place to go.

At a rare moment of this year in a political debate that I have actually made on a Sunday afternoon, I was handed, not by the same person, but by another person a monthly statement of what their medicines would cost. This is what really struck me. At the end of it, it said previous balance, \$649.59, charges this month \$2,322.56.

We have stood on this floor, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY), the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) have stood here and talked about at least one thing that we could have done that would have cost the Federal Government nothing. We are missing the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), our friend.

I say to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), we have offered it in the committee. We said put it under the Federal supply system. Use the Federal Government's buying power by buying the medicines at a reduced price. Use us just like we do in the VA system, just imagine this one alone would have been cut by almost \$1,200, just that one. Not even a benefit that we are fighting about right now. Just cut this in half. Let us be the buyer of this.

We buy bulk paper. We buy the hammers. We buy the highways. We buy

the bridges. We do all of those things. We use our buying power for those purposes. Why can we not use that for these folks? Why are we saddling not only with the prescription drug costs that are outrageous and expensive and certainly not going for research, and I am sure somebody could jump up and talk about that, as we all could, but the fact of the matter is it is lining somebody's pocket. And on top of that, we have the increased costs.

My colleagues know what my solution is. I think we ought to get rid of Medicare choice. I think we ought to get rid of MSAs. I think we ought to get rid of all of that. I think we ought to look at a Medicare program that gives the safety net for every senior and not discriminate because they live in an area where they can get a Medicare choice or not.

We ought to be making sure that these things are covered under Medicare, become a Medicare benefit, and that would solve an awful lot of problems for a lot of people and would give us a health care system that is stabilized and not so off and on again and pulling people in and out of these programs, but something they can count on, which is what they always thought they were going to have when they had Medicare.

Mr. TURNER. I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN), and I appreciate her hard work on these issues. Her work in committee as well as on the floor has meant much to all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), one of the most effective younger Members of this Congress, another Member who has worked with us very closely on these very critical issues.

Mr. LARSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), and I appreciate his great leadership on this very important issue before Congress.

I think it is instructive to those that are listening today on a Saturday afternoon that we are here continuing to press this vitally important issue. We are here for the people that Tom Brokaw appropriately recognized as the greatest generation ever, those people who persevered through the great Depression, who won the Second World War, who came home and rebuilt this great country of ours, provided for interstate commerce and made sure that we had school systems that were second to none so that we have risen today to be the preeminent military, economic, cultural and social force in the world.

1430

All they are asking for is to live out their final days in dignity. I can say it no better than the woman who was on 60 Minutes who said, "I feel like I am a refugee from my own health care system, a refugee from my own health care system because I have to travel to Canada to get the prescription drugs

that my doctor has recommended I take because I cannot afford them here in my own country."

That is why we need the legislation that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) has sponsored, that the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN) spoke about. That is why it is so important, as it should have been in 1965, that we follow the President's lead and the Vice President's lead in making sure that we make prescription drugs part of Medicare.

As the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN) has pointed out as well, also following along the lines of the Allen bill which so many of us have supported here as well, that makes nothing short of common sense, that will not cost one new dollar in terms of adding onto bureaucracy, no new tax dollars, but just using the Federal Government as a resource, and pulling those Medicare recipients along with those Federal employees that already receive a discount, thus driving down the cost of prescription drugs for our elderly.

Everywhere I go across my district I can think of no more poignant issue where people have been calling upon Congress to put down their partisan differences. Instead, we get a charade. We get a charade of proposals claiming to have been for or have passed something akin to prescription drug relief.

The Republican proposal I have aptly named the Marie Antoinette plan. My colleagues all recall when those in Paris were starving and the then Queen said, "They are without bread. Let them eat cake."

The seniors of this country have come to the capital, have plead with us to give them prescription drug relief, and our Republican counterparts are saying, "They are in need of prescription drugs. Let them buy insurance."

That is not the way to make sure that we protect and provide for the greatest generation ever, those individuals that have sacrificed so much for this Nation of ours. Let us get behind the American plan, not Democrat, not Republican, but the plan that allows people to live out their final days in dignity and provides them the access to prescription drugs, as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) pointed out, that will not have them faced with the decision of choosing between the food they put on their table, the monies they need to heat their home, or the drugs that their doctors have recommended that they take to survive. I commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) for putting forward this very important issue at this critical time.

We have got a governor out there who is cawing how he can bring people together. I have a suggestion, call the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), call the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), two of his fellow Texans, tell them to pull this Congress together in the waning days and pass on to those seniors. This is not a bipartisan issue,

this is an issue of survival, this is a moral obligation on the part of this Congress to make sure that those seniors, those citizens that have given so much need these drugs to survive. Let us get together and make it happen. I commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) for his leadership.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I know we all agree with the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) completely. I appreciate his conviction on the issue.

Another Member who has worked tirelessly on this effort to bring fairness in prescription drug prices and a prescription drug benefit under Medicare to our seniors is the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) on this subject.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) for his leadership on this, and my colleagues who are here to speak to this.

Mr. Speaker, I did not come to the health care issue as a new Member of Congress because it polled well. I came to Congress as a member of the health care profession because we have a health care crisis.

For 23 years before serving in this body, I worked with patients. I was a clinical psychologist. I worked with cancer patients, with head injury patients, with folks with severe mental illness. I can tell my colleagues that, when we talk about 44 million uninsured Americans, 11 million uninsured children, those are not just numbers, those translate into real human lives.

I have worked with patients who put off needed health care. By the time they came to us, their disease had progressed so far, there was nothing more we could do. I have been by their bedside as they died. This is not a political issue. It is not something for rhetorical flourish. It is a day-to-day matter of life and death for American people.

This Congress has named post offices. This Congress has passed resolutions on this and that. But this Congress has yet to pass a real Patients' Bill of Rights, a Patients' Bill of Rights that lets one choose one's health care provider, puts medical decisions in the hands of medical professionals, and holds insurance companies accountable when they deny one care.

This Congress has not passed that bill. Part of the reason we have not passed that bill is we have also not passed campaign finance reform. We have had a chance, but it has been held up again, two critical bills that could have passed.

The reason we cannot pass the Patients' Bill of Rights is the special interests who do not want to see that pass, who make money off other people suffering, have so heavily invested in certain campaigns that we will not even bring it to a serious discussion in the conference committee.

This Congress has not addressed pharmaceutical costs. The gentleman

from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) talked about the Republican plan as the Marie Antoinette plan, very apt prescription. I call it the placebo plan. Placebos, as my colleagues know, are medications or pseudo-medications designed to make one feel better if one believes they work, but they have no real effect. They are sugar pills.

Congress should not be passing sugar pills. The American people deserve better than placebos. The only bill we have managed to bring up is a placebo bill that resulted from polling that said the following: you have got to do something because the American people think there is a need for pharmaceutical benefits. But it does not matter what you do, so long as you say you care.

Saying you care and showing you care are different things. This body is in session still. We have set a record, I understand, one of the longest sessions of Congress in an election year. But in that time we have taken, that extended time, we have passed no Patients' Bill of Rights, no real pharmaceutical benefits. We have not done anything substantive to reduce the numbers of uninsured children and uninsured seniors in this country.

Our rural hospitals, Mr. Speaker, are suffering. There is a little bitty hospital named Morton General in a little mountain town, a timber town that has been pretty hard hit over the years. The winter weather is hitting Washington State right now up in the Cascades.

That town is an hour away from any trauma center. If a woman has a complicated pregnancy, or a logger sustains a serious ailment, that is the only hospital within an hour they can get to. With that winter weather, one is not going to be able to get a life flight up there.

This week we passed a bill before this Congress that will not do what we need to do to protect our rural hospitals. It will not do what we need to do to protect our urban and suburban hospitals. It will not do what we need to do to protect our home health agencies. We passed it for the same reason we passed the placebo prescription medication bill, for political purposes, not for health care purposes. That, Mr. Speaker, is wrong.

We are in the richest country in the history of the world, the richest country in the history of the world; and 44 million Americans, 11 million children have no health insurance. Senior citizens choose every week whether or not to take their medication or pay their rent. Doctors are leaving our suburban and rural hospitals because they cannot afford to pay back their student loans. It is a disgrace.

Mr. Speaker, almost every weekend for the past 2 years, I have flown home to be with my constituents. I have had 103 town meetings. At every one of those, someone has brought me their prescription medication bill and said, please help us with this.

I would like to be home in my district right now, not so much because there is an election, but because I would like to be home and listen to my constituents.

But if we are here, for goodness sakes let us do something that matters. Let us do something that matters. We are not going to do that. We are going to pass CR after CR after CR. We are not going to do it. It is a shame. The 106th Congress is going to go down as the longest Congress to have done the least in American history.

I applaud the leadership of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER). I applaud my Democratic colleagues who have tried to do something really substantive for the American people.

I would appeal to this body, in the few days left, let us take a chance and work together and solve at least some of these problems, a Patients' Bill of Rights, a pharmaceutical benefit, real help for our rural hospitals, not a give-back to HMOs, but real help for our hospitals.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) certainly brought the issues right down to home by the examples that he gave. I think many times people feel like we are down here debating some high-minded set of issues. But the truth is these issues make a difference to America's families. They make a difference to our hospitals and our districts. They make a difference to those health care providers that are out there trying to take care of the needs of the people we represent.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON), one of my Texas colleagues who has also worked very hard on these issues, who comes from a background where he has firsthand familiarity with the home health care industry, an individual who has fought hard on behalf of the people of his district and of Texas.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, certainly not near as hard as what the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) has. The leadership that he has taken and put forth, both in the Texas legislature as a member of the Texas Senate, and then up here following through has been most appreciated. Without the effort that the gentleman has made, many of our colleagues would not have had the benefit of the knowledge, nor the encouragement to have played much of the role that we have. So we commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), and we thank him very much for that.

Mr. Speaker, I was involved in the home health care business. I went to graduate school in hospital administration following college. Then after, I taught school for a number of years. I have basically done three things. I was a schoolteacher. I was involved in local politics. Then I, when I was very much involved with the area agency on aging for southeast Texas, became involved with home health care.

I was a delegate to the White House Conference on Aging in 1995. One of our

colleagues spoke a few minutes ago of our elderly seeking the opportunity to live out their years in dignity. Well, at that White House Conference on Aging in 1995, there were basically three goals that were set. They were to save social security, save Medicare, and save the Older Americans Act.

It was felt that, through the 5,000 people or so that participated in that conference, through the many, many, many meetings that took place over 6 or 8 days that we were there, that the primary goal was to give people the opportunity to live in dignity and to be independent in their last years of their lives.

That is what I want to talk about today. I guess it is the state of this Nation's health care that concerns me so greatly, all of us so greatly.

We saw recently, after we passed H.R. 2614, that the Republican leadership combined five bills into a conference report, even though much of what was in those conference reports had not been even considered by the Senate.

Some of the key components, like the Medicare provisions and even the, going back to education for a second, the school construction tax subsidized bonds, none of those were considered by either the House or the Senate.

It is the Democrats who have taken the lead in proposing a balanced package of Medicare and Medicaid restorations. This package ignores the efforts of the President and congressional Democrats to get Republicans to the table to craft such bills.

Instead, Republicans unilaterally put forward this partisan package. It truly bothers me. I am bothered by the Medicare, the Medicaid and the State CHIP provisions in this bill. This portion of the bill has never been acted on by either the House or the Senate.

There are increases of some \$31 billion over 5 years for Medicare, Medicaid and State CHIP providers. Of this, 41 percent goes to HMOs with no real guarantee that they will pass the funds on to beneficiaries in the form of enhanced benefits. In fact, there is not even a guarantee that they will have to stay in the communities that they now serve.

So much of the money in this bill is spent on HMOs that there is not enough for hospitals or nursing homes or home health care agencies or hospices or even community mental health centers. Only about 7 percent of the net increase in Medicare spending in the bill will directly benefit Medicare beneficiaries.

1445

While I have my colleague's ear, and while I have the opportunity to visit for a few minutes up here, I would like to make a comment about prescription drugs. It was about a month ago, I think, that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the Speaker of the House, sent a letter to the President outlining a number of health care issues that could be resolved before

Congress adjourns. And the President wrote back, and his response said, "I am extremely disappointed by your determination that it is impossible to pass a voluntary Medicare prescription drug benefit this year. I simply disagree. There is indeed time to act, and I urge you to use the final weeks of this Congress to get this important work done. It is the only way we can ensure rapid, substantial, and much-needed relief from the prescription drug costs for all seniors and people with disabilities, including low-income beneficiaries." That is what the President said.

Similarly, I signed on to a letter to Speaker HASTERT expressing my concern to learn that he had sent a letter to the President declaring his unwillingness to adopt a real Medicare prescription drug benefit before Congress adjourns this year. I disagreed that it is too late to pass real prescription drug legislation. I urged the Republican leadership to schedule for consideration legislation to improve meaningful drug coverage for all seniors. And has that been done yet? Is it on the schedule? No.

The Republicans' low-income-only prescription drug plan is an empty promise to seniors because it is not a Medicare plan. It would exclude 25 million Medicare beneficiaries from coverage. It includes no real protections or guaranteed benefits. It would provide no help to a majority of even those who would be eligible. It would take years before its coverage provisions would be implemented. And even State officials, who would be responsible for implementing the program, said that they cannot do it. Well, this proposal is really no help at all to seniors who desperately need prescription drug coverage.

We have a responsibility to the American people to act on important issues facing this Nation. It is time to listen to the thousands upon thousands of seniors who have deluged our offices, certainly mine, with heart-wrenching letters of outrageously expensive prescription bills; to hear the stories like that from my own constituent, a widower, of a lady who taught school and died because her insurance company would not pay for the treatment that she needed to save her life from breast cancer.

It is this call for leadership that this Congress has so far refused to answer, and it is time to put the people's interests ahead of the special interests and pass a universal voluntary Medicare prescription drug benefit.

One of the things that stuck out in my mind, and it has been a few years now, obviously; but back in that last Presidential campaign, Bob Dole made a comment at some point that in 1965 he voted against Medicare. I think that that was indicative to me of the difference in commitment to honoring the goals that were set by those seniors in the 1995 White House Conference on Aging. The gentleman asked the ques-

tion properly a few minutes ago: Who is it that is going to be on the side of America and make these things reality for our Nation as we have enjoyed them over the last several decades; those things that have expanded our life-span; that has given us a quality of life to be able to enjoy the last years? It is going to be the Democrats and the Democratic proposals.

I guess the final thing that I can say is that the work that we have done has been done in a manner and a way that families in southeast Texas make decisions, with common sense and fairness. That is what I think we represent, and what our efforts are trying to be. And I thank again and commend the gentleman for his efforts that he has made and the work of all my colleagues in trying to make this become a reality for the United States of America.

Mr. TURNER. I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON).

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have heard from a clinical psychologist; we have heard from the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON), who has experience in home health care; in a minute I am allowing that we will hear from the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY), who has a background in pharmacy. But now I want to yield to the gentleman from California (Mrs. CAPPS), an outstanding Member who brings to this body her experience as a registered nurse.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Texas and appreciate my fellow Members of Congress for the time that we can have to discuss this important topic. We are in the final hours of this 106th Congress. We have passed some spending bills, but there remains still a few more.

When I think of my communities in the district that I represent and the concerns of the people that I represent, and I am so honored to represent them, I know that they look to me and to all of us in the area of health care as the most significant contribution that we can make to their lives here within the Federal Government, whether it is addressing the crisis of the number of uninsured Americans, people who face every day in terror that they will have health care needs that they have no resources to meet, or whether it is the people that I can call up in my mind, those seniors who live in my district who have to choose each day whether to fill their prescriptions, lifesaving prescriptions, or to put food on their table. These are people living on fixed incomes. They are not poverty stricken, but middle-class seniors.

These are issues that we really need to be addressing here. We need to put an affordable voluntary prescription drug opportunity for all seniors within Medicare. We need to address the issues of the uninsured.

I also want to use the minutes that the gentleman has given me to talk about another issue that people in my district have said we should do something about. They want us to do some-

thing about those HMOs that are making health care decisions in the place of their doctors.

We have had, we have still, a great opportunity to enact a bipartisan bill that passed here in the House, the Norwood-Dingell patient's bill of rights, 68 Republicans and an overwhelming number of Democrats. A good bill, yet it languishes. This is something we can still do in these last few hours of this session of Congress. It contains critical provisions which, I believe, are key to quality patient care and which come directly from the experiences of people in my district and around this country with their managed care providers and with their insurance companies.

They tell me in my district that they want to be able, as a patient, to choose their own doctors, their own hospital, to see specialists when it is appropriate. They do not appreciate having these decisions being made by insurance clerks and having the doctors told what they cannot and can do. The bill we enacted right in this House would protect medical privacy, guarantee emergency room care, and ensure that health plans cannot interfere when patients enrolled in clinical trials. Most importantly, this bill we passed holds HMOs accountable when they make medical decisions that harm patients.

And this is a sticking point, and this is why there is such tremendous opposition to it right now. But we hold physicians accountable for malpractice. And when insurance companies practice medicine in a way that is not in the interests of the patients, they should be held accountable as well.

