

Madam Speaker, what it would do would be to simply take the 1040, the tax return as we now know it. And right now, we can send \$3 to the presidential campaign. This would create another box wherein we could send 3 bucks to debt reduction. That is not enough money to change our national debt, but it is enough money to make a small step in an important debate that we all ought to be a part of.

#### RETURN EDUCATION DECISIONS TO LOCAL CONTROL

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Madam Speaker, the Federal Government has spent a lot of money on education. Yet the United States continues to rank near the bottom of industrialized nations in student test scores. This simply is unacceptable.

The United States is the most prosperous Nation in the world. There is no reason why our schools cannot be second to none. However, just loading up the Federal bureaucracy with more money is not the solution. Yet this is the very approach the Big Government party of Clinton and Gore and the other liberals are attempting, and it has failed time and time again over the past 40 years.

So what is the solution? We Republicans want to return the dollars and the decisions back to the parents and teachers who know our children's names and their educational needs. Parents and teachers should set education policy, not some Washington bureaucracy or someone sitting in a fourth story of a government office building right here in Washington, D.C.

The only way to turn the test score embarrassment around is local control of local schools. But if the liberals keep following their presidential nominee down the path to the roadblock, America's future in education has no hope. For the sake of our Nation's children, let us join together and return control back to our schools and our local governments and our parents and teachers.

#### KENNY GAMBLE'S ONE-MAN URBAN RENEWAL IN SOUTH PHILADELPHIA

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, recently I had the opportunity to go to Philadelphia, and there I met with Kenny Gamble. My colleagues may remember the Gamble and Huff song writing team who produced music for the O'Jays and Harold Melvin and the Blue Notes. Mr. Gamble is a very suc-

cessful businessman and music producer. He moved back to South Philly, his childhood home in the ghetto, and is basically starting a one-man urban renewal project.

It is a very inspirational project. One of the keystones of that is a charter school that he started. Four hundred kids are in that charter school, with a waiting list of 1,400 children.

Why is it successful? Because it is run locally with input from the teachers and the parents. It is something that all the neighborhood and the community can focus on and take a lot of pride in. It does not have Washington bureaucrats micromanaging it. It does not have people from the State capital in Pennsylvania telling them what to do.

Madam Speaker, I believe this is a key corner to our education reform effort to get people back home interested and involved in the education process, because our children and our future are at stake. We should all follow Mr. Gamble's lead.

#### WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4733, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 598 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 598

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 4733) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, 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 (Mrs. BIGGERT). The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

Madam Speaker, H. Res. 598 is a rule providing for the consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 4733, the Energy and Water Appropriation Act of 2001. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration and provides that the conference report shall be considered as read.

The conference agreement provides \$23.59 billion in new discretionary spending authority for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of Energy, and several independent agencies.

The bill is \$2.3 billion above fiscal year 2000, and \$889 million above the President's request.

Most notably, Madam Speaker, as a Member whose district includes the most challenging nuclear cleanup project in the Nation, I am pleased that the conference report increases the funding for the defense environmental management cleanup activities by \$6.12 billion, an increase of \$406 million over last year.

Specifically, this legislation includes \$377 million for the critically important Hanford Tank Waste Treatment Facility that is located in my district.

Finally, I would like to point out to my colleagues that this conference report also includes an appropriation of \$5 million dedicated solely to reducing the national debt.

Madam Speaker, I want to commend the chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Appropriations, the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), for their efforts to defend the House position on a long list of important items in this legislation. They have worked long and hard to bring this agreement to the House, and accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the conference report.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1045

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

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), my colleague and my dear friend, for yielding me the customary half hour.

Madam Speaker, I would also like to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), and the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) for their work on this bill. They really had to juggle a lot of requests and a lot of issues. And as a result, this conference report contains funding for some very, very good water projects and infrastructure projects.

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, something happened last night in conference that will force me to oppose this rule and oppose it very strongly. Despite the fact that many people in the Northeast are currently facing what promises to be the worst heating crisis, winter heating crisis in two decades, some of my colleagues have decided to eliminate the funding in this conference report for Northeast home heating oil reserve.

Madam Speaker, I do not know why my colleagues would want to take steps to avoid helping their neighbors, but I do know how bad the situation could be in Massachusetts. According to today's Boston Globe, the Energy Information Administration announced yesterday that the stocks of heating oil shrank by another 300,000 barrels over the last week, and what that means, Madam Speaker, is that New England has less than one-third of the supply of heating oil that it had last year.

Madam Speaker, the winter we had last year was terrible, and we did not have anywhere near enough home heating oil.

Madam Speaker, two million households in Massachusetts depend on heating oil to warm their homes in the winter. Meanwhile, prices are up to about \$1.40 a gallon and to give you a sense of perspective, it was \$1 last winter and 80 cents the winter before. Madam Speaker, let me tell my colleagues it gets cold in Massachusetts and these very high prices force families to make that horrible choice between heating their homes or feeding their children.

But, Madam Speaker, we can do something about this. We can insist on a New England heating oil reserve. We can oppose efforts to stop the President from releasing 30 million barrels of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Now, to hear some of my Republican friends talk, this is a violation of a sacred thing to release this oil, but this is not the first time this oil has been released from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

Madam Speaker, this would be the 11th time that oil has been released and every time, Madam Speaker, the release had the blessings of my Republican colleagues. But all of a sudden the 11th time it is released, it is political, but the other 10 times it was not.

So contrary to the way it may seem, oil really is not a matter of political parties, it is not a matter of competition between one region or another. In Massachusetts, heating your home really is not a luxury.

For many in the Northeast, Madam Speaker, it really could be a matter of life and death. So to put people's health and safety at risk for partisan gain is absolutely inexcusable. So I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, who is dealing with this legislation and somebody who is working on his last appropriations bill before he retires.

Mr. PACKARD. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me

the time, and I would like to respond to the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) concerning Northeast home heating oil reserve and the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

I want to correct, what I hope is a misunderstanding. We have never had in this bill funding for the Northeast energy oil problem. That funding is in the Subcommittee on Interior, not in this bill. So we not only did not knock it out, it never was in this bill. There was an amendment passed on the floor of the House to do something in this area, but that jurisdiction really belongs in the Committee on Interior and not in this committee.

This is to further clarify this whole issue. The House did pass a separate freestanding bill, the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, and that would have dealt with the Northeast oil issue, but that bill is being held up in the Senate by Senator BOXER. And for that reason, it has not moved. It is on hold by the Senator.

The administration claims, however, that as long as the appropriations exist, they do not need legislation to release oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. In fact, the President announced last Friday that he was releasing 30 million barrels from that reserve. Clearly, he does not feel that legislation is necessary for this purpose.

Madam Speaker, I do not agree with him, and frankly I do not think that is a wise policy, but the fact is that is what he announced. And so we did not need to include funding in this bill for that purpose, and we did not include it in the bill. It does not belong in our bill. It belongs in the Interior Appropriations subcommittee bill. So we have not included it.

Madam Speaker, on the rule itself, however, let me just make a comment. I totally support the rule that is before the House. I commend the Committee on Rules for providing us with this rule. It should be very simple for us to move forward with this conference report under the rule, and I hope that the House will unanimously vote for the rule.

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

Madam Speaker, we had an immigration bill that started out in one bill and then it was pulled out, it was put in another bill, and then when we passed it on the floor, it was pulled out and put in another bill. Is this what is going to happen from the Northeast, it is going to go from Interior to Energy and Interior to Energy? There was a vote, 360 people voted for this Northeast petroleum reserve. It should be in the Energy bill. So to have the gentleman say it should not be in the Energy bill, I do not know why it should be in Interior and not in Energy.

I think legislation may be necessary to give the President the right, because the right the President had to release that oil lapsed last month, and I think there is a question of whether he needs the authority or not. But regardless of what happens, the Northeast petroleum reserve should have been in the Energy bill, unless the gentleman can tell me it is absolutely going to be in the Interior bill.

Mr. PACKARD. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOAKLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PACKARD. Madam Speaker, all jurisdiction for fossil fuel lies within the Subcommittee on Interior, not this subcommittee, Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, we have other energy issues, but not fossil fuel. The Strategic Petroleum Reserve is in the Interior jurisdiction.

I served on that subcommittee when I first went on appropriations, and that is where we dealt with it then and that is where it ought to be dealt with at this time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, but the gentleman, I am sure, knows it is not going to be dealt with. And we know in the past we put amendments in other bills that really did not have the jurisdiction and it passed. But I think it is going to get awful cold awful quick, and I would hate to be someone who voted against this to answer the questions why did not we not act when we had time.

As I say, go back to the Cubin bill. It goes from one committee to the other. Every time it comes up, the committee says no, it is not our jurisdiction, it is somebody else's jurisdiction. I think we should look at the problem itself and how complex it is and how necessary it is that some people have to choose between heating and eating.

And I do not think we should say it should not be in this bill because we have never handled it before. We have done a lot of things that we have never done before.

And as far as the release of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, I am not saying it is in this bill, I am just referring to an action of a Member of his party that is trying to stop the release of the petroleum. I just want to show that this has been done.

This will be the 11th time it has been done, and this is the first time that anybody accused it of being political.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I have no more requests for time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO), a colleague of mine from Somerville.

Mr. CAPUANO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, as I was watching this back in the office and as I was reading the contents of the particular bill, I have to tell my colleagues I am absolutely shocked. I do not think anyone at home, certainly nobody in my district, cares who has what jurisdiction. They could care less, they care about one thing, keeping their seniors and their kids warm. And for us to sit here and argue about jurisdiction to make promises that we may not be able to keep is ridiculous. It is patently absurd and unfair.

I came over today to make sure that the people I represent do not care if it is political or not. We are all politicians. We all do things for political reasons. Do my colleagues think any senior citizen who freezes in the middle of the winter cares about politics? They want heat. And for those people who do not have to rely on oil heat like we do in the Northeast, mark my words, without question, if we do nothing and oil heat price rises, natural gas prices will rise as well.

There are already supply problems. If we do not do it, people like me may start thinking about changing to natural gas. If we do, that puts further demand on diminished natural gas supplies. Those prices will be right behind us. And I will tell my colleagues, whether it is political or not, my hope is that every single politician in any one of us in the Frostbelt States makes this an issue, one way or the other; I am for it, I am against it.

I do not think, I have been involved with this since the day I got here. I do not think anyone who has argued for or against the Strategic Oil Reserve has said this is the only way to do it. We said there are a thousand things we can and should be doing and hopefully we will. This is one. This is the one that we can do immediately. Most of the others will take time.

For us to sit here and fiddle while the Northeast and the Midwest freezes is an insult to the people who have elected us.

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

Madam Speaker, I would just like to read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 27, the Sherwood amendment printed in House Report 106-701 includes the text of H.R. 2884 as passed the House, includes provisions to reauthorize the Strategic Petroleum Reserve through 2003 and authorizes the Energy Department to buy oil from stripper wells and establish a regional home heating oil reserve in the Northeast. Agreed on by a record vote of 393-33. Nobody who voted then questioned what bill it was going to be put in.

Madam Speaker, I think we should take the will of the House, and it should have been in this report. And I think unless it is in this report, the report is flawed.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate my friend from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) for yielding me the time and thank him for his management of this rule.

We filed this late last night, and I want to rise in strong support of it and the underlying conference report. And I want to congratulate the retiring distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD), the former mayor of Carlsbad, who will go off and be doing all kinds of wonderful things as he leaves behind him this great work product.

I also want to congratulate the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

And I want to take just a few minutes to talk about a very important provision which is in this bill, which I have been working on for a number of years. It began in Southern California when the water quality authority, a group that came together to address the water challenges that we have there, found something called perchlorate in the groundwater. And perchlorate is a chemical which unfortunately has tremendous negative repercussions getting into the groundwater.

We worked hard to try and find out exactly what led to the perchlorate getting into the groundwater, and they discovered that it came from the legal disposal of spent rocket fuel during the military buildup during the Cold War during the 1950s and 1960s.

Many people, when this perchlorate was discovered, began pointing fingers and saying that somebody is responsible for this. One of the things that we found, Madam Speaker, is that there are many companies that were very important to the buildup during the Cold War that are no longer in business, and so it was easy to begin pointing fingers. Some of us said that we needed to solve the problem, and so that is why, when we look at the fact this is a national security issue, yes, it was first discovered in Southern California, but this has national repercussions.

It has national repercussions because the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), my friend, has been faced with the same problem.

□ 1045

There are people from other States of the Union who have found just recently the discovery of perchlorate in the groundwater. So I was very pleased that several months ago the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the

chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the subcommittee chairman, agreed to put together a hearing which was designed to specifically address this question.

We were able to utilize something I am very proud of, new technology; and we had a hearing of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the subcommittee that the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) chairs, which was able to include community activists from Southern California, people with the Water Quality Authority, and several of my colleagues who in a bipartisan way joined in introducing the authorizing legislation, H.R. 910.

They included the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO), the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) and others, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the gentleman from California (Mr. ROGAN), who have been very supportive of this effort.

