

again to our guest chaplain, Reverend Robert Hobson, of Sun City, Arizona.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. McNULTY. 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 327, nays 53, not voting 51, as follows:

[Roll No. 437]

YEAS—327

Abercrombie	Cramer	Harman
Ackerman	Crenshaw	Hart
Akin	Crowley	Hastings (WA)
Allen	Cubin	Hayes
Andrews	Culberson	Hayworth
Arney	Cummings	Hill
Baca	Cunningham	Hinchey
Bachus	Davis (CA)	Hinojosa
Ballenger	Davis (FL)	Hobson
Barcia	Davis (IL)	Hoeffel
Barrett	Davis, Jo Ann	Hoekstra
Bartlett	Davis, Tom	Holden
Barton	DeGette	Holt
Bass	DeLauro	Honda
Becerra	DeMint	Hooley
Bentsen	Deutsch	Horn
Bereuter	Dicks	Hostettler
Berkley	Dingell	Hoyer
Berman	Doggett	Hunter
Berry	Dooley	Inslee
Biggert	Doolittle	Isakson
Bilirakis	Doyle	Israel
Bishop	Dreier	Issa
Blagojevich	Duncan	Istook
Blunt	Dunn	Jackson (IL)
Boehrlert	Edwards	Jackson-Lee
Boehner	Ehlers	(TX)
Bonior	Emerson	Jefferson
Bono	Engel	Jenkins
Boozman	Eshoo	John
Boswell	Evans	Johnson (CT)
Boyd	Everett	Johnson (IL)
Brady (TX)	Farr	Johnson, Sam
Brown (FL)	Ferguson	Jones (NC)
Brown (OH)	Flake	Jones (OH)
Brown (SC)	Fletcher	Kanjorski
Bryant	Foley	Kaptur
Burr	Forbes	Keller
Burton	Fossella	Kelly
Buyer	Frank	Kennedy (RI)
Calvert	Frelinghuysen	Kerns
Camp	Frost	Kildee
Cannon	Gallegly	Kilpatrick
Cantor	Ganske	Kind (WI)
Capito	Gephardt	King (NY)
Capps	Gibbons	Kingston
Cardin	Gilchrest	Kleczka
Carson (IN)	Gilman	Knollenberg
Carson (OK)	Gonzalez	Kolbe
Castle	Goode	LaFalce
Chabot	Goodlatte	LaHood
Chambliss	Gordon	Langevin
Clement	Graham	Larson (CT)
Clyburn	Granger	Latham
Coble	Graves	LaTourette
Collins	Green (WI)	Leach
Combest	Greenwood	Lee
Condit	Grucci	Levin
Conyers	Gutierrez	Lewis (CA)
Cox	Hall (TX)	Lewis (GA)
Coyne	Hansen	Lewis (KY)

Linder	Pelosi
Lipinski	Pence
Lofgren	Peterson (PA)
Lowe	Petri
Lucas (KY)	Phelps
Lucas (OK)	Pickering
Luther	Pombo
Lynch	Pomeroy
Maloney (CT)	Portman
Maloney (NY)	Price (NC)
Manzullo	Pryce (OH)
Matheson	Putnam
Matsui	Quinn
McCarthy (MO)	Radanovich
McCarthy (NY)	Rahall
McCollum	Rangel
McCrery	Regula
McHugh	Rehberg
McInnis	Reynolds
McIntyre	Riley
McKeon	Rivers
Meehan	Rodriguez
Meeks (NY)	Roemer
Menendez	Rogers (KY)
Mica	Rogers (MI)
Millender-McDonald	Rohrabacher
Miller, Dan	Ross
Miller, Gary	Rothman
Miller, Jeff	Roybal-Allard
Mollohan	Royce
Moran (KS)	Rush
Moran (VA)	Ryan (WI)
Morella	Ryun (KS)
Murtha	Sanchez
Nadler	Sanders
Napolitano	Sandlin
Neal	Sawyer
Nethercutt	Saxton
Ney	Schiff
Norwood	Sensenbrenner
Ortiz	Serrano
Osborne	Sessions
Ose	Shadegg
Owens	Shaw
Oxley	Shays
Pascarell	Sherwood
Paul	Shimkus
Payne	Shows
	Shuster

NAYS—53

Baird	Kennedy (MN)	Ramstad
Baldwin	Kucinich	Sabo
Borski	Larsen (WA)	Schaffer
Brady (PA)	LoBiondo	Schakowsky
Capuano	Markey	Strickland
Casullo	McDermott	Stupak
Crane	McGovern	Sweeney
DeFazio	McNulty	Taylor (MS)
English	Miller, George	Thompson (CA)
Etheridge	Moore	Thompson (MS)
Finler	Nussle	Towns
Ford	Oberstar	Udall (NM)
Gillmor	Obey	Velazquez
Gutknecht	Olver	Visclosky
Hefley	Otter	Waters
Hilliard	Pallone	Weller
Hulshof	Pastor	Wu
Johnson, E. B.	Peterson (MN)	

