the bill (H.R. 5521) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). All points of order are reserved on the bill.

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE—INTEGRITY OF PROCEEDINGS AS PRESCRIBED BY THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule IX, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House, offer a privileged resolution that I noticed, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

A resolution, in accordance with House Rule IX, expressing a sense of the House that its integrity has been impugned and Constitutional duty hampered by the inability of the House to bring to the floor the Fiscal Year 2003 Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, due to the severe under funding of Education within the President's Fiscal Year (FY) 2003 Budget.

Whereas under Article I, Section IX, of the Constitution states no money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of

Appropriations made by law.

Whereas it is the fiscal duty of the Congress to appropriate annually the funds needed to support the execution of programs and operations of the Federal government.

Whereas to date the House has only consid-

ered five Appropriations bills.

Whereas as President, George W. Bush has been persistent in resonating public concern for better schools. He dedicated significant amounts of time and public dialogue during his first year in office to the passage of H.R. 1, the "Leave No Child Behind" Act, not only implying he favored more help to schools from the federal treasury but specifically authorizing large increases in a number of key program areas.

Whereas within weeks of signing H.R. 1, Public Law No: 107–110, the "No Child Left Behind" Act, the President submitted a budget that stopped six years of steady progress in federal support to local schools

dead in its tracks.

Whereas instead of the strong and consistent growth in support to local schools that the federal government has provided for more than a decade, the President's FY 2003 Budget holds aid to local schools virtually flat. Furthermore, his Budget Director now insists that if Congress exceeds the budget request by even the smallest amount, the President will veto entire appropriation bills.

Whereas the future of our labor force and our economy is heavily dependent on elevating the education and skills of all future workers.

Whereas about one third of the 53.6 million children now in elementary and secondary schools in America are at serious risk of being left behind. The achievement gap between these students and the rest of the student population remains large and has failed to close.

Whereas of the 53.6 million children currently enrolled in elementary and secondary schools in this country, 9.8 million, or nearly 20 percent, are from households defined by the Commerce Department as being in poverty.

Whereas the House is faced with the choice of supporting schools or supporting the President and his effort to reverse the trend of expanding federal support for local schools.

Whereas the Congress has provided states with an unfunded mandate by approving the "No Child Left Behind" Act without the necessary financial resources to fund it. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Congress should provide states with the resources they need to fully implement the "No Child Left Behind" Act as it promised less than a year ago, by completing action on the Fiscal Year 2003 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will hear briefly from the proponent of the resolution as to whether the resolution constitutes a question of the privileges of the House under rule IX.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the recognition to speak on the resolution.

Article 1, section 9 of the Constitution states that "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law."

It is the fiscal duty of the Congress to appropriate the money necessary to provide the funds needed to support the execution of programs and operations of the Federal Government. To date, only five of these important measures have been considered.

The failure of this unrealistic budget resolution is especially true in respect to the fiscal year 2003 Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies appropriations bill in its funding for education. This inaction has hampered this body's constitutional duty.

## $\square$ 1500

Mr. Speaker, this inaction has hampered this body's constitutional duty and impinged its integrity. President Bush dedicated significant amounts of time and public dialogue during his first months in office to the passage of H.R. 1, the Leave No Child Behind Act. It specifically authorized large increases in a number of key educational programs. However, within weeks of signing the bill, the President submitted a budget that stopped 6 years of steady progress. His budget director now insists that if Congress exceeds the budget request by even the smallest amount, the President will veto the entire appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, section 702 of House rule IX, entitled "The General Principles," concluded that certain matters of business arising under the Constitution mandatory in nature for the House have been held to have a privilege

which supersedes the rules establishing the order of business. The powers of raising revenue and appropriating funds is the question of the House's constitutional authority and is therefore privileged in nature, especially given the importance of this funding to the future of our Nation.

The future of our labor force and our economy is heavily dependent on elevating the education and skills of future workers. The achievement gap between students who are at risk and the rest of the student population remains large and has failed to close.

It is not only the prerogative of this Chamber but its constitutional duty for the House to take action on the Labor, Health and Human Services and Labor bill. The Congress has provided States with an unfunded mandate by approving H.R. 1 without the necessary financial resources to fund it. The majority of this body voted for H.R. 1, and we should deserve to be heard.

Mr. Speaker, my question of privilege regards the integrity of our proceedings as a House as prescribed by the Constitution. The U.S. Constitution conveys upon this body the power to originate appropriation measures. It is not only our responsibility, it is our duty and obligation to reinstate this message and this legislation about the importance of education. And I do believe the resolution that I have introduced is privileged in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The Chair is prepared to rule on whether the resolution offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) constitutes a question of privileges of the House under rule IX.

