

Norwood	Ryun (KS)	Taylor (NC)
Nussle	Salmon	Terry
Ose	Sanford	Thomas
Oxley	Saxton	Thornberry
Packard	Scarborough	Thune
Paul	Schaffer	Tiahrt
Pease	Sensenbrenner	Toomey
Petri	Sessions	Traficant
Pickering	Shaw	Upton
Pitts	Shays	Vitter
Pombo	Sherwood	Walden
Porter	Shimkus	Walsh
Portman	Shuster	Wamp
Pryce (OH)	Simpson	Watkins
Quinn	Skeen	Watts (OK)
Ramstad	Smith (MI)	Weldon (FL)
Regula	Smith (NJ)	Weldon (PA)
Reynolds	Smith (TX)	Weller
Riley	Souder	Whitfield
Rogan	Spence	Wicker
Rogers	Stearns	Wilson
Rohrabacher	Stump	Wolf
Ros-Lehtinen	Sununu	Young (AK)
Roukema	Sweeney	Young (FL)
Royce	Tancredo	
Ryan (WI)	Tauzin	

Gutierrez	McCollum	Radanovich
Hastings (FL)	McDermott	Shadegg
Istook	McGovern	Slaughter
Johnson (CT)	McIntosh	Stabenow
Klink	Meeks (NY)	Stupak
Largent	Mica	Talent
Lazio	Mollohan	Waxman
Maloney (CT)	Peterson (PA)	Wise

□ 1537

Messrs. MURTHA, FARR of California, and EDWARDS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I was absent and unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of the motion to suspend the rules and pass H. Res. 646 (roll-call No. 551).

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. 115 and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Pursuant to the rule just adopted, I call up the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 115) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 115

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 26, 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 asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

Mr. Speaker, H.J. Res. 115 is a continuing resolution, and it continues the funding of our Government for one day until midnight tomorrow night.

I am not sure that is the smartest way to go. I think that, with the progress that we are making now, that

we could probably be finished by Friday or Saturday. I would have preferred to have introduced a resolution to go to at least Saturday. However, the President of the United States has told us that he would only sign CR's for one day at a time. And, of course, that is his prerogative. He is the President and he has the veto pen; and unless we have a two-thirds vote to override him, he prevails. And so, he prevails in this case, and we have a 1-day CR. If we do not finish our business tomorrow, we will have another 1-day CR.

Where we are on the progress of our bills is, after having passed the Foreign Operations appropriations conference report today, there are only two outstanding conference reports, one of which we intend to file tonight, that is the District of Columbia appropriations bill along with the Commerce, State, Justice bill. And then the one remaining bill is the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education bill, which we hope to be able to file by tomorrow night and move to consideration of it Friday or Saturday.

Then we will have completed our appropriations process. All this CR does is extend the continuation of the Government from midnight tonight to midnight tomorrow night.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my ranking member for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say I want to thank the President of the United States for insisting that this continuing resolution be for only 24 hours and that we operate with these 24-hour resolutions from now on.

And the reason is simple. Most of the discussion right now is over the fact that the Republican leadership refuses to move on the Democratic education initiatives that include funding for school modernization and also for more teachers and more money that goes back to the local towns and school districts to hire more teachers. I just want to say how important those initiatives are.

In the State of New Jersey, we rely mostly for our school funding on local property taxes; and increasingly we find that the towns are unable to afford more money for educational purposes. And so, what we have is that the class sizes continue to rise; the school buildings, in many cases, do not receive the necessary repairs; we have overcrowding where we cannot even in a lot of the school districts build a new school because we do not have the money.

So when the Democrats talk about an initiative that allows these towns to have more money to hire teachers, to reduce class size, or to pay for school modernization or for new schools, these are real problems, these are real issues that affect people every day and affect

NAYS—191

Abercrombie	Gordon	Oberstar
Ackerman	Green (TX)	Obey
Allen	Hall (OH)	Olver
Andrews	Hall (TX)	Ortiz
Baca	Hill (IN)	Owens
Baird	Hilliard	Pallone
Baldacci	Hinchey	Pascrell
Baldwin	Hinojosa	Pastor
Barcia	Hoefel	Payne
Barrett (WI)	Holden	Pelosi
Becerra	Holt	Peterson (MN)
Bentsen	Hooley	Phelps
Berkley	Hoyer	Pickett
Berman	Inslee	Pomeroy
Berry	Jackson (IL)	Price (NC)
Bishop	Jackson-Lee (TX)	Rahall
Blagojevich	Jefferson	Rangel
Blumenauer	John	Reyes
Bonior	Johnson, E. B.	Rivers
Borski	Jones (OH)	Rodriguez
Boswell	Kanjorski	Roemer
Boucher	Kaptur	Rothman
Boyd	Kennedy	Roybal-Allard
Brady (PA)	Kildee	Rush
Brown (FL)	Kilpatrick	Sabo
Capps	Kind (WI)	Sanchez
Capuano	Kleczka	Sanders
Cardin	Kucinich	Stenholm
Carson	LaFalce	Strickland
Clay	Lampson	Tanner
Clayton	Lantos	Tauscher
Clement	Larson	Taylor (MS)
Clyburn	Lee	Thompson (CA)
Condit	Levin	Thompson (MS)
Conyers	Lewis (GA)	Thurman
Costello	Lipinski	Tierney
Coyne	Lofgren	Towns
Cramer	Lowey	Turner
Crowley	Lucas (KY)	Udall (CO)
Cummings	Luther	Udall (NM)
Davis (FL)	Maloney (NY)	Velazquez
Davis (IL)	Markey	Visclosky
DeFazio	Mascara	Waters
DeGette	Matsui	Watt (NC)
DeLauro	McCarthy (MO)	Weiner
Deutsch	McCarthy (NY)	Wexler
Dicks	McIntyre	Weygand
Dingell	McKinney	Woolsey
Dixon	McNulty	Wu
Doggett	Meehan	Wynn
Dooley	Meek (FL)	
Doyle	Menendez	
Edwards	Millender-McDonald	
Eshoo	Miller, George	
Etheridge	Minge	
Evans	Mink	
Farr	Moakley	
Fattah	Moore	
Filner	Moran (VA)	
Forbes	Murtha	
Ford	Nadler	
Frank (MA)	Napolitano	
Frost	Neal	
Gejdenson		
Gonzalez		

NOT VOTING—36

Bonilla	Collins	Engel
Brown (OH)	Danner	Franks (NJ)
Campbell	Delahunt	Gephardt
Chenoweth-Hage	Ehrlich	Greenwood

children in New Jersey and throughout the country every day.

