

Strickland	Thurman	Watkins
Stump	Tiahrt	Watts (OK)
Stupak	Tierney	Waxman
Sununu	Toomey	Weiner
Sweeney	Traficant	Weldon (FL)
Talent	Turner	Weldon (PA)
Tancredo	Udall (CO)	Weller
Tanner	Udall (NM)	Weygand
Tauscher	Upton	Whitfield
Tauzin	Velazquez	Wicker
Taylor (NC)	Vento	Wilson
Terry	Visclosky	Wolf
Thomas	Vitter	Woolsey
Thompson (CA)	Walden	Wu
Thompson (MS)	Walsh	Wynn
Thornberry	Wamp	Young (AK)
Thune	Waters	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—31

Abercrombie	Gekas	Pombo
Ackerman	Greenwood	Ros-Lehtinen
Berman	Gutierrez	Roukema
Capps	Hutchinson	Ryun (KS)
Conyers	Jefferson	Scarborough
Dingell	Kilpatrick	Smith (MI)
Doolittle	Maloney (CT)	Spratt
Doyle	Meehan	Watt (NC)
Ehrlich	Mica	Wexler
Fowler	Moran (VA)	
Frost	Murtha	

□ 1304

Messrs. TANCREDO, BRADY of Texas, and NORWOOD changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2000

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 385, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 82) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of House Joint Resolution 82 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 82

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 18, 1999" in section 106(c) and inserting in lieu thereof "November 23, 1999". Public Law 106-46 is amended by striking "November 18, 1999" and inserting in lieu thereof "November 23, 1999".

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Pursuant to House Resolution 385, 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. 82, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

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

This continuing resolution extends the current CR for 5 days, until November 23, specifically for the purpose of allowing the Senate to have time to consider the measures that we will send them today.

Mr. Speaker, in the interest of allowing our Members to get home to their families and preparing for the Thanksgiving period, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I would very much like to see Members get home for Thanksgiving, but I think my public duty is to help Members understand what they are going to be voting on before they go home, because otherwise when they do go home, their experience with the news media and angry constituents is not going to be a very pleasant one; and I am afraid there are a lot of nasty surprises in this bill, some of which I will be discussing over the next 12 to 15 hours.

Let me say, first of all, that this bill has been a battleground about national priorities and national direction. It has been the arena for battles between the President and his allies on one side and his political opponents on the other. By any measure, I think it is safe to say that the President has won victory after victory. We are going to be stuck having to extend the government, I am afraid, several times through CRs like this one because of some of the decisions made in the bill that is coming next, and people need to understand how they interrelate.

I think you can say, for instance, that in the area of international leadership, the President and those of us who agree with him have won a great victory in funding the Wye peace process agreement. We have won a very important battle in making sure that debts that would never be repaid are going to be wiped out so that Latin America and Africa can, in fact, become good markets for our products as well as stable neighbors in an ever more complicated world.

We have won the fight to, at least for now, take the U.S. off the list of U.N. deadbeats. On the environmental front, the President has beaten down virtually every antienvironmental rider that was tossed his way. In the fight against street crime, the President won 50,000 new cops.

On the education front, it is important to understand some of the major achievements that we have made. We have seen a lot of people denigrate the President's effort to provide for 100,000 new teachers. I want to put that effort in context. What Democrats have been fighting for on education in this package is a four-pronged research-based attack on educational incompetence and poor performance. The research shows, for instance, that children do much better in smaller classes. That is why the President fought so hard for and won the battle for 100,000 new teachers. That research also shows that, espe-

cially at the high school level, students perform better, they exhibit less anti-social adolescent behavior, and there is far less violence in high schools that are smaller.

And so we have an initiative that will provide for smaller high schools, or at least to help local school districts build smaller learning centers within their high schools. The research also shows that students do best when their teachers are welltrained. It sounds obvious, but some people seem to have missed it. So we have an initiative in this bill that will add additional funding for partnership grants between university schools of education and local school districts so that those schools of education are producing the kinds of teachers that the districts actually need. And also in the process, we are trying to raise the standards for those teachers so that they are actually getting a degree in the subject that they are going to wind up teaching, also I guess a shocking idea in some quarters.

And lastly, research also shows that if you want to reform schools, you need to do it from bottom to top and around again, that reform has to be comprehensive, systemic; and that is why this bill adds additional money to the Obey-Porter bipartisan comprehensive school reform package.

All of those are very good things. I say that there is no doubt on the major issues that have divided us the last 3 months, the President has run the table. He has won on issue after issue. But I think there are some things that are just as important as winning and losing, and I want to talk about some of them as we discuss this continuing resolution. We are being asked to continue the government a few more days so it gives us time to pass the next bill that is coming at us. I think we need to understand what is in that bill before we vote on this resolution.