NOT VOTING—51

Aderholt	Gekas	Platts
Baker	Goss	Reyes
Baldacci	Green (TX)	Ros-Lehtinen
Barr	Hastings (FL)	Roukema
Blumenauer	Herger	Schrock
Bonilla	Hilleary	Scott
Boucher	Houghton	Sherman
Callahan	Hyde	Smith (WA)
Clay	Kirk	Souder
Clayton	Lampson	Stump
Cooksey	Lantos	Tancredo
Deal	Mascara	Tanner
Delahunt	McKinney	Thomas
DeLay	Meek (FL)	Weldon (FL)
Diaz-Balart	Myrick	Whitfield
Ehrlich	Northup	Wilson (SC)
Fattah	Pitts	Young (AK)

□ 1029

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES 112, MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2003

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 568, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 568

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 112) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes. The joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the joint resolution equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to reconsider.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 568 is a closed rule providing for the consideration of H.J. Res. 112, making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2003. The rule provides 1 hour of debate in the House equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the joint resolution and provides one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, H.J. Res. 112 makes further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2003 and provides funding at current levels through October 11, 2002. This measure is necessary in order that all necessary and vital functions of government may continue uninterrupted while Congress continues its work on the spending measures for the next fiscal year. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass both the rule and the underlying resolution, H.J. Res. 112.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. FROST. Well, Mr. Speaker, Republicans' shameful refusal to lead the

House continues today. We are into the new fiscal year, and this House has still only passed 5 of the 13 appropriation bills.

Now, Republicans have been turning back flips to try to shift the blame for their own shameful failures. They like to say it is the fault of the other body that the House has not done its work, but we all know how an appropriations bill becomes a law. The Constitution requires the House to pass it before the other body can.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing to stop House Republicans but themselves. And what is stopping them? Simply put, some Republicans are afraid to vote for the cuts in education, health care, and other priorities that most members of the Republican Conference seem to support. So Republican leaders have quit even trying to do the work Americans elected them to do.

While House Republicans refuse to do their work, Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans would be happy just to find a job. After all, America is suffering through the weakest economy in 50 years, and a recent Gallup Poll found that 52 percent of Americans believe the economy is getting worse. Frankly, it is hard to argue with them.

Long-term unemployment is at an 8-year high, and some 2 million Americans have lost their jobs. The Census Bureau reports the number of people living in poverty has increased, and the median household income has dropped. Corporate scandals, the massive criminality at Enron, WorldCom, and the like, have rocked the economy and devastated the retirement plans of millions of Americans. After the worst quarter for the S&P 500 since 1987, millions of Americans are dreading the arrival of 401(k) statements, statements that may now look more like 201(k) statements.

Overall, the stock market has lost \$4.5 trillion in value since Republicans took control in Washington a year ago January. And the Dow has hit a 4-year low.

What has been the response of the Republican House during this troubled time? They refuse to stop corporate expatriates who flee overseas to avoid paying their fair share in taxes and who leave other Americans stuck with the bill, and they refuse to extend unemployment insurance for all Americans suffering in this economy.

Mr. Speaker, this is a shameful failure of leadership. I do not think it is going to end as long as Republicans control the House of Representatives.

But there is one important step we can take today. We can finally allow the House to vote on the education funding necessary to implement the bipartisan No Child Left Behind Act.

At the appropriate time, I will oppose the previous question. If it is defeated, we will amend the rule to provide for a fair vote on the appropriations bill for the Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

Since Republican leaders cannot decide how to bring up this critical bill,

we would offer Members several options. The Committee on Appropriations chairman could bring his bill to the floor. Conservatives and their Republican Conference who have seemed so interested in slashing education spending so far could bring up their version, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, could bring up his bill.

In addition, my amendment to the rule would require the House to immediately consider legislation extending unemployment benefits to the millions of American workers who have exhausted those benefits and have no immediate prospects of finding employment. And to help spur the creation of jobs in the country, we will call on the House to consider economic stimulus legislation before we adjourn for the elections. This body has wasted enough valuable time. We have only a few days left to do the people's business; and by defeating the previous question, perhaps we can start taking care of the business we were sent here to do.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members that it is inappropriate to use cell phones on the floor of the House.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time at this point, so I reserve my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and then I will yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for 8 minutes.

Is this not extraordinary? We have no appropriation bills coming out of the Congress; we have a continuing resolution for another week, and the Republicans cannot even produce a single speaker to defend their position. They want this to slip on through. They just want us to vote on this and leave town and the American people not notice that they are unwilling to do the people's business. Extraordinary commentary on the lack of leadership on the Republican side.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, ever since Labor Day this Congress and the President have been focused almost exclusively on Iraq, and there is absolutely no question that we will soon be at war. Meanwhile, the economy is showing serious signs of stress, and this body is doing virtually nothing about it.

Only 10 percent of our domestic appropriation bills are in place for the coming year. We are looking down a deep economic shaft with very little light at the end of the tunnel. We are in danger of leaving for the election with almost nothing being done to help provide that light, and there is a lot of talk in this institution about simply passing a series of continuing resolutions and then finally kicking all of these problems over until after the election, conveniently.