The resolution offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) expresses the sense of the House that the Congress should complete action on a legislative measure. Specifically, the resolution calls upon the Congress to provide the States with additional education resources by completing action on a general appropriation bill.

The Chair has most recently ruled on November 4, 1999, consistent with the principal enunciated by Speaker Gillett in his landmark ruling of May 6, 1921, that a resolution expressing a legislative sentiment ordinarily does not give rise to a question of privileges of the House under rule IX. Specifically, the Chair held on that occasion that legislative sentiment that the President should take specified action to achieve a desired policy end did not present a question affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, its dignity or the integrity of its proceedings as required under rule IX.

In the opinion of the Chair, the instant resolution expressing the sentiment that Congress should act on a specified measure also falls short of the standards of rule IX.

The Chair would quote from the landmark Gillett ruling: "No one Member ought to have the right to determine when it should have come in preference to the regular rules of the House." Pombo

Portman

Putnam

Quinn

Pryce (OH)

Radanovich

Ramstad

Regula

Rehberg

Riley

Royce

Revnolds

Rogers (KY)

Rogers (MI)

Rohrabacher

Ros-Lehtinen

Ryan (WI)

Rvun (KS)

Saxton

Schaffer

Schrock

Sessions

Shadegg

Sherwood

Shimkus

Simmons

Simpson

Gonzalez

Hall(TX)

Harman

Hilliard

Hinchey

Hinojosa

Hoeffel Holden

Holt

Honda.

Hooley

Hoyer

Inslee

Israel

(TX)

Jefferson

John

Kaptur

Kildee

Kind (WI)

Kleczka

Kucinich

Langevin

Lantos

Lee

Levin

Lipinski

Lofgren

Lowey

Luther

Lynch

Markey

Matsui

Matheson

McIntyre

McNulty

Meehan

Mollohan

Hill

Gordon

Skeen Smith (MI)

Shuster

Shaw

Shays

Sensenbrenner

To permit a question of privileges of the House either urging or requiring congressional action or inaction on education funding would permit any Member to advance virtually any legislative proposal as a question of privileges of the House.

As the Chair ruled on December 22, 1995, the mere invocation of the general legislative power of the purse provided in the Constitution, coupled with a fiscal policy end, does not meet the requirements of rule IX and is really a matter properly initiated through introduction in the hopper under clause 7 of rule XII.

Accordingly, the resolution offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) does not constitute a question of privileges of the House under rule IX and may not be considered at this time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is: Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. JEFF MILLER OF FLORIDA

Mr. JEFF MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table

The SPEAKER pro tempore. question is on the motion to table.

the The question was taken; and Speaker pro tempore announced that

the ayes appeared to have it. Mr. VISCLOSKY. 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 210, nays 200, not voting 21, as follows:

## [Roll No. 433]

YEAS-210 Aderholt Crenshaw Grucci Akin Gutknecht Cubin Armey Culberson Hansen Bachus Cunningham Hart Hastings (WA) Baker Davis, Jo Ann Ballenger DeLay Hayes Havworth Bartlett DeMint. Diaz-Balart Hefley Barton Bass Doolittle Herger Bereuter Dreier Hobson Duncan Hoekstra Biggert Bilirakis Dunn Horn Hostettler Blunt Ehlers Boehlert Emerson Houghton Boehner English Hulshof Bonilla Everett Hunter Bono Ferguson Hyde Boozman Flake Isakson Fletcher Brady (TX) Issa Istook Brown (SC) Foley Bryant Forbes Jenkins Fossella Johnson (CT) Burr Burton Frelinghuysen Johnson (IL) Buver Gallegly Johnson, Sam Jones (NC) Calvert Gekas Gibbons Camp Keller Cannon Gilchrest Kellv Gillmor Cantor Kennedy (MN) Kerns King (NY) Capito Gilman Castle Goode Goodlatte Chabot Kingston Chambliss Goss Kirk Graham Knollenberg Coble Collins Granger Kolbe LaHood Combest Graves

Green (WI)

Latham

LaTourette

Cox

Crane

Lewis (CA) Lewis (KY) Linder LoBiondo Lucas (OK) Manzullo McCrery McHugh McInnis McKeon Mica Miller, Dan Miller, Gary Miller, Jeff Moran (KS) Myrick Nethercutt Northun Norwood Osborne Ose Otter Oxlev Paul Pence Peterson (PA) Petri Pickering Platts

