

tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA) at 7 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 761, ELECTRONIC SIGNATURES IN GLOBAL AND NATIONAL COMMERCE ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-670) on the resolution (H. Res. 523) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the Senate bill (S. 761) to regulate interstate commerce by electronic means by permitting and encouraging the continued expansion of electronic commerce through the operation of free market forces, and other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4578, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-671) on the resolution (H. Res. 524) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4578) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. OBEY. Before we move into the Committee of the Whole, I thought that an understanding was being reached about the sequence of an amendment. Is that not correct?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. If the gentleman will yield, it is our understanding based on our agreement of last week that we would take the Obey amendments as they appeared in the bill.

Mr. OBEY. The problem is that one of the Members who would offer those amendments is called away to another meeting and so we wanted to ask unanimous consent before the House went into the Committee that that amendment be taken out of order simply so that she could leave.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. If the gentleman will yield further, is that one of the amendments that we had agreed to in the unanimous consent?

Mr. OBEY. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would find no objection to accommodating that Member. But I expect that the same agreement of the time limitation would still apply.

Mr. OBEY. Yes, absolutely.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I have no objection to that.

ORDER OF CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENT NO. 10 DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4577, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to consider amendment No. 10 notwithstanding that portion of the bill may have been passed in the reading of the bill for amendment, but otherwise subject to the order of the House of June 8, 2000.

□ 1930

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

There was no objection.

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

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

□ 1930

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole House rose on Thursday, June 8, 2000, the amendment by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 19, line 21.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. I rise to enter into a colloquy with our distinguished chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), who is standing in for our distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER).

Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) prepared to enter into that colloquy with me?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the answer is affirmative.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to thank the gentleman

from Illinois (Chairman PORTER) for his outstanding leadership of the subcommittee and because we have the unique opportunity of having the chairman of the full committee here, I also want to thank him for his leadership of the full committee.

Mr. Chairman, this is not in the colloquy, but I want to say with great assurance there is not a fairer, more thoughtful chairman of any standing committee in the Congress of the United States than the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), who chairs the Committee on Appropriations.

It is with great affection and great respect that I rise and thank him for participating in this colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about the funding level for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention of childhood immunizations. The operations and infrastructure account, which provides grants to States for outreach and education on immunization, has, Mr. Chairman, as you know, decreased from \$271 million in 1995 to \$139 million in 2000, almost cut in half.

While this bill increases funding for the operations and infrastructure account by \$15 million this year, it is my hope that this funding would increase by an additional \$60 million for a total of \$75 million.

Mr. Chairman, I am also concerned about the vaccine purchase account within the Childhood Immunization Program at CDC. The President requested, as you know, an increase of \$10 million this year and funding has remained level. I would like to see funding in this account increased by the \$10 million President Clinton requested, plus an additional \$10 million on top of that.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) for his hard work on this bill, and I would like to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), in his absence, for his hard work on this bill.

Given the constraints of the budget resolution, the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Florida have done an outstanding job of writing what has proved to be a difficult bill for Members on both sides of the budget debate.

It is my hope, Mr. Chairman, that we may work together on this account in conference.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) and I both appreciate the leadership of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) on this issue.

As the gentleman knows, our allocation was not nearly as high as we had hoped, and we prepared the best bill that we could while under the current budget constraints.

With that said, I agree that the operations on infrastructure portion of the

program provides the important funding for State immunization initiatives, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) and I both would be very happy to work with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) on this issue as we move forward in the process.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, (Mr. GREEN), a very good friend of mine and someone who has been tireless in working towards increased funding for immunizations.

(Mr. GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for organizing this colloquy this evening.

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for your pledge to work to increase funding for section 317, the immunization program.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) and I have introduced the resolution calling for an increase in section 317 funds for children's immunizations, and I am pleased that thanks to the efforts of the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), this year's Labor, HHS bill does include a slight increase in section 317 funding. However, much more is needed.

While immunization rates in most States are improving, we are not doing as much as we could do if one of four American children are not receiving the immunizations that he or she needs. In Houston, which I represent, and Chicago over 44 percent of the children are not getting one or more of the immunizations.

Section 317 infrastructure funds are used by the States and cities to identify needs, conduct community outreach, establish registries, open clinics, deal with disease outbreaks, and undertake educational and tracking efforts, among other things.

These infrastructure funds have been reduced rather dramatically, as my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), mentioned in the past 5 years from 271 million to 139 million.

The need for increased infrastructure funding is particularly important in light of the recent Journal of the American Medical Association survey that shows over 50 percent of American children are either under or overvaccinated.

The JAMA study shows that 21 percent of toddlers receive at least one extra immunization, while 31 percent missed at least one. In other words, close to 50 percent of American children are receiving too few or too many vaccinations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HOYER was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Again, section 317 funding increase is supported by the American Academy of Family Physicians, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Public Health Association, and this increase is also supported by the Association of Maternal and Child Health Programs, Every Child by Two, the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers, and the Association of County and City Health Officials.

Most important, an increase in the 317 funds, Mr. Chairman, is supported by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), and our subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), and my good friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Again, I want to thank the chairman for his support; and hopefully in conference committee we will get that additional funding if we can see the allocations increase.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) for his comments. Mr. Chairman, I also want to thank him and congratulate him for his work on this subject.

Obviously, we have talked a lot about in the previous decade, previous century about prevention, about how health care would be much cheaper if we prevented illness as opposed to treating illness. Nothing has been so successful, I think, in that regard as has childhood immunization.

We have, in effect, eliminated some diseases that have afflicted children and human beings for centuries really; and, therefore, this investment in immunizations plays an incredible dividend. It is probably as good an investment as we can possibly make, so not only is it the right thing to do to keep children healthy and to protect them from diseases, but it is also, from a financial standpoint, a very worthwhile investment that saves us a very geometric savings for every dollar invested.

I thank the gentleman for his leadership and would be glad to yield to him for any comment he might have.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for yielding. I see our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) from Chicago, and knowing that both Houston and Chicago, 44 percent of our children are either getting more or less the immunizations they need.

I know in my own district in Houston, our population turns so quick, that we may do a great immunization program 2 or 3 years ago, but we have so many new children who are coming in to urban areas in our country that this money, this infrastructure money will help create a registry so we will know that a child does not over-immunize or hopefully not under-immunize, and we will get those immu-

nizations and the registry will help the States.

I know the State of Texas is supporting this, and State health commissioners and, of course, our cities to provide that registry so we will spend a dime today and save us a dollar tomorrow.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I think the gentleman makes a very cogent observation. I had the opportunity to meet just within the last 30 days with the Secretary of the Department of Health in Maryland, and he made that exact point, needing such a registry. So that not only would it assist school officials and health officials, but it would preclude children from being overimmunized, as well as making sure that children who are not get that which they need. So that it has both sanguine effects from that standpoint.

I appreciate the gentleman's observations.

Does the gentleman from Texas want additional time?

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for his efforts on the committee, and, again, I thank the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) for the efforts and the commitment to try and have more money during conference process.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I had the opportunity to meet a little earlier today with representatives of PerkinElmer, a corporation which is a high-technology company based in Wellesley, Massachusetts; and we talked about neonatal screening for treatable, inherited disorders.

I mention that only in the respect that, again, we were talking about prevention and early intervention. These dollars, as the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) and the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman PORTER) have pointed out, are dollars well spent; and the only reason, as the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) pointed out that they have not been included in this bill at this point in time is because the budget numbers were so very tight.

I want to thank the chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) as well for their willingness to work with us over the next few months to try to increase substantially the numbers dedicated to the immunization program so that we can make sure that every child in America receives the shots and immunizations that he or she needs to ensure at least to the safety that we can accord with those immunization shots.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill through page 31, line 14, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and opened to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill from page 20, line 1 through page 31, line 14 is as follows:
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES
ADMINISTRATION

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES

For carrying out titles II, III, VII, VIII, X, XII, XIX, and XXVI of the Public Health Service Act, section 427(a) of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act, title V and section 1820 of the Social Security Act, the Health Care Quality Improvement Act of 1986, as amended, and the Native Hawaiian Health Care Act of 1988, as amended, \$4,684,232,000, of which \$25,000,000 from general revenues, notwithstanding section 1820(j) of the Social Security Act, shall be available for carrying out the Medicare rural hospital flexibility grants program under section 1820 of such Act: *Provided*, That the Division of Federal Occupational Health may utilize personal services contracting to employ professional management/administrative and occupational health professionals: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$250,000 shall be available until expended for facilities renovations at the Gillis W. Long Hansen's Disease Center: *Provided further*, That in addition to fees authorized by section 427(b) of the Health Care Quality Improvement Act of 1986, fees shall be collected for the full disclosure of information under the Act sufficient to recover the full costs of operating the National Practitioner Data Bank, and shall remain available until expended to carry out that Act: *Provided further*, That for the collection of fees authorized by section 1128E(d)(2) of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 for the full disclosure of information under the Act sufficient to recover the full costs of operating the Healthcare Integrity and Protection Data Bank, and shall remain available until expended to carry out that Act: *Provided further*, That no more than \$5,000,000 is available for carrying out the provisions of Public Law 104-73: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$238,932,000 shall be for the program under title X of the Public Health Service Act to provide for voluntary family planning projects: *Provided further*, That amounts provided to said projects under such title shall not be expended for abortions, that all pregnancy counseling shall be nondirective, and that such amounts shall not be expended for any activity (including the publication or distribution of literature) that in any way tends to promote public support or opposition to any legislative proposal or candidate for public office: *Provided further*, That \$554,000,000 shall be for State AIDS Drug Assistance Programs authorized by section 2616 of the Public Health Service Act: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding section 502(a)(1) of the Social Security Act, not to exceed \$109,148,000 is available for carrying out special projects of regional and national significance pursuant to section 501(a)(2) of such Act.

For special projects of regional and national significance under section 501(a)(2) of the Social Security Act, \$30,000,000, which shall become available on October 1, 2001, and shall remain available until September 30, 2002: *Provided*, That such amount shall not be counted toward compliance with the allocation required in section 502(a)(1) of such Act: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be used only for making competitive

grants to provide abstinence education (as defined in section 510(b)(2) of such Act) to adolescents and for evaluations (including longitudinal evaluations) of activities under the grants and for Federal costs of administering the grants: *Provided further*, That grants shall be made only to public and private entities which agree that, with respect to an adolescent to whom the entities provide abstinence education under such grant, the entities will not provide to that adolescent any other education regarding sexual conduct, except that, in the case of an entity expressly required by law to provide health information or services the adolescent shall not be precluded from seeking health information or services from the entity in a different setting than the setting in which the abstinence education was provided: *Provided further*, That the funds expended for such evaluations may not exceed 3.5 percent of such amount.

HEALTH EDUCATION ASSISTANCE LOANS
PROGRAM

Such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of the program, as authorized by title VII of the Public Health Service Act, as amended. For administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program, including section 709 of the Public Health Service Act, \$3,679,000.

VACCINE INJURY COMPENSATION PROGRAM
TRUST FUND

For payments from the Vaccine Injury Compensation Program Trust Fund, such sums as may be necessary for claims associated with vaccine-related injury or death with respect to vaccines administered after September 30, 1988, pursuant to subtitle 2 of title XXI of the Public Health Service Act, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That for necessary administrative expenses, not to exceed \$2,992,000 shall be available from the Trust Fund to the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND
PREVENTION

DISEASE CONTROL, RESEARCH, AND TRAINING

To carry out titles II, III, VII, XI, XV, XVII, XIX, and XXVI of the Public Health Service Act, sections 101, 102, 103, 201, 202, 203, 301, and 501 of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977, sections 20, 21, and 22 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, title IV of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and section 501 of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980; including insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries; and hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft, \$3,290,369,000, of which \$145,000,000 shall remain available until expended for equipment and construction and renovation of facilities, and in addition, such sums as may be derived from authorized user fees, which shall be credited to this account: *Provided*, That in addition to amounts provided herein, up to \$71,690,000 shall be available from amounts available under section 241 of the Public Health Service Act, to carry out the National Center for Health Statistics surveys: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available for injury prevention and control at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention may be used to advocate or promote gun control: *Provided further*, That the Director may redirect the total amount made available under authority of Public Law 101-502, section 3, dated November 3, 1990, to activities the Director may so designate: *Provided further*, That the Congress is to be notified promptly of any such transfer: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, a single contract or related contracts for the development and construction of laboratory building 18 may be employed which collectively

include the full scope of the project: *Provided further*, That the solicitation and contract shall contain the clause "availability of funds" found at 48 CFR 52.232-18: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$10,000,000 may be available for making grants under section 1509 of the Public Health Service Act to not more than 10 States.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to cancer, \$3,793,587,000.

NATIONAL HEART, LUNG, AND BLOOD INSTITUTE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to cardiovascular, lung, and blood diseases, and blood and blood products, \$2,321,320,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DENTAL AND
CRANIOFACIAL RESEARCH

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to dental disease, \$309,007,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DIABETES AND
DIGESTIVE AND KIDNEY DISEASES

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to diabetes and digestive and kidney disease, \$1,315,530,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF NEUROLOGICAL
DISORDERS AND STROKE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to neurological disorders and stroke, \$1,185,767,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ALLERGY AND
INFECTIOUS DISEASES

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to allergy and infectious diseases, \$2,062,126,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF GENERAL MEDICAL
SCIENCES

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to general medical sciences, \$1,548,313,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CHILD HEALTH AND
HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to child health and human development, \$984,300,000.

NATIONAL EYE INSTITUTE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to eye diseases and visual disorders, \$514,673,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ENVIRONMENTAL
HEALTH SCIENCES

For carrying out sections 301 and 311 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to environmental health sciences, \$506,730,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON AGING

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to aging, \$790,299,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ARTHRITIS AND
MUSCULOSKELETAL AND SKIN DISEASES

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to arthritis and musculoskeletal and skin diseases, \$400,025,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON DEAFNESS AND OTHER
COMMUNICATION DISORDERS

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to deafness and other communication disorders, \$301,787,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF NURSING RESEARCH

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to nursing research, \$102,312,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON ALCOHOL ABUSE AND ALCOHOLISM

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to alcohol abuse and alcoholism, \$349,216,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON DRUG ABUSE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to drug abuse, \$788,201,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MENTAL HEALTH

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to mental health, \$1,114,638,000.

NATIONAL HUMAN GENOME RESEARCH INSTITUTE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to human genome research, \$386,410,000.

NATIONAL CENTER FOR RESEARCH RESOURCES

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to research resources and general research support grants, \$832,027,000: *Provided*, That none of these funds shall be used to pay recipients of the general research support grants program any amount for indirect expenses in connection with such grants: *Provided further*, That \$75,000,000 shall be for extramural facilities construction grants.

JOHN E. FOGARTY INTERNATIONAL CENTER

For carrying out the activities at the John E. Fogarty International Center, \$50,299,000.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to health information communications, \$256,281,000, of which \$4,000,000 shall be available until expended for improvement of information systems: *Provided*, That in fiscal year 2001, the Library may enter into personal services contracts for the provision of services in facilities owned, operated, or constructed under the jurisdiction of the National Institutes of Health.

NATIONAL CENTER FOR COMPLEMENTARY AND ALTERNATIVE MEDICINE

For carrying out section 301 and title IV of the Public Health Service Act with respect to complementary and alternative medicine, \$78,880,000.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For carrying out the responsibilities of the Office of the Director, National Institutes of Health, \$342,307,000, of which \$48,271,000 shall be for the Office of AIDS Research: *Provided*, That funding shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed 20 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only: *Provided further*, That the Director may direct up to 1 percent of the total amount made available in this or any other Act to all National Institutes of Health appropriations to activities the Director may so designate: *Provided further*, That no such appropriation shall be decreased by more than 1 percent by any such transfers and that the Congress is promptly notified of the transfer: *Provided further*, That the National Institutes of Health is authorized to collect third party payments for the cost of clinical services that are incurred in National Institutes of Health research facilities and that such payments shall be credited to the National Institutes of Health Management Fund: *Provided further*, That all funds credited to the National Institutes of Health Management Fund shall remain available for one fiscal year after the fiscal year in which they are deposited: *Provided further*, That up to \$500,000 shall be available to carry out section 499 of the Public Health Service Act: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding section 499(k)(10) of the Public Health Service Act, funds from the Founda-

tion for the National Institutes of Health may be transferred to the National Institutes of Health.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For the study of, construction of, and acquisition of equipment for, facilities of or used by the National Institutes of Health, including the acquisition of real property, \$178,700,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$47,300,000 shall be for the National Neuroscience Research Center: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, a single contract or related contracts for the development and construction of the first phase of the National Neuroscience Research Center may be employed which collectively include the full scope of the project: *Provided further*, That the solicitation and contract shall contain the clause "availability of funds" found at 48 CFR 52.232-18.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MS. PELOSI

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I offer Amendment No. 11.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) the designee of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY)?

Ms. PELOSI. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman most certainly is.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Points of order are reserved under the order of June 8. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 11 offered by Ms. PELOSI:

Page 31, after line 23, insert the following: In addition, \$600,000,000 for such purposes: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, June 8, 2000, the gentlewoman from California, (Ms. PELOSI) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

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

Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), for allowing me to be the designee on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak to this amendment, which would increase funding \$600 million to reduce the demand for drugs here in America. Specifically, it would fund State and local drug treatment and prevention activities.

It recognizes that if America's drug controlled policy is to succeed, our policy must not focus only on supply reduction. We must balance our policy by including domestic efforts by including demand reduction services. We must

address America's enormous drug treatment and prevention needs.

More than 5.7 million Americans are in severe need of substance abuse treatment, and 3.6 million lack needed treatment; 5.7, 3.6, just over 2 million Americans are receiving the substance abuse treatment, have access to treatment. And I am not even saying they have all that they need, but 3.6 have none.

Just 2 months ago, I offered a drug treatment amendment during the supplemental appropriations bill consideration. I tried to offer my amendment on the House floor for a straight up and down vote. At the time the chairman of the committee said this amendment should go through the regular process and not be dealt with on the supplemental.

It was said to wait for the appropriation subcommittee and the committee markups. They offered to work with me at the time through the appropriate process to fund domestic demand reduction strategies; however, this is the regular process. We had no success at the subcommittee/full committee and now is the time, the amendment is before this committee. I look for your support.

□ 1945

Please know that treatment and prevention are more effective than any other drug control options. A Rand Corporation study sponsored by the United States Army and the Office of Drug Control Policy determined that to reduce cocaine consumption, funds invested in drug treatment, drug treatment, were 23 times more effective than source country control. In addition, this is 11 times more effective, drug treatment and prevention, is 11 times more effective than interdiction at the border, and 7 times more effective than even law enforcement.

Certainly we want to reduce the supply and we want to interdict at the border and we must have a balance between treatment and incarceration, but this Rand Commission study says that treatment is 23 times more effective. In other words, if you wanted to reduce demand in the U.S. by 1 percent, you could spend \$24 million by having treatment on demand in the U.S., or you could spend over \$700 million in the source country in order to reduce demand by 1 percent in the U.S.

My amendment increases funding \$600 million for the substance abuse block grant and community treatment services, it invests \$400 million for the block grants and \$200 million for local treatment services via competitive grants. It provides treatment for an additional 150,000 addicted individuals and proven prevention services to an estimated 690,000 youths. It expands existing service infrastructure.

This investment leverages additional local and State funds, it strengthens State and local coordination and helps integrate service delivery. The amendment focuses on youth, while allowing

communities to invest these funds according to local priorities. It helps our youth avoid a life of drugs and helps current drug users to turn their lives around. We must reduce domestic drug use and increase funding for drug treatment and prevention.

In September of 1999, America's drug czar, General McCaffrey, wrote an op-ed stating, "It is a sad time when the number of incarcerated Americans exceeds the active duty strength of the Armed Forces. A Rand Corporation study," the one I referenced, and this is the McCaffrey quote, "found that increasing drug treatment was the single-most cost-effective way to reduce domestic drug consumption."

We know treatment and prevention are more effective than any other options. How cost effective is this? Each \$1 invested in drug abuse prevention saves \$15 in reduced health, justice and other societal costs. Each \$1 invested in drug prevention will save communities \$4 to \$5 in costs for drug abuse counseling and treatment. The National Treatment Improvement Evaluation Study evaluated SAMSHA's substantive abuse treatment services and found significant and lasting benefits, including 50 percent decrease in drug and alcohol use 1 year after completing treatment, 43 percent decrease in homelessness, and 19 percent increase in employment.

Mr. Chairman, I contend this is a dollar well spent, and certainly an investment we should make. It is a small step. We still will have millions of people in our country not receiving the substance abuse treatment that they need, but it is a step in the right direction, and, as we consider giving all kinds of military assistance to Colombia in order to reduce drug consumption in the U.S., we must consider that \$1 is worth \$23 spent that way, \$1 spent on treatment in the United States. So I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Before the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Chairman Young), the Clerk will read the subsequent paragraph which is being amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH
SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH
SERVICES

For carrying out titles V and XIX of the Public Health Service Act with respect to substance abuse and mental health services, the Protection and Advocacy for Mentally Ill Individuals Act of 1986, and section 301 of the Public Health Service Act with respect to program management, \$2,727,626,000.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 15 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would point out to our colleagues that this amendment was offered in the full committee and it was debated at great length followed by a recorded vote. The amendment was not agreed to. It was not so much that we did not agree with what the gentlewoman would like to accomplish, but we did not have the money. The budget approved by this House and by the other body put a severe restriction on the funds available. If the gentlewoman would have offered some way to pay for this or offered an offset somewhere else in the bill, we might be more friendly toward the amendment, but, unfortunately, that is not the case.

I would like to point out also for the benefit of our colleagues, this bill provides the President's budget request for the Substance Abuse Block Grant, \$31 million more than last year's level. I know it is not as much as the gentlewoman would like. It is not as much as I would like, but it was the best we could do, given the allocation that we had.

Mr. Chairman, I must oppose the amendment.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, to speak to this amendment, and would say to our distinguished chairman that if we did not have to have a very expensive tax cut, we would have enough money to meet the treatment needs in our country to reduce demand for drugs.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to refresh our memories as to what is going on here. What is happening is that we are offering a series of amendments, but under the rule under which this bill is being debated we will not be able to get votes on those amendments. The reason we will not is because the majority party, in order to squeeze out enough room in the budget for their huge tax packages, they have scaled back substantially on virtually every domestic appropriation bill that we will bring to this floor. That is why this bill is \$3 billion below the President on education, almost \$2 billion below on worker protection and job training, and over \$1 billion below on health care.

Mr. Chairman, what we are trying to do with this and other amendments is to illustrate that we think there ought to be a different set of priorities than those which are guiding the majority party. Last week the majority party passed a tax bill which, over the next 10 years, will give over \$200 billion in tax relief to the richest 400 Americans in this society. I have nothing against those folks, but it seems to me that it is a much higher priority for this country to meet its education obligations, its health care obligations and its job training obligations.

What the Pelosi amendment is trying to illustrate is that this Congress and the administration are apparently both supporting an expensive new proposition to fight a drug war in South America, but that this Congress is refusing to add funding to the budget to deal with drug treatment here at home. When we have only 37 percent of the Americans who are presently in need of drug treatment able to get treatment because of insufficient drug treatment slots, it seems to me that we have a terrible imbalance in our Congressional priorities.

So I recognize this amendment is not going anywhere, because we cannot even get a vote on it under the rule, but I think this is just another example of the price we pay in terms of increased crime, in terms of increased drug addiction, because this Congress is hell-bent on providing some huge tax cuts for the wealthiest people in this society, while it is ignoring our needs to deal with the concrete problems that affect and afflict virtually every community in the country.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of my time be managed by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services and Education of the Committee on Appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, I apologize to the Members for being late, but my plane was delayed. As I came over here and passed one of the television screens, I heard the gentlewoman from California saying that she could not offer this, she was told, in full committee markup, but that she could offer it here on the floor because this was regular order. But I suggest to the gentlewoman that if you do not offer an offset, it is not regular order. It is not fiscally responsible.

I just heard the gentleman from Wisconsin saying that we refused to add money. We funded this account, which is a very important account, at exactly the level the President of the United States requested. So I would ask the gentlewoman, she is adding \$600 million. Where did that figure come from?

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, the \$600 million relates to what we think we could hopefully get passed here. If I just may say, with the gentleman's yielding, just to clarify what is here on the floor, when I offered this amendment at the time of the emergency supplemental, when no offset would have been required, it was rejected by the majority in the full committee saying that we should go through the regular

order, even though drug use in America is an emergency, and that is why we were having an emergency supplemental to send military assistance to Colombia. It was declared an emergency.

So then when they said go the regular order, we go to full committee and were defeated, and are now bringing it to the floor to point out the imbalance in our values, where we will give a tax cut instead of giving drug treatment to reduce drug consumption in America. So the \$600 million relates to that.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the gentlewoman knows very well we are not in the process here of moving money from tax cuts to spending. That is not the regular order. The order here is that if you have an amendment to offer, you have to find an offset, because we live within limits.

Mr. Chairman, I very much agree with the gentlewoman that the President of the United States was wrong in allocating \$1.6 billion to drug interdiction and crop eradication in Colombia. That money would have been better spent on treatment programs or prevention programs here at home.

The difficulty is that the gentlewoman is never willing to take the money from a lower priority and allocate it to a higher priority. It seems to me that the great flaw in the argument coming from the other side, on all of these amendments, is that you simply want to add money, without the responsibility for the bottom line of living within some standard. The standard is not what we need. We need a lot more in a lot of programs. The standard is that we have to live within a budget, and that is what we have to do. So we have to make the tough decisions over here, and over on that side you simply say, "Let's add money to this, let's add money to that, let's add money to other program." There is a need; of course there is a need. But somebody has to be responsible that we do not go off the graph in spending.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, let me simply say we tried to provide this funding on the same footing that the funding was provided for the drug war in South America. We were told by the majority party at that time, come back and deal with it on the regular bill. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) said that, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALAHAN) said that, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) said that, and several others.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, if I may say to the gentleman, the gentleman did not do that. The gentleman had the opportunity, but he did not.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, we did

try to do it. We have tried on numerous occasions to cut back the amount of money that you are providing for your tax cuts, including the budget resolution we brought to the floor. All you would have to do to be able to fund this and every other amendment is to cut back your tax cuts by 20 percent.

Now, the rules of this House prevented us from getting a vote on that proposition, but that does not mean that we do not have an obligation and conscience to bring it up to demonstrate what we believe to be the skewed priorities of the majority.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the gentleman made that point over and over again, and I might agree with the point, but this is not the regular order. Regular order is to be responsible and to cut something if you want to increase something.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, in fairness to the gentleman, since he is being so generous with his time, I want to use the first phase of my time from him to praise him for his leadership as chair of our subcommittee.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman. Maybe that is all the time I will yield.

Ms. PELOSI. No, I was going to say so much more about the gentleman, but I have another amendment, so I will spend some time then, because we have been very pleased by his leadership on the committee.

So great a leader is the gentleman that he was very clever in this bill, Mr. Chairman, and I think it would be instructive to the Members of this House to know that in this bill there is money allocated for different programs, that the entire amount is designated to be emergency requirements pursuant to Section 251(b).

□ 2000

That says that one must adjust the caps if the President includes designation of the term as an emergency request.

Mr. PORTER. Let me reclaim my time.

Ms. PELOSI. This is an emergency request.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to reclaim my time and reserve it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) controls the time. He must yield time.

Mr. PORTER. The gentlewoman can get the time from the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). I have other speakers on my side. In fact, the gentlewoman better yield some time to us now.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON), a very valued member of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this \$600 million amendment adds \$400 million to States through the substance abuse block grant program. It

adds \$200 million to local communities through competitive grants for critical substance abuse treatment services in collaboration with the States. That is what this amendment is about. It is very, very clear that these resources are necessary.

Now, what is also a bit confusing is that during the emergency supplemental markup the President of the United States requested of that committee \$1.6 billion for the Colombian aid package. We sought during that hearing to add a comparable amount of money, not just on the supply side of the narcotics problem, but also on the demand side, because we know that to reduce cocaine consumption, funds invested in drug treatment were 23 times more likely and more effective than source country control, that they were 11 times more effective than interdiction and 7 times more effective than law enforcement in reducing cocaine consumption. So we sought to match that on this side.

Now during the course of that discussion, the majority added money for agricultural products, \$4 billion, several billion in increased defense spending above the \$300 billion appropriation, more than the Defense Department was even asking for, and the emergency supplemental for \$1 billion on crop eradication in Colombia became a \$14 billion bill in emergency supplemental that I believe is still stuck in the Senate.

Mr. Chairman, all we have sought to do under regular order, which the chairman of the full committee asked us to do, was to offer an amendment on the demand side of the problem in our own country. That amendment was flatly rejected by the full committee; and we are here today, Mr. Chairman, raising similar concerns to show the American people, but also to show the full committee, Mr. Chairman, that there are Members of Congress who want to do something not only on the supply side but also on the demand side.

I congratulate the gentlewoman for offering her amendment.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, we went through this drill in the subcommittee, the same 10 amendments, the same increase in every single one of them, just to show that Republicans want to cut.

We have increased, including Head Start, education \$2 billion, increased over last year.

Let me give a good idea. One of these amendments increases special education. When the Democrats had control of this House, they promised to increase special education up to 40 percent of the funding. The maximum they ever funded was 6 percent. Republicans, in 5 years, have doubled that spending for special education. This bill increases special education funding

\$500 million; but yet we will see an amendment come forward to spend another billion dollars without any offsets, just to say that Republicans are cutting special education. That is the logic that they use.

Why? Every single one of these bills is brought forward just for the election coming up in November, to show how those mean Republicans want to cut education and cut the other socialized programs.

Well, there is a party with fiscal responsibility. There is a party also that wants to tax and spend and spend and spend, just like they did when they were in the majority.

Let us take a look at it. Look at education. It was a disaster when they left office. Education construction was destroyed. The infrastructure is terrible. We are last in math and science, because they put more money into it, just kept pouring more money, more money, more money, without any quality or responsibility into it.

We have changed that. Look over the 5 years, test scores are starting to go up but at the same time those that are entering colleges are still having to take remedial education. That is wrong. We need to do more in education. I agree with my colleagues on that. We have increased it \$2 billion.

Now, how did they plan on paying for this? We will hear tax breaks for the rich, tax breaks for the rich. Well, I want to say, any tax relief limits the amount that they spend on these social programs. It will only be for the rich. We will never find them supporting tax relief. Every single bill. The same liberals fought against the balanced budget because it limited their amount of spending. They fought against welfare reform because it limited their amount of spending. They fought against the Social Security lock box because when they were in the majority for 30 years they took every dime out of the Social Security trust fund and put it up here for new spending, and then they increased taxes every year so that they could pass more for increased bureaucracy.

Now every one of these amendments we are going to see they want more, they want more, they want more. Every single appropriations bill, except for defense, they will increase. They will cut defense also to pay for more socialized spending.

Excuse me. I know I am not supposed to have this on the floor, but God says he does not want this amendment. I am sorry.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will remind the Member from California that personal electronic devices may not be used on the floor of the House and should be disabled when they are brought into the Chamber.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. In 1993, they had the highest tax possible. They stole every dime out of the Social Security trust fund, even the gas tax. Does one think they put it in a transportation

fund? Absolutely not. They put it in the general fund so they could spend more money. There was no hope of a balanced budget. Debts were destined to go up. The budget went beyond \$200 billion every single year, but yet we will see the exercise here tonight from my colleagues on the other side to spend more money. Reject the amendments.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), a champion fighting against substance abuse in our country.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Pelosi amendment to increase drug treatment funding by \$600 million. This Nation has a problem with drug addiction, and we cannot continue to incarcerate our way out of this health crisis. With less than 5 percent of the world's population, the United States has one quarter of the world's prisoners. The rapid expansion of the U.S. prison industrial complex has been fueled by the so-called war on drugs. While all of our communities are suffering, inner city, rural, black, white, Asian, Native American, name it, we have a problem.

I am stunned and outraged by a report that was released last week by the Human Rights Watch which said that African American men are imprisoned for drug crimes at 13 times the rate of white men even though black and white rates of drug use are similar, with overall far more white than black users.

This is an American problem. In our Federal system, 60 percent of the prisoners are drug law violators with no violent criminal history. According to the latest Bureau of Justice statistics, 55 percent of convicted jail inmates are using drugs in the month before the offense. Let us stop politicizing this. Let us do something about it. Support the Pelosi amendment.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the very distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI). We must focus our health and drug control policy on drug use prevention and drug treatment. The fact is that millions and millions of Americans are in severe need of substance abuse treatment. We can start now. We can focus not only on supply reduction but also on demand reduction. To do this, we must focus on prevention and treatment. The funding provided by the Pelosi amendment will help our youth avoid a life of drugs, and it will help those that are currently drug users turn their lives around.

This investment will leverage additional local and State funds for important health services and will strengthen State and local coordination. This crucial amendment focuses on youth while allowing communities to act according to their own local policies. For

each dollar invested in drug use prevention, we will save those communities 4 or 5 dollars. That is the offset we should account for.

Effective prevention programs engage youth interactively. I urge all my colleagues to support the Pelosi amendment.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK), a member of the committee.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) for allowing me to speak on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), in offering this amendment, correctly states that drugs are a huge problem in the United States. They destroy lives. They destroy lives of people who voluntarily get involved with drugs. I would hope that we would put some emphasis on self-responsibility into any debate such as this.

I know that the gentlewoman is wanting to give assistance through drug treatment programs to help people that have gotten themselves caught in drugs to get out of it. That is good, but it is not as though we are not doing anything. Among the multiple billions and billions of dollars of tax money that is spent to combat drugs, on top of the private plans and the private money that goes to combat them, but one part of the tax money that we already have is \$2.7 billion for the very program to which the gentlewoman wants to add another \$600 million. Yet to hear some people talk, one would think that we are not doing anything and that somehow the people who are not using drugs are responsible for those who are using drugs.

Now, we want to help them. We want to help them get out of that cycle, but it is not done by trying to say it is penny-pinching Republicans that somehow are at fault. No. It is the people who use drugs that are at fault, and we are trying to help them. We are trying to help society. We have a \$2.7 billion substance abuse treatment program already. So let us not pretend that nothing is being done. For goodness' sakes, let us have some priorities. We have an overall budget of the amount to spend because one of the other things that has drained so much from this country is when we have had these massive Federal deficits that obscenely push debt on to our kids and our grandkids and destroy their futures, just as drugs destroy them. One of the drugs is addiction to Federal spending.

When we have had deficits of hundreds of billions of dollars each year, it is because people offer amendments that say let us just spend another \$600 million; I do not know where it will come from, but let us just spend it.

They say, well, our proposal is do not lower anyone's taxes. We had a vote on lowering taxes in this House last week. It received bipartisan support; two-thirds of the House, on the estate tax,

on the death tax. That is one of many tax proposals. I know some people say look, do not give relief to people that have been supporting the highest level of taxes since World War II. We have an addiction here in Washington that many people have to spending and just spend and spend and spend.

□ 2015

That is every bit as damaging to this country as the addiction of people that are on drugs. We have got to break both of those habits. So we are funding substance abuse programs. We are funding huge amounts of it. But let us also make sure that we set an example and not have Washington politicians that are addicted to spending and say, to stop one addiction, we will feed another. That is not going to work.

This amendment, if the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) wants to offer a cut someplace else to offset that spending, that might be in order. I cannot support the adoption of this amendment. I urge a no vote.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), a Congresswoman who has worked very hard to fight substance abuse in our country.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, of course, we have to be careful how we spend money, but it is not just how much, it is how wisely we spend the money. We might as well put our money on programs that we know work. We know that treatment and prevention are more cost effective than other options. Each dollar invested in drug abuse prevention saves \$15 in reduced health and social and criminal justice and other societal costs. Each dollar invested in drug abuse prevention will save communities \$4 to \$5 for drug abuse, counseling, and treatment.

Recent studies show that substance abuse treatment services have lasting and significant benefits; 50 percent decrease in drug and alcohol use 1 year after completing treatment; 43 percent decrease in homelessness; 19 percent increase in employment.

We can win a war on drugs. We know how to spend money. It is not with helicopters in Colombia, but it is with the Pelosi amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) has 30 seconds remaining.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES), who is a former prosecutor, member of the freshman class, who knows of what she speaks on this substance abuse challenge in our country.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding me this time. It is important that we invest money in treatment. Having served as a judge for 10 years and a prosecutor for 8 years, I have seen how treatment works.

We spend a lot of money building jails to keep people in jail and spend no money for treatment. People go to jail with an addiction. They come out of jail with an addiction. It is important that we as a country recognize the need for treatment, the demand for treatment, and put money in treatment. That is where it works. We know it works. We spend money building jails. Let us spend some money on treatment.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to close.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues have very eloquently pointed out what a good investment that treatment on demand and prevention are to our people in need of substance abuse treatment in our country. They have also pointed out that it is a wise investment, that it saves money, that it is 23 times more effective than a source country control that we are proposing that is being proposed in the supplemental bill.

But I want to make another point, Mr. Chairman; and that is that this Committee of the Whole could make this \$600 million investment and save us a great deal of money in the short and long run.

We could follow the lead of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), our distinguished chairman. In this bill, he has reported out of the committee \$500 million worth of spending that has been designated emergency, that has not required any offset as long as there is a request of an emergency requirement as defined by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act.

So this is not going afield. It is following the example. If the Republicans could find this emergency standing for their priorities, why cannot we do it for people who need help in our country on the substance abuse side?

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, we can agree about the importance of drug treatment and drug prevention; and for that reason, we funded this account at the exact amount that the President asked us in his budget to fund it.

Someone said a minute ago, we are spending no money on drug treatment. We are spending \$1.631 billion on drug treatment. It is a lot of money. I would readily admit there is more need there, but we are funding at the level the President requested. We are acting within our responsibility. That is our job. That is what we are doing.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part: "An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law."

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member desire to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, regretfully, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) is correct on his point of order. The Republican majority has not allowed us to bring this bill, this amendment, to the floor in the same fashion that other priorities that the gentleman put in the bill coming out of full committee received protection under emergency standing.

This \$600 million for treatment in demand is at least as important as the priorities that received that emergency status coming out of the full committee. So the idea that this should not apply, we should not be able to bring this here because we do not have an offset we just want to be treated like the Republican priorities. By that, I do not mean the Republican priority of giving a tax cut to the wealthiest 1 percent of our people, giving a \$200 billion tax cut to 400 Americans, to 400 Americans when we have 3.5 million people in our country who need substance abuse.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) will confine her remarks to the point of order.

Ms. PELOSI. Further to the point of order, there is a lot of money in the supplemental bill, if that ever sees the light of day, for treating the drug abuse problem in our country by sending military assistance to Colombia. We think this is a better way.

So I wish that it were in order. But I have to concede that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) is correct. The Republicans protect the tax cut, they protect their own spending priorities, but they do not protect that.

Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded and sustained.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, let me, first of all, acknowledge the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member, for his kindness and hard work on this issue along with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), chairman of the committee.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) knows that I testified in front of the subcommittee on the issue of mental health services for children. So I had intended during this process, this appropriations process, to offer an amendment to do more than what the administration has done. Frankly, I do not think it is enough.

The administration asked for \$86 million, and I know that the bill has funded children's mental health services at \$86 million, but let me explain why I have come to suggest that we need to do more. We will look forward to working with the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), who is ably a member of the Subcommittee on Labor,

Health and Human Services, and Education, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), who has done a phenomenal job as it relates to mental health across the board on expressing the consternation about dealing with mental health, period, in this Nation.

First all, we have the question of parity and stigma. So I want to raise the issue of what is happening to our children. I fully believe that Columbine and Jonesboro, the 6-year-old little boy that shot his 6-year-old classmate, the 13-year-old boy that shot his teacher, the little boy in Pontiac, Michigan, who shot someone at age 11, and the tragedy that has happened in my own 18th Congressional District where, just yesterday, on Sunday, a 14-year-old girl shot and killed a 16-year-old boy tends to, not only the issue of guns, but it deals with the holistic approach to children.

We need better mental health services for our children. My amendment was to add \$10 million more to mental health services for children. It is because of articles like this on the front cover of *Ebony*, "Out of the Closet, the Mental Health Crisis in Black America." It comes to the hearing that was held in my district with Senator PAUL WELLSTONE, "Panel told of mental health ills," when over 30 witnesses talked about the crisis that they feel in their own families, with their own children, or setting the National Congress for Hispanic Mental Health, and the Hispanic community is crying out for more resources, or the Mental Health Awareness Campaign that shows that we need to do something about people in crisis.

Today more than 13.7 million children suffer from mental health problems. The National Mental Health Association reports that people who commit suicide have a mental or emotional disorder. The most common is depression.

Although one in five children in adolescence has a diagnosable mental, emotional, or behavioral problem that could lead to school failure, substance abuse, violence or suicide, 75 to 80 percent of these children do not receive any services in the form of specialty treatment or some form of mental health intervention.

That is why we must increase the funding for comprehensive children's mental health services to reach the 75 to 80 percent of children suffering from mental illness.

Both the National Mental Health Association and the Federation of Families for Children Mental Health Services support increased funding for children's mental health and agree that we need to focus this Nation's attention and intervention measures so that we can prevent tragedies like Columbine, Paducah, Littleton, and Jonesboro.

I, too, believe that there can be relief for those who need some form of tax relief. But I do believe that we are, if you will, harvesting dollars for big tax cuts, rather than looking at the basic quality-of-life needs of our children.

The grant programs funded under the Comprehensive Community Mental Health Services programs are critical to ensure that children with mental health problems and their families have access to a full array of quality and appropriate care in their communities. They simply do not have it.

Some of the testimony that came was the frustration of parents that said I do not know where to go. I cannot leave out of my apartment or my rental house and go down the street to a community health clinic and get the kind of mental health services that I need. That stifles the opportunity to heal and to cure these children who need us to listen and need us to protect them and need us to heal them. To date, there have not been sufficient funds to award grants to communities in all of the States.

The story of Kip Kinkle, the 15-year-old student who shot his parents and went to school to kill several others, is tragic, yet illuminating. For 3 years before this horrendous event, Kip suffered from psychosis and he heard voices. Yet, no one did anything to address this situation. No teacher sent him to the nurse, and no one asked his parents to take him to a doctor to find out what was wrong.

When they did, what they talked about was that he was using profanity in class. He was, but he was responding to the voices in his head.

Kip Kinkle needed help. He needed help in his school. He needed help at home. This is not to blame the parents. It is to provide the kind of resources that are necessary.

I have worked diligently to bring attention to this most devastating problem.

As I indicated, I want to applaud the leadership of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for his forward-thinking leadership in years past. Mr. Chairman, I would simply say that, again, I am grieved down on an important issue; but I am gratified to have the opportunity to make the case.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer this Amendment to increase the funding for the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration by \$10 million dollars by decreasing the funding for the Chronic and Environmental Disease Prevention under the CDC.

For technical reasons, I realize that this Amendment does not specifically earmark the funds for comprehensive children's mental health services, but that is the intent of the Amendment. Children's Mental Health needs to be a national priority in this country today.

Currently, we spend 10 times the amount on research into childhood cancer, than on children's mental health, yet one of five children is affected by some sort of mental illness.

Today, more than 13.7 million children suffer from mental health problems. The National Mental Health Association reports that most people who commit suicide have a mental or emotional disorder. The most common is depression.

Although one in five children and adolescents has a diagnosable mental, emotional, or behavioral problem that can lead to school

failure, substance abuse, violence or suicide, 75 to 80 percent of these children do not receive any services in the form of specialty treatment or some form of mental health intervention.

This is why we must increase the funding for comprehensive children's mental health services to reach this 75 to 80 percent of children suffering from mental illness.

Both the National Mental Health Association and the Federation of Families for Children's Mental Health Services support increased funding for children's mental health and agree that we need to focus this nation's attention on intervention measures so that we can prevent tragedies like Columbine, Paducah, Littleton and Jonesboro.

The grant programs funded under the comprehensive community mental health services program are critical to insure that children with mental health problems and their families have access to a full array of quality and appropriate care in their communities. To date, there have not been sufficient funds to award grants to communities in all the states.

The story of Kip Kinkle, the fifteen year-old student who shot his parents and went to school to kill several other students is tragic, yet illuminating.

For three years before this horrendous event, Kip suffered from psychosis and heard voices, yet no one did anything to address this situation. No teacher sent him to the nurse and no one asked his parents to take him to a doctor to find out what was wrong.

I have worked diligently to bring attention to this most devastating problem in our society by holding not one, but two hearings on children's mental health. The first was through the Congressional Children's Caucus and the second, in my district in Houston along with Senator PAUL WELLSTONE.

At the joint hearing in Houston we had over 30 witnesses to speak on the need to increased diagnostic services for children's mental health. Additionally, we discussed the link between suicide and mental health disorders.

According to the 1999 Report of the U.S. Surgeon General, for young people 15–24 years old, suicide is the third leading cause of death behind intentional injury and homicide.

Persons under the age of 25 accounted for 15 percent of all suicides in 1997. Between 1980 and 1997, suicide rates for those 15–19 years old increased 11 percent and for those between the ages of 10–14, the suicide rates increased 99 percent since 1980.

Within every 1 hour and 57 minutes, a person under the age of 25 completes suicide. The fact that 8 out of 10 suicidal persons give some sign of their intentions also begs the question, why do we not make children's mental health a national priority.

We know that more teenagers died from suicide than from cancer, heart disease, AIDS, birth defects, strokes, influenza and chronic lung disease combined.

Because childhood depression is so very prevalent, we must recognize the dire need for increased services to treat our youth. Almost 12 young people between between the ages of 15–24 die everyday by suicide.

Nationwide, 20.5 percent of high school students have stated on self-report surveys that they have seriously considered attempting suicide during the preceding 12 months. These are just some of the alarming statistics related to children's mental health.

Last week's killing of a Florida teacher by a 13-year-old honor student is just a most recent attempt in a series of increasingly violent attacks perpetrated by adolescents in the past few years. Columbine, Littleton, and Paducah are just a few indicators that the possible lack of access to mental health services has resulted in an increase of children becoming involved in criminal activity and becoming involved in the juvenile justice or child protective systems.

Our children need to be listened to . . . they need to be heard. Children are complex human beings. Although they are young, they send us signals when they are troubled; the real tragedy occurs when adults do not listen to those signals or provide them with the help that they need. Effective mental health resources in our communities and schools can help in many instances prevent these acts of violence and suicide among our youth.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment that provides the additional funding necessary to address mental illness so that our children will not continue to suffer needlessly because of a lack of mental health resources.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD the Houston Chronicle article entitled "Panel Told of Mental Health Ills," as follows:

PANEL TOLD OF MENTAL HEALTH ILLS
SUICIDE ATTEMPTS BY CHILDREN CITED
(By Janette Rodrigues)

Alma Cobb trembled with nervous tension Thursday as she told a roomful of strangers the ways her 14-year-old son, David, has tried to commit suicide since his first attempt at age 5.

But her voice was surprisingly firm.

"He tried to hang himself, stab himself and electrocute himself," Cobb testified during a hearing Thursday on children's mental health needs called by U.S. Rep. Sheila Jackson Lee, D-Houston.

A transcript of the hearing will go into the congressional record. Jackson Lee and Sen. Paul Wellstone, D-Minn., who also attended the hearing, hope to use the transcript in getting Congress to pass legislation improving children's mental health services.

Studies estimate that 13.7 million American school children suffer from mental health, emotional or behavioral problems. In the Houston area alone, more than 178,000 will need mental health care during their school years.

Suicide and entry into the juvenile criminal justice system are by-products, advocates say, of a society that shuns the issue and hasn't exerted the political will to address preventable problems.

Cobb's story and that of other such parents, services providers and mental health professionals was compelling, and sometimes moving.

But what Cobb has experienced is startling.

Her daughter, Clara, 14, also suffers from emotional and behavioral disorders. She first tried to kill herself at age 7. She and her brother have been absent from school because of their diagnosed mental illness and numerous hospitalizations related to suicide attempts.

Despite documentation of that fact, Cobb said later, the district where her children attend school considered her children truants, not sick, and fined her more than \$3,000 and took her to court.

"Sometimes, my children can't attend school because of their mental illness and suicide attempts, but schools don't understand it," Cobb said, "They just understand their regulations."

Regina Hicks, deputy director of child and adolescent services for the Harris County Mental Health/Mental Retardation Authority, is familiar with the Cobb family's story. The children receive services through the agency.

Hicks said their struggle with the school district is unusual but, unfortunately, not unheard of in cases involving children.

Studies show that at least one in five children and teens in America has a mental illness that may lead to school failure, substance abuse, violence or suicide.

Most such schoolchildren don't receive adequate help because of the stigma attached to their condition, the lack of early intervention and scarce resources, mental health care professionals and service providers told the hearing.

Speaker after speaker voiced the need for increased funding.

"In Texas, we must be particularly concerned that the state budget for children's mental health services has remained virtually flat since 1993, despite growth in both population and need," said Betty Schwartz, executive director of the Mental Health Association of Greater Houston.

"Current budget discussions offer little hope for improvement in the coming legislative session."

Harris County Juvenile Court Associate Judge Veronica Morgan-Price said the piece of MHMRA's budgetary pie for juveniles is small.

She and others spoke of their frustration that the juvenile justice system has become a surrogate for mental health facilities.

Many said it's the norm in Harris County for mentally ill juveniles to get adequate help only after they commit an act that ends with them in a detention facility.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill through page 37, line 2 be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill from page 32, line 1 through page 37, line 12 is as follows:

AGENCY FOR HEALTHCARE RESEARCH AND
QUALITY

HEALTHCARE RESEARCH AND QUALITY

For carrying out titles III and IX of the Public Health Service Act, and part A of title XI of the Social Security Act, \$123,669,000; in addition, amounts received from Freedom of Information Act fees, reimbursable and interagency agreements, and the sale of data shall be credited to this appropriation and shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount made available pursuant to section 926(b) of the Public Health Service Act shall not exceed \$99,980,000.

HEALTH CARE FINANCING ADMINISTRATION
GRANTS TO STATES FOR MEDICAID

For carrying out, except as otherwise provided, titles XI and XIX of the Social Security Act, \$93,586,251,000, to remain available until expended.

For making, after May 31, 2001, payments to States under title XIX of the Social Security Act for the last quarter of fiscal year 2001 for unanticipated costs, incurred for the current fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary.

For making payments to States or in the case of section 1928 on behalf of States under title XIX of the Social Security Act for the first quarter of fiscal year 2002, \$36,207,551,000, to remain available until expended.

Payment under title XIX may be made for any quarter with respect to a State plan or plan amendment in effect during such quarter, if submitted in or prior to such quarter and approved in that or any subsequent quarter.

PAYMENTS TO HEALTH CARE TRUST FUNDS

For payment to the Federal Hospital Insurance and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds, as provided under sections 217(g) and 1844 of the Social Security Act, sections 103(c) and 111(d) of the Social Security Amendments of 1965, section 278(d) of Public Law 97-248, and for administrative expenses incurred pursuant to section 201(g) of the Social Security Act, \$70,381,600,000.

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

For carrying out, except as otherwise provided, titles XI, XVIII, XIX, and XXI of the Social Security Act, titles XIII and XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, and the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments of 1988, not to exceed \$1,866,302,000, to be transferred from the Federal Hospital Insurance and the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds, as authorized by section 201(g) of the Social Security Act; together with all funds collected in accordance with section 353 of the Public Health Service Act and such sums as may be collected from authorized user fees and the sale of data, which shall remain available until expended, and together with administrative fees collected relative to Medicare overpayment recovery activities, which shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That all funds derived in accordance with 31 U.S.C. 9701 from organizations established under title XIII of the Public Health Service Act shall be credited to and available for carrying out the purposes of this appropriation: *Provided further*, That \$18,000,000 appropriated under this heading for the managed care system redesign shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Health and Human Services is directed to collect fees in fiscal year 2001 from Medicare+Choice organizations pursuant to section 1857(e)(2) of the Social Security Act and from eligible organizations with risk-sharing contracts under section 1876 of that Act pursuant to section 1876(k)(4)(D) of that Act: *Provided further*, That, for the current fiscal year, not more than \$630,000,000 may be made available under section 1817(k)(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395i(k)(4)) from the Health Care Fraud and Abuse Control Account of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund to carry out the Medicare Integrity Program under section 1893 of such Act.

HEALTH MAINTENANCE ORGANIZATION LOAN AND
LOAN GUARANTEE FUND

For carrying out subsections (d) and (e) of section 1308 of the Public Health Service Act, any amounts received by the Secretary in connection with loans and loan guarantees under title XIII of the Public Health Service Act, to be available without fiscal year limitation for the payment of outstanding obligations. During fiscal year 2001, no commitments for direct loans or loan guarantees shall be made.

ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES
PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR CHILD SUPPORT
ENFORCEMENT AND FAMILY SUPPORT PROGRAMS

For making payments to States or other non-Federal entities under titles I, IV-D, X, XI, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act and the Act of July 5, 1960 (24 U.S.C. ch. 9), \$2,473,800,000, to remain available until expended; and for such purposes for the first quarter of fiscal year 2002, \$1,000,000,000.

For making payments to each State for carrying out the program of Aid to Families

with Dependent Children under title IV-A of the Social Security Act before the effective date of the program of Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) with respect to such State, such sums as may be necessary: *Provided*, That the sum of the amounts available to a State with respect to expenditures under such title IV-A in fiscal year 1997 under this appropriation and under such title IV-A as amended by the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 shall not exceed the limitations under section 116(b) of such Act.

For making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to States or other non-Federal entities under titles I, IV-D, X, XI, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act and the Act of July 5, 1960 (24 U.S.C. ch. 9), for the last 3 months of the current year for unanticipated costs, incurred for the current fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary.

LOW INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE

For making payments under title XXVI of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, \$1,100,000,000, to be available for obligation in the period October 1, 2001 through September 30, 2002.

For making payments under title XXVI of such Act, \$300,000,000: *Provided*, That these funds are hereby designated by Congress to be emergency requirements pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That these funds shall be made available only after submission to Congress of a formal budget request by the President that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

REFUGEE AND ENTRANT ASSISTANCE

For making payments for refugee and entrant assistance activities authorized by title IV of the Immigration and Nationality Act and section 501 of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-422), \$423,109,000: *Provided*, That funds appropriated pursuant to section 414(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act for fiscal year 2001 shall be available for the costs of assistance provided and other activities through September 30, 2003.

For carrying out section 5 of the Torture Victims Relief Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-320), \$10,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to this portion of the bill?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR THE CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT

For carrying out sections 658A through 658R of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (The Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990), in addition to amounts already appropriated for fiscal year 2001, \$400,000,000; and to become available on October 1, 2001 and remain available through September 30, 2002, \$2,000,000,000: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated for each of fiscal years 2001 and 2002, \$19,120,000 shall be available for child care resource and referral and school-aged child care activities: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided for fiscal year 2002, \$172,672,000 shall be reserved by the States for activities authorized under section 658G of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (The Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990), such funds to be in addition to the amounts required to be reserved by the States under section 658G.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. HOYER

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 12 as the designee of

the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 12 offered by Mr. HOYER:
Page 37, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$417,328,000)".

Page 39, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$600,000,000)".

Page 39, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$600,000,000)".

Page 49, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$400,000,000)".

Page 50, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$416,000,000)".

Page 50, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$416,000,000)".

Page 50, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$416,000,000)".

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would advise that, under the unanimous consent agreement propounded by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) on June 8, all points of order against each of the designated amendments to be offered by Rep. OBEY or his designee shall be considered as reserved pending completion of debate thereon.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I am aware of that, if I may advise the Chair; but I simply want to reserve the point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

□ 2030

Mr. Chairman, this amendment adds \$416 million to the bill for title I grants, \$600 million to the bill for Head Start, \$400 million to the bill for the 21st Century After School Centers, and adds \$417 million to the bill for child care development block grants.

Mr. Chairman, before I start, I want to respond to a couple of the allegations that have been made from the other side. First of all, that somehow we are forced to do this. I want to say first to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), who rises on the floor and says, gee whiz, we are forced to do that, and if the rest of us are responsible we will have to live within these limits. Let me tell my colleague something I learned a long time ago, and that is to not accept the premise of those who are arguing against me.

The premise of the gentleman is incorrect, Mr. Chairman. It is irresponsible to accept the parameters that have been placed on this bill. It is irresponsible to the children that I am

going to talk about and the families that I am going to talk about to live within the parameters of the bill.

Why do we have those parameters? Not because they are in a rule, not because they were given to us by some extrinsic force, they are in the rule because of the majority party's tax cut. Now, they may not like that, but that is the fact. That is the fact.

Now, let me tell my colleague from California, who talks about fiscal responsibility. A, I support defense; B, I supported the welfare reform; and, C, as the gentleman knows, I supported the balanced budget amendment. But the fact of the matter is I did so with the premise that we would keep sufficient revenues to meet our responsibilities.

The most fiscally irresponsible administration in the history of this country was under Ronald Reagan. Hear me now. Here are the facts. Back in 1950, 125 percent of GDP we were in debt. That came down. It came down to less than 23 percent, 24 percent. It flattened out for a few years and then, guess what happened on Ronald Reagan's watch? It went through the ceiling, and added \$4 trillion to the debt.

Do not preach to this side of the aisle about fiscal responsibilities, my colleagues. At no time did we have the votes to stop a Ronald Reagan veto of spending. At no time. This is Ronald Reagan's spending. It was not a question of fiscal responsibility, it was what he wanted to spend the money on. He wanted to spend the money on defense. I happened to think he was right.

Where he was not right was doing the same thing my colleagues are doing this year. He wanted to cut and did cut revenues precipitously. But he did not have the courage of his tax-cutting convictions, because the courage of his tax-cutting convictions would have been to cut spending. But he did not want to do that because he may have paid a political price for it.

Now, let me tell my colleagues what this amendment does, quickly. We add, as I said, \$416 million for title I. The conference agreement on the Republican budget resolution requires \$7 billion in cuts, or 6 percent below the fiscal year 2000 level, last year's level. Premising large tax cuts on unrealistic spending cuts makes the conference agreement a fiscally unsound and risky budget plan.

That is why we are here, Mr. Chairman. I am offering an amendment today to fix a few of the problems. We do not have offsets within this bill because the offset premise that the gentleman from Illinois wants us to accept would be incorrect for us to do, because it is irresponsible for the gentleman to have forged, well, the gentleman did not do it, he did not vote for it, and we admire the gentleman for that, but the fact of the matter is many of the gentleman's colleagues did. They fashioned these numbers. My amendment, as I said, adds a total of \$1.8 billion.

Now, that sounds like a lot of money. But let it not surprise anybody that that figure is approximately the figure that has already been adopted by the Republican majority in the Senate. So if we are irresponsible, I guess our colleagues in the Senate over there are as well.

We ask for increases for title I funding, Head Start, 21st Century After School Centers and the child care and development block grant. The four parts to my amendment do this: Adds \$416 million, as I said, to title I.

Now, that \$416 million means that 650,000 children in America who qualify for services, and who are not now getting it, 650,000 disadvantaged children, will get services if my amendment passes. That is not paper, that is not rhetoric, those are real kids from real families who need help to compete in this world economy. Is the tax cut more important than those 650,000 kids?

We add \$600 million to Head Start, a program everybody says works, making the total increase for fiscal year 2001 equal to \$1 billion. That is an additional 50,000 low-income children who will be served and 3,000 infants and toddlers who will be served. That is 53,000 children. This is not about rhetoric and numbers, this is about real kids.

We add \$400 million to the 21st Century After School Centers. We all know that crime is up after school. Why? Because kids do not have families at home. This amendment will allow 900 additional communities above the gentleman's bill to establish 3,000 centers serving 1 million children. Is that irresponsible, I ask my chairman? Is it fiscally responsible to tell those 1 million kids to get out on the street; that we do not have enough money in the richest Nation on the face of the Earth to provide them with those centers? Those children, 1.6 million children, will be denied service because of the Republican tax cut.

Lastly, we add \$417 million for the bill for child care and development block grant for 2001 funding. Eighty thousand more children will be served if we pass this amendment.

My colleagues, we are talking about real kids here and programs that work. The chairman says and said in the committee when we marked this bill up that he thought this funding is okay. He told me that I was probably right, that we probably need to do this, but that we cannot do it because of the constraints. Those constraints are self-imposed.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) is recognized for 15 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), the chairman of the authorizing committee.

(Mr. GOODLING asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I was kind of surprised. I thought there was an overwhelming Democrat majority during the Reagan years. We cannot blame him for vetoing, because he vetoed very few bills. So there is no argument about we did not have the votes to override his veto.

But I want to compliment the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), since he has become the chairman of this subcommittee. When I think of the amount of money that has been spent prior to his coming on as chairman, and the fact that no one paid any attention about whether it was a quality program or was not, my hats are off to him.

Let us talk about a couple of the areas. Child care and development block grant, \$1.6 billion for fiscal year 2001. That is a \$400 million increase over last year. Let us talk a little bit about Head Start and how we denied children for 12 years any opportunity of getting a head start because the only thing my colleagues wanted to talk about was that we must cover more, we must cover more. No one paid any attention to whether there was any quality in the program. What a tragedy.