□ 1545

The bottom line is the Republican leadership talks about the need for discipline in the classroom. How are we going to have discipline in the classroom if we have a class that has 25, 30, or even 40 students? If we give money back to the school districts to hire more teachers, they can reduce the class size. I think the President's suggestion is down to 18 students at the elementary level. That means better discipline in the classroom, better learning opportunities for these kids in the public schools.

And the same thing goes for the school modernization initiative. How can they learn if they are in a building that is falling apart? I have been to school districts in my district where the roof was collapsing. Or in other situations where they have to have two shifts and kids go to school starting at 7:00 in the morning to noon and then 12:00 noon to 5 o'clock, or something like that.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats are talking about something that is real here. This is not pie in the sky. All we are saying is that we have the money now, let us make it available for these towns, because it helps with their property taxes. But most importantly, it helps with these kids and their lives.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments. Am I correct that if we passed the initiative that we have been hoping to pass on making sure that we have more classrooms and more teachers to bring class sizes down and have safe and clean, healthy schools to teach in, am I correct that if a local subdivision did not want to have more teachers, or did not want to do any school construction, that this legislation would not force them to do anything? Am I correct?

Mr. PALLONE. Absolutely.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, so it would be the local school board's choice, the local citizens' choice whether or not to utilize these resources.

Mr. PALLONE. Absolutely.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services and Education.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, if I could say to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the money for both classroom size reduction and for school construction has been included in the conference report since July 27. It is fully available under title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Under this title the school district, if it decides it does not need the money for school construction, can use the money for other purposes like

teacher training or equipping classrooms with technology and computers.

So there should be no dispute about the money being available. The dispute is about whether money is to be mandated by Washington to be spent for a particular purpose, or whether the local school district and the parents in that school district will decide the use for that money. The money is there; there has never been a dispute about the money. There is a dispute about Washington control or about local decision-making. We favor local decision-making.

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

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for the gentleman, as he knows, and for all that he has done in his capacity as chairman of the subcommittee. But I think there is a serious issue here about whether the money really is available in the sense that what has been proposed, from what I understand from the Republican leadership, is that this is more in the nature of a block grant and it is not necessarily the case the way the language is now that this money would be available for these purposes.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would say to the gentleman that the way it is structured, not only \$1.3 billion would be available for school construction, \$2.7 billion would be available for that purpose. Or the \$2.7 billion would be available for classroom size reduction. In other words, we are not straitjacketing the process; we are giving flexibility so that the schools can decide their needs themselves. That is the way it should be done, in my judgment.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would again yield, I think there is a serious question about that and whether or not the money would actually flow to the school districts. I understand the gentleman disagrees.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), chairman of the subcommittee, my friend; but I would nonetheless like to set the record straight, because I view this issue quite differently than does he.

He says that the argument is not about availability of money. He says the argument is simply about whether or not we are going to have Federal dictation to local school districts or whether they are going to have some flexibility.

I would point out one simple fact: 93 percent of all of the money that is spent by every school district in the country, on average, is raised and spent in accordance with State and local wishes. That hardly sounds to me like Federal dictation. It is true that what we are trying to do on this side of the aisle is to assure that the other 7 percent is focused on what we regard to

be critical national priorities. One of those priorities is school construction. Another is teacher training. A third is class size.

We happen to believe that the research shows that children do a better job of learning if the classes are small enough so that teachers can have, from time to time, control of the classroom in which they are teaching and have some close personal relationship with those students.

We also happen to believe that children do better if they are not in schools that are falling down. There is a \$125 billion backlog on school construction in this country. The President is trying to fashion a program which meets at least 20 percent of that need, and we make no apology in trying to focus that 7 percent of Federal funds that we provide on those items.

The third point I would make is simply this. With respect to class size, lest anyone in this Chamber believe that there is not a large degree of flexibility for local school districts, let me point out the following: school districts now have flexibility to spend up to 25 percent of the funds on training, existing teachers, testing new teachers, and providing high-quality professional development to ensure that all teachers have the knowledge and schools to teach effectively.

So if school districts have already reached the class size target at 18, they are free to move a significant portion of their funds to teacher training, as the majority demanded last year.

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

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman says that we here in Washington know that reduced class sizes are better for kids to learn, and we here in Washington know that kids should not have to go to school in dilapidated classrooms. What makes the gentleman think that the local school board does not know those same things? What makes him think that we have to tell them how to spend their money?

It seems to me that the argument that since 93 percent of the money is raised locally, we ought to be able to dictate how our 7 percent is used simply goes against the genius of public education in our country. The secret is not Washington control, it is local control. That is what we have done for 200 years in America, and it seems to me that we can trust them to make these decisions. They have made a lot of good decisions.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, taking back my time, I would simply say the gentleman has asked why is it that local school districts do not recognize these same priorities. The fact is that they do, and that is why they are asking us to pass these programs. Take a look and see which educational organizations have supported these programs: the PTA, right on down.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman continue to yield?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would prefer that the gentleman get some time from the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG). I would be happy to continue this exchange, but I prefer that some of it be on his time.

But let me simply complete my thought. Directing that 7 percent of the education money that is spent in this country be spent on national priorities is not what I call running roughshod over local control. What we are saying is they control 93 percent of the funds. Spend it any way they want. But if they want us to use taxpayers' dollars at the Federal level, we want them used for areas that we know by research work, and in areas that have an extra problem.

We know that the average school in this country is 43 years old. Some of them are so old we cannot even wire them anymore for modern technology. We ought to be helping to change that, instead of obstructing the efforts of the President to do something about it.

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has just clearly defined our differences. We believe that education decisions can be made at the local level, and we are willing to give not the President's level of \$1.3 billion, but \$2.7 billion. If local school districts want to use it for school construction, they can. We believe that they can make these decisions without Washington direction.

The flexibility that we believe in and the control that they believe in clearly defines the differences between our two parties in this area. That is the way it is. We understand it. We accept it. We think that they are wrong; and obviously, they think that we are wrong.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we have had this argument in our committee before, and I ask the gentleman why then does he not believe that all the education money that we appropriate in his bill should not be simply block granted? Let me give a specific example.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, what makes the gentleman think that I do not believe that?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, if he does, that is fine. Why does he not propose that?

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, again reclaiming my time, I will say to the gentleman that we have made every effort, for example, to put money into special education for disabled children. Now, that is an account that is a Federal mandate. We know that that money has to be spent. The more money that we put into that account,

while it obviously helps that situation and that need, it also frees up other money that has had to be spent in that account for other purposes and allows the local school district to decide where those funds can best be used.

So, yes. Are we for more flexibility? Absolutely. That is what we believe in.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I understand his premise. We have, for instance, billions of dollars in our bill for Head Start. Is it the gentleman's position that we ought to make that flexible so that if a community locally decides that they do not need a Head Start program in that community, they can use those dollars for something else?

Mr. PORTER. That is not an education program. That is an HHS program. It is a Federal program. It is not administered by the schools.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), my distinguished friend and chairman of the subcommittee, that in some instances he is correct. In Prince George's County, the Head Start program is administered by the school system and they can use Head Start money only for Head Start. They do not have the flexibility, I tell my friend, to put that money in other places.

Now, why is that? Why is that? Because 435 of us have been elected by the people of the United States to make policy, to make judgments, to establish priorities. I have full respect for State legislators. I was in the State legislature for 12 years, president of the Senate for my last 4. I respect the members of the State Senate. I respect my county council and my county executive.

But, Mr. Speaker, they were not elected to decide how we spend Federal tax revenues. As a matter of fact, we had a revenue-sharing program that most on that side of the aisle voted to repeal, as I recall. This is in effect what the gentleman from Illinois is talking about, a revenue-sharing program.

I believe, as the gentleman from New Jersey believes, that there is a critical problem in America: A, there is a shortage of teachers; B, there is a shortage of classrooms and we have crowded classrooms. Now, it may not exist in every school system. So what I believe, and what the President believes, is because we have identified a problem, the gentleman is correct, it may not exist in every school system. We are providing a program to respond to that problem.

Now, those who represent school districts that think that the teacher-pupil ratio is perfect, that the school buildings do not need rehabilitation, they do not need help with school bonding, then fine. They do not have to take the money. But we have identified as Fed-

eral legislators a need, and we are prepared to take the responsibility for appropriating funds to solve that problem.

□ 1600

That is where the gentleman and I disagree. He places it in a context that I think is not the premise that I adopted. I am not for controlling the local system. What I am for doing is establishing a Federal policy which says that we need to have small classrooms so that we can educate our children to be competitive in a world-class economy. I think that is essentially what we are trying to do.

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, we are doing exactly the same thing. The money is there. In fact, more money is there for construction, for classroom size reduction. We simply provide flexibility as to how that money will be used.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman is not correct. Let me tell you, Mr. Chairman, why you are not correct. What you do is you take a sum of money and you distribute that by formula pursuant to title VI to every school system in America that may or may not have this particular problem that I think I have identified, my constituents have identified; and what you have turned it into is a revenue-sharing program to be disseminated. Some jurisdictions, frankly, are going to get a paltry sum.

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

Mr. Speaker, the fact is the administration asked for \$1.3 billion in renovation funds. They asked for \$1.75 billion for class size. You merged that into a block grant. They asked for \$3 billion. You gave them \$2.7 and block granted it.

We have seen from the way you use the community service block grants and other programs that the first step on your side of the aisle is always to block grant funds. Then, after you block granted it so you do not have to take the heat for individual program cuts, then you cut the guts out of them in the second and third years. That is what has happened time and time again in social service programs, and we are not going to fall for it.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), who is one of the leading experts in this Congress on the issue of education and funding for education.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I would simply say to my colleague from Wisconsin that there was already \$365 million in the education block grant. The total for all activities including class size reduction and school renovations is \$3.1 billion. I would also say to my friend from Maryland that his example of Head Start is an example of a federal

program that does not exist under the Department of Education. It may be that school districts apply to the Department of Health and Human Services or the State of Maryland. But clearly that is not an example of what we are trying to do in providing greater flexibility in these accounts.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I tell my friend from Illinois, my point was, A, that the money in Head Start is in our bill. I said in our bill. I understand it is not in the education title because it is administered under HHS. It happens to be run by the education department in my county, and about one-quarter of the Head Start programs, as the gentleman knows, in America are under the education departments. Three-quarters are not.

My point was that the Head Start money is money that is identified for a particular program. I tell my friend from Illinois that we made a determination that children from at-risk homes needed a special start, a head start. It is a program Ronald Reagan said worked.

We, therefore, at the Federal level made a determination that we were going to, in our case, make billions of dollars available, but for this purpose, because we have made, as a Federal legislative body, a determination of a need.

My point to you, sir, is that I believe that we have made on our side of the aisle a similar determination that there is a classroom shortage in America, that there are crowded classrooms in America, and that we have a teacher shortage in America as a result of having more students in our schools than any time in our history.

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

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

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

I understand the gentleman from Maryland's discussion about a specific Federal purpose like the Head Start Program or a specific Federal purpose like school construction or a specific Federal purpose like reducing the size of classrooms for teachers. But in this particular instance, there are specific needs that this money can fill.

