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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 7, noes 412, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 223]

AYES—7

Bentsen
Carson (IN)
Filner
Hastings (FL)
McNulty
Smith (NJ)
Towns

NOES—412

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett
Bartlett
Barton
Becerra
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Largent
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velázquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins (OK)
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—14

Bass
Cox
Fattah
Gephardt
Hall (OH)
Hilliard
Horn
Hutchinson
Lewis (CA)
Paul
Shaw
Spence
Wynn
Young (AK)

□ 1110

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2216, 2001 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2216) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF FLORIDA

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XXII and by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Florida moves that the bill (H.R. 2216) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, be taken from the Speaker's table, that the House disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, the motion to go to conference is basically a routine motion. We need to get to conference on this supplemental. We have military operations, training activities, we have readiness issues ready to close down if we do not provide the additional money that is needed. Much of the money that has been used already from the fourth quarter accounts of the military have gone to pay for things like higher fuel costs, like all of us will have to do at the fueling pumps, to pay for medical expenses that have already been incurred by members of the military, their families and retirees, that have already been incurred but have not been paid. They need to be paid.

There are other items included in this conference, and time is extremely important. I suggest that we should get on with moving this bill into the conference so that we can actually sit down with our counterparts in the other body, have the conference, and have a supplemental bill ready to report back to the House early next week.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Of course I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman intend to yield to this side of the aisle any time?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was not going to until the gentleman asked. I would be more than happy to yield to the gentleman. Would he like to name a specific amount of time?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, it depends on how much time the gentleman intends to take. Normally it is an hour, but it can be less than that.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, actually I am ready to vote, but I would yield to the gentleman 10 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr Speaker, could we make it 20 minutes on this side?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), and I would advise him that I do not intend to use much more time on this. The issue is so important that we need to get to it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for 20 minutes to control of debate.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are caught up in two issues here this morning. One is, of course, the issue before us, the question of the proper disposition of the motion to go to conference on the supplemental appropriations. But we are also, in debating that issue, caught up in the larger question this morning of what is going to happen for the rest of this day as we move into the subject that will dominate debate for the rest of the day, campaign finance legislation.

□ 1115

It had been the reasonable expectation of reformers on both sides of the aisle, I believe, that the two competing propositions would be allowed to face each other in a stand-up, fair fight, Shays-Meehan on one side of the issue and the Ney-Wynn proposition on the other side of the issue. Instead, the Committee on Rules has not allowed that to happen. What they have done is report a rule which will require campaign finance legislation to be debated under very strange circumstances. It will not allow Shays-Meehan to present their package as a coherent whole. It requires some 12 amendments to be voted on separately. I would say that that is sort of like telling people to go into a car dealer if they want to buy a car and telling them they have to buy one that is disassembled; they will have to buy a transmission separately; they will have to buy the tires separately; they will have to buy the motor separately.

That is not the way you buy cars, and that is not the way we ought to legislate. We ought to have a fair fight between the two principal propositions that we will be asked to choose between today. But instead we are not going to be given a fair fight, because apparently the people who designed these rules think the only way they can win the debate is to stack the deck. I think that is unfortunate because I think we have evidence on both sides of the aisle that there are Members who want true reform and are willing to vote for it.

I would simply say that I have substantial doubts about the wisdom of either of the propositions that will be brought before us. But if the House leadership will go through these kind of machinations and this kind of manipulation and these kind of contortions in order to block the incredibly tepid reform represented by Shays-Meehan, I would hate to see what they would do to block comprehensive reform of campaign finance legislation.

Let me also say a bit about the motion before us. I do not, when the time comes, expect to vote against the motion to go to conference; but I will ask for a rollcall vote on it. I want to express some concerns about what we ought to do on that proposition.

We are being asked to go to conference on a bill which everyone understands is totally inadequate even by administration standards. The administration has told us in the words of the FEMA director, Mr. Albaugh, and also in the words of Mr. Daniels, the OMB director as quoted in the Houston Chronicle, that they will probably need considerably more money than is presently appropriated for FEMA. Yet the House bill for the supplemental actually rescinds existing appropriations for FEMA. That makes no sense whatsoever.

Secondly, the administration is planning to spend $30 million on a political mailing to tell people that they are going to get a tax cut check, and they already know they are going to get a tax cut check. Meanwhile, the Congress is refusing to appropriate the money necessary to the victims of radiation poisoning, a claim which has already been clearly established and an entitlement which has already been clearly established. So they are willing to spend money on this political mailing, but they are not willing to deliver these payments to people who are sick and dying who have been literally fried by their own government. I do not think that makes much sense.

Thirdly, even though the administration has asked us to provide funding to protect public health and to protect the health of our farm stock from the twin problems of mad cow disease and foot and mouth disease, this Congress has chosen not to appropriate funds requested by the administration for those items. When the proper time comes, I will have a motion instructing conferees to accept those three changes in the House bill. But for now I want to make clear that this additional step this morning has been required because of the anger that is felt I think on the part of people on both sides of the aisle about the stacked deck that has been provided to us in the rule on campaign finance.

This House ought to be able to debate these two issues straight up and not be hampered by indirection and manipulation. The name of the game is clear. It is the hope of the people who designed this rule on campaign finance that they can pick off one or more of those 12 separate fix-up amendments to Shays-Meehan and in the process prevent people from voting on the entire comprehensive, coherent package. That is indeed unfortunate. I think it is an abuse of the process, but it is not the first time we have seen that around here.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I listened with interest to the gentleman's discussion. I checked my schedule, the card that I carry to tell me where I am supposed to be all day long. I thought we were here talking about a supplemental appropriations bill for national defense and for other health issues and other emergency disaster issues. I did not realize that this motion had anything at all to do with campaign finance reform. That is because it does not. Absolutely nothing. And then I thought, are we on a tax bill? No, we are not on a tax bill. This has nothing to do with a tax bill. So I am not sure where we are going with this debate.

I mentioned in my opening comments about the needs of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps and the Coast Guard. Let me tell Members what else is in this supplemental bill, that has nothing to do with campaign finance reform or with the tax refund except for the money to mail out the refund checks.

This legislation will address emergency needs related to natural disasters, a number of which have occurred; including recent floods, ice storms, in Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin, New Mexico, Oklahoma and Texas; the Seattle earthquake; and approximately 300 wildland fires that we have had to deal with. These needs are also covered in this supplemental appropriations bill. Assistance is important to all of the communities that suffered these terrible disasters.

Additional energy needs are met for the poorest of the poor, those who need help with their energy assistance. LIHEAP, a program that everybody in this Chamber knows about, is provided $300 million in this bill. I think that is a program that the gentleman from Wisconsin supports enthusiastically. We did increase it over the President's request to the $300 million mark. Also in this bill is $160 million to implement last year's conference agreement on Title I, Education for the Disadvantaged. There is $115 million to enable the Department of Treasury to mail out the tax rebate checks. If people have tax rebate checks coming to them, we ought to mail them out.

Mr. Speaker, the discussion today is about sending this bill to conference. We need to get this bill to conference so we can work out the differences between the House bill and the Senate bill. They are not that great, actually. We will be able to bring this conference back to the House, I believe, early next week if we can get to conference today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, let me reiterate one thing that the gentleman from Florida spoke about. There is a problem called ''hold harmless'' in title I education funds, to where the States that are losing population maintain a certain level, but those States that are gaining children that are impoverished do not get additional dollars. I worked with a Senator in the other body from California, we brought it to conference; and we decided to fund both until we can find resolution to that. Guess what? There was not enough money to do that. So those children that are the poorest of the poor in title I funds, this supplemental takes care of it. That is one of the reasons this is important.