It was not until 1994 that we were able to get anybody to think about quality. I was able to get 25 percent of any new money at that time toward quality. But it was not until 1998 that we really got serious about it. Yet every study, every study told us over and over again that the children are not getting a head start. Why? It became a jobs poverty program. It became a baby-sitting program. What a tragedy, because we could have done something to help them. Many of them would not be in special education today because they would have had the reading readiness programs that they should have had at that time.

But, again, it was not until 1998, until we seriously thought about quality rather than quantity. And I want to thank this Secretary, because she is the first Secretary who has shut down 100 Head Start programs. I could not get anybody to do that. Thank goodness. Rather than coming up, as she was instructed to do, she was to come up every time and say we must cover more, we must cover more, we must cover more, she did not say that. Because every time I would say, we need to talk about quality, and she would say, that is correct.

So, again, we put a lot of money into Head Start, and the chairman again is increasing Head Start. It will be up to \$5.7 billion. And finally, hopefully, they will be quality programs.

Then technology in the 21st Century Community Learning Center program. Again, we have seven technology programs on the books, five of which are funded. When we just had a reauthorization program, they offered amendment after amendment to add a couple

more technology programs. No one paid any attention to the fact that having five spread over every agency we were accomplishing very little.

So if we get the other body to act, we will be talking about one technology program. So if they need to improve the preparation of the teacher to use the technology, they can do that. If they need hardware, they can do that. If they need software, they can do that. But instead of spreading them out over five different programs, spread over every agency downtown, we are going to make a real difference.

But, again, we are looking at a \$2 million increase, \$2 million above the President's request, in the area of technology.

Then, when we talk about 21st Century Community Learning Centers, funded at \$600 million, \$147 million above last year, we need to understand that, more importantly, this program just started in 1995 and it was at \$750,000. Now we are at \$905 million.

We just had a hearing, and in that hearing all sorts of questions were being raised as to whether as a matter of fact they are using the money the way the Congress intended it to be used. So, again, I cannot compliment the chairman enough for his efforts not only to bring more money to all of these programs but to insist that there are quality in those programs.

Title I, same story. Child after child after child denied an opportunity to get a part of the American Dream because, again, no one paid any attention to quality. One of the largest school districts, maybe the largest, used 55 percent of their title I money for teacher aides. And guess what? Sixty-some percent of those did not even have a high school diploma. To make matters worse, they were teaching without any supervision. So we have tried to change and redirect that.

So, again, hats off to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER). He has done an outstanding job to not only give us more money but to give us quality in programming.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) to remind me who was in charge of the Department of Education from 1981, as he was lamenting that nobody cared about quality and that nobody cared about whether these were operating effectively on behalf of children. Who was in charge of the Department of Education, Department of Human Services from 1981 to 1993?

Congress was not in charge. We did not run them. The fact of the matter is, as the gentleman pointed out, the first Secretary to tell a Head Start program it could not operate because it was not doing what we wanted for children was Donna Shalala. The gentleman was correct on that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK).

□ 2045

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland. We have given so much lip service and a lot of discussion nationwide about the importance of education. For years this has been the national dialogue coming from the grassroots. But in those days when we were talking about education, it was always there is a deficit, we cannot possibly add to the funding for education.

Finally, we now have a surplus. And what do we do? We come to the floor with a self-inflicted strait jacket ordained from somewhere that we cannot spend this money as the national electorate would want us to spend it.

Certainly we are for quality education. Certainly we are for quality Head Start and all the other programs. But quality costs money. It seems to me that it is absolutely tragic and reprehensible that the appropriators come to the floor and discuss to cut \$1.8 billion from the President's request. It means thousands of people are going to be denied the opportunity to have help in Head Start, in child-care programs, in after-school programs, in math instruction and reading, all the things that will narrow the divide between the poor and the rich children of this society.

We always talk about equal educational opportunity. The place to do it is for the poor children in the early-education programs and in child care.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), a valued member of our subcommittee.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my subcommittee chairman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, this is really an amendment about four important programs: to add money to title I, grants to LEAS, to Head Start, 21st Century After-School Centers, and child care CCDBG for fiscal year 2001.

But as with most of these amendments, from my Democratic colleagues, it turns out to be an opportunity for discussion about Republican tax cuts. And for my friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), just a few moments ago, it turned out to be an opportunity to denounce the record of President Ronald Reagan, who did lead this Congress in 1981 to cut taxes on the American people so that they could keep a little more of their money.

My friend from Maryland suggests, and I believe I am quoting him correctly, that President Reagan was willing to do without revenues, to cut back on revenues, so that he could cut taxes.

Well, I have here in my hand a document entitled Table B-80, Federal Receipts and Outlays. It is for the past 60 past years, 1940 to the year 2000. And it shows very clearly, when we talk about total revenue to the Nation, that, back

in 1981, when President Reagan persuaded a Democrat House to go along with the Senate of the United States in cutting taxes, that revenues then were \$678.2 billion per year.

This document, put out by the Department of the Treasury and the Office of Management and Budget, and I defy any Member of this House of Representatives to show me that it is incorrect, shows that, under the Reagan years after those tax cuts, revenues went up each and every year after these tax cuts that had been denounced by my friend from Maryland.

In 1982, revenues went up from \$678 billion to \$745 billion dollars. They went up in 1983. They went up in 1984. Until in 1989, the last year of the Reagan administration, revenues, not spending, but revenues to the Federal Government, even after these substantial tax cuts, had virtually doubled to \$1.143 trillion. And this is even after the tax cuts that Democrats supported and that Republicans supported in 1981.

What it shows, and what it has shown every time is that when we have cut taxes on the people of America, that they have used the money wisely, that the economy has grown. It happened again in 1997. It happened as far back as the 1960s, when President Kennedy cut taxes. Every time we cut taxes, there is an enhancement of economic activity and revenue increases.

Now, also, another point that my friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), made is that President Reagan had an opportunity to veto the spending that occurred during his term in office. And that is true. But I will tell my colleagues one thing that President Reagan did not have an opportunity to veto is the increase in entitlement spending that went on from fiscal year 1981 to fiscal year 1989.

And as the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) well knows, that is where the growth in Federal expenditures came, not in appropriation bills that President Reagan could or could not have vetoed, but in entitlement spending.

So I will just say to my friends that, while we are hearing tonight and we heard last week, we can and undoubtedly we will hear again tomorrow before this bill is passed and probably we will hear on every appropriation bill, that we are having to cut back on important programs because Republicans want to cut taxes, actually the opposite is true. Every time we have cut taxes under Democrat Presidents, under Republican Presidents and even under this Democrat President, there has been more economic activity, there has been more revenue to spend, and the American people have been the beneficiaries thereof.

I defy anyone from the Democratic side of the aisle to dispute the fact that revenues went up during the Reagan administration.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking about bipartisanship in terms of the estate tax. And indeed that is what happened. But how about some partisanship in terms of the education of our children? We cannot balance the budget on the backs of kids who cannot defend themselves.

I rise in strong support of the Hoyer amendment to significantly increase funding for our Nation's children.

Many of my colleagues have emphasized on both sides of the aisle that this amendment could be a lifeline perhaps. It will ensure that our children have a chance for a better education and growth opportunities.

In my hometown of Paterson, New Jersey, we have seen the tangible benefits of so many of the programs. These are not puristic victories. These are victories of substance with children who would have no other means of support in the classroom.

Our Head Start and after-school programs have brought thousands of children into nurturing environments. In an age of unprecedented wealth and the lowest peacetime unemployment rate, cities like Paterson and Passaic still have double-digit unemployment.

I understand tomorrow we even introduce an amendment to cut the after-school programs that are already in existence. This is unconscionable.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman who just spoke that the amendment of the gentleman makes additions in four different line items; items we have increased over the last year by almost a billion dollars.

There are no cuts here, none at all. They are important accounts. We gave them substantial increases, except in one case, \$947 million of increases. I think we have done the very best we can within fiscal responsibility.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY).

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Hoyer amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I only have a short amount of time, but I think there is something we should talk about very seriously.

After-school programs do work. Unfortunately, we are going to see cuts in New York State alone. I was in my schools this morning. And I know our schools want it, our parents want it, and certainly our children want it.

We are seeing more and more children being left alone after school. We can take that time, and we can use that time to make sure our children are enriched with academic programs, making sure they are in a safe environment, and certainly raising their intellect on everything else.

Why am I doing this? Why am I supporting this? Because I happen to think

that is one way of reducing crime, because I happen to think that is one way of making sure our young people do not go into drugs and alcohol and then violence.

This is a program that can work, it should work, and certainly we should be supporting this.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to just re-edify that this bill increases education, if we include Head Start, \$2 billion. There is no one wanting to take education away from kids. It increases it \$2 billion over last year if we include Head Start.

If we take a look, it increases special education \$500 million, not cut, but \$500 million. Impact aid, which the President zeroed out, is increased under this bill, which is very important to Native Americans and also to the military.

Plus, the Ed Flex bill that we passed last year with bipartisan support gives the schools the ability to use the dollars as they see fit, not as Washington rules down the mandates which ties up the schools. That is one of the reasons the charter school movement that we pushed for years is so important.

So we have not cut education, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

(Mr. CARDIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, let me just speak to one part of the Hoyer amendment which deals with the Child Care and Development Block Grant.

The Hoyer amendment would provide an additional \$418 million for this program. This is flexible funds to our States to provide for child care for our children.

The Subcommittee on Human Resources of the Committee on Ways and Means has held a hearing, and we found that affordable quality day-care is not available to too many children in our country. Only five States set the eligibility for the funds at the maximum allowed under Federal law, 85 percent of the median income.

Forty-five States are below that. My own State of Maryland set it at 40 percent. Only one out of every 10 children who are eligible today for the funds can get the money because of the lack of Federal funds.

The Hoyer amendment provides help for 80,000 children in this category. We should be supporting this amendment today.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, what we are arguing about here is not crime, is not child care, is not education. What we are ar-

guing is how much of an increase the House mark increases funding for all these programs.

What the Democrats are trying to do with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is increase it further.

We certainly support after-school child care. We certainly support the block grants. We are a strong supporter of Head Start. That is why it has increased every year under Republican leadership.

But the Hoyer amendment fails to make the case as to why these funding levels were picked. Could he explain why he decided that when we go from \$600 million on the 21st Century After-School Centers he goes to a thousand, why that level?

□ 2100

Was there scientific? Was there research? Was there testimony to that effect? No, there was not. All the Democrats are trying to do is increase our increase to show that they measure compassion by dollars spent. It is not going to do the job.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, if we can pass a defense appropriations bill that is \$20 billion more than last year, if we can find the money for nuclear weapons, if we can find funding for a misguided missile defense system, surely, surely, we can pass the Hoyer amendment to help our most vulnerable children.

As I look at the provisions in this bill, I ask myself, who is taking care of our children? Where will our children go after school? Where will our children find the guidance they need? Who will help poor children prepare to enter school? The Hoyer amendment restores some of the most damaging cuts in H.R. 4577, cuts that deny nearly 2.4 million children the help that they need to get a better start in life.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES), whose predecessor I might say, Mr. Chairman, Louis Stokes, was one of the great leaders on our committee.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. Let me say this. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) said that the studies have shown that Head Start does not work so we should not give any more money to Head Start. The studies have shown that jail does not work so why do we keep building jails? If I adopt his perspective of spending more money on jails, then let us at least spend the same amount of money that we spend on child care and day care and Head Start, because Head Start works and our children ought to have at least the benefit of a great education in the beginning and hopefully they do not end up in jail.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time. I will

close as I began. First of all, I do not adopt the premise it was an irresponsible budget that was adopted. The gentleman from Illinois has acknowledged that these expenditures are good. Secondly, the gentleman from Georgia asked, where do these numbers come from? Frankly they came from the President, adopted by the United States Senate, as well, and I think they ought to be adopted by us. Thirdly, I would say to my colleagues, this is about real children, disadvantaged children, 2.4 million children who will be served if this amendment passes that will not be served at the level you suggest.

Now, maybe you think there are not 2.4 million children in America who need help. Maybe you think like, as the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) said, that it is those 400 people who are going to get \$200 billion under the tax cut that are more important than those 2.4 million children. That is quite a balance; 400 very rich people getting \$200 billion while we cut \$1.8 billion in this amendment for 2.4 million children. What kind of Nation has that kind of priority? It is a Nation that will not long succeed. It is a Nation whose children will not compete effectively in world markets. It is a Nation who will see itself increasingly becoming a Nation of the rich and the poor. Let us adopt this amendment. Let us set our priorities straight. Let us act to help those 2.4 million children.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me say once again, the gentleman says that it is irresponsible not to adopt these amendments. The fact is the amendment are in violation of the budget resolution. The budget resolution was adopted by the majority of both Houses of the Congress. We have to live within it even though the gentleman does not feel bound by it.

Let me add that the gentleman could have offered responsible amendments that have offsets within the limits of that budget resolution and within the limits of our allocation but the gentleman chose not to. In fact, it is crystal clear year after year that nobody on that side of the aisle is willing ever to cut anything, but always add.

We have to operate within a budget resolution that is fiscally responsible. We have added \$947 million, almost \$1 billion to these four line items. We are doing the best we can. They are important priorities.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. HOYER. Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland will state his point of order.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois has made a point. Mr. Chairman, would I have been in order to offer an amendment to add \$1.883 billion to serve those 2.4 million

by reducing the tax cut that is proposed?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will not entertain a hypothetical question.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I am raising a point of order with reference to whether I would be in order to offer such an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will not address a hypothetical question.

Mr. HOYER. Shall I offer the amendment and then have it ruled on?

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it is in violation of section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. The Committee on Appropriations filed a suballocation of Budget Totals for fiscal year 2001 on June 8, 2000, House Report 106-660. This amendment would provide new budget authority in excess of the subcommittee suballocation made under section 302(b) and is not permitted under section 302(f) of the act.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to address the point of order?

Mr. HOYER. Yes, I do wish to address the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, I asked the point of order. I offered an amendment. The amendment under consideration by the Chair now as to whether or not it is in order is an amendment to add \$1.883 billion to the bill for the purposes of including 2.4 million children within the ambit of the bill. This bill deals at its base with individuals who are getting child care services, getting Head Start services, getting educational services generally, getting before- and after-care at school. This would expand that.

Mr. Chairman, this is extraordinarily relevant to the provisions of this bill.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is not addressing the point of order, if I may suggest.

Mr. HOYER. I am addressing the substance of the bill and the relevancy of my amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. HOYER. I am about to say that but for the tax cut, there would be revenues available to have paid for this amendment. I understand the Chair is going to rule it out of order because the Committee on Rules has not protected it and therefore has dictated the ruling of the Chair. I regret that, but more importantly than that, the 2.4 million children of America who will not be served regret that.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further Members that wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to make sure I understand on this point of order, though, and make it abundantly clear to all Members of the House that if this amendment had off-sets to make up for these additional massive spending increases by simply taking the dollars and reducing them elsewhere in the bill, this amendment would, in fact, be in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will not address hypothetical questions.

The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair is authoritatively guided by an estimate of the Committee on the Budget, pursuant to section 312 of the Budget Act, that an amendment providing a net increase in new discretionary budget authority greater than \$1 million would cause a breach of the pertinent allocation of such authority.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) on its face proposes to increase the level of new discretionary budget authority in the bill by greater than \$1 million. As such, the amendment would violate section 302(f) of the Budget Act.

