

Deutsch	Kleccka	Reyes
Diaz-Balart	Knollenberg	Reynolds
Dicks	Kolbe	Riley
Dingell	Kuykendall	Rivers
Dixon	LaFalce	Rodriguez
Doggett	LaHood	Roemer
Dooley	Lampson	Rogan
Doolittle	Lantos	Rogers
Doyle	Largent	Ros-Lehtinen
Dreier	Larson	Rothman
Duncan	Latham	Roukema
Dunn	LaTourette	Roybal-Allard
Edwards	Lazio	Royce
Ehlers	Leach	Rush
Ehrlich	Lee	Ryan (WI)
Emerson	Lewis (CA)	Ryun (KS)
Engel	Lewis (KY)	Salmon
Eshoo	Linder	Sanchez
Etheridge	Lipinski	Sanders
Evans	Lofgren	Sandlin
Everett	Lowey	Sanford
Ewing	Lucas (KY)	Sawyer
Farr	Lucas (OK)	Saxton
Fletcher	Luther	Scarborough
Foley	Maloney (CT)	Schaffer
Forbes	Maloney (NY)	Schakowsky
Ford	Martinez	Scott
Fowler	Mascara	Sensenbrenner
Frank (MA)	Matsui	Serrano
Franks (NJ)	McCarthy (MO)	Sessions
Frelinghuysen	McCarthy (NY)	Shadegg
Frost	McCollum	Shaw
Gallegly	McCrery	Shays
Ganske	McGovern	Sherman
Gekas	McHugh	Sherwood
Gephardt	McInnis	Shimkus
Gibbons	McIntyre	Shows
Gilchrest	McKeon	Shuster
Gillmor	McKinney	Simpson
Gilman	McNulty	Sisisky
Gonzalez	Meehan	Skeen
Goode	Meek (FL)	Skelton
Goodlatte	Meeks (NY)	Smith (NJ)
Goodling	Menendez	Smith (TX)
Gordon	Metcalf	Smith (WA)
Goss	Mica	Snyder
Graham	Millender-	Souder
Granger	McDonald	Spence
Green (WI)	Miller (FL)	Spratt
Gutknecht	Miller, Gary	Stabenow
Hall (TX)	Miller, George	Stearns
Hansen	Minge	Stenholm
Hastings (WA)	Mink	Stump
Hayes	Moakley	Sununu
Hayworth	Mollohan	Sweeney
Herger	Moore	Talent
Hill (IN)	Moran (KS)	Tanner
Hinchee	Moran (VA)	Tauscher
Hobson	Morella	Tauzin
Hoeffel	Murtha	Taylor (NC)
Hoekstra	Myrick	Terry
Holden	Nadler	Thomas
Holt	Napolitano	Thornberry
Hooley	Neal	Thune
Horn	Nethercutt	Tiahrt
Hostettler	Ney	Toomey
Hoyer	Northup	Towns
Hulshof	Norwood	Traficant
Hunter	Nussle	Turner
Hutchinson	Olver	Udall (CO)
Hyde	Ortiz	Upton
Inslee	Ose	Velázquez
Isakson	Owens	Vitter
Istook	Oxley	Walden
Jackson (IL)	Packard	Walsh
Jackson-Lee	Pallone	Wamp
(TX)	Pascrell	Watkins
Jenkins	Pastor	Watt (NC)
John	Paul	Watts (OK)
Johnson (CT)	Payne	Waxman
Johnson, E. B.	Pease	Weiner
Johnson, Sam	Pelosi	Weldon (FL)
Jones (NC)	Petri	Weldon (PA)
Jones (OH)	Phelps	Wexler
Kanjorski	Pickering	Weygand
Kaptur	Pitts	Whitfield
Kasich	Pombo	Wilson
Kelly	Porter	Wise
Kennedy	Portman	Wolf
Kildee	Price (NC)	Woolsey
Kilpatrick	Pryce (OH)	Wynn
Kind (WI)	Quinn	Young (AK)
King (NY)	Rahall	Young (FL)
Kingston	Regula	

NAYS—45

Aderholt	Hall (OH)	Sabo
Baird	Hastings (FL)	Slaughter
Baldwin	Hefley	Stark
Bilbray	Hill (MT)	Strickland
Borski	Hilleary	Stupak
Brady (PA)	Hilliard	Taylor (MS)
Costello	Kucinich	Thompson (CA)
Crane	Lewis (GA)	Thompson (MS)
DeFazio	LoBiondo	Thurman
Dickey	McDermott	Udall (NM)
English	Oberstar	Visclosky
Fattah	Peterson (MN)	Waters
Filner	Pickett	Weller
Green (TX)	Pomeroy	Wicker
Gutierrez	Ramstad	Wu

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5

Barrett (NE)	Conyers	Tancred
Carson	Levin	

NOT VOTING—21

Clay	Houghton	Peterson (PA)
Cummings	Jefferson	Radanovich
Danner	Klink	Rangel
Fossella	Manzullo	Rohrabacher
Gejdenson	Markey	Smith (MI)
Greenwood	McIntosh	Tierney
Hinojosa	Obey	Vento

□ 1025

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi changed his vote from "present" to "nay."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 407, this time has been designated for the taking of the official photo of the House of Representatives in session.

The House will be in a brief recess while the Chamber is being prepared for the photo. As soon as these preparations are complete, the House will immediately resume its actual session for the taking of the photograph.

About 15 minutes after that, the House will proceed with the business of the House. The 1-minute will be at the end of the legislative session today.

For the information of the Members, when the Chair says, the House will be in order, we are ready to take our picture. That will be in just a few minutes.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 10:30 a.m.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 29 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 10:30 a.m.

□ 1030

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 10 o'clock and 30 minutes a.m.

(Thereupon the Members sat for the official photograph of the House of Representatives for the 106th Congress.)

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 10:50 a.m. Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 33 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 10:50 a.m.

□ 1052

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) at 10 o'clock and 52 minutes a.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4577, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by the direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 518 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 518

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4577) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendments printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. Points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived except as follows: beginning with "Provided" on page 44, line 4, through "as amended" on line 14. Where points of order are waived against part of a paragraph, points of order against a provision in another part of such paragraph may be made only against such provision and not against the entire paragraph. The amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules may be offered only by a Member designated in the report and only at the appropriate point in the reading of the bill, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against the amendment printed in part B of the report are waived. During consideration of the bill for further amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the

Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. During consideration of the bill, points of order against amendments for failure to comply with clause 2(e) of rule XXI are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. House Resolution 515 is laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER); pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 518 is an open rule to provide for consideration of the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2001. Traditionally, this bill has proven quite controversial, and this year is no exception. However, this rule should not be controversial as it provides for an open and fair debate of the many issues at hand.

Under the rule, there will be an hour of general debate divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations. The amendments printed in part A of the Committee on Rules report will be considered as adopted, along with the rule.

I want to make a few facts clear about these amendments before the rhetoric starts flying. Under the first amendment, the maximum Pell Grant, which will reach the highest level in history under this bill, will not be reduced. The second amendment provides a mechanism to ensure that the House complies with the fiscal restraints dictated in the budget resolution.

Now, specifically, the amendment provides an incentive for the House to remain within the advanced appropriations cap set in the budget resolution. While the amendment does use the child care and development block grant to create this incentive, it also ensures that the child care block grant will not

be reduced beyond a certain level, a level that provides for an increase above last year's spending.

After general debate, the bill will be open for amendment under the 5-minute rule, except that the amendment printed in part B of the Committee on Rules report, to be offered by the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON), will be debatable for 10 minutes. Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will receive priority recognition. The rule also waives clause 2(e) of rule XXI to protect Members' ability to offer certain amendments.

During consideration of the rule, the Chair will have the flexibility to postpone votes and reduce voting time as a way to expedite consideration of the bill and give due consideration to Members' schedules.

Finally, the minority will have another opportunity to alter the bill through the customary motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, before my good friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle begin their expected protest of this legislation, I would like to point out some facts as well as the merits of this bill.

□ 1100

We will hear my Democratic colleagues claim that there is not adequate funding in this measure, but the bill actually spends \$4 billion more than last year.

I think in most people's mind, \$4 billion is nothing to sneeze at, and this funding will allow many worthwhile programs to see increased spending under this legislation. This bill balances fiscal responsibility and Government accountability with social responsibility.

Making tough spending decisions and setting priorities is a part of responsible governing that respects the trust and hard-earned dollars of the taxpayer. This bill focuses on our priorities, including education.

I am pleased that this legislation will provide almost \$43 billion for education programs, which is an added investment of \$2 billion over last year. This funding will assist students from preschool age through college. Head Start will receive a \$400 million increase. Elementary and secondary education programs will receive \$576 million more than last year. And the maximum Pell Grant for college students will be raised to \$3,500, the highest level in history.

In addition, the bill addresses the educational needs of the disabled. By injecting an extra \$500 million in State special education grants, this bill keeps our commitment to children with disabilities.

The Federal Government mandates that States provide a free public edu-

cation to disabled children, but we have not kept up our end of the bargain in terms of sharing in the cost. This bill moves us one step closer to keeping our promise.

By fulfilling this commitment, we will free up State and local resources, which can then be devoted to education priorities set by the State and local school districts who are closest to the children we are trying to help.

This legislation further meets the needs of today's classrooms and students by preparing them for jobs in a high-tech economy through an increase in the Technology for Education program, bringing total funding to more than \$900 million.

Even more important than providing for an educated citizenry is ensuring their good health. That is why this legislation invests an additional \$2.7 billion in discretionary health care spending. These added resources will be pumped into community health centers that have done such yeoman's work serving the poor and uninsured in our communities.

The Ryan White AIDS Care Act programs will also see an increase over last year's level and above the President's request. Perhaps most importantly, this legislation gives hope to those who suffer from incurable or untreatable diseases by making a significant investment of almost \$19 billion in biomedical research through the National Institutes of Health, with a commitment to do more in the future.

I would like to commend the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman PORTER) for his dedication to the goal of doubling funding for the NIH over 5 years. The chairman understands the great promise that this research holds for saving lives and conquering diseases such as cancer, heart disease, diabetes, Parkinson's, and many others.

I am also encouraged by the progress made in the last couple of years in the area of pediatric research through an appropriation for the graduate medical education provided in children's hospitals. While the \$800 million this bill provides falls short of the full authorization, it does represent progress, since it doubles last year's funding.

I hope to work with the chairman through the end of the process to find a way to fully fund children's GME at a level of \$285 million and put free-standing children's hospitals on par with other teaching institutions.

It is critical that we recognize the differences between adult and child medicine and provide this support to those whom we trust with caring for our most precious resources.

Mr. Speaker, I think the dedication this bill demonstrates towards these priorities within the constraints dictated by fiscal responsibility is to be congratulated.

The subcommittee did not face a simple task in crafting this bill, but I believe it is a responsible approach; and I

am proud of their willingness to make tough decisions to keep our fiscal house in order while making wise investments in the areas of greatest need.

Still, I am sure if each of my colleagues legislated alone, they would look at the many worthwhile programs in this bill and prioritize spending in 435 different ways. In recognition of the different views among us, this legislation is being considered under an open process which will allow every Member an opportunity to rework this legislation to their will. So there is really no reason that every single one of my colleagues should not support this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to vote yes on the rule, as well as the subcommittee's balanced approach to this legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) for yielding me the customary half hour.

Mr. Speaker, this annual appropriations dance is growing staler than the Macarena. Year after year, this leadership attempts to gut programs critical to working families, and year after year they are publicly shamed into finally passing adequate spending levels. Fiscal year 2001 is gearing up to be no different.

The rule for this underlying bill is a sham and deserves to be defeated. In the dead of night, the Committee on Rules has rewritten the underlying bill in the hopes it might survive a floor vote. No one in this body has had an opportunity to adequately review this new version, but I can share with my colleagues at least one little gem.

According to the new rule, any programs that are forward-funded in the bill will trigger an automatic rescission. And did the majority pick on someone their own size in choosing the program to target for this rescission? Not in the least. The automatic rescission will cut funds from the Child Care Development Block Grant, which funds child care for the poorest children in our Nation.

Passing annual appropriations bills remains the most basic and critical function that we perform in this body. This particular spending bill funds some of our most essential programs, those that keep Americans healthy, educate our children, and protect our workers. But once again, the current leadership has skirted this responsibility and is pushing a bill that it knows will be vetoed in its current form.

The original bill was narrowly adopted in the Committee on Appropriations on a party-line vote 29-22, with every Democrat opposed. Moreover, the committee version of the bill would delay

any new worker safety provisions, particularly those designed to protect workers from repetitive motion injuries.

My colleagues and I have often marveled at the short-sighted vision the current leadership holds for the Nation, and this year's Labor HHS appears to be no exception.

The bill cuts education funding at a time when school enrollment is exploding and education is at the top of our Nation's list of priorities. Education is cut \$3.5 billion below the President's request, including the repeal of last year's bipartisan commitment to hire 100,000 new teachers, to reduce class size and turning that initiative into a block grant; denial of \$1.3 billion to renovate 5,000 schools for urgently needed safety repairs; \$1 billion cut from teacher quality initiatives for recruitment and training; \$400 million cut from after-school care serving 1.6 million children; \$416 million cut from title I assistance, affecting up to 650,000 low-income children; \$600 million cut from Head Start, denying early education to 53,000 children, elimination of funding for elementary school counselors.

The leadership's bill cuts funding to train and protect America's workforce and contains a controversial rider which once again blocks OSHA's regulation on ergonomics for the sixth consecutive year.

The bill cuts millions from worker protection initiatives, including efforts to make the workplace safer, to promote equal pay, to protect pensions, and to crack down on sweatshops.

The ergonomics rider prohibits the issuance of a new OSHA rule that would prevent 300,000 debilitating ergonomics injuries per year. In addition, the bill cuts over \$1 billion for the training of adult and dislocated workers and summer jobs for 72,000 at-risk youth.

Moreover, the underlying bill cuts funding to protect elderly Americans. The bill eliminates family care support for 250,000 Americans with long-term care needs; cuts funds to enforce quality nursing and family care for 1.6 million elderly and disabled people; cuts mental health for seniors; cuts funds to eliminate Medicare waste, fraud, and abuse.

In addition, the bill cuts funding for the battered women's shelters, for family planning, and for health coverage for uninsured workers.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this week the Committee on Rules had an opportunity to correct these cuts by allowing full consideration of amendments offered by my colleagues. We offered amendments to increase funding for education and research. We offered amendments to protect senior citizens and attack weak labor standards. All of these efforts were defeated on a party-line vote.

Thusly, Mr. Speaker, I urge the defeat of this ill-conceived rule.

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

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), the chairman of the subcommittee, who crafted this very difficult legislation in a very fine manner.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), that the cuts she has described, are not cuts. They are cuts from the President's budget. And the President's budget, this President, has been particularly adept at drawing a political document. All Presidents draw a political document, but this President has taken it to an art form; and it is, basically, a document that is not responsible.

Let us start the debate today by being very, very clear. When the other side talks about cuts, they are talking about cuts from an irresponsible President's budget. If we look at the Department of Education, there are no cuts in programs. There is a \$2.4 billion increase in spending in this bill over last year in discretionary programs.

If we look at the Department of Health and Human Services, there is a \$2.2 billion increase over last year.

There are cuts in some programs in the Department of Labor. But this is an economy that is growing so fast, where we have almost full employment, that the need for job training is less than in the past. Such growth justifies a slowdown in spending.

So I would say to the gentlewoman, let us talk not about cuts. There are not cuts except in certain areas where they are justified. There are increases. They simply are not increases of the magnitude that the President has suggested because the President's budget is not responsible, I believe; and because we have a limited allocation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), the ranking member on the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my great colleague, my dear friend, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, do my colleagues know where their Committee on Rules was last night around midnight at the witching hour? When everybody else was nestled all snug in bed, the Committee on Rules was at work, under the cover of darkness, rewriting the rule for the Labor, Health and Human Services appropriations bill, where they once again put children's programs on the chopping block.

Mr. Speaker, picking on children is becoming the pattern in the Committee on Rules. Two weeks ago, the

Committee on Rules killed an amendment that would have sent American medicine and American food to sick and starving children in North Korea and Sudan.

Then my Republican colleagues took money from the Women, Infants' and Children's Nutrition Program, the WIC program, and handed it over to the apple and potato growers.

Today, Mr. Speaker, they will put child care block grants at risk, and all to please the Republican conservatives who fear using next year's money to pay this year's bill because they themselves have imposed impossible budget caps.

Mr. Speaker, children should not be the scapegoats of Republican budget cuts just because they cannot fight back. And people will find out what my Republican colleagues did even though it was late at night.

If my Republican colleagues really need to come up with some more money, I think they should stop picking on children, pick on someone their own size.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule. I thank my friend from Columbus, Ohio, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that we are proud to have a hard-working Committee on Rules. I am glad that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) was able to join us last night.

One of the challenges of dealing with a very recalcitrant minority that wants to obstruct any kind of progress here in this House is that we have to try to fashion rules that will get the majority to provide full support; and, unfortunately, we have a difficult time working in a bipartisan way.

We try our best to do it. We try to reach out to the other side. But when we hear rhetoric like that that my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, just provided, it makes it really tough for us. Because, in fact, in the area of child care development, we have a 33 percent increase over last year.

□ 1115

Now, one of the things that I was proud to have worked on earlier this year, that unfortunately I fell short by eight votes of getting the support on, was something called biennial budgeting. I know that while one member of the Committee on Rules in the minority joined us in support of this, my friend from Massachusetts opposed it.

We are talking here about all kinds of scenarios that are down the road and that, frankly, future Congresses will be

addressing. As we look at this question of advance appropriations and forward funding, it seems to me that if we were able to have a biennial budget process, which it seems my friend is advocating here, it sounds like he is an advocate of the biennial budgeting process, he should have joined with us and voted in favor of that so we could have addressed this question in what I believe would be a really more responsible way than going through the annual process. But we have to deal with it as it is right now.

I want to say that I believe that this is a very, very responsible measure. My friend from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), who is going to be presiding over the last labor, health and human services appropriations bill before his retirement, is to be commended for his hard work. I think that his words just a few moments ago put it right on target when he said that all kinds of rhetoric is going to be out there trying to claim that cuts are being made when, in fact, we are bringing about responsible increases to address these issues. I commend him for his very fine work.

There are a number of very important issues that are being addressed in this measure. I want to particularly compliment him for the \$900 million that is for technology, for education programs which will help today's students have the potential to be competitive when it comes to dealing with our global economy. We have a responsibility to ensure that we pursue that. I think we have been right on target in doing that.

There are a wide range of very good measures in this bill. What we need to do is recognize that we are complying with the budget resolution that passed, not, as the gentleman from Illinois said, the very irresponsible budget package that was put forward by the President of the United States. That is not what is providing us with direction here. We are following the budget resolution that passed. We are increasing responsibly in areas where need is taking place.

Mr. Speaker, we continue to hear the other side of the aisle talk about Draconian cuts. We went through this in the middle part of the last decade right after we won the majority and they tried to claim that we were cutting the school lunch program when we were increasing it, they tried to claim that we were cutting programs for seniors. They were trying to describe us as being somehow inhumane. Nothing could be further from the truth. We are, in fact, responsibly dealing with societal needs while at the same time dealing with the fiscal constraints that are imposed with the budget process that we have.

I strongly support this rule. I urge my colleagues to support it and the very important appropriations bill that we will be moving ahead with.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the Democrat leader.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to vote no on this rule and if it does pass, to vote no on this bill. Everyone in America knows that the most important issue in front of us is education and training children, the way we raise children. Go into any business in America today and they will tell you they need trained people. They do not have enough trained people to fill the jobs. We constantly are asked by businesspeople for legitimate reasons to open up immigration rolls to bring in trained people to fill the jobs that Americans are not available to fill today.

Every family knows that raising a child today is more difficult in a very busy and different world that we live in. Parents have less time with children by about a third than they did 15 or 20 years ago. This bill walks away from all of those concerns. There is not enough money in it for the teachers that we need to teach our children in elementary and secondary schools across the country. It zeros out the funds that are supposed to be there for the 100,000 teachers that we should be trying to help the local districts with. It provides no funds for the effort to try to repair and rehabilitate and expand school building structures, so we can get smaller class sizes to go with the teachers that are all designed to get smaller class size. It guts the President's proposal to improve teacher quality and insist on teacher recruitment and school accountability.

Denying all of this funding is frankly inexcusable and unnecessary. Part of the reason, I guess, that we are not able to put enough money into these efforts is that tomorrow we have a bill to wipe out the estate tax entirely. Everything that we do here is a choice. We have a choice. We can wipe out the estate tax entirely or we can simply modify it and make it more reasonable, thereby not spending as much money on that effort and using those moneys that we do not use on that effort to deal with schools and children and teachers and standards in public schools.

We are making a choice this week that we want the top 10 percent of the top 1 percent of Americans to get an incredible tax cut rather than spending the money on our children, on our future, on our ability to keep this economy which is white hot going in the right direction. That is the choice we face today.

I urge Members to vote against this rule, to vote against this bill so that we can make the right choice for America's most precious resource which are our children.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the

distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

Mr. COBURN. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, in about 6 months from now, I will be back in my medical practice in Oklahoma. The one thing I will not miss is a lack of integrity and straightforwardness about when we discuss these issues.

Everybody in this House knows that the funding in Labor-HHS bills have climbed faster than in any other thing that we have funded in this House under Republican control. We are \$40 billion more under this appropriation bill than we were in 1995. There is \$14.3 billion more for children, for health, for education to be available, to be spent in 2001 than was available last year. And for anyone to come to the House floor and to say that there is a cut in programs, it is not only untrue but it smirches the integrity of this entire House.

We have a bill that spends much more than I want to spend on many of these programs because the accountability is not there, but we are going to spend the money to fulfill the needs even though the accountability is not there. It is important for us to make sure when we talk about priorities that what we are really talking about is a difference in the amount of increase in spending in priorities, not in cutting any major program. My heart aches for my grandchildren, because if we progress in this House with statements of untruth for political demagoguery purposes, we do neither party any positive benefit and we undermine the very value of this institution.

So I would beg that as we debate this bill the next 16 hours, to tell the Members of the House and tell the people in the country the same thing you would tell your grandchildren. Would you lie to your grandchildren? Would you be untruthful about what is really going on? We can have an honest debate about the differences in priorities. But I beg you, do not undermine the integrity of this House by baseless claims of cuts in spending.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of talk here today from people who understand the cost of everything and the value of nothing. When someone says that we do not have cuts in this bill for education and health care and job training, what they ignore is what happens to real people.

This budget is not the last budget for the Clinton administration. This budget is the first budget for the next decade. We do not have a society or a country frozen in time. We have a growing population. They have growing needs. We are going to have over a mil-

lion additional students in college needing Pell grants, needing Work Study. We are going to have about a million and a half additional students in high school, needing title I and all the rest. We are going to have more people needing medical services, because our population is growing larger and it is aging. We are going to have about 25 million more people in the coming decade. It would be kind of nice if the people's bill, which this bill is, responds to those growing needs. But it does not. That is why it cuts the President's educational request by \$3 billion. It cuts worker training and other worker protection programs by \$1.7 billion. It cuts health care by \$1 billion from the President's request.

Why does it do that? Because we are moving into a new era. We have been in an era of huge deficits. We are now moving into an era of large surpluses. We have some choices. The choices are whether you use those surpluses to cut taxes or to buy down debt or to invest in national security, education, health care, science and the like or whether you do a reasonable combination of all of them. What we are doing in this bill today is making these cuts because the Republican majority in this House has decided that rather than provide a prescription drug benefit under Medicare, rather than invest larger amounts in teacher quality, rather than investing larger amounts in smaller class size, rather than strengthening job training, they want to provide \$90 billion in tax relief to people who make over \$300,000 a year. That is why these cuts are being made. I think that is wrong.

I have no objection to legitimate tax cuts aimed at farmers who are on the edge or aimed at trying to help small businessmen provide health care for their employees. But when those tax cuts are so large that they prevent us from eliminating the debt and prevent us from making needed additional investments in child care, in health care, in after-school centers and in enforcement of international child labor standards, then this bill is misguided and misbegotten.

This rule denies us the opportunity to offer 11 amendments to add funding to restore teacher quality, school facility repair, early childhood education, child care, after-school initiatives, better nursing home care and all the items that I just mentioned. It tries to hide it, but when you adopt this rule, you are also voting to cut by over \$800 million the child care block grant. You can deny it, but that is the fact. All of the amendments we want to be made in order could be financed by simply having the Republican majority in this House cut back their planned tax cuts by 20 percent and you would have enough to do all of the things we think that are necessary to move this society into the 21st century and to respond to the growing population and the grow-

ing need that accompanies that growing population.

This vote more than any other vote defines the differences between the two parties. It tells us what your values are. It tells us whose side you are really on. In our view, the majority party ought to scale back its tax promises so that we can meet the education and health care and job training responsibilities of this society.

□ 1130

We did not get to have the greatest economy in the world by nickel-nursing on these needed training programs.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to have 35 million more people knocking on the doors of national parks over the next 10 years, we are going to have 40 percent more commercial airline flights, we are going to have millions of more kids in school. We need to respond to that. If we do not provide these increases, then on a per-person basis and on a per-family basis, we are cutting back the amount of help we are giving to working families trying to share in the American dream.

This is the bill more than any other in the Congress that attempts to do that. It is a sad commentary on the priorities of this place that we are denied the opportunity to even offer the amendments, to even offer the amendments. They provided protection in the rule for all kinds of unauthorized programs that are in the bill itself, but they will not provide that same protection under the rule for the amendments we seek to offer. It is an unbalanced rule; it is an unfair bill. It should be defeated.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

I would say to the gentleman from Wisconsin, my friend and colleague, that he is going to offer all 11 amendments as we have agreed, and the reason that the rule denies him the right to offer them is because none of them have any offsets. They contain \$10 billion of additional spending that would, obviously, breach our allocation and therefore violate the budget that was adopted by the majority of this House. The amendments are irresponsible.

Sure, we would like to add \$10 billion of spending to this bill. It has very important priorities. But somebody has to be responsible for the bottom line and put some restraint on adding spending at any level to our bill or any other bill. So it seems to me that the gentleman is going to have an adequate opportunity to offer the amendments. We will make a point of order because they do not have offsets as our rules require. This does define the difference between the two parties. We are responsible for the bottom line.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would simply say in response that yes, we can offer the amendments, we just cannot get votes on them. That does not help a whole lot.

Secondly, they are offset. We suggest that we pay for them by cutting back tax plans by 20 percent. If we cut the outlays on the tax plans by \$2.4 billion, we can pay for every single one of the amendments we would like to have votes on.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to be in the well supporting the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER). I am very proud to be here supporting him for the last 4 years. I will tell the minority leader why you are going to bring in 200,000 people from other countries. For 20 years I sat here in the minority, and the only thing I ever heard from the majority was quantity, quantity. No quality. No quality. The only thing they ever talked about was quantity. If we can just cover more children, if we can just have more programs, if we just spend more money. Nobody ever went out to see whether they were doing any good, so we spent \$140 billion in title I.

So what do we have now? Do you close the achievement gap? No, Mr. Minority Leader, you did not close the achievement gap one bit. In fact, it has increased. So for the first time in the last 4 or 5 years we have been talking about quality, not quantity. We have been talking about results, not process. Every time they would come and say we need more money, and I would say, for what, they would say, to cover more children, and I say, with what, mediocrity? You are not helping them.

So yes, now we have the highest Pell grants; and yes, now we have the lowest interest rates. Yes, now we have more money for college work study, all of these things. We also took 166 job-training programs spread out over every agency doing nothing to prepare our people, because there was so little money and so many programs. But again, it was the same mindset: more programs, more programs, and somehow or other, all of our problems will go away.

Well, we have changed this. We are now moving toward quality, not quantity. We are now moving toward results, not process; and we are going to see a big difference.

So again, I am proud to be here supporting the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) in this effort. We want to close that achievement gap. More money for Even Start, more money for Head Start; but we reformed Head

Start. For 10 years we heard, more money for Head Start, more money, but nobody said, are we accomplishing anything? Lo and behold, we discovered all over this country we were accomplishing very little to get them reading-ready to go to school. Now we have changed that, and so the word is quality. The word is also family literacy. For the first time we are now talking about if we are going to break the cycle, we deal with the entire family.

So again, we are on the right road, and thanks to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) for the last several years we have been moving in the right direction. The whole emphasis is on quality, not quantity; results, not process.

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

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, we should reject this appropriations bill which turns its back on our children and our veterans. It demonstrates a lack of commitment to our Nation's veterans which we should not stand for, but maybe even more troubling is the degree to which this grossly underfunds Federal education programs.

The Republican bill is a giant step backward for American education. It eliminates funding for two programs that are critical for giving students the tools they need to flourish: the class size reduction initiative and the Elementary School Counselors Demonstration Act. Over the next 10 years, we will need 2.2 million new teachers nationwide to keep pace with enrollment. The Republicans want to play politics with children and slash the Democratic initiative to hire 100,000 additional teachers. This will jeopardize more than 1,000 teachers already hired in my home State of Illinois; it will leave kids packed in overcrowded classrooms.

The elimination of the Elementary School Counseling Demonstration program will deny counseling services to more than 100,000 elementary students. These essential services help troubled students overcome problems, promoting the mental health of our students and the safety of our schools. In April, I was joined by over 80 Members in calling for the funding of the school counselor program at \$100 million in fiscal year 2001. In addition, the bipartisan Working Group on Youth Violence recommended that we fund school counselor programs to help reduce school violence. Despite the support and to the detriment of the school safety and our children's well-being, no funding was provided for this initiative.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I will include the Working Group's report and the letter to the appropriators for the RECORD.

BIPARTISAN WORKING GROUP ON YOUTH VIOLENCE—FINAL REPORT—NOVEMBER 17, 1999

Members of the Bi-Partisan Working Group on Youth Violence:

*Republicans:* Jennifer Dunn, Chair, Zach Wamp, Vice-Chair, Heather Wilson, Jim Greenwood, Mark Souder, Sue Kelly, Marge Roukema, Judy Biggert, Buck McKeon, Bob Barr, Tom Tancredo, and Rob Portman.

*Democrats:* Martin Frost, Co-Chair, Robert Menendez, Vice-Chair, Bud Cramer, William Delahunt, Sander Levin, Bobby Scott, Bart Stupak, Bob Etheridge, Ruben Hinojosa, Patsy Mink, Tim Roemer, and Sheila Jackson-Lee.

V. SCHOOLS.

*Findings*

C. Often one adult can make a difference by taking an interest in a child and nurturing him or her. This might be a teacher, an administrator, a counselor, or others.

*Students with behavior disorders account for a majority of problems encountered in schools today. Additional resource staff in our schools, such as counselors, school psychologists, and social workers are needed, not only to help identify these troubled youth, but to work on development skill building. (Emphasis added.)*

There is no real infrastructure of support for our kids when it comes to mental health services in our schools and no national models for how best to structure school community mental health programs. Currently, there are only 90,000 school counselors for approximately 41.4 million students in our public schools—roughly 1 counselor for every 513 students. In California, there is only one counselor for more than 1,000 students. That is simply not enough. As Mr. Porter stated during this presentation, current school counselors are unable to address students' mental health needs since they are responsible for such large numbers of students. Instead, their role is relegated to administrative, scheduling, and career counseling.

Additional resource staff is needed to address specifically the personal, family, peer level, emotional, and developmental needs of students. By focusing on these mental health needs, these staff members will pick up early warning signs of troubled youth and improve student interaction and school safety.

The resource staff can also provide consultation with teachers and parents about student learning, behavior and emotional problems. They can develop and implement prevention programs, deal with substance abuse, set up peer mediation, and enhance problem-solving skills in schools. In short, resource staff can provide important support services to students, parents, and teachers.

There are a number of different ways to enhance the availability of emotional support and mental health services in schools. Schools can partner with community-based mental health organizations or enhance staff training by providing more opportunities at school for the development of informal adult-child mentoring relationships. We expect that there are a number of models that may vary in effectiveness at different schools and age levels. The federal government should initially support the development of research-based models for school mental health programs that could then be built upon.

Furthermore, schools and communities should incorporate programs that encourage parents to become involved in their child's education. Improving parenting skills through federally-funded programs like WAC, TANF, Food Stamps, Medicaid, public health clinics, teen parenting, child welfare,

juvenile delinquency and homeless programs may be an effective way to reduce juvenile violence in the long term.

Finally, teacher quality has been shown to have a profound impact on the success of a child. Because teachers are on the front line, there is a great need to help them understand how to identify and intervene in the life of a troubled child. Studies indicate that by the school year 2008–2009, we will need an additional two million teachers in our schools. We can ensure that we have quality teachers in the future by creating incentives for educators to continue teaching and by encouraging people to begin teaching after careers in other professions through such programs which help mid-career professionals become teachers.

**Recommendations:**

*Congress should provide grants to States and local educational agencies to recruit, train, and hire school-based resource staff, such as school counselors, school psychologists, and social workers. (Emphasis added.)*

*Congress should authorize the Department of Health and Human Services to work with schools and the mental health community in developing models that enhance the availability of mental health services in schools. (Emphasis added.)*

*Congress should encourage local educational agencies to implement professional development activities designed to assist teachers in identifying and assisting at-risk youths. (Emphasis added.)*

*Congress should authorize the Departments of Health and Human Services and Education to develop a public awareness campaign aimed toward parental involvement in schools.*

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Washington, DC, April 18, 2000.

Hon. JOHN PORTER,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services and Education, Appropriations Committee, Washington, DC.

Hon. DAVID OBEY,  
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services and Education, Appropriations Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PORTER AND CONGRESSMAN OBEY: We write to request funding for the Elementary School Counseling Demonstration Act (ESCD A) under Title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act at \$100 million in FY 2001.

At a time when our communities are experiencing surges in school violence, we have an obligation to do all that we can to provide communities with the resources they need to keep their schools and students safe. School counselors are an integral part of this effort.

School counselors, school psychologists, and school social workers provide some of the most effective prevention and guidance services available to our nation's children. These highly trained professionals help improve students' academic achievement, provide students with essential mental health services and intervention, and help students cope with the stresses of youth.

Across the country, school counseling professionals are stretched thin and students are not getting the help they desperately need. Studies indicate that, although 7.5 million children under the age of 18 require mental health services, only 20 percent receive necessary counseling. This lack of access to counseling services is having detrimental effects on both the students and the community. Of those students who most need, but do not receive, mental health services, 48 percent drop out of school. Of those who drop out of school, 73 percent are arrested within five years of leaving school.

America's schools are in desperate need of qualified school counselors. The current national average student-to-counselor ratio in our elementary and secondary schools is 561 students to every school counselor. According to the American Counseling Association and the American School Health Association, the maximum recommended ratio is 250:1. Every state in the nation exceeds this recommended student-to-counselor ratio.

Congress can ease the pressing shortage of school counselors by investing in this important initiative. The Elementary School Counseling Demonstration Act (ESCD A)—expected to soon be expanded to the Elementary and Secondary School Counseling Program—enhances schools' ability to provide much needed counseling and mental health services. ESCD A is a small program that awards funds through a competitive grant process to only those schools most in need of counseling services.

And the best news yet—this worthy initiative gets results. Under the model ESCD A program, Smoother Sailing, counseling services have proven to decrease the use of force, weapons, and threats against others; decrease school suspensions; decrease the number of referrals to the principal's office by nearly half; and make students feel safer. Further, school counseling and mental health services improve students' academic achievement and reduce classroom disturbances. Studies on the effects of small group counseling for failing elementary school students found that 83 percent of participating students showed improved grades.

In FY 2000, ESCD A was funded at \$20 million. This funding will only provide grants to approximately 60 of our nation's 14,000 public school districts. We believe that we must do better and increase funding for elementary and secondary school counseling services under ESCD A to \$100 million for fiscal year 2001.

We understand that you are under considerable pressure to manage requests for the FY 2001 Education Appropriations. However, we urge you to give serious consideration to this important request.

Sincerely,

Lane Evans; Nancy Pelosi; Lynn Woolsey; Nancy L. Johnson; Connie Morella; Bernard Sanders; Lois Capps; Sherrod Brown; Debbie Stabenow; Harold Ford, Jr.; Steve Rothman; Elijah E. Cummings; Nick Rahall; Carolyn B. Maloney; Patrick J. Kennedy; Dennis J. Kucinich; John Spratt; Eliot L. Engel; Diana DeGette; Edolphus Towns; Adam Smith; Stephanie Tubbs Jones; Anthony Weiner; Earl Pomeroy; Melvin L. Watt; John D. Dingell; Corrine Brown; David Wu; Earl Blumenauer; Carlos Romero-Barceló; Grace F. Napolitano; John Conyers; James McGovern; Marcy Kaptur; Tom Lantos; David Price; John E. Baldacci; Ike Skelton; George Miller; Cynthia McKinney; Jerry Costello; Michael Doyle; Robert T. Matsui; Julia Carson; Bennie Thompson; James L. Oberstar; Alcee L. Hastings; Jerrold Nadler; Barbara Lee; Jan Schakowsky; Donald M. Payne; Michael E. Capuano; James H. Maloney; Karen L. Thurman; Danny K. Davis; Gene Green; Eleanor Holmes Norton; Sam Gejdenson; Henry A. Waxman; Joseph Crowley; Robert Wise; Dale E. Kildee; Sheila Jackson-Lee; Martin Frost; Thomas Allen; Bob Clement; Leonard L. Boswell; Mark Udall; Chaka Fattah; Fortney Pete Stark; Collin C. Peterson; Bruce R.

Vento; Joe Baca; Brian Baird; Tom Sawyer; Robert Menendez; Juanita Millender-McDonald; Jim Davis; Ted Strickland; John Larson; Ciro D. Rodriguez; Peter Deutsch.

Mr. Speaker, all in all, this bill fails our students and does not reflect the priorities that Americans place on investing in quality education. I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, as I am listening to the other side talking about cuts in this bill, it is really very hard for me to fathom this. This is like hearing that black is white, that up is down. I think George Orwell would find this rhetoric very, very familiar.

I would suggest that my colleagues turn to page 277 of the committee report. It simply says, it shows quite clearly that in fiscal year 2001 the program administrators, the people actually spending this money, are going to have \$12.3 billion more money to spend than they had in fiscal year 2000; \$12.3 billion. That is an increase. The 2001 number is bigger than the 2000 number. It is not just a little bit bigger. It is 14.5 percent bigger. That is three times the rate at which the economy is growing. It is about five times the rate of inflation. But what we are hearing from the other side is that even that increase is not enough. Frankly, I think it is too high, but it is consistent with the budget resolution that we passed in this Chamber and in the other Chamber, and I am going to support it. But to hear the other side complaining about cuts is shocking to me.

Now, if the other side really finds programs that they feel need more funding, which no doubt they do, they are free to offer amendments to reshuffle this money around, to transfer from one account to another; but they cannot do that to their satisfaction, even with a 14.5 percent increase in the money that is available.

I think what is clear here, the difference between the two parties is that there is no amount of money that is enough. We have a record high level of spending, record high discretionary spending. This bill is at a record high level, and we have record high taxes. Despite that, they want more money and more spending.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this rule, which simply keeps the bill consistent with the budget resolution and then vote yes on final passage.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAULO).

Ms. DELAULO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule.

This bill cuts the heart out of opportunities for education, for health, and

for the well-being of our families in order to be able to provide for, in the long run, a tax cut for the wealthiest people in this Nation.

Let me give my colleagues one example of one area of cuts. It dramatically will cut the Child Care Development Block Grant. It specifically singles out child care funding to be the first on the chopping block. Our Nation's children on the chopping block.

Not long ago, a group of Members, 120, wrote to the committee urging an increase of funding for this critical program. They were a bipartisan group of Members, I might add. Now we have to stand here today, and we have to stand and oppose a proposed cut in funding. How can this be? The Child Care Development Block Grant provides access to quality child care to thousands of working families. It allows parents and in many cases single working mothers as they leave home each day to be able to support their families, to be able to make sure that their children have child care.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow working families, but most importantly, the children of these families, to fall through the cracks. Even the current funding levels serving only one in 10 eligible children are completely inadequate. Studies show that serious problems with child care quality persists, leaving children at risk of important development and school failure.

Mr. Speaker, children are our Nation's most precious resource; they are our future. In these times of great economic prosperity, how can we leave these youngsters behind? Where is our commitment to child care in our country if we ignore the needs of children zero to 3, we ignore the needs of children 3 to 5, we ignore the needs of working families in this bill? Let me just tell my colleagues that budgets, in fact, are not just numbers on a piece of paper. Budgets are a reflection of our values and our priorities as a Nation. Defeat this rule and defeat this bill.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO).

Mr. MANZULLO. It is amazing, Mr. Speaker, how the people on the other side of the aisle can continue to come forth with such statements that Republicans are cruel to children. Most of these education programs are actually being increased in spending, so I do not understand where the rhetoric is coming from.

The reason I am here today is to advise that last April I invited the OSHA administrator to visit Zenith Cutter in my district. Zenith Cutter is a small manufacturer of industrial knives and has about 175 employees. Mr. Jeffress saw firsthand, with Cedric Blazer, the owners, what industry is already doing in the area of ergonomics without any government mandates. It makes no sense to finalize the ergonomics rule by

the end of this year, because nobody at OSHA understands the rule.

In fact, we held a hearing in our congressional district the day after a blizzard. Over 100 people showed up from small to large industries. The OSHA people came in from Chicago, and as well-intentioned and as kind as they were, they could not adequately describe exactly what these ergonomic rules are or the standards that would be promulgated with the resulting rules.

So I therefore support the decision of the Committee on Appropriations to hold off any action on the proposed ergonomic rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

□ 1145

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, in Austin, Texas, working families of over 2,000 children rely on Federal assistance to cover part of the cost of their child care. Unfortunately, almost as many families cannot get child care assistance and are on a waiting list. Countless others never apply because they know the wait is so long. For those working families, this vote does not represent a tough choice; it is the wrong choice. It says these families will have to wait a little longer.

Child care that is safe, affordable, and of high quality is essential for our families, and it is essential for our Nation. This bill makes the wrong choice on this vital need.

For older children, working parents know that the period after school and before they return home from work is a critical time. It is prime time for juvenile crime, and a top need for constructive, after-school care. The cuts in this bill to after-school care are not a tough choice, they are the wrong choice for those students as well as their neighbors.

For students who advance all the way through school and who deserve to be able to get all of the educational opportunity for which they are willing to work, college student financial assistance in the form of Pell grants is essential. The cuts to Pell grants in this bill are not a tough choice, they are a wrong choice for our students and their hope for the future.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that these wrong choices being forced on the House today are not by accident; they are directly related to the next bill that this House will take up. That is a bill to cut the taxes for poor old Steve Forbes, for poor old Ross Perot. Seventy-three percent of this huge, Republican-proposed tax cut would go to the wealthiest 17 percent of taxpayers. In order to give this huge tax cut to the very richest people in this country, they propose their so-called tough choice, which is the wrong choice on child care, the wrong choice for after-

school care, and the wrong choice on grants for college education.

The two bills are closely intertwined. And they are wrong on both. We ought not to cut Ross Perot and Steve Forbes' taxes in order to inflict so many cuts on the working families of this country.

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and to this bill. The committee unfortunately included a prohibition on the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, this is hard to believe, to stop OSHA from implementing protections against repetitive stress disorder, carpal tunnel syndrome, and the litany of physical injuries workers sustain every day because of the dangerous design of their jobs and workplace.

Many of these workers are women. They are our mothers, our aunts, our sisters, and our daughters. Each year, according to the AFL-CIO, 400,000 women workers suffer injuries from dangerously designed jobs. Sixty-nine percent of all workers who suffer from carpal tunnel syndrome, and I think everyone knows this, are women.

The bill therefore represents a betrayal of promises made to the women of America. In fiscal year 1998, the Committee on Appropriations report stated that "the committee will refrain from any further restrictions with regard to the development, promulgation, or issuance of an ergonomic standard following the fiscal year 1998."

In the following year, Chairman Livingston and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) signed and sent a letter reiterating Congress' promise. The letter stated, "It is in no way our intent to block or delay issuance by OSHA of a proposed rule on ergonomics."

So why does the bill before us prohibit OSHA from protecting women workers who are hurting and being crippled by dangerous workplace? A promise was broken, and Congress is on the verge of leaving America's working people, the vast majority of our citizens, unprotected from dangerous workplaces.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on the rule and no on this bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule, and I am also in strong opposition to the provision in this bill which would bar OSHA from implementing its ergonomic standard. This standard would protect hundreds of thousands of American workers suffering from musculoskeletal disorders every year. As a public health nurse, I know the debilitating effects these disorders can have.

They are the most prevalent, expensive, and preventable workplace injuries, accounting for more than one-third of all occupational injuries and illnesses serious enough to result in days away from work, affecting more than a half a million workers each year, and costing businesses over \$15 billion.

Congress has prevented OSHA from issuing an ergonomic standard since 1995. So many medical and professional organizations have strongly encouraged OSHA to act without further delay on this ergonomics rule.

Medical and professional organizations have strongly encouraged OSHA to act without further delay on this ergonomics rule. These groups include: The American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, the American Academy of Orthopedic Surgeons, the American Association of Occupational Health Nurses, the American Occupational Therapy Association, the American Nurses Association, the American Public Health Association, and the AFL-CIO and all of their affiliated unions.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that this appropriations process has once again become the means by which we leave our workers without the safety protections they deserve. I believe it is irresponsible to prohibit OSHA from acting in the best interests of American workers. I object to the rider on the Labor-HHS appropriations bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, this is a wasted opportunity. H.R. 4577 is a bad bill, and we should have a rule that would include an amendment to guarantee every one of our students and all of their schools the resources and the assistance they need to perform at the very, very highest standards.

Instead, we have a bill that repeals last year's bipartisan agreement to hire 100,000 new teachers. This bill rejects the funds needed to make urgent safety and health repairs to 5,000 schools. It denies after-school services to more than 1 million students, and actually eliminates Head Start for 53,000 children.

The one amendment that does bring funding to education does it by taking funds now used to keep American workers safe on their jobs.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against this rule, and insist on a new rule that allows the House to vote for education funds so that our students and schools will not be left behind.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today and see a bill that would do little for the educational system of our country. This is a result of the budget that the Republican majority has given us. It emphasizes cutting taxes, but it hurts the future of our Nation.

This bill does not provide for the President's plan for school modernization, and ensures our children will continue to suffer from substandard school facilities.

In my home State of Texas, where my wife teaches high school algebra, we have 4 million students in almost 7,000 schools. Of these schools, 76 percent need repairs or upgrades to reach good condition; 46 percent need repairs in building features such as plumbing, electrical, heating, or cooling; 60 percent have at least one environmental problem, air quality, ventilation, or lighting; and the student ratio to computers stands at 11 to 1.

Over the next decade it will get worse, not only in Texas but across the country. Over the next decade, the number of Texas students in elementary and secondary schools will increase by 8 percent.

What we need to do is not underfund \$1 billion in teacher quality improvement and recruiting, as this bill does, cut 40 percent of after-school programs, underfund Head Start. We need to provide for the future of our Nation.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday we talked about national defense, and it is an issue on which we can be a little more bipartisan. But, unfortunately, today is a day when we have to put on our partisan hats. My friends from both sides of the aisle have seen this happen already today.

Let me just take this time, as a member of the subcommittee, to thank someone, my subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), and also the full authorizing committee chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), two people who are retiring this year, for working and trying to work on a bipartisan basis for education and for health care over the last 5 years. We have a good record to show. We have a record of a 46 percent increase over 5 years in education.

We will today put on our partisan hats and define the differences in the parties. We have had references to the American dream, and certainly the American dream is embodied in this very fine piece of legislation today. The American dream includes a good education. I mentioned the 46 percent increase that we have had over the last 5 years of Republican governance in this House of Representatives.

The American dream means good health care. The American dream means good jobs and good job training. I am proud of everything we have done in that respect.

The American dream, Mr. Speaker, also means a sound economy. It means being fiscally responsible and living within our budget, and giving the people of America back just a little bit of their hard-earned income in the form of a tax cut.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard about the President's budget being slashed. It is easy for the President of the United States to float a figure out there when he knows that this House of Representatives and this Congress has got to live within a budget, and at the end of the day we are going to live within the bottom line.

It is easy to say, yes, the President had a budget and we have cut numbers from the budget, but look what the President did and his party did when they had it all to themselves. This is spending for special education, cumulative growth in funding. Look what happened in 1993, 1994, in fiscal year 1995, when the President and his party had it all to themselves. Then look at the increase in special education, cumulative growth funding since Republicans have been in office and in the majority in this House. We have a record. These are real figures for real people. I am proud of our record in special education growth.

With regard to Job Corps funding, again part of the American dream, the figures are right here for us. Look at the increases that the Democrats had when they were in control, when they ran the Committee on Rules, when they had vast majorities in this House of Representatives. These were the small increases in Job Corps training. This is what a Republican Congress has done on the other side of the page. The numbers speak for themselves.

Vote for the rule. Vote for fiscal responsibility and vote for a continuation of the American dream.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, two exemplary students apply to the school of their dreams. Both are accepted. Both are overjoyed. But one will not be attending this institution of higher learning for one reason and one reason only: He or she did not receive enough financial aid.

Who is going to tell this well-deserving student, I am sorry but the money just is not available, even though we now live in the greatest fiscal times in our history?

I will vote against this rule, and one of the reasons is because of the example of the reduction of Pell grant money by \$48 million. Do we even know how many children's lives this would affect? We are cutting funding to students who otherwise would not be able to go to college, many of whom are our summer interns.

This grant provides an opportunity. It provides for a future for students

who otherwise would not have the resources to attend college. We tell our children that education is a means of success and a better way of life. If we take away the funding that Pell grants provide, we are taking away students' chances for a better life. We should increase these opportunities, not take them away.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

I just want to tell the gentleman who just spoke that Pell grants in the bill are increased by \$200 to the requested level, and the only reason that there is an adjustment in the amount of money spent for the Pell grants is that there is estimated to be less demand for them in the next fiscal year.

There is increase in the Pell grants. We are not cutting them, we are increasing them, exactly as the President put in his budget.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, all of us say we have education as a priority, and we understand education is a priority of the American citizens, but when we come to appropriations, it does not seem that way. Maybe it is just in North Carolina. My State tells me we will lose almost \$92 million. Please, Mr. Speaker, I beg for people to correct me, to say that this is not true. I want to make sure that that is not true.

They say we will lose \$1.4 million in adult training; in youth training, again, \$1.2 million; in disabled workers, again we will lose; just down the line; Head Start, \$11 million; development block grants, another \$11 million plus; and Title I, Title I, even there, it is \$39,000; ESEA Title I migrant programs, more than \$1 million; again, the Eisenhower/Teach to High Standards grant, \$15 million; class size reduction, and we all know smaller classes mean indeed that we are able to teach better, \$36 million.

I must vote against this rule, and I urge my colleagues, please allocate those resources for those children we say we love.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that as you visited local schools, and talked to teachers, students and school administrators during our most recent recess, you heard their cry for additional teachers, more training and smaller class sizes. They shared with you the challenges they face daily to accommodate the ever increasing enrollments.

We must provide adequate funding to hire 100,000 new teachers to meet the enrollment needs. This is especially important for our nation's poor, minority and rural community children.

I don't know if you had an opportunity to analyze the effects of this bill on your state.

Our state would be facing devastating reductions in:

	<i>Dollars</i>
Adult Training .....	-1,401,000
Youth Training .....	-1,298,000
Dislocated Workers .....	-4,134,000
Re-employment Services ...	-1,557,000
Unemployment Insurance	-1,967,000
Head Start .....	-11,935,503
Child Care and Development Block Grant .....	-11,439,157
ESEA Title I LEA Grants ..	39,586
ESEA Title I Migrant Grants .....	-1,030,448
Eisenhower/Teach to High Standards Grants .....	-15,225,126
Class Size Reduction .....	-36,217,944
Vocational Education Tech-Prep Grants .....	-5,771,250
Leveraging Educational Assistance (LEAP) .....	-868,140
Preparing Teachers to Use Technology .....	?
21st Century Community Learning Center .....	?

Passing this bill in its current state could be devastating to the state of North Carolina, netting more than a \$92,000,000 loss for the state. North Carolina would receive no support under this bill. It doesn't assist the state improve its dilapidated schools or poor performing schools.

Ninety-two million dollars is a lot of money and could make a major difference in improving education in our state.

This bill seems to me to say, it's okay if we continue to ignore the needs of our children.

My colleagues, I urge you to fully fund the President's proposal.

Because of the tremendous lack of support and vision for education and health of children and teachers, I must vote "no" on this bill.

□ 1200

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time to close.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, over the last 2 weeks, we have seen a systematic attack by this House on public investments that make this economy the flourishing growing economy that it is today. Just yesterday in the committee, we put together a bill which cut deeply into the President's request for National Science Foundation funding. That is the basic scientific research that underlies all the advances we eventually make in health care through the National Institutes of Health, in developing new technologies, such as the Internet, which was developed through an investment by the Defense Department and the National Science Foundation.

This bill itself says that it wants to have a 15 percent increase in the National Institutes of Health, but then it has a language provision in the bill which prevents that money from actually being spent. This bill ignores the fact that we have growing school populations and growing senior populations who need added services, not less.

This bill denies us the opportunity to support the President's program to

strengthen teacher training. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) for years has said do not just put money into class size, put money into quality teachers. The gentleman is right, and that is why we have tried to do both in the amendments that we wanted to offer but are being denied the opportunity to get a vote on in the rule today.

So I would suggest there are all kinds of reasons why, if you care about the future economic strength of this country, if you care about equal educational opportunity, if you think people ought to get health care without begging for it, there are all kinds of reasons to vote against this bill.

This bill makes all of these reductions in order to finance your huge tax cuts for the wealthiest people in this country; 73 percent of the benefits go to the wealthiest 1 percent. That is a high price to pay to give those folks a bonus.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself my remaining time.

Mr. Speaker, let me remind my colleagues again that this is an open rule. The bill before us will be debated under an open process that will allow Members who disagree with the bill's priorities to change them. Also, despite my colleagues warnings of dire consequences, this bill actually increases spending to the tune of \$4 billion over last year.

The extra investment will allow for increases, not cuts, but increases in many priority programs including National Institutes for Health, Job Corps, Community Health Centers, Ryan White AIDS Care programs, the Centers for Disease Control, the Substance Abuse and Mental Health programs, Services Administration, Low Income Home Energy Assistance, Childcare and Development Block Grant, Head Start, the Technology for Education Program, Special Education, Impact Aid and Student Financial Assistance, and that is just to name a few.

Mr. Speaker, at the same time, this bill is responsible, balancing the need to fund worthwhile programs while keeping our budget balanced. It is this kind of responsible governing, where priorities are set, waste is eliminated, and fiscal prudence is maintained that will keep our Nation's economy on track.

I urge my colleagues to support this fair and open rule as well as the underlying legislation.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak against the rule because it is a stealth attempt to reduce funding for Pell Grants for education by \$48 million. This is ridiculous, particularly at a time when our nation and our world is moving at warp speed with new technologies, globalization, and innovations and change. Changes which affect how we live, how we work, how we learn.

It is a quality education that has allowed America to master these rapid changes and move forward in this new economy.

Education has helped us move forward from the days of the horse and buggy to the information superhighway.

It is education that has allowed us to move from horse stables into stable careers and success in the new economy. And, for millions of Americans the Pell Grant has made education possible.

We know that our continued economic prosperity depends on two things—businesses getting the skilled workers they need for our growing economy, and workers getting the skills and training they need to keep working smarter. If this backwards rule passes, we will have turned our backs on both the American public and American businesses who depend upon a highly trained, well educated workforce.

By voting to slash Pell Grants, Congress will be saying “no” to millions of students trying to gain the skills necessary to move forward, and compete in the 21st century. And, “no” to the businesses that tell us everyday how desperate they are for a highly skilled and well educated workers.

During this period of economic prosperity and budget surplus, we should be seizing the opportunity to advance the well being of our citizens by training and educating our students and workers instead of shortchanging them.

Let’s not say “no” to the 67 percent of our high school graduates who are now going on to college, and struggling to pay college tuition.

Vote against this rule (bill) and in favor of needy students across this country, and in favor of American businesses who desperately need a well educated workforce. Let’s keep our American economy growing.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this rule for H.R. 4577, the FY 2001 Department of Labor, HHS and Education Appropriations Act, to offer my strong objection and concern with the addition of another amendment to part A of the Rules Committee report, providing for a rescission from the child care and development block grant (CCDBG) of any funds appropriated in excess of the \$23.5 billion advanced appropriation cap contained in the FY 2001 concurrent budget resolution.

The child care development block grant (CCDBG) is a major source of child care assistance for low and moderate working families. Usually out of necessity, not choice, mothers are working outside the home in greater numbers than ever before. Moreover, with many employers having difficulty finding the workers they need, due to a 30-year low in unemployment; and the continued demand generated by welfare reform. It is imperative now more than ever that the availability of affordable and quality child care services exist.

Accordingly, now is not the time from Congress to limit the amount of funding available for CCDBG.

Regretably, as I read the language found in the Rules Committee report it is essentially placing a marker which states that the House of Representatives does not support the need for this important program.

While, I will vote for the rule as I believe it is important that the House have the opportunity to debate the important provisions in the Labor, HHS appropriations bill, I strongly oppose the Rules Committee report language on

the CCDBG. And I intend to work for additional funding for this necessary, beneficial program.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. 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 (Mr. PEASE). 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, 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 218, nays 204, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 247]

YEAS—218

Aderholt	Emerson	Lewis (CA)
Archer	English	Lewis (KY)
Armey	Everett	Linder
Bachus	Ewing	LoBiondo
Baker	Fletcher	Lucas (OK)
Balenger	Foley	Manzullo
Barr	Fowler	Martinez
Barrett (NE)	Frelinghuysen	McCollum
Bartlett	Gallely	McCrery
Barton	Ganske	McHugh
Bass	Gekas	McInnis
Bateman	Gibbons	McIntosh
Bereuter	Gilchrest	McKeon
Biggart	Gillmor	Metcalf
Bilbray	Gilman	Mica
Bilirakis	Goode	Miller (FL)
Billey	Goodlatte	Miller, Gary
Blunt	Goodling	Moran (KS)
Boehlert	Goss	Nethercutt
Boehner	Graham	Ney
Bonilla	Granger	Northup
Bono	Green (WI)	Norwood
Brady (TX)	Gutknecht	Nussle
Bryant	Hansen	Ose
Burr	Hastert	Oxley
Burton	Hastings (WA)	Packard
Buyer	Hayes	Paul
Callahan	Hayworth	Pease
Calvert	Hefley	Peterson (PA)
Camp	Herger	Petri
Campbell	Hill (MT)	Pickering
Canady	Hilleary	Pitts
Cannon	Hobson	Pombo
Castle	Hoekstra	Porter
Chabot	Horn	Portman
Chambliss	Hostettler	Pryce (OH)
Chenoweth-Hage	Hulshof	Quinn
Coble	Hunter	Radanovich
Coburn	Hutchinson	Ramstad
Collins	Hyde	Regula
Combest	Isakson	Reynolds
Cook	Istook	Riley
Cooksey	Jenkins	Rogan
Cox	Johnson (CT)	Rogers
Crane	Johnson, Sam	Rohrabacher
Cubin	Jones (NC)	Ros-Lehtinen
Cunningham	Kasich	Roukema
Davis (VA)	Kelly	Royce
Deal	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
DeLay	Kingston	Ryun (KS)
DeMint	Knollenberg	Salmon
Diaz-Balart	Kolbe	Sanford
Dickey	Kuykendall	Saxton
Doolittle	LaHood	Scarborough
Dreier	Largent	Schaffer
Duncan	Latham	Sensenbrenner
Dunn	LaTourrette	Sessions
Ehlers	Lazio	Shadegg
Ehrlich	Leach	Shaw

Shays	Talent	Walsh
Sherwood	Tancredo	Wamp
Shimkus	Tauzin	Watkins
Shuster	Taylor (NC)	Watts (OK)
Simpson	Terry	Weldon (FL)
Skeen	Thomas	Weldon (PA)
Smith (NJ)	Thornberry	Weller
Smith (TX)	Thune	Whitfield
Souder	Tiahrt	Wicker
Spence	Toomey	Wilson
Stearns	Trafcant	Wolf
Stump	Upton	Young (AK)
Sununu	Vitter	Young (FL)
Sweeney	Walden	

NAYS—204

Abercrombie	Gutierrez	Oberstar
Ackerman	Hall (OH)	Obey
Allen	Hall (TX)	Olver
Andrews	Hastings (FL)	Ortiz
Baca	Hill (IN)	Owens
Baird	Hilliard	Pallone
Baldacci	Hinchee	Pascarell
Baldwin	Hinojosa	Pastor
Barcia	Hoeffel	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	Rahall
Blagojevich	(TX)	Rangel
Blumenauer	Jefferson	Reyes
Bonior	John	Rivers
Borski	Johnson, E.B	Rodriguez
Boswell	Jones (OH)	Roemer
Boucher	Kanjorski	Rothman
Boyd	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Brady (PA)	Kennedy	Rush
Brown (FL)	Kildee	Sabo
Brown (OH)	Kilpatrick	Sanchez
Capps	Kind (WI)	Sanders
Capuano	Kleczka	Sandlin
Cardin	Kucinich	Sawyer
Carson	LaFalce	Schakowsky
Clayton	Lampson	Scott
Clement	Lantos	Serrano
Clyburn	Larson	Sherman
Condit	Lee	Shoos
Conyers	Levin	Sisisky
Costello	Lewis (GA)	Skelton
Coyne	Lipinski	Slaughter
Cramer	Lofgren	Smith (WA)
Crowley	Lowey	Snyder
Cummings	Lucas (KY)	Spratt
Davis (FL)	Luther	Stabenow
Davis (IL)	Maloney (CT)	Stark
DeFazio	Maloney (NY)	Stenholm
DeGette	Mascara	Strickland
Delahunt	Matsui	Stupak
DeLauro	McCarthy (MO)	Tanner
Deutsch	McCarthy (NY)	Tauscher
Dicks	McDermott	Taylor (MS)
Dingell	McGovern	Thompson (CA)
Dixon	McIntyre	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	McKinney	Thurman
Dooley	McNulty	Tierney
Doyle	Meehan	Towns
Edwards	Meek (FL)	Turner
Engel	Menendez	Turner
Eshoo	Millender-	Udall (CO)
Etheridge	McDonald	Udall (NM)
Evans	Miller, George	Velázquez
Farr	Minge	Visclosky
Fattah	Mink	Waters
Filner	Moakley	Watt (NC)
Forbes	Mollohan	Waxman
Ford	Moore	Weiner
Frank (MA)	Moran (VA)	Wexler
Frost	Morella	Weygand
Gephardt	Murtha	Wise
Gonzalez	Nadler	Woolsey
Gordon	Napolitano	Wu
Green (TX)	Neal	Wynn

NOT VOTING—13

Clay	Greenwood	Myrick
Danner	Houghton	Smith (MI)
Fossella	Klink	Vento
Franks (NJ)	Markey	
Gejdenson	Meeks (NY)	

□ 1224

Mr. PALLONE and Mr. MOLLOHAN 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.

#### APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Without objection, and pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 4355(a), the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy:

Mr. RODRIGUEZ of Texas.

There was no objection.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

#### REPORT OF NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD ENTITLED "SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING INDICATORS, 2000"—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Science:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

As required by 42 U.S.C. 1863(j)(1), I am pleased to submit to the Congress a report of the National Science Board entitled, "Science and Engineering Indicators—2000." This report represents the fourteenth in a series examining key aspects of the status of American science and engineering in a global environment.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 8, 2000.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4577, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 518 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4577.

The Chair designates the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) as chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PEASE) to assume the chair temporarily.

□ 1228

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4577) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Service, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, with Mr. PEASE (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER).

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, before I begin the general debate, I want to acknowledge the wonderful work of our staff on our subcommittee. Tony McCann, the clerk and chief of staff has done a magnificent job for this subcommittee for the entire 6 years that I have been privileged to chair it; and he has been very ably assisted by a wonderful staff: Carol Murphy, Susan Firth, Geoff Kenyon, Tom Kelly, and Francine Salvador on our side and Mark Mioduski and Cheryl Smith on the minority side.

□ 1230

Every one of them is an expert. We rely greatly upon their counsel and advice, and we are fortunate to have professionals of this standard as our staff.

I also want to thank the associate staff of the subcommittee. They work very hard for each of the Members; and I want to thank my staff, particularly Katharine Fisher, my administrative assistant, and Spencer Perlman, my legislative director.

Let me add that it has been a tremendous privilege for me to serve for the last 21 years on the Committee on Appropriations and on this subcommittee, and it has been wonderful to be able to serve as one of the sub-

committee chairmen under our full committee chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG). He does a magnificent job for our country, for this House of Representatives, and for our committee; and it has been an absolute joy to be a subcommittee chairman under his leadership.

Let me also say that it has been a great privilege for me to serve with my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). We work very well and closely together. People may not believe that after the debate we will probably have today; but we do. And I have learned a great deal from him. He is a very senior Member of the House, has been on this committee, interestingly enough, many years longer than I have; and I think our relationship is a very solid and good one. Both of us realize that, in the end, the process leads us to finding common ground and to making the right decisions for our country and for the programs that are under the jurisdiction of the subcommittee.

Each of the subcommittee members, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA), the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER), the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. DICKEY), the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the gentlewoman from Kentucky (Mrs. NORTHUP), and the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), on our side; the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), of course; the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER); the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI); the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY); the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO); and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) on the minority side, they spend countless hours in hearings that last far longer than any other subcommittee. They are all very, very dedicated and hard-working Members that give a great deal of their time and effort to this process; and I want to thank each one of them. It has been for me a great privilege to have Members like this serving on this subcommittee, and I know that they will provide the institutional knowledge that will carry it forward long after I have departed.

Let me also add that we work very, very closely with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING). He has provided the kind of leadership in the authorization of many of the programs that our subcommittee funds, and he has been the kind of authorizing chairman that appropriators salute because he has taken on the job of reauthorizing almost all of the education and some of the labor law that needs reauthorizing. He has not shirked one bit from that responsibility and has done a terrific job of reflecting the kind of philosophy that we believe gets results for people.