

Paul  
Reyes

Roukema  
Slaughter

Stump  
Towns

□ 1710

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. Res. 122, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 2003

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 580 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 580

*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. 122) 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). The question is, Will the House now consider House Resolution 580.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the House agreed to consider House Resolution 580.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, for purposes 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 purposes 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 580 is a closed rule providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 122, making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes.

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, House Joint Resolution 122 makes further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2003 and provides for funding at current levels.

We had agreed in the Committee on Rules that this would be through November 22.

At the conclusion of the debate on this, by consent on both sides there will be an amendment offered to change that date of November 22 to October 18, 2000, a week from tomorrow. This measure is necessary in order that all necessary and vital functions of government may continue uninterrupted until Congress completes the work on the spending measures for the next fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass the rule, as we will amend it, and of course the underlying resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, if the Members here in the Chamber and Members watching this on television in their offices are a little confused, there is very good reason that they should be confused. Let me kind of review the bidding here, what has gone on today.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican leadership is in a total and utter state of disarray and denial.

□ 1715

First today we were told, well, there would be a continuing resolution until next week, until October 18. And then, no, they changed their minds; and it was going to be a continuing resolution until November 22. Now, apparently they have changed their minds again and now the resolution is going to be until October 18, which is next week.

The question really is, Why are they doing this? Why can they not decide to let the House work its will on the appropriations bills? Why do they say one thing to Members at one moment, another thing 5 minutes later, another thing another 10 minutes later?

This is a disgrace, a disgrace, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, on September 30 the fiscal year ended, and the deadline passed for House Republicans to do their most basic job, passing the appropriations bills to fund priorities like education and health care. In the 10 days since then, the stock market has dropped to a 5-year low, and we have learned that another 417,000 Americans filed unemployment claims at the end of last month.

By stubbornly refusing to do their jobs they are getting paid to do, the Republican leaders are hurting the millions of Americans who are busy looking for work. This House has failed to fund important initiatives in education, health care, and other key priorities.

Well, here we go again, Mr. Speaker. Republicans are still fiddling while America's economy burns. So in a few minutes we will vote on a continuing resolution that was November 22. Now it is October 18. Who knows what it will be an hour from now.

Republican leaders want this CR so they can hide evidence of their fiscal

mismanagement. It is the same cynical strategy they are using to hide their secret plan to privatize Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, why will Republicans not be honest with the American people? Not too long ago they insisted that Congress had to vote on an Iraq resolution before the election. As the President himself said, and I quote, "I cannot imagine an elected United States, elected Members of the United States Senate or House of Representatives saying, 'I think I am going to wait for the United Nations to make a decision.'"

To paraphrase the President, I cannot imagine being a House Republican who has presiding over this failed economy and saying, I am not going to do anything about it. Because that is exactly what House Republicans are going to do, postpone action on important domestic and economic issues. They are desperate to hide their failed economic policies and dangerous Social Security plan from the voters. But they cannot hide the truth.

The Republicans' refusal to govern is hurting American priorities from the economy to education. In a recent memo to the Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations outlined just how harmful this refusal to govern is. According to the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG), "A long-term continuing resolution would have disastrous impacts on the war on terror, homeland security and other important government responsibilities."

The gentleman's memo pointed out that a long-term CR, and we do not know how they define long term, is it a week, is it a month, that a long-term CR would undermine the war on terror by denying nearly \$40 billion in additional homeland security funds requested by the President. It would short change our veterans by funding VA medical care at 2.5 billion less than what is needed to meet their needs, and would hurt our children's education by underfunding Pell grants by nearly \$1 billion.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans' failed economic policies have driven America into a huge deficit ditch that poses a grave threat to Social Security and other priorities like education, prescription drugs, and homeland security. So Republican leaders hope that by refusing to fund the government no one will notice the fiscal straitjacket they have put the country in.

The shell game is most obvious on education. Many Republican Members want to go home to tout their bipartisan No Child Left Behind Act we passed with so much fanfare last year; but they refuse to actually provide schools with the resources they need to carry out the reforms Congress mandated. Indeed, the bill funding the Departments of Labor, Education and Health and Human Services backed by most Republican Members would gut education and other priorities, and

that is why they do not want to bring it to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to be straight with the American people and start digging out of this fiscal ditch. That will require Republicans owning up to the disaster they have made of the Federal budget. For that reason, Members are going to be called on in just a moment. We will have very serious questions about this particular continuing resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve honesty from the Republicans on critical domestic issues. There is no excuse for this House putting off its most basic work. The economy is weak, prescription drugs are still sky high, the budget is back in deficit, and many Republicans want to privatize Social Security.

It is time to quit playing politics. It is time to get back to doing the American people's business and to actually pass appropriations bills rather than this shell game of "Maybe we have a one week CR, maybe we have a one month CR. Gee, we do not know. We just want to leave so we can go home and campaign."

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, what now? We have since Labor Day focused almost exclusively on Iraq, Iraq, and then Iraq. And then Iraq. We have now finally finished that business.

And the average American family is sitting home and they are saying, "You know, I wonder when those guys and gals are going to get around to doing the stuff that deals with our family security. I wonder when they are going to get around to dealing with unemployment. I wonder when they are going to get around to dealing with the fact that people are losing their shirts in their 401(k)'s, their now 101(k)'s." And they are asking, "I wonder when they are going to get around to protecting the integrity of our pension plans from corporate marauders. And I wonder when they are going to get around to dealing with the fact that a lot of Americans have lost their health insurance in the last year."

I do not understand this institution's reaction. I know virtually every Member of this House, some a lot more than others. And I know that when I talk to each and every one of you that you are, individually, people of good will who want to solve the country's problems. But when you get together, the collective result of that individual talent and concern is disastrous. Because instead of producing a determination to attack problems, what apparently is produced is a determination to avoid them.

Now, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) has described the confusion on the Republican side of the aisle today. Here is what I think is at the root of that confusion. You have passed a budget resolution at the beginning of the year that told fibs. It pretended

that you could hold education spending to a level that would stop and grind to a halt the progress we have made in expanding investments in education over the past 5 years.

You pretended you could afford a health care budget which cuts a billion and a half dollars out of health care services to the American people. And you have pretended a lot of other things, and now those pretensions are coming home to roost. And so the leadership is trying to figure out how they can get out of town without having to face up to those irreconcilable contradictions. And so their original game plan today was to have a continuing resolution that puts us over until November 22, after the election, conveniently putting aside until after the election all issues.

The administration, which has made so much of its desire to see accountability in our schools, is doing as much as it can possibly do to avoid accountability for each and every one of us in our stewardship. And so what happened in the Republican Caucus is that some of the Members got a little ditsy, and they said, "Gee whiz," some Members said for instance, "You mean we are going to go home without dealing with the drought? Gee, we want more time to deal with the drought."

So all of the sudden the November 22 date is changed to next week because the leadership still has not figured out how to resolve that because they have a problem. Because while some of their Members want to attack the drought problem, their President, our President, has already said that he is going to veto a bill which pays for those drought expenses. So they have that problem.

Then they have the huge problem of wanting to hide from their constituents the fact that they were bringing progress in education investments to a screeching halt. They have their votes from the No Child Left Behind Act which promised all kinds of progress on teacher training, on handicapped education, on education for kids who need help with language skills. They have that vote, but the problem is that bill does not deliver the money. The appropriation bill that delivers the money is being bottled up because they do not want to have to admit that they are not going to provide the money to fund the promises they made just a few months ago. So as a result this place looks silly.

We have done our dead-level best as an institution to try to deal with the challenges facing us in Iraq. We ought to turn to those same challenges at home. This continuing resolution does not allow us to do that. I will, therefore, vote against it. I am against any continuing resolutions that are more than one or two days at a time. When I see that the majority has scheduled action on education and on health care, I will vote for them and not until.

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

Mr. Speaker, less than 40 minutes ago we were in the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), myself, all of us were there to pass a rule. We passed a rule. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) was there. The ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) was there. We passed a rule that allowed that we would have a continuing resolution until the 22nd of November.

I came down here to the floor of the House and began talking with Members indicating that we would have the CR until the 22nd, and lo and behold, telling them that it is distinctly possible that we may be back next week or at some other point in time; but then I hear the Clerk read and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) stand up and say that it has changed.

What has happened in this institution? Do we have a phantom Committee on Rules somewhere? Why is it that I continue to go upstairs thinking that I am participating in a process of importance?

Somewhere along the lines we are losing our rudder; and we have things that need to be done, and Republicans need to do it and Democrats need to do it. Liberals need to do it, and conservatives need to do it on behalf of this country. We cannot continue down this path.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), my very good friend.

□ 1730

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me the time. I want to speak on the substance, but I want to spend 30 seconds on the process.

I want to tell those of my colleagues who were not here prior to 1994 that their side of the aisle was regularly outraged at procedures that were pursued, none of which were as egregious as some of the process that we are confronted with. I do not believe this is a process that anybody on the Committee on Appropriations would sanction, on either side of the aisle. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) is absolutely correct, and I join him in those comments.

Mr. Speaker, I will be the first to admit this House can point to real legislative accomplishments this week. We considered our most solemn duty, a resolution authorizing our Commander-in-Chief to use our Armed Forces. We finally passed two appropriations conference reports; two down, 11 to go. We will soon take up landmark election reform legislation, the Help America Vote Act of 2002.

But, Mr. Speaker, one week does not a session make.

There is little doubt that the preceding 5 weeks were anything but an evasion of leadership and responsibility. While we bobbed and weaved, the American people took it on the chin again and again and again.

The unemployment rate showed a tiny reduction from 5.7 to 5.6 percent from August to September, but it still was far above the rate of 3.9 percent in October, 2000.

There are 8.1 million unemployed Americans today, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, an increase of 2½ million Americans from just 2 years ago.

The year before President Bush took office, the economy created 1.7 million new jobs. Since January of 2001, we have lost 1.5 million jobs.

The poverty rate increased for the first time in 8 years in 2001. In the first year of the Bush administration, 1.3 million Americans slipped back into poverty, with 32.9 million now living in poverty and this the richest nation on the face of the earth.

The median household income fell 2.2 percent in 2001, after increasing every year since 1992. More than 400,000 bankruptcies were filed in the second quarter of this year, an all-time high. In the same quarter, 1.23 percent of home loans were in foreclosure, a record high, but that is not all.

The number of Americans without health insurance increased by 1.4 million people from the end of 2000 to the end of 2001. Health insurance costs increased 12.7 percent in 2002, the largest annual increase since 1990. Prescription drug prices increased by nearly twice the rate of inflation in 2001. And then, of course, as all of us know, the stock market has lost \$4.5 trillion in value between January, 2001, and September, 2002.

But the topper, the most egregious statistic for which we have a large share of the responsibility, has been the historic reversal of the Federal budget.

The \$86.6 billion surplus inherited by this administration, excluding Social Security, that President Bush inherited has turned into a \$314 billion deficit, almost half a trillion dollars; and the only medicine the Republican party's economic gurus can prescribe is this—cut taxes.

As we consider this continuing resolution, I urge the American people to ask themselves Ronald Reagan's famous question: Are we better off today than we were 2 years ago? The answer tragically and unfortunately is we are not.

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

Mr. Speaker, last week we went through a very similar debate when we passed the CR last week to get us to this point. There was some heated discussion on the floor, and there was a bit of finger pointing. I do not think it does this institution all that good to point fingers, but I suppose that is just the nature of a political body that that has to happen.

I think in that light it may be instructive just to review where we started in the 107th Congress and the start of this year and where we are right

now. That perhaps has added to some of the sounds of confusion that we are going through this time.

We are required by law, as we all know, to pass a budget and agree on some numbers between the House and the Senate. We have talked about that at length on the floor of this House, and we all know that the House responded to that in a way and passed a budget according to the rules and laws that we abide by. We also know that the Senate did not do that.

It presents a problem, obviously, simply because we do not have an agreement on both sides by which to argue about our differences. It causes some dissension, certainly does not make the appropriators' job very easy, but that is the framework by which we have to work with this appropriation process.

So we have tried then to get bills out at least and have broad consensus. Five of them, if my number is correct, have passed the House, now await action in the Senate, and we have some contentious appropriations bills that need to be acted on later.

Every year, as a matter of fact, the same bills tend to pop up that are contentious, and the appropriators are working very hard to try to work out the differences so we can narrow that gap, but unfortunately, this year happens to be an election year. Everybody, or at least one-third of the other body and everybody in this body, desires to go home to campaign and hopefully come back and start the 108th Congress anew, but before we do that, of course, we have to finish this process.

It is true when we were up in the Committee on Rules meeting earlier this afternoon, the CR was to take us until November 22. The reason for that time between then and now was to give the appropriators a little bit more time to work out the differences that they may or may not have and try to take a deep breath, come back after the election and get it resolved.

Of course, in this body there are a lot of discussions that go on under the radar, and it was felt, probably through a signal of Members perhaps on both sides of the aisle, that a resolution carrying the CR to November 22 may not have passed. We do not know that, we did not put it to a vote, but sometimes we take a gauge and we learn where the levels are.

The determination was made, because there had been talk not only last week but the week before, that probably the last CR would be on the 18th of this month, a determination was made then that we would have the CR until the next week to allow the appropriators to go back to work, and that is what this rule is all about, is to allow us to have a CR to take us into next week. We will come back next week.

I suppose that we will hear the same sort of rhetoric next week as we try to get all of our business done, but I think this is a responsible way to do it.

There are some major issues, I might add, that are overhanging the whole

Capitol, not just this body. Today, we passed a very historic piece of legislation that, as my colleagues know, we debated for 2½ days regarding the Iraqi situation. But in line with the Iraqi situation and the potential that we may have to go to war is the issue of homeland security, and we have acted on that.

When the President came to the Congress with his proposal for homeland security, there were Members, probably on both sides of the aisle, that said would it not be great if we could create an Office of Homeland Security and have that done by September 11. We did not get it done by September 11, but the House did act on that bill, and that is waiting in the other body, again, for that bill to pass so we can work out whatever differences we may have.

I think it would be unconscionable for us as a Congress, in view of what we did today and the action on Iraq, to leave here, to leave here and not pass the homeland security bill. I hope that the other body will work on that. I hope they work extremely hard on that in the next week so that when we come back, we will have to come back next week to at least, if nothing else, respond to the CR.

I believe that for us as a Congress one of the things that we need to do is to put the final exclamation point on what I think all Americans want us to do, in lieu of the threat that we have coming from the Middle East and particularly Iraq, is to make sure that our homeland security is as strong as it can be. It can only be stronger, in my view, if the Senate acts on that bill, we can go to conference and work out the differences and pass it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, would the Speaker be so kind as to inform us as to the amount of time remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) has 12 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) has 22½ minutes remaining.

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

I was going to ask my good friend and namesake, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), whether or not we needed a budget resolution to pass the Defense bill today.

We did not need one.

And are we going to take up appropriations measures next week when we return?

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in the best of all worlds, of course, it would be nice if we could do that. Anything is possible. It is likely probably not, in all honesty.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, did my colleague not just say,

though, that that was the purpose of the CR?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I am sorry if the gentleman misinterpreted what I said on that. The purpose of the CR is to fund the government for one more week, if, in fact, under that period of time these things can come together.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, my colleague is not going to answer my question. They did not need a budget resolution, as argued that we needed, in order for us to go forward with the Defense bill today. The answer to that is, no, we did not. The answer to are we going to take up appropriations measures next week, absolutely not. We are going to come back here and do another CR, and we need to get on with it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO).

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I am wondering if my friend from Wisconsin would answer a question.

I am very curious about this explanation that we cannot act on appropriations bills because there is no conference agreement on a budget resolution. As our friend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) indicated, we passed two final bills today. Is that not right? How could we do that?

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the answer is very simple. When they had the will to pass a bill, they passed it. When they do not want to pass the bills, they do not pass them. They were not trying to hide what they were doing on Defense, but they are trying to hide what they are doing on Education and Agriculture and Transportation.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, do we have a number of bills that have been passed out of committee available for floor action?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, you bet. We have the Agriculture bill. We have the Labor H, could be ready very quickly if they would let us bring it to a vote. We have the HUD independent offices bill. We have a number of others as well.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I will have another question for the gentleman.

I read this continuing resolution, and there is something that bewilders me. As we all know, our economy is fragile and there is always a dispute about what we can or should do at the Federal level to help speed up the economy.

Clearly, one of the areas in this country where we have major problems is our transportation and infrastructure.

□ 1745

Am I right that this year we are having highway obligation limit of about \$31.8 billion?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, the language in this CR—

Mr. SABO. No, this year.

Mr. OBEY. Right now we are operating under the level the gentleman described, yes.

Mr. SABO. In our previous continuing resolutions we were told we had an obligation limit of \$31.8 billion.

Mr. OBEY. Right.

Mr. SABO. What is this language in the bill today? I read it, and it seems to me we are writing into law something about 31.8, that appears to be a smoke screen to make people feel good, then there is an exception for it which indicates and takes us back to a highway obligation limit to 21.7.

Mr. OBEY. That is correct. This resolution cuts the amount that would be available to the States to \$27.7 billion. So the gentleman's State is going to lose \$54 million, my State will lose \$69 million, if it is carried to term, and so on.

Mr. SABO. This is confusing. I know that there is disagreement between House and Senate bills, but from all the interpretations of what we have been doing, I think it is clear that no one can dispute that if we want to spend money that has impact on jobs, maintaining or creating jobs, the best money spent is on existing programs, where plans are made, where States are ready to spend it. Am I wrong?

Mr. OBEY. If the gentleman will continue to yield, the gentleman is right, and what is at stake here is 200,000 jobs.

Mr. SABO. And so this bill goes contrary to what we have done in our first couple of CRs and actually writes into the CR that we are reducing funding for highways next year.

Mr. OBEY. That is right. Instead of having a disagreement between the House and the Senate, we have a disagreement between the House and the House.

Mr. SABO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I feel a sense of frustration similar to some who have expressed it on the floor today, because I joined some of my colleagues in the Committee on Rules in seeking support for a rule to allow the CR to be brought up to do one primary thing, to keep the government running beyond tomorrow night at midnight.

Now, there may be some who would like to see the government close down and play the blame game: "it is your fault, or it is your fault, or it is our fault, or it is their fault." The problem is, the blame game does not get us anywhere.

Now, we are here today with a CR because the appropriations bills have not

become law. Today we passed the conference reports on the defense bill with a very healthy bipartisan vote and on the military construction bill with a very bipartisan vote. Those are two good bills, and we had promised the President we would get them to his desk before any others. But if anybody listening to this debate believes that we have not passed the appropriations bills because the Committee on Appropriations has not done its job, they are mistaken. If anyone believes that the appropriations process has broken down, they are mistaken.

There was a breakdown. The breakdown was in the budget process. It totally collapsed. And it collapsed because the law was not followed. The Budget Act was not obeyed. The Budget Act provides that the House pass a budget resolution; send it to the other body, the way we do other legislation; the other body passed a budget resolution; the two Houses come together in a conference committee and work out the differences; and then report back to the House and report back to the Senate the ideal budget resolution with the same numbers and the same words. As all my colleagues know, a conference report has to be identical.

Here is where the breakdown occurred. The House passed a budget resolution. Whether you voted for it or did not vote for it, whether you liked it or did not like it, the House passed a budget resolution. The other body did not. So during the appropriations process we have been dealing with a broken budget process because the top number, the 302(a) number which is the overall budget number for discretionary spending, is one number in the other body and a different number in the House.

Now, I have been seeking a mathematician ever since that happened to tell me how we can reconcile these appropriations bills when one top number is \$9 billion higher than the other one. Either the high one has to come down or the low one has to come up or they have to meet in the middle somewhere. This has not happened so the budget process totally collapsed.

Nevertheless, the Committee on Appropriations has continued to do its work. We have already passed and sent to the other body a number of appropriations bills, including the two we passed today, the Defense and Military Construction bills. We have also sent the Interior bill to the other body and, we have sent the Treasury, Postal bill the legislative branch bill to the other body. And I would report to you, Mr. Speaker, that we are prepared to send all the other bills to the other body after they are considered here. The committee has marked up those appropriation bills and they are ready for consideration.

Someone asked about an omnibus bill, and I would have to suggest that at this late period in this process that may be the way out, that is, to do an omnibus bill. As a matter of fact, seeing this day coming, I could prepare an

omnibus bill, and I could add it to a CR. We are going to be back here next week. By the time we get back here next week, I could have another CR ready that would have an omnibus appropriation bill on it that would finalize our business as far as the House is concerned.

So that is sort of the history of where we are and why we are here. The appropriations process did not break down; the budget process did. And most of the bills that we reported from committee had general support from both parties; and all of those bills were reported out of the committee with good solid votes. But now the bill we are considering today, Mr. Speaker, has to do with a continuing resolution to keep the government functioning beyond midnight tomorrow night.

After writing and rewriting several different continuing resolutions, we introduced the first one last night. Since then, we have introduced three additional ones. We went to the Committee on Rules, they gave us a rule that would allow us to take up the CR that would take us to the 22nd of November. That does not mean we will quit and run and go home tomorrow or tonight. That means we have that much more time available to work on trying to conclude our business.

But along the way we ran into another obstacle, and that obstacle was that there are some people who did not think there was enough in this CR for an interest that they had. And I think their interest is legitimate, but there are legitimate interests all over this Congress that are not included in this CR because a CR is a temporary funding measure.

So we were hoping to bring this rule to the floor, get a bipartisan vote for it, take up the CR, and keep the government functioning so that the Congress could continue to do its work. Now we have found out that we may not have all the votes we need on our side to pass it and we may not get any votes on the minority side. That doesn't make it very bipartisan, to say the least. I have asked a number of my friends on the other side if we could have some votes to help us pass this rule, to make up for the votes we may lose on our side; and the answer was no, we are not going to vote for it.

If we could have had a little bit of cooperation, this rule could be out of here, the CR could be out of here, and all my colleagues could be on airplanes headed for home; and I would go back to the office and put the finishing touches on that omnibus appropriation bill and have it ready by next week. But instead, we are here.

We could use a little cooperation. Some of my friends on this side would not like it if we passed the rule the way it is currently written because they want their interests in this resolution, and I do not blame them. But sometimes we have to settle down, cut, and go to the finish line. And that is where we thought we were today, but evidently we are not.

Other than that, Mr. Speaker, I hope everybody has a nice day, nice weekend; and we will see everyone next week.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland if I have any time left, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOYER. I believe there is time, as I understand it, Mr. Speaker.

We have heard much about the budget and the fact we have not passed the budget in the same form through two Houses. But as I recall, we passed a deeming resolution budget, which means the House numbers are the numbers we are supposed to adhere to. Am I not correct that we used that deeming resolution to pass the five bills to which the gentleman previously referred that have passed the House? Is that correct?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct. We are functioning under the deeming resolution.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, could we not, therefore, have passed the other eight bills in the same manner?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I would like to think that we could. The problem would be that conferencing those bills would be impossible, at least if we did all of them.

Mr. HOYER. I agree with the gentleman, because there are very substantial differences. The gentleman mentioned a number of differences in our priorities. But what that would have done, Mr. Speaker, is to make it clear what those differences are for the American people in terms of education, in terms of health care, in terms of biomedical research.

So we could have done that and set before the American people the differences that exist between our body and the other body, could we not?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am only going to respond to the gentleman in this way: that we deemed a budget number because we could not get a real budget, and we had to have a top line that the House had previously agreed to. As I pointed out in my remarks, I know a lot of Members did not vote for it. Nevertheless, the House worked its will, and that is the budget number we are now working with.

It would have been much easier for me and for the gentleman from Maryland, as the ranking member on a very important subcommittee, and for the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), as the ranking member on the full committee, and for all of us, if we had a common top number so that we could have then created common 302(b) numbers and we could have been well on our way to conferencing these bills.

Mr. HOYER. Again, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I agree that would have been easier; and, furthermore, I believe, had there been agreement and a majority for the

House-passed budget numbers, we could have passed our bills.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, the problem is that the votes are not there to sustain the budget the House passed and put forward, and that really is the nub of the problem, that we passed a budget that was not realistic and that, therefore, we and the Committee on Appropriations are unable to pass bills which can garner the requisite votes to pass. And I sympathize with the gentleman's challenge.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, my friend, the gentleman from Maryland, is very smooth in the way that he makes his points, but his comment would be speculation because there are those of us who believe that we could pass those bills at the number that we deemed. And if the other body would have had the same number, whether it was \$768 billion, \$759 billion, or \$749 billion, we could have made this work.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we did not have the same numbers on the five bills we did pass.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. The gentleman is correct, but he understands that we did not get to conference on those bills.

Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I wish we could conclude this business today and let the Members have a weekend at home, because for those who have strong election campaigns, they need a little bit of time at home to reconnect with their constituents. But I am not sure that is going to happen today. We will do the best we can, and I thank the gentleman for yielding me all of his time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to this discussion and wonder what the American people might be asking themselves about this inside-the-beltway discussion of budget resolutions, continuing resolutions, and deeming resolutions.

Let me bring it back home to Americans in real terms. Because we have not done the one thing Congress has the responsibility to do each year, pass appropriation bills, the children of military families who might be put at risk in a war against Iraq, and I voted for that military authorization today, the children of military families, their schools, will not be getting the Impact Aid funding as they should be this November.

□ 1800

The Fort Hood school district in my congressional district will be losing millions of dollars that they otherwise would have gotten in November.

I am told Fort Leavenworth in Kansas might have a serious financial crisis in the next month or two because of Impact Aid funding not having been passed in the appropriation bill.

What all this esoteric discussion means, the children of the military

families, those families which we might be sending into combat in Iraq, are not going to get the education funding they deeply deserve; which is somewhat ironic on the same day that we just voted to authorize the use of military force in Iraq.

Secondly, this means a lot in regard to highway spending and American jobs. A vote for this rule is a vote to cut highway spending by \$4.1 billion. What does that mean? It means the loss of over 190,000 jobs in an economy which has already lost 2 million jobs. It means the loss of good-paying jobs from New York to California to Texas. It means we cannot repair the aging highway infrastructure in America at the rate that we were even doing last year, considering the fact that 21 percent of the bridges in the Federal highway system are substandard and many of those are unsafe.

It means that the 4 days a year that Americans already spend in congestion away from their work, it means more pollution, more time away from their families and less efficient businesses. According to the Texas Transportation Institute, a loss of \$75 billion a year because of congestion, extra fuel and lost time because of inadequate highways and inadequate transportation systems.

So this is not an esoteric, inside-the-Beltway debate, it is a debate about jobs and cleaner air and more efficient businesses.

Mr. Speaker, we have not met our responsibility. Because of the leadership in this House, we have not been allowed to do our one responsibility that we must do: pass appropriations bills. What I think has happened is a combination of a slow economy, the war against terrorism, and an irresponsibly large tax cut which has cut the budget so drastically that we cannot afford to fund the Leave No Child Behind education bill, and many Members want us to not vote on these until after the election. That is irresponsible. We should do our work. It is our responsibility.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I was in my office watching this debate. If I could do one thing in this Congress, being one of the longest-serving congressmen, it would be to shut off the television. The nonsense I heard from that side of the aisle that affects my committee is pure, pure BS. That is exactly what it is. And they are playing the political game on television so the people at home can watch this dishonesty as they present it.

I worked very hard on this and I must tell the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), I worked very hard, including the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), who is the

ranking member, to make sure as it came down that we reinstated, and \$31,799,104,000 is going to be spent. Yes, that is what it is. Just read it. Has the gentleman read it?

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SABO. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I reclaim my time. I reclaim my time.

This was an agreement we reached, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and myself, to in fact have the money spent as a continuing resolution to the level of \$31,799,104,000, and it reverts back to \$27.7 billion. That is what this House agreed to.

It also says that none of the obligated funds will be affected. That is in there, too.

It also says, by the way, it can be changed at a later date; and that will probably be true, too.

But to allude to those people that depend upon our highways, and no one defends those highways better than I do, no one works harder to make sure that the transportation system is improved. It is so much better than what was proposed.

Mr. Speaker, to stand up on television and play the political game on this floor of the House is wrong. The Committee on Appropriations chairman is trying to do his job. I have 64 bills over in the other body that have not been acted on. How many bills in the other body belong to the gentleman that the majority leader in the Senate has not acted on?

Do not ask us to play the political game against my leaders in this House and say it is all their fault. Look at the Senate side. Look at the Senate side. What have they done? Have they passed a budget? Have they looked at the appropriating bills? No, they have not.

In addition, when we get done, I will probably insist on the Senate side to bring us more money. But, in reality, they worked in good faith. Our leaders worked in good faith. I worked in good faith. My ranking member worked in good faith. And to stand up on this floor and play the political card is absolutely wrong for this House.

If the gentleman wants to have power that bad, go at it. But I am thinking of the people of the United States right now. I am thinking about the people who depend on transportation and on the bridges the gentleman talked about. There is more money in this. We have \$4.4 billion put back into it when we passed the budget. And the gentleman voted for it.

I am a little excited right now because my back hurts, but the fact of the matter is I have watched this 30 years. I have watched this body for 30 years, and ever since we put the television cameras in, debate on this floor has deteriorated and is for political purposes instead of solving problems.

Our job is to solve the problems and represent the people of this Nation for

the best of this Nation, not for political purposes.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The Chair reminds Members not to characterize Senate action or inaction.

The Chair would also ask the courtesy of all Members to engage in debate only when yielded time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) is suffering some back pain today; and, unfortunately, it is affecting his ability to read. If he would read the language, it says, "Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, the annual rate of operations for Federal aid highway programs for fiscal year 2003 shall be \$31,799,104,000, provided that total obligations to this program while operating under joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2003 shall not exceed \$27.7 billion unless otherwise specified a subsequent appropriation act."

That means, baby, all you get to spend as far as the States are concerned is 27.7 billion bucks, unless you pass different language than the language that is in this resolution.

I do not know if the gentleman is reading in Turkish, Russian, or Egyptian, but if you read it in English, that is what it says. If you vote for this rule, you are voting to cut highway funding by \$4 billion.

And as Lily Tomlin used to say, "That's the truth!"

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, until just a few minutes ago, I was up in the Speaker's rostrum and I was listening to all of this debate. I will try to not get too emotional about this, but the gentleman is probably correct. That is what it says, but this resolution is only for one week.

And as the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) just said, what that means is for the period of one week, yes, it may be reduced; but they also have language and an agreement it will not be reduced. So we are straining out the gnat and gulping down the camel.

The issue is, will the House agree with a resolution that will keep the Federal Government open for one week? That is a pretty simple question, and I think the answer is, or should be, yes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I think he said it correctly. The House from the very beginning has been prepared and willing and has done its work. The problem is the House is only one part of Congress, and we have had problems from the very beginning because we have a budget resolution which we have deemed and which we will abide by, and the other

side has not. Now, that makes it impossible to come to an agreement.

Somebody said earlier, Well, does the House have the will to pass appropriation bills? I think the answer to that question is, yes. But we do not have an agreement. If there is no agreement, what is the point?

I think the gentleman from Maryland said, what are our priorities? Let me ask a question. What are the priorities of the other side of the aisle? Not only for the first time in 26 years did one branch of the Federal Government not pass a budget, in violation of Federal law, but our friends on the left never offered a budget resolution. They ask what our priorities are, what our blueprint is. We have a budget. We can tell the American people, this is what the Republican blueprint was.

Now, how do we compare that to the plan on the other side of the aisle? The other side of the aisle never offered a budget plan.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) just asked what are our priorities. Here is what they are.

Our priority is not to run the government by spending Social Security money the way theirs apparently are.

Our priorities are to increase funding for special education, a prescription drug benefit for senior citizens, super-fund cleanup and other things the American people support, and many things the majority side of the aisle would like to support.

The reason we are going through this exercise is the majority does not wish to be held accountable before the election for the choices that it has presented to itself. When the majority enacted its tax cut in 2001 and the recession was prolonged and the unforeseen events of September 11 occurred, the majority put itself into a box. Because it refuses to reconsider the speed and scope of the tax cut, the majority has only two choices to fund the government.

The first choice is to dramatically reduce what we spend on schools, on the environment, on health care, on veterans' benefits and other desirable programs; and they do not want to cast those votes before the election.

The other choice is to fund those problems at a higher level but dip into the Social Security surplus and spend Social Security money to run the government, and they do not want to do that before the election either.

So their strategy is to play rope-a-dope, is to come back week after week, continuing resolution after continuing resolution, and not own up to the consequences of what they have done. What they are doing is wrong.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, this has been somewhat of a peculiar situation that we find ourselves in. The other side, after being

all over the ballpark all day, has now decided on a one-week CR. That is fine. That is their prerogative. They are in the majority. It would have been nice if they decided this 12 hours ago. Presumably, we will be back on Tuesday, maybe Wednesday or maybe Thursday.

The only regret I think any of us have is, while the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, is an honorable man, and certainly his committee has completed a lot of its work, he has been prevented by his own leadership from bringing his work product to the floor. He has only been permitted to bring five appropriation bills to the floor. Eight have not been brought to the floor. They should have been. Most of them have been completed by the gentleman's committee. It would be nice if they were brought to the floor so they could be voted on one at a time and resolve the problems that face this country.

Mr. Speaker, I will be calling for a rollcall vote on this rule. A number of our Members will be voting "no" to express their displeasure in the way that the majority has been handling this matter.

□ 1815

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of what we have been able to accomplish here. Some of us were just going through the litany of items which the 107th Congress, specifically the House of Representatives with this very narrow 5-to-6-vote margin that we have been able to do. And it is true, one of the first things we did, as the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) has pointed out so well, we were able to pass a budget, and no budget has passed in the Senate; but we have been able to pass a budget here, and we have gone through a rigorous debate on that. But let us look at some of the other things that we have been able to accomplish to help the American people, and I think it is very important to note that one of the greatest successes we had back in 1996 has proved to be passage of welfare reform. We have been able to pass a very meaningful, positive welfare reform measure from this House of Representatives.

One of the other items obviously, as we have looked at now bipartisan support for President Bush's initiative to potentially use force in dealing with the horror of Saddam Hussein and Iraq and, along with that, the potential for some kind of response to that from Iraq, we have passed out of this House a measure that was called on by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the minority leader, to do it by September 11; and we have passed a bill

establishing a Department of Homeland Security. That is something we are very proud of as we deal with the war on terrorism.

We also are very proud of the fact that in a bipartisan way, both Houses of Congress and with the President's signature ultimately, we passed the No Child Left Behind Act, dealing with education, what before September 11 of last year was our number one priority.

Prescription drugs, a very important issue which was talked about in the Presidential campaign, we are proud of the fact that we have been able to pass out, within the guidelines of our budget, a \$350 billion prescription drug program so that seniors can have access to affordable prescription drugs. The other body has not taken action on that.

We have been able to pass out of this body a very, very meaningful reform of the pension structure; and we all know with the economic challenges that we are facing, our retirees, those who are looking towards retirement in the future, the challenges they are facing, we have been able to bring about meaningful reform on that issue.

I am very proud about something that we worked to try to give President Clinton beginning back in 1994 when it expired, we have been able to pass Trade Promotion Authority. Both Houses of Congress have done that. The President signed it. Our ambassador, the U.S. Trade Representative, Mr. ZOELLICK, is in the process of trying to work out new market-opening opportunities for us. That is going to provide an economic boost for the United States of America; and we have been able to pass that out of this House, again something we have not been able to do in 8 years.

We also were able to bring about meaningful middle-income taxpayer tax relief. We have heard this criticism of the tax package, but it was focused towards middle-income wage earners with the provisions that we have had in there on the marriage penalty, the death tax, the child tax credit. These are things that have been designed to help working Americans.

We also have been able to deal with the challenge of corporate fraud, and we all have been horrified by the actions of some top executives in this country. We have been able to pass out of this House and the other body meaningful reform when it comes to corporate fraud.

We hope very much that we will be able to get election reform passed. We have had what I believe to be a very good conference package. Again, it started right here in this House of Representatives. We did it in a bipartisan way. I am very, very proud of that. We have been able to increase veterans benefits. We have much to be very proud of, much of it done in a bipartisan way.

So let us not criticize what we have got. We have got a 1-week continuing resolution; let us pass it and continue with our work.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON  
 Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

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. 122) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes. The joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The amendment specified in section 2 shall be considered as adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the joint resolution, as amended, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. The amendment referred to in the first section of this resolution is as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike "inserting 'November 22, 2002'." and insert "inserting 'October 18, 2002'."

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 193, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 459]

YEAS—225

Aderholt	Boozman	Collins
Akin	Brady (PA)	Combest
Armey	Brady (TX)	Cox
Bachus	Brown (SC)	Crane
Baldacci	Bryant	Crenshaw
Ballenger	Burr	Cubin
Barr	Burton	Culberson
Bartlett	Buyer	Cunningham
Barton	Callahan	Davis, Jo Ann
Bass	Calvert	Davis, Tom
Bereuter	Camp	Deal
Biggert	Cannon	DeLay
Billrakis	Cantor	DeMint
Blunt	Capito	Diaz-Balart
Boehlert	Castle	Dicks
Boehner	Chabot	Doolittle
Bonilla	Chambliss	Dreier
Bono	Coble	Duncan

Dunn	Kennedy (MN)	Rogers (KY)
Ehlers	Kerns	Rogers (MI)
Ehrlich	King (NY)	Rohrabacher
Emerson	Kingston	Ros-Lehtinen
English	Kirk	Ross
Everett	Knollenberg	Royce
Ferguson	Kolbe	Ryan (WI)
Flake	LaHood	Ryun (KS)
Fletcher	Latham	Saxton
Foley	LaTourrette	Schaffer
Forbes	Leach	Schrock
Fossella	Lewis (KY)	Sensenbrenner
Frelinghuysen	Linder	Sessions
Galleghy	LoBiondo	Shadegg
Gekas	Lucas (OK)	Shaw
Gibbons	Manzullo	Shays
Gilchrest	McCrery	Sherwood
Gillmor	McHugh	Shimkus
Gilman	McInnis	Shuster
Goode	McKeon	Simmons
Goodlatte	McKinney	Simpson
Goss	Mica	Skeen
Graham	Miller, Dan	Smith (MI)
Granger	Miller, Gary	Smith (NJ)
Graves	Miller, Jeff	Smith (TX)
Green (WI)	Mollohan	Souder
Greenwood	Moran (KS)	Stearns
Grucci	Morella	Sullivan
Gutknecht	Murtha	Sununu
Hansen	Myrick	Sweeney
Hart	Nethercutt	Tancredo
Hastings (WA)	Ney	Tauzin
Hayes	Northup	Taylor (NC)
Hayworth	Norwood	Terry
Hefley	Nussle	Thomas
Herger	Osborne	Thornberry
Hillery	Ose	Thune
Hobson	Otter	Tiahrt
Hoeffel	Oxley	Tiberi
Hoekstra	Paul	Toomey
Horn	Pence	Upton
Hostettler	Peterson (PA)	Vitter
Houghton	Petri	Walden
Hulshof	Pickering	Walsh
Hunter	Pitts	Wamp
Hyde	Platts	Watkins (OK)
Isakson	Pombo	Watts (OK)
Issa	Portman	Weldon (FL)
Istook	Pryce (OH)	Weldon (PA)
Jenkins	Putnam	Weller
Johnson (CT)	Quinn	Whitfield
Johnson (IL)	Radanovich	Wicker
Johnson, Sam	Ramstad	Wilson (NM)
Jones (NC)	Regula	Wilson (SC)
Kanjorski	Rehberg	Wolf
Keller	Reynolds	Young (AK)
Kelly	Riley	Young (FL)

NAYS—193

Abercrombie	DeFazio	Johnson-Lee
Ackerman	DeGette	(TX)
Allen	Delahunt	Jefferson
Andrews	DeLauro	John
Baca	Deutsch	Johnson, E. B.
Baird	Dingell	Jones (OH)
Baldwin	Doggett	Kaptur
Barcia	Dooley	Kennedy (RI)
Barrett	Doyle	Kildee
Becerra	Edwards	Kilpatrick
Bentsen	Engel	Kind (WI)
Berkley	Eshoo	Kleczka
Berry	Etheridge	Kucinich
Bishop	Evans	LaFalce
Blagojevich	Farr	Lampson
Blumenauer	Fattah	Langevin
Borski	Filner	Lantos
Boswell	Ford	Larsen (WA)
Boucher	Frank	Larson (CT)
Boyd	Frost	Lee
Brown (FL)	Gephardt	Levin
Brown (OH)	Gonzalez	Lewis (GA)
Capps	Gordon	Lipinski
Capuano	Green (TX)	Lofgren
Cardin	Hall (TX)	Lowey
Carson (IN)	Harman	Lucas (KY)
Carson (OK)	Hastings (FL)	Luther
Clay	Hill	Lynch
Clayton	Hilliard	Maloney (CT)
Clement	Hinchey	Maloney (NY)
Clyburn	Hinojosa	Markey
Condit	Holden	Mascara
Conyers	Holt	Matheson
Costello	Honda	Matsui
Cramer	Hooley	McCarthy (MO)
Crowley	Hoyer	McCarthy (NY)
Cummings	Insole	McCollum
Davis (CA)	Israel	McDermott
Davis (FL)	Jackson (IL)	McGovern
Davis (IL)		McIntyre

McNulty	Rangel	Strickland
Meehan	Rivers	Stupak
Meeks (NY)	Rodriguez	Tanner
Menendez	Roemer	Tauscher
Millender-	Rothman	Taylor (MS)
McDonald	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (CA)
Miller, George	Rush	Thompson (MS)
Moore	Sabo	Thurman
Moran (VA)	Sanchez	Tierney
Nadler	Sanders	Towns
Napolitano	Sandin	Turner
Neal	Sawyer	Turner
Oberstar	Schakowsky	Udall (CO)
Obey	Schiff	Udall (NM)
Olver	Scott	Velazquez
Owens	Serrano	Visclosky
Pallone	Sherman	Waters
Pascrell	Shows	Watson (CA)
Pastor	Skelton	Watt (NC)
Payne	Slaughter	Waxman
Pelosi	Smith (WA)	Weiner
Peterson (MN)	Snyder	Wexler
Phelps	Solis	Woolsey
Pomeroy	Spratt	Wu
Price (NC)	Stark	Wynn
Rahall	Stenholm	

NOT VOTING—13

Baker	Ganske	Reyes
Berman	Gutierrez	Roukema
Bonior	Lewis (CA)	Stump
Cooksey	Meek (FL)	
Coyne	Ortiz	

□ 1842

Mr. THURMAN, Mr. BOUCHER and Mr. RANGEL changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.J. Res. 122, 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 Florida? There was no objection.

□ 1845

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2003

Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 580, the rule just adopted, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 122) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk reads the title of the joint resolution.

The text of House Joint Resolution 122, as amended pursuant to H. Res. 580 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 122

*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 "October 18, 2002".

SEC. 2. Section 101(2) of Public Law 107-229 is amended by striking "section 15" and all