Secondly, we met with Secretary Rumsfeld this morning. While all the 12 appropriations bills have been going up, if you have got a baseline, up to a level like this, Defense with all of the deployments we have had, the cost is down here in the cellar. Even this supplemental will only bring us up to a level here. It will not even bring us back up to the baseline.

Secretary Rumsfeld said that one of the most important things that will happen if we do not get this besides all of the ships and things and the repairs and the training that stops, our TDY personnel, that is temporary duty orders, and our permanent moves, right now it is the summertime when our military folks' kids are out of session and they are trying to get their families moved in to their next base so that they can enroll their children into the schools. If we do not hurry up and do this, that is going to be delayed; and all of those families, the disruption of not having your child entered into a school is going to be affected. So we strongly support this amount in this supplemental. It is critical. We should have done it before we left for our Fourth of July break, and now it is even more critical.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Florida has indicated what is in this bill. There is no argument about what is in this bill. I intend to vote to go to conference. The problem is what is not in this bill. It does not contain the roughly $1 billion that we have been given indications from the administration itself that in the end we will need to meet our obligations in dealing with the disasters cited by the gentleman from Florida, including the huge disaster in Houston and several in other States, including my own. It does not contain the money requested by the administration to protect this country from foot and mouth disease and from mad cow disease. And it does not contain the money that is needed to pay the victims of radiation poisoning who are entitled to that money. We will have a motion to instruct asking that those three items be included.

With respect to the other point made by the gentleman, I fully grant that this issue does not involve campaign finance. But when what I believe to be a majority of this House, composed of people on both sides of the aisle, when that House majority has been denied the opportunity by the Committee on Rules that runs this House, when they have been denied the opportunity to vote on the package that they believe ought to pass for campaign finance reform, except in piecemeal fashion, then there are only so many tools available for that majority to protest what is going on. That is why we are having this additional debate this morning. I regret the fact that it takes the time, but not nearly as much as I regret what the Committee on Rules did to what I believe is the majority will of this House.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON), who is a member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee and chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I normally would not rise to get into this debate, but I just got back from visiting our troops in Korea. They need our help. I just got back from Italy from visiting our troops. They need our help. I visited my base at home. They need our help.

I think, with all due respect to the gentleman from Wisconsin, I like the gentleman from Wisconsin and we are friends, but I think to use our servicepeople and involve them in a disagreement over a political matter in this House, I cannot stand idly by and not speak that I think that is inappropriate. Our people in the field need to train, they need care, they need help. To allow them to become part of a partisan battle here I think is inappropriate.

□ 1130

We voted on this. We should pass this. We should get this help.

I just came back from the Defense Department. They need a lot more help, because we have underfunded the Defense Department. They admit they have waste, they admit they have problems, and they are trying to change them. I think that we should get on with that and not bring other debates into a situation where our troops and their lives and their training and their families on these PCS changes and everything else is affected. It is not appropriate.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out it is the majority in this House that held this supplemental up for 4 months. This debate does not have one whit to do with whether our military personnel will get the help they need or not. They will. They will have virtually unanimous support on both sides of the aisle. To suggest that aid to them will be delayed by 1 day is absurd, preposterous, nonsense. Everybody on both sides of the aisle is going to be for that aid. What we want to see in addition is other obligations of the government also met to American citizens, including the American citizens who were literally killed by their own government through the use of nuclear testing and other problems associated with conducting nuclear tests. That has nothing whatsoever to do with whether our military personnel will get the funds they need. Of course they will.

I challenge the gentleman to name one person involved in this bill on either side of the aisle who is opposed to that money. He cannot because there are not any.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am curious where the figure of 4 months comes from, where they held this bill up for 4 months. We passed this bill on the June 20, which was about 2 weeks after we got the request from the White House. The House expedited consideration of this measure, brought it to the floor; and we passed this bill.

The problem has been that the other body did not take it up right away, and they just passed it a few days ago. So I do not know where the gentleman got the idea that we delayed it for 4 months, because we did not delay it at all.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to tell the gentleman. The White House itself announced they were not going to send down the request for the supplemental until after the tax bill was finished because they did not want to upset the apple cart on their tax bill.

The last time I looked, the White House was in Republican hands, as is the majority of this House.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I just wanted to make sure that the gentleman was not saying that the House delayed this bill, because the House did not delay this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. No, I am not saying that. I am saying that the administration itself delayed the request for over 2 months until they could get their precious tax gift to rich people out of the Congress.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would yield to the gentleman if he would answer this question: Will the gentleman agree then that the House actually did expedite the bill once we got the request?

Mr. OBEY. Absolutely, no problem with the timing. I have a lot of problems with the timing of the White House on this one.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for that response.

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what this argument is about today, because everybody knows we have to go to conference on this bill. Now when we bring the conference report back or during the conference itself, there will be some negotiations and there will be some discussions. There may be some things added and some things taken away, but the truth of the matter is, we sent this bill to the Senate at $6.5 billion, which was the amount that was agreed upon by the House and the Senate. The Senate leadership said that they would not go above $6.5 billion. Their bill is a little different than ours, but that is also not unusual. That is why we go to conference, to work out those differences.

So I am not sure what this argument is all about. In the beginning, it sounded like it was about campaign finance reform, but I do not think that is the case. We need to get this bill into conference, Mr. Speaker, so I am going to ask for a very strong yea vote so that we can continue the process.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the supplemental but in opposition to the rule for the Shays-Meehan bill. What we needed was a fair fight, an up or down vote on Shays-Meehan, a quality, balanced, bipartisan campaign finance bill that a majority of this House has supported twice and that has already passed the Senate.

We needed a fair rule. But what did we get? We got a mine field. We got Shays-Meehan shattered, fragmented, broken into 14 separate parts that needs to be reassembled in separate votes into that fragile flower called consensus. After the mine field, more poison pill votes. Apparently the leadership felt they could not win on the merits so they had to manipulate the process to shortchange the American people once again. Campaign finance reform is the litmus test for real change in this Congress. And the real litmus test for supporters of campaign finance reform is voting against this destructive, unfair, undemocratic rule.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), our ranking member, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to go to conference, and also support of the later motion to instruct conferees to oppose rescission of funds from the Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA, the disaster relief fund. The Senate restored the $389 million that was cut in our original supplemental that passed here, but estimates now say that FEMA may need as much as a billion dollars between now and October 1. The need for money in this fund is real and it is pressing and we should not be reducing or cutting any funding from FEMA.

Already this year there will be 27 major disaster declarations across our country, including the devastating funds in my hometown of Houston and across southern Texas, southeastern Texas, Louisiana, and even up into Philadelphia from Tropical Storm Allison. The damage estimates from this declaration alone are estimated to be $5 billion. Traditionally, FEMA pays about half of this amount in damage assistance so we are talking about $2.5 billion.

Since FEMA's disaster budget is only $1.6 billion total, we need to make sure that funding is increased and not decreased. There is still a lot of time left in this fiscal year, and I would expect we have not seen the last of the disaster declarations and thus need more funding for disaster relief.

To date, FEMA has had 85,000 disaster relief applications in the Houston area from Tropical Storm Allison. Of the 70,000 homes that FEMA inspected, 67,000 of those inspections are completed and 3,500 were completely destroyed. Over 10,000 suffered major damage and 33,000, almost 34,000, have minor damage, totaling 47,999 affected properties.

Of the more than $500 million initially allocated for this disaster by FEMA, $434 million, or 84 percent of these funds, have already been committed; and we are not even 2 months after the disaster. That is, they either have been or will be sent out to those in need of assistance.