Mr. Speaker, the rules of this House are designed to help the House leadership address problems. Instead, on this occasion as they have been used on so many other occasions, they are being used to avoid problems. And then, even though we have only passed five of the 13 appropriation bills required in this House, we have some Members of this House who sound like the great Alibi Ike of the Cosmos, because they look for somebody else to blame for the fact that we have not been able to do our own job. I think that that has to stop.

I think people need to understand just how bad it would be if this government were to function on a continuing resolution for any significant period of time. That action would put the economy at high risk, in my view. It will virtually guarantee that almost nothing will be done about our economic problems. Political positions of both parties on a variety of issues will harden, and we will come back after the election, and we will be faced with a large supplemental request for Iraq, and the need to pass all of next year's fiscal 2004 appropriation bills. That will create a huge incentive to simply extend last year's spending patterns through the coming year, and that will have very bad effects on the economy. It will also lead to a lot of nasty and unintended consequences.

Example: it will leave a number of agencies funded at levels significantly below where they need to be, and many of those agencies will be at the center of our efforts to protect our people against terrorist threats. But we will also have other programs for which spending will be at higher levels than Congress expected or intended.

Example: the highway spending that is in the continuing resolution right now is \$4 billion higher than the level it was intended to be under the Republican budget resolution. And also, we have an anomaly, which means that the National Institutes of Health, which both parties have promised to increase by 15 percent this year, we will have the National Institutes of Health funded at \$3.8 billion less than the President's budget. That does not make any sense. But that is what is going to happen if this House continues to avoid its responsibility to bring up the Labor-Health bill and other appropriation bills.

The problem we have is there is an impasse within the Republican caucus between conservatives and moderates over what spending levels ought to be on education and on the Labor, Health and Education bill in general. And because of that impasse, the leadership is refusing to bring that bill up, and they are also acquiescing to the demand of a few hard-liners in their caucus that because they do not bring up the Labor-HHS bill, they should not bring up any other appropriation bill either.

Well, I sent a letter to the Speaker trying to propose a way out of this box, and I suggested that the Speaker allow the President's education budget to

come to the floor; in fact, bring the whole Labor-HHS bill to the floor, bring the President's budget to the floor, if you want, allow the Republican caucus to offer a substitute to that, and allow the minority to offer our substitute, and let the chips fall where they may. It does not guarantee an outcome, but it does move the process forward.

In the past, many times, past Speakers have allowed controversial bills to go forward, even when they could not guarantee a result, because they understood the gravity of continuing on a long-term continuing resolution and all of the programmatic harm that would do to the country and the economy. So the very least that the majority should do, instead of just passing another CR, is to bring to the floor the Labor, Health and Education bill so we can meet our primary domestic responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to do something else. We have a very shaky economy, and in the midst of that, we are going to be dislodging Saddam Hussein. He is a bad actor, we will all welcome his departure, and no doubt that departure would be good for the people of Iraq. Sanctions would be lifted, they would have a renewed opportunity for a better life. But our economic problems here at home will still remain, and the economic problems of people who live along the Mississippi will not be taken care of by whatever we do on the Tigris and Euphrates rivers.

We also need to have an economic stabilization package that recognizes that things are dangerously different here at home than they were when the majority passed its budget resolution and its tax provisions a year ago.

In addition to putting the Labor, Health and Education bill on the floor so we can face up to our choices rather than avoid them on that issue, we also ought to see an economic stabilization package on this floor that would include, for example, extension of unemployment insurance, a strengthening of the safety net for programs for families hit by economic weakness, help to small business and farmers who are losing their ability to pay for health insurance, protections for investors, and protection for workers' pensions, additional infrastructure funding to provide for immediate job growths and, if I may be so bold, I know we are not supposed to say that nasty word around here, but we also do need a restructuring of the tax cuts to focus more of those cuts on low- and middle-income taxpayers struggling to get by and less on the economic elite which is doing quite well in comparison to their less well-off neighbors.

□ 1045

That is what we ought to do if we were in the business of solving problems, but it appears to me that, with the exception of dealing with Iraq, this House is going to be essentially a bystander.

As a practical matter, we have a government shutdown as far as the House of Representatives is concerned, so the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) is stuck with the responsibility under these circumstances of bringing another CR to the floor when we all know that he would prefer to meet his responsibilities, as we would prefer to meet ours.

But we are not being given that opportunity because of an internal war within the Republican caucus. In my view, the Republican leadership needs to bring that bill to the floor. Their refusal to do so is nothing, in my view, but a confession of either incompetence or irresponsibility, I am not sure which.

So I would urge, Mr. Speaker, that we vote down this rule, that we vote down the previous question on the rule, so that we can bring something back to the floor which represents a real and broad-based attack on the economic problems facing this country.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY).

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding time to me. I appreciate his leadership, and the leadership of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. Speaker, the success or failure of any nation or any endeavor is determined by the leadership it has and the decisions they make. This Congress was sent here by the people of this country to make decisions and to do the people's business, and to represent the people of this country in a responsible way and make decisions for the common good, and not serve special interests.

It is amazing to me that we continue to not have appropriations bills on the floor of this House to deal with the people's business and to accomplish the tasks for which we were sent.

I am reminded of the old joke that they tell in my part of the country: Do not worry about the mule going blind, just load the wagon. We act like we do not know what we need to do.

This is not complicated. We know how to deal with this. Blaming somebody else; let us just find somebody, it does not matter who, but let us blame it on somebody else; let us blame it on the other body, on somebody down the street. Let us just blame somebody. It is always somebody else's fault.

We cannot stand as a Nation to continue to ignore the business of the people. We must be responsible.

The economy, to say the economy is not doing well is a gross understatement. We have a war at our doorstep. We have a war on terrorism that we have been fighting for over a year, and we have not dealt with issues pertaining to those two great concerns.

The cost of health care is skyrocketing, and taking money out of the economy at such a rate that none of us know how we are going to deal with it; yet, we cannot get to the floor of this House the business of the people.

We have been up here playing games since Labor Day trying to make it look like somebody is doing something, when the fact is we have not accomplished a frazzling thing since we got back after Labor Day. At the very least, bring it to the floor and let us vote on it.

We have asked, and the Blue Dog Coalition that I am a member of repeatedly has asked, the other side of the aisle, we have asked the leadership in the Republican Party, just work with us; just talk to us. We can figure this out. Let us do the job. Let us do the job that we were sent here to do.

We are not asking them to agree with us, we are just asking them to talk with us about it. Bring it to the floor and let us vote on it. When we work together, there is nothing we cannot do. But when everything has to be done in accordance with the Republican leadership, and when they are making bad decisions like they are right now, it makes it very difficult to get the job done.

It is the American way. This is what this Congress was established for. Let us bring it to the floor and take care of it.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I guess the chickens have come home to roost. A long time ago, the first thing we did practically in this Congress was pass a big tax bill. Some of us stood down here and said, hey, we ought to figure out what we need to spend before we decide we are going to give a lot of stuff away; but the leadership on the other side of the aisle said, do not worry, there is plenty of money. There is no problem. Just trust us.

Well, there are a lot of hospitals and a lot of schools and a lot of people out there trusting them, and what they see is that they have given it all away, and they will not even admit it. If they would just get up and say, we have made a mistake, we should not have done that, we should maybe go back and rethink what we did.

But I understand their theory. Their theory is when they make a mistake, just keep saying it and pushing it, even if it does not make any sense. They were out here yesterday on the marriage tax penalty. They have been out here every week with something.

What really ought to aggravate the American people in the way they have handled this budget, when I come in here, I fly in here from Seattle. I get here at 4 o'clock on a Tuesday for a vote on a couple of post offices being renamed on Tuesday night. Then we have a little something on Wednesday, and on Thursday we are out, and I am on that plane at 5 o'clock.

I am on the ground less than 48 hours in this town. If Members call that a good week's work for a good week's pay, I have to tell the Members something: Most of the people in the world have to at least work 40 hours. They

cannot even keep their people here to work on the problem, but they would rather say, let us just have a continuing resolution. It is going so well, let us let it go on.

Why do we not just pass a continuing resolution until the first of March and give up this charade. What they are going to do is 1 week at a time, and then they are going to take the next one, which will be up to October 18. Then they will say, well, we ought to do it after the election, so we will do the 17th of November; and then, of course, well, we will do December 15; and then we will come in on January 10; and then come in again, and we will finally get to work in February.

They ought to be ashamed of themselves that they do not bring the bills out here. Bring them out here, and we will see. They should bring out whatever they can agree on. Since they do not want to talk to us about what they are bringing out, they should bring out their best shot and put it on the floor here. But no, they want to talk about Iraq, and they want to talk about a lot of other things, but they do not do the business of the House.

We ought to vote this rule down and bring out the bills.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY).

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding time to me, and I regret we are here maintaining the status quo for another 7 days.

The status quo for 6,700 people in the First Congressional District of Indiana is unemployment. The status quo for many of those 6,700 people who have probably permanently lost their job in the domestic steel industry and in other industrial facilities is that they have now also permanently lost their health care. Their status quo for the next 7 days is to pray that they, their spouses, and their children do not have an injury and that they do not get sick.

Many of those 6,700 people in the First Congressional District of Indiana who have lost their job have been forced into early retirement. They were promised a pension. The status quo for a good number of those people who were promised a pension is that they will get less than they were promised because the companies they worked for are some of the 37 that have entered into bankruptcy over the last several years.

We have had programs over the last several years under the Clinton administration to help reduce class sizes so that the children in the First Congressional District could receive the best education possible, so hopefully, if jobs ever return to the First District, they would be eligible for them; but we are talking about the status quo and not reducing class sizes over the next 7 days.

