

at this point? The authority for the government to remain open expires in one day. We still have seven major appropriation bills, funding more than half the government, that have still not been acted upon. And if they are not, a whole lot of government will not be operating two days from now. Yet we are about to debate a bill which is going nowhere.

Now, we have been trying to get together to resolve the remaining differences on the seven major appropriation bills that have still to be disposed of so that we can finish our work, keep the government open and go home. We have some rather major problems. If anybody has noticed what has been happening today and yesterday with the stock market and NASDAQ, you have a huge collapse on your hands. And it is probably going to get a lot worse. We are trying to figure out how to reach agreement on things as controversial as the IMF. We have been trying to get to a meeting since 10 o'clock this morning between the principal conferees on the labor-health-education budget, and we have a wide variety of other disputes that are preventing us from finishing our work.

I would point out that while the press seems to be under the impression that there are only five or six items that still are in dispute, we have over 300 open issues that are still highly controversial that must be resolved before tomorrow night. Yet we are being asked now to begin debate on a bill which we know is going nowhere.

This bill is so extreme that the Republican majority in the Senate has shoved it aside and produced an entirely different bill. We have yet to finish action on the Labor-Health bill, the Transportation bill, the State-Justice-Commerce bill, the Foreign Operations bill, the District of Columbia bill, the Ag bill is being vetoed so we have to deal with that one again. We have the Interior bill that still is not passed. Yet what is happening? This Congress is being tied up on bill after bill on one issue, sex. On the Treasury-Post Office bill, that bill has been hung up and still remains at issue because of resistance to insurance coverage on contraception on the part of some members of the majority party. The Agriculture bill was held up for many weeks because of a strong feeling on the part of some members of the majority party that the FDA ought to impose a ban on another birth control device. The State-Justice-Commerce bill is being held up on an issue relating to abortions in prison. The Foreign Operations bill, which is our basic foreign policy document in the appropriations area, is being held up because you have a small group of persons in the majority party who insist that if they do not get their way on the international family planning issue, the entire bill will be held hostage. And now we are asked to bring this bill up and debate the issue of family planning services once again. That issue is being brought up not to resolve

anything on the House floor but to resolve a difference within the Republican Caucus between a group that calls themselves moderates and a group that calls themselves conservatives.

I just want to say, sometime, sometime it would be nice if this Congress stops being bogged down on this issue, if we could quit debating bills that are not going anywhere so that we can get in the rooms and work out the differences on bills that are going somewhere and must go somewhere so that we can finish our work on time. This debate does nothing but satisfy political problems within the majority party caucus on a bill that is going nowhere.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. OBEY. I think that is a terribly destructive waste of time, and that is why, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Does the gentleman yield back the time to the gentleman from New York before making his motion?

Mr. OBEY. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 58, nays 349, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 499]

YEAS—58

Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Becerra
Brown (CA)
Clayton
Conyers
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Filner
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gephardt
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)

Hefner
Hinchev
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kilpatrick
LaFalce
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lowe
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Martinez
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)

Miller (CA)
Mink
Moakley
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pastor
Pelosi
Rodriguez
Sabo
Scott
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Towns
Waters
Woolsey
Yates

NAYS—349

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry

Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehkert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)

Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss

Chenoweth
Clay
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Ewing
Fattah
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth

Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kildee
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Ortiz
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Paul
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Quinn

Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Traffant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—27

Abercrombie	Fossella	Oxley
Baesler	Greenwood	Pickering
Barr	Harman	Poshard
Buyer	Hulshof	Pryce (OH)
Christensen	Hutchinson	Ryun
Cunningham	Kennedy (RI)	Wamp
Doyle	Kennelly	White
Ensign	Moran (VA)	Whitfield
Fawell	Ney	Wise

□ 1659

Messrs. STUMP, ETHERIDGE and KENNEDY of Massachusetts changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. YATES and Mr. CONYERS changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, earlier this afternoon, when the House voted on a motion to adjourn, I was unavoidably detained. I was conducting a satellite teleconference with the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Treasury to constituents in Honolulu discussing the financial crisis in East Asia and the International Monetary Fund. Had I been present, I would have voted no.

FURTHER PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4274, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The Chair would advise that the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) has 24½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) has 12 minutes remaining in the debate on the rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, moving right along in an expeditious manner, as we have been trying to throughout the day on most of the questions we have faced here, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma City, Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK), a member on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule regarding the appropriations measure on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

There has been a lot of work, of course, that has gone with this bill, as there always is, this being one of the largest spending bills each year that comes before the House.

I especially want to compliment the chairman of the Subcommittee of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER). This is always a very difficult bill, bringing together, as it does, so many different issues, so much major funding. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) has gone to great pains to work with a large number of Members who had concerns over this measure.

I know the gentleman is personally very pleased with the additional funding for medical research through the National Institute of Health, which are in this bill, the efforts to increase the efficiency of the money that actually reaches the classroom through Federal funding for education, whether it be through different block grants and things such as impact aid. I know the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) has been very diligent in that.

Mr. Speaker, there is one particular portion of the bill, however, that I want to make sure that I mention. A part of this bill each year involves Federal family planning funds under title 10 as it is called. In the Federal Family Planning Program of title 10, within the bill, is a measure which was adopted in the Committee on Appropriations in consultation, of course, with the authorizing committee involved to make a major reform in that particular program.

Mr. Chairman, 1½ million teenagers each year receive services under the title 10 Family Planning Program. Some of it is treatment for sexually transmitted diseases. Some of it is providing contraceptives and counseling to young people.

Since this program has been in place since 1971, however, which provides a mechanism for Federal dollars to provide contraceptives to teenagers with neither the knowledge nor consent of their parents, since that time, Mr. Speaker, the out-of-wedlock pregnancy rate among teenagers in America has doubled.

We hear a lot of talk about family involvement in major issues of our times, and certainly the rate of teenage pregnancy is one of those.

The measure adopted by the Committee on Appropriations has been desired by a great many American families for a great number of years. It says, in most simple terms, that an unemancipated minor, a teenager who is still dependent upon their parents, should not be provided contraceptives at Federal taxpayers' expense unless their parents are notified.

This does not apply to any particular other types of services. This does not, for example, say that parents have to be notified if it is some sort of emergency medical care. But if taxpayers' money is to be used to pay for future sexual activity by a teenager, this simply says that the parent ought to be notified.

As the parent of teenagers myself, Mr. Speaker, I know that they cannot receive pierced ears without parents being notified. They cannot go on field trips or get aspirins at school without parents being notified.

Yet Federal taxpayers' dollars are used to provide contraceptives to teenagers and the parents are never told. If my child were picked up for using drugs or using alcohol, I would expect to be notified.

The real tragedy is that there is not even notification for children who are

below the age of consent. We have laws on the books in this State on statutory rape, contributing to the delinquency of a minor, taking indecent liberties with a minor, and so forth, and the title 10 clinics ignore those laws. They neither report violations of them to the parents nor to law enforcement authorities.

This bill has reforms in it that says they will provide notification in both of those instances. It is a very important measure to try to get parents involved in monitoring and helping with the life and the problems and the circumstances of their youth.

This measure needs to be preserved in this bill. We will have debate on measures to take it out. It is important that we keep it in.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule, and I do so because I recognize that, while there is a political purpose being served by the use of the marshal law tactic to go in and select out one particular provision of the Labor-HHS bill and to use this chamber to then debate just that particular provision for the next few hours, what we are doing, and for political purposes because the Republicans feel they can win on that issue, but what they do not talk about are the other provisions that are hidden in this bill, provisions like eliminating the Federal Fuel Assistance Program, eliminating the program to provide summer youth jobs to hundreds of thousands of children all across our country who in the middle of summer need to go to work.

What we are not seeing is a debate about whether or not we believe as a Congress, whether the Republicans agree in the Congress, that what we ought to do is go out and cut the Federal Fuel Assistance Program, cut a program that millions of Americans count on and will count on this winter to make sure that they stay warm.

We are in a situation where we read in the newspaper about how well America is doing and how much money the wealthy in our country have made and how the unemployment rate is down and the inflation rate is down and the stock market up, until the last month or so used to be up.

But what we do not read about are the millions and millions of very poor people. We do not read about the hundreds of thousands of senior citizens that every winter hang blankets across parts of their houses because they simply cannot afford to keep those houses warm, that have to choose between having a hot meal or staying warm in their beds at night.

How many times do we have to have our elderly people suffer because they do not get enough money in Social Security? Then we turn around in this bill and cut a billion dollars out of the