That $434 million is already more than the $389 million that we cut in the last supplemental that passed this House. Remember, this is just one disaster with $5 billion in damages. Twenty-six other parts of our country have suffered disasters of varying degrees. That is why I would hope the House would agree with the Senate and restore the $389 million as the first step, and we need to make sure that we provide FEMA the money not just for my own constituents but also for all the people in our country who have experienced disasters.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the motion to instruct that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) will offer shortly. As my colleague, the gentleman from Houston, Texas (Mr. GREEN) just spoke of Tropical Storm Allison, the damage that has been done is unbelievable. Last week, my colleagues the gentlemen from Texas (Mr. DELAY) and (Mr. BRADY) and I were joined by Secretary of Health and Human Services Thompson when we toured the Texas Medical Center, which is in the 25th district that I represent. This is the largest medical center in world.

As a result of Tropical Storm Allison, it is estimated the damage to that medical center alone will exceed $2 billion. The three main hospitals are shut down. The City of Houston and Harris County, the fourth largest city, the third largest county in the United States, is now operating with one level-one trauma center because the other level-one trauma center, Herman Hospital, has been shut down and will be shut down for several months.

The two main medical schools, Baylor College of Medicine and the University of Texas Health Science Center are shut down as a result of this storm. This is an area that trains a large portion of our doctors, including one of the largest percentages of pediatricians are trained through the Texas Medical Center, and a large portion of that is shut down. As my colleague mentioned, the Harris County Tax Collector Assessor estimates the damage close to $5 billion and FEMA now estimates their obligation to date to be about $2.4 billion, of which they paid out already about $400 million.

That being said, FEMA only has approximately $800 million in direct and contingency appropriations on hand in order to cover this storm, not to mention the affects of Allison in Louisiana, Florida, and Mississippi; not to mention the storms that just occurred in West Virginia; not to mention other storms that have occurred; not to mention the other storms that will occur for the remainder of the fiscal year.

As my colleague mentioned, 85,000 people in the 30 counties that were affected in Texas have filed claims with FEMA. 60,000-plus homes have been inspected. 3,500 homes are already deemed to have been destroyed beyond repair and that number will certainly go up.

The fact is that the money that FEMA currently has in their disaster accounts now is insufficient, and to take $389 million out would be a grave mistake.

The other body has seen the wisdom of this and they have restored the

money; and, in fact, they added a million dollars as a place holder to look at adding to this.

The director of the Office of Management and Budget, Mr. Daniels, told our committee, the Committee on the Budget, the other day, he told the Senate Committee on the Budget subsequently, that they believed that FEMA will need additional money in the current fiscal year.

Now as I said, in the past, when we debated this, when the committee on the House side chose to rescind the $389 million, Tropical Storm Allison had not yet occurred, and had the committee marked up the bill a week later after Tropical Storm Allison, I strongly believe that they would not have chosen to rescind it because they could not have foreseen the disaster that was going to occur.

This was a 500-year event, meaning that it has a half of a percent of a chance of happening in any given year, but it did occur.

So I would hope that the House will adopt the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) to instruct, that the House, when it goes to conference with the Senate on this otherwise very important bill, will recede to the Senate's position, restore the $389 million; and I would hope, even more to the point, that the House and the Senate conference will go further and add the billion dollars that is estimated because it is going to be far greater than that. But we know we will have other disasters, and we will have to respond because it is an essential function of the government. And Congress should not be standing in the way of that.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, very briefly, when the vote comes, I will join my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and ask the people to vote yes on the motion. I will also ask them to vote yes on a later motion that we will make to add three items to this proposition. We will simply be asking the House to approve three Senate actions that would eliminate the rescission for FEMA, that would fund the administration request for mad cow disease and for hoof and mouth disease, and to fund the claims for radiation victims, many of whom are sick or dying and some of whom have already died.

□ 1145

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I am happy to hear the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) say that he will vote for this motion. I hope that everybody will vote for this motion so we can get to the business of the conference.

I would point out that the gentleman from Wisconsin will be an important member of that conference committee and will have every opportunity to make whatever suggestions that he has; and I am satisfied that he would be very influential in that conference committee, as he always is. But we need to vote. I do not know if the gentleman is going to ask for a rollcall vote or not, but we need to get on with the conference. I would like to get the conference work done before the House adjourns for the weekend.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. 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. 2216, as well as on any motion to go to conference on H.R. 2216, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

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

Mr. OBEY. 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 423, nays 3, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 224]

YEAS—423

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Largent
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry

Thomas	Udall (NM)	Weiner
Thompson (CA)	Upton	Weldon (FL)
Thompson (MS)	Velázquez	Weldon (PA)
Thornberry	Visclosky	Weller
Thune	Vitter	Wexler
Thurman	Walden	Whitfield
Tiahrt	Walsh	Wicker
Tiberi	Wamp	Wilson
Tierney	Waters	Wolf
Toomey	Watkins (OK)	Woolsey
Towns	Watson (CA)	Wynn
Traficant	Watt (NC)	Young (AK)
Turner	Watts (OK)	Young (FL)
Udall (CO)	Waxman	

NAYS—3

DeFazio	Filner	Wu

NOT VOTING—7

Foley	Morella	Spence
Jefferson	Paul	
Lewis (CA)	Scarborough	

□ 1208

Mr. STARK changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 224, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 224, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2216 be instructed:

(1) to insist that no provision to rescind funds from the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Disaster Relief Fund be included in the conference report on H.R. 2216;

(2) to agree to the provision contained in the Senate amendment that appropriates an additional $35,000,000 for ''DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE—SALARIES AND EXPENSES''; and

(3) to agree to the provision contained in the Senate amendment that appropriates an additional $84,000,000 for ''Payment to Radiation Exposure Compensation Trust Fund'' for claims covered by the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) each will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I think more than a few Members of this House and a lot of people outside of this institution have been pleasantly surprised at the relative unity this House has had on a bipartisan basis on appropriation bills this year.

Last night we passed the agriculture appropriations bill with 95 percent support in this House. We had similar majorities which supported the transportation bill, the energy and water bill, the interior bill. And it seems to me that that kind of consensus we have been able to develop on each of those bills has been good for both parties, it has been good for the House, it has been good for the country. It helps us to get our work done, and it helps us to build a foundation for cooperation on other items. I think it has been a very positive thing and something we have not seen enough of in this House in recent years.

However, the legislation which the majority is asking us to pass today in this bill does not represent that type of consensus. It is not bipartisan legislation. It has been handed down from on high. I think it is severely constrained by a narrow, partisan, ideological judgment about how we spend our money and how we meet the country's needs, and I think the current situation illustrates clearly how misguided that judgment is.

There are a few people on the other side of the aisle and people in the White House who have taken the position that once Congress has passed a budget plan, we have to put together our bills through the year, and that we cannot address any other needs beyond those anticipated in the original plan. It does not matter how much circumstances change; it apparently does not matter what the magnitude of natural disasters are that strike; it does not matter, I suppose, if we decide to go to war. If we have only a few months left in the fiscal year and a hurricane strikes, we can wait until October 1 to provide assistance, or we can fire IRS agents or close down some other badly needed program in order to find the money to pay for that disaster assistance. That, in essence, is the point of view that is controlling the consideration of this bill.

Now, some people are having difficulty understanding the term ''faith-based initiative.'' I think an example might be our disaster assistance program. We are praying that we do not have any more storms. We are trying to preclude acts of God from getting in the way of our budget process. I think that is an arrogant way for human beings to go about legislating, but so be it; that apparently is the mindset around here.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out, and this chart demonstrates one example, which shows what happened to one highway in Houston after the reign of terror in June of 2001. Currently, we are trying to cope with that huge gulf storm. Damage in a single county in Texas was estimated to be $4.8 billion.

□ 1215

The director of FEMA called me and told me that he thought that it could be possible that they would need significant additional money above the amount already appropriated by this Congress, and when contacted by the Houston Chronicle, OMB director Daniels stated, and I quote, that ''It is highly likely'' that FEMA's budget will need another boost this year.

What is going to happen with this bill? OMB told my office last night they are not planning to make a request. They are hoping to slide by on existing funds. If everything goes right and if God decides that the weather is not going to operate the way it normally does, we may just make it through. But if we have a normal year and we have a couple of hurricanes after we leave here in August, what then? We are not going to have the money to respond to those disasters.

What are we going to do then? Are we going to go down to Texas and deobligate money that we have initially provided? I would hope not. But whatever happens, without additional funding, we will not be providing normalcy to people who are affected by those storms.

Why is that? The reason is that all of the needs facing the Federal Government apparently must be met within a $6.5 billion package. Why is that? That is because that number was picked out by Congress last December when we were trying to get out of here in time for Christmas.

Does that number have any relationship to the current projected surplus outside of Social Security and Medicare? No, it does not. Did we know at the time how much rising fuel costs would affect steaming costs for the Navy or training exercises in the Air Force? No, we did not. Did we know how much those costs would deplete spare parts inventories for aircraft, tank, and ships? No, we did not.

Did we know we were going to face major electricity blackouts in most of the western United States? No, we did not. Did we know we were going to have a severe storm hit the gulf coast in the month of June? No, we did not. I did not know that a tornado with 250 mile-an-hour winds was going to hit a town in my own congressional district.

We did not know any of those things. Yet, we are being told that we have to stick within that magic number because that is what the number was defined as last summer. That is a ridiculous way to legislate.

When this conference report comes back, it will be the last train through the station for the year. If Mitch Daniels or others at the White House think there is a high probability or even a significant probability that additional FEMA funds will be needed, and evidently they do, then they ought to ask for them, rather than to pretend that this problem does not exist.

In my view, we are playing a stupid numbers game with the lives of people

who have already gone through a great deal just to insist that the numbers concocted in the middle of the night 8 months ago are the right numbers.

So consequently, I will be asking the House in this motion to do three things. First, I ask that we accept the Senate judgment and eliminate the action of the House in rescinding previously-approved money for FEMA. Everybody in this House knows that we are going to need that money. Let us fess up.

Secondly, I am going to ask that we instruct the conferees to recede to the Senate and accept the funds which the administration requested but the House deleted to deal with foot and mouth disease and mad cow disease.

Thirdly, I will ask the House to instruct conferees to recede to the Senate and accept the money needed to process the checks that are owed to victims of radiation exposure. Some of those people are extremely ill. Some have already died.

These are people who were exposed, in many instances unknowingly, to radiation as a result of the development, testing, and transportation of radioactive material by the Federal Government. In other words, those people were fried by their own government. It seems to me that a government that can spend $30 million on a political mailing to tell people that they are going to get a tax cut is a government that should not be simultaneously denying already-earned benefits to people who are dying and need that money now, not after they are in the grave.

I would also point out that the administration itself sent a letter commending the Senate ''for not including the provision in the House-passed version of the bill that would have rescinded $389 million in disaster relief funding for FEMA.''

I would urge Members to listen to the administration on this item, and listen to us on the other two items, do what we know we are going to have to do, and instruct the conferees to accept these three items.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to start by saying I appreciate the gentleman's comments about the bipartisan way we have been dealing with appropriation bills. He is exactly right, we have worked together very well. We have had some differences, but that is not unexpected nor unusual for the bill we are talking about now, the supplemental appropriations bill.

He mentioned the agriculture bill passing with about 90 percent aye votes. The truth of the matter is that the bill we are now discussing passed the House with 80 percent of the vote. So there was a very large vote in the House for the bill as the committee wrote it as modified by three amendments that were agreed to in the House during the debate on that bill.

So I appreciate the fact that we can work together. I think, before this is over, we will end up having worked together and produced a good conference report.

The difficulty with accepting a motion to instruct on a bill that does not have that many differences to start with is that it really ties the hands of the House negotiators. The gentleman from Wisconsin will be one of the chief negotiators when we go to conference with the Senate.

We should not do that negotiation here on the floor. That is why we have conference committees in the first place.

I was asking the gentleman to yield, but he was very busy with his statement and he did not yield. I was going to ask the gentleman, a question. He talked about the FEMA rescission in the House bill, and we did talk about that at length when we debated the bill on the floor on June 20. The fact is that this Congress, under the Republican majority or the Democratic majority, never ignored the needs of our communities when it came to disasters. Whatever funds were needed, we made them available. I do not think that is a concern.

I was going to ask the gentleman if he would be willing to amend his motion to recommit just to include the issue of FEMA. We would be happy to accept it if he would amend it. But we do not want to have our hands tied going into conference. We need the ability to negotiate with the other body, which is the same ability that the other body has to negotiate with us. Then we will produce a conference report that I think at least 80 percent of the House would agree with.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. If the gentleman would like me to respond, and I thank the gentleman for yielding, let me simply say I appreciate the gentleman's suggestion. I think that demonstrates that even he understands that we need to reject what the House originally did with respect to FEMA.

But I would say that I cannot accept the gentleman's offer because I think there is no rational reason whatsoever for the House not to do what the Senate has already done and to provide the money that we badly need in the agricultural area, and to provide the money that we know we have a moral obligation to provide to the victims of radiation poisoning. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the gentleman that we do not do conferences here on the floor of the House or on the floor of the Senate, we do the conferences in conference committees. We do that because there has to be give and take.

There has to be negotiation. If we adopt this motion to recommit, we tie the hands of the conferees. The other body will not tie the hands of their negotiators. So I think it is a mistake to adopt this motion to recommit.

As far as the FEMA issue is concerned, we have had numerous meetings already with the potential conferees in the other body. We are pretty much agreed that we have found other ways to provide that money without getting into the FEMA fund. So we do not really need that part of it.

When the gentleman from Wisconsin chaired the committee, he did not look favorably upon motions to instruct when he took the committee to conference because it tied his hands. That is the same thing here.

We do not have that many differences. We will be able to produce a good conference report that at least 80 percent of the House will agree to, but we need the flexibility. Do not tie our hands as we go to conference with the Senate, because their hands will not be tied in any way.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 20 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to tie the hands of the conferees on these three items, because I think there is absolutely no reason for us to use these items as leverage.

I think the people who are eligible for these funds and need these funds need to know that they are going to get them, and the sooner we do that, the better off everybody is going to be.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding time to me. I thank the chairman of the Committee for going to conference, because obviously I want to go to conference, but my concern is that we need to make sure we restore the funding to FEMA, and even look at the emergency needs that we will have, not just for my area in Houston, but all across the country.

I rise in support of the motion of the ranking member to instruct conferees, particularly the section on restoring funds for FEMA. The need for the money is real. Again, FEMA's budget is $1.6 billion. The flood in Houston alone was $5 billion. FEMA typically pays half of the loss, so that is $2.5 billion. We will have more emergency needs in the last 3 or 4 months of the fiscal year.

I spoke earlier, but let me share with you a story of a frustration that I know a lot of people have when they

have these floods. I have a senior citizen couple. He is 70 years old, she is 63. Their house was destroyed. They were on a fixed income. They live on $2,000 a month. Their mortgage is paid off. The only thing they were eligible for was a small business loan. Granted, it was 4 percent, but because of their excellent credit rating, they were not eligible for a grant.

This 70-year-old individual and the 63-year-old person are now looking at a 30-year loan. How many of us are going to be paying our home mortgages at 100 years old, or at 93 years old? That is what worries me about not providing the adequate resources to FEMA, because we will see more of this. A senior citizen should not have to say, ''I am going to sign a loan that is for 30 years because my house is destroyed.''

That is what is frustrating. That is why we need to make sure we provide the money FEMA needs, not just eliminate the rescission of the $389 million, but we need to provide what FEMA needs between now and October 1 for the losses in Houston, Texas, that we can see from here in this picture. This is not actually my district, this is downtown Houston. But can Members imagine some of the subdivisions that I represent? The water was that high above the homes. We are talking about hundreds and even thousands of homes that were damaged.

That is why we need to make sure that FEMA has that money restored.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the ranking Democrat on the subcommittee.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the chairman of the full committee, and rise in very strong support of the Obey motion to instruct.

Mr. Speaker, I want to specifically address the portion of the motion to instruct that involves the $35 million of the request for the Animal Plant Health Inspection Service as part of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

I would say that if Members have been paying any attention to the newspapers and see what is going on in Europe and in Latin America, they would see the pressures on our Department of Agriculture to keep out of our country these severe animal diseases that are just absolutely devastating both livestock and human lives in places around the world.

Our Department has a special new responsibility that they have been trying to augment with this supplementary appropriation bill. They have asked us for this $35 million to hire additional custom inspectors and veterinarians, and to make sure we have a doubling or tripling of our canine force to try to detect animal and disease problems that may be entering our country.

This really is, I think, a difficult issue for many Americans, yes hard to understand. Life is pretty comfortable for the majority of people in our country. It is hard to understand that there actually could be such serious threats to our food chain. America has not had foot and mouth disease since 1929. But it spreads rapidly. And it will be devastating if it enters this country. We have seen mad cow disease do its damage to millions of animals and now to humans in Europe. Human beings are dying in Europe, in very developed economies, from this. These are almost, it seems, other-worldly experiences, but they could happen to us.

We really need this $35 million to help the USDA. They have asked us for this money, and hopefully with this motion to instruct we will be able to get it. Mr. Speaker, the USDA continues to need the money. The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), who has just been so vigilant on this issue, will be talking about this in a minute. He has another letter from USDA seeking this assistance.

We had a vote in the subcommittee, in the full committee, very close, 27 to 35 when I offered it as an amendment. It was defeated on a close margin at that point, but I urge the conferees and I urge this House to consider this motion to instruct. Give us this $35 million the Administration has requested. Keep America free of these exotic pests and serious animal diseases.

□ 1230

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time; and I rise in opposition to the motion to instruct.

My friend from Ohio was just making some points about how we all want to work on stopping any threat from entering our borders and threatening livestock or people in this country from any problem that currently exists overseas. We are in total agreement on wanting to do all we can to stop this from entering our country in any way whatsoever. However, the solution that is being proposed in this motion to instruct is unnecessary because in fact there is a system in place already that can be accessed by the Secretary of Agriculture on a moment's notice if something were to occur in this country.

We have gone over this over and over again as we have moved separately on our agriculture appropriations bill in pointing this out clearly, and we even asked and reviewed with the Secretary that the money that she could access would amount to $30 billion. We are talking about an amount here of $35 million that, when compared to that $30 billion, is a drop in the bucket in terms of what would be necessary to fight whatever threat may enter our borders.

The Secretary gets that authorization from a program that was implemented 20 years ago for the Animal Plant and Health Inspection Service. Twenty years ago, in response to an avian influenza catastrophe, we included the following language in our annual appropriations bill, which has served the purpose over the years, and I read from that bill: ''In addition, in emergencies which threaten any segment of the agriculture production industry of this country, the Secretary may transfer from other appropriations or funds available to the Department such sums as may be deemed necessary for the arrest and eradication of contagious or infectious disease or pests of animals, poultry, or plants.

Mr. Speaker, we have carried this language each year for the past 20 years, and this language does permit the Secretary to simply declare that an emergency exists and that simple language would then allow the Secretary to fully access the Commodity Credit Corporation, through that corporation, a $30 billion entity, to take whatever action is necessary to address the emergency. We feel strongly this is the proper approach; and this permits the Secretary to meet any need much faster than waiting for congressional action, followed by OMB apportionment and treasury warrants, and everything else that is required by this action.

So the system that is in place now we feel very confident would address any threat that could enter our country. And if, in fact, it was not, we would have sufficient time to review what threat could possibly enter our country and deal with it appropriately. But to pull a figure out of thin air of $35 million at this point and to say we must insist this money goes into the budget is unnecessary, and I guess an exercise in caution that some feel we need to take but is absolutely not something we need to do at this time.

I, therefore, oppose this motion to instruct and urge its defeat.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I would simply point out, Mr. Speaker, the administration has asked for the FEMA money. The Congress is rescinding it. The gentleman says this money for agriculture was pulled out of the air. This is the administration request that we are simply trying to comply with.

Thirdly, the radiation item is an item which is owed people who are dying, at least in part because of the action of their own government. I think it will be very difficult for Members to explain their opposition to any of these three items.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for including in this motion language that would instruct conferees to accept the Senate provision to provide $35 million for USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, as requested by the Bush administration, to protect American agriculture from serious animal disease threats like foot and mouth disease and mad cow disease.

Unless we take steps now to protect ourselves, an outbreak of these diseases could be absolutely catastrophic for our country. My State of North Carolina is a good example of that. One estimate says that if foot and mouth disease were to break out in certain counties in eastern North Carolina, with concentrated hog operations, within a 20-mile perimeter we would have to destroy more animals than were destroyed in all of the country of England.

Our Governor, Mike Easley, and agriculture commissioner Meg Scott Phipps have worked hard on a prevention effort, but the States need help from the Federal Government. Now, earlier this year Secretary Veneman did authorize the use of $32 million in APHIS funding for foot and mouth and mad cow disease border inspection activities. During our debate in the Committee on Appropriations, we were advised that this and other funds available from the Commodity Credit Corporation were sufficient; that USDA had adequate resources to address foreign animal disease. That, however, was not accurate. And I am amazed to hear the subcommittee chairman repeating that argument this morning.

The President, 8 weeks after Secretary Veneman made these funds available, requested $35 million in supplemental funding for APHIS. I have confirmed with the Agriculture Department just this morning that we still need this $35 million in supplemental funding and that without it the Agriculture Department does not have adequate resources to protect the United States against foreign animal diseases. It is amazing to me, it totally escapes me, how we would not want to prepare ourselves for what could be an absolutely devastating outbreak.

We have to do all we can to protect this country against the threat of foreign animal diseases. We should honor the administration's well-justified request and accept the position of the Senate on this $35 million for the Agriculture Department. So I urge adoption of the motion to instruct.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time until the gentleman is ready to close, as he has the right to do in this particular case, as I have no further requests at this time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, if I could inquire of the gentleman. The last time we were in this situation the gentleman did not use a lot of his time and at the end took about a 10-minute block with several speakers. Is the gentleman indicating that he has no additional speakers except himself?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. No, I just thought I would save a little time. I might have a few closing remarks for our side prior to the gentleman closing.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 22 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 15 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I think this is an excellent motion to instruct, and one of the things this motion does is seek to remedy a long overdue injustice.

U.S. Citizens who went to work in uranium mines and downwinders who lived below atomic bomb explosions have suffered severely at the hands of the United States Government. Government doctors knew they were in danger. The Atomic Energy Commission knew they were in danger. But nobody told them, when they were working in the mines, the mines were dirty and they were going to get lung cancer. Nobody told the people living downwind that they were in danger.

These victims had to go to court to try to seek justice. And they lost in the courts, and the courts came back and said, this situation cries out for justice. Finally, in 1990, the U.S. Congress acted and corrected that injustice and said compensation should be paid and a national apology be given to these individuals. Very few occasions in our Nation's industry has that occurred.