I am from California, where HMOs got started; and I have seen for myself in my own experience and those of the people with whom I worked so many years as a school nurse that HMOs have done some wonderful things, such as spreading the availability of preventive care. But over the past decade or so in my district, the power has swung too far into the corner of HMOs and insurance companies making health care decisions and into the area of pursuing profits over patient care. Patients are being cut out of the decision-making process of their own health care. Doctors, nurses, other health care professionals are overruled by bean counters and profit takers. The bottom line is what is being intruded into health care, and our health care system is eroded today by mistrust and by anger.

This legislation that we passed here, the model that we could still enact into law, is supported by virtually every major health care organization in this country. As I mentioned, this House passed it by nearly a two-to-one margin last year. The American people support it overwhelmingly. We have no excuse that we cannot afford to do something about this. We have examples of the gentleman's own State where a patient's bill of rights has been in place and where it has worked effectively. It has not cost people more than a dollar or two more in their premiums.

The fear about everything going to the courts has not, in fact, turned that way. A very small number of lawsuits have actually resulted. When we have the example of Texas' patient's bill of rights being put into place, there is absolutely no reason why we should not be addressing this in this session of Congress before we adjourn. Our constituents at home are asking us to do this, and I am urging the leadership in this House and in the Senate and in that conference committee to deal with this before we adjourn.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, we appreciate so much the experience the gentlewoman brings to this body with her background in nursing. It gives us a unique perspective.

I want to yield now to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY). He was one of the original cosponsors of the Prescription Drug Fairness Act. He comes to this body with a background of training in pharmacy, and I think he brings not only the expertise of pharmacy to bear on these issues but I have found him to bring the common sense of rural Arkansas to bear on these issues, and for that I have been very appreciative. So I am honored to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BERRY. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), my great friend; and I want to commend him for his leadership on health care matters in this Congress and in the time that he has been here. It is nice to be here with my Democratic colleagues today that have all worked so hard to try to improve the health care system in this country.

One of the previous speakers on the Republican side earlier today said it is time for a reality check. I could not agree more. Let us check the reality of the situation we are dealing with today. We are at the end of the session. We are here on a Saturday afternoon and would be proud to be here if we were just taking up the legitimate business of the American people. We have no patient's bill of rights. We have no prescription drug coverage for our senior citizens. That is the reality. We have not made provisions for more reimbursements for our hospitals to keep them in business. They are going broke every day. That is the reality. We have made no provisions to keep our home health care providers in business. That is the reality. Nor to keep our ambulance services in business. That is the reality. We have not made provisions for school bonds, smaller classrooms, after-school classes, teacher training, or any of the education programs that our children so desperately need. That is reality.

Let us talk about what we have done. We passed a patient's bill of rights in a bipartisan way in this House, and the leadership in the House and the Senate killed it in the Senate and in conference in a disgusting way. They should be ashamed of themselves.

They raised, and the Democrats voted against it, I voted against it, but

the Republicans raised their own budget. They raised their own spending caps just a few days ago so that they could give an \$11.5 billion Christmas present to the HMOs, not to correct these problems I just talked about, not to help our seniors with a prescription drug benefit, not to provide a patient's bill of rights, not to help our hospitals or our health care providers, but to give a Christmas present, granted it would be early, but it would be a nice Christmas present to the insurance companies that have poured money, in an unprecedented way, into their campaigns. That is reality.

1500

Governor Bush stands before the American people and proclaims his great concern for our senior citizens not having prescription medicines. He claims that he almost single-handedly passed a Patients' Bill of Rights in Texas, which we all know is not right. And he also proclaims that he has this great ability to work in a bipartisan way.

I would suggest to you today, the Democrats are here. We are on the floor of the United States House of Representatives, and we are ready to go. We are ready to pass a Patients' Bill of Rights. We are ready to pass a prescription drug benefit for our seniors. We are ready to pass increased Medicare reimbursements to keep our hospitals and nursing homes and all of our other health care providers in business, not to enrich them, just keep them in business so that our seniors and our citizens in this country have decent health care in the greatest Nation that has ever been.

And he claims to have this great bipartisan ability. He will not even need bipartisan ability. We are ready to go. The Democrats are here. We are ready to do business. He has got to work on the Republicans. I would suggest, maybe he should call the Speaker Hastert. Maybe he should call the majority leader in the Senate and tell them, "I am for this." That is what he says. He says, I want to help America's seniors. I want to be sure every American that buys health insurance has the opportunity to make their own health care decisions along with their health care professionals. That is what he says. Maybe he should give the majority leader in the House a call. Maybe he should call the whip on the Republican side and say, "I'm ready to go. Let's just go ahead and do this this fall. It will be great for the campaign. We can say we don't even have to get elected. We have already gotten it done." But the reality is they only talk about it.

This is the greatest attempt to deceive a Nation that has ever been. The pharmaceutical manufacturers in this country have poured tens of millions of dollars into this campaign in an attempt to deceive the American people. Any time the American people see this tag line, Citizens for Better Medicare,

look out. What they mean is citizens for more profit for the pharmaceutical industry, and we are supporting this candidate because we think they will support us when the time comes, and we think they will protect our outrageous profits at the expense of the wonderful senior citizens in this country. And it has already been mentioned, they are the greatest generation.

It is unbelievable that we are here today and have been fighting this battle for over 2 years. Yet even though we are here on Saturday afternoon, the Democrats virtually alone in their effort to move these issues forward, and it still has not happened. The President is ready to do these; he knows it is the right thing to do. The Republicans claim they are. It is absolutely amazing that we have not been able to get this done. That is the reality check. I thank the gentleman from Texas once again for his leadership in this matter.

Mr. TURNER. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY). He has a unique way of bringing it right down to home in good common sense terms. As I asked in my opening remarks for this Special Order hour of the American people, who is on your side, who is fighting for you, I think it is clear that you and the other Democrats in this Congress are working hard to provide the prescription drug benefit, the Patients' Bill of Rights, and funding for the Medicare program that the American people want.

It is almost amazing as I heard you express it when you talked about the issue, when you try to identify who is against these things, who would want this Congress to fail to pass a Patients' Bill of Rights, who would want this Congress to fail to pass a prescription drug benefit for seniors. There are only two groups, the insurance industry and the big pharmaceutical manufacturers. Everybody else would say, "Let's move on and get the job done." As you said, we are here and we are ready to go to work and get it done before this Congress ends.

The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) brought experience as a pharmacist. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) brought his experience as a clinical psychologist. The gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPP) brought her experience as a nurse. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON) brought his experience to the table from home health care. It is now an honor and a privilege to yield time to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER), a medical doctor.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for spending part of your Saturday afternoon with us today.

I had lunch today at a Chinese restaurant. I got the little fortune cookie. I was walking, eating my cookie on the way over here. It said, "Laughter is the best medicine." My experience as a family doctor is the best medicine often causes hysterical laughter because when people get the bills and see

what they are paying for these drugs, it is a shocker for them.

My experience as a family physician, and it is a sad experience, is that the patient comes into the doctor, you write out the prescription that you think is the right thing to do and you think this can help that person and they come back a week or two later. I bet the gentlewoman from California has had this experience, the gentleman from Washington has had this experience.

"How are you doing?"

"About the same."

Well, I wonder what happened. You talk and talk and talk. You finally find out, I went to the pharmacist to get that medicine and they filled it for me, they gave me the bill and I could not afford it, and I decided not to take the medicine. That is the experience in Arkansas, as over a third of our seniors have no drug benefit at all. Also, those are the same group of people, I think it is over 60 percent of our seniors, their only source of income is Social Security. So this problem of not having a prescription drug benefit is a real one.

I was very optimistic when we began this Congress almost 2 years ago that we would do something in Medicare to modernize it. That is all we are asking for. We have a Medicare program. People talk about those bureaucrats in Washington. This is Medicare. They talk about the one-size-fits-all. This is Medicare. It is the Medicare program that my mother relies on, our parents all rely on; but it needs to be updated, and it needs to be updated with a drug program. Here we are on a Saturday afternoon, hoping that somehow in the next week before we finally adjourn that something will occur in this area; but I suspect most of us are not very optimistic that will happen.

The Patients' Bill of Rights. Let me relate another anecdote from my experience as a physician. I think that to me the worst thing I had to do that illustrates why I am a supporter of the Patients' Bill of Rights was I have had several occasions as a family doctor in recent years where if a patient came to see me and they were depressed, they had some mental health problem and I may or may not give them a prescription or do whatever I can do as a family doctor, but I thought they needed counseling and they had an insurance program. I would have to take them in, this is the way their plan worked, I would take them into a room and say, "Here's the telephone. Here is an 800 phone number; dial this number. You're going to get a complete stranger at the end of that line who will tell you, number one, do you get any counseling, number two, what kind of person will give you that counseling and, number three, how often and for how long a period you will get that counseling."

Well, that is that person. That is the patient's insurance company. They have made that decision, with their employer perhaps, to choose that in-

surance company. But my opinion as a health care provider, as a family doctor, if that clerk at the end of that phone is going to make health care decisions, then they should be just as liable as I am if something goes wrong. I see my fellow health care professionals over here also nodding their heads. That is what the most controversial part of the Patients' Bill of Rights is about, that if a health insurance program is going to practice medicine, they should be responsible legally like the rest of us that practice medicine for real. I do not know why that seems to be so controversial, but it is.

A third issue I want to touch on is this issue we have had come up just recently in the last few days with the vote on what was called this tax bill and the Medicare give-back provisions. That deals with the problem that our hospitals are struggling with around the country. A lot of us, I had promised my folks back home, yes, before we are out of here we are going to have some additional money for rural hospitals and health care providers. Lo and behold, I said, it is not going to be a problem because it is bipartisan; there is great support for it.

What happened? Instead of getting the kind of bill we all thought we were going to get, we are getting a bill that gives far too much money to managed care organizations, to HMOs, and not enough to hospitals. It is really difficult to understand at this late hour why on something like that we are here today, why that cannot be worked out so that we can give our health care providers back home some relief.

The last point I would like to make is on campaign finance reform. I think that sadly a lot of us have concluded, we would like these issues to be decided on what is the best policy. Unfortunately, a lot of these issues are being decided by who gives the most money to which party to help their particular position. The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) is trained as a pharmacist. He actually made most of his money now as a farmer, but he understands these drug issues so well, made mention of Citizens for Better Medicare and the reason that he and I talk about it is that they are now spending a ton of money in the Little Rock media market trying to influence this congressional race we have in South Arkansas.

It is not the race that he and I are involved in in our two districts, but it is in the same media market. The Arkansas Democrat-Gazette had a report come out about a week ago. Citizens for Better Medicare, which is financed by drug company money, these are pharmaceutical companies, has now spent close to \$800,000, if not more by this week, to impact that one race. They are opposing the proposals that we all support to include a drug benefit in Medicare.

I do not deny anyone their right to run an ad. I do not deny anyone the right to support whatever candidate

they want, but when they call themselves Citizens for Better Medicare, people need to understand and the folks in south Arkansas and in my district also need to understand that Citizens for Better Medicare is drug company money trying to block a drug benefit for Medicare, and that is wrong.

I thank the gentleman from Texas for his work today and I thank the Speaker again for being here.

Mr. TURNER. I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER). I know all of us have been confronted with that front group called Citizens for Better Medicare, which there is no citizens there. It is just the big drug companies pouring money into these issues, trying to influence the outcome of elections, and it is wrong and I hope the American people understand who is on their side and who is fighting for them.

We have only a minute or two left. I want to yield to the gentleman from Washington because he wanted to share some of his thoughts about the unfairness of pouring the lion's share of the money into the HMOs for the Medicare+Choice side instead of giving it to our rural hospitals and other health care providers.

Mr. BAIRD. I will be fairly briefly. Most Americans do not realize it, but there is a tremendous inequity in Medicare compensation in our country today and it works like this: all Americans pay the exact same amount of money into Medicare as a percentage of their salary. But not all Americans receive the same benefit. Depending on where you live in this country, you may receive pharmaceutical benefits, eyeglasses, hearing aids in one part of the country under Medicare, but in another part of the country you may receive none of those benefits and pay a supplemental premium and have to pay copays. This inequity, more than anything else I believe is what we should be correcting in these so-called BBA fixes that we have been trying to pass in the last week, but this bill that came before us this week did not adequately address it. It was painful for many of us who know the desperate straits of our hospitals, who know the desperate straits of our rural health care communities and who also would like to see a minimum wage increase passed to have to vote against that bill because it did not do enough to restore fundamental fairness and equity to the Medicare compensation system. Neither did it do enough to protect our home health agencies, nor did it protect and promise that the money that went to the HMOs would actually get to our hospitals.

I applaud the leadership of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) in raising these issues and thank him for his efforts and leadership on this.

Mr. TURNER. I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD). I appreciate his participation along with the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN), the gentleman from Arkansas

(Mr. BERRY), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON), the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS), and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER) as we have tried to lay out before the American people the issues to let them have the choice and the decision as to deciding who is on your side on these critical issues. We are going to continue to work to get the job done for the American people.

THE REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE FOR PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to spend a few minutes this afternoon discussing the situation we face ourselves today in terms of dealing with the home-stretch of the year 2000 election. There is, I understand why we have seen in many expressions of public attitude, a sense of confusion. We have heard the Republican candidate for President, Governor Bush, talk about his concern about the gridlock and partisan bickering here in Washington, D.C., trying to make it some aspect of his campaign, that somehow this would be an advantage of his candidacy, somehow either not knowing, caring or not being honest with the fact that it is his party that is not dealing with allowing partisan solutions to come forward.

As is known to every Member of this Chamber, there was a bipartisan solution to the issue of a Patients' Bill of Rights that was passed with overwhelming Democratic support and a number of Republican supporters as well, a significant majority of this Chamber. But unfortunately the Republican leadership refused to allow a fair and honest discussion of this proposal to move forward and decided to appoint members of the conference committee who actually disagreed with the overwhelming sentiment, the overwhelming bipartisan sentiment of this Chamber.

1515

In the area of efforts to reduce gun violence, we had an historic opportunity last year when finally there was a little glimmer in the United States Senate where there were some provisions that were passed that would have been small steps towards reducing gun violence, a huge concern for people around the country.

One of those, the gun show loophole, for instance, had bipartisan Senate support, would have had an opportunity for passage here, but this legislation has been bottled up in a conference committee by the Republican leadership that will not meet with the Republican Senate leadership and bring legislation to the floor of this Chamber. That juvenile justice conference committee has not met since last sum-

mer; not the summer of the year 2000 but since August of 1999, losing an opportunity to have a bipartisan solution towards reducing the epidemic of gun violence.

Perhaps nowhere is the stark differences between the candidates more clear than dealing with the area of the environment, and I wanted to take the opportunity today to have an opportunity to discuss these issues.

I notice that I am joined by my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), a senior member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, a senior member of the Committee on Resources, someone who has been involved with the issues of the environment since he and I served together as local officials in Oregon more than a decade ago. I am pleased to yield to him at this time for some comments about the environment, the year 2000 election, and the issues that are facing us.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the area of the environment is perhaps where we find the most stark contrast both between the parties here in the House and between the Presidential candidates. For a minute I would like to turn to energy policy because this is very much on the minds of my constituents.

In the West, where there are long distances between towns and many of my constituents live in rural areas, there are no mass transit alternatives and the high price of gasoline is a real problem for my rural communities. Here back, here in the East, where we are stuck today, people are very concerned about projected heating oil shortages, huge run-ups in prices of heating oil and, of course, the energy industry not being particularly competitive. The natural gas folks have taken the opportunity to quickly jack up the price of natural gas to follow that of oil. So even if adequate supplies are available for people in the East to heat their homes during this coming cold winter, the prices are going to be considerably higher than last year.

So I believe it is worth examining, particularly, the two candidates for President on the issue of the future of energy policy and how we got here. How did we get into this pickle? Did we not learn back with the gas crunch, back in the 1970s, when people had to stand in line and they had what, the red and the green flags? And people got in fights in lines for gas stations, and you would have to get up two hours before you went to work to go sit in line to buy gasoline for your car. It seemed initially that the U.S. learned a lesson.

In the Carter administration, we began a very aggressive policy of development of alternative fuels, conservation, renewable resources; but it all came to a screeching halt with the election of Ronald Reagan. And unfortunately, although the Clinton admin-

istration has tried to restore funding in those areas, we have to remember that for the last 6 years, 6 years, Governor Bush likes to talk about well, why has the Vice President not delivered on this or that or that? Why has he not done more on conservation renewable resources, because he has been confronted with a Republican majority who is in thrall to the oil companies. That is why. They do not want conservation renewables. They do not want alternative energy development, and it is really clear. If we just look at this year's budget, we would see that as of this date, the Republicans have cut renewable energy resource \$106 million below the President's request in the energy and water bill, and passed a \$211 million cut in the President's request for energy research in the Interior bill.

What is their solution? Well, we are not quite sure. I mean, Governor Bush and a number of prominent Republicans have talked about drilling in the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge.

Now let us set aside the issues of that spectacular and distant place and the potential for environmental degradation. Just look at the practicality of what they propose. It is laughable. The pipeline today, which is coming from Prudhoe Bay, and I have been to this area, is full. It is full. And it is pumping oil as quickly as it can to the coast, where it is being loaded as quickly as they can on tankers. Now, that should be of some help to us, particularly in the West. But guess what? The Republicans passed legislation at the request of two oil companies in 1996 to export all of Alaska's oil.

They have a short memory. We made a promise to the American people. The American people paid for that pipeline, and they were promised none of that oil will go overseas. Guess what? Every single drop is going to Japan and China, where they are paying a lower wholesale price than the same oil companies are charging their refineries on the West Coast for oil which they obtained elsewhere, but profits are up 300 percent. So their solution is we should drill in the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge, I guess so we can export oil more quickly to Japan and China.

I am not quite certain how that helps, but that is the one thing that Governor Bush has been able to say about this.

It is clear he cannot say much more, nor can the Republicans over there if we look at the campaign and expenditure reports: Massive contributions from the oil industry. I mean, it is pennies to the oil industry. Their profits are up 300 percent; seven billion dollars in the last quarter, an absolute record. They do not want anybody to rain on their parade, and raining on their parade means we do serious things in this country for energy independence, for conservation, renewable resources, fuel economy standards, mass transit. And time and time and time again our colleagues on that side of the aisle try and kill mass transit. They are engaged

right now in trying to kill off Amtrak, becoming the only major industrial nation on Earth without a passenger railroad.

They have sat back and delayed better fuel economy standards. Do you really believe Detroit cannot make more economical automobiles? I really think they could; but if they are not forced to do it, well, why should they? And our colleagues on that side of the aisle have been very willingly working with the oil companies and a few of the automobile companies to set back those standards. They do not want to save oil. They do not want to save gas. In fact, former Representative Cheney, the Vice Presidential candidate, felt that his job as the CEO of the Haliburton Company, an oil exploration company, was to drive up the price of oil and he was engaged, as CEO of that company, in colluding with the OPEC countries and advising them to restrict production to drive up the price.

Of course, it helped his stock options when he left the company. He said very proudly in the debate with Senator LIEBERMAN that he had not made his dollars in the public sector; he made them in the private sector. Well, guess what? He was playing golf 5 years ago as a lobbyist, a former Member of Congress, with the CEO of Haliburton who took a real liking to him. They had a great time, a good round. He said, I think you ought to take my job, Dick. I am retiring. And he did. So he went from a guy with a lot less than a million bucks to a guy with many millions by working for this oil company.

So we have to wonder, who is going to dictate oil policy in the coming administration?

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I too was struck by that comment about having made his money in the private sector, not sully himself with government. But is it not true that the company for which he went to work and some of the performance bonuses that he has earned have been a result of massive government contracts, for example, with the military?

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, if the gentleman would yield back, in fact, yes, Haliburton had very large government contracts; and I am certain being a former Defense Secretary may have helped a little bit there, but there is also now some question being raised about whether or not in carrying out those contracts that there was some impropriety. And, in fact, there are investigations ongoing on whether or not the taxpayers were defrauded.

So not only was the gentleman given a job which took him from being worth not very much to being a multimillionaire in a very short period of time, in conducting that job, his company was doing business with the Defense Department, where he formerly was head of the Defense Department, and is now under investigation for impropriety. And, thirdly, of course, one way they did raise their profits was by laying off

lots of American workers. So this is really a record to brag about.

All that leads back to the point that I was trying to make earlier, which is the Governor of Texas came up through the oil industry, has received massive campaign contributions from the oil industry. His Vice President worked in an oil services industry and has become a multimillionaire by dint of a very short stint there and some very generous stock options and other pensions and things. And their public articulations are ridiculous on the issue of energy independence or getting down the cost of fuel in this country, conservation or renewables.

They are proposing things that are absurd. Drill ANWR to ship more oil, which they support, to Japan and China, I guess. Yeah, they need oil and gas in Japan and China. I grant you that. So I really have got to wonder what the future would look like for Americans if we find that Exxon, Mobile, BP, Amoco and whatever the name of the one giant oil company is these days is sitting right there in the White House. I do not think that that is going to be a very pleasant future for American consumers and people certainly need to think about that.

Not only is there an environmental threat from not dealing with energy efficiency and conservation and renewable resources, which is very large and goes to the issues of global warming which they do not believe in, but there is also an immediate threat to the American public and to the American consumers from the outrageous and extortionate prices that they are being charged by the oil cartels under the excuse of restrictions with the OPEC countries which Vice Presidential nominee Cheney advised the OPEC countries to do. But perhaps since he gave them that advice when he was an oil executive, if he becomes Vice President he will give them different advice and tell them to raise production and lower prices. We can only hope that he will be more generous and enlightened if he achieves office.

I would be happy to yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman referencing the issues that we are facing regarding energy and global warming. These are part and parcel of the critical elements that we are facing here in the year 2000 election. I do not think it has been given quite the currency that one would have liked. But just again today on the editorial page of The New York Times, there was a reference to a new report that is coming forward, the third report from the group that was set up after the Kyoto Accords to try and monitor this, with over 50 recognized experts now finding not only is the consensus of scientific opinion stronger than ever that we have, in fact, contributed to the impacts of global warming that, in fact, it is accelerating but that it may be actually worse than we thought over the course of the next 100

years; that the increase in temperature may be over 10 degrees Fahrenheit over the course of the next century. And in that context we are faced with a Republican ticket that does not have a program or a proposal dealing with global warming.

In fact, George Bush, Sr., derided Vice President GORE for his interest, his concern and his leadership about this issue. You may recall him being dismissed as the ozone man in the 1992 elections.

Mr. DEFAZIO. If the gentleman would yield on that a second, we might note that this spring the depletion of the ozone layer over Antarctica is the worst in recorded history and extends well up above parts of New Zealand and Australia, and last summer for the first time we had significant ozone problems over the North Pole. So it is extraordinary that anybody would have derided someone for raising that very serious issue, both of global warming and ozone depletion, which is so detrimental to the future of our planet.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I would just take just one brief pause here, reclaiming my time, because I think it does touch on another central issue of the year 2000 election, and that is the incredible claim that is being made by some that there is basically no difference between Vice President GORE and Governor Bush in terms of which of these gentlemen would be elected to be President.

1530

In fact, I found it interesting that there are some who are claiming, first among them Ralph Nader, a gentleman who for years I have watched, and I have admired some of his work; just right out of college, one of my first opportunities for public service was at a local university where I had a chance to play a small role in helping facilitate the Student Interest Research Group in Oregon. I admired Mr. Nader and some of the Raiders. But somehow, to hear Mr. Nader suggest that people should vote for him because there is no difference between the two candidates strikes me as outrageous. I think there will be an opportunity in the course of our conversation here to point out some of those differences.

I note with interest that the Republican Party is now starting to use some of the words of Ralph Nader. They are putting on in effect ads for Nader, because they are hopeful that they can use this to undermine the support for the Vice President. I guess it is something that one has come to expect from the Republican campaign; and sadly, I am hearing from Mr. Nader that they cannot quite distinguish the difference. They are unaware of the difference between, or they are not willing to admit the difference between the two gentlemen on issues of reproductive freedom, which has inspired the National Organization for Reproductive Rights, NARAL, to have to take out ads pointing out the threat that would be posed

to women's right to choose her reproductive health options. Governor Bush does not support a woman's right to choose, versus the President in the form of AL GORE who does, and the impact that this would have on the decisions for people that would be appointed to the Supreme Court.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, sometimes we have to find a little humor in dire circumstances. I did see a cartoon which is very illustrative of the difference between Governor Bush and Vice President GORE on appointments on the Supreme Court. It was a cartoon which showed a Supreme Court made up entirely of Justice Scalia and Justice Thomas. Of course, Governor Bush has said, and remember, his father thought that Mr. Thomas was the most qualified person for the job, and now, of course, his son has said that he thinks that Thomas, being loyal to his dad, I guess, and Scalia are the shining lights on the Supreme Court and he wants to replicate them on the Supreme Court. His appointments would be more Scalias and Thomases.

Well, we can throw out a woman's right to choice with the first appointment of a Scalia or Thomas clone. With the second appointment of a Scalia or Thomas clone, we can throw out the Civil Rights Act and a whole lot of other very important Federal laws that are based on Supreme Court decisions that would be revisited by a very radical right-wing court, and that is inevitable under his stewardship as President.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, just reclaiming my time briefly, it is interesting that people are talking about the fluid political situation that this Presidential election, it seems that each poll shows jockeying around the country and there are people looking at whether or not they are ahead in the electoral college or not, but clearly it is a fluid situation and I think most commentators believe in the next 10 days it could go either way. Certainly we have watched the struggle for control of the House of Representatives. Most pundits feel the House is very much in play. Some even think that it is possible that the Senate may change hands, but certainly there is a momentum toward the Democratic side over there.

One thing that we have not talked about is how much in play the third branch of government is, the Supreme Court, and I appreciate the gentleman's reference to the close nature of many sensitive decisions. The Washington Post recently had an analysis of the recently concluded term of the Supreme Court, where they analyzed 19 key decisions, and eight of the 19 decisions were 5-4 decisions that could turn on the appointment of, as the gentleman says, one or two justices.

We have recently completed the longest period in 177 years without an appointment to the Supreme Court; 177 years have passed since we had this pe-

riod of over 6 years before an appointment. We have three over the age of 70 who are on the Supreme Court; we have some who are cancer survivors. There is, in all likelihood, significant changes that are going to take place, and whether it is dealing with the environment, a woman's right to choose, civil rights, as the gentleman mentioned, or the balance between the Federal and State governments, there are huge issues that hang in the balance, and perhaps at no time in our Nation's history for the last 40 or 50 years has the Supreme Court been so in potential of having a dramatic shift.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, a lot of the public does not focus on this on a daily basis, and neither do I. I mean, the Supreme Court is that bulwark we have against bad legislation, bad laws in this country. It is the bulwark we have for our Bill of Rights, our precious individual liberties. Just recently, snuck through the Congress in the intelligence bill is an Official Secrets Act for the United States of America.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I beg your pardon?

Mr. DEFAZIO. An Official Secrets Act. It was made part of the intelligence bill which, of course, we cannot read before we vote on it, and it was put in it before anyone knew it was there. They do have a special room where you can go and read it if you want, but you cannot talk about it, so I do not go and read it. But they put in a clause which would establish an Official Secrets Act in the United States of America. Not even just for national defense purposes, but for anything that any government bureaucrat who is anywhere in the government who has a stamp that says, classified, they can stamp anything on their desk "classified," and anybody who discloses it or second- or third-hand prints it in the newspaper or talks about it, even a Member of Congress, would be subject to criminal penalties.

Now, would we ever know about the problems created at the Department of Defense in acquisition or the problems in other parts of the government if all of the States could just be simply classified? So we are going to be turning to the next Supreme Court unless we can get this bill vetoed by the President and sent back down here to strip out the new Official Secrets Act. We will be turning to the next Supreme Court to see whether or not our precious liberties maintain any sort of modicum of control over the government. I mean that is extraordinary. Just think about it. It is not just the woman's right to choice. It is civil liberties, it is States' rights, and in this case, it is free speech. And these things are all important.

Mr. Speaker, our current obscene system of campaign finance came from a bad Supreme Court decision. The American people are pretty sick of

what is going on with the just unbelievable millions and billions of dollars this year, more than \$1 billion, being spent on the campaigns for elected office, and that is a result of a well thought-out reform adopted after the Watergate scandal being thrown out in a bad Supreme Court decision. They affect our everyday lives. It is important. And to have Governor Bush say he wants to have Scalia, Thomas, Scalia, Thomas, Scalia, Thomas as the Supreme Court, and we look at their decisions. It is going to be a very grim day if we care about any of those things.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, briefly reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's concern, and I think we ought to note at this point that it actually goes, of course, far beyond the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court is the ultimate law of the land. It does symbolically capture our attention; it is something we can focus on. But, of course, as the gentleman well knows, we rely heavily, in terms of our work in the Federal Government, in enforcement of rights from environment to choice to consumer protection; it is a rare decision that gets to the Supreme Court.

Day in, day out, these are decisions that are made in the Federal district courts and circuit courts where there has been a log jam that has been created, and again, because the Republicans in the Senate have refused to move forward in a bipartisan way for an appointment to lower-court positions. Oftentimes, these are incredibly well-qualified people, where there is bipartisan support back home. But there is a backlog now, and the floodgates are going to be loose for the next administration, and there will be hundreds of judicial appointments that will seize and control the character of the judiciary for a generation to come.

I would note that we have been joined by our colleague from the State of Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY), and I am happy to yield to her if she wishes to continue the colloquy.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As we look at this election and look at what it means to people, I think sometimes as we talk about in this Congress, we have actually stopped a lot of environmental riders. Well, what are riders? What does that mean? What does really affect people in their everyday lives? All I have to do is look back at the time when in 1994, 6 short years ago, when Gingrich and gang took over and some of the policies that they tried to put into effect. I mean whether it was doing away with our clean drinking water amendments or our clean air provisions and laws, and what does that mean to real people.

Well, first of all, when we do not have clean air and we have any kind of a lung problem or one has asthma, I mean, this is devastating to someone if they do not have clean air to breathe. Look at the Bush record and look at what has happened in Texas, and they

have some of the worst air pollution in the world. Well, if I have any kind of a respiratory problem, I do not want to live there. I want to make sure our State and our Nation has clean air to breathe. If we look at people's everyday health and how it relates to water, would it not be a shame if one went to the faucet, took a glass, filled it full of water and said well, I really cannot drink that. I have to buy bottled water and the cost of that.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time briefly, I appreciate the gentlewoman's references to the issue of clean air, because this is something research is showing is not just a transitory problem. We have just had published a report in Southern California, which is now no longer the smog capital of the United States.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. It used to be.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. That honor, that distinction has been claimed by Houston during the course of Governor Bush's term of office, that losing this lung function over the course of a few years becomes permanent. They have been able to identify that the smog in Southern California reduces the growth of lung capacity 10 percent and makes people more likely for a lifetime to be hospitalized, for example, for asthma attacks. When we look at the record of Governor Bush in Texas, the smog problems in Texas cities have actually increased in the 6 years that he has been governor.

Mr. Speaker, Texas ranks first in the Nation in toxic air emissions from industrial facilities, discharging over 100 million pounds of cancer-causing pollutants and other contaminants in the air annually. Of the 50 largest industrial companies in Texas, 28 violate the Clean Air Act. Currently, the areas of Houston, Galveston, Dallas, Fort Worth, El Paso, Beaumont, Port Arthur are in violation of Federal clean air standards for ozone pollution. As I mentioned, for the second year in a row, Houston is the smog capital of the United States, surpassing Los Angeles.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman talks about that, again, we have to say well, so what, it is the smoggiest place; but how does it affect people? Well, asthma is now the number one reason that children miss school, the number one reason for absenteeism in our schools today. That is directly related to what the gentleman was just talking about; it is our air and whether or not it is clean air or dirty air.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, it strikes me that if Governor Bush was concerned about that environmental threat, we would have seen some manifestation of it, some energy, some passion.

1545

Mr. BLUMENAUER. As Governor-elect, Bush opposed new vehicle emissions testing programs that had been designed and contracted by the State to implement the 1990 Clean Air Act.

He called it onerous and inconvenient. As Governor in 1995, he worked out a deal with his legislature to overturn the centralized inspections, because it was too inconvenient. Instead, the decentralized system, similar to the old system except it costs more, the tests were less accurate, and it was easier to evade.

Now we are in a situation. Dallas, for instance, is in noncompliance. His response in the case of Dallas was to argue with EPA to change how they were testing the methodology, not clean it up.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, that is the interesting way to deal with air pollution, of course, would be to change the standards. I think we can actually expect in a Bush Presidency, if there should continue to be a Republican Congress, that that would happen.

I remember the bad old days before we had a Federal Clean Air Act, and as a concerned graduate student at the University of Oregon, went to a meeting with people concerned about pollution from a local company. And this was before we had a Federal law and the representative of this rather large company that is now known and advertises widely for being environmentally responsible was to say, that is the smell of jobs, and if you do not like it, we will move to Idaho, because they do not care.

Mr. Speaker, that is what happens if you dismantle strong Federal standards, which is exactly what we know would happen under a Bush-Cheney Presidency, if they had a compliant Congress.

Let me just turn for a second for clean water. We take it for granted. Water is going to become one of the most precious commodities in this century. Wars will be fought over water according to the CIA. In fact, we are close to that in some parts of the world. We are running out of potable water. We take a lot for granted.

At the height of the Republican revolution here, I sat on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, we had a markup that went on for 5 days. We were working on a piece of legislation to reauthorize the expired Clean Water Act. We went through amendment after amendment, trying to fix the problems with the law and lock step, 100 percent of the Republicans voted against us, the Democrats in the minority, and that bill went through the House.

And if Bill Clinton, if we had not had a President downtown saying if that bill gets near my desk, I will veto it, shred it and destroy it, that probably would have become the law of the land, and it would have taken us back actually to the days when any industry anywhere could dump.

This bill actually embodied a new principle, and this is free market economics. Anybody who wants to can dump whatever they want in the water,

and the bill said the public would be obligated if they wanted to use the water for something other than a sewer to clean it back up. It would have taken us back to the 1950s and early 1960s when we had rivers here in the eastern United States that actually caught fire. A lot of people are too young to remember that today. That actually happened, the Cuyahoga River and other rivers, they caught fire, they were so polluted, they were so dead.

The Willamette River in our own State was an open cesspool, and it is only because of Federal laws that many of these rivers have begun, begun to restore their health.

We are not yet done with that journey, and it is going to come to a screeching halt if not turning back the clock with a Bush Presidency.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. If I may just reclaim my time briefly, I want to just follow up on one of the gentleman's points, because today many people take for granted the protections of the Clean Water Act. They take for granted some of the progress that came, as the gentleman mentioned, at the expense of a lot of time, money, energy and struggle.

One of the members of the ticket, Secretary Cheney, who has a record that he compiled as a Member of this Chamber, and when we look back at what his work is there, it gives us some sense, perhaps, of his values and what it brings to the Republican ticket.

Mr. DEFAZIO. A voting record is a very good way to understand someone's future conduct.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. If we look at the voting record of then-Representative Cheney, he voted seven times against authorizing clean water programs, often as one of a small minority who voted against authorization.

In 1986, he was one of only 21 Members who voted against the override of President Reagan of the appropriations to carry out the Clean Water Act, one of only 26 Members to vote against overriding the veto of the Clean Water Act, a lifetime record, according to the League of Conservation Voters of 13 percent, one of the worst of that generation.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I am going to go back to clean air for just a minute. I know we have been talking about clean water. I want to go back to clean air for just a minute.

The gentleman was talking about the voting record of Governor Bush or the State he presides over, and the gentleman talked about when the pollution went up in Dallas, not wanting to do emission tests because it was inconvenient and it was costly.

I had the privilege, I guess, of going to school in Southern California for a couple of years, and the first 2 months I was at school, September and October, I was sick the entire time. I did not know what was wrong with me.

Finally, I went to a doctor, then I went to another doctor, because I had

no idea why I felt so lousy. And then one day, I woke up, and there were mountains behind the college. I said, where did they come from? A miracle has happened. There are mountains back here. We finally discovered it was the air pollution that had made me sick for 2 months.

Mr. Speaker, in our State, where we do have mandatory vehicle emissions, I go have those. And, yes, it is a little bit inconvenient. It costs me some money, but having had that experience of what happens when you have dirty air, I now gladly go and get my car tested to make sure that I am driving a car that does not pollute.

I just think that is what happens to people every single stinking day that you have that kind of air pollution. People become sick, and it may be inconvenient to go and get your car tested, but let me tell my colleagues, it is a lot more inconvenient to be sick, it is a lot more inconvenient to be in the hospital, and when you look at the number of students that miss school every single year because of their asthma problems, I will tell my colleagues it is well worth it. I cannot imagine having a President who would not care about our clean air.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. The comments the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) is making in terms of her personal commitment to the environment, actually, we know from survey research that the American public is willing to pay a little bit for clean air. They are willing to pay a little bit for clean water.

They know that investing in the long run in the environment is something that is important for their future and their children's future. That is why as we look at the two candidates and compare their performances, compare their platforms and their ideals, looking at the performance in the State of Texas is so unnerving for me. Texas ranks near the bottom of all the States in the union in the investments that they make to try and clean up the environment.

One would think that a large State with such huge environmental problems would be maybe working a little harder. But the State of Texas ranks 44th out of all the States in per capita spending on environmental programs.

Mr. Speaker, they are the third worst in the country for toxic water pollution. When we look at areas, for instance, like open space and public lands, the Bush-Cheney ticket has responded that maybe they would like to undo some of the monument designations that we have seen this administration step forward, but looking at what they have done in the State of Texas. Texas ranks 49th out of the States in the amount of money it spends on its State parks.

Governor Bush appointed a commission to look at those problems. I will say that this is an area that has had bipartisan support around the country. Republicans and Democrats in our

State support public space, open space, parks.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. They have done it with their dollars, by the way.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. They have stepped up, they approved local initiatives. The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is on the Committee on Resources that has been working with the interesting leadership of the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) to craft CARA, which is currently dead in the Senate, because the Republican leadership will not allow it to be voted on, that passed here overwhelmingly with bipartisan support; but in Texas, the governor appointed a commission to look at it and then would not support that commission's efforts to solve the problems.

They wanted to remove a cap on the sporting goods tax to increase their revenues. He did not support the proposal. The measure died.

He created this task force and ignored the request for additional funding. A year ago on the campaign trail, Governor Bush did not even know how to respond to a question about the CARA legislation. He did not know whether he supported it or not. He certainly has not added his voice to try and break the partisan gridlock on the part of the Republicans in the Senate right now so he could get CARA through this Chamber.

Mr. DEFAZIO. If the gentleman would yield on that, there may be two reasons for Governor Bush opposing this wonderful new program that would not have cost the American taxpayers a penny to better take care of our public lands, to enhance open space, acquire park lands from willing sellers with great private property protections in the bill.

I think perhaps it goes back to where we started our discussion, because this thread runs through everything. Dirty air down in Texas is principally due to pollution by the oil industry.

The money for the CARA bill is money that comes from lease charges offshore oil and gas drilling. These are public lands. These are public resources. We exact a modest royalty when the oil companies do not defraud the taxpayers, for the extraction of that oil and gas. And the law has said for more than 20 years that that money is supposed to flow to the acquisition of open space, conservation, and park lands. And it has not.

Finally, in a bipartisan basis, this Congress came together and said enough is enough. We are going to take that money that is being paid by those oil and gas companies, and we are going to use it for the purpose for which it is intended. We are not going to steal it, and spend it on some other part of the Federal Government or the Pentagon or anything else.

Perhaps Governor Bush's concerns come back to the oil industry again, since he made his fortune drilling rather unsuccessfully for oil, but that is

not a prerequisite to making money in that industry. Or Vice Presidential nominee Cheney, who headed up an oil services company that consulted with the OPEC countries and got them to successfully constrain production to drive up the prices, also did well in the industry.

If I could just reference one thing from yesterday that many people might have missed on the floor, we had a debate over something called POGO, not the comic strip; but POGO is the scandal, where a number of oil companies defrauded the Federal Government. That is, the taxpayers of the United States, from paying their lawful fees for the extraction of oil and gas from Federal lands, from lands that were owned by all the people of the United States.

They essentially plea bargained to a one half of a \$1 billion settlement. We do not know really how much they stole; but they plea bargained to that. But this Republican Congress has spent all of its time trying to investigate the people who blew the whistle, not the oil company executives who defrauded the American people of hundreds of millions of dollars. But let us find and get and harass those whistleblowers in the Federal Government who exposed this.

1600

Do we think that those whistleblowers would be able to keep their jobs in a Bush-Cheney oil company administration? I do not believe so.

So to say there is no difference between the candidates for President is absurd, and particularly on all these strains that can come back to the tentacles of the oil industry which has had the largest profits and the largest increase in profits in its history in this last quarter, gouging the Americans every day at the pump, and is responsible for many of the problems we have talked about. Now we are going to put their folks in the White House. I hope not.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, going back to talk about CARA for a minute and, again, a program that really provides open space, provides public lands, makes sure that we take care of our coastline and our coastal resources, and, again, it does not cost the taxpayers money because it comes from the drilling offshore. I believe that program, not only was supported in a huge way here, in a bipartisan way, but supported by most of the Governors in the states.

Now, I do not know, and maybe one of the gentlemen know, whether Bush supported that as Governor of Texas. I am asking my colleagues that because he keeps talking about, "well, I want to work in a bipartisan way, and I can get the job done." I cannot tell my colleagues how many times I have heard "I can get the job done. I can go work in a bipartisan way. I will get results."

I wish he would pick up the phone and make a call to the Senate President and the Speaker of the House if he

cares about that issue or any other issue that we have been dealing with here. I mean, we can go into real Patients' Bill of Rights. He says he supports that, even though he did not.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, he vetoed it.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. He vetoed it, right.

Mr. DEFAZIO. It came along without his signature.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. But he says he supports it. But I am just saying he keeps talking about how he can get this done in a bipartisan way. I wished he would pick up the phone and call some of these people.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that sentiment.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, do my colleagues know if he supported CARA?

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that he is now supportive.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Oh, he did not know about it. That is right, he did not know about it. When all the other governors supported it, he did not know about it.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Yes. In response to a direct question, he was unable to indicate whether or not he supported it. He just did not know how to answer that question, according to the San Antonio Express News of June 15, 1999.

But having attempted to do something in Texas, falling short of the mark, not supporting them, it would seem this would be a classic opportunity if he now supports it, if it is "free money from the Federal Government", and if he opposes "partisan bickering", maybe he can intervene and say something to the Republican leadership so all it has to do is be voted on. Because we all know, if it were brought to a vote on the floor of the Senate, it would pass overwhelmingly because it is supported by the American public. It just makes too much sense.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, do we need to give him the phone numbers of those people?

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, it is a concern. But it seems to me that we take a step back and we look at the approach that has been offered up.