The point of order is sustained. The amendment is not in order.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Illinois as to what his intention is with respect to proceeding with this bill at this point. As he knows, in the discussion which occurred that was attendant to the approval of the unanimous consent request last week, when he propounded that unanimous consent request, I would read from page H4106 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. When the gentleman asked unanimous consent that the agreement be approved under which we are now operating, I said as follows:

Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I simply would note under my reservation, Mr. Speaker, that I have no objection to this arrangement, with the understanding that when the House returns to this bill, it will not be at a time when Members are still flying back to Washington on their airplanes, and that it will not be debated in the dead of night.

I did that because this is the major priorities debate for the session. We feel very strongly on this side of the aisle that if we cannot get votes on amendments, at least we ought to be able to debate them at a time when Members are here and someone is at least paying attention to the debate. And we offered to have other appropriation bills on the floor tonight rather than this one so that that could be accommodated and we could still finish the scheduled work this week. We had been told this morning that it was understood on the majority side of the aisle under those conditions this bill would come up this evening but that we would not proceed past 9 o'clock.

So I am asking the gentleman at this point what his intention is with respect to proceeding with the bill beyond this point since it is now 9:12.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. PORTER. It is my understanding that we have pending to be completed this week in addition to this piece of legislation the appropriations for the Department of Interior and the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, and that we also have pending

a conference report on military construction. As the gentleman well knows, tomorrow morning we have in full committee the Commerce-Justice-State appropriation. There is a great deal of work to do. I do not know where we are going to get the time to get it accomplished unless we are willing to work to some reasonable hour. I would suggest to the gentleman that it would be appropriate if we would continue longer this evening and try to complete some of these additional amendments if we possibly could so that we can complete this bill by tomorrow, if possible.

Mr. OBEY. I would simply then observe, Mr. Chairman, that the unanimous consent agreement was agreed to with the understanding that is stipulated in the RECORD. There is no question about being willing to work, but it is not the fault of the minority that the majority party went home Friday without even getting a rule out of the Committee on Rules for the Interior bill, for instance, which could have easily been on the floor tonight.

I think what is going on here, not certainly on the part of the gentleman because I think in his heart of hearts he agrees with me, but I think what is going on here is a determination by the majority party to debate this bill at a time of day when it will be the least noticed of any major appropriation bill before the House. If we cannot rely on each other's word around here, and I am certainly not speaking about the gentleman from Illinois, but if we cannot rely on each other's word around here, then we do not have any civility at all left in this place.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION: OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

□ 2115

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were ayes 15, noes 17.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 202, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 255]

AYES—187

Abercrombie	Blumenauer	Conyers
Ackerman	Bonior	Costello
Allen	Borski	Coyne
Baca	Boucher	Cramer
Baird	Boyd	Crowley
Baldacci	Brady (PA)	Cummings
Baldwin	Brown (FL)	Davis (FL)
Barcia	Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)
Barrett (WI)	Capps	DeFazio
Becerra	Capuano	DeGette
Bentsen	Cardin	Delahunt
Berkley	Carson	Deutsch
Berman	Clay	Dicks
Berry	Clayton	Dingell
Bishop	Clement	Dixon
Blagojevich	Clyburn	Doggett

Doyle	Levin	Rahall
Edwards	Lewis (GA)	Rangel
Engel	Lipinski	Reyes
Eshoo	Lofgren	Rivers
Etheridge	Lowey	Rodriguez
Evans	Lucas (KY)	Rothman
Farr	Luther	Roybal-Allard
Filner	Maloney (CT)	Rush
Forbes	Markey	Sanchez
Ford	Mascara	Sanford
Frank (MA)	Matsui	Saxton
Frost	McCarthy (MO)	Sanders
Gejdenson	McCarthy (NY)	Schaffer
Gonzalez	McDermott	Sensenbrenner
Green (TX)	McGovern	Sessions
Hall (OH)	McIntyre	Shadegg
Hastings (FL)	McKinney	Shaw
Hill (IN)	McNulty	Shays
Hilliard	Meehan	Sherwood
Hinchee	Meek (FL)	Siskiy
Hinojosa	Meeks (NY)	Skelton
Holden	Menendez	Slaughter
Holt	Millender-	Smith (WA)
Hooley	McDonald	Snyder
Hoyer	Miller, George	Spratt
Inslee	Minge	Stabenow
Jackson (IL)	Mink	Stenholm
Jackson-Lee	Moakley	Strickland
(TX)	Mollohan	Stupak
Jefferson	Moore	Tanner
John	Moran (VA)	Tauscher
Johnson, E. B.	Murtha	Taylor (MS)
Jones (OH)	Nadler	Thompson (CA)
Kanjorski	Napolitano	Thompson (MS)
Kaptur	Neal	Thurman
Kennedy	Oberstar	Tierney
Kildee	Obey	Turner
Kilpatrick	Olver	Udall (CO)
Kind (WI)	Ortiz	Velazquez
Klecza	Pallone	Visclosky
Klink	Pascrell	Waters
Kucinich	Pastor	Watt (NC)
LaFalce	Pelosi	Weiner
Lampson	Peterson (MN)	Wexler
Lantos	Phelps	Weygand
Larson	Pomeroy	Woolsey
Lee	Price (NC)	Wu
		Wynn

NOES—202

Aderholt	Dunn	Kelly
Archer	Ehlers	King (NY)
Army	Ehrlich	Kingston
Bachus	Emerson	Knollenberg
Balleger	English	Kolbe
Barr	Everett	Kuykendall
Barrett (NE)	Fletcher	LaHood
Bartlett	Foley	Latham
Barton	Fossella	LaTourrette
Bass	Fowler	Leach
Bereuter	Franks (NJ)	Lewis (CA)
Biggert	Frelinghuysen	Lewis (KY)
Bilbray	Galleghy	LoBiondo
Bilirakis	Ganske	Lucas (OK)
Bliley	Gekas	Manzullo
Blunt	Gibbons	McCreery
Boehert	Gilchrist	McHugh
Boehner	Gilman	McInnis
Bonilla	Goode	McKeon
Bono	Goodling	Mica
Boswell	Goss	Miller (FL)
Brady (TX)	Graham	Miller, Gary
Bryant	Granger	Moran (KS)
Burr	Green (WI)	Morella
Burton	Greenwood	Nethercutt
Buyer	Gutierrez	Northup
Callahan	Gutknecht	Norwood
Calvert	Hall (TX)	Nussle
Camp	Hastings (WA)	Ose
Canady	Hayes	Oxley
Cannon	Hayworth	Packard
Castle	Hefley	Paul
Chabot	Herger	Pease
Chambliss	Hill (MT)	Peterson (PA)
Coble	Hilleary	Petri
Collins	Hobson	Pickering
Combest	Hoekstra	Pitts
Condit	Horn	Pombo
Cooksey	Hostettler	Porter
Crane	Houghton	Portman
Cubin	Hulshof	Pryce (OH)
Cunningham	Hunter	Quinn
Davis (VA)	Hutchinson	Radanovich
Deal	Hyde	Ramstad
DeLay	Isakson	Regula
Diaz-Balart	Istook	Reynolds
Dickey	Jenkins	Riley
Doolittle	Johnson (CT)	Roemer
Dreier	Johnson, Sam	Rogan
Duncan	Jones (NC)	Rogers

Rohrbacher	Simpson	Thune
Ros-Lehtinen	Skeen	Tiahrt
Roukema	Smith (MI)	Trafficant
Royce	Smith (NJ)	Upton
Ryan (WI)	Smith (TX)	Vitter
Ryun (KS)	Souder	Walden
Salmon	Spence	Walsh
Sanford	Stearns	Watkins
Saxton	Stump	Weldon (FL)
Scarborough	Sununu	Weller
Schaffer	Sweeney	Whitfield
Sensenbrenner	Talent	Wicker
Sessions	Tancredo	Wilson
Shadegg	Tauzin	Wolf
Shaw	Taylor (NC)	Young (AK)
Shays	Terry	Young (FL)
Sherwood	Thomas	
Shimkus	Thornberry	

NOT VOTING—45

Andrews	Gillmor	Ney
Baker	Goodlatte	Owens
Bateman	Gordon	Payne
Campbell	Hansen	Pickett
Chenoweth-Hage	Hoeffel	Sabo
Coburn	Kasich	Shuster
Cook	Largent	Stark
Cox	Lazio	Toomey
Danner	Linder	Towns
DeLauro	Maloney (NY)	Vento
DeMint	Martinez	Wamp
Dooley	McCollum	Watts (OK)
Ewing	McIntosh	Waxman
Fattah	Metcalfe	Weldon (PA)
Gephardt	Myrick	Wise

□ 2136

Mr. CANNON and Mr. BRADY of Texas changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 24 offered by Mr. OBEY:

Page 37, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$1,000)".

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I am in the process of offering an amendment to the child care section of this bill. It is my understanding that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) wanted to have a colloquy. Did the gentleman want to have that before I offered the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida, Mr. YOUNG is recognized for 5 minutes on a pro forma amendment.

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word so we can have this colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I have been discussing the order of business for the balance of the evening and for the completion of this bill. I would like to say that this is the first time in 3 years that this bill has come to the floor as a separate independent individual piece of legislation, and I think it is important that we deal with it expeditiously.

Mr. Chairman, there are a substantial number of amendments that have

been printed in the RECORD. I am satisfied that Members who have had them printed would probably want to offer them. I think it would not be a bad idea if Members would let their respective subcommittee leaders know whether or not they intend to offer those amendments.

I make this suggestion for this purpose: I understand that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and many Members would like for the committee to rise and continue our work tomorrow. It is extremely important that we complete this bill tomorrow. Otherwise the rest of our appropriations schedule will fall considerably behind, and I do not think any of us want that to happen. So the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I have been discussing how do we get out of here at a reasonable time tonight and also be able to complete this bill tomorrow?

Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to yield to the gentleman for his comments on this subject.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, let me simply say this: On this side of the aisle, because this bill has not been on the floor for 3 years, we want to see this bill voted on. Speaking very frankly, politically, we would be delighted to finally see this House vote on this bill, and substantively we would also be delighted to see us vote on the bill and would like to see it done tomorrow.

We are operating under a unanimous consent agreement under which some 11 Democratic amendments have been laid out in the unanimous consent request with time limits attached to them. We would be very happy to attach time limits to all remaining amendments. We believe that 80 percent of the amendments on the Democratic side will not be offered. Of those that will be offered, our understanding from talking to most of the Members is that they will be offered and withdrawn after an explanation of what the Member was trying to do for 5 minutes. I know of only two or three amendments on our side that do not fit that category and on which we need to do further work, but we are willing to work out time limits on all of those.

The problem as we see it is that there is a significant number of amendments that on our list are tentatively listed to be offered by Members on your side of the aisle. We do not have the capacity to work with your Members to work out time agreements. We are happy to agree to time limits on those as well, but we cannot do the work on the majority side with your Members. Your leadership staff and you need to do that.

All we want is what I said when I agreed to the unanimous consent request on Friday, that when this bill is debated, it not be debated in the dead

of night, because it has been 3 years since this bill has been on the floor.

□ 2145

So I want to assure what I honestly believe would be best is if we could rise on this bill tonight. I do not know what the gentleman has scheduled for the remainder of the week in terms of the order but it seems to me that overnight your leadership staff, your committee staff ought to be able to get together with your members and reach an understanding so before we come back on this bill tomorrow we can enter into a unanimous consent request which we can both agree to, which would enable us to finish the bill tomorrow. That would be our goal as well, but if we waste 4 hours' time we are not going to get past this point in the bill tonight, I assure you. That does not do anybody any good, and I think the time would be better spent simply consulting with Members to see how much time they think they need on their amendment and whether they, in fact, need to offer it at all, that is legislation.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Reclaiming my time, let me suggest to the gentleman that the unanimous consent agreement that the gentleman and I developed last week, had a time limit on the specific amendments but there was no time limit on when the House would complete its business today.

Secondly, the time that we spent last week on this bill, and today, has been on amendments from your side of the aisle. There are a substantial number of amendments that will probably be offered from our side of the aisle that have already been printed in the RECORD, and certainly each Member has the option to offer those amendments. Now my suggestion would be that we take up the next amendment and during that time we sit down and see if we can develop another unanimous consent request to propound that would be agreeable to the House; that would put some time limits on the rest of the amendments as we did on the first series of amendments, and guarantee the Members that we will complete action on this bill by tomorrow night.

Also, tonight we would like to appoint conferees on the military construction bill, which would also become a vehicle for a large portion of the supplemental that the House passed very early in the year, which is important to very many Members who are serving here in the House.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I simply want to repeat, and I am reading from page H4106 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 8, when the unanimous consent request was propounded at that time under which we agreed to a time limit on the 11 amendments that we are now operating on, I

said the following: I said, "Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would note that I have no objection to this arrangement with the understanding that when the House returns to this bill it will not be at a time when Members are still flying back to Washington on their airplanes and that it will not be debated in the dead of night."

We were then assured today that we would be out of here on this bill at least by 9:00 tonight. Now I am told something else and if that is the case, then as the gentleman knows, this unanimous consent request was offered because we had 160 amendments to the bill. If we are not going to stick to the agreement we had, we are going to offer all 160 amendments.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Reclaiming my time, I would ask the gentleman to read the next line and see who responded from our side to agree to the 9:00 adjournment tonight.

Mr. OBEY. The gentleman full well knows what conversations took place both publicly and privately. If we cannot count on the majority to keep their word, then we might as well know it now.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. That is what I am asking the gentleman, who agreed on our side to the 9:00 adjournment tonight?

Mr. OBEY. Your leadership staff told us today.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. It was not part of the RECORD that you just read, is that correct?

Mr. OBEY. You asked for a unanimous consent agreement. I told you under which conditions I would give it, and I told you both privately and we did it in the RECORD, as you well know.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Is the gentleman willing to try to work out a unanimous consent agreement that would complete consideration of this bill by tomorrow night, whatever time it might be?

Mr. OBEY. I told you, I am perfectly willing to put limits on every amendment, but I cannot control which amendments are going to be offered on your side of the aisle. We have done our work on this side of the aisle and identified Members who were going to offer amendments and they have largely agreed not to offer them.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Well, I understand what the gentleman is saying and, as I said earlier, all of the time so far on this bill has been spent on the amendments from your side. So there would obviously be time required on our side to offer amendments, but I am prepared to make a recommendation to my side of the aisle on a time limitation in order to complete this bill by tomorrow night, if you are willing to sit down and to try to reach an agreement on that.

Mr. OBEY. All I can tell the gentleman is that I want to finish tomorrow night, but I have no way of guaranteeing we are going to finish tomorrow night until I know what the plans are

on the gentleman's side of the aisle with respect to amendments.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. If we get a unanimous consent agreement, a unanimous consent agreement is binding.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired, the pro forma amendment of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) proceeding without objection, and now the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) may proceed for 5 minutes on amendment No. 24.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, this is the first of 160 amendments that we intend to offer to this bill. This amendment adds \$1,000 to the Child Care and Development Block Grant. I am offering this amendment because it is the only way under the rule under which this bill is being considered that we can have a discussion about the effect of the majority party's tax cuts on each and every individual program that delivers services to the people that we represent. The majority party has decided in the last 2 months to do the following: They have passed a minimum wage bill that provided \$11 billion worth of benefits to minimum wage workers but they required, as the price for passage, that we also add \$90 billion worth of tax benefits to people who make over \$300,000 a year.