There are many things in that package that disturb me. The protracted battle to persuade the majority to allow the United States to pay its back dues to the United Nations has resulted in a compromise that may still prevent release of all of the funds that are needed to return the U.S. to a position of good standing in the U.N. I think that is regrettable.

The Republican majority was also steadfast in its refusal to provide the Justice Department with the \$14 million that they need to pursue tobacco litigation. This money is needed for efforts to recover the hundreds of billions of tax dollars paid through the Medicare trust fund, the Public Health Service, the veterans and military medical systems, and the Social Security disability fund in dealing with tobacco-related illnesses. The tobacco companies that lied repeatedly to the American people about the health effects of smoking should pay a substantial portion of those costs. The Republican majority is clearly trying to protect them from having to repay the taxpayers.

I believe funds will be found by the administration to initiate litigation; but as everybody knows, legal outcomes are often dictated by the relative size of legal war chests. That is one of the things, for instance, that I am told CBS news had to take into account when they discussed whether or not to put on that famous "60 Minutes" special which went after the tobacco companies for not telling the truth. I would say that while the appropriation requested by the Justice Department to augment their ability to pursue that issue is small, the long-term fiscal impact on the Federal Government could be enormous; and we have failed to recognize that in the bill that is coming to us.

The Republican majority also repeatedly refused to include language that both the White House and I asked them to include to ensure that 100 percent of the money paid from the Medicare and Social Security trust funds is returned to those trust funds if it is recovered in litigation. That item was repeatedly raised during negotiations. It is the fair thing to do with those funds. I find it hard to construct an argument that they should be used for a different purpose, but the Republican leadership flatly rejected that concept in both the Senate and the House.

□ 1315

I think the reason (and this was even said in conference,) they did not want to approve this language is because it would provide incentives to proceed with the lawsuit. Well, we ought to proceed with that lawsuit.

I think nothing more clearly underlies or underscores the hollowness of the claim of the majority that they have suffered a recent conversion and are now strong supporters of Social Security. Nothing is more clearly underscoring of the hollowness of that claim than their new-found concern over the solvency of those trust funds. It is a concern that suddenly emerged around here after Labor Day when polling data demonstrated to them how badly they had been damaged by their attempts to pass a huge tax bill that rewarded the rich, using all of the resources needed to strengthen Social Security and Medicare.

Another issue at the center of negotiations was whether to include a small across-the-board cut. This cut was not necessary to reach the offset targets to make sure the bill was paid for; more than enough money was available from other sources. It is simply an attempt by the majority to create a symbol that could be used to pretend that in the midst of this orgy of gimmickry in spending, that they are continuing to be fiscally responsible.

If my colleagues take a look at the dollars being provided across the board by the majority, it is apparent, it is apparent to me that the Republican leadership is willing to spend almost any amount to get out of town, just so long as we can obscure how much that real-

ly is through accounting gimmicks. I think that is a big mistake.

The problem with an across-the-board cut is that people say, "My God, any agency head ought to be able to administer a half a percent cut across the board." Of course they could. They could easily find waste if they are left to their own devices. But that is not the way this across-the-board cut is designed. Their across-the-board cut completely abandons the core responsibility of Congress to determine spending priorities. There are programs that could afford a 1 or 2 or even 10 percent cut. But, instead, the Congress requires much more limited authority be given to the President, and that means that this Congress ignores the fact that there are some programs that require a precise amount of money in order to protect the taxpayers' interest.

Those kinds of programs fall into two categories: one, to protect public safety, and the other to control the in-flow and out-flow of public funds. These are largely accounts that include things like the FBI, the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Air Traffic Control, Customs Service, and Border Patrol. Numerous studies have demonstrated that cuts in the administration of the Social Security agency can drive up the error rate in the disbursement of those funds enough to cost the Federal Government as much as \$6 for every dollar saved in reduced expenditures in Social Security Administration; and yet those studies are ignored in the way this cut is applied.

Then we get to the question of national defense. The way national defense is treated in this across-the-board cut is very interesting. It was treated the way this bill treats it in order to protect congressional pork. So what the provision requires is that we will have to see about a \$520 million reduction in operation and maintenance accounts, which is the core of our military readiness, and that is occurring at the same time that the Pentagon reported that two out of the 10 divisions in the U.S. Army are now rated at C-4; in other words, not close to having the parts, people, and maintenance that are necessary to undertake military action. Yet, operation and maintenance is going to be required to be cut by a larger percentage than anything else in this bill. The reason for that is because the folks who put this bill together wanted to protect the projects and the pork in the research and procurement accounts. So we get that weird anomalous result.

