

Ford	Lantos	Rogers (KY)
Frost	Largent	Rogers (MI)
Gallegly	Larsen (WA)	Ross
Ganske	Larson (CT)	Roybal-Allard
Gekas	Latham	Rush
Gilchrest	LaTourette	Ryun (KS)
Gillmor	Leach	Sabo
Gilman	Levin	Sandlin
Gonzalez	Lewis (CA)	Sawyer
Goode	Lewis (GA)	Saxton
Goodlatte	Lewis (KY)	Schaffer
Gordon	Lowe	Schakowsky
Graham	Lucas (KY)	Schiff
Granger	Lucas (OK)	Scott
Graves	Luther	Serrano
Green (TX)	Manzullo	Sessions
Greenwood	Mascara	Sherman
Grucci	Matheson	Shimkus
Gutierrez	Matsui	Shows
Gutknecht	McCarthy (NY)	Shuster
Hall (OH)	McCollum	Simpson
Hall (TX)	McCrery	Skeen
Hansen	McGovern	Skelton
Hart	McIntyre	Smith (MI)
Hastings (FL)	McKeon	Smith (NJ)
Hastings (WA)	McKinney	Smith (TX)
Hayes	Meek (FL)	Snyder
Hayworth	Meeks (NY)	Solis
Herger	Millender-Hill	Souder
Hill	McDonald	Spratt
Hilleary	Mink	Stenholm
Hilliard	Moore	Strickland
Hinojosa	Moran (KS)	Stump
Hobson	Napolitano	Stupak
Holden	Nethercutt	Sweeney
Holt	Ney	Tanner
Hooley	Norwood	Tauzin
Horn	Nussle	Taylor (MS)
Hostettler	Ortiz	Taylor (NC)
Hoyer	Osborne	Terry
Hulshof	Ose	Thomas
Hunter	Otter	Thompson (CA)
Hyde	Oxley	Thornberry
Inslee	Pallone	Thune
Isakson	Pascarell	Thurman
Israel	Pastor	Tiahrt
Issa	Payne	Tiberi
Jackson (IL)	Pelosi	Towns
Jackson-Lee	Pence	Trafficant
(TX)	Peterson (MN)	Turner
Jefferson	Peterson (PA)	Upton
Jenkins	Phelps	Vitter
John	Pickering	Walden
Johnson (IL)	Platts	Walsh
Johnson, E. B.	Pombo	Watkins (OK)
Johnson, Sam	Pomeroy	Watson (CA)
Jones (NC)	Portman	Watt (NC)
Keller	Price (NC)	Watts (OK)
Kelly	Pryce (OH)	Weldon (FL)
Kennedy (MN)	Putnam	Weldon (PA)
Kennedy (RI)	Radanovich	Weller
Kerns	Rahall	Whitfield
Kildee	Rangel	Wicker
Kingston	Regula	Wilson
Kirk	Rehberg	Wolf
Knollenberg	Reyes	Woolsey
Kolbe	Reynolds	Wu
LaHood	Riley	Wynn
Lampson	Rodriguez	Young (AK)
Langevin	Roemer	

NAYS—120

Armey	Deutsch	King (NY)
Baldwin	Doggett	Kleccka
Barr	Doolittle	Kucinich
Barrett	Dreier	LaFalce
Bass	Dunn	Lee
Berman	Eshoo	Linder
Biggett	Fattah	LoBiondo
Blumenauer	Ferguson	Lofgren
Boehlert	Flake	Maloney (CT)
Borski	Fossella	Maloney (NY)
Boswell	Frank	Markey
Brady (PA)	Frelinghuysen	McDermott
Brown (OH)	Gephardt	McHugh
Capuano	Goss	McInnis
Cardin	Green (WI)	McNulty
Castle	Harman	Meehan
Chabot	Hefley	Menendez
Conyers	Hinche	Mica
Coyne	Hoeffel	Miller (FL)
Crane	Hoekstra	Miller, Gary
Culberson	Honda	Miller, George
Davis (CA)	Istook	Moran (VA)
Davis, Tom	Johnson (CT)	Morrell
DeFazio	Jones (OH)	Murtha
Delahunt	Kanjorski	Myrick
DeLay	Kaptur	Nadler
DeMint	Kind (WI)	Neal