They took a tax bill which they called the marriage penalty and under the guise of providing relief for the so-called marriage penalty they produced a tax bill which gave 73 percent of those benefits to people who made over \$100,000 a year. Then last week, the majority passed through this House an inheritance tax package that gave over \$200 billion in potential tax relief to the wealthiest 400 people in this country.

Yet we are prevented, because of the budget resolution and the limits imposed by that resolution, we are prevented in the appropriations process from trying to make our case by demonstrating on a program by program basis what they have had to squeeze in order to do that.

What they have done on child care is to cut the President's request by 400-and-some million dollars. Now they say, well, that is not really a very deep cut in the President's budget, and it is no cut at all because of what we provided last year. They forget the fact that we are only providing child care to about 1 out of every 10 children who are presently eligible for assistance under Federal law.

I can only offer an amendment to add a thousand dollars to this.

The \$417 million cut in the President's program means that 80,000 fewer children will be served. Under the rules, I can only offer an amendment raising this amount by a nominal amount, and I do so simply because at this point that is the only way that we can make our point about the misplaced priorities in the majority party's budget resolution.

I would have preferred that we go through this in a systematic fashion, have a short 30-minute debate on each of the major items in the bill at a time of day when we are not being buried, after this bill has been hidden from public view for more than 3 years, but that is not to be. So I guess instead of having the orderly subject by subject discussion that I had hoped we would have, we are going to have to offer a series of amendments to every line of this bill. In that way we will indicate our strong objection to what the majority party has done and our profound belief that their priorities are fundamentally misguided and misbegotten. It seems to me that child care, it seems to me that education, it seems to me that health care, it seems to me that job training are more important to the country than to provide giant tax cuts to the wealthiest people in this country.

I am all for targeted tax cuts, targeted at those who need it the worst, those who need it the most but certainly the 400 richest Americans are not among them and that is one of the points we are trying to debate and illustrate in comparative priorities this evening.

□ 2200

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), our ranking member, to add \$1,000 to this particular item, Child Care and Development Block Grant.

I rise in support of this meager amount because we need to show a sign that we are willing to support the children of this Nation. At a time when we have a \$179 billion surplus, we are cutting programs for children and families.

It seems to me in this well-performing economy where we are creating more and more millionaires day in and day out, we would be willing to support children and families. At a time when we can have Members wax eloquently about getting people off of welfare, it seems to me we would support families for safe and secure child care so that parents and single mothers in particular could go to work, could seek out additional educational opportunities, and feel comfortable that their children are being taken care of in safe environments. If we cannot support a meager \$1,000 increase, then I think that we cannot be credible as we talk about trying to pass this appropriation from the floor of Congress.

It is important that we understand that most eligible children are denied assistance. Nationally, only one of 10 children who is eligible for child care assistance under Federal law receives any help.

No State is currently serving all eligible families. States are severely limiting access to assistance. Only five States set their income eligibility

guidelines at the maximum level allowable under Federal law, 85 percent of their State median income in 22 States; a family of three earning \$25,000 a year does not qualify for help. In three States, Alabama, Missouri, and South Carolina, a family of three earning \$18,000 a year, 130 percent of poverty, cannot qualify for help.

It is unconscionable that we cannot agree from both sides of the aisle to do what we know we could do in this budget for children. Let me just add that, in addition to this cut, this denial of care for children in this block grant, the idea that we cannot support the President's budget for Head Start is appalling to me.

I worked in Head Start prior to coming to Congress. I served first as an assistant teacher and went on to become the supervisor of Parent Involvement and Volunteer Services. Head Start is the best thing that ever happened to this country. We empower children and families.

Last Friday, when I left here, I went to the 26th anniversary of one of the Head Start programs in my district, training and research. Ninety percent of the parents whose children were enrolled in the program that I attended last Friday were enrolled in school themselves. They were inspired by their involvement in Head Start to get back into school and to get an education so that they cannot only determine their children's educational destiny, but that they could better themselves and their families.

Head Start has been excellent for America. We have children who have had an opportunity for early childhood development who never would have had an opportunity. At one time in this country, early childhood education was only for the rich and the well off. For us not to support the President's budget on Head Start is again unconscionable.

This \$1,000 amendment will show us for what we are if we do not support it. I am sorry that we have to be in a protracted debate about supporting child care and education and health care for children. This is America. This is an America that is doing extremely well.

I would ask all of my colleagues to please support this amendment in an indication that they care about children.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important for members of the committee to realize what is going on tonight. It is hard to imagine that the author of the amendment is serious about adding a mere \$1,000 to this very important program. But it does give Members on both sides of the aisle an opportunity to get up and talk about a program which both the majority and the minority in this House of Representatives feel very strongly about; that is the Child Care Block Grant.

But it also gives the minority party in this committee an opportunity to

get up and say that there has been a substantial cut in child care appropriation when, actually, that is the farthest thing from the truth. The truth of the matter is that the Child Care Block Grant under this very bill that we are debating tonight has been increased by \$400 million over the expenditure of last year.

Now, it is true that the President in his budget came up with an increase of over \$800 million requested in his budget, and it is easy to request money in the national budget. But the fact of the matter is that this committee, in a responsible manner, provided a substantial increase to Child Care Block Grants. It is incorrect to come before this body and say that those funds have been cut; \$400 million more than last year is an increase.

Now, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the previous speaker, also mentioned a very valuable program, Head Start. It is a program that is dear to my heart. It has been supported by Members of both parties. It has been supported by administrations of both parties.

But it is inaccurate to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this committee has cut Head Start. Indeed, we did not give the President all of the money he requested. But the fact of the matter is that this bill that we are debating, although it does not touch on this amendment, this bill that we are debating increases Head Start again by \$400 million.

\$400 million more for Head Start in this bill, \$400 million more for child care in this bill. That is hardly a cut. I just wish that we could get the facts straight and not be suggesting things that are not part of the bill.

I oppose the amendment because I do not believe it is offered seriously, but I hope that no one in this House or no one in this committee will be under the mistaken impression that these two programs have been cut. Indeed, they have received substantial increases thanks to the leadership of this subcommittee.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), our ranking member, for bringing this amendment up because, not that I disagree with the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), because there are some increases in this legislation, the problem is that when we see the need that we have, the increases that they have are still not meeting the needs of our communities.

This is a great example of this one little amendment talking for \$1,000 increase in child care grants that talk about where our priorities are here on this House floor. I am not faulting the Committee on Appropriations. I understand they have the rules they live by. We gave them those rules with the budget resolution that had the wrong priorities, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the reason this amendment is here is to talk about child care, and I will go into that. But let us talk about some of the other priorities that our appropriations process is leaving out, again not to fault the members of the committee or the chairman, because they are doing the best they can with the guidelines that we gave them.

Expanded educational opportunity. Trying to fix the infrastructure of our schools in our country. Prescription drugs for seniors may be a part of this, we do not know. Expanded health care for our children. Congress made an effort in 1997, the Balanced Budget Act, for the CHIPs program. We still have a long way to go.

Following the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) on the Head Start, granted there is more funding in this appropriations bill for Head Start, but it still falls very short of the need in my own district in Houston, Texas, and I am sure everywhere else in the country. There are so many children who are Head Start qualified that the money is not there because we are not willing to put our money where our mouth is.

That is just to talk about a few of the human needs, Mr. Chairman. Let us talk about other issues that we need to address: defense of our Nation, protection of our borders, continue to see our crime rate drop needs to continue the community policing that we hopefully will see in the appropriations bills that come.

The problem is our priorities are wrong. We spent last Friday talking about an estate tax cut which only benefits 2 percent of the people in this country, and then the amendments rejected that will take that down to 1 percent.

So that is why our priorities are wrong. That is what is wrong. That is why I am glad our ranking member came up with this amendment that talks about the new investment in child care that is needed.

States now cannot keep up with the need of child care assistance even with our TANF funds, and I know that from my own experience again in Texas. Most eligible children are denied assistance. Nationally, only one out of 10 children who are eligible for child care assistance under Federal law receives any help.

No State is currently serving all eligible families with child care. States have severely limited access to assistance. Only five States set their income eligibility guidelines at the maximum allowable under Federal law, 85 percent of their State median income. In nearly half the States, 24 States, a family earning \$25,000 a year does not qualify. In three States, Alabama, Missouri, South Carolina, a family of three earning \$18,000, 130 percent of poverty cannot qualify for help.

Even with low eligibility cut-offs, States have long waiting lists. California has 200,000 families that are

waiting. In Texas, we have 36,000 families that are waiting for child care assistance.

That is why this amendment is so important. It gives us the opportunity to talk about our priorities. We need to put our priorities in the needs of our country, because those children that need that child care, Mr. Chairman, those are the ones hopefully that will be serving here someday. We need to prepare them for that. All of us were prepared when we were growing up.

Today's children need even extra help with what we do, whether it is child care, whether it is Head Start, whether it is quality education. Again, most of the funding comes from the local level, but we can help our local communities and provide assistance and smaller class sizes and building reconstruction.

The limited resources lead to inadequate policies and force parents to have to make really difficult choices. Assistance policies keep quality care out of the reach of low-income children. Nearly one-third of our States are paying rates based on out-of-date market surveys, making it unaffordable for programs serving low-income children that invest in quality.

When one thinks about it, despite expert recommendations, over a third of our States, of our parents, pay 10 percent of their income. When one says 10 percent, that does not sound like much. But if one has a poor family, how much of that is housing? How much of that is health care? How much of that is utilities? How much of that is transportation hopefully to get to that job from the welfare reform bill that we passed on this floor.

Basic health and safety protections are lacking in many States. Only 10 States meet the national recommendation for child-staff ratios in their licensing requirements.

□ 2215

And only 10 States require all family child care providers to meet any requirements and regulations.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, consider the case of Sue and Dan Williams. I am going to change the name a little bit, but they are real people. Sue was on welfare for several years, trapped in the hopeless welfare cycle and then during welfare, because of welfare reform, decided, okay, it is time to get a job. And she was a little scared about it, but she got a job and needed to have some child care. And that is a mother's primary concern, which it should be. And we all admire mothers for that. That is why in the welfare reform bill there was \$20 billion in child care for people like Sue and Dan Williams for their children, \$20 billion.

In addition to that, when the senior citizens and their family have to live with them, there is dependent care, a tax credit for families like that. There is social services, block grants. There

is child care to States and entitlement programs to the tune of \$8.8 billion in Federal support for the child care programs through the year 2001.

These programs are strongly, strongly supported by Congress on both sides of the aisle, programs such as Head Start, Even Start, the Campus-Based Child Care, IDEA Services for Preschoolers and Infant Programs for after school.

Mr. Chairman, I have been to some of these after-school programs. These children are learning things. They are learning life skills. They are learning to work with each other. They are learning play acting and things that build their self-esteem. These are very good programs.

The chairman of this committee has worked hard to support this stuff. He has gone out in the field. He has not stayed in the ivory tower of Washington and waited for the White House to hand down some irresponsible number, some risky scheme from the Gore-Clinton administration. He has gone out and said, how do these programs actually work? How do they affect real people?

This is not a matter of political rhetoric. This is not a matter of, well, we are going to spend more money than them. It is a matter of Sue and Dan Williams and their children and their parents and caring for them. I think the committee and the chairman of the committee have done the right thing on this.

What I would say to my colleagues across the aisle, we keep hearing how, well, if we have to have more money, well, maybe we do, but maybe we ought to look at the efficiency of these programs, as well. Is it possible under the Clinton-Gore model that too much of the money is being squandered by wasteful Washington bureaucrats? Is it possible that a lot of that money never leaves Washington, D.C., and if we go down to HUD or if we go down to some of these Federal Government agencies we can find the money on the sixth floor, third office down to our right because it never gets out of that bureaucrat's hands and to the streets where it can help the children of the Williams.

That is what the committee mark is all about. The committee has made a significant commitment in this and will continue to. Think about Head Start alone increased by \$400 million, 8 percent above last year's in order to serve an additional 20,000 kids. Think about the level. It is the highest in the 35-year history. That is very, very significant. The Child Care Development Block Grant is increased by \$400 million, 34 percent.

The gentleman from Illinois (Chairman PORTER) has gone out and reviewed these programs. He has asked the bureaucracies to be more efficient. But he has also said we have got to help as many children as possible and he has done it in the best interest of America's kids.

It is sad to me that people would come up with arbitrary numbers to irresponsibly use children as a pawn in some political chess game. It upsets me. Because they know in their heart of hearts this money comes from Social Security, it does not come from some other area. If they want to spend this money irresponsibly, they have to go home and tell our seniors, well, do you know what we did? We did what we did for 40 straight years, we dipped back into that Social Security Trust Fund. And they should not be doing that, Mr. Chairman, because Social Security should be handled on a bipartisan basis.

It is not a matter of Democrat versus Republican. It is a matter of putting our seniors first. That is why I do not think we should just irresponsibly and arbitrarily come up with numbers to increase programs for political purposes. We have to do what is best for children. We have to do what is best for seniors.

That is why I support the mark of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) on this and I think we should reject, respectfully reject, the Obey amendment.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. ROEMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, we have heard the old adage over and over again about a billion dollars here and a billion dollars there and pretty soon we are talking about real money.

This amendment is a real amendment because we are talking about a thousand dollars to people that in three States, a family of three making \$18,000 a year, cannot qualify for help to get child care for their family.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Members in this body are listening because I am sure that people out in the country are listening. A thousand dollars to them, when they are making \$18,000 a year and they are working sometimes two and three jobs and the most important thing in the world to them is their children, this amendment is important.

Yes, it is important because we are talking about differences in priorities tonight at 10:20 Washington, D.C., time. And maybe we will be here until 2:20 and maybe we will be here all day tomorrow talking about education. I hope we are. This is the most important issue to me and the single most important reason why I picked the Committee on Education and the Workforce to serve on in this body.

A thousand dollars to a family of three making \$18,000 a year in three States where they cannot qualify for any help to get child care to take care of their children while they work, this idea behind this amendment can help some real people with real problems address their dire need for quality and affordable child care.

We have heard some people on the other side of the aisle talk about, oh,

this bill does not cut anything, it does not cut programs that make a difference for working people or people concerned about getting their children educated.

Let us talk about some real cuts. The adult job training program is cut by \$93 million below last year's appropriated level. The dislocated workers, \$207 million cut below last year's appropriated level. That is \$300 million, Mr. Chairman, when we are in a world economy today where we are engaging in trade, where we all know that we are going through the information and knowledge revolution in America today, where businesses are all saying the most important thing we can do in Washington is help them with doing more in education, and where our workers, whether they be underskilled or unskilled or whether they be dislocated because of trade, that we do something to help these workers make sure that, as we engage in trade with Mexico and China and other countries, that we make sure we help our working families get trained for new jobs if they are dislocated from an old one.

That is fairness. That is help in education in the new economy.

Now, I also hear Mr. Chairman, and I think the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) is absolutely with us on this point, that we need more resources if we are going to get more accountability and quality in our education programs.

I was a fighter for more charter schools, and we did that. I fought for more public choice in education, and we are doing that. I fought and authored the bill last year for education flexibility to give our local schools more choice over what they do with Federal money. We are doing many of these things, giving the local school more quality programs to pick from but they choose what they want to do.