Many of these victims are Navajo Indians who live in the remotest part of the country. They knew nothing of the dangers, and they are entitled to this compensation. But guess what, my colleagues, the government is out of money. The government account is empty, and we are issuing IOUs to those people. We are issuing IOUs to elderly Navajo widows who have large families. We are issuing IOUs to people that are living and have lung cancer and are waiting for this payment, many waiting for 25 years. There are 438 IOUs totaling $31 million.

This is a national outrage, and this motion to instruct will tell the House conferees to accede to the Senate number and put the money in there and do justice.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding me this time, and I too rise in strong support of this motion to instruct, especially its support for payments under the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act, or as it is known, RECA.

The people covered by RECA include uranium miners and millers and others who worked to support our nuclear weapons program and those people who were exposed to fallout unknowingly from our program. Because of that exposure, they are sick, sick with cancers and other serious diseases. Many of them are residents of Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah, people like Merle and Richard Leavell of Cortez, Colorado, or Eugene Cox of Montrose.

When Congress enacted this law, we promised to pay compensation for these illnesses, but we have not kept that promise. We have not appropriated enough money to pay everyone who is entitled to be paid. The Department of Justice tells me that on July 6, the end of last week, they had sent 438 people letters that are basically IOUs. Those people should have gotten checks that would have totaled $31 million. In Colorado, 51 Coloradoans have received these IOU letters. They should have been paid $5 million.

What the letters say is that the payment must wait for further appropriations. What the letters mean is that we in the Congress have failed to meet a solemn obligation. Now, the Senate put the $84 million back in the bill for these RECA payments. So it is important that the House accept that addition. That is all this motion to instruct says that should happen and that is why we must approve this motion today.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I remember sitting and listening to these workers in the State of Colorado and looking into their eyes and hearing them speak about how important it was not just for the money but for the principle of this. This is an apology, and this is also an affirmation that the work that they did is work that has not been done in vain. We need to acknowledge the debt we owe to these Americans that put their lives on the line.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 11 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 22 minutes remaining?

Mr. OBEY. Does the gentleman intend to use any more of his time? I only have, I believe, two speakers.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I intend to use just a few minutes prior to the gentleman closing on his motion. Other than that, I have no further speakers.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON).

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I want to congratulate the gentleman for submitting this motion to instruct that includes doing the right thing. The Senate recognized it is the right thing to provide this funding for victims of exposure to radiation.

It is interesting. We have a problem in our country where people tend to sometimes lose faith in their government. Here in Congress we stood up, I was not here at the time, but Congress stood up years ago and said, the government did something wrong and we are going to admit responsibility for doing something wrong in terms of inappropriately exposing people to radiation and so we are going to compensate these people. But at this point, it looks like Congress was talking a good game; but they are not backing it up with the actual funds.

I have met so many people who have these letters in hand, these promises that someday we are going to give you this money. These are people that went through the process of filing a claim, filling out all the forms, going through their history, and the government then said, yes, you do qualify, but, gee, we do not have any money. That is just not acceptable.

I challenge anyone in this body to look one of these victims in the eye and say, well, we do not have enough money for you. We are going to spend $35 million to send a letter to everyone telling them they are going to get a tax rebate, but we do not have enough money to compensate you while you are sick and dying from cancers caused by this Government. These actions have affected people in my State and in my own family.

It is time for Congress to stand up and do what is right and fund this. I encourage everyone to support this motion to instruct.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time; and I thank him for this motion.

I stand in strong support of this motion, particularly the portion that gives a certain amount, $35 million, to APHIS. We wish we did not have to call for this emergency, but all of us are keenly aware of the outbreak in England in February of 2001. I can tell my colleagues that it affects all of the United States, but it has a particularly devastating potential effect for the State of North Carolina.

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, I also would like to enter into the RECORD a letter from our Governor to President Bush. It is a copy of a letter that goes to President Bush from the commissioner of agriculture as well as the President pro tempore and our Speaker of the House.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Raleigh, NC, March 29, 2001.

Hon. GEORGE W. BUSH,
President of the United States, The White House, Washington, DC.

Hon. ANN VENEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT BUSH AND SECRETARY VENEMAN: As you are aware, since being confirmed in England on February 19, 2001, Foot and Mouth Disease (FMD) has been extremely active in many sections of the world, culminating in the catastrophic events that have occurred in the United Kingdom and parts of Western Europe over the past 18 months.

Introduction of this virus into the United States remains to be seen, but we do know that it would bring catastrophic consequences to the animal livestock industry, with direct and indirect financial losses in the billions of dollars. Of particular concern here in North Carolina is our extensive swine industry (10 million animals), as well as our precious beef and dairy cattle commodities (950,000 head). We have been working diligently over the past month strengthening our safety net towards minimizing the risk of the introduction of the disease into our state and country.

Because FMD is a foreign animal disease, the USDA has primary jurisdiction over the prevention and eradication of this disease. Through the efforts of our State Veterinarian in the North Carolina Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, as well as the efforts of members of our General Assembly, we are strengthening the procedures we have in place in North Carolina for disease eradication. However, we have serious concerns that we believe can only be addressed by a stronger USDA, APHIS effort.

The USDA, APHIS should be urged to do the following:

1. To promptly conduct a full risk assessment, particularly identifying the most likely methods of entry of FMD into the U.S., and implement risk management plans of action based upon the identified or perceived risks.

2. To immediately ban all used farm equipment and supplies (including harness and tack) from FMD countries until further notice. Future action would depend upon the outcome of the USDA, APHIS risk assessment and risk management plan.

3. To work with appropriate federal agencies to immediately install effective sanitary footbaths at the point of entry for all international conveyances (by air, sea, land) and complete surveillance and decontamination of all cargo. It should be mandatory that all passengers pass through the footbath upon disembarkation.

4. To conduct a thorough and complete compliance review of the disposal of international garbage from foreign conveyances (by air, sea, land).

5. To work with appropriate federal agencies to ensure that all foreign conveyances (by air, sea, and land) are appropriately decontaminated of possible FMD virus.

6. To immediately enter into active discussions with FEMA officials with the intent of proactively developing a national Emergency Support Function (ESF) for animal industry, with USDA being the primary responsible agency. The ESF should address both natural disaster and animal health emergencies of national importance. In addition, technical advice and assistance should be provided to states to develop regional compacts between state emergency management agencies.

7. To review the FMD diagnostic capabilities at the Foreign Animal Disease Diagnostic Laboratory on Plum Island and develop a plan of action to enhance capabilities to an appropriate level. Such plan of action should consider approaching Congress to allow FMD testing at certified state laboratories.

8. To notify the AVIC and State Veterinarian in the state of destination in advance of imported animals/animal products.

9. To immediately and thorougly review all livestock import protocols at points of entry for Mexico and Canada.

10. To thoroughly review the manufacturing and distribution capabilities of FMD vaccine and the impact of its use in an FMD eradication program.

11. To work with appropriate federal agencies to ensure full surveillance and decontamination of international parcel post packages.

12. To consider the benefits of restricting the importation of any grooming, training, or riding equipment/supplies for imported equine, with the exception of a halter and lead rope.

13. To notify NASDA of the results of above, including needed resources, in order to develop partnerships to help procure necessary resources to fully implement risk management plans.

14. To ensure that funds are available for indemnification to the producer as provided by federal law.

Many of these suggestions were developed by the Georgia Department of Agriculture and forwarded to the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture (NASDA). The State Commissioners and Directors of Agriculture have held several telephone conferences regarding this situation and have expressed similar concerns.

We must be extremely diligent in our efforts to prevent the introduction of this disease into the United States. Your assistance in this will be greatly appreciated.

With kindest regards, we remain

Very truly yours,

MICHAEL F. EASLEY,
Governor.

MEG SCOTT PHIPPS,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

SENATOR MARC BASNIGHT,
President Pro Tempore.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES B. BLACK,
Speaker of the House.

Mr. Speaker, let me just quote from this.

He wrote to each of us in the North Carolina delegation. He called to our attention that North Carolina would be affected greatly. I will not enter this into the RECORD because it will not come out right, but if indeed there was an outbreak, we can see that poultry, dairy and indeed all the livestock would be immediately impacted. Within 5 to 15 miles, we will have a devastation on our hands unseen before in the

United States. So they are calling not only because they need to have staff, they also are putting more resources of their own.

I entered into the supplemental bill an amendment in the Committee on Agriculture, when we considered the agricultural supplement, to put $50 million. They could not do it within the amount of money they had. This gives the House the opportunity independently to do this. I would think we would want to do that. We would not want to have the outbreak.

Let us do the right thing and prevent the outbreak by giving sufficient money that the staff can be equipped to handle such a devastation.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the purposeful way in which the appropriations process has proceeded under his leadership. But it is also true that this motion to instruct draws our attention to some very serious deficiencies in the budgetary process which are becoming more obvious with the passage of every day.

The White House today tells us that the anticipated budget surplus of $200 billion for the year is down very, very substantially, by more than $30 billion, more than 15 percent.

It is very likely that if disaster strikes from natural causes or if we have an invasion of foreign animal disease strike our shores, that we will respond appropriately with the necessary funds. But the question arises where are those funds going to come from if we do not budget for them in the first instance.

Increasingly one is driven to conclude that the answer to that question is going to be from places like the Medicare Trust Fund initially and perhaps even the Social Security Trust Fund if that becomes necessary. That is why this motion to instruct is very appropriate. Every Member of this House ought to give it their very careful consideration.

We are not being honest in the way we are dealing with the people's money here. We are living in a time of budget surpluses, but those surpluses are going down day after day, week after week. If we do not anticipate our needs honestly and appropriately now, sure as we are standing here, we are going to be digging into those trust funds, and the security of our senior citizens who rely upon the Medicare Trust Fund to get their health care needs will be put into jeopardy.

This motion to instruct is very appropriate, very pointed, and we ought to pass it.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield whatever time he might use to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, sometimes I wonder when we listen to debate in this Chamber if we are not made up of a lot of Chicken Littles with concerns about the money that is put in here for APHIS and trying to prevent the diseases from coming over here. They are not here.

There is absolutely no threat at this point domestically to any of us, humans, plants, animals, because our systems work. We are working every day in a bipartisan way to make sure that we remain safe from these threats that have devastated other countries.

Can anybody guarantee that nothing is going to happen? Of course not. That is why we have over and over again talked to the Secretary and communicated with everyone involved who could possibly have a role in preventing these diseases from entering our country to make sure we are doing everything we can.

Even though there was a request by the administration in this area, we reviewed that with the Secretary of Agriculture over and over again, specifically to find out if she could access this multibillion-dollar fund if, in fact, something happened.

There is also a plan in place that, looking a step further, assuming that the sky does fall and Chicken Little is finally right, there would be an indemnity program for livestock if something were to occur. Of course, we cannot predict, and all we can do is do all we can to be prepared.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I believe in a bipartisan way in this House we should feel comfortable that we are doing all we can, but to stand up and say over and over again, oh, my goodness, we have to pour more money in for inspectors and so forth, it is not prudent. You cannot live by the fact that something terrible may happen every day. Let us be optimistic and look at the positives in the bill. We should feel good about that.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, did the gentleman say there is already a multibillion-dollar fund available for this purpose?

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct, there is $30 billion that the Secretary of Agriculture could access if one of these threats entered our country domestically.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. If the gentleman would continue to yield, that money is available today?

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary could access that, that is correct. If the Secretary or we in this room agreed in a bipartisan way that it was not enough, we could come back and deal with that at the appropriate time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that very revealing information.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for the motion to instruct and the time to respond to a crucial provision, and that is to insist that no provision to rescind funds from the FEMA Disaster Relief Fund be included in the conference report.

We might think this is a benign instruction, but as we move this supplemental to the floor, many of us have to rise and oppose the rescinding of $329 million, as well as attempting to add more dollars, as the Senate had informed us that FEMA at that time, rather than a billion dollars that was discussed on this floor in their coffers, only had about $178 million.

Mr. Speaker, we are devastated in Houston by Tropical Storm Allison. In my community and the surrounding area alone, 5,000 homes were destroyed. The University of Houston is suffering about $100 million and growing worth of damage; the Medical Center, $2.2 billion and growing; St. Joseph's Hospital, $60 million; Texas Southern University, another institution of learning, also with damages that are not covered by flood insurance; and many, many people in my community who have not yet filed their FEMA application.

Mr. Speaker, we need more resources. Tropical Storm Allison dumped 36 inches. It was an unpredictable storm. Many people lost their lives, and this is a vital instruction to be able to provide the necessary funds to help those who are still recovering.

Mr. Speaker, I support the motion to instruct.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman ready to close?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have only one remaining speaker, me.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat something that I said at the beginning of the debate in opposition to the motion to instruct. On the issue of FEMA, this Congress never ignored the issues of our communities when it came to natural disasters, and I hope that we never will.

Mr. Speaker, as I offered to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) early in the debate, if he would amend his motion just to deal with FEMA, we would be prepared to accept it, but we are not prepared to accept a motion to instruct that really ties our hands when we go to negotiate with the other body.

One of my colleagues on the other side mentioned Social Security and

Medicare. The only way we would use any money set aside for Social Security and Medicare is if those who cannot control their appetite for spending have their way. We are doing the best we can to hold the line on spending so we do not use any monies from Social Security and Medicare funds. I understand that there are demands for more spending on not only this issue, but every issue that comes before us. But we have to constrain our appetites for spending by the Federal Government.

An example of what I am talking about, several of my colleagues talked about 438 outstanding payments, worth $31 million, on point number 3 on the motion to instruct. Well, if that is the case, why would we have to go to $84 million if all we need is the $31 million? I use that as an example. We need to work out these figures, work out these disagreements, and come together on them.

All in all, before I yield back my time, and before the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) closes on his motion, this motion is asking us on the conference committee to cave in to our brothers and sisters in the Senate before we ever go to conference. That is not why we go to conference. We go to conference to work out the differences. If our ability to negotiate is taken away, then the product we bring back may or may not be an acceptable product.

Mr. Speaker, let us dispose of this motion to instruct now. Let us go to conference, do the best we can to represent the interests of the House of Representatives, and bring back a conference report that is really needed. It is late. This supplemental appropriations needs to get passed and sent to the President. Let us get to our job. Let us do the negotiating. Let us bring back a conference report on the supplemental that 80 percent or more of the House can agree to.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are asking the House of Representatives today to approve three items which are supported by the Republican administration.

Number one, FEMA. The Director of the Federal Emergency Management Administration tells us we are going to need more money. The OMB Director is quoted in print as saying we will need more money for disaster assistance. Yet this House, without this motion, will be supporting a proposition that cuts from existing funds $389 million for disaster assistance. This issue is not about spending more money, it is about telling the truth about what our spending plans are.

Secondly, the administration has asked for the money to protect us from foot-and-mouth disease and from mad cow disease. The gentleman from Texas said our system works well. ''Do not worry, no worry.'' Well, I would ask my colleagues to recognize what the administration itself has said. ''Given the various foreign animal disease outbreaks in other parts of the world this year, USDA has been conducting a top-to-bottom review of its core programs to ensure we have the necessary resources to protect American agriculture from devastating animal diseases. These additional funds will help strengthen these important programs. MFD is a highly contagious and economically devastating disease. It is one of the animal diseases that livestock owners dread most because it spreads widely and rapidly, and because it has grave economic consequences.''

□ 1300

The way to save money is to spend it on prevention. You do not wait until the epidemic hits and then try to do something. It is too late. We already have had to destroy virtually every citrus tree in Florida because of citrus canker from a blight that was not supposed to come into the United States, either. I would say caution ought to be the watchword here.

Lastly, the gentleman says we do not need the $82 million to pay the victims of radiation poisoning. These are people who are dying, at least in part, because of the action of their own government, and they did not know that they were being exposed to danger. I would point out that the Justice Department itself says that we need $82 million this year; not $31 million, $81 million.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I was just going by what the speakers on the gentleman's side said, that it was $31 million that they needed.

Mr. OBEY. With all due respect, I would prefer to go by what we know. We are told by the Republican Justice Department, not us, that we need $81 million. In each of the three cases, what we are asking you to do is to put in what your own administration has said we will need to spend.

This is not about spending levels. It is about truth-in-budgeting. It is about fessing up to what we actually will have to spend in the end. There is no point in hiding from ourselves what the actual costs of these items will be. Every single one of these items has been requested by the administration. Every single one of these items is in the national interest. Every single one of these dollars will have to be spent in the end. We might as well be honest and face up to it now.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly urge my colleagues to support a motion to instruct conferees to eliminate the $389 million rescission from FEMA's Disaster Relief Fund included in the House version that was not included in the Senate version. I went to the Rules Committee and came to the floor in mid-June to oppose this rescission because I knew the extent of the growing burden from the most current damage assessments and visits to my district and the area. FEMA, OMB, and Senator HUTCHISON from Texas held my same original position on this rescission. I do not completely fault the House Appropriations Committee for initially targeting the Disaster Relief Fund because when they began drafting this bill there was no tropical storm Allison. However, I was very disappointed in the sometimes ugly accusations sent my way that I was playing political games with disaster relief. Instead of politics, let us look at the arithmetic.

The fund currently has only $583 billion in contingency appropriations which OMB expects to be released soon. The fund also has over $200 million in normal appropriated funds, leaving the Disaster Relief Fund with roughly $800 million. The original funds that the rescission had targeted has been spent. The money the House Appropriations Committee thought was available for a rescission is gone, due to the unpredictable financial burden of tropical storm Allison. So far, 85,000 Texans have filed for assistance and FEMA has disbursed well over $300 million, and many sources close to the recovery operation are predicting that federal obligations for recovery will reach $2 billion in Texas alone.

I would like to relate the recent development since we debated this issue in mid-June. The Senate's version of the bill eliminates the rescission and includes an extra $1 million as a placeholder for additional funds. OMB's latest statements say that more, certainly not less, money will be needed in the Disaster Relief Fund this year. Let me stress this again: the Bush administration says it is ''highly likely'' to request emergency supplemental funds for the Disaster Relief Fund in 2001. I hope this stance by a very fiscally conservative administration will convince my colleagues that I was only reacting to nonpartisan arithmetic—there simply was not going to be enough Disaster Relief Fund moneys to pay for repairs in Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Florida, and Pennsylvania. The administration recognized the situation back in June, and I am confident that the House Appropriations Committee is well aware of the Disaster Relief Fund situation now. I ask them, in light of the well-publicized financial situation of the fund, to join me in support of this Motion to Instruct Conferees.

Damage from tropical storm Allison has been appraised at $4.88 billion in Harris County (Houston), TX. I have heard from the hospitals and medical schools of the Texas Medical Center that damage assessments are $2 billion to state-of-the-art, nonprofit health care facilities, 25–30 percent of which is estimated to be covered by insurance. Add this to the fact that over 50,000 Texans in Harris County alone are either in temporary housing or working to make their homes livable again. Given the incredible extent of the damage resulting from tropical storm Allison, the administration is predicting that additional funds will be needed in fiscal year 2001 in addition to the rescission which I urgently hope will be restored.

FEMA, the administration, Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, and I believe that as much as $1 billion may be needed in additional funds for 2001. As far as I know, Congress rarely failed to come to the aid of a locality stricken by a major natural disaster. I am sure that the Appropriations Committee would not remove a large percentage of funding from the DRF, against the wishes of the administration, when disaster bills from a destructive deadly storm are rising steadily and depleting the DRF.

Finally, I want to remind my colleagues that 28 disaster declarations have already been made in the first half of 2001. At the beginning of hurricane and wildfire season, I think it is a mistake to be undermining FEMA's primary method of assistance, the Disaster Relief Fund.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, Messrs. BRADY and CULBERSON, join me in casting our votes against the motion to instruct because it attempted to tie the hands of appropriators as we go to conference. This procedural vote is a party line vote and has no practical effect on Houston.

We can, should, and will continue to meet our commitment to Allison's victims and still meet our commitment to fiscal responsibility. Similarly, we can, should, and will continue to put people before politics.

While it was premature and petty for the Democrats to essentially try to go to conference on the House floor today, rest assured that we will continue to work together for Houston in the most prudent, responsible, and effective way. Notwithstanding the demagoguery from the other side, Houston has nothing to fear.

The Appropriations chairman indicated during the debate on the Democrats' motion to instruct conferees on the supplemental that if they would limit their motion to just the removal of the FEMA rescission, he would accept it. The Democrats declined his offer.

"We will provide whatever funds are necessary to meet these disasters in Texas and nationwide. We have always done so. We will meet our responsibilities with the necessary dollars," said Chairman YOUNG.

We express our appreciation to Chairman YOUNG for his commitment to the victims of tropical storm Allison and vow to fight to restore funds to FEMA as the bill moves through conference.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion.

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. 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 205, nays 219, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 225]

YEAS—205

Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank
Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McGovern
McInnis
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shows
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NAYS—219

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilirakis
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Coble
Collins
Combest
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kerns
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCrery
McHugh
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reynolds
Riley
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Traficant
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins (OK)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Berman
Kirk
Lewis (CA)
McDermott
Miller, George
Paul
Pomeroy
Putnam
Sanchez

□ 1323

Mr. SAXTON and Mrs. KELLY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid upon the table.

Stated for:

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 225 on June 12, 2001. I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Stated against:

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 225, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted "nay."

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed the vote on rollcall 225, the motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 2216. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees:

Messrs. YOUNG of Florida, REGULA, LEWIS of California, ROGERS of Kentucky, SKEEN, WOLF, KOLBE, CALLAHAN, WALSH, TAYLOR of North Carolina, HOBSON, ISTOOK, BONILLA, KNOLLENBERG, OBEY, MURTHA, DICKS, SABO, HOYER, MOLLOHAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SERRANO and Mr. OLVER.

There was no objection.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. MCNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCNULTY).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 6, noes 418, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 226]

AYES—6

Conyers
Filner
Hall (OH)
Israel
McNulty
Serrano

NOES—418

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Largent
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velázquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins (OK)
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Berman
Dooley
Kilpatrick
Lewis (CA)
McHugh
Paul
Pomeroy
Sensenbrenner
Watson (CA)

□ 1349

Mr. DINGELL and Mr. KIRK changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2356, BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN REFORM ACT OF 2001

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 188 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 188

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. 2356) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform. 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 House Administration. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, 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 amendments printed in the report are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such 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. After passage of H.R. 2356, it shall be in order to consider in the House S. 27. All points of order against the Senate bill and against its consideration are waived. It shall be in order to move to strike all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 2356 as passed by the House. All points of order against that motion are waived. If the motion is adopted and the Senate bill, as amended, is passed, then it shall be in order to move that the House insist on its amendment to S. 27 and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from