We have talked a little bit about air quality problems in the State of Texas, which are substantial, and they are getting worse as it relates to other parts of the country. Governor Bush has touted his voluntary program to deal with over 700 factories that are not meeting the air quality standards. Many of these have been grandfathered in.

The approach that was touted by Governor Bush under legislation in Texas over a year ago, Senate bill, S. 767, was basically voluntary compliance. Well, in the face of this voluntary compliance, the Texas Air Crisis Campaign has gone back and looked at what has actually happened in the State of Texas.

Of these over 700 factories, only a small number have stepped forward and done anything. The total amount of harmful air pollution from these few dozen plants that are doing anything at all has reduced harmful air pollution by less than one-third of 1 percent. It is an approach that I think is something that most people would not be very excited about applied on the Federal level.

But if we are going to have appointees that are drawn from the ranks of the people that are supposed to be regulated, if we are going to have a judiciary that is populated with people who are hostile to the notion of government regulation, we may be forced to rely on this approach. I think the report is such that it would be a sad one in terms of actually producing results.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I could not find this earlier in my notes. I know we have covered a lot of ground here, but there is so much to talk about that the conventional press is not talking about.

He mentioned the ties of Vice Presidential nominee, former Representative, former Secretary of Defense, former Halliburton Company executive, Mr. Cheney. Mr. Cheney, again, was chief executive for a short 4 or 5 years of this oil services company. During that time, and he says, again, if we recall, nothing to do with the public the fact that they gifted him with \$30 million for his tenure there, 5 years.

Well, their government contracts during that time period doubled to \$2.3 billion. Their two largest customers were, surprise, the United States Department of Defense. Former Secretary Cheney of the revolving door managed to get them contracts with the agency which he headed until just a year or two before that. They also had a contract from the British Defense Ministry.

Then they raked in another \$1.5 billion in government loans from the Export-Import Bank and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, up from \$100 million before Mr. Cheney took over.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. But it had nothing to do with the government, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, this is the private sector making money off the government. But that is his proud record. I think that causes some grave concern. I mean, not only as chief executive was he involved in colluding with the oil ministers of the OPEC countries and urging them to drive up the price of oil, and he succeeded in that effort, but, then after he finished raising the price of our oil and gas by colluding with OPEC, he then turned to the Federal taxpayers to greatly enrich his company, and then to provide him with a huge payoff as he left.

But, remember, he did take some tough steps while he was there. He did lay off several thousand American workers. So he certainly deserved that

\$30 million golden parachute when he left. We can certainly understand that.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, it is probably a very small amount of money compared to all the money he brought in off of government.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, we are reaching the last 4, 5 minutes of our discussion here today. I did want to accord the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) some time if she had some concluding thoughts about the impact of the 2000 election, the environment and the choices that we are faced.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I think this is, and people have said it before, this is probably one of the most important elections we will ever have. It is interesting. I turned on the news last night when I got home, and I watched them talking to many people who were undecided. One of the things they said over and over again was, well, there is not much difference between the two of them. Well, we like one. We know he does not know much, but we do not like his personality much. So those were the kinds of information that they were talking to the press about. Or I do not know whether I am going to vote.

I guess I want people to keep a couple of things in mind as this election comes up. First of all, one of the things that makes this country so great is that people participate. So voting is absolutely critical. It is really all about democracy. If we want to keep this democracy going, then people really need to participate, and they need to do that by voting.

Then I think they have to really think through what a President does. I mean, a President deals with the Congress. They deal with policy that affects everyday people's lives, day in and day out, whether it is if they can go and afford their prescription drugs, whether there is a safety net for them with Social Security so that, when they retire, if they do not have much money, like my mom did. I mean, she had \$72 a month in her retirement plan. She could not have survived without Social Security.

It is the roads we built. It is making sure that we keep our Nation free. It is how they deal with foreign policy. It is who appoints the Supreme Court. It is who sets the policy, and are they looking out for just a few people, or are they looking out for all of us.

I want them to think very, very carefully about this election. I want them to vote. But this decision is in their hands about who is it that they want for President, to think through the kind of person they want as President and the skills that person has to help each person in this country.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, just on the theme of voting, I hear many of the same things that the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) heard on television last night from some of my own constituents. The government is not relevant to me. What you are doing is not relevant to me.

Well, a lot of times it is not. They are right. The fact that we investigate whistleblowers and not oil price company fixing or stealing money from the American taxpayers, it is right, the government is not relevant to their concerns. It is not relevant, because they did not vote. If one does not vote, the government is going to be run by the special interests who are funding many of the campaigns. People must vote. They have to go out and vote.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I think that is an appropriate tenor on which to close our discussion, because there are opportunities from coast to coast for people to make a difference in this election, because it is so close.

It seems to me that it is important. It is one of the things I could not disagree with Mr. Nader more strongly. There is a huge difference between the record of the most environmentally sensitive Vice President since Teddy Roosevelt, an administration that has done an excellent job with the environment, not everything, maybe, that some of us would want, but as my colleagues have pointed out, having to actually hold back the tide from an antienvironmental Congress led by Republicans who were not sympathetic.

It seems to me that this is an opportunity for Americans to look very clearly at what they want in terms of an administration that is going to govern, not just for 4 years, but is going to determine a judiciary for a generation.

I would hope that people would, in fact, focus on the difference between performance and make a difference, not pretend to send a message, but to really take that vote in a way that will make a difference in terms of the President, in terms of the Congress, in terms of providing the type of political representation they want.

It seems to me that, when we have the most competitive Presidential race in 40 years, the most competitive Congressional race in half a century, and a situation, as I mentioned, we have not seen with the Supreme Court in 177 years, and all of them converge at the same time in this election, it is critical for people to cast that vote carefully because it is going to make a huge difference for them, their children, and for generations to come.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BECERRA (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and October 29 on account of business in the district.

Mr. GREEN of Texas (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today after 11:00 a.m. on account of personal reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legis-

lative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. MCNULTY) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SHERMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HILL of Montana, for 5 minutes, today and October 29.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

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

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

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2780. An act to authorize the Attorney General to provide grants for organizations to find missing adults.

H.R. 2884. An act to extend energy conservation programs under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act through fiscal year 2003.

H.R. 4404. An act to permit the payment of medical expenses incurred by the United States Park Police in the performance of duty to be made directly by the National Park Service, to allow for waiver and indemnification in mutual law enforcement agreements between the National Park Service and a State or political subdivision when required by State law, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4957. An act to amend the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 to extend the legislative authority for the Black Patriots Foundation to establish a commemorative work.

H.R. 5083. An act to extend the authority of the Los Angeles Unified School District to use certain park lands in the City of South Gate, California, which were acquired with amounts provided from the land and water conservation fund, for elementary school purposes.

H.R. 5157. An act to amend title 44, United States Code, to ensure preservation of the records of the Freedmen's Bureau.

H.R. 5314. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to facilitate the adoption of retired military dogs by law enforcement agencies, former handlers of these dogs, and other persons capable of caring for these dogs.

H.R. 5331. An act to authorize the Frederick Douglass Gardens, Inc., to establish a memorial and gardens on Department of the Interior lands in the District of Columbia or its environs in honor and commemoration of Frederick Douglass.

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

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 614. An act to provide for regulatory reform in order to encourage investment, business, and economic development with respect to activities conducted on Indian lands.

S. 835. An act to encourage the restoration of estuary habitat through more efficient project financing and enhanced coordination of Federal and non-Federal restoration programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1586. An act to reduce the fractionated ownership of Indian lands, and for other purposes.

S. 2719. An act to provide for business development and trade promotion for Native Americans, and for other purposes.

S. 2950. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Sand Creek Massacre National Historic Site in the State of Colorado.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Sunday, October 29, 2000, at 6 p.m.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 1689. Referral to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure extended for a period ending not later than October 29, 2000.

H.R. 1882. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than October 29, 2000.

H.R. 2580. Referral to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure extended for a period ending not later than October 29, 2000.

H.R. 4548. Referral to the Committee on Education and the Workforce extended for a period ending not later than October 29, 2000.

H.R. 4585. Referral to the Committee on Commerce extended for a period ending not later than October 29, 2000.

H.R. 4725. Referral to the Committee on Education and the Workforce extended for a period ending not later than October 29, 2000.

H.R. 4857. Referral to the Committee on the Judiciary, Banking and Financial Services, and Commerce for a period ending not later than October 29, 2000.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. REYES:

H. Con. Res. 438. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the importance of locating a national immigration museum in El Paso, Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. RUSH, Mr. KILDEE, Mr.

OWENS, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. REYES, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. HINCHEY):

H. Res. 661. A resolution supporting youth civic literacy in the United States; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS TO PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1275: Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. REGULA.

H.R. 1512: Mr. INSLEE.

H.R. 3842: Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, and Mr. LARSON.

H.R. 5185: Mr. PAYNE.