The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3859, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 2, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 297]

WASHINGTON, D.C., June 20, 2000

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

YEAS—420

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make the following statement to correct a printing error in the RECORD.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request, in that the committee has been made aware of the printing error and has corrected it.

September 27, 2001

CORRECTION OF PRINTING ERRORS IN HOUSE REPORT 106–645

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the report to accompany H.R. 4577, Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001, House Report 106–645, includes a printing error. On page 204, roll-call vote number 4, the amendment dealing with ergonomics, under the column for Members voting “nay,” there is a name “Mr. Lextra.”

The SPEAKER. That name should not be in that column. There is no such person on the Committee on Appropriations or in the House of Representatives.

Under the column for Members voting “present,” the name of the gentleman from California (Mr. DIXON) appears. The report committee filed with the House shows that the gentleman from California (Mr. DIXON) voted “nay,” not “present.” His name should not have been printed in the “present” column but in the “nay” column.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would just like to inquire of the gentleman from Florida how many other times has Mr. Lextra voted in this or any other committee, even though he is not a member of the committee and, to my knowledge, is not a Member of the House?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman is well aware, he and I read every word and every comma of each report. I also know the name Mr. Lextra ever, and I doubt the gentleman from Wisconsin has.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 4635, and that I may be permitted to include tables, charts, and other extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 525 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4635.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members will pay attention closely to the arguments on the amendments to this section of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. Pursuant to House Resolution 525 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole rose on Monday, June 19, 2000, the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) had been disposed of and the amendment being considered was H.R. 4635, making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, with Mr. PEASE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that after disposition of these amendments, the House return to the reading of the bill on page 9.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Chairman, is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I feel constrained to object to the request at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) will state his objection, in writing.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment on the same subject as yesterday, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to inquire if this is the appropriate time in the bill to offer that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Committee proceeds further on page 10 the gentleman will be in order in the reading, but at the moment another Member of the House, a member of the committee, is seeking recognition to strike the last word.

After that the Clerk will read to the proper point in the bill.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the bill? I am pleased, Mr. Chairman, to see that a number of Members have recognized that the VA medical research account is underfunded in this bill, and that we want to increase this funding through amendments that we are going to consider soon. The chairman of the ranking member have done a good job under tough constraints on this legislation, but this is one item that we really need to tend to here today. I am glad to see that we will have the opportunity to do so.

I have been a strong proponent of VA medical research, and I offered an amendment during the full Committee on Appropriations markup that would have increased that account by $25 million. I want to take just a minute today to explain why I support increasing the VA medical research account and why it is so important for us to find a way of doing so.

The original request from the VA to OMB was to fund the VA research at $397 million. Outside supporters of the program believe the program should be funded at $386 million. These recommendations are both well above the current bill’s level of $321 million.

Most of us have heard about the Seattle foot, that remarkable artificial limb that has been depicted in television commercials by a double amputee playing pick-up basketball or by a woman running a 100-yard dash. It is not obvious that she has two artificial legs until the camera zooms in at the end of the commercial. The technology for this prosthesis was developed by VA researchers in Seattle.

Research at VA hospitals is important because it is clinical research, mainly. The researcher, who is almost always affiliated with a neighboring teaching hospital, also treats patients, veterans. The VA research program is a model for other federally-assisted research. This program needs $1 million.

To bring the program back to the high water mark of 1998 would take $43 million. Dr. Feussner has listed four areas that would benefit particularly from additional research dollars: Parkinson’s Disease, end-stage renal failure, diabetes, and Post-Traumatic Shock Disorder. Additional research into the treatment and cure for hepatitis C would also be looked at carefully.

We also need to increase the commitment to training the next generation of clinician and nonclinician investigators. To keep that program on track would take an additional $10 million.

Now, Mr. Chairman, difficult decisions will need to be made on these upcoming amendments, and there are several of them. They all offer an offset of some sort. Most of the offsets I would not support if they stood alone. But the overall allocation for our VA-HUD subcommittee is just not sufficient, and these difficult trade-offs must be made.

I am hopeful that, at the end of this process, an additional allocation will be available and that we will be able to fund VA medical research at close to $386 million and that any offsets that we adopt can largely be restored. However, it is very important to raise the appropriations level here today for medical research before this bill goes any farther in the appropriations process.

I hope this is helpful, this overview of how these monies might be spent and why we need them. Additional funding for VA research will benefit our veterans and our country, and I hope Members will pay attention closely to the arguments on the amendments to follow.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to this section of the bill?