Northup	Royce	Stearns
Oberstar	Ryan (WI)	Sununu
Obey	Sanchez	Tancredo
Owens	Sanders	Tauscher
Paul	Shrock	Tierney
Petri	Sensenbrenner	Toomey
Pitts	Shadegg	Udall (CO)
Quinn	Shaw	Udall (NM)
Ramstad	Shays	Velazquez
Rivers	Sherwood	Wamp
Rohrabacher	Simmons	Waters
Rothman	Slaughter	Weiner
Roukema	Stark	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—19

Bachus	Houghton	Smith (WA)
Baker	Kilpatrick	Thompson (MS)
Burton	Lipinski	Visclosky
Callahan	McCarthy (MO)	Waxman
Cox	Mollohan	Wexler
Duncan	Olver	
Gibbons	Ros-Lehtinen	

□ 1225

Messrs. SHAYS, QUINN, HONDA and MCNULTY and Mrs. MORELLA changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. MCKINNEY changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 371, final passage of H.R. 2646, the Farm Security Act of 2001, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, due to District business which required my attention, I am unable to be present for final passage of H.R. 2646, The Farm Security Act, rollcall No. 371. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2646.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN THE ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 2646, FARM SECURITY ACT OF 2001

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 2646, the Clerk be authorized to correct the table of contents, section numbers, punctuation, citations and cross-references and to make other such technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House in amending the bill.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2960

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2960.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. BONIOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the distinguished majority leader, the schedule for the remainder of the day and for the following week.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I am pleased to announce the House has completed its legislative business for the week.

The House will next meet for legislative business on Tuesday, October 9, 2001, at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and at 2 p.m. for legislative business. The House will consider a number of measures under suspension of the rules, a list of which will be distributed to Members' offices later today. On Tuesday, no recorded votes are expected before 6 p.m.

On Wednesday and the balance of the week, the House will consider the following measures, subject to rules being granted: the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2002; and H.R. 2975, the PATRIOT Act of 2001.

Mr. Speaker, appropriators are also working hard on many bills now in conference, and it is my hope that the appropriations conference reports will be available for consideration in the House at some point next week.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, if I might inquire of the distinguished gentleman from Texas a couple of questions. Can the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished majority leader, tell us what appropriation conference report might in fact surface next week for our consideration?

□ 1230

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I am pleased to respond. We believe that Interior is the most likely appropriation bill to come back from conference next week.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, if we could just review for a second where we are through the appropriation process. There are two left here in the House to do, the Labor-HHS and the Defense bill; is that correct?

Mr. ARMEY. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, in the Senate, they have four or five left; is that the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I am not sure exactly, but it is four or five, yes.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, we should expect these conference reports to start

to flow with some rapidity here within the next couple of weeks so that we can finish them by the end of perhaps October; is that a fair assessment?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, that is my expectation. I am told by the appropriators who are, in fact, negotiating bicamerally and bipartisanly with the White House that things are going well, and we should have every reason to expect that we could complete our work by the end of the month.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, is the Aviation Security bill possible for schedule next week?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, again, I want to thank the gentleman for the inquiry. If the gentleman will continue to yield, the negotiations on that bill continue. I believe they are really down to one issue, and it is possible that we might see that bill on the floor next week. And as soon as it is agreed to, we will bring it to the floor.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, if I could just make a brief comment on that to the gentleman from Texas. We believe that those who protect and screen our airports should be professionally trained and hired by the Federal Government, and we hope that that will be a part of the bill that moves through this body. And, if not, we hope to have the opportunity to provide the body with a chance to support that concept and that proposal.

The second thing that I want to point out about this bill to the gentleman from Texas is that we believe it is essential that workers who have been laid off be given relief. We passed, the Congress passed, I should say, this \$15 billion bill for the airline industries and a \$70 billion farm bill. It seems to me we certainly can take care of the literally hundreds of thousands of workers now who have been affected by the results of what occurred on September 11, so I am hopeful that the workers are a part of a relief package.

If we are moving together, I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, as a country, as Americans, through this very difficult period of ours, everyone has to move, everyone has to be brought together, everyone has to be a part of resolving the problems that beset us and are before us. American workers who have borne the brunt of this catastrophe, who are there cleaning up the sites, who will be there reconstructing the sites, and who are fighting for our country today and wearing our uniform, those Americans deserve to have the consideration of the support they need in a time of economic layoffs.

