The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 578, I was not able to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, OCTOBER 31, 2000

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 6 p.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The motion of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) is privileged and is not debatable.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, would the effect of moving the time for us to do business tomorrow from 10:00 in the morning until 6:00 at night in effect have Members then not be able to be at home in their districts either working or with their families tomorrow night for Halloween? Is that the effect of this vote?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question that the gentleman has posed is not a proper parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ROEMER. That is the effect of this vote, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 199, noes 159, not voting 75, as follows:

[Roll No. 579]

AYES—199

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cox
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kelly
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
Mascara
McCarthy (MO)
McCrery
McHugh
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Packard
Paul
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Sherwood
Shimkus
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stabenow
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—159

Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boyd
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Carson
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Davis (FL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Filner
Ford
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hill (IN)
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Kucinich
Lampson
Larson
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shows
Sisisky
Smith (WA)
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Wilson
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—75

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Barr
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Burton
Campbell
Cardin
Clay
Conyers
Cooksey
Crane
Crowley
Danner
Davis (IL)
Delahunt
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Everett
Fattah
Forbes
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hilliard
Hulshof
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Klink
Kolbe
LaFalce
Lantos
Lazio
Lipinski
Maloney (NY)
Martinez
McCollum
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Metcalf
Morella
Neal
Oxley
Pascrell
Pickering
Pickett
Riley
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Slaughter
Snyder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Talent
Thompson (MS)
Visclosky
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weygand
Wise

☐ 1105

Mr. BROWN of Ohio changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 579, I was not able to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTIONS 121, 122, 123, AND 124, EACH MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 662 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 662

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 121) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes. The joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 122) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes. The joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 123) making

further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes. The joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 4. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 124) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes. The joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Members are reminded that the use of personal electronic communications devices is prohibited in the Chamber of the House, and they are to disable wireless telephones before entering the Chamber of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 662 is a closed rule providing for consideration of House Joint Resolutions 121, 122, 123 and 124. Each of these joint resolutions make further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for a period of 1 day. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 662 provides for 1 hour of debate on each joint resolution, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule waives all points of order against the consideration of these joint resolutions. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit on each joint resolution, as is the right of the minority. This rule was favorably reported by the Committee on Rules yesterday, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) for being more brief than he was the last time. He caught me off guard. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary half-hour, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for the consideration of the eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth continuing resolutions we have done in the last month. Each one of these continuing resolutions will keep the Federal Government open just 1 more day, because my Republican colleagues just have not finished their 13 appropriation bills.

The 1974 Budget Act requires that these bills, those 13 bills, be signed into law by October 1. But, my Republican colleagues have spent much too much time passing tax breaks for big business and not enough time on school construction.

So, here we are on October 30 with only five appropriation bills signed into law. Those bills are Defense, Military Construction, Interior, Transportation, and Agriculture, and VA–HUD and Energy and Water. Meanwhile, waiting at the White House are Legislative Branch, Treasury-Postal, and others. Still outstanding are Labor, Health and Human Services; Commerce, State, Justice; Foreign Operations; and District of Columbia. But, because so many bills are outstanding, Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues have been forcing Congress to spend time passing emergency measures and protections for special interests, while Democrats have still been fighting for new school construction.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) have a school construction bill that is supported by 230 Members of Congress, Democrats and Republicans alike. This bill would provide $25 billion over 10 years of interest-free financing for school construction and modernization with prevailing wage protections. But my Republican colleagues refuse to put this bill into the Labor, Health and Human Service appropriation bill so that the President can sign it and local communities can begin building new schools.

So, rather than wasting time this month on abbreviated work weeks, renaming post offices, and tax breaks for the special interests, my Republican colleagues should have been passing Medicare reform, prescription drug programs within Medicare, and funding school construction.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule.

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

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this rule. I think we ought to do 1-day rules and 1-day CRs, but more importantly, I think it is time for us to reach the compromises necessary and finish up the work of the 106 Congress.

We are all asking why we are here today, and we have different views on it. According to ''The Baltimore Sun,'' it is because of Republican gridlock in Congress again. Once again, leaders of this House are finding they cannot get their way. Whatever happened to the fine art of compromise? I know my friends on the other side of the aisle would differ with that and have a different opinion of that. Both sides are right, perhaps.