For example, in the school district in Somerset County, where Crisfield students go to high school, there is no new construction that is needed. There are no new teachers needed, because classroom sizes are already small and getting smaller because the community is reducing in size. What is desperately needed in that poor, lower shore community, where salaries are very low, is some technology. So this particular program as distributed across the country can help in school class size, school construction, but in that community specifically these dollars spent

by the local school district can help in the arena of enhancing those teachers, in training, technology, and computers.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

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

Mr. Speaker, the Un-Congress, as "The Washington Post" now calls us, will approve now its fifth continuing resolution, and with it the Federal Government will stay open for an additional 24 hours.

Mr. Speaker, I will support, of course, this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. It finally focuses on doing work. For as every one of us knew when we approved the fourth continuing resolution just 6 days ago, not much was going to be done in the 5 days that we lost. We knew it would take a measure such as this.

As "The Washington Post" again stated, "The un-Congress continues neither to work nor to adjourn. For 2 years, it has mainly pretended to deal with issues that it has systematically avoided."

This Congress has avoided a real patients' bill of rights, it has avoided a meaningful Medicare prescription drug benefit, it has avoided campaign finance reform, and now, of course, it seeks to avoid, I tell my friend from Maryland, the Democratic initiatives on class size reduction and school modernization.

It seeks instead to simply parcel out very small sums of money to everybody in America, and perhaps solve no problem, because the monies that everybody will receive will be too small to accomplish any one objective.

The mother of all budget train wrecks, those irresponsible and decisive government shutdowns in 1995, Mr. Speaker, has morphed this year into the eerily quiet derailment. After 6 years of Republican leadership, our budget process is in a shambles. It is unnecessarily contentious, it is often disingenuous. And I want to make it clear, as I have made it clear on each one of the four previous continuing resolutions, this is not the fault of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), a distinguished, able, effective and very honest chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who does this institution credit in his leadership.

I believe it has contributed to the growing cynicism in our country towards the legislative process. While our budget debate need not degenerate into intransigence, the GOP's approach, in my opinion, over the last 6 years has made such an outcome inevitable.

The majority has adopted unrealistic budget resolutions in each of the last 3 years. That is why we are here today, because the budget resolution was unreasonable. And guess what we did just a few hours ago? We changed the budget caps. Why? Because they were not working.

In some years, including this one, House and Senate Republicans have been unable to reach agreement even among themselves, Mr. Speaker, as you know, and, although I do not want to put words in your mouth, I am sure you lament as well.

Just 2 years ago, Congress failed to enact a budget for the first time in 24 years, since the adoption of the 1974 Budget Act. And I will say to my friends on the majority side of the aisle, that budget could have been adopted without a single Democratic vote. It was not. Both Houses are controlled by the majority party, and they did not adopt a budget.

Republicans have loaded up spending bills with legislative riders that, frankly, have no place on appropriation bills. As Chairman YOUNG said recently, "the thing that is holding us up are the non-appropriation issues that should have been taken care of in authorizing committees."

Finally, Republicans have proposed spending cuts that even ardent conservatives could not long have lived with. My good friend the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking member of our Committee on the Budget, how quickly they forget, released a report on Monday that debunks the myth of big spending Democrats. I want to have my majority party friends hear this. In fact, domestic appropriations have risen faster when the House is controlled by Republicans.

I will just let that sink in a while, because it is contrary, of course, to what you argue out on the hustings.

So while I urge my colleagues to vote for this continuing resolution, Mr. Speaker, and to complete this year's budget, I lament the fact that again we are hung up at the end of a session because of our unwillingness in the majority to confront the educational needs of America's children and America's families.

We have been discussing the difference, and the difference is the identification of a critical need in America, that of more classrooms. Why? Because we have more children in school than at any time in our history. And we know that we have a teacher shortage, a quality teacher shortage; and what we seek to do is expand upon the availability of classrooms and of teachers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the majority party to take a hard look at our process. No reasonable person, in my view, can conclude that this is the way this great institution ought to be run. Even Senator PHIL GRAMM commented in the morning's Post, "I think the budget process has been destroyed; and I think, unfortunately, Republicans have been heavily numbered among the assassins." So said PHIL GRAMM.

Mr. Speaker, we can and should do better. Let us come to agreement on providing more classrooms and more teachers for our children.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Chair would remind

Members that it is not in order in debate to refer to statements of Senators occurring outside the Senate Chamber.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say, as good a friendship as I have with my friend the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), I would strongly disagree with the statement that he made that the Republican majority has not done well for education. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) pointed out very effectively that we have actually provided more funding this year alone than the President asked for. The only difference is the great debate over who is going to control the funds, who is going to make the decision on what the needs are, back in my congressional district or in his congressional district, a bureaucrat in Washington, or the locally elected school board back home in our districts.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Democrats controlled this House for 40 years, and what have we ended up with? This Nation, with all its resources, last in math and science of all the industrialized nations; last in literacy. Our schools are crumbling, and they need help. But what have they done? They have catered to the trial lawyers and the unions to rip off our school system. And I want to be specific.

They talk about school construction. Waive Davis-Bacon. It costs between 15 to 35 percent, depending on what State, to build schools, because Federal dollars have to fall under the prevailing wage. They say, well, we want a living wage. Ninety percent of all the construction in this country are nonunion, and they earn a living wage. And, guess what? Minority contractors have a good chance at the jobs, where they do not with the unions.

We can build schools. Let us not take that money away from the schools. Let us let the schools keep it. Do they want more construction, do they want teacher training, or whatever? But my colleagues on the other side, because they get most of their campaign money out of the unions, will not cross the unions.

Secondly, my colleague from Wisconsin says that 93 percent of the money is controlled by State and local, and 7 percent Federal.