We are the status quo Congress, and given the market's collapse, given the recession that we are in, given the def-

icit that has been created, I think we have much better things to be doing today than maintaining the status quo. I hope that the rule is defeated.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule.

I have just heard my friend, the gentleman from Indiana, talk about the status quo. The status quo is that we want to keep the government going; we do not want it to shut down. That is really the alternative we are faced with right now.

What we are dealing with is a continuing resolution that will go from October 4 to October 11. Now, people have been talking about the fact that we have this unprecedented situation, and we have never been in these dire straits before when it comes to the process of appropriations.

It is true, we may be moving into new territory, but we have done some of our work here. It is clear that we have passed 5 of the 13 appropriations bills. As the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) pointed out in his testimony before the Committee on Rules yesterday, we basically have six other bills in the bullpen ready to go that we would like to consider.

I do not want to spend a lot of time talking about history here, but, Mr. Speaker, Members should realize that we have, in the past, to my knowledge, never had a time when the minority did not fail to offer a budget. This year we know there was no alternative, so our friends can talk and say, shame on you, and we should be embarrassed and all; but our friends on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, have not come up with a proposed budget. We know that the only entity to pass out a budget was the House of Representatives. We did it with Republican support, and it was the Republican budget that moved ahead.

If we look at the past, Mr. Speaker, we also have had times where we have dealt with continuing resolutions going back to 1990, when we saw a continuing resolution that was vetoed by the President. We saw one of the subcommittees have a continuing resolution that lasted an entire year.

So yes, this is a challenging time for us. We are trying to get a continuing resolution passed for October 4 to October 11 so we can get our work done dealing with the very challenging situation. We have been able to deal with the very, very tough times since September 11 of last year, providing basically about \$100 billion, and we have stepped up to the plate and done that.

So we are at a time of war. This is a war on terrorism that we are dealing with. That has created many of the challenges that we have.

However, I hope we will be able to come together and work on this process. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) for the fine work he is doing in trying to move this process along.

Let us pass this rule, let us pass this continuing resolution, and let us continue working as hard as we possibly can to get our work done.

□ 1100

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), who just stated that we Democrats had no budget. If the gentleman who is the chairman would listen for a moment, I believe he will agree that when I appeared before the Committee on Rules asking that the Blue Dog budget be made in order, we were denied an opportunity to bring it to the floor of the House because it did not meet the preconceived notion of what a budget ought to look like. I keep hearing this and we will hear it again today time and time again, but it does not speak the truth because some of us do want to bring a budget to the floor of the House.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding. I am sorry that I did not hear exactly what the gentleman said earlier, but let me say that you recall in the past that what we have done and what we have tried to do this year was to have a complete budget package that was put forward and not an amendment process, and we went through this debate earlier when we went through it. And the gentleman and I disagree on that, but I think it is very clear to state for the record that from our interpretation we did not have a complete budget substitute that was put forward.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is exactly correct in the way he states it, but that is not the way this body should work. We should not have preconceived notions of what the budget ought to look like and deny the minority an opportunity to even have an amendment. And that is what has caused us to be in the position we are in today, in which we, the House, have not passed but five appropriations bills and yet my friends on this side stand up and blame the other body because we have not done our work.

And I would ask that the gentleman on the Committee on Rules in this rule today, do we have a continuation of the pay-go rules and the discretionary caps, or have we allowed them to expire?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, there is no pay-go on this. This is just appropriations only.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, so we do not have pay-go and discretionary pay caps in this amendment. I understand that this is a CR that continues all programs at last year's levels; and, therefore, a pay cap is not necessary. I understand that. But I take this to the floor today to notice that the Blue Dog Democrats and I believe a large number of my other colleagues on this side are going to insist that when we get into a CR that takes us into a lame duck session or a CR that takes us into next year or a CR that takes us into the next century, based on the way this House is being run, we think there ought to be some meaningful pay-go rules, and they ought not be allowed to expire.

And I would appreciate in the discussion if the finger pointing would stop and most of us, and when I point the finger at my friends over here, I always acknowledge three are coming back at me. But it is an interesting dilemma where it has gotten us to the point in which we are not doing our work on education, on any of the much-needed Medicare/Medicaid rules; and yet all we can do here is point the finger at the other body.

Let us do our work, and you will be surprised what kind of help you get if you allow us to debate these issues instead of stonewalling as you did on the budget.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I have to agree with the gentleman and the points that were made by several Members that have spoken today, it does not do us any good to point fingers; but there are some things that have happened that we cannot ignore that we are dealing with. And one of the things that we are dealing with is that we have not passed a budget in the Congress. That makes it very, very difficult for both Houses to deal with their appropriations process with the same numbers. That is the difficulty. And, again, it does not do any good to point fingers at that, but that is the fact.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. In the summer of 2001 the majority came to this floor with its tax cut proposal and told us the following: for the new budget year that we are heading into, for every \$100 that we were going to spend, we would have about \$115 of income coming in without touching Social Security.

Well, they underestimated the impact of the recession. They understandably could not foresee the impact of September 11, and they irresponsibly went ahead with the tax cut in the face of good economic judgment.

So where we do stand today? For every \$100 we are scheduled to spend, we do not have \$115 coming in. We have \$90, \$90.

The reason that we do not have a budget on the floor is the majority does not want to confront the hard consequences of that problem that it created, because there are only three choices. The first choice is to slash education, health care, environmental protections, veterans benefits, lots of things that lots of people on their side support. So they cannot bring to this floor appropriations bills that do that and pass them.

The second option would violate a seeming religious principle of the majority which would be to renegotiate the size and speed of the tax cut, which is what a rational, sensible approach to this problem would be; but it violates the creed of the Republican Party, so that is off the table.

The third option is to do what we are going to do after the voters have spoken on November 5, and that is to cover the hole in the budget by spending Social Security money. The majority does not want its Members to face the electorate in 33 days and explain they voted to run this government by spending Social Security money. So rather than renegotiate their sacred tax cut, rather than bring to this floor a budget bill that would reflect the conscience of the choice they irresponsibly made in 2001, they are playing rope-a-dope with the American public.

So we will come back next week and pass another extension and the week after that and pass another extension. The problem with this rule and the problem with this continuing resolution is that it misrepresents the choices that confront the American public. The majority is going to run the government by spending Social Security money. We object to that. And we forcefully object to the unanimous consent that they will not talk about the consequences of making that choice. We should defeat this rule. We should sit down as Republicans and Democrats, renegotiate this country's budget, pull us back out of the red, pull our economy back up, and stop the charade that we see on the House floor today.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the important thing for those of us who share the responsibilities of this Nation is, of course, to make sure that the government works for the people. And so we are on the floor today to deal with what we call a continuing

resolution. We do this in the shadow of war and the costliness of \$100 billion that may be spent on a preemptive unilateral strike by this White House. But I think the important thing that should be focused on is the needs and the hurts of the American people.

I may use the 18th Congressional District to suggest that I know that there are good people working here on both sides of the aisle. I know the appropriators are trying to work steadfastly. But here is what is happening to the American people while we are stalemated, if you will, around appropriations. Take the 18th Congressional District in Houston, Texas. We have got agencies that deal with child care that are literally shutting down because working parents who are trying to make ends meet do not have the funding for child care. We do not have the 100,000 teachers promised that was made a couple of years ago, so that there are 16,000 fewer teachers being trained. We find with the new numbers in poverty that there are now 1.3 million families living in poverty. In my own congressional district and State we have got 700,000 homeowners that have no insurance. We have as well those who are losing their benefits of Medicare and Medicaid because our Labor-HHS bill that covers education and Medicare and Medicaid has not yet been funded.

And so what we do on this floor is so vital; it absolutely impacts the matters of life and death for our constituencies. And here we are with a continuing resolution because Republicans refuse to recognize that the multibillion dollars tax cut that was rendered some months ago must be ceased and stopped so that we can focus ourselves on providing the needs of the American people in a bipartisan manner. I hate to go home to my seniors who are making choices between their prescription drugs and paying their rents and their mortgages. I hate to go home to young mothers who want to work who have moved off welfare but cannot function because they have no child care. I hate to go home to my inner city schools because they are overloaded in their classrooms.

Vote against this rule and get back to work on behalf of the American people.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and in support of the continuing resolution. I have listened to some of the debate this morning and have heard a number of my Democratic colleagues harshly critical of this continuing resolution. I do not know whether they intend to vote for the continuing resolution or not; but as we all know, a vote against the continuing resolution is a vote to shut down the

government. And while we are struggling to finish this appropriations process, and it is a struggle, today the Republicans are going to make it very clear that we do not think that we should shut down the government while we work out the differences that we still have.

So we are going to pass this continuing resolution today. I hope we have support from my Democratic colleagues on that. Judging from the discussion so far this morning, I am not terribly optimistic; but I hope we will because, as I said, we should keep the government open while we resolve these differences.

As always for the CR itself, frankly, I would not write it. If it were up to me, I would not write it exactly this way, but it is a short term CR; it does not take us terribly long into the future. Hopefully, it will take us past the time in which the defense appropriations bill will be signed into law. That is about half of the discretionary spending in this process, and that will give us a chance to revisit this issue. And if we have not worked out the rest of the appropriations bills, we can refine and improve and hopefully perfect the continuing resolution that might be required at that point. If we can do that, I will support that CR. If we cannot improve it and correct the flaws, then I will vote against that continuing resolution.

But the point is as we go through this process we Republicans are responsibly trying to struggle through a difficult process to work out our differences and pass the spending bills necessary for this government. And it is a difficult process for a simple reason. We think there ought to be some budgetary restraints. We think there is a point at which we have got to say to the American people what we have said twice on this floor when we have passed the budget resolution, a second time when we have passed the deeming resolution acknowledging that as an operative budget.

What we said is we have got huge new needs for funding this war on terrorism. We have got huge new expenses we have got to incur to protect our homeland. And given those huge new expenses which we all accept, we have got to tighten our belts in some of the other areas of government where we cannot afford to keep growing all of these programs at three, four and five times the rate of inflation, as we have in recent years.