But perhaps a little practical constitutional reminder is in order for us today. You, we, cannot beat a President, unless we have two-thirds of the votes. The Constitution guarantees that under our separate, but coequal branches of government, that the only way the House of Representatives can win is to have two-thirds of the vote, no matter how we like or dislike a President, now or in the future. And we cannot get two-thirds of the vote, unless we are willing to work with at least some on the other side of the aisle which, unfortunately, our leadership has chosen not to do.

Remember the budget resolution where all of this began? The President's budget called for $637 billion in spending, and you said you were going to hold discretionary spending to $625 billion and you complained about big spending Democrats, including we Blue Dogs, those of us in the Blue Dog Coalition proposed a budget suggesting a compromise of $633 billion. This budget was supported by 138 Democrats and 37 Republicans.

□ 1115

If 45 more Republicans had joined with 137 of us, perhaps the debate would be a little different. Perhaps we would not even be here. If the leadership in Congress had been willing to work with us, we could have had a credible bipartisan budget that would have held spending down to $633 billion. Instead, we are on a path to spend $645 billion or more next year, $12 billion more than the Blue Dogs suggested and $8 billion more than the President requested. Some compromise.

Some compromise, spending $8 billion more than the President. And yet my colleagues, some continue to come to the floor and say how much more are we going to spend. Well, they have won on this issue. When we passed the rule last week on the foreign operations bill, they voted to raise, at least some, not all, a majority of us, not me, voted to raise the caps to $645 billion. The issue of how much we are going to spend is a moot issue.

I would much rather have held it to $633 billion. My Republican colleagues wanted to go to $645 billion. The President wanted to keep it at $637 billion.

So let us not have any more of this because any of these issues that spend more money, my colleagues should know by now that the rules of the House suggest that if we spend more than $645 billion, we will sequester all spending next year to bring the level back to $645 billion if we mean it, and I hope we mean it. So let us quit talking about that money is the issue.

I do not know how the leadership in the House honestly can complain that Democrats are big spenders when they have already voted appropriation bills

and sent to the President spending $11 billion more than the President requested. I do not understand how voting to increase spending by $21 billion on programs that a prominent Republican has identified as low priority, unnecessary, or wasteful spending is acceptable, but asking for $5 billion more for education makes someone a big spender.

Under the plan being pushed by leaders in the Congress, we will squander the surpluses that should be used to deal with a variety of my priorities including eliminating our national debt. Leadership is taking credit for debt reduction that was achieved only because their proposals to use the entire budget surplus for tax cuts was defeated.

The recent conversion to debt reduction rhetoric after 2 years of rhetoric to the contrary comes after their tax cut proposals fell flat. The cover of the September 16 issue of Congressional Quarterly described the leadership strategy with this headline: ''Desperate to find a way out, GOP settles for debt reduction.''

Mr. Speaker, we easily could have bipartisan agreement on death tax relief, on marriage tax penalty relief, on a Medicare prescription drug benefit, a Patients' Bill of Rights, campaign finance reform legislation; yet this Congress will adjourn without enacting any legislation on any of these issues. The leadership has chosen to take these issues off the table. They have won on these issues. They are off the table. But we will not go home, we will not go home without making sure we have given our hospitals, nursing homes, and home health care providers the relief that they need. That is the dividing issue, the one that must be worked out.

There is strong support among Democrats for meaningful estate tax relief that would repeal the death tax for all estates less than $4 million and reduce rates for all other estates by 20 percent immediately. This proposal could be signed into law. But according to the Wall Street Journal, some in the Republican leadership rejected that proposal because they are afraid that ''the GOP would lose a powerful election-year issue for its candidates.'' And they might be right.

We heard a lot of rhetoric Saturday about the need for a national energy policy; yet we are about to conclude another Congress without any effort on the part of the House to develop a national consensus on energy policy. We could have taken a small step by adopting the tax incentives for domestic oil and gas producers that were included in the Senate version of the tax bill, but for some reason the leadership of the House opposed this bipartisan effort as well.

Surely we can reach a bipartisan agreement now if leaders of the Congress are willing to work with the President to find compromises on the remaining issues. But I have to ask, why did the congressional leadership not accept the President's offer to meet yesterday to discuss an agreement on responsible tax relief and a Medicare package that provides assistance to health care providers as well as beneficiaries, instead of providing over 40 percent of the funding for HMOs?

Let me repeat so that all of us can understand and hear clearly, particularly the leaders of the Congress: we will not have a final budget agreement that allows us to leave here without making sure we have given our health care providers the relief that they must have, nor without satisfactory compromises regarding school construction, class size reduction, immigration, and the other issues remaining.