□ 1615

That is the way it is supposed to work. Just look at IDEA and special education. Look at the requirements in the D.C. bill; we capped the amount that liberal trial lawyers could take out of special education, Alan Bernstein's number one problem in San Diego, the superintendent of schools.

But yet my colleagues wanted to pay off for the liberal trial lawyers and op-

pose it. Luckily, the Senate saw through in the conference. Guess what? The city was able to hire 123 special-needs teachers. Democrats wanted to control it. We said no, let the local district do it.

When I was chairman of the authorization committee, 16 programs came forward from different areas. Every one of them had the absolute best program in the world. And after the hearing, I said, which one of you have any one of the other 15 in your district? None of them. That is the whole point.

We want to give it directly to the schools so that the teachers, the parents, and the local administrators can make those decisions. My colleagues want Federal control of everything.

Another good example was Goals 2000. There are 14 "wills" in that bill, which means you will do it. They say it is voluntary. Well, it is only voluntary if you want the money. One of those wills you had to establish another board to see if you comply with Goals 2000. It then went to your school board. It then went to the principal; it then went to the superintendent.

Think about it, all the schools in California sending all of that paperwork to Sacramento and the bureaucracy it takes. Then where did it go? It came back here to the Department of Education.

Think of all the schools in the United States sending all of that paperwork and bureaucracy and, of course, there was paperwork going back. That is why we only get 48 cents out of a dollar to the classroom.

That is what my colleagues on the other side want to continue to do is have government control of education. Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is a difference, in the two parties.

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, let me first commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, for his sacrifices in trying to work through the difficult details of the bill.

If my colleagues listened to the last several speakers who came before us, claiming this is a do-nothing Congress, as if all of this slow-down of bill passage is our fault, well, if my colleagues listened to the other side of the aisle, this Chamber and this government would be financially insolvent if they had their way.

No rhyme or reason, no restrictions on spending. Our projects, our way or the highway. I voted for Patients' Bill of Rights. I have voted for hate crimes. I voted for a number of issues that are not considered traditional Republican issues, but I have yet to see my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle want to come to conclusion on any of those bills.

Minimum wage, let us not pass it, let us just use it for campaign issue; and then they come down to the floor here today, and assume some way, we, as

the Republican majority, are holding up the will of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I personally believe we are exemplifying the will of the people by trying to bring some restraint and establish priorities and focus Federal resources.

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) said, despite the stump speeches, domestic spending has risen at the behest of the Republican leadership. Amen to that. We are finally putting our money in domestic accounts for the people of the United States who are the taxpayers. No longer are we willing to waste away money on international expeditions, finding ways to send money to every nation that never votes with us at the U.N. treaties or any other instances.

Again, I hope that the Members of this Congress will applaud and appreciate the hard work of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), and I hope they will come together and end the rhetoric.

Yes, it is almost election day; and we know we are all tense and ready to leave, but our government is better for the debate and the negotiations that have occurred. If the President is willing to negotiate with us on some of these final outstanding issues, we will be gone. Do not look to us and blame us for all of this slow-down.

I think a lot of it is occurring on the other side of the aisle, and they should take equal credit.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I think to understand our concern about today people need to understand what the record was yesterday. And if my colleagues take a look at what our Republican friends in the majority have tried to do on education since the day that they took over control of this Chamber 6 years ago, my colleagues will see the following:

Over that 6-year period, they tried to cut the President's budget request for education by a total of over \$13 billion.

They shut down the government twice to try to force the President to buy their priorities which included the elimination of the Department of Education.

They will claim, well, you are just talking about cuts in the increase, you are not talking about cuts in actual spending levels.

I have two responses to that. First of all, we will have a million more children in our schools, and so any budget that does not provide increases for education each year, in fact, results in less dollars being spent on every child each year, and that is not a way to promote educational quality.

My second point is that even if you only measure the cuts, which our Republican friends tried to make in pre-existing spending levels, you will find that they, on four occasions in the last 6 years, they tried to cut education spending below the amount that was being spent at the time to the tune of more than \$5.5 billion.

After we went through all of the arguments, we wound up, because of pressure from the White House and pressure from the Democratic side of the aisle, we wound up restoring some \$15.5 billion to those education budgets. That is the track record.

I was amused when I saw the Republican leadership yesterday in a media event brag about the fact that they should be trusted on education, because they had increased spending on education by over 50 percent since they had taken control of the House. That is true, but only after you shut down the government twice to try to avoid doing that, only after you tried to cut \$5.5 billion below existing spending levels.

The only reason that spending for education has risen by 50 percent over the last 6 years is because we made you do it. I find it ironic that you are now taking credit for the fact that you were beaten in previous years. That is an interesting trick, but the numbers that I am giving you happen to be true.

Mr. Speaker, the record will bear them out.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the following three charts demonstrating what I have just said:

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION—GOP EDUCATION CUTS BELOW PRESIDENT'S REQUEST
(In millions of dollars)

Fiscal year	Request	House level	House cut	Percent cut
1996 Labor-HHS—Education	25,804	20,797	-5,007	-19
1997 Labor-HHS—Education	25,561	22,756	-2,805	-11
1998 Labor-HHS—Education	29,522	29,331	-191	-1
1999 Labor-HHS—Education	31,185	30,523	-662	-2
2000 Labor-HHS—Education	34,712	33,321	-1,391	-4
2001 Labor-HHS—Education	40,095	37,142	-2,953	-7
Total FY 96 to FY 01	186,879	173,870	-13,009	-7

Note.—Discretionary Funding—Minority Staff, House Appropriations Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION—GOP EDUCATION APPROPRIATION CUTS COMPARED TO PREVIOUS YEAR
(In millions of dollars)

Fiscal year	Prior year	House level	House cut
1995 Rescission	25,074	23,440	-1,635
1996 Labor-HHS—Education	25,074	20,797	-4,277
1997 Labor-HHS—Education	22,810	22,756	-54
2000 Labor-HHS—Education	33,520	33,321	-199

Note.—Discretionary Funding—Minority Staff, House Appropriations Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION—EDUCATION FUNDING RESTORED BY DEMOCRATS
(In millions of dollars)

Fiscal year	House level	Conf agreement	Restoration	Percent increase
1995 Rescission	23,440	24,497	1,057	5
1996 Labor-HHS—Education	20,797	22,810	2,013	10
1997 Labor-HHS—Education	22,756	26,324	3,568	16
1998 Labor-HHS—Education	29,331	29,741	410	1
1999 Labor-HHS—Education	30,523	33,149	2,626	9
2000 Labor-HHS—Education	33,321	35,703	2,382	7
2001 Labor-HHS—Education	37,142	40,751	3,609	10
Total FY 95 to FY 01	197,310	212,975	15,665	8

Note.—Discretionary Funding—Minority Staff, House Appropriations Committee.