What we are simply saying is we need a little bit of restraint in these other areas of government. Now, there would be an easy solution to this and it is the solution that would draw a tremendous majority of votes on the Democratic side of this aisle, and that would be to forget about the budget and just spend a whole lot more. Maybe we could just agree to whatever number is being floated at the other end of this building or maybe a higher number still because the objection on this side of the aisle is

that we are not spending enough money.

Well, my colleagues, we have been spending too much money for too long. We have got legitimate needs in defense and homeland security. It is time to tighten our belts in the other areas.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the continuing resolution and continue this struggle for a responsible budget.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PHELPS).

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

Mr. PHELPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, as we debate another continuing resolution, and there is talk of recessing until after the elections, I am concerned we have not addressed all 13 appropriations bills and extending unemployment benefits.

Congress enacted a budget last year based on projections of a \$5.6 trillion surplus. Several Members warned about the danger of making decisions based on projected surpluses that might not materialize, but our warnings were ignored. One year later the projections have turned out to be wrong and we are looking at large deficits and a growing national debt.

Circumstances have changed dramatically since we enacted the Republican budget last year. The projections turned out to be too optimistic, revenues are much lower than expected, we face tremendous new expenses for homeland defense and the war on terrorism and a possible war with Iraq. But the Republicans refuse to consider any changes to their budget policies in response to the changed circumstances.

We understand that circumstances have changed greatly in the past year. We understand the economy is in turmoil and we are facing a war on terrorism but that does not give us an excuse to not come up with a budget. We should not ignore our responsibility to the American people.

The American people have shown a tremendous willingness to make sacrifices to help win the war on terrorism, just as they did in World War II. But instead of asking all Americans to make sacrifices to pay for the war on terrorism, the administration and Republican leadership are paying for the war with borrowed money, leaving the bill to be paid for by someone else in the future.

In my congressional district in central and southern Illinois, there is a high unemployment rate and the economy is suffering. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned because the Republicans refuse to extend unemployment benefits to the millions who have exhausted benefits and need help now. Unemployment is at an all time high and median household income has dropped. The stock market has lost millions and the Dow is at a low.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned we are going to leave these important issues unaddressed until after the elections.

Oppose previous question and let us get on with doing the people's business.

□ 1115

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

Mr. Speaker, the continuing resolution before us is an indictment of the Republican majority. They have failed to help the unemployed, failed to rescue the economy, failed to complete the appropriations process and failed the American people.

If the previous question is defeated, I will introduce a package that contains the CR we are debating today, extends unemployment insurance, brings the Labor-HHS bill to the floor so that we can move the appropriations process forward, and calls for an economic stimulus package to get this country moving again.

Meaningless sense of the House resolutions will not get it done, Mr. Speaker. Passing continuing resolutions to avoid tough choices is not going to get it done either. There is an unfinished agenda of issues that mean something to the middle-class Americans, Mr. Speaker, and Democrats want to help them, even if Republicans do not.

By defeating the previous question, the House can take up this economic package and reverse the economic decline that the Republicans have brought us. Let us get America back to work again.

I urge a no vote on the previous question.

The material previously referred to by Mr. FROST is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 568

OFFERED BY MR. FROST

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 112) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes. The joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the joint resolution equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

Sec. 2. (a) Immediately after disposition of H.J. Res. 112, the Speaker shall declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5320) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, 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. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provision in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those specified in subsection (b). Each such amendment may be offered only in the order specified, may be offered only by the Member specified or his designee, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. All points of order

against such amendments (except those arising under clause 7 of rule XVI) are waived. If more than one of the amendments specified in subsection (b) is adopted, only the last to be adopted shall be considered as finally adopted and reported to the House. 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.

(b) The amendments referred to in subsection (a) are as follows:

(1) An amendment in the nature of a substitute by Representative Shadegg of Arizona.

(2) An amendment in the nature of a substitute by Representative Obey of Wisconsin.

(3) An amendment in the nature of a substitute by Representative Young of Florida.

Sec. 3 Immediately after disposition of H.R. 5320, the House shall without intervention of any point of order consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5491) to provide economic security for America's workers. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; (2) an amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Representative Thomas of California or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order (except those arising under clause 7 of rule XVI), shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Sec. 4. (a) On the legislative day of Thursday, October 10, 2002, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, the House shall without intervention of any point of order consider in the House the bill specified in subsection (b). The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; (2) an amendment specified in subsection (c), which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

(b) The bill referred to in subsection (a) is a bill that Representative Thomas of California shall introduce on or before the legislative day of October 7, 2002, on the subject of economic stimulus and that Representative Thomas shall designate as introduced pursuant to this resolution.