Ackerman Allen Andrews Baca Baird Baldacci Baldwin Barcia Barrett Becerra Bentsen Berkley Berman Berry Bishop Blagojevich Blumenauer Bonior Borski Boswell Boucher Boyd Brady (PA) Brown (FL) Brown (OH) Capps Capuano Cardin Carson (IN) Carson (OK) Clay Clayton Clement Clyburn Condit Convers Costello Coyne Cramer Crowley Cummings Davis (CA) Davis (FL) Davis (IL) DeFazio DeGette Delahunt DeLauro Deutsch Dicks Dingell Doggett Dooley Doyle Edwards Engel Eshoo Etheridge Evans Farr Fattah Filner

Ford

Frank

Frost

Gephardt

Smith (NJ) Smith (TX) Souder Stearns Sullivan Sununu Sweenev Tancredo Tauzin Taylor (NC) Terry Thomas Thornberry Thune Tiahrt. Tiberi Toomey Unton Vitter Walden Walsh Wamp Watts (OK) Weldon (FL) Weldon (PA) Weller Whitfield Wicker Wilson (NM) Wilson (SC) Wolf Young (AK) Young (FL)

## NAYS-200

Moran (VA) Murtha Green (TX) Nadler Napolitano Neal Oberstar Obev Olver Ortiz Owens Pallone Pascrell Pastor Payne Pelosi Peterson (MN) Phelps Jackson (IL) Pomeroy Jackson-Lee Price (NC) Rahall Rangel Johnson, E. B. Reves Rivers Jones (OH) Rodriguez Kaniorski Roemer Kennedy (RI) Ross Rothman Kilpatrick Roybal-Allard Rush Sabo Sanders Sandlin Sawyer Schakowsky Larsen (WA) Larson (CT) Schiff Scott Serrano Lewis (GA) Sherman Shows Skelton Slaughter Lucas (KY) Smith (WA) Snyder Solis Maloney (CT) Spratt Maloney (NY) Stark Stenholm Strickland Stupak McCarthy (MO) Tauscher McCarthy (NY) Taylor (MS) McCollum Thompson (CA) McDermott Thompson (MS) McGovern Thurman Tierney Towns Turner Meek (FL) Udall (CO) Meeks (NY) Udall (NM) Menendez Velazquez Millender-Visclosky McDonald Miller, George Waters Watson (CA)

Waxman Wexler Wu Weiner Woolsey Wynn NOT VOTING-21 Abercrombie Ganske McKinney Barr Callahan Pitts Roukema Gutierrez Hastings (FL) Cooksey Hilleary Sanchez Davis, Tom LaFalce Stump Deal Lampson Tanner Ehrlich Mascara Watkins (OK)

□ 1524

Mr. EDWARDS and Mr. HINOJOSA changed their vote from "yea" to 'nav.

Mr. HEFLEY and Mr. WELDON of Florida changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to table was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE-IN-TEGRITY OF PROCEEDINGS AS PRESCRIBED BY THE CONSTITU-TION

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House, and I offer a privileged resolution, that I noticed yesterday pursuant to rule IX, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas Article I, Section VIII, of the Constitution states Congress shall have Power to promote the progress of Science and the useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

Whereas such protections on Writings and Discoveries have been promulgated by patent, copyright, and other laws, including Public Law 98–417, affording Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries for a limited period of time; Whereas Public Law 98-417 breaches this

constitutional requirement by failing to impose such limitation on the protection of

certain medical inventions;
Whereas provisions of Public Law 98-417
imbue the Food and Drug Administration
with the authority to secure for limited time for Inventors the exclusive Right to their re-

spective Medical Inventions; Whereas public Laws 98–417 fails to provide the Food and Drug Administariton the authority to refrain form securing this exclusive right for inventors if the conditions for such exclusivity are not met;

Whereas due to the failure of Congress to provide the Food and Drug Administration with the proper authority to fulfill obligations under the Act, certain medical inventions have received the exclusive Right to their respective Inventions without limita-

Whereas the unlimited exercise of exclusivity by prescription drug manufacturers subjects healthcare consumers and third party payers to no-competitive prices and rein significantly higher prescription

drug costs for purchasers; Whereas health care costs increased by 5% in 2001, 3.7 times faster than overall inflation

Whereas prescription drug cost spending is the fastest growing component of heath care costs, and rose 17% in 2001;

Whereas health insurance premiums rose by 11% in 2001, driven largely by the in-

creased cost of prescription drugs; Whereas state Medicaid spending increased by 11% in Fiscal year 2002, driven primarily by increased prescription drug spending and enrollment growth: