

making an announcement about the schedule.

Madam Speaker, I would like to advise the Members that we will have this vote in just a few minutes, and after that vote the House will go into recess until approximately 5:30 this evening.

When we reconvene between 5:30 and 6:00, we will begin the debate on the ergonomics legislation. The rule calls for 1 hour's debate, so the body could expect then to have a vote on the floor between 6:30 and 7:00 this evening.

Those Members who would desire to be involved in that debate on that legislation would be advised to be prepared to be here by 5:30 this evening to begin that debate.

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

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for informing us of the schedule for the rest of the day.

Madam Speaker, let me suggest to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) that since the other body debated this most important worker safety provision, probably one of the more important ones we have had in a decade, for 10 hours, why we cannot in the interim between now and 5:30 extend the time so that Members who wish to speak on this on both sides of the aisle would have proper time to develop their arguments.

It seems to me that an hour is far too insufficient to deal with the issue of this magnitude.

Madam Speaker, I would request the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the majority leader, to give us some extra time so we can debate this fully.

□ 1415

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his inquiry. Let me say, Madam Speaker, one of the fascinating aspects of the other body is that a 10-hour period of debate is known in the other body as expedited procedure. They adhere to that minimum amount of time under which they can consider legislation.

We have a rule, a rule that has been passed by the House, that calls for an hour's debate. The House, having expressed its will on that rule, clearly has committed itself to that course of action, voted on by the House; and that time will begin between 5:30 and 6.

Mr. BONIOR. Will the gentleman continue to yield?

Mr. ARMEY. I am happy to continue to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BONIOR. I would say to my friend from Texas, number one, we were not notified when we did the colloquy, the gentleman and I here last week, that this bill was coming up on the floor this week. It is a significant bill. It means a lot to many people in

this country. You know the numbers as well as I do. It affects 110 million workers. We were not told that it would be before us this week, number one.

Secondly, we think an hour, 60 minutes, on such a significant bill, divided 30 minutes on your side and 30 minutes on ours, is far too inadequate to deal with something of this major proportion, especially given that this review act is new.

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Speaker, I really do not believe that it is valuable to continue this discussion much longer, but let me say that the gentleman is correct in observing that there was no discussion about this bill during the colloquy of last week because we did not know then that the Senate would send this bill to us.

The Senate has sent this bill to us. It is considered to be an important bill, as witness the fact that this body, just a few hours ago, voted a rule with clear anticipation of bringing this legislation up tonight. So the body has expressed its will on the rule, and the purpose of my announcement is to inform this body that we will indeed take up this work, the rule for which you passed; and it will be taken up under the conditions of that rule between 5:30 and 6.

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, we are trying to do this in a civil way. I understand the gentleman's point. I wish Members on their side of the aisle would listen and try to understand our position because we are trying to make a point. I have heard the gentleman's explanation. Some I agree with; some I do not agree with. There is no necessity to bring this bill up just because the Senate, the other body, acted on it recently, especially in lieu of the fact that as I said earlier, we were not given notice that this bill was coming up.

We are prepared to deal with it today, but we are not prepared to deal with it at 5:30 with an hour debate when we go into recess when we have got plenty of time to give Members on the floor of the House to express themselves. We will not have a proper debate on one of the most important pieces of legislation we will have before us this year. Why we cannot get an extra hour for debate is beyond me between now and this hiatus of 5:30. If it is in order, I would like to move and ask unanimous consent that we add another hour of debate to the rule that was passed just recently.

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Speaker, I believe I control the time. The gentleman is going to ask me to yield him time for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, that is correct.

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

#### REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF DEBATE TIME ON S.J. RES. 6, DISAPPROVING DEPARTMENT OF LABOR RULE RELATING TO ERGONOMICS

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time that was designated under the rule this morning be extended from 60 minutes to an hour and 20 minutes evenly divided on each side. One hundred and twenty minutes.

Mr. ARMEY. Two hours.

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

Mr. MCINNIS. Madam Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DICKS. Madam Speaker, point of order. Did the person stand that objected?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes, several Members stood and objected. The RECORD will indicate Mr. MCINNIS stood and objected.

#### HONORING 21 MEMBERS OF NATIONAL GUARD KILLED IN CRASH ON MARCH 3, 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 47.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCHROCK) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 47, 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 413, nays 0, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 32]

YEAS—413

Abercrombie	Biggert	Camp
Aderholt	Bilirakis	Cannon
Akin	Blagojevich	Cantor
Allen	Blumenauer	Capito
Andrews	Blunt	Capps
Armev	Boehmert	Capuano
Baca	Boehner	Cardin
Bachus	Bonilla	Carson (IN)
Baird	Bonior	Carson (OK)
Baker	Bono	Castle
Baldacci	Borski	Chabot
Baldwin	Boswell	Chambliss
Ballenger	Boucher	Clay
Barcia	Boyd	Clayton
Barr	Brady (PA)	Clement
Barrett	Brady (TX)	Clyburn
Bartlett	Brown (FL)	Coble
Barton	Brown (OH)	Collins
Bass	Brown (SC)	Combest
Bentsen	Bryant	Condit
Bereuter	Burr	Conyers
Berkley	Burton	Costello
Berman	Buyer	Cox
Berry	Calvert	Coyne