

tion to call up a resolution as a question of the privileges of the House, and said:

“Mr. Speaker, the question of privilege expresses the sense of the House that its integrity has been impuned because the antidumping provisions of the Trade and Tariff Act of 1930, Subtitle B of title VII, have not been enforced.

“Therefore, the resolution calls upon the President to, number one, immediately obtain volunteer restraint agreements from Japan, Russia, the Ukraine, Korea and Brazil which limit those countries in July to June fiscal year 1999 to their exports calculated from fiscal year 1998.

“Number two, to immediately impose a 1-year ban on imports of hot-rolled steel products and plate steel products that are the product of manufacture of Japan, Russia, the Ukraine, Korea or Brazil, if the President is unable to obtain such volunteer restraint agreements within 10 days.

“Number three, to pursue with all tools at his disposal a more equitable sharing of the burden of accepting imports of finished steel products from Asia and the countries within the Commonwealth of Independent States.

“Number four, to establish a task force to closely monitor the imports of steel.

“Finally, to report to Congress by no later than January 5 with a comprehensive plan for responding to this import surge, including ways of limiting its deleterious effect on employment, prices and investment in the United States steel industry.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. LAHOOD, responded to the foregoing notice, and said:

“Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time or place designated by the Chair within two legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

“Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] will appear in the Record at this point.

“The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.”

¶124.26 PRAYERS AND INVOCATIONS AT PUBLIC SCHOOL SPORTING EVENTS

Mr. SMITH of Texas moved to suspend the rules and agree to the following concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 199):

Whereas prayers at public school sporting events are entirely consistent with our American heritage of seeking Divine guidance and protection in all of our undertakings;

Whereas sporting events provide a significant and long-lasting impact in character and values development among young people;

Whereas prayers and invocations have been demonstrated to positively affect the fair play and sportsmanlike behavior of both players and spectators at sporting events;

Whereas lower court rulings about prayer at sporting events have placed school and community leaders in the difficult position of choosing between conflicting values, rights, and laws;

Whereas congressional leaders have found value in beginning each legislative day with prayers; and

Whereas statements of belief in a Supreme Power and the virtue of seeking strength and protection from that Power are prevalent throughout our national history, currency, and rituals: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),* That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) prayers and invocations at public school sporting events are constitutional under the First Amendment to the Constitution; and

(2) the Supreme Court, accordingly, should uphold the constitutionality of such practices.

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. LAHOOD, recognized Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. CONYERS, each for 20 minutes.

After debate,  
The question being put, viva voce,  
Will the House suspend the rules and agree to said concurrent resolution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. LAHOOD, announced that two-thirds of the Members present had voted in the affirmative.

So, two-thirds of the Members present having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and said concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote whereby the rules were suspended and said concurrent resolution was agreed to was, by unanimous consent, laid on the table.

*Ordered,* That the Clerk request the concurrence of the Senate in said concurrent resolution.

¶124.27 HURRICANE FLOYD DISASTER

Mrs. FOWLER moved to suspend the rules and agree to the following resolution (H. Res. 349):

*Resolved,*  
**SECTION 1. FINDINGS.**

The House of Representatives finds the following:

(1) Hurricane Floyd made landfall on the coast of North Carolina on September 15, 1999, as a category two hurricane.

(2) In the State of North Carolina alone, the hurricane caused the deaths of at least 50 individuals, damage to more than 40,000 homes, and billions of dollars in infrastructure damage and agricultural losses.

(3) Citizens of the States of Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, and Connecticut have registered for Federal disaster relief aid as a result of Hurricane Floyd.

(4) More than 6 weeks after this disaster, the citizens of these States continue to await critical assistance from the Federal government to rebuild their homes, businesses, and lives.

**SEC. 2. SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**

It is the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should immediately transmit to Congress the President’s recommendations for emergency response ac-

tions, including appropriate offsets, to provide relief and assistance to the victims of Hurricane Floyd.

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. LAHOOD, recognized Mrs. FOWLER and Mr. TRAFICANT, each for 20 minutes.

After debate,  
The question being put, viva voce,  
Will the House suspend the rules and agree to said resolution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. LAHOOD, announced that two-thirds of the Members present had voted in the affirmative.

Mr. COBLE demanded that the vote be taken by the yeas and nays, which demand was supported by one-fifth of the Members present, so the yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mrs. BIGGERT, pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, announced that further proceedings on the motion were postponed.

¶124.28 MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3064) “An Act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.”

¶124.29 H. CON. RES. 213—UNFINISHED BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore, Mr. LAHOOD, pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, announced the unfinished business to be the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 213) encouraging the Secretary of Education to promote, and state and local educational agencies to incorporate in their education programs, financial literacy training.

The question being put,  
Will the House suspend the rules and agree to said concurrent resolution?

The vote was taken by electronic device.

It was decided in the { Yeas ..... 411  
affirmative ..... { Nays ..... 3

¶124.30 [Roll No. 553] YEAS—411

Abercrombie	Bateman	Boswell
Aderholt	Becerra	Boucher
Allen	Bentsen	Boyd
Andrews	Bereuter	Brady (TX)
Archer	Berkley	Brown (FL)
Armey	Berman	Brown (OH)
Bachus	Berry	Bryant
Baird	Biggert	Burr
Baker	Bilbray	Burton
Baldacci	Bilirakis	Buyer
Baldwin	Bishop	Callahan
Ballenger	Blagojevich	Calvert
Barcia	Blumenauer	Camp
Barr	Blunt	Campbell
Barrett (NE)	Boehkert	Canady
Barrett (WI)	Boehner	Capps
Bartlett	Bonilla	Capuano
Barton	Bonior	Cardin
Bass	Bono	Castle