

Gordon	Mascara	Sandlin
Goss	Matsui	Vento
Graham	McCarthy (MO)	Sanford
Granger	McCarthy (NY)	Sawyer
Green (TX)	McCollum	Saxton
Greenwood	McDermott	Schaffer
Gutknecht	McGovern	Schakowsky
Hall (OH)	McHugh	Scott
Hall (TX)	McInnis	Serrano
Hansen	McIntyre	Sessions
Hastings (FL)	McKeon	Shadegg
Hastings (WA)	McKinney	Shaw
Hayes	McNulty	Shays
Hayworth	Menendez	Sherman
Hefley	Metcalf	Sherwood
Hill (IN)	Mica	Shimkus
Hilleary	Miller (FL)	Shows
Hilliard	Miller, Gary	Shuster
Hinojosa	Miller, George	Simpson
Hobson	Minge	Siskiyou
Hoefel	Mink	Skeen
Holden	Moakley	Skelton
Holt	Mollohan	Slaughter
Hooley	Moore	Smith (MI)
Horn	Moran (KS)	Smith (NJ)
Hostettler	Moran (VA)	Smith (TX)
Houghton	Morella	Smith (WA)
Hoyer	Murtha	Snyder
Hulshof	Myrick	Souder
Hyde	Nadler	Spence
Inslee	Napolitano	Stabenow
Isakson	Neal	Stark
Istook	Nethercutt	Stearns
Jackson (IL)	Ney	Stenholm
Jackson-Lee (TX)	Northup	Strickland
Jefferson	Nussle	Stump
Jenkins	Olver	Stupak
John	Ortiz	Sweeney
Johnson (CT)	Ose	Talent
Johnson, E. B.	Owens	Tancredo
Johnson, Sam	Oxley	Tanner
Jones (NC)	Packard	Tauzin
Jones (OH)	Pallone	Taylor (NC)
Kaptur	Pascrell	Terry
Kelly	Paul	Thomas
Kennedy	Payne	Thompson (CA)
Kildee	Pease	Thompson (MS)
Kilpatrick	Pelosi	Thornberry
King (NY)	Peterson (PA)	Thune
Kingston	Phelps	Thurman
Kleckza	Pickering	Tiahrt
Knollenberg	Pickett	Tierney
Kolbe	Pitts	Toomey
Kucinich	Pombo	Traficant
Kuykendall	Pomeroy	Turner
LaFalce	Porter	Udall (CO)
LaHood	Portman	Udall (NM)
Lampson	Price (NC)	Upton
Lantos	Pryce (OH)	Velazquez
Largent	Quinn	Visclosky
Larson	Ramstad	Vitter
Latham	Rangel	Walder
LaTourette	Regula	Walsh
Lazio	Reyes	Wamp
Leach	Reynolds	Waters
Lee	Riley	Watkins
Levin	Rivers	Watt (NC)
Lewis (CA)	Rodriguez	Waxman
Lewis (GA)	Roemer	Weldon (FL)
Lewis (KY)	Rogan	Weldon (PA)
Linder	Rogers	Weiner
Lipinski	Rohrabacher	Weldon (PA)
LoBiondo	Rothman	Wheeler
Lofgren	Roukema	Whitfield
Lowey	Royal-Allard	Wicker
Lucas (KY)	Royce	Wilson
Lucas (OK)	Rush	Wolf
Luther	Ryun (KS)	Woozley
Maloney (CT)	Salmon	Wu
Maloney (NY)	Sanchez	Young (FL)
Markey	Sanders	Wynn

## NOT VOTING—44

Ackerman	Gutierrez	Meeks (NY)
Bateman	Herger	Millender-Hill (MT)
Bilbray	Hill (MT)	McDonald
Burton	Hinchey	Oberstar
Capps	Hoekstra	Pastor
Carson	Hunter	Radanovich
Conyers	Hutchinson	Ros-Lehtinen
Cox	Kanjorski	Sabo
Cubin	Kasich	Scarborough
Dingell	Klink	Tauscher
Dooley	Martinez	Taylor (MS)
Dunn	McIntosh	
Fattah	Meehan	
Franks (NJ)	Meek (FL)	

Vento	Wexler	Wise
Watts (OK)	Weygand	Young (AK)

## □ 1028

Messrs. COBURN, BLAGOJEVICH, DICKEY, McHUGH, MORAN of Virginia, LINDER, SALMON, BENTSEN, SPENCE, FROST, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. SANCHEZ, and Ms. DANNER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin and Mr. PETRI changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 82, MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000 AND H.J. RES. 83, MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000—Continued

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The pending business is consideration of House Resolution 385 offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS).

