

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the grounds 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 216, nays 200, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 277]

YEAS—216

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

NAYS—200

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

NOT VOTING—17

Armey	Istook	Snyder
Blumenauer	Lipinski	Spence
Carson (OK)	McNulty	Tancredo
Cubin	Myrick	Udall (NM)
Ehrlich	Northup	Waters
Houghton	Schaffer	

□ 1351

Mr. BERRY and Ms. ESHOO changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the 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. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I was absent earlier today to attend the funeral of a member of my family and I missed rollcall votes number 275, 276 and 277.

Had I been present and voting, I would have voted yes on rollcall 275, yes on rollcall 276, and no on rollcall 277.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY COMMITTEE ON RULES REGARDING AMENDMENTS TO LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

(Ms. PRYCE of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules is planning to meet next week to grant a rule which may limit the amendment process on the Legislative Branch appropriations bill for fiscal year 2002. The bill was ordered reported by the Committee on Appropriations this morning and is expected to be filed later today.

Any Member wishing to offer an amendment must submit 55 copies of the amendment and one copy of a very brief explanation of the amendment to the Committee on Rules in room H-312 of the Capitol no later than 12 noon on Monday, July 30. Members should draft their amendments to the bill as reported by the Committee on Appropriations. The text is available at the Committee on Appropriations.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2620, DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 210 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 210

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2620) 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, 2002, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule

XXI are waived except as follows: beginning with", except that" on page 64, line 12, through "drinking water contaminants" on line 17. Where points of order are waived against part of a paragraph, points of order against a provision in another part of such paragraph may be made only against such provision and not against the entire paragraph. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on rules accompanying this resolution may be offered only by a Member designated in the report and only at the appropriate point in the reading of the bill, shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the report are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill, points of order against amendments for failure to comply with clause 2(e) of rule XXI are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER); pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 210 is an open rule which provides for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided between the chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), and the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), on H.R. 2620, the fiscal year 2002 Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development and Independent Agencies Appropriations bill.

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. After general debate, any Member wishing to offer an amendment may do so as long as it complies with the regular rules of the House. The rule makes in order one amendment printed in the report accompanying the rule and waives all points of order against that amendment.

The rule waives points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI for legislating on an appropriations bill and prohibiting nonemergency designated amendments to be offered to an appropriations bill containing an emergency designation.

Finally, the rule permits the minority to offer a motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, this bill provides yet another example of a carefully crafted bill from the Committee on Appropriations that strikes a balance between

fiscal discipline and social responsibility. I would like to commend the chairman and the ranking member, and all the members of the Committee on Appropriations, for making the tough decisions required to produce a thoughtful bill that meets our most important priorities.

While we can never agree on everything, this is a good bill which we can all agree addresses some of our Nation's most pressing needs. It takes care of our veterans, it addresses the Nation's critical housing needs, it helps to preserve and protect our environment, it invests in scientific research, and continues our exploration into space.

This legislation maintains our commitment to our Nation's veterans, who selflessly place themselves in harm's way so that we may enjoy the very freedoms which we so cherish. Our veterans deserve our thanks, but more importantly they deserve and have earned the benefits in this bill.

This year, the fiscal year 2002 Veterans-HUD appropriations bill provides an additional \$1 billion over last year's increase for Veterans Medical Health Care, bringing the total to \$21.3 billion.

□ 1400

I am proud to inform my colleagues and, more importantly, our veterans that we have increased Veterans Medical Health Care by \$4 billion over the course of the last 3 fiscal years.

This bill increases Veterans Medical and Prosthetic Research yet again, by \$20 million, and provides an extra \$128 million over last year's funding levels for the Veterans Benefit Administration to expedite claims processing.

Finally, H.R. 2620 provides \$100 million for Veterans Extended Care Facilities, an increase of \$50 million over the President's request.

Mr. Speaker, along with providing for the needs of our veterans, this legislation makes available important resources to help the most vulnerable in our society with a very basic need: placing a roof over their heads.

Low-income families will benefit through this bill's investment in the Housing Certificates Program, which provides funding for Section 8 renewals and tenant protection.

A \$1.8 billion increase over last year's funding level will allow for the renewal of all expiring Section 8 contracts and provide needed relocation assistance at the level requested by our President. A total of \$15.7 billion is provided for this important program in fiscal year 2002. This includes \$197 million to fund some 34,000 new Section 8 vouchers.

In my district in Columbus, Ohio, we know all too well how crucial this housing assistance is for families who are trying to lift themselves up and improve their lives.

Other needed housing programs that help our elderly, that help people with AIDS and that help the disabled are also receiving increases over last year's funding levels in this report.

H.R. 2620 also looks toward the future by preserving and protecting our environment for the next generations to enjoy.

The bill targets funding and places an emphasis on State grants to protect the water that we drink and the air that we breathe.

The State Revolving Fund for Safe Drinking Water is increased by more than \$25 million from last year's level, the Clean Water State Revolving Fund is funded at \$1.2 billion, equal to last year's level, and, finally, State Air Grants are increased \$8 million over last year.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation provides important funding which maintains our commitment to the exploration of space and the improvements of science.

I am pleased to say that the National Science Foundation is increased by some 9 percent or \$414 million above the last fiscal year. This will go a long way to try to help foster scientific discovery, promote basic research, as well as increase science education.

NASA also receives an increase that will bring total funding to more than \$15 billion. It fully funds the space shuttle operations and increases funding for the International Space Station programs. This will enable the United States of America to maintain our superiority in space exploration and aeronautical research.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this bill addresses an unexpected shortfall within the Federal Emergency Management Agency by providing \$1.3 billion in emergency designated funding.

While, as a fiscal conservative, I am generally opposed to the use of emergency designations on appropriations bills, this bill and the amendment made in order under this rule provides that the funds will only be made available if it is determined that they are necessary for FEMA to meet the needs of the communities adversely affected by disaster. These funds simply represent an insurance policy for some of our Nation's hardest hit communities.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill, and it deserves our support. It takes a responsible path towards addressing our Nation's most pressing needs and priorities. I urge all of my colleagues to support this straightforward and non-controversial rule, as well as this must-do piece of legislation.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Ohio for yielding me the customary half hour and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I have strong concerns about the rule and the process it represents. As I stated earlier, the Committee on Rules and the current leadership are developing a compulsive aversion to regular order. In what has become standard operating

procedure, the Committee on Rules emerged only moments ago to consider what should be a noncontroversial open rule on an appropriations bill making its initial pass through this Chamber.

The underlying bill is too important for this country to be treated so cavalierly. The gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) deserve rich praise for their work, particularly in adding funds to the President's anemic budget for science. The President's budget requested a meager 1.2 percent increase for the National Science Foundation, barely half the amount necessary to cover inflation. The Committee wisely added \$368 million to the President's request, an amount which will allow on-going research in basic physics, chemistry, mathematics and engineering.