We would not need to be here on October 30 if 2 or 3 months ago, when this work should have been happening, the Republican leadership had been willing to work with us in a bipartisan spirit on a fiscally-responsible budget that funded priority programs including Medicare, provided reasonable tax relief, and paid down the debt. Unfortunately, for some reason the leadership has chosen a course that has produced gridlock and inaction.

Mr. Speaker, it is your move. The ball is in your court. Do your job and you will find a lot of bipartisan support, especially if you were to ask.

This is the message that I hope that all of us will take. It is time to quit the fingerpointing. We are down to the last few issues. Some of them are very, very important; but all of them must be compromised. It is unrealistic to believe that anyone, the President or the House, can get their way absolutely. But a reasonable compromise on all of these issues could be reached this afternoon if only we would find the willingness to sit down and to talk to each other, a willingness that we have not been willing to do for the last 2 years, 4 years or 6 years. That is why we are here today.

Again, we cannot, we cannot defeat this President, the next President, or any President unless we have two-thirds of the vote. We cannot get two-thirds of the vote unless we work for it.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), who in the well of the House outlined many of the same arguments that he outlined last night when we gathered here in informal session to have an honest discussion on some differences.

One thing that I think is interesting is this: when the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) put the question to the gentleman from Texas, if we reverted to the President's original budget numbers, if that were the key to accommodate the President as my friend points out, that certainly the President has a role in this process, if we were to revert to the President's original estimates, could there be a guarantee that the President would sign the appropriations bills? The gentleman from Texas was very candid last night. He said he could not guarantee that, and he respectfully submitted that that was not the question.

But, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the question, because that is the argument my friend from Texas has made. We do not seek to ignore the President or deal with some sort of blatant hostility. We understand consensus and compromise and we have done that. And even as the gentleman outlined the challenge confronting us with Medicare, I would remind all of my colleagues that just last week on this floor we passed a piece of legislation vital for health care with the bulk of the help going to hospitals, especially rural hospitals, to local health care, to nursing homes.

The fact is some chose not to vote for it. Now, good people can disagree. We are here in this situation, as we try to find consensus and compromise, and the question again, Mr. Speaker, is this: How much is enough?

I understand the calendar. I do not presume to be naive. I know this is the political season. But I would join with the gentleman from Texas who says let us not engage in fingerpointing. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the challenge before us is to put people before politics, and that is what I suggest we do.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the Democratic whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, for those Americans who may be following these proceedings, they might be asking themselves what exactly are we doing here 30 days after the appropriation and funding bills are supposed to have been enacted into law? What have we accomplished? Or a better question: What have we not accomplished this Congress?

I would like to give a brief overview. Over the last 2 years, the Republican leadership of this Congress has had a unique opportunity. It was an opportunity to work with House Democrats and to work with the President to craft a sensible, bipartisan solution to some of America's most difficult and toughest problems: the unchecked powers of the HMOs to veto family health care decisions; the fact that literally millions of senior citizens cannot afford to buy prescription medicine that they need; the need to increase the minimum wage for those people who work and make this country run by taking care of our seniors in nursing homes and feeding us and cleaning our offices and taking care of our children in child day care centers; the fact that kids from one end of this country to the other are forced to go to school in cramped, overcrowded classrooms.

The Republican leadership had 2 whole years, some would say 6 years since they became the majority, to work with President Clinton and Democrats to respond to these problems. Had they decided to work with us

by now, we could have had a prescription drug benefit in effect. People who use HMOs could have had the right to legally challenge them. Millions of people would not have been thrown off the benefits of HMO plans or denied benefits under those plans. We could have started working on repairing and modernizing our schools all over this country.

Minimum wage workers who are struggling, often adults with a couple of children, to provide for their family could have had thousands of dollars into their pockets. But I am sad to say that instead of rolling up their sleeve and working with us, the Republican majority chose to obfuscate, to shrug their shoulders, to walk away.

Mr. Speaker, just do not take my word for it. Listen to what America's leading newspapers are saying. Rollcall: ''What a mess . . . If (voters) paid attention, they'd surely be appalled, as practically everybody here in this town is. House leaders failed to work out a joint strategy with Senate leaders, and they have been utterly uninterested in working with House Democrats.''

The Washington Post: ''The Un-Congress continues neither to work nor adjourn. For 2 years, it has mainly pretended to deal with issues that it has systematically avoided.''

The Baltimore Sun: ''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.''

And, of course in the USA Today today they described this Congress as a ''costly do-little Congress.'' I might also add, Mr. Speaker, that this is a do-little and a delay Congress. They have done little; they have delayed much.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have demonstrated that the only place they are capable of leading Congress is gridlock and dead end. It is time for a change. This has been an utter failure. We have failed to address the main issues that the American people have sent us here to address, and the American people understand that. They know that, and they will respond to that if we do not, in the next couple of days, answer some of these questions that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) and others have addressed.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I felt compelled to react to some of the speakers that have preceded. Republicans have come in with some additional spending. Deployments by the Clinton-Gore administration, Haiti, $4 billion; $3 billion of that is in Aristide's pocket. Extension of Somalia where we had 18 Rangers killed; the United States paid for 86 percent of Kosovo.

I think that is wrong. And my colleagues on the other side would say that there should be more burden-sharing from NATO countries. That has come at a great expense of our defense, of our military, of our men and our women.

□ 1130

We have got 22 ships that are tied up to the pier because of deferred maintenance. The Secretary of the Navy just announced the descoping and cancellation affecting repair and maintenance of 26 naval ships, which means that is 26 more ships this year will not be worked on; and that the lack of funds, because we have used it, they have had to shift the ship repair money over to the CV, the carriers, and the submarine refueling because of the deployments that we have had.

My colleagues talk about working bipartisan. Many of us long for that, and we have on many cases. But I want to give my colleagues an idea that, with the HMOs, when Governor Bush, and I believe that the polls are showing it, is President, we will pass a patients' bill of rights. But it will not allow lawyers to sue unlimited amounts and put a hospital, a doctor, or a health care provider out of business with one lawsuit. Then one will not be able to go down and sue the small business that hires them in good faith. I mean, that is a pretty strict difference between the two parties. When one talks about compromise, we are not going to allow one to put health care providers out of work.

If one looks at the bill that is before us right now with Davis-Bacon, many States have overridden Davis-Bacon requirements. Now, their side of the aisle wants even those States that do not have Davis-Bacon to have to fall under construction. We think that is wrong. A, it adds between 15 to 35 percent to the school construction. We are saying let the schools keep the extra money instead of paying the union wage.

Those are pretty big differences. The reason that we have not come forward is, on both sides, that the different positions sometimes are here or they are out here to the left. I think where we have come to the center and work together, that is the best thing that this Congress can do. That is what we are trying to do. That is why we are here today.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me the time. The gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), the last speaker, just answered a big part of the previous question of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

The reason we cannot go back and undo the budgets now is that there is only one really left. We have spent the money. We have different opinions as to whether we have spent it wisely, but it is done. My point that I am trying to make is it is done.

We have set the caps of spending of $645 billion. If we wanted to spend less, we should have done it with the budget resolution that would have had the kind of support to carry us through. We did not do that. But that is done.

I wanted to emphasize where I am coming from and where I think a lot of Members on both sides of the aisle are coming from regarding the health care, the Medicare relief bill.

For the rurals, the urbans, the teaching hospitals, what I would like to have seen us done is add a 2nd year of full market basket update for inpatient hospital services. That needs to be done to get consistency. Restore cuts for skilled nursing facilities for 2 years, not just one. Restore cuts for home health providers for 2 years, not just one. Improve the formula for Medicare disproportionate share hospitals to equalize payments to rural hospitals.

Now, many were already saying, then you are wanting to spend more money. No. I believe that we could have given less to the HMOs and more to our hospitals, and we would have had a better package. That is my opinion. I suspect that there are more that share that opinion, because I really believe, and more of the folks believe, that that is what we should have. We have the argument of consistency.

Our rural hospitals and others that are struggling to keep their doors open, we give them 1 year. The atmosphere that we are in today, what kind of planning can you give. Why could we not give a 2-year certainty on this and then start working soon after the next election as to where we truly go with health care policy? We need to do this.

That is why I say I think people are having some real wrong ideas and thoughts that we are not going to be able to work this and several other areas out on the Medicare relief bill.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, in case the American people are having difficulty understanding the argument of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), as most of us over here are having difficulty, because it does come down to us, we believe, the President asking for more money; and we are trying to keep control of the budget.

But if we cannot understand that, they should be able to understand one of the other issues, the major issue of contention between the Republicans and the other side of the aisle and the Clinton-Gore administration; and that is the Clinton-Gore administration is demanding that we stay here, and they are holding us hostage with the demand that we give a blanket amnesty to millions of illegal immigrants.