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), my colleague, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, today, we place before the House what will hopefully be the last continuing resolution for fiscal year 2000. Yesterday, I referred to the movie "Groundhog Day" to describe the events of the past few weeks, where we seem to wake up each morning and do the same things we did the day before. And while we are here again as we were yesterday considering a rule to bring forward another short-term extension of the budget deadline, we are confident that a final agreement has been brokered and the process is finally now near total completion.

Like yesterday's, this rule is a standard closed rule providing for consideration of a continuing resolution whose expiration date is November 23. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the joint resolution, provides 1 hour of debate, equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, and affords the traditional motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, we have all been struggling to find the right negotiating mix to bring this budget process to a conclusion. Our firm line in the sand has remained constant: we will not spend one dime of the Social Security Trust Fund. While there has been the normal and appropriate give and take between the White House and the Congress on a host of other issues, our constituents,

both young and old, I think are the real winners today.

Mr. Speaker, for the first time in over the 3 decades, Washington, D.C., will not be using Social Security as a slush fund. We have made the tough choices necessary to balance the budget without touching Social Security. It has been a long, it has been an arduous process; but the end result under the circumstances, I think, is well worth the effort: a more secure retirement for all Americans.

Just as there was 5 years ago when our new majority pledged to balance the budget, some cynical naysayers have claimed that we could not do the job this year without borrowing from Social Security. They were wrong in 1994, and they are wrong again today. We can do better, and this budget proves it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to particularly commend at this time the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERFT), Speaker of the House, for his persistence and leadership, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and all the other Members who have made this day come to pass.

It is a good victory for Congress, and a good one for the American people. I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and the underlying CR, of course.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), who I have not seen since 4 o'clock this morning, for yielding me the customary half hour, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, even though we are 49 days into the fiscal year, only eight of the thirteen appropriation bills have been signed into law. Appropriation negotiations have been going on and on and on, with little hope in sight. That is until very early this morning.

Early this morning at about 2 o'clock, the appropriators and the White House reached agreement on an enormous omnibus appropriations bill that lumps all unfinished business together in one massive document nearly no one can understand. And supposedly, we just need to pass a couple of more continuing resolutions to keep the government open until the appropriation process is mercifully behind us, and the President signs this behemoth bill.

Mr. Speaker, the rule we are considering today makes in order not one, but two continuing resolutions. The first expires on November 23, and the second expires on December 2. I am told this is done to accommodate the deliberations of the Senate, so I see no reason to oppose it, despite the strange and inefficient process.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule, and support the continuing resolution.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), my

colleague and friend, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) for yielding me the time, and I think we are going to pass the rule without too much difficulty.

But, Mr. Speaker, if I could have the attention of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) just mentioned the 4 o'clock hour, and he is right on target. At 6 minutes after 3 a.m. this morning, with the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) in the chair, I was able to file the final agreement on the last appropriations package.

We went to the Committee on Rules at 20 minutes after 3:00 and by 3:45, my part of it was complete and I was home by 4:30 this morning. I am not sure when the gentleman from Massachusetts got home, but the important issue here is that I have the opportunity to compliment and congratulate the Members of the Committee on Appropriations and the subcommittee chairmen and all of those who have done such a good job through this process.

But, Mr. Speaker, the unsung heroes do not often get those accolades, and I think it is appropriate that they do. Those heroes are the members of the Committee on Rules. They are here for early morning meetings and late night meetings. I want to compliment the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) and all of the members of the Committee on Rules for being available when the legislative process requires their presence.

In the last 10 days of our very serious negotiation with the representatives from the President's office, there have been numerous evenings when the Committee on Rules was told, be available, because we think we might have a bill for their consideration tonight. They have had to wait here until 10 or 11 o'clock at night, or midnight, and then the appropriators were not ready or the deal had not been struck yet. They have been so faithful to their responsibilities, and I just think it is timely to call attention to the work that they do and the generous giving of their time to help this process move.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Chairman DREIER) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), the ranking member, and all of the members of the Committee on Rules for being so patient with us as we move this process through.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, first of all, before I begin, I simply want to say something about two people. I would like to say that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) is one of the most decent human beings I have ever dealt with in the over 30 years I have been a Member of this House. He and I do not

share the same political philosophy on many, many issues; and he and I have different institutional responsibilities. We try to meet our institutional responsibilities to this House as one.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say with all the sincerity at my command that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), in the way that he deals honorably with each and every other Member of this House, is the way every Member of this place ought to deal with each and every Member. I know that if the gentleman promises me something, he will stick to it. And I know that he will do the best job that he can to deal with the concerns of each and every Member of this House.

I also want to say that with respect to his counterpart in the other body, Senator STEVENS, Senator STEVENS and I are both known for our placid temperaments. I simply want to say that I regard Senator STEVENS as one of the easiest people to deal with. Not because he is easy in negotiations; he is hard as nails. But one always knows where he is coming from, and he plays it straight; and I, again, appreciate that very much.

Mr. Speaker, I want to explain why I called the last motion, and why I will be calling a number of other motions today. I think there are certain requirements that this House ought to meet in dealing with the most basic responsibility it has each year, which is to pass the budget for the coming year.

Budgets are not just numbers. They define our priorities. They indicate our values. The budget is the primary document by which Congress tries to influence the future direction of this country. We owe it to the country to consider that budget in a serious, thoughtful, fair-minded and honest way.

We are not going to do that today. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) indicated that this rule was put to bed at almost 4 o'clock this morning. It looks like it. I saw Arianna Huffington, again a person with whom I do not share much in common philosophically, but I saw her on a television program on women's issues a few nights ago; and she observed that she was very concerned about politicians who would brag about the fact that they were up until 4 o'clock in the morning making decisions. She said, "I do not trust any decision that is made at 4 o'clock in the morning," and I think she is largely right.

My problem, and I have numerous problems with this bill and I will explain more of them in detail when we get to the actual appropriation vehicle later on today or tomorrow, but the fact is that there are two problems that I have that override all others. First of all, we have at least nine separate authorization measures which are being folded into this bill. One of them, a more than 300-page authorization bill which is yet to be conferred, and yet it is being thrown in here. I defy my colleagues to tell me what is in it, and I urge my colleagues to remember that

we will probably be, long after this bill is done, we will be trying to find out what is in it.

There are nine separate authorizations. I believe instead of having only 1 hour to debate all of those authorizations, plus the budgetary decisions that were made here in the bill before us today, I believe each of those authorizations should be pulled out of the bill. They should be debated separately and sequentially for at least an hour before we vote on each and every one of them.

Secondly, I think we should have had 24 hours to understand what is in this bill. We are going to be haunted by a number of things that are in this bill. Mr. Speaker, among the authorizations that are added to this bill are the Medicare, Medicaid and State Children's Health Insurance program, which I probably favor. But I think we ought to know more about how they are being put together.

Second, we have the Admiral James W. Nance and Meg Donovan Foreign Relations Authorizations Act. I do not have the foggiest idea what is in that and neither does anybody else on the floor. We have H.R. 3428, which brings several dairy authorization measures to this floor, including the Northeast Compact. That compact was slipped into the law in the first place several years ago without ever having been voted on by either body. It was slipped in by the Senate, and now we are again slipping it in without it ever having been considered by either body. I think that is illegitimate.

The Intellectual Property and Communications Omnibus Reform Act. That is the satellite bill. I understand, coming from a rural area, the loan guarantees that are useful in rural areas have been taken out of that bill.

□ 1045

I understand there are also patents and trademark items in that bill. I think we ought to know more about that.

We have the Superfund Recycling Equity Act. This bill reminds me of what Churchill said about Russia, "A riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma." We do not have any idea what that bill is really going to do in the fine print.

Then we have the Canyon Ferry Reservoir provisions, and international debt relief (again which I favor); but I am concerned, very, very concerned, about one section of that bill, which I think may not in fact deliver what it appears to promise.

Then we have a number of private bills which have been attached, one of which I think I would favor and the other which I am concerned about because it only includes a few people out of a much broader class that ought to be included in the kind of relief contemplated by that bill that is going to be given.

In my view, every time I make a motion which requires a rollcall before we

can proceed to the next stage, that gives Members more time to find out what is in this bill before they actually cast the most important vote of the session. That is why I intend to make numerous motions today, and I most definitely would not count on being out of here by 4 p.m. or 5 p.m., or maybe even today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The Chair would remind all Members that it is not appropriate to make references to the characteristics of Senators, even favorable characteristics.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE).

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by associating myself with the comments of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Today, we have before us an omnibus bill which, unfortunately, bears many similarities to the legislation that we considered a year ago at the close of the session. And for many of us, we promised we would never again let ourselves be trapped in this situation. We had a bipartisan budget process reform task force that worked. We came up with a series of recommendations. But, tragically, none of these recommendations was even brought to the floor for debate. I hope that in the year 2000 we can indeed take up this budget reform proposal and, hopefully, avoid an omnibus catch-all bill of the type that is being criticized today.

I recognize there are many good points to the bill, and I too would compliment the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for his work. I have deep respect for him. But I would like to point out that there are many things in there that ought to be separately considered or are simply inappropriate in the bill, and commitments were made earlier in the session by the Speaker, by the majority leader and others that these provisions would not show up in an appropriations bill.

One such provision relates to dairy policy. In this country we have endured a dairy policy which has split our Nation into separate zones for no good reason other than to try to maintain some anti-competitive framework in dairy. This is crazy. In early December, we will go to Seattle, many will go to Seattle, for the WTO conference where we will be urging that Congress expand our international trade opportunities. And why is it at the same time that we are expanding international trade opportunities we continue to balkanize our country with respect to dairy programming?

Mr. Speaker, it makes absolutely no sense that we would continue to balkanize this country for purposes of dairy policy so that fluid milk from one part of the country, namely the upper Midwest, is at a competitive disadvantage because of government policy with fluid milk from other parts of the country. We cannot allow this type

of antiquated dairy policy to survive, and for this reason and others I will be opposing the bill.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, marginally, to delay proceedings, but I do not think that significant deaths should go unnoticed. Unmourned, yes, but not unnoticed. And I am talking about the caps of 1997.

In 1997, this House engaged in a great orgy of self-congratulation by adopting a budget bill which not only cut Medicare, apparently without anybody here realizing that that was happening, but which enacted a set of restrictions on total spending. They would have lasted from 1997 until 2002, and they would be a template for the future. Alas, they did not last very long. The great balanced budget accomplishment of 1997, the caps, which were unnecessary and unrealistic at the time, have died. And it does not seem to me in this Chamber, where we are so given to ceremonial oratory, that we ought to allow that death to pass unnoticed.

The premature passing of the caps, as I said, is not an occasion for mourning. I think it is an occasion for celebration that reality has finally broken through the ideological miasma, but it ought to be noted. And it ought to be noted for a couple of reasons.

First of all, there were many of us who, in 1997, thought that the caps were, to use technical parliamentary language, a very stupid idea. They were clearly unrealistic, unsustainable, and they were a farce. And I find, Mr. Speaker, having been one of those who said that in 1997, that as I get older one of the few pleasures that increases with age is being able to say, "I told you so." So I do want to say that I and others told you so in 1997. Welcome to reality.

But it also is important because it shows that the vision of the role of the public sector that motivated this House, and particularly the majority in 1997, was flawed deeply. The American public understood better than this House did that there are needs that can best be served by private expenditures, but for a civilized society to achieve the right quality of life, some things have to be done together; transportation, the environment, compassion for people in need, public safety.

And the reason the caps died unceremoniously, hopefully unnoticed, according to the people on the other side, they have a new thing about Social Security spending, but I urge people to go back and read the budget debates of 1997. Never has an entity, the caps, been so widely praised and so quickly thrown over the side when reality broke in.

But the important point is that this is simply not a mistake made in numbers. It was a miscalculation about the American people's understanding of the importance of a public sector. The

problem the people who put the caps had is this. It is a mathematical problem. They tried to construct a whole that was smaller than the sum of the parts.

All year we have been dealing with the parts. And as we look at those parts, public safety, education, the environment, highways, et cetera, et cetera, as we look at the parts, we find that they add up to more than that whole. And, therefore, the whole with the "W" has become a hole with an "H." It has become a hole in the ground into which the caps have been interred and over which today we will shovel the dirt.

So Members should be aware that when they vote today on the major bill, the multi-omnibus appropriation bill, they are funding the government at a reasonable level. And funding the government at a reasonable level means the end of the caps. And I hope that we will not again put ourselves through that.

Now, of course, it is also the case that that bill will undo part of what we did with Medicare. And as I look at the extent to which this bill today will repudiate what was so enthusiastically held in 1997, I do wonder whether or not the crack investigative team, assembled by the gentleman from Indiana on the Committee on Government Reform, ought not to be set forward. Because there is a possibility that in 1997 imposters invaded this House, impersonated Members and voted into public policy Medicare and spending programs that were so foolish that today we have to repudiate them.

Now, back in 1997, DNA evidence was not as developed, so we may never know whether it was the real Members of the House or a group of mass invaders who did it. But whatever the reason was, the fact that the bill today will be a thorough repudiation of the mistakes of 1997, is something to be noticed, although not mourned.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I wish we could vote. I wish we had something of consequence to vote on. I wish my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would have provided us with real legislation.

I thank my good friend from Massachusetts, the ranking member of the Committee on Rules; but unfortunately, what we have here is a bag of tricks. This is a continuing resolution with an extension to November 23. It is a rule for that. I would ask, though I do realize that we are facing the Thanksgiving holiday, that we take our responsibilities in this body seriously. And though I appreciate the work of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the ranking member for their individual intensity in the negotiations of this particular omnibus

bill, it is sad and it is not worthy of the American people.

Earlier this morning we heard a point that I think is very well taken. The American people do not even know what we are doing up here. They do not understand the concept, and all of the mishmash and misinformation that has been given to them leaves them confused.

I think this bill has some valuable points to it. Ultimately, when it comes to the floor, we are told that teaching hospitals, Medicare payments to hospitals, and health care providers are included. That is a positive. It helps my community in Houston. My own school district suffered for the lack of teachers, so 100,000 teachers will be valuable. Fifty thousand police will be valuable as well.

But I cannot tell for the life of me whether we are spending the Social Security surplus or whether we are saving it. And because my seniors are extremely important to me, I have great doubts about this bill. And, in fact, since it is not here on the table, I think all the Members should be questioning this bill.

Then it is interesting that although we have argued continuously about riders and legislating on appropriations bills, because every time we bring up the idea of a patients' bill of rights, which 80 percent of the American people would like to see us pass, or prescription protection for our seniors, who are begging for relief because they cannot pay for housing and food and prescriptions at the same time, we get an argument that we cannot legislate on appropriations bills. Yet we have a 300-page State Department bill, which nobody knows what is in it; we have satellite TV special interests, and I am sure they are interested in that. I happen to support the resolution on that. But here we are lumping all of that together. We have the dairy issue, which some of our Members are for and against.

□ 1100

We are lowering the maintenance and readiness of our military by cutting into that very deeply. We have literally taken women for granted and thrown them aside because we have said family planning for women around the world, protecting their lives is irrelevant; here goes women again; just throw them off the side of the Earth.

And then I have been meeting for the families of the victims of the Tanzania and Kenya bombings. We agree we were in error. We know we did not have the kind of secure premises that we should have had in our embassies overseas. And yet, nobody has responded to the plea of these families to provide them with any relief. At least no one has called my office and said that we have given relief to the victims of those bombings who have lost loved ones. Some family members lost two members of their family.

And then we leave in a deep, dark hole 300,000 immigrants who have been

paying taxes in this country who pleaded to simply allow them to apply for legal citizenship because the INS messed up procedurally their right to apply for citizenship. We have been begging for relief for these individuals who own homes, who pay taxes, whose children are in school, but we have thrown them aside.

Human lives around here does not matter. But if they have got a big checkbook, they can write a check to somebody, you can be sure, to get their stuff in an omnibus bill.

I would tell Members who are considering voting for this that it is not worth voting for and sacrificing principles when they do not know whether they are saving Social Security or whether they are digging a big, deep hole.

If we had gone through this process the way we were supposed to go through it and had the appropriate review of these appropriations bills, maybe we would be able to have a considered process in dealing with this omnibus bill.

I would simply say, Mr. Speaker, that this continuing resolution really needs to be extended so that we can go to the drawing boards and deal with this bill in the way that the American people would like us to do so. And that is to include the likes of prescription protection for our seniors; include a patients' bill of rights; to discuss a real hate crimes bill; to provide compensation for the families who lost loved ones in the bombings in Africa; to keep family planning in; and, yes, to take care of our teaching hospitals, the 100,000 teachers and the 50,000 police.

But for God's sake, let us not vote on a ghost of a bill when we do not know whether we are saving Social Security or spending every dime.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to today associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). This is no way to do the process and the work of the House.

As the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) pointed out, we have nine authorizations in this bill. I would like to focus on one of them.

I have had the misfortune, I guess you might call it, of serving on the Livestock and Horticulture Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture the last 4 years and went through the process when Steve Gunderson and myself, as ranking member, and tried to bring some legislation to the floor.

At that time, we were told that this was too complicated; we could not legislate it; so we had to give this to the Department and set up a process to figure out how we are going to untangle this convoluted system that puts one part of the country against another.

So we went through that process. The results did not please the people that put this forward, so now they have turned around 180 degrees and they say, well, now it is not appropriate to do this by rule; now we are going to legislate it.

But what people need to understand, in addition to that, the fact that we are legislating 1(a), which is basically the current fluid milk differentials, we are also legislating the Northeast Compact again in this bill, we are taking probably the most important part of the dairy provision and suspending it until December 1, 2000. And that is the new manufacturing price maneuver that was established under this rule that USDA put forward.

Now, those of my colleagues that have dairy farms in their district should understand this. I represent a district that in some places we have more cows than we have people. I have one county that has 63,000 cows. I have more cows in my district than they have in the whole entire Northeast Dairy Compact. And so, we are very concerned about this. But the people that represent dairy farmers understand that the basic formula price that we have got in place has caused some tremendous volatility in the prices for dairy farmers.

We have seen a drop of \$6 a hundred-weight a few months ago. We just saw another big drop recently. We are not going to fix this by stalling this whole process and legislating, basically, the status quo on dairy.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCIO).

Mr. BALDACCIO. Mr. Speaker, first of all, this is certainly a very terrible process, and it is no way to run a railroad.

There are many things that I would add, or there are many things that I would take out if I were in charge and was able to do it. But that is not the way the process works. And now we are at this particular point.

I think that there are more good things in this package than there are things that cause me concern to vote against it. One, I would like to focus on in particular is dairy.

The policies that we have been hearing talked about as it pertains to dairy does not take away from the issue of recognizing that the USDA's policy was going to cost small dairy farmers \$200 million. It was not going to leave things the way they were. It was going to take \$200 million from small dairy farmers who are on the verge of collapse or death and be put out of business. It retains an extension in a dairy compact that was a compact between the consumers and the dairy farmers.

If we look at the price differentials, we will see that the price of milk in the Northeast is five cents cheaper than the national average. So that has been a benefit between the farmers and the consumers.

I am also a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, and we

work on these issues; and there is no unanimity to these issues, but there are always disagreements. I appreciate the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations and the concerns that he shares, because some of us look at this glass of milk as half full rather than half empty.

I would also like to focus on the teachers, the teacher training, the smaller classrooms, more discipline, higher test scores. We are talking about 50,000 more police officers, safer schools, more protection in our community. We are looking at veterans' health care. And we are talking about corrections in the balanced budget amendment that impacted on hospitals and home health agencies.

So there are many things that I think that when we look at that we could be in opposition towards. And, believe me, there are many things that I would rewrite. But, as I have learned in this process, we will have an opportunity in the future to change those things, to fight for those things, and another day will be in front of us.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for the observation that this has been a debate about the continuing resolution rule, and I think it has been properly described.

I think it is a worthy rule. We all know we have to have the continuing resolution. We have provided for contingencies as this, as has been explained by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) and myself. No matter how the Members feel about individual pieces of the appropriations process, I do urge their consideration and in a favorable way for this continuing resolution, which is necessary for us to get on with our business and the rest of the day's work.

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

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

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

This will be a 15-minute vote followed by a possible 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 375, nays 45, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 599]

YEAS—375

Abercrombie	Armey	Ballenger
Aderholt	Bachus	Barcia
Allen	Baker	Barr
Andrews	Baldacci	Barrett (NE)
Archer	Baldwin	Barrett (WI)

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

NAYS—45

NOT VOTING—13

Ackerman	Franks (NJ)	Scarborough
Capps	Hoekstra	Wexler
Conyers	McIntosh	Weygand
Dunn	Meehan	
Fattah	Ros-Lehtinen	

□ 1129

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

Ms. McCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. GEJDENSON, Ms. DELAUR, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. RUSH changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER THE VOTE OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote just taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (LATOURETTE). Did the gentleman from Wisconsin support the previous question?

Mr. OBEY. Yes, I did.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. GOSS

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the vote offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 316, noes 101, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 600]

YEAS—316

Abercrombie	Fossella	Millender-	Thomas	Upton	Weldon (FL)	Bereuter	Gilman	Miller, Gary
Aderholt	Fowler	McDonald	Thompson (MS)	Vento	Weldon (PA)	Berkley	Gonzalez	Mink
Archer	Frank (MA)	Miller (FL)	Thornberry	Vitter	Weller	Berry	Goode	Moakley
Armey	Frelinghuysen	Miller, Gary	Thune	Walden	Whitfield	Biggert	Goodlatte	Moran (KS)
Bachus	Galleghy	Mink	Thurman	Walsh	Wicker	Bilbrey	Goodling	Moran (VA)
Baird	Ganske	Moore	Tiaht	Wamp	Wilson	Bilirakis	Gordon	Morella
Baker	Gekas	Moran (KS)	Toomey	Watkins	Wolf	Bishop	Goss	Murtha
Baldacci	Gephhardt	Moran (VA)	Traficant	Watts (OK)	Young (AK)	Blagojevich	Graham	Myrick
Ballenger	Gibbons	Morella	Turner	Waxman	Young (FL)	Bliley	Granger	Nadler
Barcia	Gilchrest	Murtha		Weiner		Blunt	Green (TX)	Napolitano
Barr	Gillmor	Myrick				Boehlert	Greenwood	Neal
Barrett (NE)	Gilman	Nadler				Boehner	Hall (OH)	Nethercutt
Bartlett	Gonzalez	Neal					Hall (TX)	Ney
Barton	Goode	Nethercutt					Northup	
Bass	Goodlatte	Ney					Hastings (WA)	
Bateman	Goodling	Northup					Hayes	
Bereuter	Goss	Norwood					Hayworth	
Berkley	Graham	Nussle					Hefley	
Berman	Granger	Ortiz					Herger	
Biggert	Greenwood	Ose					Hill (MT)	
Bilbrey	Gutierrez	Oxley					Hill (TX)	
Bilirakis	Hall (OH)	Packard					Hilleary	
Bishop	Hall (TX)	Pastor					Hinchey	
Blagojevich	Hansen	Paul					Hinojosa	
Biley	Hastings (WA)	Pease					Packard	
Blunt	Hayes	Pelosi					Pastor	
Boehlert	Hayworth	Peterson (PA)					Paul	
Boehner	Hefley	DeGette					Pease	
Bonilla	Herger	DeLauro					Peterson (PA)	
Bono	Hill (MT)	Pickering					Petri	
Borski	Hilleary	Pickett					Petri	
Boswell	Hilliard	Pitts					Phelps	
Boucher	Hinojosa	Porter					Pickering	
Boyd	Hobson	Portman					Pickett	
Brady (PA)	Holden	Price (NC)					Pitts	
Brady (TX)	Horn	Pryce (OH)					Pomero	
Bryant	Hostettler	Quinn					Pomeroy	
Burr	Radanovich	Radonich					Porter	
Burton	Houghton	Ramstad					Portman	
Buyer	Hulshof	Rangel					Price (NC)	
Callahan	Hunter	Regula					Pryce (OH)	
Calvert	Hutchinson	Reyes					Radanovich	
Camp	Hyde	Reynolds					Ramstad	
Campbell	Isakson	Riley					Rangel	
Canady	Istook	Rodriguez					Reynolds	
Cannon	Jackson (IL)	Roemer					Rivers	
Cardin	Jefferson	Rogan					Rodriguez	
Castle	Jenkins	Rogers					Roeper	
Chabot	John	Rohrabacher					Rogers	
Chambliss	Johnson (CT)	Roukema					Rohrabacher	
Clay	Johnson, Sam	Royal-Allard					Rothman	
Clyburn	Jones (NC)	Royce					Roukema	
Coble	Jones (OH)	Rush					Royal-Allard	
Coburn	Jones (OH)	Ryun (KS)					Royce	
Collins	Kaptur	Sabo					Rush	
Combest	Kasich	Salmon					Ryun (KS)	
Cook	Kelly	Sanders					Sabo	
Cooksey	Kilpatrick	Sandlin					Salmon	
Cox	King (NY)	Sanford					Sanders	
Cramer	Kingston	Sawyer					Sandlin	
Crane	Klink	Saxton					Sanford	
Crowley	Knollenberg	Schaffer					Sawyer	
Cubin	Kolbe	Schakowsky					Saxton	
Cummings	Kuykendall	Serrano					Schaffer	
Cunningham	LaFalce	Sessions					Schakowsky	
Danner	LaHood	Shadegg					Scott	
Davis (FL)	Lampson	Shaw					Serrano	
Davis (IL)	Largent	Shows					Sessions	
Davis (VA)	Latham	Shays					Shadegg	
Deal	LaTourette	Sherman					Shaw	
DeFazio	Lazio	Sherwood					Shays	
Delahunt	Leach	Shimkus					Sherman	
DeLay	Levin	Shows					Sherwood	
DeMint	Lewis (CA)	Shuster					Shimkus	
Deutsch	Lewis (KY)	Simpson					Shows	
Diaz-Balart	Linder	Siski					Shuster	
Dickey	Lipinski	Skeen					Simpson	
Dicks	LoBiondo	Skelton					Sisisky	
Dingell	Lofgren	Smith (MI)					Skeen	
Dixon	Lowey	Smith (NJ)					Skelton	
Doggett	Lucas (KY)	Smith (TX)					Slaughter	
Dooley	Lucas (OK)	Smith (WA)					Evans	
Doolittle	Maloney (NY)	Snyder					Matsui	
Dreier	Matsui	Souder					Everett	
Duncan	McCarthy (NY)	Spence					McCarthy (MO)	
Ehlers	Stearns	Stearns					Smith (NJ)	
Ehrlich	McCormy	Stump					Smith (TX)	
Emerson	McHugh	Stupak					Smith (WA)	
Engel	McInnis	Sumunu					Snyder	
English	McIntyre	Sweeney					Souder	
Eshoo	McKeon	Talent					Spence	
Everett	McKinney	Tancredo					McInnis	
Ewing	Meeks (NY)	Tanner					McIntyre	
Farr	Menendez	Tauscher					McKeon	
Fletcher	Metcalfe	Tauzin					McKinney	
Foley	Mica	Taylor (NC)					Menendez	
		Terry					Metcalf	
							Mica	
							Stabenow	
							Talent	
							Tancredo	
							Tanner	
							Tauscher	

[Roll No. 601]

AYES—352

NOT VOTING—16

□ 1139

Messrs. HOLT, OBERSTAR, and GUTKNECHT changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. HERGER, DICKS, HALL of Ohio, and BOYD, and Mrs. MYRICK, Ms. BERKLEY, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to table the motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 352, noes 63, not voting 18, as follows:

