

But at the beginning of the session, my Republican colleagues said they planned to have all this work finished on time, but a few months ago, my Republican colleagues passed a budget containing \$1 trillion in tax cuts, mostly for the rich. Their budget left no money for middle-class tax cuts, Social Security preservation, school construction, Medicare prescription drug benefits.

Now, it is October 3, Mr. Speaker, and my Republican colleagues' unrealistic budget has left them very much behind on the appropriation process.

So to make matters worse, Mr. Speaker, most of last week we spent our time voting on noncontroversial suspension bills. Today, 2 days into the new fiscal year, 11 out of 13 appropriation bills have yet to be signed into law. The Senate has yet to pass VA-HUD, the Commerce-Justice, and they have not even reported Treasury-Postal.

The House has just to pass Agriculture, Transportation, and our Labor, Health and Human Services conference reports. The Senate has not passed either the legislative branch of the Interior conference reports. President Clinton has vowed to veto the Energy and Water conference report.

Mr. Speaker, Foreign Operations, and the District of Columbia have not even been sent to conference. Mr. Speaker, in order to keep the Federal Government open for business, Congress must either pass 11 more appropriation bills that the President can sign by Friday or pass this continuing resolution. So this continuing resolution will keep the Federal Government open until October 14, despite the unfinished bills.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Republican colleagues to finish the work to pass the bills that President Clinton will sign and to fulfill their responsibility to the American people.

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.J. Res. 110 and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

#### FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 604, I call

up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 110) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of H.J. Res. 110 is as follows:  
H.J. RES. 110

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 106-275 is amended by striking "October 6, 2000" in section 106(c) and inserting in lieu thereof "October 14, 2000".*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 604, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

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

Mr. Speaker, the second CR which is before us today merely extends the date of the original CR from October 6, 2000 through October 14, 2000. We need to do this because, although the House has passed all 13 bills, and as of a few minutes ago we now passed 6 of the conference reports, there are several that still have not passed, and we need to get those done.

We are moving along fairly well. We finished the conference report on the Transportation bill this morning. We will file that this afternoon and hopefully have it on the floor tomorrow.

Also we are scheduled to meet in conference on the Agricultural appropriations bill this afternoon, and we would hope that we can finish that tonight and have it ready for consideration by the House before the week is over.

We are moving, but there are still a few outstanding issues that need to be resolved, most of which, by the way, Mr. Speaker, are not really appropriations items, but they have to do with other items that have been placed upon these bills.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, again, there is nothing new with what we are doing here today. We have in the past had Congresses that have failed to get their appropriations work done on time and so they have required continuing resolutions; that is not the issue. The issue is why we are here on this occasion still in this same crunch, and when you answer that question, you see why this session is different from so many others in the history of the Congress.

It is different, because in past years when the Congress failed to get its appropriations work done on time, it was usually because there were honest fights which were occurring over funding levels for programs all the way through, and you had honest fights between honest pieces of legislation. And it was clear what each side in those controversies were trying to do.

This year has been different. This year we have seen bill after bill after bill come to the floor initially and each time those bills came to the floor, we were told by the majority leadership, well, we know the bill does not make sense at this point, but this is only the first inning, we will fix it up along the way.

Basically, the reason that we are stuck here today and the problem we face today does not have so much to do with what people are now doing or not doing to bring this session to a close, what we are really faced with is the consequences of what was not done in the first 10 months of this session. What was not done was to bring bills to the floor which were a genuine reflection of the intention of the majority party and which were a genuine reflection of what we really in the end expected the Congress to produce in each of the 13 appropriation categories.

Those bills essentially were political press releases put out so that the majority party could continue to pretend that there was room in the budget to fund their huge tax packages, the large majority of the breaks in those packages being directed to the most well-off among us in this society. They wanted to continue the fiction they could afford those huge tax packages, also at the same time provide a pay down of debt, a huge increase in the military budget of some \$20 billion, although not nearly as much of it went to readiness as the President asked for.

In order to maintain those fictions, they maintained the pretense that this Congress is going to spend about \$40 billion less than, in fact, it will wind up now spending. So now we are stuck here seeing this institution having great difficulty finding the off button so that people can go home.

As I said many times, that is not the fault of the majority on the Committee on Appropriations, they are practical realists. They have tried time and time again to demonstrate what kind of legislation could be passed. And when you deal with legislation straightforwardly and forthrightly and produce legislation which honestly reflects the priorities of the House, then you can pass it with a bipartisan majority on both sides; that was just demonstrated on the previous appropriations bill that we passed today.

The problem we have is now after pretending to be fiscal tightwads for almost 9 months, the majority party is now in its rush to go home, now trying to jam a lot of money into a lot of bills in a very short period of time in order to get out of here. But they were still refusing to recognize that of the new money being put on the table, a good piece of that needs to be put in the bill that funds the education, health, social service and worker protection programs in the Federal budget.

They are refusing to put money in that bill, but they put billions more in the energy and water bill, and they will put billions more in other appropriation bills as they move through this

place. Some of those decisions will be responsible, a good many of them, in my view, will not be. So this Congress has no choice but to vote for this continuing resolution in order to keep the government open.

The reason we are in this situation is simply because the product that the Committee on Appropriations was forced by the majority leadership to produce was not a genuine product in the first place. The committee knew that on the majority side of the aisle. The committee knew that on the minority side of the aisle. I think everyone knew that on both sides of the aisle on and off the committee, but for the sake of pretense, this charade has gone on for 10 months, and only now are the real choices being faced and wrestled with.

Mr. Speaker, I regret the fact that my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), has to bring another continuing resolution before us. He has no institutional choice, we have no institutional choice but to vote for it if we are to be responsible. But I regret very much the 9-month charade that has preceded what we are now trying to do in the last inning days of the session.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, except to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the CR today and take no quarrel with the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) for his handling of this bill and any other bill that he has been handling.

I am somewhat disappointed by, as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has been talking about, the process to the extent that we have taken action on appropriation bills. We have been increasing spending appropriations in bills above the amounts requested by the President, without any indication how all the increased spending we have passed will fit within a fiscally responsible budget.

Mr. Speaker, I think people need to understand how this game is being played today, because the majority, the leadership I might say, has said that we are going to put our priorities and we are going to take out the President's priorities, and then any increase that is going to be on increased spending we are going to blame on him. That is not the way it ought to work.

This place ought to work if we are interested in keeping a fiscally responsible budget. If there is a plan on how we can continue to pass appropriation bills which spend more than the President has requested, plus all the tax cut items and other spending items and fit them into the new budgetary frame-

work, I wish someone would explain it to me, and I think I speak for the majority on both sides of the aisle.

□ 1500

According to recent press accounts, the congressional leadership intends to quietly raise the discretionary spending limits for 2001 in the first omnibus appropriation bill.

I do not object to raising the caps for 2001. Everybody realizes the spending caps set in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 were unrealistic. But if we are going to raise the spending cap for 2001, we should be looking at setting new, realistic discretionary spending caps for 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006.

The existing caps for fiscal year 2002 are even more unrealistic than they are for next year. Unless we set new, realistic caps, we will face the same problem next year with discretionary caps that are ignored and no discipline on discretionary spending, and the finger of blame being pointed on both sides of the aisle.

More importantly, the discretionary spending caps expire after 2002, leaving no discipline on discretionary spending at all.

If the Republican leadership is truly interested in controlling spending, I would encourage them to again consider the Blue Dog proposal to set new discretionary caps for the next 5 years now, while we have an opportunity.

We are suddenly hearing a lot of rhetoric from the other side regarding the 90/10 plan and the majority's commitment to debt reduction. I would have preferred that the leadership had been as enthusiastic about that position 6 months ago when we offered the same budget, which would have made debt reduction the top priority for the surplus, instead of pursuing tax cuts that would consume all the surplus.

But I am glad we have come around to our way of thinking. Unfortunately, the substance of the 90/10 plan falls short of the recent rhetoric coming from the other side about debt reduction. If we have a moral obligation to pay off the debt as soon as possible, as the leadership has said, then why does the Republican leadership's debt reduction plan only apply to next year? Why can we not take action now to extend the plan to set aside surpluses for debt reduction until we have eliminated the entire national debt?

The 90/10 plan being touted by my Republican colleagues would leave Congress free to abandon our moral obligation to debt reduction and return to fiscally irresponsible proposals to use the entire surplus for tax cuts and increased spending next year.

Instead of continuing an ad hoc process without any real plan, we need to reach agreement between Congress and the President on an overall budget framework that ensures that we have enough resources to meet our various tax cut and spending priorities and pay down the debt, and then extend the discipline by setting new discretionary

caps and agreeing on a plan to eliminate the national debt.

There are some on this side of the aisle that would like very much to join in that endeavor.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), who sadly has no vote on this floor, but happily, at least, has a voice.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, especially given the very special circumstance in which I find myself.

This process has to be as frustrating for my Republican colleagues as for Democrats. After all, we are stuck here with the overwhelming number of our appropriations unresolved this late, and into a new fiscal year.

I do believe I have a right to be more frustrated than most because mine is not a case of delay in funding Federal agencies. It is more complicated than that. You are asking me to put an entire city of half a million people on hold, the city that I represent.

It is important for the House to be aware of what happens when we put a city on hold. In this high-crime big city, 175 new police officers now cannot be hired; 88 new firefighters, to help fill out the depletion that occurred when the District was in financial crisis in the 1990s, cannot be hired.

We have five new charter schools, and that is what this Congress has most wanted. They are now in operation. We have the largest number of charter schools in the United States, but there is no money for these new charter schools, making their start very shaky, because they are already in operation. School has begun.

There is \$4.5 million for school recreation centers to get our kids off the streets during the busy crime hours between 3 and 6; that is on hold.

To the public, this seems like games we play with ourselves. Games or not, it is far more serious for the District of Columbia than for any other place in the United States. The District got its work done on time. We have submitted a balanced budget with a surplus. Because the Congress has not done its work, the District cannot begin to spend its own money, raised in the District of Columbia from its own taxpayers.

We cannot continue to treat this city this way. We need a new process, Mr. Speaker.

I have just called the Mayor to say to our new Mayor, the mayor who has received so much in lip service compliments for the work that he has done already in the District, to say "Mr. Mayor, your city is on hold for CR number 2."

We have a new Mayor. We have a new council exercising excellent oversight. They have done what the Congress said they should do. Everything in the District is new. Painstaking reforms are occurring. There is a new government in the throes of wholesale

reform. The very least this body should do is to let that government take care of itself and begin to spend its own money.

The only thing that is not new about the District of Columbia is the process that the Congress forces upon it in order for the city to spend its own money. I ask that we look closely at this process, and I ask Members to help me next year to change this process and free D.C.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding time to me, and again I rise, as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) rose, to say to my distinguished chairman and friend, who does a great service for this institution of the House and a great service for the Committee on Appropriations, and it is a better committee for his service, but unfortunately, he was given a no-win task at the beginning of this year.

Mr. Speaker, let me quote: "Nobody has ever done this many this quick in less time." Some may recall that that was the self-congratulatory statement in July of the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), regarding this body's passage of all 13 appropriation bills through the House.

Even, frankly, the New York Times could not contain itself. The headline over a story earlier this year cried out, "GOP passes spending bills at record clip." But oh, what a difference a few months makes, and, I might say, a dose of reality. We had passed in July and sent to the President two of 13 appropriation bills that were signed into law. August came and went. September came and went. We have two bills signed by the President of the United States and 11 still pending.

Now, we have passed the energy and water, and the President says he is going to veto that. So the two out of 13 was the same as we had in July, and despite the fact that both chambers have since passed the energy and water spending bill, the President vowed again just the other day to veto it.

In addition to the haste, I might say, that we passed these bills in, there was a great deal of hubris, too, on the part of the leadership, which acted as if we could disregard the views of the minority and the fact that it only held a six-seat margin.

My friends on the other side of the aisle have said that that makes it difficult. I agree. The only way it can be done is for us to come together and work together, realizing that the American people have elected 435 folks who have differences of opinion, 100 members of the Senate who have differences of opinion, and, as Speaker Gingrich pointed out and I referenced last week when we passed the CR, a president of the United States who does not agree with some of us.

Apparently it just never occurred to the Republican leadership that it need-

ed to or should reach out to Democrats and to the President and try to strike a bipartisan budget resolution last April. That is why we are here, because the budget resolution passed on a partisan vote was not reasonable, was not acceptable, and could not be implemented, no matter how talented the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) or the subcommittee chairmen were on the Committee on Appropriations. Everybody knew that and said it in April. That is why we are here.

Instead, they forged ahead, and I do not mean the chairman. He was directed to do that. They forged ahead with a budget plan that even many of my Republican friends knew was unrealistic and could not be implemented.

Were we really going to eliminate Head Start for more than 40,000 children to make room for big tax cuts? Were we really going to cut more than 600 FBI agents and 500 DEA agents? Were we really going to provide Pell grants to 316,000 less young people to go to college? Of course not. Neither that side of the aisle nor this side of the aisle thought that was going to occur.

So in failing to come up with a reasonable budget resolution, and I want to tell the Members, I voted for a couple. I particularly voted for the one that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) offered which said, let us do 50 percent debt reduction, 25 percent for investment and 25 percent for targeted tax cuts. That made sense. Even if we did one-third and one-third and one-third, that would have made sense.

Now, however, because of our failure to enact a reasonable budget resolution, we are operating in an unrestrained, unidentified budget context without parameters. I do not think that is what anybody wants to do. It is certainly not what I want to do.

Yesterday my good friend, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), a Republican leader in this House, a man of great wisdom, in my opinion, and great integrity, he is a member of the Committee on Appropriations whom I respect and who understands the necessity of legislative consensus, he was quoted in Roll Call: "We knew all along we would appear to be losing when we broke these limits in the budget resolution."

So this was predictable. The day of reckoning was as foreseeable as the beginning of the new school year, the turning of leaves, and the start of the football season.

The responsibility for this logjam lies with those who thought this budget resolution was reasonable.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues, however, obviously, to vote for this continuing resolution. It is not the Chairman's fault that this continuing resolution is here. We have not finished our business. Who is responsible for that? All of us. We understand that.

But I speak not so much in a partisan vein but for this institution, because if we come together, whether it is next

year or the year after or whatever, in an attempt to pass appropriation bills that we can send to the President in a timely fashion, then we will not lose the leverage as a legislature, and forget about Republicans, Democrats, or who is president, but as a legislative body.

But every week that goes by, we lose leverage. That is not good for the institution of the Congress. I argued that when we were in control, and I will argue it when they are in control. Let us work together to approve the remaining spending bills. I just voted for one. I was glad to see it passed. I hope the President signs it. That is what we should have been doing all along.

I want to tell my friends, I think that 90 percent of the Republicans on the Committee on Appropriations knew that to be the case and wanted to do that. I hope we can do that, Mr. Chairman, as we conclude this session, and I hope we certainly can do it next year, whatever the outcome of the election.

Again, in closing, let me congratulate the chairman. Let me congratulate the ranking member. I do not know anybody in this body who works harder, who is more conscientious, who is more courageous in standing up for his beliefs and the beliefs of his party than the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

But I very frankly think that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) are working together in a way in which America can be proud and can place its trust in. I am just sorry that they could not get the rest of us perhaps to go along in as bipartisan a fashion as they most of the time have the opportunity to do.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the problem we face, as was described by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), is that we essentially have no idea what the limits are. We had a phony limit that was produced in the original budget resolution in the spring, and the House pretended that it was going to live with the spending limit or discretionary funds laid out in that resolution.

□ 1515

But we all know that, for the third year in a row, that understated the reality by about \$40 billion in terms of what the Congress would eventually do.

Now, following that pretense, for a long period of time this year, we now have been given a new construct by the majority party leadership. They have said, well, under our new 90/10 arrangement for use of our surplus, \$28 billion will be available plus \$13 billion because they are recomputing the base from which they were operating. That gives us about \$40 billion on the table which can be used for tax actions or for spending actions or for entitlement actions.

The problem is that that is outlays. We measure the deficit in outlays. But

because we do not spend all of the money that we appropriate in any given year, there is a difference between what the committee actually appropriates and what is actually outlaid in any given fiscal year.

So because of that difference, what is really on the table is up to \$80 billion in additional spending. The problem is no one knows what the plans are for using that huge amount of money. So we are asked to approve a bill at a time. I voted against the Energy-Water bill because I did not know whether we ought to be providing that much money in that bill when we still did not know what the other bills were going to look like.

So we are drifting along with no idea of what the limits are, no context, no limits, no discipline, someone in the leadership office having some idea of what the game plan is. That changes from day to day. But we do not know so we cannot tell our constituents, and the press certainly does not know.

So in the end, we will do what about six anonymous people in the leadership office tells us will be done, but that is not the way we ought to run a railroad or a legislative body. We ought to be able to know what the limits are so that we can choose within those limits. That is not a privilege which is being afforded us. There is not much we can do about that on the minority side of the aisle. But it is an irresponsible way to run what is supposed to be the greatest legislative body in the world.

Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) going to yield back?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I will yield back after I make a closing statement.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the indication of support for the CR. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is exactly right. We have to do this from the institutional standpoint. So we are going to pass this CR today.

I listened to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), one of the more articulate members of this Congress. I would have to say that I agree with an awful lot of what he said. Our budget process is less than perfect. But I want to make sure that everybody understands that the budget process is just one piece of the process. The appropriations process is something entirely different, although it might seem to some that they are both one and the same; but they are not.

But, unfortunately, the appropriations process becomes captive to the budget process on occasion, and we are not the masters of our own destiny sometimes when it comes to the appropriations process.

But we have done a good job in the House. The House can be proud of the

fact that, yes, in fact we did pass all of our bills, and we passed them fairly early. In fact, all 13 bills were passed before the end of July, except for D.C.. The D.C. bill was actually on the floor in July but was pulled off the floor for some other measure that apparently had more importance at one point or another.

Also, we have passed, in terms of conference reports, through the House the Defense conference report, the Military Construction conference report, the Energy and Water conference report, the Treasury-Postal conference report, the Legislative Branch conference report, and the Interior conference report, which we passed just a short time ago today.

We have completed the conference on the Transportation appropriations bill this morning. At 4 o'clock this afternoon, we will convene a conference meeting on the Agricultural appropriations bill.

So we are moving on our responsibility, but we, in the House, are only one-third of the players. The other body is a player and the President of the United States is a player. When it gets to the point that bills are sent to the President, and we do not know what he is going to do on some of these bills, he becomes as powerful as two-thirds of this House and two-thirds of the Senate. Because if he vetoes one of our bills, it takes two-thirds of both Houses to override the veto.

So we try to work together. I think what we saw earlier today on the Interior appropriations bill was an indication of how, if we work together, both sides, the majority, the minority, understanding that there are strong differences, to resolve those differences, it is amazing what we can accomplish. I am really proud of the House for the strong vote that we received for the Interior bill just a short time ago.

So Mr. Speaker, it is essential that we pass this CR today, and I again appreciate those statements from the minority, from the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), recognizing that it is important to pass the CR today that would keep the government operating to the 14th of October. Hopefully by then we will have much more positive and constructive news to report.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). All time for debate is expired.

The joint resolution is considered as having been read for amendment.

Pursuant to House Resolution 604, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 415, nays 1, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 509]

YEAS—415

Abercrombie	Crowley	Hobson
Ackerman	Cubin	Hoefel
Aderholt	Cummings	Hoekstra
Allen	Cunningham	Holden
Andrews	Danner	Holt
Archer	Davis (FL)	Hooley
Armey	Davis (IL)	Horn
Baca	Davis (VA)	Hornett
Bachus	Deal	Hoyer
Baird	DeGette	Hulshof
Baker	Delahunt	Hunter
Baldacci	DeLauro	Hutchinson
Baldwin	DeLay	Hyde
Barcia	DeMint	Inlee
Barr	Deutsch	Isakson
Barrett (NE)	Diaz-Balart	Istook
Barrett (WI)	Dickey	Jackson (IL)
Bartlett	Dicks	Jackson-Lee
Barton	Dingell	(TX)
Bass	Dixon	Jefferson
Becerra	Doggett	Jenkins
Bentsen	Dooley	John
Bereuter	Doolittle	Johnson (CT)
Berkley	Doyle	Johnson, E. B.
Berman	Dreier	Johnson, Sam
Berry	Duncan	Jones (NC)
Biggert	Edwards	Jones (OH)
Bilbray	Ehlers	Kanjorski
Bilirakis	Ehrlich	Kaptur
Bishop	Emerson	Kasich
Blagojevich	Engel	Kelly
Bliley	English	Kennedy
Blumenauer	Etheridge	Kildee
Blunt	Evans	Kilpatrick
Boehlert	Everett	Kind (WI)
Boehner	Ewing	Kingston
Bonilla	Farr	Klecza
Bonior	Fattah	Klink
Bono	Filner	Knollenberg
Borski	Fletcher	Kolbe
Boswell	Foley	Kucinich
Boucher	Forbes	Kuykendall
Boyd	Ford	LaFalce
Brady (PA)	Fossella	LaHood
Brady (TX)	Fowler	Lampson
Brown (FL)	Frank (MA)	Lantos
Brown (OH)	Frelinghuysen	Largent
Bryant	Frost	Larson
Burr	Galleghy	Latham
Burton	Ganske	LaTourette
Buyer	Gejdenson	Leach
Callahan	Gekas	Lee
Calvert	Gephardt	Levin
Camp	Gibbons	Lewis (CA)
Campbell	Gilchrest	Lewis (GA)
Canady	Gillmor	Lewis (KY)
Cannon	Gilman	Linder
Capps	Gonzalez	Lipinski
Capuano	Goode	LoBiondo
Cardin	Goodlatte	Lofgren
Carson	Goodling	Lowe
Castle	Gordon	Lucas (KY)
Chabot	Goss	Lucas (OK)
Chambliss	Graham	Luther
Chenoweth-Hage	Granger	Maloney (CT)
Clay	Green (TX)	Maloney (NY)
Clayton	Green (WI)	Manzullo
Clement	Greenwood	Markey
Clyburn	Gutierrez	Martinez
Coble	Gutknecht	Mascara
Coburn	Hall (OH)	Matsui
Collins	Hall (TX)	McCarthy (MO)
Combest	Hansen	McCarthy (NY)
Condit	Hastings (WA)	McCrery
Conyers	Hayes	McDermott
Cook	Hayworth	McGovern
Cooksey	Herger	McHugh
Costello	Hill (IN)	McInnis
Cox	Hill (MT)	McIntyre
Coyne	Hilleary	McKeon
Cramer	Hilliard	McKinney
Crane	Hinche	McNulty

Meek (FL)	Rahall	Stark
Meeks (NY)	Ramstad	Stearns
Menendez	Rangel	Stenholm
Metcalf	Regula	Strickland
Mica	Reyes	Stump
Millender-	Reynolds	Stupak
McDonald	Rivers	Sununu
Miller (FL)	Rodriguez	Sweeney
Miller, Gary	Roemer	Talent
Miller, George	Rogan	Tancred
Minge	Rogers	Tanner
Mink	Rohrabacher	Tauscher
Moakley	Ros-Lehtinen	Tauzin
Mollohan	Rothman	Taylor (MS)
Moore	Roukema	Taylor (NC)
Moran (KS)	Roybal-Allard	Terry
Moran (VA)	Royce	Thomas
Morella	Rush	Thompson (CA)
Murtha	Ryan (WI)	Thompson (MS)
Myrick	Ryun (KS)	Thornberry
Nadler	Sabo	Thune
Napolitano	Salmon	Thurman
Neal	Sanchez	Tiahrt
Nethercutt	Sanders	Tierney
Ney	Sandlin	Toomey
Northup	Sanford	Towns
Norwood	Sawyer	Trafficant
Nussle	Saxton	Turner
Oberstar	Scarborough	Udall (CO)
Obey	Schaffer	Udall (NM)
Olver	Schakowsky	Upton
Ortiz	Scott	Velazquez
Ose	Sensenbrenner	Visclosky
Owens	Serrano	Vitter
Oxley	Sessions	Walden
Packard	Shadegg	Walsh
Pallone	Shaw	Wamp
Pascrell	Shays	Waters
Pastor	Sherman	Watkins
Payne	Sherwood	Watt (NC)
Pease	Shimkus	Watts (OK)
Pelosi	Shows	Waxman
Peterson (MN)	Shuster	Weiner
Peterson (PA)	Simpson	Weldon (FL)
Petri	Sisisky	Weldon (PA)
Phelps	Skeen	Weller
Pickering	Skelton	Weygand
Pickett	Slaughter	Whitfield
Pitts	Smith (MI)	Wicker
Pombo	Smith (NJ)	Wilson
Pomeroy	Smith (TX)	Wise
Porter	Smith (WA)	Wolf
Portman	Snyder	Woolsey
Price (NC)	Souder	Wu
Pryce (OH)	Spence	Wynn
Quinn	Spratt	Young (AK)
Radanovich	Stabenow	Young (FL)

## NAYS—1

DeFazio

## NOT VOTING—17

Ballenger	Hinojosa	Meehan
Dunn	Houghton	Paul
Eshoo	King (NY)	Riley
Franks (NJ)	Lazio	Vento
Hastings (FL)	McCollum	Wexler
Hefley	McIntosh	

□ 1543

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

So the joint resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall No. 506, H. Res. 603, waiving Points of Order against the Conference Report on H.R. 4578. Had I been present I would have voted "yea." Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall No. 507, H.R. 4578, the Interior Appropriations Conference Report for Fiscal Year 2001. Had I been present I would have voted "yea." Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall No. 508, H.J. Res. 278, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the importance of education, early de-

tection and treatment, and other efforts in the fight against breast cancer. Had I been present I would have voted "yea." Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall No. 509, H.J. Res. 110, making further appropriations for fiscal year 2001. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

## FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3767. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make improvements to, and permanently authorize, the visa waiver pilot program under section 217 of such Act.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2045. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to H-1B nonimmigrant aliens.

□ 1545

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MORELLA). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that she will postpone further proceedings today on the remaining motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record votes on postponed questions will be taken tomorrow.

## PROVIDING FOR CONCURRENCE BY HOUSE WITH AN AMENDMENT IN SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 707, DISASTER MITIGATION ACT OF 2000

Mrs. FOWLER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 607) providing for the concurrence by the House with an amendment in the Senate amendments to H.R. 707.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 607

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall be considered to have taken from the Speaker's table the bill H.R. 707, with the amendment of the Senate thereto, and to have concurred in the amendment of the Senate to the text with the following amendment:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment of the Senate, insert the following:

## SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

## TITLE I—PREDISASTER HAZARD MITIGATION

Sec. 101. Findings and purpose.

Sec. 102. Predisaster hazard mitigation.  
Sec. 103. Interagency task force.  
Sec. 104. Mitigation planning; minimum standards for public and private structures.

## TITLE II—STREAMLINING AND COST REDUCTION

Sec. 201. Technical amendments.  
Sec. 202. Management costs.  
Sec. 203. Public notice, comment, and consultation requirements.  
Sec. 204. State administration of hazard mitigation grant program.  
Sec. 205. Assistance to repair, restore, reconstruct, or replace damaged facilities.  
Sec. 206. Federal assistance to individuals and households.  
Sec. 207. Community disaster loans.  
Sec. 208. Report on State management of small disasters initiative.  
Sec. 209. Study regarding cost reduction.

## TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

Sec. 301. Technical correction of short title.  
Sec. 302. Definitions.  
Sec. 303. Fire management assistance.  
Sec. 304. President's Council on Domestic Terrorism Preparedness.  
Sec. 305. Disaster grant closeout procedures.  
Sec. 306. Public safety officer benefits for certain Federal and State employees.  
Sec. 307. Buy American.  
Sec. 308. Treatment of certain real property.  
Sec. 309. Study of participation by Indian tribes in emergency management.

## TITLE I—PREDISASTER HAZARD MITIGATION

## SEC. 101. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) natural disasters, including earthquakes, tsunamis, tornadoes, hurricanes, flooding, and wildfires, pose great danger to human life and to property throughout the United States;

(2) greater emphasis needs to be placed on—

(A) identifying and assessing the risks to States and local governments (including Indian tribes) from natural disasters;

(B) implementing adequate measures to reduce losses from natural disasters; and

(C) ensuring that the critical services and facilities of communities will continue to function after a natural disaster;

(3) expenditures for postdisaster assistance are increasing without commensurate reductions in the likelihood of future losses from natural disasters;

(4) in the expenditure of Federal funds under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), high priority should be given to mitigation of hazards at the local level; and

(5) with a unified effort of economic incentives, awareness and education, technical assistance, and demonstrated Federal support, States and local governments (including Indian tribes) will be able to—

(A) form effective community-based partnerships for hazard mitigation purposes;

(B) implement effective hazard mitigation measures that reduce the potential damage from natural disasters;

(C) ensure continued functionality of critical services;

(D) leverage additional non-Federal resources in meeting natural disaster resistance goals; and

(E) make commitments to long-term hazard mitigation efforts to be applied to new and existing structures.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this title is to establish a national disaster hazard mitigation program—