Now, the American people should be able to understand that. All of this budget talk, if one cannot understand what is going on there, one should be able to understand that this administration, the Clinton-Gore administration, the other side of the aisle, want us, and we are refusing, to grant a

blanket amnesty so that millions of more illegal immigrants will, number one, be granted amnesty and eventually be eligible for government programs, which means millions of illegal immigrants who are now not eligible will be eligible for health care benefits, for education benefits.

Here we are trying to give a modest, just a modest bit of tax relief to the American people, and that is outrageous; but it is not outrageous to bring millions of more illegal immigrants into this country and make them eligible for government benefits. Give me a break. Give the American people a break.

No, I am proud to stand here with the Republicans saying, no, we are going to watch out for the American people. We care about others. We care about our immigrant population. In fact, legal immigrants are some of our proudest citizens. We are happy to have them here as legal immigrants. But to have millions of illegal immigrants be granted amnesty is thumbing their noses at legal immigration and at the American people.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes 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 gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM). I understand what he is saying. He made a very important point. He is asking for reason and balance; and that is, to respond to the needs of rural and urban hospitals and not give to HMOs the $34 billion that our Republican colleagues want to give to insurance companies, and not allow some of those dollars to be utilized to pay health care providers and hospitals.

Secondarily, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), my good friend who just spoke, has also a misunderstanding what those of us are trying to do with respect to legal immigration or access to legalization.

Mr. Speaker, I serve as the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims on the Committee on Judiciary; and I am sorry to say it is not a million people coming into this country, it is thousands of homeowners and taxpayers who have lived in this country for almost 20 years. In fact, the National Restaurant Association is begging us to be responsible to hard-working members of their community who have worked in their restaurants.

This is a question with the INS. We all know the status of the INS, it made a great error and did not allow these individuals to proceed to apply for citizenship. It is not giving them blanket amnesty; it is allowing them to apply for citizenship.

Interestingly enough, when many of us voted in 1996 for what we thought was a fair immigration policy in the dark of night, Republicans took away the court proceedings that were proceeding in a very orderly manner, sponsored by the Catholic Dioses, that would allow individuals to go into the courtrooms and proceed in the process of securing their citizenship. That was stopped in the dark of night in 1996.

So what we are standing here for is to ensure that those who are trying to seek legalization, access to legalization fairly and honestly, citizens in Nevada, citizens in Rhode Island, in New York, in Michigan, in California, in Texas, who are already here, whose children are going to school, they want to be able to access legalization.

In fact, in my good city of Houston, a poor man by the name of Mr. Gonzalez, working 13 years, is about to be deported and his family left abandoned because he cannot have access to legalization.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR).

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) for raising this, because this is one of the great shames and scandals of our country.

These people which the gentlewoman speaks of are the people who do the work of this country. We could not be building the roads; we could not be feeding the people of this country. They have been here for 15 and 20 years, and they live in fear every day because of their status. They make this country work.

It just is an absolute outrage that we have to deal with this issue in a way that is not responsible to them and to the future of this country. The gentlewoman from Texas is absolutely right. We ought to do something about this. These are the people that take care of our children, our grandparents, our roads, our buildings. They collect our garbage. They do a lot of things.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the minority whip, for his eloquence on his issue, because I hate the undercurrent that I am hearing in this body. That is that the reason why we are here and the reason why we are stuck in the mud besides the issues on health care and this tax cut is because we do not want this millions of illegals to come into this country.

Mr. Speaker, they are here, and they are not millions, they are thousands of hard-working individuals who love this country, who love their families, and who came here out of persecution, and we opened the doors.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that we need to work on this issue.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), my good friend, who I would be delighted to yield to when I finish my point, and maybe he can get some time from his side, because I know his heart is good.

Mr. Speaker, I simply say we need to get down to dealing with hard-working individuals and stop this undercurrent of bias that I am hearing. It hurts my heart.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, every time we talk about illegal immigration, we talk about racial bias. I have about had it. There are immigration laws. If they are in the country illegally, we should throw them out.

We are putting up a neon sign blinking all over the world, come on and run in, run in illegally, and we will make one a citizen, and then we will let one bring one's family. Beam me up here.

I disagree with this illegal immigration. If they want to come into America, damn it, get in line. There are laws. Follow the law. When Congress starts letting people jump the fence and get away with it and then use it for political gain, Congress has failed the American people, and Congress has shredded the Constitution.

I want to say one last thing. Several days ago, 10 Mexican narco-terrorists crossed the border and started shooting at our border patrol. They needed a helicopter to come in and provide air coverage.

We are guarding the borders all over the world. We are flooded with heroin and cocaine. And my colleagues are here wanting to make more illegal immigrants citizens.

I am not for making one more illegal immigrant a citizen. There is no bias in my heart. I am tired of the charge that is being placed against us.

If they want to come into America, get in line like many Americans did legally. If they are not in this country legally, JIM TRAFICANT says they should be thrown out, and the Congress of the United States should not have a flashing sign saying jump the fence.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important issue, more than my colleagues think. There is a lot of political ramifications that are not very good for the country. With that, I would hope the Democrat party would take a look at the issue a little more carefully.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The Chair reminds Members that they are to refrain from the use of profanity in debate on the House floor.

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.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, would the Chair be kind enough to advise the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) and myself of the remaining time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) has 9 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) has 19½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the Democratic whip.

□ 1145

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I will not take the 2 minutes, but I wanted to correct something.

The impression has been left here that these people are illegal; that they have come here and not followed the rules. The fact of the matter is that many of them have come here as a result of persecution in their countries. They have been in line. They are waiting for documentation. It is not the case of them sneaking across the border and cutting in front of other people. These are people who have been here, have been accepted here, are waiting in line and not getting their documentation processed.

I might also add for my colleagues that it is very ironic that we could come here and do on a voice vote 193,000 people, allow them into this country, high-tech people, when no one was around here, and then these folks who have been here for as much as 14 years cannot get the satisfaction of knowing that the taxes they have been paying for 14 years and the work they have been providing to this country is being ignored.

It is an outright scandal and it is a shame. But they happen to be nonhigh-tech people. They are people who do the work of the country. They do our garbage, they do our roads, our schools, they take care of our kids, they do our wash, they do the stuff in the restaurants, cook our food. They deserve to be here.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. The only thing I wanted to offer to this debate is the fact that all of us in this Nation, all of us, no matter how we look and what language we might have started out with, have come from somewhere and have sought opportunity.

I do not know how I came legally. I was not able to come here legally, as I understand it. My colleagues may question my history, but I know my history. I came in another manner.

So I would simply say that anyone who wants to challenge these individuals needs to look at their own personal history. This is a terrible shame what we are doing in this Congress.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY).

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I would just reiterate what the gentleman from Texas has already said, and certainly part of this disagreement is about the immigrants; but the major disagreement we have is that the Republicans have chosen to raise their own budget caps and spend that money by giving it as a wonderful trick or treat present to the HMOs. They have chosen to deny the relief that our hospitals and nursing homes need. They have chosen to deny prescription drug benefits for our seniors. They have chosen to deny estate tax and marriage tax relief to our citizens.

These people cannot wait. This money should not go to the insurance companies, it should not be wasted by giving it to the HMOs. It should be used to provide a prescription drug benefit for our seniors, to keep our hospitals and nursing homes in business, to provide the services we need, to provide estate tax and marriage tax relief to our citizens.

We should not have to wait another 1 year or 2 years or 4 years to see this benefit granted to the American people. It is time for this Congress to do its work that we should have done a long time ago.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) to instruct the gentleman from Arkansas what was actually in that bill he voted on.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, some of us are sitting here somewhat confused. We have been listening carefully to the debate and hearing, for example, that these folks are legal but they are in fear of their status; that in fact we have chosen to give $34 billion to the HMOs.

If anyone bothered to check the entire cost of this bill, which is money for the hospitals, Medicare+Choice, home health, preventive care, on and on and on, the entire package, according to CBO, scores at $31.5 billion over 5 years. Now, I know there has been a discussion on the Presidential trail about fuzzy math; but to be able to stand up last night and today and to continue to repeat that there is $34 billion for managed care in this bill is to simply ignore the fact that the entire package is $31.5 billion.

By the way, the single largest percentage in this package goes to hospitals. That is appropriate because hospitals are the single largest cost factor in Medicare. As a matter of fact, the American Hospital Association, the largest hospital grouping in the country, has written a letter saying, we urge the Members to vote for the legislation; we urge the President not to veto the legislation. Now, when are we going to let the hospitals speak for themselves?

We just heard repeated this apparent political mantra that is necessary that we are shorting the providers, the other providers, the hospitals. The hospitals said we should have voted for the bill. Frankly, some of the Democrats have been coming up to me and saying, gee, I would like to have another opportunity. My leadership led me astray. I did not realize exactly what was in the bill. Well, sorry, it came up, we voted on it, and it was passed.

The providers themselves have written letters, more than four dozen home health associations, various specific acute hospitals, psychiatric hospitals, the providers; and they have said, sign the bill. Yet we continue to hear this argument, which is totally devoid of reality, that somehow we are spending $34 billion on the HMOs out of a $31.5 billion bill and that we are shorting the other providers, when the American Hospital Association said, we like it, deliver it, and please, Mr. President, sign it.

Now, we are also not talking about the very, very nice package of preventive care provisions that are in there extending the preventive care, which was first put in by this majority in 1997, having not been done before. We have extended it in terms of digital mammography; we have increased the number of Pap smears available for those in risk groups; we have provided screening for glaucoma; we provided screening for colonoscopies. In fact, the second largest grouping in this bill is for preventive care and beneficiary assistance.

One of the largest dollar amounts in the package is to put real dollars toward correcting the overpayment by beneficiaries on hospital bills because they have not been treated fairly and honestly by this administration in terms of what an actual percentage of the bill is. The beneficiaries are paying 20 percent of the listed price when HCFA is negotiating the price down, and that 20 percent becomes 30, 40 and 50 percent of the bill. That is shameful. We moved directly to start stopping that. That is the single largest chunk.

We also, finally, allow immunosuppressive drugs to be available to those who have had organ transplants for the rest of their lives. Current administration has held it at 3 years.

This bill is full of really good stuff supported by all of these groups, and what we continue to hear is a total misrepresentation. I know my colleagues will not stop it, but what they are saying is simply not true.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I too am dismayed at the tone this debate has taken with respect to immigration, and I am saddened and ashamed about it.

All of us think we should enforce the immigration laws; but the immigration laws have worked to damage a segment of our society, hard-working Americans with families who work hard and pay taxes every day, people who have been here since before 1986, paying taxes and raising families, and the law needs to be made equitable for those people.

Last year, in Denver, we had a lady who, because she was afraid she would be ejected from this country permanently under the immigration laws,

left this country. She left this country and she left her newborn child, who is an American citizen, in the arms of her husband, who is also an American citizen, because she was afraid that she would never be able to come back if she did not leave and reapply.

That is not only an inequity, it is a terrible human tragedy, and that is what we are trying to do. We are not trying to open the borders to everybody. We are not trying to let criminals in here. We are trying to protect the rights of hard-working Americans who are decent citizens and who pay taxes. That is what we are trying to do.

I think we should stop all of this terrible slurring on the race and everything else, and we ought to get down to what this is all about.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, none of us is happy being here today on this resolution. I believe it is fair to say that both sides would rather be home talking to our constituents about the future. And as long as I can remember, there have been continuing resolutions passed for several days at a time so that only the negotiators were kept here finishing the job. As I recall, one year during the Reagan administration, agreement was never reached, and the entire next fiscal year was conducted under a continuing resolution that President Reagan signed.

Yet we are here today forced to pass a series of continuing resolutions because we have a President who has been reluctant to leave the stage with grace and dignity. In order to have his way, he is willing to threaten to shut down the government unless we agree to this nonsense. He is willing to shut down the government unless we agree with him on his priorities in the budget. And he is willing to put everyone else at risk, both parties included, unless he gets his way.

Does the world not see what is going on here? My guess is that they do not because they view the world through the eyes of an uncritical press. In 1995, the President vetoed a continuing resolution because it contained a ''legislative rider,'' his words, in an appropriations bill. Today, he is holding an entire Congress, Democrats and Republicans alike, hostage because we are unwilling to approve his ''legislative rider'' in an appropriation bill. Is he likely to succeed? Perhaps. Because we have an uncritical press that will not tell that story.

The American people might be interested in one rider he insists upon. We have heard it talked about today. The President is insisting on a rider that will grant total amnesty to as many as a million immigrants who came to the Nation illegally. Now, to be sure, we are a Nation of immigrants. We welcome those who come to our shores and use the legal process to become Americans. But the President wants to put those who ignore our laws ahead of those who are law abiding. But we will never hear this from the press.

We have been here daily since the President issued his edict that he would not sign any continuing resolution that was longer than 24 hours. I want to commend the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). I have never seen two more dedicated workers for the cause of getting the people's work accomplished. They have been here day and night to complete the task.

I confess they differ in their views as to the right solution for the final sticking points; but unlike the President, they are here working. They were prepared to meet even on that evening last week when the President and his Chief of Staff were attending the World Series, and the next day, when the President found it more important to get in a round of golf. And over the past weekend, when the President was campaigning for his side, oh, yes, we have been ready to meet and solve this. But the President has not been here, and an uncritical press will not point that out.

In fact, the President plans a trip to California this week to campaign. We will pass one of these 1-day continuing resolutions, and a military jet will be dispatched to take it to the President for his signature. But that cost of thousands of dollars will not be billed to his party or the people he was campaigning for. The taxpayer will foot the bill. But an uncritical press will not burden the public with that fact.

We are here and will be here until the President returns to town to sit down and negotiate. We do not expect every decision to go our way, but neither should the President.

□ 1200

But absent the critical press, we will never know.

So we are left to stand here on this 30th day of October. We will pass this series of 24-hour continuing resolutions. We will wonder when the President plans to return from the campaign. We will get the job done for the American people. And we will look back to the old days when Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Johnson, Ford, Carter, Reagan and Bush understood that their day had passed and they left the stage with grace and dignity and we will long for that time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. 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.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 286, nays 73, not voting 73, as follows:

[Roll No. 580]

YEAS—286

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clement
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Evans
Ewing
Fattah
Fletcher
Foley
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kelly
Kennedy
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McGovern
McHugh
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Packard
Pallone
Paul
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Rivers
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer

Schakowsky
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Spence
Stabenow
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Traficant
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Vitter
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—73

Andrews
Baird
Becerra
Berman
Berry
Bonior
Boswell
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Condit
Costello
DeGette
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Edwards
Etheridge
Farr
Filner
Ford
Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Holt
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Kildee
Lampson
Lee
Lewis (GA)
McDermott
McKinney
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Miller, George
Moran (VA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Phelps
Price (NC)
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sandlin
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thurman
Towns
Velazquez
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Woolsey

NOT VOTING—73

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Barr
Blumenauer
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Campbell
Cardin
Conyers
Cooksey
Crane
Crowley
Danner
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
Delahunt
Dickey
Everett
Forbes
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Goodlatte
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hilliard
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
King (NY)
Klink
Kolbe
LaFalce
Lantos
Lazio
Lipinski
Maloney (NY)
Martinez
Mascara
McCollum
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
Metcalf
Neal
Oxley
Pascrell
Pickett
Radanovich
Riley
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Snyder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Talent
Thompson (MS)
Turner
Visclosky
Walden
Watkins
Weygand
Wise

□ 1221

Mr. WAXMAN changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. GORDON and Mr. KUCINICH changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 580, I was unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 296, noes 64, not voting 72, as follows:

[Roll No. 581]

AYES—296

Aderholt
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clement
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fletcher
Foley
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kelly
Kennedy
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McGovern
McHugh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Minge
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Ose
Packard
Paul
Payne
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Rivers
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Spence
Stabenow
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Udall (NM)
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—64

Baird
Becerra
Bentsen
Berry
Bonior
Capuano
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Condit
Costello
Davis (FL)
DeGette
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Filner
Ford
Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Green (TX)
Holt
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Kildee
Kucinich
Lampson
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Markey
McDermott
Meek (FL)
Miller, George
Mink
Moakley
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Pelosi
Phelps
Rangel
Rodriguez
Sisisky
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Udall (CO)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Woolsey
Wu

NOT VOTING—72

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Barr
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Campbell
Cardin
Conyers
Cooksey
Crane
Crowley
Danner
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
Delahunt
Dickey
Everett
Forbes
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Goodlatte
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hilliard
Hooley
Horn
Hoyer
Hulshof
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
King (NY)
Klink
Kolbe
LaFalce
Lantos
Lazio
Lipinski
Maloney (NY)
Martinez
Mascara
McCollum
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
Metcalf
Neal
Oxley
Pascrell
Pickett
Radanovich
Riley
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Snyder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Talent
Taylor (NC)
Thompson (MS)
Turner
Watkins
Weygand
Wise

□ 1231

Mr. OLVER changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 581, I was unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall No. 577, on approving the Journal of October 30, 2000. Had I been present I would have voted ''yea.'' Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall No. 578, on passage of a bill making further continuing Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2001. Had I been present I would have voted ''yea.'' Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall No. 579, on setting the Hour of meeting for October 31, 2000. Had I been present I