

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

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

I wanted to point out that, as a matter of fact, the resolution that I am bringing here today has been around for at least 2 weeks, and the fine-tuning of the statistics were in the hands of the Democrats as of 6 o'clock last evening.

But the fine-tuning from statistics really does not amount to anything anyway because the resolution simply says, if this Congress is going to discuss child care, they will discuss it in relationship to all children. It does not tell how they should do it. It just says, since 70 percent of preschool children are not in a formal day care setting, we should also think about the parents of those 70 percent.

So even if we fine tuned the statistics, it does not matter because the resolution simply states that if the Congress is going to consider child care in this particular session, it should consider all children, it should consider all parents. The resolution is that simple.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) has 20½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) has 19½ minutes remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, that is what I have always admired about the gentlewoman from New York. She gets the job done in a hurry, and I appreciate that. And, therefore, I am not going to let her outdo me. I am going to get the job done, too.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, further proceedings on this resolution are postponed until 5 p.m.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED NEW TAX INCREASES

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I will not bother taking the well, but I just wanted to say that last week President

Clinton proposed a budget with \$106 billion of new tax increases in it.

While all taxes punish personal thrift and freedom, the President's proposal to raise taxes on financial products which encourage long-term investment and savings are particularly ill-conceived.

It is incredible that the President, who is fully aware of the impending crisis in Social Security, would propose to hike taxes on the products that American families and businesses use to plan for their own retirements. Millions of American families use this very life insurance product to save for retirement, adding to the supplemental Social Security check that they might receive.

Mr. Speaker, surveys show that many moderate-income families use private sector retirement products such as annuities to plan for their future. In fact, many of the owners of annuities are women. They are women, 55 percent of whom are married, while 28 percent of them are widowed.

□ 1630

They are the people that control most of these small annuities in America.

The President proposes to increase the tax burden on these same annuities—annuities that 85% of the owners intend to use as the fundamental source of their retirement savings. Why should government discourage these families from saving their money?

Mr. Speaker, this is an irresponsible and ill-advised proposal for the many Americans struggling to get by and yet still plan for the future.

I urge my colleagues to reject President Clinton's tax increases on America's families and their future. The future of the American family deserves better.

#### EDUCATING AMERICA ON COLORECTAL CANCER

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, today I filed a resolution with 20 of my cosponsors, a bipartisan resolution, connected with colorectal cancer. We have spent a lot of time in the House talking about breast cancer and other forms of cancer and how important it is to be screened, but we have neglected colorectal cancer.

Mr. Speaker, in my State of New York, we are ninth in the number of fatalities. We have 55,000 people that die each year from an absolutely curable or preventable disease.

We think it is terribly important. We have asked Secretary Shalala of HHS if they will help formulate an educational process for both medical professionals and their patients to make sure Americans are screened for this disease. It is terribly important for women, because women have a feeling that this is a man's disease, but it is an equal-opportunity killer. We have some

Members of this House who are recovering from colorectal cancer who are sponsoring this bill, and I invite all my colleagues to join us in what I think is one of the most important health issues facing America. This disease is over 92 percent preventable. No one need die from colorectal cancer. It is up to us to educate.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5 p.m.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 5 p.m.

□ 1701

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. UPTON) at 5 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of agreeing to House Resolution 352, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 191, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 12]

YEAS—217

Aderholt	Combest	Goodling
Archer	Cook	Goss
Armey	Cooksey	Graham
Bachus	Cox	Granger
Baker	Crane	Greenwood
Ballenger	Crapo	Gutknecht
Barr	Cubin	Hall (TX)
Barrett (NE)	Cunningham	Hamilton
Bartlett	Davis (VA)	Hansen
Barton	Deal	Hastert
Bass	DeLay	Hastings (WA)
Bateman	Dickey	Hayworth
Bereuter	Dreier	Hefley
Bilbray	Duncan	Herger
Bilirakis	Dunn	Hill
Bliley	Ehlers	Hilleary
Blunt	Ehrlich	Hobson
Boehlert	Emerson	Hoekstra
Boehner	English	Horn
Bonilla	Ensign	Hostettler
Brady	Everett	Houghton
Bryant	Ewing	Hulshof
Bunning	Fawell	Hunter
Burr	Foley	Hutchinson
Burton	Forbes	Hyde
Buyer	Fossella	Inglis
Calvert	Fowler	Istook
Camp	Fox	Jenkins
Campbell	Franks (NJ)	Johnson (CT)
Canady	Frelinghuysen	Johnson, Sam
Cannon	Gallegly	Jones
Castle	Ganske	Kasich
Chabot	Gekas	Kelly
Chambliss	Gibbons	Kim
Chenoweth	Gilcrest	King (NY)
Christensen	Gillmor	Kingston
Coble	Gilman	Klug
Coburn	Goode	Knollenberg
Collins	Goodlatte	Kolbe