So I want to really emphasize how important that is and how strongly we are going to push that measure as we move ahead in the next week or so. I would ask the gentleman, what is the likelihood of this economic piece being included in the Aviation Security bill?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman again for the in-

quiry and let me express my sincere appreciation for the points the gentleman has made. On the first point of airline security, there is no doubt about it. Airline security is important; in fact, the security of all transportation in America is important, and that is why indeed we are working so hard. Like the gentleman from Michigan, we believe that the people who are charged with these responsibilities should be professionally trained and competent in the manner in which they carry out their duties. That is why indeed we are working so hard to complete the Airline Security Act which, frankly, would be better understood as a Transportation Security Act for all of America.

Again, the second point that the gentleman raises, the workers that have been finding themselves out of work are, indeed, weighing heavily on the President's mind; and he has sent up a Workers Compensation bill that is being looked at as we speak.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps even on a larger sense of importance, it is our desire to get every American who wants work and who is able to work back on the job as soon as possible. And that is why so much time and effort is being put into this economic stimulus package which, hopefully, we can find its way working through the Committee on Ways and Means in the near future, in which case we should be able to work together to address these concerns of all of these good, deserving American citizens.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. The President made the first step on this worker compensation package yesterday in his announcements. I understand his position; but I do not agree with it. I think it is woefully inadequate. I do not think there is enough resources there.

The whole unemployment compensation picture is very cloudy in this country. Very few people are eligible for it today. People will be shocked to know that less than 40 percent of the workers in this country are eligible for compensation. In my own State of Michigan, we have a freeze of \$300 per week; it has been there since 1995. There are all kinds of reforms that are needed in unemployment compensation.

I know we are moving very quickly to take care of the needs of workers in this country, given what has happened and what was happening before September 11, but we have some very major reforms that are needed. And I hope we can work together to embody these reforms as we move ahead with a transportation security package and with the stimulus package as such in the next week and month ahead.

Finally, if I could just raise this one other point with the gentleman from Texas, my friend, and then I will finish. The markup on Fast Track has been now scheduled for Tuesday. I understand it was postponed today. Is that bill coming to the floor soon? If the

gentleman from Texas could help us with that, I would certainly like to know when.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, again, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan for asking. If the gentleman will continue to yield, the Fast Track or Trade Promotion Authority bill will be, I am told by the chairman of the committee, marked up on Tuesday. I understand this is by agreement with both the Republicans and Democrats in the committee. We would obviously be looking for an opportunity to schedule that bill for the floor as soon after it is reported as possible. At this point, though, until they actually have the markup, I cannot make any pronouncements about its actual floor schedule.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I will just share this final comment with my colleague. I have done it before with him, he knows it, and I just think it is important to reiterate it, and that is that is a very, very divisive issue.

I am sure that it would not be wise to bring that up at this point in this session. To the extent that I could be heard over there, and I know I am talking to people who believe deeply in a concept that is different from mine; I think it would be wise not to raise this issue in this Congress and certainly in this session. I would advise my colleague so. But if it is brought up, we are prepared to have a vigorous debate on it.

I would just say one final thing; I am sounding like a Baptist preacher here, excuse me, I am doing a lot of conclusions and finals, but just let me say in the final conclusion, let me just say to the gentleman from Texas that the industrial heartland of this country has been rocked very hard over the, not just since the September 11 tragedy that has occurred, but prior to that. We have huge numbers of folks in steel and auto and iron and hotel and restaurant and you name it that have been affected by this economy. I really think that the leadership on the gentleman's side of the aisle really has to think hard about whether or not we want to have this debate at this time.

We can go ahead and have it, and we will have a vigorous debate and a vigorous argument and we can respect each other's opinions. But Members need to know that it will be an enormously vigorous, difficult issue. I do not think that is the kind of division that the country is looking for right now. I do not think it would be helpful, and I just hope that the leadership on the gentleman's side of the aisle, including the distinguished majority leader, will factor that in in his decision-making. And I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) for listening to me this afternoon.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I thank the gentleman again. If I might say, Mr. Speaker, that one of my favorite parts of my week are these weekly exchanges with the gentleman from Michigan. The

gentleman is always very well focused and to the point in the points he makes. I do appreciate the point the gentleman makes, and I do also look forward to what will be a good floor debate and one that I think we will all enjoy participating in.

But if I might, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to indulge me, it has been brought to my attention that the gentleman from Michigan and, very likely, the gentleman from St. Louis, Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) might find some time, and I would hope very much, to get together Monday night to enjoy the Monday night football game. I have no doubt that one or the other will enjoy it more than one or the other, but I do wish the two gentlemen from Michigan and Missouri an opportunity to watch that game, perhaps together, put down their bets, and maybe just take one evening to have a little bit of good, relaxed companionship around a good sporting event. And we will be back to work with rigorous debate soon after that, but I do not think it hurts any of us to indulge ourselves in what is America's favorite full-time pastime.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Michigan share more in common with their respective teams than the gentleman from Missouri; I only wish we had as great a success as the Rams this year. But I appreciate the gentleman's comment and I will take him up on it.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY,
OCTOBER 9, 2001

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, October 9, 2001, for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR
WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON
WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House join me in wishing my favorite nephew, Ryan, a happy 4th birthday on Saturday next.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

MEDICARE DRUG DISCOUNT
SECURITY ACT

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take a moment to talk about a very important issue for American seniors and that is a Medicare Drug Discount Security Act that myself and Senator CHUCK HAGEL introduced some time ago.

The President of the United States recently announced his own plan that mirrored many of the things we tried to accomplish. We are very proud of our approach to providing seniors with discounts on prescription drugs. The President announced it in a ceremony at the Rose Garden and we were quite pleased that he had taken the direction by Executive Order. As many of my colleagues know, there was a lawsuit filed by the chain discount drugstores opposing the measure, and it resides now in Federal court.

One of the interesting mythical dynamics that followed the President's announcement was groups saying that it was nothing more than window dressing. It was smoke screen. It was political posturing. It would not amount to much. It is insignificant. It is immaterial. It is not necessary, nor is it helpful. We heard that from a number of groups and a number of citizen and senior advocates. We were quite shocked because we thought, in a free society, a free market economy, when you are able to leverage the number of people participating, thereby getting them a discount on the prices they pay, that is a pretty simple and superb way in which to get seniors discounts now.

□ 1245

Others have objected to the plan saying it was not a good scheme. I questioned at the time if it is such a bad scheme, why do millions of Americans sign up to be AARP members? Usually it is because they get a discount on motel rates and other things.

It was interesting, in the Washington Post of Tuesday, September 25, there was a headline, a new Kennedy campaign on drug cause, former House Member Joseph Kennedy, a Member of this body now in Boston, Massachusetts, has been using now and creating a drug delivery system under his Citizens Energy Corporation. This allows people to join together as members of that group in order to get a discount on prescriptions.

It is interesting, when a Democrat, Mr. Kennedy, announces the plan, AARP says, it certainly is needed, says John Rother, policy director at AARP, a senior citizens advocate group advocating a prescription drug benefit for Medicare recipients. It goes on to talk about the discounts people will be able to receive. It goes on to suggest in this plan that although Citizen Help hopes to target the needy, Kennedy says the group does not have an elaborate screening process. He assumes well-to-do people will opt to stick with private insurance plans which charge on average 5 to 25 copayment for the prescription.

That therein lies the political conundrum. When we announce it as Republicans, Senator HAGEL and myself, and the President enunciates it from the White House, it is met with skepticism, scorn, and outright laughter. When a Democrat announces the plan, it becomes the focal point of how to save seniors money.

Last year during the campaign season I remember Democrats taking a bus and taking seniors up to Canada because they could buy prescription drugs cheaper. Yes, I applaud that. I think it is great when you find a discount, even if you have to cross the border, but they used that as a political campaign and tool in which to defeat senators, by saying our seniors have to go to Canada to get a discount.

Our plan, on the other hand, now mirrored by former Member Kennedy allows people to get discounts here in their own country. They do not have to get on a bus, they do not have to travel to Canada, and they can go to their local pharmacies. They can go to their local plans and get these kinds of discounts.

So I would hope in the spirit of this wonderful new bipartisanship that has emanated out of this Chamber, since September 11 we get down to the business of helping seniors, Democrats, Republicans, Independents, get prescription drug coverage and get it more affordable, without creating a government scheme that will oftentimes be more complicated and more difficult for average seniors to access.

I salute former Member Kennedy. I salute AARP for making the positive comments about our plan. I thank him for introducing it in the community where I was born in Boston, Massachusetts, and I just hope other Democrats now listening to this and reading the newspapers will finally suggest that President Bush was right in announcing from the Oval Office, or at least from the Rose Garden, that he intended to help seniors today, not next year after debate, not the following year after debate, not 5 years from now when the political process winds itself up into a lather trying to provide it, but instead, doing it through the free enterprise system which Mr. Kennedy has done here in this plan.

I urge my colleagues to look at our bill, Senator HAGEL's in the Senate and