

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 214, as amended, on which the yeas and the nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 193, answered “present” 2, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 564]

YEAS—224

Aderholt	Goodling	Petri	Hall (TX)	Hastings (FL)	Oliver
Archer	Goss	Phelps	Berkley	Hill (IN)	Ortiz
Armey	Graham	Pickering	Berman	Hilliard	Owens
Baker	Granger	Pitts	Berry	Hinojosa	Pallone
Ballenger	Green (TX)	Pombo	Blagojevich	Hoeffel	Pascrell
Barr	Green (WI)	Porter	Blumenauer	Hoekstra	Pastor
Barrett (NE)	Greenwood	Portman	Boehlert	Holt	Paul
Bartlett	Hansen	Pryce (OH)	Bonior	Hooley	Pelosi
Barton	Hastings (WA)	Quinn	Boucher	Hoyer	Pickett
Bass	Hayes	Radanovich	Boyd	Inslee	Pomeroy
Bateman	Hayworth	Rahall	Brady (PA)	Jackson (IL)	Price (NC)
Biggert	Hefley	Regula	Brown (FL)	Jackson-Lee	Ramstad
Bilbray	Herger	Riley	Brown (OH)	(TX)	Rangel
Bilirakis	Hill (MT)	Rogan	Capps	Jefferson	Reyes
Bliley	Hilleary	Rogers	Capuano	Johnson, E. B.	Reynolds
Blunt	Hinchey	Rohrabacher	Cardin	Jones (OH)	Rivers
Boehner	Hobson	Ros-Lehtinen	Carson	Kennedy	Rodriguez
Bonilla	Holden	Roukema	Clay	Kildee	Roemer
Bono	Horn	Royce	Clayton	Kilpatrick	Rothman
Borski	Hostettler	Ryan (WI)	Clement	Lantos	Royal-Allard
Boswell	Hulshof	Ryun (KS)	Clyburn	Kind (WI)	Rush
Brady (TX)	Hunter	Salmon	Condit	Klecka	Sabo
Bryant	Hutchinson	Sanford	Conyers	Klink	Sanchez
Burr	Hyde	Saxton	Coyne	Kucinich	Sanders
Burton	Isakson	Schaffer	Cramer	LaFalce	Sandlin
Buyer	Istook	Sensenbrenner	Crowley	Lampson	Sawyer
Callahan	Jenkins	Shadegg	Cummings	Lantos	Schakowsky
Calvert	John	Shaw	Danner	Lee	Scott
Camp	Johnson (CT)	Shays	Davis (FL)	Levin	Serrano
Campbell	Johnson, Sam	Sherwood	Davis (IL)	Lewis (GA)	Sherman
Canady	Jones (NC)	Shimkus	DeFazio	LoBiondo	Sisisky
Cannon	Kaptur	Shows	DeGette	Lofgren	Skelton
Castle	Kasich	Shuster	Delahunt	Lowey	Slaughter
Chabot	Kelly	Simpson	DeLauro	Lucas (KY)	Smith (WA)
Chambliss	King (NY)	Skeen	Deutsch	Luther	Snyder
Chenoweth-Hage	Kingston	Smith (MI)	Dicks	Maloney (NY)	Spratt
Coble	Knollenberg	Smith (NJ)	Dingell	Markey	Stabenow
Coburn	Kolbe	Smith (TX)	Dixon	Martinez	Stark
Collins	Kuykendall	Souder	Doggett	Mascara	Strickland
Combest	LaHood	Spence	Dooly	Matsui	Stupak
Cook	Largent	Stearns	Doyle	McCarthy (MO)	Tanner
Cooksey	Latham	Stenholm	Edwards	McCarthy (NY)	Tauscher
Costello	LaTourette	Stump	Engel	McDermott	Thompson (CA)
Cox	Lazio	Sununu	Eshoo	McGovern	Thompson (MS)
Crane	Lewis (CA)	Sweeney	Etheridge	McKinney	Thurman
Cubin	Lewis (KY)	Talent	Farr	McNulty	Tierney
Cunningham	Lipinski	Tancredo	Fattah	Meehan	Toomey
Davis (VA)	Lucas (OK)	Tauzin	Filner	Meeks (NY)	Towns
Deal	Maloney (CT)	Taylor (MS)	Ford	Menendez	Turner
DeLay	Manzullo	Taylor (NC)	Frank (MA)	Millender-	Udall (CO)
DeMint	McCollum	Terry	Franks (NJ)	McDonald	Udall (NM)
Diaz-Balart	McCrery	Thomas	Frelinghuysen	Miller, George	Velazquez
Dickey	McHugh	Thornberry	Frost	Minge	Vento
Doolittle	McInnis	Thune	Gejdenson	Mink	Visclosky
Dreier	McIntosh	Tiahrt	Gephhardt	Moakley	Waters
Duncan	McIntyre	Traficant	Gilman	Moore	Watt (NC)
Dunn	McKeon	Upton	Gonzalez	Moran (VA)	Weiner
Ehrlich	Metcalf	Vitter	Gordon	Murtha	Wexler
Emerson	Mica	Walden	Gutierrez	Nadler	Weygand
English	Miller (FL)	Walsh	Gutknecht	Napolitano	Woolsey
Everett	Miller, Gary	Wamp	Houghton	Neal	Wu
Ewing	Mollohan	Watkins		Oberstar	Wynn
Fletcher	Moran (KS)	Watts (OK)			
Foley	Morella	Watson			
Forbes	Myrick	Weldon (FL)			
Fossella	Nethercutt	Weldon (PA)			
Fowler	Ney	Weller			
Gallegly	Northup	Whitfield			
Ganske	Norwood	Wicker			
Gekas	Nussle	Wilson			
Gibbons	Ose	Wise			
Gilchrest	Packard	Wolf			
Gillmor	Pease	Young (AK)			
Goode	Peterson (MN)	Young (FL)			
Goodlatte	Peterson (PA)				

NAYS—193

Ackerman	Baird	Barcia
Allen	Baldacci	Barrett (WI)
Andrews	Baldwin	Becerra

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2000

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the previous order of the House, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 75) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of House Joint Resolution 75 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 75

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 106-62 is further amended by striking “November 5, 1999” in section 106(c) and inserting in lieu thereof “November 10, 1999”. Public Law 106-46 is amended by striking “November 5, 1999” and inserting in lieu thereof “November 10, 1999”.

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

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

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. 75, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the current continuing resolution, under which the agencies that are funded in the five remaining uncompleted appropriations bills expires tomorrow night. Negotiations on these remaining bills are ongoing. However, I must say that while we are making some progress in our negotiations with the administration, they are going slow but sure. So it appears we will not be able to complete our agreements on these remaining bills for the next several days.

As the CR that we are operating under presently expires at midnight tomorrow night, the joint resolution before the House would extend the provisions of the current CR until November 10. I would have preferred that we would have been able to have completed our work by tomorrow night, but the issues involved require additional time to work out. In light of this situation, I urge all Members to support this extension.

Messrs. RAMSTAD, DOGETT, GILMAN, BALDACCI, PASTOR and FRELINGHUYSEN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2528

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2528, the Immigration Reorganization and Reform Act of 1999.

I would say again that we have been spending early mornings, long days, and late nights in negotiation with the representatives from the President's office, and we are making progress. The meetings are and have been constructive, and we do hope that we can finish our business sooner rather than later. I would also point out that this House has done a very good job of getting its appropriations matters considered. This will be the 32nd appropriations measure to be voted on in the House in preparing for fiscal year 2000.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, why are we here? I have been trying to answer that question every time we bring a new continuing resolution to the floor. Yesterday it dawned on me. Yesterday my watch quit running for about the fourth time, and so I finally gave up on it and went and bought a new one, and that brought into clear focus what we are doing here.

Every 7 days we are bringing a continuing resolution to the floor. We wind up the clock for another 7 days, but it is a clock that does not run. And so we keep coming back here every 7 days, winding up the good old clock, but the hands never move, time does not pass, and we repeat the same arguments over and over again the following week. Sooner or later I would think people would get a little tired of that, but I guess not tired enough yet to do something about it.

We are here now, we have passed three continuing resolutions, we are about to pass a fourth, and we had a meeting last night which took us on a short route to nowhere. And, unfortunately, if that meeting is any indication, we are going to be here for a lot more 7-day periods, and Members are not going to be able to go home and enjoy a Thanksgiving. The 23 Senators who are set to take trips abroad are not going to be able to climb on their airplanes and we are going to be back here grinding the same fine powder into dust.

I think the reason we are here is simply this: This is a Congress that has, for the past year, at the insistence of the majority party, spent almost its entire effort in trying to pretend that we were going to have big enough surpluses that we could afford to pass a giant tax bill that gave 70 percent of the benefits to the wealthiest people in this country. And that got in the way of this Congress' doing anything about Social Security, it got in the way of our doing anything about Medicare, it got in the way of being able to reach reasonable compromises on education.

We stand here in a House that has not been able to complete action on a meaningful Patients' Bill of Rights nor has it been willing to pass a minimum wage bill. And it reminds me of that old gospel song "Drifting Too Far From the Shore." We have been here so

long, going through these same motions, that we forget some of the very basic things that we are supposed to be doing when we are here.

Now, what we ought to be doing, if we do not meet any other responsibility, is we ought to be meeting our main responsibility, which is to finish the action necessary to complete a budget. This Congress has done virtually nothing except focus on that question and the tax question for almost a year, and yet we are still here, stuck on second base, with no prospect of being driven home.

I ask why? And as I think about it, I think the reason is that the majority party in this House apparently believes that the main action that is necessary in order to complete action on a budget is to reach a consensus within their own party in the House on the question as to what kind of budget that ought to be. Now, it is important for any party to know who it is and what it is; it is important for any party to have a sense of self and to be able to communicate that to the country. But after that is done, it is also necessary for us to recognize that the House is one of only three branches of government that deals with the budget, the other two being the Senate and the President.

It is not enough for one-half of this House to reach an internal consensus about what has to be done if that consensus leads to no way of reaching agreement with the other two major players in the system that our Founding Fathers designed and placed into the Constitution.

□ 1230

And so, we are not stuck here because the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has not done his job. We are not stuck here because the Committee on Appropriations has not tried to do its job. They have tried mightily. We are stuck here because somehow the impression has developed that the only thing we have to do to get a budget is to develop a unanimous point of view in the majority party caucus.

Now, the Democrats ran this House long enough for me to realize that it is almost impossible for a party to ever achieve a unanimous view on any subject. And so, on most truly important questions, it is, therefore, important to achieve a bipartisan consensus so that even if we do not have a hundred percent of votes for something in the majority party, but if we put together what we are trying to do with a majority of the other side, we could have a pretty healthy product that will withstand criticism from all sides.

That is what we ought to be doing. But instead, we are still thrashing around dealing with ego problems and dealing with ideological problems while we are continuing to come back and winding up that old, dead clock every 7 days. In the end, the only thing that is going to move is our wrists.

So it seems to me that we ought to cut through that. What we need is for

serious-minded people to sit down, recognize that compromises need to be made. A reasonable compromise was put on the table last night, but there was no one home to deal with it. So I guess we will continue to drift along. I regret that.

I know if the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) had his way, we would not be stuck in this inertia. But we are. I simply hope that sometime between now and Thanksgiving the powers that be in this institution recognize that this is a deadend route and we need to come to conclusion on these issues and go home.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have only one remaining speaker to close the debate, and so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER).

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

Mr. Speaker, I, too, would say that, as my ranking member the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has said, that I think that he is right that we would not be here if the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) were given some freedom to work out what is going on here. But that is not where we are.

It is now five weeks past the beginning of the fiscal year, and the Congress simply has not done its work. One week ago we adopted our third continuing resolution, and here we are with one more continuing resolution being proposed. This one adds only 3 more working days, not even a full week, only 3 more working days to the time to do the work.

Well, what has been accomplished in the week under the third continuing resolution? We are still short of completing the budget. As a matter of fact, not one of the five budgets that is still in conference that had not been signed by the end of the first continuing resolution 2 weeks ago, not one of those five budgets has been negotiated, which is, it seems to me, about the only way for differences of opinion and in policy and dollars between the executive branch and the legislative branch under our process to be resolved.

Now, if the Republican leadership were tending to other business of the American people that they overwhelmingly want done, that would be one thing. But take campaign finance reform. No, that has been killed for 1999, almost certainly for the year 2000, as well. Take the patients' bill of rights. No, the Speaker of the House just named a conference committee that excludes the major proponents from his own Republican Party, the proponents of the bipartisan bill that passed the House just a couple of weeks ago; and that conference committee is carefully chosen so that it will defy the will of this House.

Take a prescription drug benefit program within Medicare to help the hundreds of thousands of senior citizens who cannot afford to pay for prescription drugs on which their very lives depend. No, this Republican leadership has simply refused to bring that bill out for debate because the drug companies that oppose it make a very great deal of money selling drugs to senior citizens whose lives depend upon it.

Take providing in the budget for reducing class size so our kindergarten and elementary schoolchildren, which is where all the professional educators of all political ideologies attest that we could make a great positive difference in education, requires both more teachers and more classrooms to accomplish reducing the class size in our schools. No, they refuse to fund that in the budget for education.

Take extending Social Security so that Americans over 30 can be sure that Social Security will be there when they need it as it is for those who are over 50. No, they have done absolutely nothing that would extend the lifetime of Social Security by so much as a single day.

This is a strange record for a legislative body. Usually legislative bodies at least try to respond to the collective will of their constituents, to the people's collective will. We are going to vote this 3 working days additional continuing resolution, but we are going to be back here next Wednesday voting additional continuing resolutions.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I have supported the previous three continuing resolutions that we have previously approved to try and give time for the Committee on Appropriations to end their negotiations.

Unfortunately, I do not believe that the negotiations are now done at the Committee on Appropriations level. I believe they are being orchestrated by the Republican leadership in this House, and I think the Republican leadership has proven itself to be dysfunctional with respect to those negotiations and with respect to doing the people's business. So now we are called upon to approve our fifth continuing resolution, a continuing resolution that does not assure that the work will get done.

There is no evidence from approving the past three continuing resolutions that the work of this Nation has been done by this body. For that reason, I find myself very inclined to oppose this continuing resolution.

Maybe we should stay in over the weekend. Maybe the people ought to work all night. Maybe the leadership ought to give the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman

from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and others with expertise and experience in this field the ability to get the work of this Nation done.

The side-bar tragedy to all of this is that, while 435 of us remain in town, while a couple of dozen committees remain in town, while the floor is in session periodically from time to time waiting for the Committee on Appropriations, the Republican leadership will not let the rest of the people's business go forward. So we are not able to have the consideration of a prescription drug benefit for our elderly population.

Many of us now know what our grandparents and our parents struggle with in terms of pain for the prescription medicines they need. We know that we need to provide them some additional financial help. The President has made that proposal. But we cannot get consideration of that on the floor.

Many of us know that we need to extend the fiscal solvency of Social Security, but nothing is before this Congress that would extend that solvency by a single day. And so, we do not attend to that business, the needs of the elderly, the needs of future generations to know that Social Security will both be secure and financially solvent when they need it.

We passed HMO legislation, and then we see just a brutal force act of appointing conferees that are not inclined to support that legislation, that are not inclined to support progressive managed care protections for families that are denied care in many cases by HMO bureaucrats, by managed care employees, that have no medical expertise, that interfere with the doctor-patient relationship.

So that HMO legislation will not come forward in a form that it will help American families meet the medical needs of their children and of their family members.

Why did they do that? Apparently, they could not stand to have two honest brokers on this committee so they could not appoint the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) or the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) who are proven to be honest brokers on behalf of real and sensible HMO reform.

While we spent the first 9 months of this legislative year while the Republicans tried to sell to the American public a trillion-dollar tax bill, the vast majority of benefits that went for very large corporations and very, very wealthy individuals in this country, a tax bill and a tax cut that was repudiated by the American public overwhelmingly, especially when they compared it to their other priorities of protecting Social Security, making Social Security secure, improving the educational system of their children, reforming the HMO system, providing for a prescription benefit, America said they would like us to address those issues before they start addressing tax cuts for the wealthy, they would like to see us pay down the deficit if we are

not going to do that before they want tax cuts for the very wealthy in this country.

Having lost that battle, the Republicans are now here telling us that we after a trillion dollars that they apparently said that they had room for, given the deficit, given the long-term debt, given the Social Security problem, a trillion dollars, they now come back and say we do not have a dime for prescription drug benefits, we do not have a dime to improve our education system, we do not have a dime to try and help people out in the Social Security system, we do not have a dime to try to help people with minimum wage.

In fact, minimum wage, designed to help people who are the working poor, people who get up and go to work every day of the year and at the end of the year they end up poor, rather than do that, they want to load up the minimum wage with 90 to 100 billion dollars in tax cuts, 75 or 80 percent of which goes to the top one percent of people in this country.

So while we are trying to help what are low-income workers with increasing the minimum wage, they say the price of that is we have got to lather up the top one percent of this country with \$100 billion in tax benefits.

The fact of the matter is that this continuing resolution will do nothing to get the people's business done in this House of Representatives because the Republicans refuse to address this legislation. They refuse to do what America needs to have done, what American families wants, the education of the children, the protection of their elderly members, the protection of wages.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have been pretty patient about all of these appropriations bills.

The gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is speaking out of order. He is not speaking to the issue before us. I think the gentleman should be compelled to constrain his remarks to the issue before us, and that is the continuing resolution.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. The issue before us, Mr. Speaker, is whether or not we are going to be given another 7 days to fail. They have failed. They have been given 5 weeks, and they have failed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) will suspend.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. That is the issue before us, Mr. Speaker, is the failure of the Republicans with the five continuing resolutions; and that is what I am speaking to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California will suspend. The gentleman will confine his remarks to the pending legislation.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman will be more than happy to talk about the pending legislation and the failure the last three times that we have had this kind of legislation before us of the Republicans either to move and reach a budget agreement so this Nation will know where we stand with respect to Social Security, the debt and our obligations, both domestic and foreign, the failure of the Republicans to do that under this legislation the previous three times.

I think it opens a legitimate question: Why are we now doing this for another 7 days? Why are we not staying here working over the weekend or whatever is necessary?

□ 1245

These conference committees have been meeting time and again. But every time they sit down to meet, somebody walks into the room and hands somebody a piece of paper and the negotiations are off. If you are going to ask the American people to be patient for another 7 days, they have been patient for 5 weeks, while we have not had a budget. They ought to know that in fact there is going to be some chance, some chance of success that we will have a budget that meets the needs of this country and that while we are here, the other 430 Members of Congress that are not engaged in these negotiations, maybe we could get on with the rest of the people's business, the people's concerns about their education system, their Social Security system, the HMO system, the minimum wage that workers need in this country to try to provide for their families. That is why people ought to think long and hard before they just give carte blanche again to another 7 days when we have failed in the past 5 weeks to do the business of this country, the business of America's families, the business of America's elderly, the business of America's children.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself one minute just to say that it is that kind of political poison that has caused the problem that we have in the House in trying to move appropriations legislation. This type of poison is passed on to the administration, and then they last week refused to even come to meetings to negotiate. We have finally gotten them to meetings and we are negotiating. But this kind of political diatribe does not really add to getting the job done, which is what we are trying to do.

I would point out to that gentleman that this House has passed every appropriations bill, every conference report, and we are dealing with the vetoes that the President sent to us. The President is finally, finally, sending a representative down here to negotiate with us. The gentleman is really offbase. He is making his usual political speech, but all we are trying to do is get this continuing resolution passed which I thought we had agreed to do.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. He who is without sin, let him cast the first stone.

The gentleman who just spoke on the other side complains that we are not able to produce final results at this early date. When the gentleman's party was in charge of this body, I recollect being here on Christmas Eve one year, after having passed maybe eight or 10 continuing resolutions and they were unable to deliver, and they had a huge majority in this body at that time.

Now, the administration is refusing at this point to negotiate on any of these bills except the Foreign Operations bill. I am chairman of the State, Commerce, Justice bill that the President vetoed. The bill would be law if he had signed it. We did our part, sent it down there and the President vetoed the bill and now refuses to negotiate on any of these bills except foreign aid. All they want apparently is to give money to foreign countries, do not worry about the FBI or law enforcement or the drug war or the courts. "Let them fend for what they may, all we want," apparently the White House is saying, "is foreign aid." Give it away.

I say if you are really serious on that side about getting out of here, getting our business done, cooperate, have your White House cooperate, let them come up here and talk with us and let us work out the details. We are ready. We could have my bill finished in 4 or 5 hours maximum. We have offered and pled even with the Office of Management and Budget in the White House, "Let's talk." They say, "Not until we get our foreign aid."

So, Mr. Speaker, there is the crux. The White House only wants at this point in time to give the taxpayers' money of this country away to foreign countries and be damned to what happens here at home.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am amused. We were just urged by the gentleman from Florida to avoid inflammatory remarks and then we hear the kind of ridiculous statement that was just made, suggesting that the President lusts after only one thing, and that is to send money abroad. The last time I looked, the President had a long list of requests of this Congress. He is asking us to provide 100,000 new teachers which the majority party has refused to do. He is asking us to provide 50,000 new policemen which the majority party has refused doing. He is asking that we actually make available to the National Institutes of Health for medical research all of the money that we pretend we are making available rather than delaying virtually all new grants

for an entire year, putting at risk scientific research teams all over the country. The majority party has refused to do that. And now we are told, Oh, gee, we should not talk about that because that is not the subject at hand." The subject at hand is getting the permission of the Congress for the government to continue for another 7 days without shutting down. That is the subject at hand. What the gentleman from California was talking about is simply his assessment of why we are in this fix. I think the gentleman was on point.

With respect to the two myths that were just peddled about the administration's refusal to negotiate, that is a joke and everyone in this Chamber, including the press watching, knows it is a joke. We have seen headlines for the past 6 months coming out of your leadership's office saying, "No, we are not going to negotiate directly from the President because he stole our socks in negotiations last year." "We have got a little sisters of the poor complex. Every time we think about negotiating with the President, we are afraid he is going to outnegotiate us." And so the leadership has already declared publicly its lack of confidence in its own negotiating ability and they say, "No, we're not going to get into the box and negotiate with the President, we're only going to do this at a lower level."

Last night a conversation took place between the President and your leadership, and, as you know, the President offered again to send his chief of staff, Mr. Podesta, down here to negotiate directly with your leadership. And again he was told by your leadership, "No, we don't want to get in the same room with you, so instead, why don't you have the appropriators meet." Well, the appropriators did meet, for a while at least some of us, and after an hour, there were only two Republicans left in the room. Everybody else had gone home. We were there, the White House was there, and the White House made two compromise offers in a row, both of which were rejected by the other side.

So it is silly to suggest that the White House has not been offering to negotiate. They have been in the room every time there has been a meeting. I just suggest, I think we should stop the hyperbole and I think we ought to get on with the business of government, but I think it is fair to observe that the President has a reason for wanting to see this bill negotiated along with the others, because the majority party has a long record of dragging its feet in meeting its international responsibilities. For a year and a half, in the middle of the Asian debt crisis which threatened to swamp our own economy and swamp our own currency, the majority party refused to provide the IMF funding that was necessary. It has dragged its feet on paying our dues at the United Nations for 2 years and, as I said, on the domestic side, the majority party has steadfastly refused to agree to the President's request for

100,000 new teachers or for 50,000 new cops on the beat, among other things.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that we have gotten into this kind of a tit-for-tat argument, but I guess it is inevitable given the fact that this Congress is unable to do anything but. I hope things change. I think the best way to change is to get off the floor and get back into the negotiating room on the foreign operations bill that I thought was so close to an agreement last night. Everyone understands that that is the logjam which is holding this place up.

And so if you want to go home, I would suggest you act like it and get down to doing some serious negotiating.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for our ranking member the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). I think he is a great leader and a great Congressman. And, too, I have great respect for our new chairman. But I think it is time for some perspective here and it is time to put the politics aside, folks. There is too many politics being played now with the budget of the American people. I can remember one year as a Democrat in a Democrat majority being here until December 23 with continuing resolution after continuing resolution after continuing resolution. This is not unusual. In fact, there have been great strides. Every appropriation bill has been passed. Now, maybe we do not agree with all of them, but it is time to say something that has to be said: These bills have been subject to too much political chicanery. Even the fine Defense appropriation bill was almost held hostage with a veto threat for more foreign aid. As a Democrat, I support the stance that this majority party has taken on spending overseas and looking at the domestic side.

Now, I think we are very close and I think it is time for the leaders that we have, more than competent, to sit down, close the doors, turn up the heat, have some chili and some baked beans and not leave until you get it done. I know they can do it.

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, after that speech by our colleague from Ohio, I am somewhat hesitant to talk politically. But I do want to mention and remind people of what happened last week when we had the Labor-HHS bill.

All of these arguments about who is taking money from Social Security, we have a letter from the Congressional Budget Office, they have letters, it is all based on what assumptions you give the Congressional Budget Office, you get different answers. Most people, their eyes start to glaze over because it

is so arcane. The other issue that sometimes people do not understand when we talk about it back home is a motion to recommit, because that is kind of arcane, too. But it really is designed to protect our democratic experiment here. We have our plan, the majority offers its plan, and then the minority's rights are protected because they always have a right to recommit, to make a motion to recommit with instructions.

Last week on the Labor-HHS bill when they had their chance to put their plan on the table, they could have said, "We like your plan but we want to put more money into education." They did not do that. When they had their chance to say, "We like your plan but we would have rearranged the priorities and we would have put more money into veterans benefits," they did not do that, either.

Looking at the record, and it is a matter of public record, when they had their chance to reflect what their priorities were on the Labor-HHS bill, their motion to recommit with instructions included basically our bill except they included the full congressional pay raise.

That is how political this business has become. I think my colleague from Ohio is exactly right. We are only a few billion dollars apart with the White House. Despite all of the political posturing that is going on right now, we have all agreed on some simple, basic facts. We are not going to close down the government, we are not going to raid Social Security, we are not going to raise taxes, everything else is negotiable. I think with a few hours' of good faith bargaining on the part of the White House and congressional leaders, we could have a bargain, we could have a deal, we could put this budget together for the good of the American people, for the good of everybody here, we could all be done by next Monday at probably midnight. I hope we can all get together and get that done.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, after this continuing resolution is passed and sent to the Senate, we will have two choices: We can continue this once-a-week rewind operation, or we can decide this afternoon that we are going to sit down and come to closure on the agreement that I thought we were within an hour of achieving last night on the Foreign Operations bill. If that can be achieved, then we can move to try to deal with the issues that still divide us on the issue of education, on the issue of crime, and on the issue of paying our U.N. dues.

□ 1300

I would like to think we could conclude that in a reasonable time and get out of here. I do not think, frankly, that either party is scoring any points on these issues. I have said many times that the worst thing that can happen

to people in this town is when you come to believe your own baloney, and the fact is that I think we have a lot of that going on. And I do not think, frankly, that the country is paying much attention to what we say. They are more interested in what we do, and what they see so far is that we have been doing nothing.

So I would suggest we stop doing nothing, come to an agreement on these four remaining bills and get out of town. But it is going to take a determination on the part of the majority party to negotiate with the President, rather than laying down ultimatums about what is on or off the table. This happened last night. When that mindset changes, we may begin to see some progress around here.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this has been somewhat of a spirited conversation over a measure that we thought was going to move fairly quickly. I would join the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) in wishing we had completed this business 20 minutes ago, because it is important that we get this measure passed through the House.

But it is difficult to sit here and listen to some of the political accusations that we have heard on almost every appropriations bill that has come before the House this year. It is difficult to sit here and listen to that and not feel inclined to respond. But I am not going to yield to that temptation. I am not going to respond to all of the political attacks that were made here.

But I do want to say that the attacks that some Members of the other side like to make at our majority leadership, the Speaker of the House, the majority leader, the majority whip, are unfounded. They are unfair, because these gentlemen have worked hard to try to accomplish the work of this House.

We have passed every appropriations bill in the House and in the Senate, we have passed every conference report in the House and in the Senate, and we are now dealing in that final phase where the President of the United States has decided to veto certain bills. So we are at a point where we are negotiating with the President to try to resolve our differences so that we can get new bills to him in a form that he will sign, because unless he signs them or unless we have the votes to override his vetoes, we have to reach an agreement and accommodation. That means both sides have to give a little.

Our leadership met with the President just a few days ago, and they talked with him on the phone even more recently, and he agreed to this: That we would negotiate; that any additional funding that he requested that we would agree to that he would offer offsets to pay for it.

Now, the negotiations began, and they began in earnest, and I would

compliment Jack Lew, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget. He is a tough negotiator. When he tells you something, that is the way it is. Unfortunately, some of the things he told us we did not like because they were different than what the President told us.

The President told us as we went along with spending or agreeing to spending the money that he requested that he would then offer offsets. Last night, several times at one of our lengthy meetings, I asked Mr. Lew what are the offsets? Mr. Lew refused to talk about the offsets, and to this minute in my presence has refused to talk about offsets; in other words, how do we pay for this additional spending in foreign aid.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the gentleman left the room for over an hour, and while the gentleman was out of the room, Mr. Lew did specifically refer to three different ways that offsets could be handled.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for reminding me that it was important to have an additional meeting with representatives from the Senate and from the House in order to try to finalize or come to agreement on what we were trying to do, and, despite the gentleman's insinuation, it is very difficult to be in two places at the same time. That is why I emphasized in my presence Mr. Lew was unwilling to provide the offsets.

But now we are working through that. If we can keep the atmosphere fairly civil, I think we can do that. I did not see a lot of stability coming our direction from that side of the aisle today, and I really am offended by that lack, and I am offended by the political speeches.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) said earlier that there are too many speeches. He is right, especially when they are all the same and they say the same thing. I have memorized the speech of my friend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) because he has made it every time we had an appropriations bill. So I can make his speech for him. Although I disagree with it, I can make his speech for him.

Now, we have other things to negotiate, but the President is not willing to negotiate anything on the other remaining bills until we have an agreement on foreign aid. In other words, his primary interest is how much money are we going to give him to spend around the world.

Well, we are willing to work with him on that. We are willing to do things he wants to do, because we understand that he is the President, but we have to understand that one reason we are being delayed on the other bills is because the administration refuses

to negotiate with this House and the leaders of this House on anything else until the foreign aid bill is settled and decided.

Now, we are willing to go along with that, and that is why we wanted to get this measure off the floor early so we could get back to those negotiations and try to have that package wrapped up by today.

Mr. Speaker, there is something else that I would like to mention. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) said that we start to believe our own baloney. We have seen some baloney on the floor today. Most of it I did not believe, Mr. Speaker.

Anyway, let us pass this continuing resolution, and let us not be offended by the fact that it is a continuing resolution, especially coming from the Democrats who ran this House for 40 years. Let me repeat something the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) said: We repeat our speeches too often. But in view of some of the accusations made today, let me just go back a few years.

In fiscal year 1990 the Democrats controlled this House and they had a continuing resolution for 51 days. Fiscal year 1991, they had a CR for 36 days. Fiscal year 1992, they had a CR for 57 days. They did better in 1993, they only had 5 days. But in fiscal year 1994 they had 41 days. So for the Democrats to come on the floor now and accuse the Republicans of using CRs to finish the business is a little hollow.

Now, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) would like me to say the year he was chairman, for fiscal year 1995, we did not have any CRs, and he is right, and I applaud him for that. Let me tell you what else he had: He had 81 more Democrats than there were Republicans in the House. He could do most anything he wanted.

We have a small majority. We only have 10 more Republicans this year than the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) had. He had 81. But in that year that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) had 81 more Democrats than Republicans, he spent \$60 billion out of the Social Security trust fund. We are not doing that. We are balancing the budget. We are not raising taxes. We are not taking any money out of the Social Security trust fund. There is a big difference. We have accomplished some things that people did not believe could be accomplished, and we have done it with a very, very small majority and a Democrat in the White House.

Mr. Speaker, let us pass this continuing resolution and get down to the real business of finishing the negotiations on the remaining bills.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). All time for debate has expired.

The joint resolution is considered read for amendment.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the previous question is ordered.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 6, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 565]

YEAS—417

Abercrombie	Clement	Gekas
Ackerman	Clyburn	Gephardt
Aderholt	Coble	Gibbons
Allen	Coburn	Gilchrest
Andrews	Collins	Gillmor
Archer	Combest	Gilman
Armen	Condit	Gonzalez
Bachus	Conyers	Goode
Baird	Cook	Goodlatte
Baker	Cooksey	Goodling
Baldacci	Costello	Gordon
Baldwin	Cox	Goss
Ballenger	Coyne	Graham
Barcia	Cramer	Granger
Barr	Crane	Green (TX)
Barrett (NE)	Crowley	Green (WI)
Barrett (WI)	Cubin	Greenwood
Bartlett	Cummings	Gutierrez
Barton	Cunningham	Gutknecht
Bass	Danner	Hall (OH)
Bateman	Davis (FL)	Hall (TX)
Becerra	Davis (IL)	Hansen
Berkley	Davis (VA)	Hastings (WA)
Berman	Deal	Hayes
Berry	DeGette	Hayworth
Biggert	Delahunt	Hefley
Bilbray	DeLauro	Herger
Bilirakis	DeLay	Hill (IN)
Bishop	DeMint	Hill (MT)
Blagojevich	Deutsch	Hilleary
Bliley	Diaz-Balart	Hilliard
Blumenauer	Dicks	Hinchey
Blunt	Dingell	Hinojosa
Boehlert	Dixon	Hobson
Boehner	Doggett	Hoefel
Bonilla	Dooley	Hoekstra
Bonior	Doolittle	Holden
Bono	Doyle	Holt
Borski	Dreier	Hooley
Boswell	Duncan	Horn
Boucher	Dunn	Hostettler
Boyd	Edwards	Houghton
Brady (PA)	Ehrlich	Hoyer
Brady (TX)	Emerson	Hulshof
Brown (FL)	Engel	Hunter
Brown (OH)	English	Hutchinson
Bryant	Eshoo	Hyde
Burr	Etheridge	Inslee
Burton	Evans	Isakson
Buyer	Everett	Istook
Callahan	Ewing	Jackson (IL)
Calvert	Farr	Jackson-Lee
Camp	Fattah	(TX)
Campbell	Filner	Jefferson
Canady	Fletcher	Jenkins
Cannon	Foley	John
Capps	Ford	Johnson (CT)
Capuano	Fossella	Johnson, E. B.
Cardin	Fowler	Johnson, Sam
Carson	Frank (MA)	Jones (NC)
Castle	Franks (NJ)	Jones (OH)
Chabot	Frelinghuysen	Kaptur
Chambliss	Frost	Kasich
Chenoweth-Hage	Gallegly	Kelly
Clay	Ganske	Kennedy
Clayton	Gejdenson	Kildee

Kilpatrick	Neal	Shuster
Kind (WI)	Nethercutt	Simpson
King (NY)	Ney	Sisisky
Kingston	Northup	Skeen
Kleckzka	Nussle	Skelton
Klink	Obey	Slaughter
Knollenberg	Olver	Smith (MI)
Kolbe	Ortiz	Smith (NJ)
Kucinich	Ose	Smith (TX)
Kuykendall	Owens	Smith (WA)
LaFalce	Oxley	Snyder
LaHood	Packard	Souder
Lampson	Pallone	Spence
Lantos	Pascrell	Spratt
Largent	Pastor	Stabenow
Latham	Pease	Stark
LaTourette	Pelosi	Stearns
Lazio	Peterson (MN)	Stenholm
Leach	Peterson (PA)	Strickland
Lee	Petri	Stump
Levin	Phelps	Stupak
Lewis (CA)	Pickering	Sununu
Lewis (GA)	Pickett	Sweeney
Lewis (KY)	Pitts	Talent
Linder	Pombo	Tancredo
Lipinski	Pomeroy	Tanner
LoBiondo	Porter	Tauscher
Lofgren	Portman	Taylor (MS)
Lowey	Price (NC)	Taylor (NC)
Lucas (KY)	Pryce (OH)	Terry
Lucas (OK)	Quinn	Thomas
Luther	Radanovich	Thompson (CA)
Maloney (CT)	Rahall	Thompson (MS)
Maloney (NY)	Ramstad	Thornberry
Manzullo	Rangel	Thune
Markey	Regula	Thurman
Martinez	Reyes	Tiahrt
Mascara	Reynolds	Tierney
Matsui	Riley	Toomey
McCarthy (MO)	Rivers	Towns
McCarthy (NY)	Rodriguez	Traficant
McCullum	Roemer	Turner
McCrery	Rogan	Udall (CO)
McDermott	Rogers	Udall (NM)
McGovern	Rohrabacher	Upton
McHugh	Ros-Lehtinen	Velazquez
McInnis	Rothman	Vento
McIntosh	Roukema	Visclosky
McIntyre	Royal-Allard	Vitter
McKeon	Royce	Walden
McKinney	Rush	Walsh
McNulty	Ryan (WI)	Wamp
Meehan	Ryun (KS)	Waters
Meek (FL)	Sabo	Watkins
Meeks (NY)	Salmon	Watt (NC)
Menendez	Sanchez	Watts (OK)
Metcalf	Sanders	Waxman
Mica	Sandlin	Weiner
Millender-McDonald	Sanford	Weldon (FL)
Miller (FL)	Sawyer	Weldon (PA)
Miller, Gary	Schaffer	Weller
Minge	Schakowsky	Wexler
Mink	Scott	Weygand
Moakley	Sensenbrenner	Whitfield
Mollohan	Serrano	Wicker
Moore	Sessions	Wilson
Moran (KS)	Shadegg	Wise
Moran (VA)	Shaw	Wolf
Morella	Shays	Woolsey
Murtha	Sherman	Wu
Myrick	Sherwood	Wynn
Nadler	Shimkus	Young (AK)
Napolitano	Shows	Young (FL)

NAYS—6

DeFazio	Forbes	Miller, George
Dickey	Hastings (FL)	Paul

NOT VOTING—10

Bentsen	Larson	Scarborough
Bereuter	Norwood	Tauzin
Ehlers	Oberstar	
Kanjorski	Payne	

□ 1329

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

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

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 565, I was unavoidably detained.

Had I been present, I would have noted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 564 and 565, I missed the votes due to my participation in an important meeting and in the Marine Corps ceremony. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on both.

□ 1330

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 3194, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the previous order of the House, I move to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3194) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of that hour to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), my distinguished friend and colleague, for the purpose of debate only.

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

Mr. Speaker, the issue before us today is the Senate amendment to the District of Columbia appropriations bill. It struck language that the House had included relative to the issuance of needles in the needle exchange program.

Personally, I object to the Senate amendment. However, in order to move this bill and get it to conference, I do move to take the bill from the table, disagree to the amendment and agree to the conference.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I was trying to decide whether I should yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), or whether I should yield back the balance of my time. I suspected the majority would prefer that I yield back the balance of my time so in the interest of comity, that is exactly what I will do.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. YOUNG of Florida, LEWIS of California, and OBEY.

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on November 1, 1999, this body held three rollcall votes on bills considered under suspension on the floor of the House. Because of a family medical matter, I missed the following votes, Mr. Speaker:

On rollcall No. 550, H.R. 348, I would have voted "aye"; rollcall No. 551, H.R. 2337, I would have voted "aye"; rollcall No. 552, H.R. 1714, I would have voted "no."

On November 3, Mr. Speaker, due to a family medical matter, I was unable to participate on two votes. Had I been in attendance on rollcall No. 557, on agreeing to the Journal, I would have voted "aye"; and on rollcall No. 558, H.R. 2290, the Quality Care for the Uninsured Act, I would have voted "aye."

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE—CALLING ON PRESIDENT TO ABSTAIN FROM RENEGOTIATING INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS GOVERNING ANTIDUMPING LAWS AND COUNTERVAILING MEASURES

Mr. VISCOSKY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to rule IX, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House, and offer a privileged resolution that I noticed to the House on Tuesday, November 2, and ask for its immediate consideration.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

RESOLUTION CALLING ON THE PRESIDENT TO ABSTAIN FROM RENEGOTIATING INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS GOVERNING ANTIDUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING MEASURES

Whereas under Art. I, Section 8 of the Constitution, the Congress has power and responsibility with regard to foreign commerce and the conduct of international trade negotiations;

Whereas the House of Representatives is deeply concerned that, in connection with the World Trade Organization ("WTO") Ministerial meeting to be held in Seattle, Washington, and the multilateral trade negotiations expected to follow, a few countries are seeking to circumvent the agreed list of negotiation topics and reopen debate over the WTO's antidumping and antisubsidy rules;

Whereas strong antidumping and antisubsidy rules are a cornerstone of the liberal trade policy of the United States and are essential to the health of the manufacturing and farm sectors in the United States;

Whereas it has long been and remains the policy of the United States to support its antidumping and antisubsidy laws and to defend those laws in international negotiations;