Well, Madam Speaker, I am pleased that we have been able to include in this legislation in this conference report important funding to begin this to find a solution to this problem. It is a small amount of money. But it is a beginning. Again, it is one of the very serious environmental questions that we have.

So in passage of this conference report, we will in this Congress be taking a very bold step towards addressing a major environmental concern, not only for Southern California, but for the entire country.

I want to express my appreciation again to the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD). I would especially like to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who has been phenomenal in providing me with assistance in dealing with this.

Also, I want to express my appreciation to Chairman DOMENICI for his work on this and, as I said, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) and the gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT) for the effort that they have put together in helping us deal with an important problem that, as I said, impacts, it appears, Southern California right now but also the entire Nation.

So I urge strong support of this rule and support of the conference report.

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

Madam Speaker, my colleagues may recall that I applauded all that is in this bill. I am not taking anything away from my chairman. I think he did a masterful job in getting the money he got for that project, and it is well needed.

I am talking about what is not in the bill, and what is not in the bill is going to help protect the lives and safety of the people in the Northeast. Two years ago, we had an elderly couple freeze to death because they did not have money to buy fuel oil, and there was no reserve set up. We are trying to build against that so we will not have the same thing happen again.

I think it is very, very small for some people to play petty politics with this very, very important issue. Just because it affects the Northeast where maybe our Republican candidate is not doing too well and he can just "dis" it off. But there are human beings up there that are fighting for their lives, and probably some may lose their lives if the winter is as bad as some people predict.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), the head of the Democratic Caucus.

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

Madam Speaker, we ought to be very clear about the game that the Republicans are playing right now. On the one hand, they are critical of the President for announcing that he is going to release oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. In fact, they are even talking about filing a lawsuit or perhaps passing legislation to prevent the President from releasing oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

Yet, in this bill, they deleted the authority for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. So on the one hand, they are saying, gee, the President does not have the authority. On the other hand, they are deleting the authority and not giving it to him. One cannot have it both ways.

Now they try and say, oh, well, it should be in another bill. We know that is a ludicrous argument late in the session. This is a bill that is moving forward. This is the opportunity to provide the authority to release oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve so that we can deal with home heating oil prices so that we can deal with the price of gasoline.

The facts are very clear. They do not want the President to have that authority so then they can say, well, he does not have it. So we are going to challenge his action. This is perhaps one of the most cynical actions that a legislative majority could possibly take.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FROST. Yes, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Madam Speaker, is the gentleman from Texas aware this has been done 10 separate and distinct times under Republican leadership, and not one word of political chicanery was ever mentioned?

Mr. FROST. Madam Speaker, I am aware of the history. It just is ironic

that today one of the committees of this House under the leadership of a Republican chairman is criticizing the President for exercising this authority while the other Republicans are on the floor trying to prevent the President from having the authority.

Now, I cannot think of anything that is more cynical, any more than a legislative body could take to say, gee, he cannot do that, but we are sure not going to give him the authority to do it; so maybe then we can challenge his right to do it.

Madam Speaker, this is perhaps one of the worst pieces of energy policy that this majority has done in the last 6 years. I conclude my remarks. I think it is extraordinary what is happening today.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Madam Speaker, we had some other speakers, but we do not seem to have them here; and I guess the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) has no speakers, so I reluctantly yield back the balance of my time.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The Chair will take this opportunity to remind all Members not to wear communicative badges while under recognition.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I just want to repeat once again that all this discussion has been on home heating oil for the Northeast. I know that is a major issue for people who live up in that part of the country, but this is being addressed already in another bill where there is funding in the conference report that is working its way through. That is the proper venue for this.

I would like to make one other point because this is probably the first time that the issue has really been debated on the floor regarding the Strategic Oil Reserves. Part of the long-term solution, I want to emphasize the word "long-term solution," is obviously to try to find more sources to get petroleum. That has not been talked about. It certainly was not talked about at all here in debate.

I would like to cite one statistic. When we created the Department of Energy some 25, 30 years ago, it was a crisis. One of the reasons why we created the Department of Energy is, horror upon horrors, we were importing about one-third of our oil. So now here we are 25 years or so or more later and we are importing some 50 percent of our oil.

I would just contend, if it was a crisis some 25, 30 years ago to have a cabinet-level agency to look at our energy policies when we were only importing 30 percent, it certainly ought to be something that we look at right now. Obviously, part of the long-term solution is to find more sources for oil.