(c) The amendment referred to in subsection (a) is an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of a bill that Representative Rangel of New York shall introduce on or before the legislative day of Wednesday, October 9, 2002, on the subject of economic stimulus and that Representative Rangel shall designate as introduced pursuant to this resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). 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. FROST. 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.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 206, nays 198, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 438]

YEAS—206

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

Wicker
Wilson (NM)

Wilson (SC)
Wolf

Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—198

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

NOT VOTING—27

Aderholt	Green (TX)	Roukema
Baker	Hastings (FL)	Roybal-Allard
Callahan	Hilleary	Schrock
Clayton	Kennedy (MN)	Souder
Cooksey	Lampson	Stump
Davis, Tom	Mascara	Sullivan
Deal	McKinney	Tanner
Ehlers	Napolitano	Tauzin
Fattah	Platts	Waxman

□ 1141

Mr. HILL and Mr. UDALL of Colorado changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. LEACH and Mr. REGULA changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 438 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 438 I was attending a White House briefing on Iraq. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 438 I was at the White House for a briefing on Iraq. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 438 I was attending a White House briefing on Iraq. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 438 I was detained at a meeting in the White House and could not return to the House floor before the vote concluded. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

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

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3781

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3781.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.J. Res. 112, making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2003

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 568, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 112) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

□ 1145

The text of House Joint Resolution 112 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 112

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 107-229 is further amended by striking the date specified in section 107(c) and inserting in lieu thereof "October 11, 2002".

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). Pursuant to House Resolu-

tion 568, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.J. Res. 112 is the second continuing resolution for fiscal year 2003. It will extend the current CR until next Friday at midnight, October 11.

The terms and conditions of the initial CR will remain in effect. All ongoing activities will be continued at current rates under the same terms and conditions as fiscal year 2002.

I will briefly mention them again for Members. It will continue all ongoing activities at current rates, including supplementals, under the same terms and conditions as fiscal year 2002.

The term "rate for operations not exceeding the current rate" continues to be defined as stated in OMB Bulletin No. 01-10.

As in past CRs, it does not allow new starts, and it allows for adjustment for one-time expenditures that occurred in fiscal year 2002.

It continues the eight funding or authorizing anomalies in the original CR.

Mr. Speaker, this CR is non-controversial. I urge the House to move this legislation to the Senate so that the government can continue to operate until we have that glorious day when we conclude all of the appropriations bills.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, let us be thankful that the millions of American children who just started the new school year have better things to do than to watch proceedings on the House floor, because if they were, they would be learning some terrible lessons from the Republican leadership.

Lesson 1: 2 plus 2 equals 3. That is what we call the GOP's "fuzzy" math. And that is what enabled our Republican friends to enact enormous tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans while still pretending that they are committed to a balanced budget, deficit reduction and priorities like education.

Lesson 2: Say one thing, do another. Our Republican friends have voted 7 times over the last 3 years to put our Social Security surpluses in a so-called lockbox, and then they have turned right around and passed a budget that raids those surpluses to the tune of \$2 trillion.

Lesson 3: Do not do homework because, as this Republican leadership has demonstrated, we do not even need to worry about completing the basics.

While our Republican friends act like they are on a permanent summer vacation, the truth is they simply have become congressional truants. On this, the third day of the new fiscal year, this House has failed to complete work on even 1 of the 13 appropriations bills.

Since Members returned from the August district work period, we have not considered one spending bill on the floor of this House. Not one. Rather than bring up the energy and water bill, we are loading up the suspension calendar. Rather than consider the foreign operations bill, we are spending time on sense of House resolutions. Rather than doing the work that the American people expect to be done, we are in session for only 3 days again this week.

While we dither, the American people suffer the consequences, and our economy is tanking. A real Patients' Bill of Rights, stalled by the GOP leadership. A real prescription drug benefit for seniors under Medicare, blocked by the GOP leadership. Pension reform that protects workers and legislation to eliminate offshore corporate tax havens, disregarded by the GOP leadership. An increase in the minimum wage and an extension of the unemployment insurance benefits, a critical step that we ought to be taking, ignored by the GOP leadership.

Mr. Speaker, this leadership would even undo important bipartisan legislation that we have already passed. After all the fanfare about the No Child Left Behind Act, our Republican friends would slash spending on the act's programs by \$90 million, and they call for the smallest increase in education spending in 7 years.

Today, as we pass this second continuing resolution, let us be thankful that America's children are hard at work at school doing what is expected of them, because we are not. Unfortunately, the same cannot be said of us.

Mr. Speaker, I see the gentleman from California on the floor, and with the last remaining seconds I have, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) may speak. The gentleman will come up here and say, "Look at what the Democrats did."

Mr. Speaker, I came here in 1981. For the next 6 years with a Republican President and a Republican United States Senate, we ran up the largest deficits in the history of America. From 1993, under Bill Clinton, until the time he left, for 8 straight years we brought the deficit down and came into surplus. We have now squandered that \$5.6 trillion, and we are down to zero, and the economy is hurting. Let us do better.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I seldom try to put words in the mouth of other Members, but I listened carefully to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), and I think he did misspeak on one particular issue. The gentleman emphasized that the House had not considered one appropriations bill. The fact