Why can we not deliver more resources for dislocated workers, under-skilled workers, who need to move from a toolbox to a robotic arm in a computer. Let us help these workers out in this new economy with these new challenges and this new workplace that we are creating. Let us help our children in inner-city schools and rural schools in Indiana. As we improve accountability, as we improve the quality of these programs, let us get more resources for our local schools to determine whether they want to use that money for school construction, whether they want to use that money for new curriculum ideas, whether they want to use that money to try to develop more professional training programs to get their teachers skilled on the technology of the future.

So we are hopeful that we can work with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), who I think wants more resources for these education programs, to fight for these programs.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we should first realize that this amendment is not an amendment that has an offset. The only amount involved here is a thousand dollars. And the reason it is offered is simply to gain time to make the points that the minority wishes to make. The reason the amendment is in order is that there is a small amount of unobligated budget authority and outlays from which to draw these small amendments.

The point that the minority continues to make is that we are not spending enough money on matters that they think are priorities. I simply want to take this time, Mr. Chairman, to point out all of the ways where we are meeting needs by making very substantial increases in many programs that we think are very, very important.

Let me begin with community health centers, which we have funded at \$1.1 billion dollars. That is \$31 million above the President's request. The Job Corps at \$1.4 billion. That is \$7 million above the President's request. Graduate medical education we have doubled to \$80 million. We have funded Ricky Ray Hemophilia at \$100 million, a 33-percent increase. We have funded Ryan White AIDS at \$1.725 billion. That is \$130 million above last year and also above the President's request.

We funded the CDC at \$3.3 billion. That is \$189 million above the President's request and \$369 million greater than last year. We have funded infrastructure needs at CDC at \$145 million. That is above the President's request. We funded Head Start at \$5.7 billion, a \$400-million increase, or 7.5 percent increase this year. We funded special education at \$6.255 billion. That is a half-billion-dollar increase over last year.

□ 2230

We funded Pell Grants at the President's requested level, a \$200 increase to the maximum grant, to \$3500. We have increased after school centers by \$146 million to \$600 million. We have funded Impact Aid at \$215 million above the President's request and \$78 million above last year. We have increased child care \$400 million over last year, at \$2 billion in forward funding subject to a sequester to stay within the budget cap. We have increased the National Institutes of Health by \$1 billion over last year and funded it at the President's request.

The point that the minority is making that we are underfunding accounts is simply not a valid point. There are not any cuts in the bill. If there are, they are very small ones. In almost all cases there are increases, and in some cases that I have just described substantial increases over the amounts that the President has requested.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 196, not voting 56, as follows:

[Roll No. 256]

AYES—182

Abercrombie	Green (TX)	Murtha
Ackerman	Hastings (FL)	Nadler
Allen	Hill (IN)	Napolitano
Baca	Hilliard	Neal
Baird	Hinchey	Oberstar
Baldacci	Hinojosa	Obey
Baldwin	Holden	Olver
Barcia	Holt	Ortiz
Barrett (WI)	Hookey	Pallone
Becerra	Hoyer	Pascarell
Bentsen	Insee	Pastor
Berkley	Jackson (IL)	Peterson (MN)
Berman	Jackson-Lee	Phelps
Berry	(TX)	Pomeroy
Bishop	Jefferson	Price (NC)
Blagojevich	John	Rahall
Blumenauer	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Bonior	Jones (OH)	Reyes
Borski	Kanjorski	Rivers
Boswell	Kaptur	Rodriguez
Boucher	Kennedy	Rothman
Boyd	Kildee	Royal-Ballard
Brady (PA)	Kilpatrick	Rush
Brown (FL)	Kind (WI)	Sanders
Brown (OH)	Kleczka	Sandlin
Capps	Klink	Sawyer
Capuano	Kucinich	Schakowsky
Cardin	LaFalce	Scott
Carson	Lampson	Serrano
Clay	Lantos	Sherman
Clayton	Larson	Sisisky
Clement	Lee	Skelton
Clyburn	Levin	Slaughter
Conyers	Lewis (GA)	Smith (WA)
Costello	Lipinski	Snyder
Coyne	Lofgren	Spratt
Cramer	Lowe	Stabenow
Crowley	Lucas (KY)	Stenholm
Cummings	Luther	Strickland
Davis (FL)	Maloney (CT)	Stupak
Davis (IL)	Markey	Tanner
DeFazio	Mascara	Tauscher
DeGette	Matsui	Taylor (MS)
Delahunt	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (CA)
Deutsch	McDermott	Thompson (MS)
Dicks	McGovern	Thurman
Dixon	McIntyre	Tierney
Doggett	McKinney	Turner
Doyle	McNulty	Udall (CO)
Edwards	Meehan	Udall (NM)
Engel	Meek (FL)	Velazquez
Eshoo	Meeke (NY)	Visclosky
Etheridge	Menendez	Waters
Evans	Millender	Watt (NC)
Farr	McDonald	Weiner
Filner	Miller, George	Wexler
Forbes	Minge	Weygand
Ford	Mink	Woolsey
Frank (MA)	Moakley	Wu
Frost	Mollohan	Wynn
Gejdenson	Moore	
Gonzalez	Moran (VA)	

NOES—196

Aderholt	Bryant	Cubin
Army	Burr	Cunningham
Bachus	Burton	Davis (VA)
Ballenger	Buyer	Deal
Barr	Callahan	DeLay
Barrett (NE)	Calvert	Diaz-Balart
Bartlett	Camp	Dickey
Barton	Canady	Doolittle
Bass	Cannon	Dreier
Bereuter	Castle	Duncan
Biggett	Chabot	Dunn
Bilbray	Chambliss	Ehlers
Bilirakis	Chenoweth-Hage	Ehrlich
Bliley	Coble	English
Blunt	Collins	Everett
Boehrlert	Combust	Ewing
Bonilla	Condit	Fletcher
Bono	Cooksey	Foley
Brady (TX)	Crane	Fossella

Fowler	Lazio	Saxton
Franks (NJ)	Leach	Scarborough
Frelinghuysen	Lewis (CA)	Schaffer
Galleghy	Lewis (KY)	Sensenbrenner
Gibbons	LoBiondo	Sessions
Gilchrest	Lucas (OK)	Shadegg
Gilman	Manzullo	Shaw
Goode	McCrery	Shays
Goodling	McHugh	Sherwood
Goss	McInnis	Shimkus
Graham	McKeon	Shows
Granger	Mica	Simpson
Green (WI)	Miller (FL)	Skeen
Greenwood	Miller, Gary	Smith (MI)
Gutknecht	Moran (KS)	Smith (NJ)
Hall (TX)	Morella	Smith (TX)
Hastings (WA)	Nethercutt	Souder
Hayes	Northup	Spence
Hayworth	Norwood	Stump
Herger	Nussle	Sununu
Hill (MT)	Ose	Sweeney
Hilleary	Packard	Talent
Hobson	Paul	Tancredo
Hoekstra	Pease	Tauzin
Horn	Petri	Taylor (NC)
Hostettler	Pickering	Terry
Houghton	Pombo	Thomas
Hulshof	Porter	Thornberry
Hunter	Portman	Thune
Hutchinson	Pryce (OH)	Tiahrt
Hyde	Quinn	Traficant
Isakson	Radanovich	Upton
Istook	Ramstad	Vitter
Jenkins	Regula	Walden
Johnson (CT)	Reynolds	Walsh
Johnson, Sam	Riley	Wamp
Jones (NC)	Roemer	Watkins
Kelly	Rogan	Weldon (FL)
King (NY)	Rogers	Weller
Kingston	Rohrabacher	Whitfield
Knollenberg	Ros-Lehtinen	Wicker
Kolbe	Royce	Wilson
Kuykendall	Ryan (WI)	Wolf
LaHood	Ryun (KS)	Young (AK)
Largent	Salmon	Young (FL)
Latham	Sanchez	
LaTourette	Sanford	

NOT VOTING—56

Andrews	Gillmor	Oxley
Archer	Goodlatte	Payne
Baker	Gordon	Pelosi
Bateman	Gutierrez	Peterson (PA)
Boehner	Hall (OH)	Pickett
Campbell	Hansen	Pitts
Coburn	Hefley	Roukema
Cook	Hoeffel	Sabo
Cox	Kasich	Shuster
Danner	Linder	Stark
DeLauro	Maloney (NY)	Stearns
DeMint	Martinez	Toomey
Dingell	McCarthy (MO)	Towns
Dooley	McCollum	Vento
Emerson	McIntosh	Watts (OK)
Fattah	Metcalfe	Waxman
Ganske	Myrick	Weldon (PA)
Gekas	Ney	Wise
Gephardt	Owens	

□ 2327

Mr. HUTCHINSON changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, during rollcall vote No. 256, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the majority and minority have come to an agreement on the further course of this bill. At the appropriate point, I will move that the Committee rise. The debate will begin tomorrow morning. Under that agreement, there should be no further votes this evening and the intention of both sides is that we proceed until the bill is completed sometime tomorrow.

□ 2330

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

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask at which point it is appropriate for me to withdraw the amendment now pending.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) ask unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment?

Mr. OBEY. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the deep cuts that this bill makes in Medicare contractor management. The funding is not just inadequate, it is grossly inadequate, so inadequate that it is bound to impair the quality of service delivered to millions of elderly and disabled Americans—many of whom rely solely on Medicare for their health insurance.

Although the Administration requested \$1.3 billion for contractor management, an increase just over 4%, the committee rejected any increase and instead cut funding by 6%. In years past, when there were funding cutbacks and shortfalls, HCFA ordered Medicare contractors to cut service to beneficiaries. Medicare payments for patient care were delayed. HCFA told its contractors to cut back human contact and make more use of voice mail. Voice mail menus are frustrating for everybody, but imagine how exasperating they are for an elderly person who wants a knowledgeable, caring person to answer a question about Medicare or solve a problem.

The demands placed upon contractors will only be aggravated by elderly and disabled Americans who are the victims of the managed care companies pulling out of Medicare + Choice. In just one Medicare + Choice company that recently announced its pullout, there are over 100,000 elderly and disabled Americans. They will have no choice but to move back to the fee-for-service program, and this will increase the work load for Medicare contractors far more than anyone previously predicted.

In making its budget request, the Administration assumed a 3.5% increase in claims. The pull-out of Medicare + Choice firms will add to that; and if funding is cut by 6%, the cuts cannot help but strain the Medicare contractors, who are already stretched out, and degrade the services they provide to elderly and disabled Americans and their healthcare providers. This cut in funding will:

Curtail beneficiary and provider outreach programs that educate and answer questions. Delay responses to telephone calls, written inquiries, and reviews of "medical necessity." Postpone waste, fraud, and abuse investigations. Make it difficult for contractors to respond to HCFA initiatives.

As a consequence, elderly and disabled Americans will not receive the level of customer service they expect and deserve. More providers who participate in Medicare but are increasingly vocal in their dissatisfaction will leave the program. And if Medicare contractors, who pride themselves on their business and want to deliver a good product and good

service do not have the resources to administer the program, they too will exit the business. Many of them already have, and more of them will if this cut in funding goes through.

For all these reasons, we should meet the President's modest request for Medicare contractor management, and undo these self-defeating cuts. If their purpose is to impair Medicare fee-for-service, and make beneficiaries cynical about Medicare and seek another program, they may achieve that effect. But if our purpose is to give the elderly and disabled a Medicare program with the care, service, and attention they need, these cuts should be reversed, and the President's request should be filled.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Chairman, I will get to the point, who could not support Head Start, a program that provides comprehensive developmental services for America's low-income children—ages birth to five years?

Research has told us time and again that this is the most critical stage of a child's mental and emotional development. Adding \$600 million would provide additional services to 53,000 additional low-income children.

I represent the third-fastest growing metropolitan statistical area in the U.S. and yet, we have one of the highest rates of poverty, and a very young population.

For almost 30 years, I have been involved with education issues. This experience has taught me that children, regardless of income level or race, have the same potential for high achievement and healthy development. We must give them that chance.

Head Start has successfully served 17 million children and their families since 1965 * * * Lets's not jeopardize that.

To my colleagues who say no to Head Start: I say is that your final answer? I hope not.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, the Republican leadership has once again succeeded in bringing to the floor a labor, health and education appropriations bill designed to please only themselves and their right-wing friends. H.R. 4577 fails to make needed investments in public education and the domestic workforce, and, as the result, would undermine American competitiveness in the 21st century. This bill has already received what has now become its customary and well-deserved veto threat from the Clinton administration. It is clearly going nowhere, and should be soundly defeated.

This bill was doomed from its inception, because the economic premise upon which it is based is flawed. Earlier this year, before the appropriations process began, the Republican leadership decided to resume its efforts to push for big tax cuts for the rich. They attached hundreds of billions of dollars of these tax cuts to the minimum wage bill and the budget resolution. This decision to squander the surplus, rather than invest it, severely reduced the funds available to meet many of our nation's critical needs.

Overall, the bill provides \$2.9 billion less than the President requested for the Department of Education, and \$1.7 billion less for the Department of Labor. As the result, education, job training, workplace safety, and other programs are either frozen or cut, significantly reducing the level of services that can be provided.

For example, the bill would slash Title I funding, forcing school districts to cut back on

assistance to disadvantaged students. The Clinton/Clay class size reduction initiative is gutted, leaving school districts without the resources to hire and train 20,000 more top-quality teachers. Adequate funding is denied for after-school and summer programs intended to improve student achievement and reduce juvenile crime. And no funds are provided to renovate crumbling and unsafe schools.

At the same time efforts are ongoing in the Congress to erase limits on the immigration of foreign workers to fill high-tech jobs, this bill would make steep cuts in the funding of training programs aimed at helping domestic workers fill them and other positions. Dislocated workers and at-risk youth are particularly hard hit by these cuts, even though they are the one most in need of skills training. By failing to adequately invest in our own workforce, the Republican leadership is jeopardizing American competitiveness and prosperity.

This bill also jeopardizes worker health and safety by shortchanging OSHA and blocking issuance of the ergonomics rule intended to prevent about 300,000 workplace injuries a year. The Wilson amendment would add insult to injury by cutting \$25 million more from OSHA.

Mr. Chairman, this appropriations bill is a disaster. It fails to adequately invest in education, and in the development and security of the nation's workforce. I urge a no vote on H.R. 4577.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. BEREUTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4577) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LIMITING CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4577, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION ACT, 2001

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 4577 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 418 and the order of the House of June 8, 2000, no further amendment to the bill shall be in order except:

One, pro forma amendments offered by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees for the purpose of debate;

Two, the amendment printed in part B of House Report 106-657;

Three, the remaining amendments listed in the order of the House of June 8, 2000, as previously modified;

And four, the following additional amendments by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), regarding across-the-board reduction; the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), regarding reductions in Education for the Disadvantaged, Impact Aid, School Improvement Programs, and Bilingual and Immigrant Education and increase in special education; further, by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER), regarding reduction in education research, statistics, and improvement and increase in special education; by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER), regarding reduction in Job Corps Training and increase in special education for grants to States; by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER), regarding reduction in United States Institute of Peace and increase in special education for grants to States; by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), regarding fetal tissue research; by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), regarding a report of the impact of PNTR on United States jobs; by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), regarding NIH; by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), regarding additional funding for Meals on Wheels; and the amendments printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XXVIII and numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 189, 190, 191, 192, 196, 198, and 201.

Each additional amendment may be offered only by the Member designated in this request or a designee or the Member who caused it to be printed or a designee; shall be considered as read; shall be debatable for 10 minutes 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 a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON H.R. 4635, DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. YOUNG of Florida, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-674) on the bill (H.R. 4635) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.