I was particularly pleased and gratified to see the inclusion of \$8 million for a proposed Infotonics Center of Excellence in my district of Rochester, New York. This project will utilize my region's established expertise in optics, the science of light, that is critical to the future economic success of New York State. This will be a cooperative research and development facility where academic researchers, industry leaders such as Kodak, Xerox and Corning, and small companies can pool their resources and expertise. With this funding, we can begin to bridge the gap between basic research and product manufacturing focusing in optics, fiberoptics and the emerging field of photonics, transmitting data by light.

I also want to thank the chairman for the increase in funding for HUD's Office of Lead Hazard Control funding. I was pleased that 50 of my colleagues signed my letter requesting this increase, and I look forward to continuing to work with the Committee as this funding works its way through the appropriations process. Many older houses and apartments still contain lead-based paint.

Research shows that children with elevated blood lead levels are seven times more likely to drop out of school and twice as likely to fall behind their peers in language acquisition. In my district of Rochester, New York, 37 percent of the children tested have more lead in their blood than the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention say is safe. This increased funding will be a critical step in addressing this problem.

Many Members on this side of the aisle have expressed concern over veterans medical care and public housing programs that serve the country's most vulnerable citizens and families. Unfortunately, an inadequate overall allocation has forced the majority to rely on budgetary gimmicks to stay within the subcommittee's budget ceiling. These gimmicks include almost \$1 billion of delayed obligations and "pretend" budget allocations such as the recommendation to eliminate funding for the Corporation for National and

Community Service, a recommendation which the chairman announced prior to reporting the bill that he intends to reverse in conference.

These problems will cause the VA-HUD bill to be the first of the seven appropriations bills reported by the Committee that may not share broad bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, this country has the resources to care for its veterans and to provide adequate housing for the poor, the elderly and the disabled.

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

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY).

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule for the VA-HUD Appropriations bill.

I share the concerns of some Members that the designated emergency spending within the bill is at odds with our broader imperative to uphold the principles of fiscal discipline, and I applaud my colleagues for their conviction. Yet, at the same time, it is imperative that we ensure FEMA has the necessary funds to be prepared for disasters and emergencies.

Every year emergencies and catastrophes arise that draw down the account FEMA maintains to fund expenses stemming from emergency response efforts. In Houston, we just got hit with several feet of water in one day. Houston, if you have not been there, is built on a plain. There is only so much water that our system can accommodate. We got hit with a lot more than that. Now we are facing billions of dollars in damages. That is catastrophic damage. It is the exact reason that we classify some events as legitimate emergencies.

Mr. Speaker, I have opposed and will continue opposing attempts to manipulate the process by lumping wasteful spending in with the legitimate expenses that we incur by responding to actual emergencies, but that is not the case here. The FEMA account generally has emergency funds in contingency reserve to deal with true emergencies, and the flooding from Tropical Storm Allison caused a real emergency in Houston and all through the South. We know that cleaning up the damage has nearly wiped out FEMA's funding, so several weeks ago on this floor I opposed the partisan fear tactics that were used by some of my colleagues on other side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, the fact remains that FEMA has the funds necessary to carry out their duties for the remainder of this fiscal year. FEMA has the funds to make it through the year. The responsible thing to do is to restore the funds to the account. It will enable FEMA to assist Houston's recovery, and as we move into hurricane season it will enable FEMA to stand ready to meet any short-term contingency as well.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the work of the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) as we move through this proc-

ess, and I ask my colleagues to vote for the rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, so far, with the six appropriations bills which have passed the House, we have seen bipartisan support for every single one of them. This is the first bill that will generate considerable opposition, and I want to explain why.

The fault does not lie with the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) or the subcommittee. He has done the very best job he could possibly do, given the allocation that he was given. The problem is that the allocation is too low, and that forces the bill to be at least a half billion dollars lower than it should be for veterans health care, and it cripples the enforcement of clean air and water laws across the country.

It forces the bill to provide inadequate funding for housing for poor kids. It forces the bill to eliminate the National Service Corps, which even the subcommittee itself admits is not a serious initiative, but they had to do it to, quote, "fit into the so-called budget rules". It forces a number of other reductions which everyone understands in the end are essentially irresponsible.

Why does it do that? It does it because the tax bill passed earlier in the year by this Congress sucked up every single dollar on the table, which meant that we had nothing left to deal with the long-term problems of Social Security, of Medicare, of education, of veterans medical care, of environmental protection or any other national priority.

Essentially, the House majority prevented the House from facing the real world trade-offs between tax cuts of the most well-off people in our society and other crucial funding for middle income and lower income people.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I asked the Committee on Rules to make in order an amendment. Since they are providing numerous other waivers, I asked them to make in order an amendment that would allow us to add \$300 million to veterans health care, add \$382 million to housing, add \$311 million to the National Service Corps, add enough to restore the 65 EPA environmental enforcement positions that they have cut.

And we paid for it without cutting into the Medicare surplus, without adding to the deficit, by simply scaling back the size of the tax cut for people with incomes of over \$330,000, by dropping it from 39.6 to 39.1 percent instead of the 38.6 percent that the House passed earlier this year.

Mr. Speaker, the folks we are talking about have seen their after-tax income grow by \$414,000 per family over the last 20 years. I do not think that it is asking of them too much to say, instead of getting an average tax cut of \$53,000, to only get a tax cut of about \$25,000. I hardly think that is going to put them in the poorhouse.

If we had that amendment before us, we would be able to try to use that money, which would be \$1.3 billion, use a billion of it in this bill for veterans health care, for housing, for environmental enforcement and the like, still leaving \$300 million available for additional education and defense priorities.

That to me is what we ought to do, but the rule did not allow it. So I will be asking each and every one of my colleagues to vote against the previous question on the rule so that we can offer this amendment to allow the House to choose whether giving a \$53,000 tax cut to people who make \$1 million or more a year is more important than enforcing our environmental laws, more important than giving veterans the medical care they need, more important than providing decent housing for poor kids.

Mr. Speaker, I think the moral choice is obvious. I would hope that the House would allow us to face these trade-offs. The problem with the budget that has been passed is that, very skillfully, these trade-offs have been avoided. We have not been allowed to exercise real-world choices. It is time that we grow up and make these choices.

□ 1415

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) chairman of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time and for her leadership on this rule and for guiding this bill through the House for the third year in a row. I hope we are as lucky this year as we have been the last two.

I think we have a good bill, Mr. Speaker. It is a work product that incorporates bipartisanship in its truest form. The gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) and I have worked hand in hand. Our staffs have worked hand in hand and worked together on priorities. We had a manager's amendment in the full committee that the gentleman from West Virginia helped to write. We incorporated that, and the bill was passed out of committee on a voice vote. So both parties, all Members, supported the bill.

I think it is obviously a very complex bill. There are a lot of different issues in the bill. Perhaps the most important, as always has been the case, is Veterans. The authorizing committee asked for additional funds in medical care discretionary funds, and we provided a billion dollars over and above what was provided last year. So in the past 3 years, we will have increased veterans' medical care by just over \$4 billion. That is a very substantial increase. It is a tremendous commitment on the part of the Congress to provide funds to the veterans. In each case, we have met or exceeded the President's

request dating back from the previous administration.