Now, we are down to the last days of this Congress, I hope, and we have essentially two issues remaining, one involves what are we going to do with the issues of class size and teacher

training and Pell grants and special education. Are we going to meet our responsibilities there?

We have seen billions of dollars go into other appropriations bills. Now we are told, oh, you have to be tight on this one. So that is one education issue remaining.

The other issue is whether or not we are going to sufficiently respond to the President's request on school construction.

What has been missing from this debate so far on that side of the aisle is the recognition that there are two construction pieces which the administration is trying to achieve. The first is the small \$1.3 billion renovation package which we are trying to get in the Labor, Health Education appropriation bill, and the second is the bonding assistance that the administration is trying to get, either by running it through this bill or by running it through the Committee on Ways and Means, the bonding authority which they are trying to get so that they can help by the expenditure of \$2.5 billion of Federal money over a multiyear period so that they can leverage the construction of \$25 billion in additional new school facilities, modern school facilities.

As I said before, to put that in context, the demonstrated need for the country is \$125 billion. So that basically is what we find at issue on education as we try to reach agreement.

We are here because we have seen the succession of week-long continuing resolutions, and as a result of that, the Congress has moved along in a leisurely fashion, most Members being able to go home 5 days a week; the negotiators on the Committee on Appropriations being stuck here most of the time around the clock, 7 days a week.

Mr. Speaker, I have been home to my district exactly 2 days since Labor Day, and that is why I have told people I feel like a fugitive on a chain gang.

I would hope that we will be able to reach closure on these issues. Until we do, we have no choice but to approve the continuing resolution before us, but I would urge in the meantime that we have additional flexibility on the majority side when it comes to the school construction issue, because that, in my view, is the issue that has to be resolved before we are going to be able to put together the rest of the pieces on education and get out of here in time to at least say hello to the constituents that we all thought we would be greeting and meeting with and talking with for the last 3 weeks.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I had been prepared to just yield back my time early on during this debate, because the issue before us is simply a 1-day extension of the continuing resolution, but so many things have been developed during this debate that I feel tempted to respond

to each and every one of them, but I am not going to do that. But I feel tempted.

I understand the position of the minority. I served in the minority for a lot of years, as did many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle. We were not all here for 40 years, but for those who have been here nearly that long, we served in the minority almost the whole time we have been here, so we understand the frustrations.

But when we became the majority party and I became chairman of one of our subcommittees on appropriations, I was determined that the minority would have access to every bit of information, would have the opportunity to have input on every subject coming before that subcommittee, and I think any member of that subcommittee on either side would concede that and confirm the fact that that is how we function.

When I became chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, one of the first instructions I laid down to the Members and the staff that the minority would be included in all of our deliberations, and I believe they would admit to that at the staff level and the Member level.

We have met with each other off and on most of the year, and then as we got toward the end of the process, we began meeting with the President's representatives, and both parties were involved in all of those meetings. Even at that we understand the frustration of the minority.

We tried to be as responsible as we could and as generous as we could in trying to reach consensus and trying to reach bipartisan agreements.

□ 1630

And we have reached a lot of bipartisan agreements. But there is a lot of political rhetoric occurring now, because we are rapidly approaching Election Day.

One of the things that got my attention was the gentleman from Wisconsin's statement that the Republicans shut down the government. Well, that conclusion is the result of masterful and effective spin-mastering. The Republicans did not shut down the government; the Republicans passed the appropriations bills, they sent them to the Clinton-Gore administration, they vetoed them, and when they vetoed them, the government shut down for a couple of days. The Republicans sent the appropriations bills to the President. We did our job. He vetoed them. Until we were able to come back and rewrite the bills, the government was closed for a short period of time.

Now, there are two major issues that have been developed here today. There are those who spoke and complained that the budget really was not high enough, that we were not doing enough spending. I say to those people who believe that, they are true to their conviction. They really believe that there should be more government spending,

that there should be more government involvement. And while I might disagree with them, I do not question their sincerity, and I do not question their motivation for standing for what they believe.

But there are others who say, well, we are spending too much. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues will remember, as I remember, that all through this appropriations process we spent hour after hour, day after day, week after week on appropriations bills dealing with amendments from the minority side to increase spending, to increase the amount of money in those appropriations bills. Yet some of the people, not all, but some of the Members on that side who voted for all of those amendments now complain that we are spending too much money. We really cannot have it both ways. We cannot vote for every amendment to increase and vote against any amendment that would reduce and still stand up and say, with a clear conscience, we spent too much money.

There is another reason that it has taken some time to conclude this process. This is because we have included all sides, Republicans and Democrats in the House and in the Senate, and the White House. There is also another reason. We had a few years ago a real disaster, in my opinion. Under our watch, we had an omnibus bill that included about eight appropriations bills. We put all of those eight bills together, and the leadership sat down with the White House and we negotiated them. We came out with an omnibus appropriations bill. I do not think many people today still know what was in that bill.

We have not done that this year. We have resisted that. We have gone one bill at a time. The House has had an ample opportunity to deal with every bill specifically and independently, and we passed all 13 of our bills through the House early in the process. Now, we slowed down a little when the other body did not get around to taking up some of their bills; but nevertheless, we found a way to deal with that, and we attached one of the bills they had not passed to one of the bills that we had passed. And probably tomorrow, we will do the same thing again.