Madam Speaker, 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.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Madam 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 231, nays 186, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 500]

YEAS—231

Aderholt	Everett	Lucas (OK)
Archer	Ewing	Manzullo
Army	Fletcher	Martinez
Bachus	Foley	McCrery
Baker	Fowler	McInnis
Ballenger	Franks (NJ)	McIntyre
Barr	Frelinghuysen	McKeon
Barrett (NE)	Frost	Meek (FL)
Bartlett	Galleghy	Metcalf
Barton	Ganske	Mica
Bass	Gekas	Miller (FL)
Bentsen	Gibbons	Miller, Gary
Bereuter	Gilchrest	Mollohan
Berkley	Gillmor	Moore
Biggett	Gilman	Moran (KS)
Bilbray	Goode	Morella
Bilirakis	Goodlatte	Myrick
Blunt	Goodling	Napolitano
Boehlert	Goss	Nethercutt
Boehner	Graham	Ney
Bonilla	Granger	Northup
Bono	Green (TX)	Nussle
Brady (TX)	Green (WI)	Ose
Brown (FL)	Greenwood	Oxley
Bryant	Gutknecht	Packard
Burr	Hall (TX)	Pastor
Burton	Hansen	Pease
Buyer	Hastings (WA)	Peterson (PA)
Callahan	Hayes	Petri
Calvert	Hayworth	Pickering
Camp	Hefley	Pitts
Campbell	Herger	Pombo
Canady	Hill (MT)	Porter
Cannon	Hilleary	Portman
Carson	Hobson	Pryce (OH)
Chabot	Hoekstra	Radanovich
Chambless	Horn	Rahall
Chenoweth-Hage	Hostettler	Ramstad
Clyburn	Houghton	Regula
Coble	Hulshof	Riley
Collins	Hunter	Rogan
Combest	Hutchinson	Rogers
Cook	Hyde	Rohrabacher
Cooksey	Isakson	Ros-Lehtinen
Cox	Istook	Roukema
Crane	Jenkins	Royce
Cubin	Johnson (CT)	Ryan (WI)
Cunningham	Johnson, Sam	Ryun (KS)
Davis (FL)	Jones (NC)	Salmon
Davis (VA)	Kasich	Sandlin
Deal	King (NY)	Sanford
DeLay	Kingston	Saxton
DeMint	Knollenberg	Scarborough
Diaz-Balart	Kolbe	Schaffer
Dickey	Kuykendall	Sensenbrenner
Dicks	LaHood	Sessions
Dooley	Lampson	Shadegg
Doolittle	Largent	Shaw
Dreier	Latham	Shays
Duncan	LaTourette	Sherwood
Dunn	Leach	Shimkus
Ehlers	Lewis (CA)	Shows
Ehrlich	Lewis (KY)	Shuster
Emerson	Linder	Simpson
English	LoBiondo	Skeen

Smith (MI)	Thomas	Watkins
Smith (NJ)	Thompson (MS)	Watts (OK)
Smith (TX)	Thornberry	Weldon (FL)
Souder	Thune	Weldon (PA)
Spence	Tiahrt	Weller
Stearns	Toomey	Whitfield
Stump	Traficant	Wicker
Sununu	Upton	Wilson
Tauscher	Vitter	Wise
Tauzin	Walden	Wolf
Taylor (NC)	Walsh	Young (AK)
Terry	Wamp	Young (FL)

## NAYS—186

Abercrombie	Hastings (FL)	Olver
Ackerman	Hill (IN)	Ortiz
Allen	Hilliard	Owens
Andrews	Hinchey	Pallone
Baca	Hinojosa	Pascarell
Baird	Hoefel	Payne
Baldacci	Holden	Pelosi
Baldwin	Holt	Peterson (MN)
Barcia	Hooley	Phelps
Barrett (WI)	Hoyer	Pickett
Becerra	Inslee	Pomeroy
Berman	Jackson (IL)	Price (NC)
Berry	Jackson-Lee	Quinn
Bishop	(TX)	Rangel
Blagojevich	Jefferson	Reyes
Bliley	John	Reynolds
Blumenauer	Johnson, E.B.	Rivers
Bonior	Kanjorski	Rodriguez
Borski	Kaptur	Roemer
Boswell	Kelly	Rothman
Boucher	Kennedy	Roybal-Allard
Boyd	Kildee	Rush
Brady (PA)	Kilpatrick	Sabo
Brown (OH)	Kind (WI)	Sanchez
Capps	Kleczka	Sanders
Capuano	Kucinich	Sawyer
Cardin	Lantos	Schakowsky
Clayton	Larson	Scott
Clement	Lee	Serrano
Coburn	Levin	Sherman
Condit	Lewis (GA)	Sisisky
Conyers	Lipinski	Skelton
Costello	Lofgren	Slaughter
Coyne	Lowe	Smith (WA)
Cramer	Lucas (KY)	Snyder
Crowley	Luther	Spratt
Cummings	Maloney (CT)	Stark
Danner	Maloney (NY)	Stenholm
Davis (LL)	Markey	Strickland
DeFazio	Mascara	Stupak
DeGette	Matsui	Sweeney
Delahunt	McCarthy (MO)	Tancredo
DeLauro	McCarthy (NY)	Tanner
Deutsch	McDermott	Taylor (MS)
Dingell	McGovern	Thompson (CA)
Dixon	McHugh	Thurman
Doggett	McKinney	Tierney
Doyle	McNulty	Towns
Edwards	Meehan	Turner
Etheridge	Meeke (NY)	Udall (CO)
Evans	Menendez	Udall (NM)
Farr	Millender-	Velazquez
Fattah	McDonald	Visclosky
Filner	Miller, George	Waters
Forbes	Minge	Watt (NC)
Ford	Mink	Waxman
Frank (MA)	Moakley	Weiner
Gejdenson	Moran (VA)	Wexler
Gephardt	Murtha	Weygand
Gonzalez	Nadler	Woolsey
Gordon	Neal	Wu
Gutierrez	Oberstar	Wynn
Hall (OH)	Obey	

## NOT VOTING—16

Castle	Klink	Paul
Clay	LaFalce	Stabenow
Engel	Lazio	Talent
Eshoo	McCollum	Vento
Fossella	McIntosh	
Jones (OH)	Norwood	

□ 1116

Messrs. MCHUGH, HOLT, TAYLOR of Mississippi, QUINN, SWEENEY, REYNOLDS, and Mrs. KELLY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. LAMPSON changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

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.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PACKARD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and that I may include tabular and extraneous material on the conference report to accompany H.R. 4733.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 5130

Mr. CAMPBELL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 5130.

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

There was no objection.

## PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. PASTOR. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. PASTOR. Madam Speaker, this morning, as I was walking onto the floor, you reminded us that if we were going to speak on the floor that we could not wear any button that communicated a message.

I bring that to your attention because I ask what the rule is that, in the past, we have had Members speak on the floor while wearing such buttons.

In particular, yesterday I saw a number of Members that were wearing a button that communicated 90 percent. And this morning I was hoping to wear a button, but I was reminded by you that I could not.

The question is, what is the rule on wearing buttons on the floor while we speak, especially buttons that communicate a message?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Clause 1 of rule XVII, which requires Members to address their remarks to the Chair, has been interpreted to proscribe the wearing of badges by Members to communicate a message while under recognition to speak by the Chair.

The Chair would direct the gentleman to page 693 of the House Rules and Manual for a recitation of precedents under this rule, some of which involve the Chair taking the initiative when the Chair observed their display while the Member was speaking.

The Chair will endeavor to be consistent in this enforcement and will use due diligence to call the attention of the Member to this rule.

Mr. PASTOR. Madam Speaker, I want to thank Madam Speaker for her comments.

Hopefully, maybe in the morning before we start, the Chair might remind us what the rule is on buttons that communicate a message.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman for calling that to the attention of the Chair.

## CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4733, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. PACKARD. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 598, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 4733) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Pursuant to House Resolution 598, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of September 27, 2000, at page H8312.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD).

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present to the House the conference report on H.R. 4733, the fiscal year 2001 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act.

At the outset, I would like to briefly state how pleased I am that the conference committee was able to work out the dramatic differences between the House and the Senate bills as amicably as we have and with a positive effect. Given the great divide over the House and Senate priorities, many concluded that we would never be able to resolve our differences. Not only did we resolve those differences, but we did so in such a way that the critical priorities of the House were carefully protected.

I am proud of the agreement struck between the House and that Senate on energy and water resources development programs. It was a difficult and arduous negotiation, but the product of our deliberations is a package that will help strengthen our defense, rebuild our critical infrastructure, and increase our scientific knowledge.

The total amount included in the conference agreement for energy and water program is \$23.3 billion. This is about \$1.6 billion over the amount included in the House-passed bill. The bill also includes \$214 million in emergency appropriations primarily to continue recovery operations at the Los