LaHood	Paxon	Shuster
Largent	Pease	Skeen
Latham	Peterson (PA)	Smith (MI)
LaTourette	Petri	Smith (NJ)
Lazio	Pickering	Smith (TX)
Leach	Pitts	Snowbarger
Lewis (CA)	Pombo	Solomon
Lewis (KY)	Porter	Souder
Livingston	Portman	Spence
LoBiondo	Pryce (OH)	Stump
Lucas	Quinn	Sununu
Manzullo	Radanovich	Talent
McCollum	Ramstad	Tauzin
McCrary	Redmond	Taylor (NC)
McDade	Regula	Thomas
McHugh	Riggs	Thornberry
McInnis	Riley	Thune
McIntosh	Rogan	Tiahrt
McKeon	Rogers	Traficant
Metcalf	Rohrabacher	Upton
Mica	Roukema	Walsh
Moran (KS)	Royce	Wamp
Morella	Ryun	Watkins
Nethercutt	Salmon	Watts (OK)
Neumann	Sanford	Weldon (FL)
Ney	Saxton	Weldon (PA)
Northup	Scarborough	Weller
Norwood	Schaefer, Dan	Whitfield
Nussle	Schaffer, Bob	Wicker
Oxley	Sessions	Wolf
Packard	Shadegg	Young (AK)
Pappas	Shaw	Young (FL)
Parker	Shays	
Paul	Shimkus	

NAYS—191

Abercrombie	Gordon	Moran (VA)
Ackerman	Green	Murtha
Allen	Gutierrez	Neal
Andrews	Hall (OH)	Oberstar
Baesler	Hastings (FL)	Obey
Baldacci	Hefner	Olver
Barcia	Hilliard	Ortiz
Barrett (WI)	Hinche	Owens
Becerra	Hinojosa	Pallone
Bentsen	Holden	Pascrell
Berman	Hooley	Pastor
Berry	Hoyer	Payne
Bishop	Jackson (IL)	Pelosi
Blagojevich	Jackson-Lee	Peterson (MN)
Blumenauer	(TX)	Pickett
Bonior	Jefferson	Pomeroy
Borski	John	Price (NC)
Boswell	Johnson (WI)	Rahall
Boucher	Johnson, E.B.	Rangel
Boyd	Kanjorski	Reyes
Brown (CA)	Kaptur	Rivers
Brown (FL)	Kennedy (MA)	Rodriguez
Brown (OH)	Kennedy (RI)	Roemer
Cardin	Kennelly	Rothman
Carson	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Clay	Kilpatrick	Rush
Clayton	Kind (WI)	Sabo
Clement	Kleczka	Sanchez
Clyburn	Klink	Sanders
Condit	Kucinich	Sandlin
Conyers	LaFalce	Schumer
Costello	Lampson	Scott
Coyne	Levin	Serrano
Cramer	Lewis (GA)	Sherman
Cummings	Lipinski	Sisisky
Danner	Lofgren	Skaggs
Davis (FL)	Lowe	Skelton
Davis (IL)	Luther	Slaughter
DeFazio	Maloney (CT)	Smith, Adam
DeGette	Maloney (NY)	Snyder
Delahunt	Manton	Spratt
DeLauro	Markey	Stabenow
Deutsch	Martinez	Stark
Dicks	Mascara	Stenholm
Dingell	Matsui	Stokes
Dixon	McCarthy (MO)	Strickland
Doggett	McCarthy (NY)	Stupak
Dooley	McDermott	Tanner
Doyle	McGovern	Tauscher
Edwards	McHale	Taylor (MS)
Engel	McIntyre	Thompson
Etheridge	McKinney	Thurman
Evans	McNulty	Tierney
Farr	Meehan	Torres
Fattah	Meek (FL)	Towns
Fazio	Meeks (NY)	Turner
Filner	Menendez	Velazquez
Ford	Millender-	Vento
Frank (MA)	McDonald	Visclosky
Frost	Miller (CA)	Watt (NC)
Furse	Minge	Waxman
Gejdenson	Moakley	
Gephardt	Mollohan	

Wexler	Wise	Wynn
Weygand	Woolsey	Yates

NOT VOTING—22

Callahan	Miller (FL)	Sensenbrenner
Diaz-Balart	Mink	Smith (OR)
Doolittle	Myrick	Smith, Linda
Eshoo	Nadler	Stearns
Gonzalez	Poshard	Waters
Harman	Ros-Lehtinen	White
Lantos	Sawyer	
Linder	Schiff	

□ 1723

Mr. MURTHA changed his 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on the second motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

If a recorded vote is ordered on the first motion, relating to House Concurrent Resolution 202, that vote will be taken after debate has concluded on that motion.

If a recorded vote is ordered on the second motion, relating to Senate 927, that vote will be postponed until Thursday, February 12, 1998.

DAYCARE FAIRNESS FOR STAY-AT-HOME PARENTS

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 202) expressing the sense of the Congress that the Federal Government should acknowledge the importance of at-home parents and should not discriminate against families who forego a second income in order for a mother or father to be at home with their children, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 202

Whereas studies have found that quality child care, particularly for infants and young children, requires a sensitive, interactive, loving, and consistent caregiver;

Whereas most parents meet and exceed the aforementioned criteria, circumstances allowing, often parental care marks the best form of child care;

Whereas the recent National Institute for Child Health and Development study found that the greatest factor in the development of a young child is "what is happening at home and in families";

Whereas a child's interaction with his or her parents has the most significant impact on their development, any Federal child care policy should enable and encourage parents to spend more time with their children;

Whereas nearly 1/2 of preschool children have at-home mothers and only 1/3 of preschool children have mothers who are employed full time;

Whereas a large number of low- and middle-income families sacrifice a second full-time income so that the mother may be at home with her child;

Whereas the average income of 2-parent families with a single income is \$20,000 less than the average income of 2-parent families with two incomes;

Whereas only 30 percent of preschool children are in paid child care and the remaining 70 percent of preschool children are in families that do not pay for child care, many of which are low- to middle-income families struggling to provide child care at home;

Whereas child care proposals should not provide financial assistance solely to the 30 percent of families that pay for child care and should not discriminate against families in which children are cared for by an at-home parent; and

Whereas any congressional proposal that increases child care funding should provide financial relief to families that sacrifice an entire income in order that a mother or father may be at home for their young child: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress recognizes that—

(1) many American families make enormous sacrifices to forgo a second income in order to have a parent care for their child at home;

(2) there should be no bias against at-home parents;

(3) parents choose many legitimate forms of child care to meet their individual needs -- an at-home parent, grandparent, aunt, uncle, neighbor, nanny, preschool, or child care center;

(4) child care needs of at-home parents and working parents should be given careful consideration by the Congress;

(5) any quality child care proposal should reflect careful consideration of providing financial relief for those families where there is an at-home parent; and

(6) mothers and fathers who have chosen and continue to choose to be at home should be applauded for their efforts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ), each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support House Concurrent Resolution 202, the equitable child care resolution, which I introduced on January 27, 1998, to ensure that any child care proposal that this Congress may consider this year addresses the needs of parents who choose to stay at home to care for their child. Almost all of the child care proposals in Congress focus solely on expanding commercial child care, despite the fact that only 30 percent of preschool children are cared for by paid child care providers. And of that 30 percent, an even smaller percentage are in commercial child care. We know the majority of preschool children are cared for by their mother or father who stay at home for that purpose. Yet Federal child care proposals would indicate that we should not consider those who stay home as child care providers. It is inconceivable to me that the Federal Government would tell