We also provided over \$400 million for construction. This is a direct response to Members who felt that medical care centers around the country were in need of repair, major construction. This is a huge commitment that has not been duplicated in many, many years. So I think we have made a real effort here to put the funds where they need to be in Veterans.

We have also provided an additional \$175 million above last year to provide for veterans' claims processing. This is Secretary Principi's highest goal, to provide those resources. We are going to help him to meet that commitment to get those waiting times down for veterans' claims processing.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I appreciate what the gentleman has said in response to what we have already done by increasing the President's budget request for these extremely important issues. I know that we would like to do more. But we are doing the best we can to keep all of our bills within our budget number. We cannot go over that budget number.

What I wanted to say to our colleagues is that the Obey amendment might have been more acceptable except for one little problem, which I will refer to in a minute. All of our committees in the House, jealously guard their areas of responsibility and their areas of jurisdiction. The gentleman from Wisconsin is one of the outstanding leaders in doing that for the Committee on Appropriations, to preserve our prerogatives, and our responsibilities. The problem with the amendment that the gentleman from Wisconsin wanted to have made in order and he offered in the full committee, relates to two sentences:

"Paragraph 2 of section 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 relating to reduction in rates after June 30, 2001 . . .". This is the tax bill. ". . ." is amended by adding after the table the following: in the case of taxable years beginning during calendar year 2002, the preceding table shall be applied by substituting 39.1 percent for 38.6 percent."

That would change the tax law. The Committee on Ways and Means rightfully is protecting their responsibility and their prerogatives, in being opposed to this. I think it is incumbent upon us if we intend to maintain the integrity of all of our committee structures, that this is the reason we were not able to accept this amendment.

I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I also appreciate the good work that he and the gentleman from West Virginia have done to produce a really good bill.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Let me simply say that I am concerned with the integrity of this Congress. And I think we can start demonstrating that integrity by being willing to make the specific trade-offs that we have to make in the real world. The problem that we have is that the tax bill was passed before we ever had a budget. That was a clever device by which the House was shielded from having to choose whether it was more important to cut taxes by a specific amount for high-income folks or whether it was more important to use some of that money for veterans, for education, or for other high priorities. We have been denied every other way to make those trade-offs evident, so this is the only avenue left open to us. It may not be perfect, but it is a whole lot better than not joining the issue at all.

Mr. WALSH. I thank the ranking member for his comments. I would remind him that the Congress, both House and Senate, voted for that tax cut; and it is the law of the land.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN).

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the rule before us today is an open rule that allows all amendments provided for under the House rules to be offered. It also waives all points of order against provisions included in the committee-passed bill.

Of particular importance and interest, it waives points of order against a provision offered in full committee by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY). This provision would provide \$1.3 billion for the Federal Emergency Management Agency designated as emergency funding. We all know about the disaster that Tropical Storm Allison brought to Texas and the Gulf Coast.

Other States, Mr. Speaker, have also recently experienced federally declared disasters. My own State of West Virginia is struggling to recover from recent flooding. Twenty-two counties have been included in the Federal disaster declaration and a recent estimate for West Virginia has placed the damage cost in excess of \$175 million.

We know that the storm season is just beginning, and FEMA has told us that they will need additional funding. We need to provide it to ensure that communities that suffer disasters are able to receive Federal assistance in a timely manner.

While we in the minority would have preferred providing this funding in the fiscal year 2001 supplemental bill that was recently considered, the administration blocked that effort. However, in the statement of administration policy with regard to this bill, on the topic of emergency funding, they have indicated that they do not object now to the House including the emergency funding in this bill for fiscal year 2002. I am pleased that the Committee on Rules protected this provision.

I am disappointed that the Committee on Rules did not grant a waiver making in order an amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), ranking member of the full Committee on Appropriations. His amendment would have provided \$1 billion in additional resources to adequately fund many of the accounts in this bill that are admittedly underfunded. As an offset, the amendment would have decreased the recently enacted reduction in the highest marginal tax rate by just .5 percent. While I might consider this a minor change, for those who supported the tax cut, it has the implication of shifting millions of dollars from the highest-income citizens in our land to benefit some of the neediest citizens and neediest communities in our land.

Because this amendment was not made in order, I support efforts to defeat the previous question so that the rule can be amended to permit the Obey amendment to be considered by the House.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for yielding me this time, especially in light of the fact that I am rising in opposition to this rule. I would point out that it is a very reluctant opposition. This is the first time that I have opposed a rule since I have been in Congress.

The fact is in recent years we have been spending too much money. The result of that is that we are in grave danger, as a result of the spending increases we have had in recent years and the economic downturn, that within a few short years we could be back to raiding Medicare and raiding Social Security. We made a promise we would not do that. This rule makes that problem worse. It makes that danger worse. Let me explain why.

This bill, as we know, adds \$1.3 billion in funding for FEMA. Above and beyond the \$1.4 billion ordinary funding for FEMA, there is 1.3 billion additional FEMA dollars that have an emergency designation. The significance of the emergency designation is that that money does not have to be offset. So that means it is in addition to the entire budget. It is above and beyond all that we are going to spend in 2002. House rules forbid putting an emergency designation into a non-emergency bill. This rule breaks that rule. It waives that provision.

Why was that done, again I ask? It was to make sure that this did not have to be offset. That is what is wrong with this. Those of us who are going to oppose this rule do not do so because we necessarily oppose the FEMA funding. What we oppose is the fact that we are not going to be able to strike the emergency designation and require this to be offset; and as a result, we are going to increase the risk that we may,

in fact, end up raiding Medicare or Social Security at some time in the near future.

I would also point out the President did not request this. Normally when the President requests an emergency, he sends a letter requesting emergency funding and designates a specific event. The President did not do that. In fact, he issued a statement of administration policy. I will quote briefly. It says:

"The administration appreciates Congress' attentiveness to the needs of FEMA. The administration is not, however, prepared to commit to a specific level of contingent emergency appropriations at this time."

That is exactly what this does. It puts in an extra \$1.3 billion. I urge my Democratic colleagues who object to not being able to offer an amendment, do not vote against the previous question only to vote for the rule. You ought to vote against the rule if you do not agree with this rule. I urge my Republican colleagues likewise.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to also oppose the rule. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and I must read different things, but let me tell you why. This place passed out a tax cut way out there and now everybody stands up and says, "We don't have enough money to do what's necessary."

We are in such a fix that the leadership from Texas has to bring us out here and put us under martial law. Why? Because they want to have \$1.3 billion in relief to Texas. Now, yesterday on the Foreign Ops bill, we could pass all this money, 300 and some odd million dollars to wipe out drugs in Colombia. But in this bill, because we need \$1.3 billion, we take \$310 million in drug money, fighting drugs, out of the public housing in this country. We worry about it in Colombia but not in our own cities. We wipe out AmeriCorps for \$445 million. We are getting closer to that \$1.3.

The issue here is what is an emergency. The White House says that what goes on in India, where they knocked down 100,000 houses and 30,000 people died, we can give them \$5 million. That is how much the great and generous and rich United States can do. In El Salvador, where they have had the worst earthquake in history, we give them nothing.

So now the message here is to those Ecuadorians and San Salvadorans is get in a bus and get to Texas, because if there is any problem, it will get taken care of in Texas. The gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) says that West Virginia has a few problems. Folks, get in the car and get to Texas, because that is what we are going to take care of. We are not going to take care of anything else. We are

not going to take care of CDBG. We are cutting money out of there. Of course we passed this community money into the churches so we all better write a letter to our churches, send more money, because you are not going to get it from the Congress.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to thank the members of the Committee on Appropriations for their hard work on the bill. I offered an amendment in the Committee on Rules which was not granted a waiver and that is very, very disappointing, because my amendment would appropriate no additional funds and it would only authorize the use of existing funds for an important program. It would have authorized the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to establish a minority emergency preparedness demonstration program to research and promote the capacity of minority communities throughout the country to get data, information, and awareness education through grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements with eligible nonprofit corporations. These nonprofits would do research on the status of emergency preparedness and disaster response awareness in African American and Hispanic communities across the country, in rural areas, suburban areas and determine how they are impacted by natural and man-made disasters and emergencies.

□ 1430

Also, they would be authorized to develop and promote awareness of emergency preparedness programs in minority communities and to develop competent educational materials that could be disseminated in these communities and to organizations and institutions.

This was a good bill. It would be very helpful, particularly since in the past year there were 51 disasters in 33 different states, and this year there have been 23 disasters in 22 different states. The impact on minorities has been established by FEMA at 2½ times greater on minorities than any other group.

This is a very, very much-needed operation, given the disasters we have had; and I am very, very disappointed that the rule does not allow a waiver to allow consideration of my amendment, which has been printed and is in the RECORD.

I urge ultimate passage of the bill, but if we can defeat the rule and perhaps allow consideration of this amendment, I certainly would be appreciative. It would be good for America, good for African American and Hispanic communities that are impacted so greatly by our floods, tornadoes and natural disasters where there have been tremendous fatalities and loss of life over the past few years.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would encourage the gentleman that just spoke to offer that amendment when the time comes.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, we are now in the eighth of 13 appropriations bills, and, as we drive this process to conclusion, I think it would be smart to stop and look at the fuel gauge.

That is what we have here, a gas gauge. We started out with a full tank, flush with surpluses, \$95 billion this year. We did our resolution, 302(a), and gave \$4 billion more than the baseline, so you take that out. We did a budget resolution with a placeholder number for defense. Now we are having to come back and put in a real number for defense, and, in outlay terms, it is \$12 billion.

Because we did not adequately provide for defense and because we did not provide at all for emergencies, even though the chairman of our committee wanted to institutionalize that, it appeared that a bigger tax cut was feasible. So the tax cut for this year takes out \$75 billion, but for a gimmick I will mention in just a minute. So when you factor in those changes you get down to \$3 billion. That is how close we are to being empty.

Now, one thing saves us, and that is we did an artificial one-time transfer of funds from September 15 to October 1. The problem is, when we go home in August, that money may disappear when CBO does its update of the budget and economy. If that is true, we will really be running right on empty. That is all we have got left to provide for emergencies, to provide for other priorities that come along in this process before it is completed. That is what is wrong with the tax cut.

What happened? I do not blame the subcommittee at all. I did not get up to criticize the subcommittee. I think they have done as well as they could do with what was allocated.

But we pointed out if you went with this budget with these tax cuts and this allocation, this was going to happen to veterans. We could not fund fully the basic needs of the Veterans Health Care Program. It has happened. It has come to pass. We have less than they need. They have done a good job in trying to plus it up as well they could, but there is not enough there.

In the Housing Program, how could one pick a program that helps the vulnerable more than housing? We have a \$20 billion backlog in capital requirements and maintenance needs. What are we doing? Taking a half billion dollars out of it. The housing projects are a haven for drugs. We are eliminating the Public Housing Drug Elimination Program.

This is a consequence of having a budget where we did not adequately provide for emergencies, we did not adequately provide for defense, we fooled ourselves about the size of the tax cut, and now we are inheriting the consequences. You see the fruits of this in the bill before us today.

I commend the committee for doing the best they could with what they have got, but these are the consequences of the tax bill that we adopted just a couple of months ago.

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

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, the consideration of this appropriations bill and the rule attendant to it presents somewhat of a serious dilemma to all of us who are approaching this issue very carefully. On the one hand, it elicits only a sense of praise for the subcommittee chairman, the chairman of the full committee, the ranking members, for the way in which they have squeezed as much as they have into this bill, given the limited resources that they had to work with.

But that is essentially the problem. We have choked ourselves off in this country by this enormous tax cut that we passed earlier this year preceding the budget, in the craziest way of approaching fiscal policy I think we have seen in this government in a long, long time. What does that leave us with? It leaves us with some very serious problems we are not addressing.

The gentleman from South Carolina just made the point about housing. We have a \$20 billion backlog in housing. We have a housing crisis in this country. Many people, in urban and rural areas across America, find it impossible to get a house. Municipal workers, for example, are not making enough money to afford a house in the present market. This is a housing crisis. There is no place for them to live and raise their families.

Similar things can be said about environmental protection. This bill does the best it can, but it does not provide nearly enough money to protect the quality of the natural environment from toxic discharges and other releases into the ambient air and the general environment.

That is a serious mistake. And why? Because we choked ourselves off with that huge tax cut, and we do not have the resources that we need to attend to vital concerns addressing our people. The same thing can be said about health care. The same thing can be said about our growing crisis in transportation. Look at any of the airports in this country and you can see it very, very clearly. Drive along the roads during rush hour. It becomes readily apparent. We are not doing anything to deal with the need for surface transportation, particularly rail transportation between our major cities.

So, this is a dilemma for all of us. We are not allowing ourselves to deal with these important issues facing the American people.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York just spoke of the inability of our budget to handle the needs of our people. I want to speak to the veterans' budget, the veteran parts of this budget, because the same is true there. We simply have let our veterans down in this budget. We have not honored the promise, we have not honored our commitment, we have not honored our contract with our Nation's veterans.

Now, we are fond on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, at least on the Democratic side, of saying that you do not have a surplus until you have paid your bills, and we have not paid our bills to the Nation's veterans. We had a decade of flat-line budgeting, and, as a result, the quality of medical care declined, the waiting times for appointments expanded greatly, and the new diseases and the diseases of aging veterans could not be handled with the same professionalism as previously. So we have not paid our bills to our Nation's veterans.

Now, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee said that we added \$1 billion to last year's budget. Well, all independent analysts say that \$1 billion for our veterans' health care system barely keeps up with inflation and does not allow us to make the gains that we had promised over the last decade.

I am going to make several amendments to this bill when the time is appropriate to bring the level of the budget up to a more appropriate level, especially in health care.

All the veterans' groups in this Nation got together to produce something called the Independent Budget. What they did here was a very professional analysis of what was needed to care for our veterans, not just give me more money here or give me more money there, but let us reduce the waiting times to this number of days by putting this much money in. Let us increase the number of positions in the Benefits Administration so we can decrease the waiting times for adjudication. Let us make sure we can have research that will deal with the new diseases, like hepatitis C and the Persian Gulf War illness. That is what this Independent Budget does, and that is what this Congress ought to do.

So I will be making amendments to increase the health care budget by \$1.7 billion, which is what the veterans groups' analysis says. We will try to make improvements in the health research budget. We will try to make amendments to treat such diseases as hepatitis C and also to treat the Filipino veterans of World War II who we have denied care to for the last 50 years.

So we will make those amendments. I hope they will get the similar waiver that you have for emergency funding,



that you have for other items. Let us really keep our commitment to our Nation's veterans.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in reluctant opposition to the rule. I have not been here long, but this will be the first rule that I have opposed. I am not insensitive to disasters like the one we had in Texas, but I just feel that it would be disaster to ignore the spirit of our own rules and go right back to emergency spending.

We are perilously close to dipping into the Social Security and Medicare surpluses. We promised our citizens that we would not do that. We are close to it. We need not do it.

The problem is not the tax cut, the problem is spending. We have had an average of 6 percent a year growth in spending over the past 3 years. That is the problem. We cannot simply cannot maintain that.

I urge a vote against the rule.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, there you have it. You have got one group in the House who says a \$4 billion increase is too much spending. You have another group in the House that says it is not enough spending. You have a group in the House who gauges all reality on how many billions of dollars you can spend. And yet this House has passed a very balanced budget, a budget that funds the priorities. It puts in money for Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid. It pays down the debt. It takes care of our normal obligations of government, such as education, transportation and health care. Then it returns dollars to the hard-working taxpayers, and then it spends money wisely.

Yet this reckless scheme of the Democrats to blame everything on a tax reduction, you know, Georgia is going to get in the form of \$300, \$500 and \$600 checks \$1.2 billion in the next couple of weeks. Now, that is \$1.2 billion that is going to be spent by normal people, like Joe and Shirley Harrington in Wilmington Island, Georgia, and what they are going to do with that money is do something real glamorous like buy a dryer, or maybe buy some clothes for the kids who are going to be going back to school.

This is not going to be enough money for a nice vacation, the kind of money that the big Washington bureaucrats make up here. But, do you know what, they know how to spend their money more than I do.

That is what the debate is about here today, who should spend that money: the geniuses in Washington, the big bureaucracy who can control people's lives through their spending, or should

we empower the citizens of America who earned the money, the people that it belongs to?

We are faced with a very important bill, a very balanced bill, a bill that puts our veterans' health care spending over \$1 billion higher than what President Clinton did. I want to repeat that. Veterans' health care provides a \$1 billion increase over the last year, and yet I hear my friends saying no to that.

□ 1445

We are also going to put more money in Veterans Administration and medical and prosthetic research, in national cemeteries, in State extended health care facilities, and in veterans' hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, this is very, very important money.

In addition to that, we are going to put money into housing so that the poorest of our citizens can have fair and decent public housing and, there again, it is increased. We are going to put money in to protect the environment; and I, as a member of the Subcommittee on the Interior of the Committee on Appropriations, think it is very important to fund Superfund and to put money in leaking underground storage tanks, and safe drinking water, in clean drinking water State revolving funds. These are all important projects. I want to support them, and that is why I am support the rule.

I think it is important to say also that this committee has had to make some tough decisions. There are still many of us who remember when President Clinton stood in the well of the House and said, I am going to set up AmeriCorps; we are going to start paying volunteers for what they are doing for free. I guess this was some new concept in socialism in America, but people who are volunteers are doing it because they want to do it for free, but President Clinton wanted to pay them. We are saying there has been a lot of waste in that program. We do not think it is wise at this point to continue that risky scheme of paying volunteers.

So I urge my colleagues to support this rule. It does comply with the budget. Our budget, again, takes care of Social Security, Medicare, the normal and needed obligations of government such as education and housing and, in this budget, veterans. Then, it returns a portion of the surplus to the citizens of America, after paying down the debt.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues, this bill is in compliance with that budget that has passed both Houses, and I urge my colleagues to vote for the rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN).

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to oppose the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations,

the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), will offer an amendment to the rule. The amendment will make in order the amendment offered at the Committee on Appropriations by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and also at the Committee on Rules.

The amendment adds \$1 billion for veterans medical care, for critical housing programs, and to partially restore funding for the Corporation for National and Community Service, some of the issues that have been spoken to here during the debate on the rule. The money would come from paring back the recently enacted tax cut in the top tax bracket from 38.6 percent to 39.1 percent. That is one-half of 1 percent from the richest Americans to help some of the most vulnerable Americans and communities.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment and extraneous materials at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

PREVIOUS QUESTION FOR RULE ON H.R. 2620, FY2002 APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE VA/HUD

At the end of the resolution add the following new sections:

"SEC. . Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider the following amendment if offered by Representative Obey or his designee. The amendment shall be considered as read and shall be debatable for 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. All points of order are waived against the amendment. The amendment is not amendable and is not subject to a demand for the division of the question.

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS

At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 427. Paragraph (2) of section 1(i) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to reductions in rates after June 30, 2001), is amended by adding after the table the following:

In the case of taxable years beginning during calendar year 2002, the preceding table shall be applied by substituting '39.1%' for '38.65'.":

#### DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

In the paragraph "Medical Care", strike "\$21,281,587,000" and insert "\$21,581,587,000" in lieu thereof

#### DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, PUBLIC HOUSING CAPITAL FUND

In the paragraph entitled "Public Housing Capital Fund", strike "\$2,555,000,000" and insert "\$2,837,000,000" in lieu thereof

#### DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

After the paragraph entitled "homeless Assistance Grants: insert the following new section:

#### "SHELTER PLUS CARE RENEWALS

For the renewal on an annual basis or amendment of contracts funded under the Shelter Plus Care program, as authorized under subtitle F of Title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, as amended, \$100,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That each Shelter Plus

Care project with an expiring contract shall be eligible for renewal only if the project is determined to be needed under the applicable continuum of care and meets appropriate program requirements and financial standards, as determined by the Secretary."

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY,  
ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT

In the paragraph entitled "Environmental Programs and Management", strike "\$2,014,799,000" and insert "\$2,021,799,000 in lieu thereof

At the end of the paragraph entitled "Environmental Programs and Management", insert:

"*Provided further*, That the on-board staffing level of the Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assistance shall be maintained at not less than the level authorized for this Office as of December 31, 2000"

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY  
SERVICE

Strike the paragraph following the center head entitled "National and Community Service programs, Operating Expenses" and insert the following new section:

"(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for the Corporation for National and Community Service (the "Corporation") in carrying out programs, activities, and initiatives under the National and Community service Act of 1990 (the "Act") (42 U.S.C. 12501 et seq.), \$311,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003: *Provided*, That not more than \$50,000,000, to remain available without fiscal year limitation, shall be transferred to the National Service trust account for educational awards authorized under subtitle D of title I of the Act (42 U.S.C. 12601 et seq.).

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question so that we can have an opportunity to vote on this critical amendment.

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

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, again, this is a good bill; and the Committee on Appropriations has done yeoman's work in balancing a number of very, very important priorities. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the committee; along with the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), the subcommittee chairman; and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), the ranking member, have done a great job.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2620 responds to the needs of our veterans. It protects our environment. It keeps the U.S. at the forefront of space exploration. It provides needed funding to ensure new scientific discovery. It addresses our Nation's critical housing needs and, finally, helps more Americans realize the dream of owning their own homes. This we do without reversing tax relief that we just gave to the American people, tax relief which has not even gone into effect yet.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and the underlying legislation. Support the previous question.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the rule and the bill. For the past four years, my colleague, Mr. TANCREDI,

and I have offered an amendment to the VA/ HUD Appropriations bill to restore or increase the funding of the State Extended Care Facilities Construction line item. I am extremely happy to report that the Committee has fully funded the program at \$100 million for Fiscal Year 2002.

This program is used to renovate and build state nursing homes for veterans. State facilities have proven that they can provide above quality care at a more cost efficient price than the federal government. In Fiscal Year 1998, the VA spent on average \$255.25 per resident per day to care for long term nursing care residents, while state veterans homes on average spent \$40.00 per resident. This continued in 1999.

Mr. Speaker, the State Extended Care Facilities Construction program addresses the issue of long-term care for our nation's veterans. With the ranks of those requiring VA care growing on a yearly basis, states already face huge financial burdens in helping to care for our veterans. In Illinois, the waiting list for admittance to the LaSalle and Manteno state extended care facilities are as long as two to three years, and many ill veterans go untreated or are under-treated due to the lack of beds.

Additionally, this funding will help pay the millions of dollars in back payments to state care facilities. In Illinois alone, last year over \$6 million was owed to the state for construction projects to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act and other facility updates. This funding helps with the payback of unfunded grant payments, and helps improve the supply of long term care for our veterans in the future.

There are two other programs that were not funded under this bill and it is my hope that we can work with Chairman WALSH and appointed conferees to have these provisions included in the final bill. I am requesting \$800,000 through a HUD Special Purpose Grant or Community Development Block Grant to Cornerstone Services to relocate and expand its developmental training center. Cornerstone Services provides progressive, comprehensive services to persons with disabilities promoting choice, dignity, and the opportunity to live and work in the community. For 32 years, Cornerstone has been a leader in providing state-of-the-art services to meet the individual needs of persons with developmental disabilities, mental illnesses, physical disabilities, sensory impairments and dual diagnoses. The Will County-based, not-for-profit delivers developmental, vocational, and behavioral health services in five large agency-owned or leased locations and residential services in numerous agency or consumer-owned leased residences.

I am also requesting \$600,000 to Joliet Junior College to assist funding efforts for the Bridging Community, Economic and Workforce Development through Local Partnerships Project. This project embodies many of the key components of Joliet Junior College's mission and philosophy, community development, economic development, and workforce development. The college's division responsible for this initiative is the Institute of Economic Technology. The institute operates a Small Business Development Center, Entrepreneurship Services Center, Dislocated Worker Assistance Center, Business Assistance and Training Center, and a Manufacturing Extension

Center. The institute is a national model for business assistance services and economic development.

Both of these programs are desperately needed in my District and I hope that they will be included in the final VA/ HUD appropriations bill.

Again, I would like to thank Chairman WALSH and the members of the House Appropriations Committee for committing to this funding, and for honoring our nation's veterans.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, when the people of Georgia's 8th district first elected me to be their representative, I felt that our number one priority as legislators should be to operate the Federal government within its means. My view on this important matter has not changed. I cannot, in good conscience, cast a vote in favor of a pay increase for Members while the Federal government is operating under such strict spending limitations.

I have committed to the folks back in Georgia to getting our Federal government's fiscal house in order. With the economy slowing and our work in Congress to keep government spending in check, it is wrong for us to give ourselves a pay raise. We must keep big government in check and remain fiscally responsible. As I have for the past few years, today I voted to oppose a pay raise for Members of Congress.

By voting against the previous question on the rule, I want to go on record as being opposed to a cost-of-living-adjustment for Members of Congress.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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 220, nays 204, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 278]

YEAS—220

Aderholt	Calvert	Doolittle
Akin	Camp	Dreier
Armey	Cannon	Duncan
Baker	Cantor	Dunn
Ballenger	Capito	Ehlers
Barr	Castle	Ehrlich
Bartlett	Chabot	Emerson
Bass	Chambliss	English
Bereuter	Coble	Everett
Biggert	Collins	Ferguson
Bilirakis	Combest	Flake
Blunt	Cooksey	Fletcher
Boehrlert	Cox	Foley
Boehner	Crane	Forbes
Bonilla	Crenshaw	Fossella
Bono	Culberson	Frelinghuysen
Brady (TX)	Cunningham	Gallegly
Brown (SC)	Davis, Jo Ann	Ganske
Bryant	Davis, Tom	Gekas
Burr	Deal	Gibbons
Burton	DeLay	Gilchrest
Buyer	DeMint	Gillmor
Callahan	Diaz-Balart	Gilman



Goode	Lewis (KY)	Scarborough	Oberstar	Rush	Tauscher	Kingston	Ortiz	Simmons
Goodlatte	Linder	Schaffer	Obey	Sabo	Taylor (MS)	Kirk	Osborne	Simpson
Goss	LoBiondo	Schrock	Ober	Sanchez	Thompson (CA)	Knollenberg	Ose	Skeen
Graham	Lucas (OK)	Sensenbrenner	Ortiz	Sanders	Thompson (MS)	Kolbe	Oxley	Slaughter
Granger	Manzullo	Sessions	Owens	Sandlin	Thurman	LaHood	Pascarell	Smith (NJ)
Graves	McCrery	Shadegg	Pallone	Sawyer	Tierney	Lampson	Paul	Smith (TX)
Green (WI)	McHugh	Shaw	Pascarell	Schakowsky	Towns	Larson (CT)	Peterson (PA)	Stump
Greenwood	McInnis	Shays	Pastor	Schiff	Turner	Latham	Petri	Stupak
Grucci	McKeon	Sherwood	Payne	Scott	Udall (CO)	LaTourette	Pickering	Sununu
Gutknecht	Mica	Shimkus	Pelosi	Serrano	Udall (NM)	Leach	Platts	Sweeney
Hall (TX)	Miller (FL)	Shuster	Peterson (MN)	Sherman	Velazquez	Lewis (CA)	Pombo	Tauzin
Hansen	Miller, Gary	Simmons	Phelps	Shows	Visclosky	Lewis (KY)	Portman	Taylor (MS)
Hart	Moran (KS)	Simpson	Pomeroy	Skelton	Waters	Linder	Price (NC)	Taylor (NC)
Hastert	Morella	Skeen	Price (NC)	Slaughter	Watson (CA)	LoBiondo	Pryce (OH)	Terry
Hastings (WA)	Myrick	Smith (MI)	Rahall	Smith (WA)	Watt (NC)	Lucas (OK)	Putnam	Thomas
Hayes	Nethercutt	Smith (NJ)	Rangel	Snyder	Waxman	Manzullo	Quinn	Thornberry
Hayworth	Ney	Smith (TX)	Reyes	Solis	Weiner	Mascara	Radanovich	Thune
Hefley	Northup	Souder	Rivers	Spratt	Wexler	McCarthy (NY)	Rahall	Tiahrt
Herger	Norwood	Stearns	Rodriguez	Stark	Woolsey	McCrery	Regula	Tiberi
Hilleary	Nussle	Stump	Roemer	Stenholm	Wu	McHugh	Rehberg	Trafigant
Hobson	Osborne	Sununu	Ross	Strickland	Wynn	McInnis	Reynolds	Upton
Hoekstra	Ose	Sweeney	Rothman	Stupak		McKeon	Riley	Visclosky
Horn	Otter	Tancredo	Roybal-Allard	Tanner		McNulty	Rogers (KY)	Vitter
Hostettler	Oxley	Tauzin				Meek (FL)	Rogers (MI)	Walden
Hulshof	Paul	Taylor (NC)				Mica	Rohrabacher	Walsh
Hunter	Pence	Terry	Bachus	Houghton	Lipinski	Miller (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Wamp
Hutchinson	Peterson (PA)	Thomas	Barton	Jackson-Lee	McKinney	Miller, Gary	Roukema	Watkins (OK)
Hyde	Petri	Thornberry	Blumenauer	(TX)	Spence	Mollohan	Royce	Watts (OK)
Isakson	Pickering	Thune	Cubin	Jones (OH)		Moran (KS)	Ryun (KS)	Waxman
Issa	Pitts	Tiahrt				Moran (VA)	Sabo	Weldon (FL)
Istook	Platts	Tiberi				Morella	Saxton	Weldon (PA)
Jenkins	Pombo	Toomey				Murtha	Scarborough	Weller
Johnson (CT)	Portman	Trafigant				Myrick	Schrock	Whitfield
Johnson (IL)	Pryce (OH)	Upton				Neal	Sensenbrenner	Wicker
Johnson, Sam	Putnam	Vitter				Nethercutt	Sessions	Wilson
Jones (NC)	Quinn	Walden				Ney	Shaw	Wolf
Keller	Radanovich	Walsh				Northup	Sherwood	Wu
Kelly	Ramstad	Wamp				Norwood	Shimkus	Young (AK)
Kennedy (MN)	Regula	Watkins (OK)				Nussle	Shuster	Young (FL)
Kerns	Rehberg	Watts (OK)						
King (NY)	Reynolds	Weldon (FL)						
Kingston	Riley	Weldon (PA)						
Kirk	Rogers (KY)	Weller						
Knollenberg	Rogers (MI)	Whitfield						
Kolbe	Rohrabacher	Wicker						
LaHood	Ros-Lehtinen	Wilson						
Largent	Roukema	Wolf						
Latham	Royce	Young (AK)						
LaTourette	Ryan (WI)	Young (FL)						
Leach	Ryun (KS)							
Lewis (CA)	Saxton							

## NOT VOTING—10

□ 1512

Mr. SCHIFF changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. LEWIS of California and Mr. SMITH of Michigan changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The question is on the resolution.

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

## RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 195, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 279]

## AYES—228

Abercrombie	Delahunt	Kildee	Aderholt	Cramer	Goodlatte
Ackerman	DeLauro	Kilpatrick	Armey	Crane	Goss
Allen	Deutsch	Kind (WI)	Bachus	Crenshaw	Graham
Andrews	Dicks	Klecza	Baker	Culberson	Granger
Baca	Dingell	Kucinich	Baldacci	Cunningham	Graves
Baird	Doggett	LaFalce	Ballenger	Davis, Jo Ann	Green (WI)
Baldacci	Dooley	Lampson	Barcia	Davis, Tom	Greenwood
Baldwin	Doyle	Langevin	Barr	Deal	Grucci
Barcia	Edwards	Lantos	Bass	DeLay	Gutknecht
Barrett	Engel	Larsen (WA)	Bentsen	DeMint	Hall (TX)
Becerra	Eshoo	Larson (CT)	Bereuter	Diaz-Balart	Hansen
Bentsen	Etheridge	Lee	Biggert	Dicks	Hart
Berkley	Evans	Levin	Blunt	Doolittle	Hastert
Berman	Farr	Lewis (GA)	Boehlert	Doyle	Hastings (WA)
Berry	Fattah	Lofgren	Bonilla	Dreier	Hayes
Bishop	Filner	Lowey	Bono	Duncan	Hayworth
Blagojevich	Ford	Lucas (KY)	Borski	Dunn	Hefley
Bonior	Frank	Luther	Brady (PA)	Ehlers	Hilleary
Borski	Frost	Maloney (CT)	Brady (TX)	Ehrlich	Hinojosa
Boswell	Gephardt	Maloney (NY)	Brown (FL)	Emerson	Hobson
Boucher	Gonzalez	Markley	Brown (SC)	English	Hoeffel
Boyd	Gordon	Mascara	Bryant	Everett	Holden
Brady (PA)	Green (TX)	Matheson	Burr	Fattah	Hulshof
Brown (FL)	Gutierrez	Matsui	Burton	Ferguson	Hunter
Brown (OH)	Hall (OH)	McCarthy (MO)	Buyer	Fletcher	Hutchinson
Capps	Harman	McCarthy (NY)	Callahan	Foley	Hyde
Capuano	Hastings (FL)	McCollum	Calvert	Forbes	Isakson
Cardin	Hill	McDermott	Camp	Fossella	Issa
Carson (IN)	Hilliard	McGovern	Cannon	Frelinghuysen	Istook
Carson (OK)	Hinchev	McIntyre	Cantor	Gallegly	Jenkins
Clay	Hinojosa	McNulty	Capito	Ganske	Johnson (CT)
Clayton	Hoeffel	Meehan	Chambliss	Gekas	Kanjorski
Clement	Holden	Meek (FL)	Coble	Gibbons	Kaptur
Clyburn	Holt	Meeks (NY)	Collins	Gilchrest	Keller
Condit	Honda	Menendez	Combust	Gillmor	Kelly
Conyers	Hooley	Millender-	Cox	Gilman	Kennedy (MN)
Costello	Hoyer	McDonald		Goode	King (NY)
Coyne	Inslee	Miller, George			
Cramer	Israel	Mink			
Crowley	Jackson (IL)	Mollohan			
Cummings	Jefferson	Moore			
Davis (CA)	John	Moran (VA)			
Davis (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Murtha			
Davis (IL)	Kanjorski	Nadler			
DeFazio	Kaptur	Napolitano			
DeGette	Kennedy (RI)	Neal			

## NOES—195

Abercrombie	Frost	McIntyre
Ackerman	Gephardt	McKinney
Akin	Gonzalez	Meehan
Allen	Gordon	Meeks (NY)
Andrews	Green (TX)	Menendez
Baca	Gutierrez	Millender-
Baird	Hall (OH)	McDonald
Baldwin	Harman	Miller, George
Barrett	Hastings (FL)	Mink
Bartlett	Herger	Moore
Becerra	Hill	Nadler
Berkley	Hilliard	Napolitano
Berman	Hinchey	Oberstar
Berry	Hoekstra	Obey
Bishop	Holt	Oliver
Blagojevich	Honda	Otter
Bonior	Hooley	Owens
Boswell	Horn	Pallone
Boucher	Hostettler	Pastor
Boyd	Hoyer	Payne
Brown (OH)	Inslee	Pelosi
Capps	Israel	Pence
Capuano	Jackson (IL)	Peterson (MN)
Cardin	Jefferson	Phelps
Carson (IN)	John	Pitts
Carson (OK)	Johnson (IL)	Pomeroy
Castle	Johnson, E. B.	Ramstad
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Rangel
Clay	Jones (NC)	Reyes
Clement	Jones (OH)	Rivers
Clyburn	Kennedy (RI)	Rodriguez
Condit	Kerns	Roemer
Conyers	Kildee	Ross
Costello	Kilpatrick	Rothman
Coyne	Kind (WI)	Roybal-Allard
Crowley	Klecza	Rush
Cummings	Kucinich	Ryan (WI)
Davis (CA)	LaFalce	Sanchez
Davis (FL)	Langevin	Sanders
Davis (IL)	Lantos	Sandlin
DeFazio	Largent	Sawyer
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Schaffer
Delahunt	Lee	Schakowsky
DeLauro	Levin	Schiff
Deutsch	Lewis (GA)	Scott
Dingell	Lofgren	Serrano
Doggett	Lowey	Shadegg
Dooley	Lucas (KY)	Shays
Edwards	Luther	Sherman
Engel	Maloney (CT)	Shows
Eshoo	Maloney (NY)	Skelton
Etheridge	Markley	Smith (MI)
Evans	Matheson	Smith (WA)
Farr	Matsui	Snyder
Filner	McCarthy (MO)	Solis
Flake	McCollum	Spratt
Ford	McDermott	Stark
Frank	McGovern	Stearns

Stenholm	Tierney	Watson (CA)
Strickland	Toomey	Watt (NC)
Tancred	Towns	Weiner
Tanner	Turner	Wexler
Tauscher	Udall (CO)	Woolsey
Thompson (CA)	Udall (NM)	Wynn
Thompson (MS)	Velazquez	
Thurman	Waters	

## NOT VOTING—11

Barton	Cubin	Souder
Blumenauer	Houghton	Spence
Boehner	Jackson-Lee	
Clayton	(TX)	
Cooksey	Lipinski	

□ 1531

Ms. BROWN of Florida and Mr. LAMPSON changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

The resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2620 and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. YOUNG of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chair for allowing me this time to advise the Members that we will do the best we can to expedite the conclusion of this bill today, if possible. It is a lengthy bill, and there are a lot of amendments. If the Members will cooperate and help us in assembling a list of all the amendments we will have to consider, we ask the Members who have amendments to offer to the VA-HUD bill to please present them at least by the close of the general debate on the bill. Hopefully, we would be able to finish this bill tonight.

I would also say that our leadership has made the decision that if we cannot finish the bill tonight that we would come back tomorrow to finish this bill, but we need to finish it before the beginning of next week.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

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

Let me simply say I share the gentleman's desire to try to find a way to reach some type of understanding on this bill, but we have a practical problem. The problem is that there is considerable feeling on this side of the aisle that it is a might strange to ask for cooperation from the minority in

setting time immediately after a martial law approach to this House was just rammed down our throats.

So while I will certainly work with the gentleman and I would urge every Member who has a potential amendment to, by the time general debate is over, get the text of those amendments to both sides so that we have some idea of what the universe of amendments is and we can try to work out a proposed timetable, I am not very optimistic at this point that we can get clearance on our side of the aisle.

I am told, for instance, that our leadership at this point is not contemplating providing clearance, but I would like us to continue to try to work this out. I know the possibility has been raised by myself of trying to get a time limit that would make certain that we would finish this bill. If we cannot finish it today, we could make sure that the timetable assured that we could finish it early on whatever day it was continued to.

I would hope, in light of the requests we have had from both sides, that that would not be tomorrow; that if we could not finish it tonight, it would go over to Monday or Tuesday. But I frankly do not care. I will be here either time. But I think people on the majority side need to understand that it is very difficult to get clearance on this side of the aisle after martial law has just been rammed down our throats. That is not usually the way in which the majority in this House elicits the cooperation of the minority in changing the rules.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that I do appreciate his comments and I do appreciate the way we have been able to cooperate on the previous appropriations bills to have the time limit agreements so that no Member would be denied an opportunity to say what they have to say, but that we would try to do it in an expeditious manner.

As our former colleague and dear friend, Moe Udall, used to say on many of these debates, anything that needs to be said has already been said. The problem is not everyone has said it yet.

So with the cooperation of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and both sides, we would be able to expedite the consideration of this and get done today.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman continue to yield?

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to point out to the House that each of the previous regular appropriations bills has been supported on a bipartisan basis by the majority and minority. This is the first bill that we run into trouble on because, in our view, the allocation provided to the bill is insufficient, which means we will be starving housing, we will be starving veterans medical care and environmental enforcement.

Nonetheless, we had indicated our intention to work with the majority to try to work out time limits, but a little thing called martial law has blown that up. And I wish that people who have no responsibility for managing bills in this place, and I am speaking specifically of the leadership on the other side of the aisle, I know they like to wave magic wands and tell the committee to get its work done, but I wish that people who have an interest in seeing that work done in a timely fashion would work in a more cooperative manner with this side of the aisle if they are asking me to be able to get cooperation on this side of the aisle so we can do what the majority leadership wants to do.

It is sometimes hard to help people who do not want to help themselves.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Members for the bipartisan support on this rule. It was somewhat contentious, but we are prepared to take up the rule.

## DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 210 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2620.

□ 1538

## 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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 2620) 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, 2002, and for other purposes, with Mr. SHIMKUS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH).

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

Mr. Chairman, it is a privilege today to present for House consideration H.R. 2620, the Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 2002. In the interest of time, I will try to be brief.

I would, however, like to begin by telling my colleagues that I believe this is a good bill and that the Administration has indicated that they support its passage. Just as presented in