Mr. Speaker, there is no omnibus appropriations bill being developed this year. We in the House have dealt with each and every one of the bills. That takes a little time, because instead of having one large negotiation taking place, we had 13 small negotiations that, by the way, all developed into pretty big ones. So it took a little more time.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, we are not here to campaign. The political rhetoric that we hear from time to time on the floor, especially on appropriations bills, is not what we are here for. We are here to do the people's business. The campaigning should be on the campaign trail. I listened to the minority leader last week make what I thought

was an excellent speech where he appealed to us and said, let us work together, let us be bipartisan, let us do the best we can to get our job done for what is best for the American people. I liked that speech and I complimented him right after he made the speech on the floor, in public. But then so much campaign rhetoric followed. I know that he was sincere, but I just believe that some of the people on his side were not listening to his appeal.

Mr. Speaker, we are here to deal with a 1-day continuing resolution. I just ask that the Members vote for this CR so we can get about the rest of our business today and the rest of the week.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). 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 ayes appeared to have it.

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 395, nays 9, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 552]

YEAS—395

Abercrombie	Blunt	Coble	Dreier	Kuykendall	Riley
Ackerman	Boehlert	Coburn	Duncan	LaFalce	Rivers
Aderholt	Boehner	Condit	Dunn	LaHood	Rodriguez
Allen	Bonior	Conyers	Edwards	Lampson	Roemer
Andrews	Bono	Cook	Ehlers	Lantos	Rogan
Archer	Borski	Cooksey	Ehrlich	Larson	Rogers
Armey	Boswell	Cox	Emerson	Latham	Rohrabacher
Baca	Boucher	Coyne	English	LaTourette	Ros-Lehtinen
Bachus	Boyd	Cramer	Eshoo	Leach	Rothman
Baker	Brady (PA)	Crane	Etheridge	Lee	Roukema
Baldacci	Brady (TX)	Crowley	Evans	Levin	Roybal-Allard
Baldwin	Brown (FL)	Cubin	Everett	Lewis (CA)	Royce
Ballenger	Brown (OH)	Cummings	Ewing	Lewis (GA)	Rush
Barcia	Brown (OH)	Cunningham	Farr	Lewis (KY)	Ryan (WI)
Barr	Bryant	Cunningham	Fattah	Linder	Ryun (KS)
Barrett (NE)	Burr	Davis (FL)	Filner	Lipinski	Sabo
Barrett (WI)	Burton	Davis (IL)	Fletcher	LoBiondo	Salmon
Bartlett	Buyer	Davis (VA)	Foley	Lofgren	Sanchez
Bass	Callahan	Deal	Forbes	Lowe	Sanders
Becerra	Calvert	DeGette	Fowler	Lucas (KY)	Sandlin
Bentsen	Camp	DeLauro	Frank (MA)	Lucas (OK)	Sanford
Bereuter	Canady	DeLay	Frelinghuysen	Luther	Sawyer
Berkley	Cannon	DeMint	Frost	Maloney (NY)	Saxton
Berman	Capps	Deutsch	Galleghy	Manzullo	Scarborough
Berry	Cardin	Diaz-Balart	Ganske	Markey	Schaffer
Biggert	Carson	Dickey	Gejdenson	Martinez	Schakowsky
Bilbray	Castle	Dicks	Gekas	Mascara	Scott
Bilirakis	Chabot	Dingell	Gephardt	Matsui	Sensenbrenner
Bishop	Chambless	Dixon	Gibbons	McCarthy (MO)	Serrano
Blagojevich	Clay	Doggett	Gilchrest	McCarthy (NY)	Sessions
Biley	Clayton	Dooley	Gillmor	McCrery	Shaw
Blumenauer	Clement	Doolittle	Gilman	McDermott	Shays
	Clyburn	Doyle	Gonzalez	McGovern	Sherman
			Goode	McHugh	Sherwood
			Goodlatte	McInnis	Shimkus
			Goodling	McIntyre	Shows
			Gordon	McKeon	Shuster
			Goss	McKinney	Simpson
			Graham	McNulty	Sisisky
			Granger	Meehan	Skeen
			Green (TX)	Meek (FL)	Skelton
			Green (WI)	Menendez	Smith (MI)
			Gutierrez	Metcalfe	Smith (NJ)
			Gutknecht	Millender-McDonald	Smith (TX)
			Hall (OH)	Miller (FL)	Smith (WA)
			Hall (TX)	Miller, Gary	Snyder
			Hansen	Minge	Souder
			Hastings (WA)	Mink	Spence
			Hayes	Moakley	Spratt
			Hayworth	Mollohan	Stabenow
			Hefley	Moore	Stark
			Herger	Moran (KS)	Stearns
			Hill (IN)	Moran (VA)	Stenholm
			Hill (MT)	Morella	Strickland
			Hilleary	Murtha	Stump
			Hilliard	Myrick	Sununu
			Hinchey	Nadler	Sweeney
			Hinojosa	Napolitano	Tancredo
			Hobson	Neal	Tanner
			Hoeffel	Nethercutt	Tauscher
			Hoekstra	Ney	Tauzin
			Holden	Northup	Taylor (MS)
			Holt	Norwood	Taylor (NC)
			Hooley	Nussle	Terry
			Horn	Oberstar	Thomas
			Hostettler	Houghton	Thompson (CA)
			Hoyer	Hoyer	Thompson (MS)
			Hulshof	Olver	Thornberry
			Hunter	Ortiz	Thune
			Hutchinson	Ose	Thurman
			Hyde	Oxley	Tiahrt
			Inslee	Packard	Tierney
			Isakson	Pallone	Toomey
			Istook	Pascrell	Towns
			Jackson (IL)	Pastor	Trafficant
			Jackson-Lee	Paul	Turner
			(TX)	Payne	Udall (CO)
			Jefferson	Pease	Udall (NM)
			Jenkins	Pelosi	Upton
			John	Peterson (MN)	Velazquez
			Johnson (CT)	Petri	Vitter
			Johnson, E. B.	Phelps	Walden
			Johnson, Sam	Pickering	Walsh
			Jones (NC)	Pickett	Wamp
			Jones (OH)	Pitts	Waters
			Kanjorski	Pombo	Watkins
			Kasich	Pomeroy	Watt (NC)
			Kelly	Porter	Watts (OK)
			Kennedy	Portman	Weiner
			Kildee	Price (NC)	Weldon (FL)
			Kilpatrick	Pryce (OH)	Weldon (PA)
			Kind (WI)	Quinn	Weller
			King (NY)	Radanovich	Wexler
			Kingston	Rahall	Weygand
			Klecza	Ramstad	Whitfield
			Knollenberg	Rangel	Wicker
			Kolbe	Regula	Wilson
			Kucinich	Reyes	
				Reynolds	

Wolf	Wu	Young (AK)
Woolsey	Wynn	Young (FL)
NAYS—9		
Baird	Costello	Kaptur
Barton	DeFazio	Miller, George
Capuano	Ford	Visclosky
NOT VOTING—28		
Bonilla	Greenwood	Owens
Campbell	Hastings (FL)	Peterson (PA)
Chenoweth-Hage	Klink	Shadegg
Collins	Largent	Slaughter
Combest	Lazio	Stupak
Danner	Maloney (CT)	Talent
Delahunt	McCollum	Waxman
Engel	McIntosh	Wise
Fossella	Meeks (NY)	
Franks (NJ)	Mica	

□ 1656

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and could not vote on rollcalls Nos. 544 through 552. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" for each of these measures.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 835, ESTUARIES AND CLEAN WATERS ACT OF 2000

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 648 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 648

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (S. 835) 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. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), my friend, the ranking member of the Committee on Rules; pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

□ 1700

During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 648 provides for consideration of the conference report to accompany S. 835, the Estuaries and Clean Waters Act of 2000. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration. The rule also provides that the conference report shall be considered as read. This is a standard rule for

this type of conference report. And I believe it is totally without controversy. I strongly urge my colleagues to support it.

Before we get a chance to vote, Mr. Speaker, S. 835 is an excellent piece of environmental legislation and yet another addition to the fine environmental legacy of the 106th Congress. S. 835 encourages partnerships between Federal, State, and local interests for estuary habitat restoration. Of even greater importance is that the bill supports the development and implementation of comprehensive management plans for the National Estuary Program. This is of particular importance to me because of the Charlotte Harbor NEP, which is located in my district in southwest Florida. I worked hard with our local community to secure the NEP designation for Charlotte Harbor, and I am pleased this legislation will ensure a comprehensive management plan goes forward from the process.

Another key issue for my home State of Florida is title VI of the bill, which authorizes a pilot program to allow States to explore alternate water supply solutions to meet critical needs. We have always had water wars in Florida, but given the increase in population and the attendant demand for water, we will surely reach a crisis point unless we take immediate action now. The alternate water source provisions in this bill will help in that effort, and I want to thank my colleague and good friend, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. FOWLER), for her hard work in particular on this issue.

S. 835 also includes other critical restoration efforts for areas such as Lake Pontchartrain and the Tijuana River Valley. I am extremely disappointed to note the Senate refused to accept a provision passed by the House that would have established an EPA grant program to improve water quality in the Florida Keys. I am not aware of any substantive problem on this issue, and I remain hopeful we can adopt this program perhaps through another legislative vehicle.

Even so, this bill is a remarkable piece of legislation, and I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and his Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for their hard work in the area and the successful result. In short, Mr. Speaker, this is a good rule, it is a good bill, and I encourage my colleagues to support both.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, my dear friend from Florida (Mr. GOSS), for yielding me the customary time; and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule for the bipartisan conference report. America's estuaries are in trouble. According to the national water quality inventory, 44 percent of our estuaries are not meeting their designated uses, whether they are fishing, swimming, or supporting aquatic life.

This bill attempts to do something about that by authorizing \$275 million over the next 5 years to help the Corps of Engineers restore estuary habitats.

These funds will be available, Mr. Speaker, for projects to improve degraded estuaries and estuary habitats and get them to the point that they are self-sufficient ecosystems.

Mr. Speaker, estuaries are areas where the current of a river meets the tide of the sea; and because such a wide variety of life thrives there, they are the beginning of the food chain. Estuaries provide the nursing grounds for fisheries, support numerous endangered and threatened species, and host almost half of the migratory birds in the United States.

But, Mr. Speaker, estuaries are very fragile and are suffering from increasing human and environmental pressures. In response to those pressures, this bill includes a number of individual bills that passed the House overwhelmingly. The conference report passed the Senate by unanimous consent and is supported by State and local governments and the business community and the entire environmental community. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me this time, the honorable dean of the Massachusetts delegation; and I wish to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their support of this rule that makes in order this very important piece of legislation, the Estuary Habitat Restoration Improvement Act.

For those of my colleagues who are familiar with my State of Rhode Island, we are practically one big estuary. The Narragansett Bay runs right through my State. It is a very important part of our whole economy; and so, therefore, this bill represents an important step forward for our State and also for our Nation in preserving these fragile estuaries.

My State, as my colleagues know, has had a long history of trying to work to preserve its Narragansett Bay. It goes to the importance of fishing in our State, sailing, swimming, and our number one industry, the tourism economy. Of course this has a major impact on our tourism economy. So for all of these reasons, this Habitat and Estuary Restoration Act is very important for our State's economy.

It is not only the case in Rhode Island but it is also the case nationally that our waters have not always been treated with the respect and care that they deserve. Estuaries are very valuable ecosystems in our overall environment. They nourish a wide variety of animal and plant life, as the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) pointed out. They also serve to help filter pollution that comes in in the