I will insert in the RECORD at this point, Mr. Speaker, extraneous material related to my remarks, and I will expand further on that subject for the RECORD.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am amazed, for instance, that on pay-fors, that the conferees chose to ignore the opportunity to recoup for the taxpayers money that we should be recouping from the sale of what is known as the Block C portion of spectrum

sales. Several years ago when block sales portion of the spectrum was auctioned off a number of winning bidders went into bankruptcy without paying the Government for the spectrum rights that they had purchased. They have been allowed to hold on to those spectrum rights, refused to make any payments, and now they have the prospect of reemerging from bankruptcy by selling their share of the spectrum for a good deal more than they paid for it. It is a good deal if you can get it, but the American taxpayers are taking a bath; and we were blocked from correcting this specifically by one Member of the House Republican leadership.

But what bothers me the most about this proposal is the fact that it is laced through with accounting fixes to conceal an orgy of spending that every Member would deny if confronted with it by his constituents. I will insert in the RECORD a chart which shows that when this bill is passed, the Congress will have spent \$17,400 million that will not be counted in determining how much that we have spent. It also has declared almost \$15 billion in expenditures to emergency spending so that they are also exempt from spending limits we are supposed to be abiding by.

LIST OF GIMMICKS IN APPROPRIATIONS BILLS

[In millions of dollars]

	BA	0
SPENDING NOT COUNTED BY CONGRESS		
Directed CBO to reduce their spending estimates, but actually spends Social Security:		
AG—Directed outlay scoring (1.14% of BA)	—163	
CJ—Directed outlay scoring (1.14% of BA)	—336	
DOD—Directed outlay scoring	—10,500	
E&W—Directed outlay scoring (1.14% of BA)	—103	
FO—Directed outlay scoring (1.14% of BA)	—144	
INT—Directed outlay scoring (1.14% of BA)	—170	
L-HHS—Directed outlay scoring (1.14% of BA)	—970	
Directed outlay scoring (highway and transit firewalls)	—1,341	
TRANS—Directed outlay scoring (1.14% of BA)	—143	
TPO—Directed outlay scoring (1.14% of BA)	—151	
VA HUD—Directed outlay scoring (1.14% of BA)	—820	
DOD—Spectrum asset sales	—2,600	—2,600
Subtotal	—2,600	—17,441

Declaration of emergencies for normal program spending:

Declare Year 2000 Census an emergency	—4,476	—4,118
Defense emergency designations	—7,200	—5,500
Declare part of Head Start an emergency	—1,700	—629
LIHEAP emergency declaration	—1,100	—825
Refugees emergency declaration	—427	—126
Forest Service Wildland Fire Management	—90	—3
Public health emergency declaration	—584	—310
Subtotal	—15,577	—11,511

FY 2000 SPENDING COUNTED AGAINST 1999 OR 2001

Legally delay spending until the final days of the fiscal year so it is counted next year:	0	—1,250
DOD—Delay contractor payments	—1,674	
Labor HHS—Delayed Obligations \$5.0 B in BA delayed until 9/29/00	—720	
VA medical care delay obligation of \$900 M	—104	
FO—Delayed obligations	—485	—485
CJS—Delayed availability of balances in Crime Victims Fund until after FY 2000	—1,300	0
Rescind section 8 housing funds	—1,785	—4,233
Subtotal, delayed obligations	—1,785	—4,233

Legally count spending against last fiscal year even though it is available for FY 2000: DOD—Advance Appropriations	—1,800	—1,800
Legally count spending against next fiscal year even though it is available for FY 2000:		
DOE—Elk Hills School Lands Fund	—36	—36
L-HHS—Increased advance funding for FY 2001 (total FY 2001 advances are \$19 bilion)	—10,100	—532

LIST OF GIMMICKS IN APPROPRIATIONS BILLS—Continued
[In millions of dollars]

	BA	O
HUD—section 8 advance appropriation for FY 2001 (37% of program total)	4,200	0
Subtotal	−16,136	−2,368
<hr/>		
MISCELLANEOUS SPECIAL ACCOUNTING GIMMICKS		
Across the Board cut 0.38%	−2,143	−1,206
Capture Federal Reserve Surplus	−3,752	−3,752
New Hires Data Base for student loan collection (incl directed scoring)	−878	−876
Slip military and civilian pay by one day	−3,589
Labor HHS—HEALTH loan recapture	−68	−27
United Mine Workers Combined Benefit Fund	−39
L—HHS—Title XX, social services block grant, cut below mandatory level	−608	−430
TRANS—Mandatory offsets (rescission of FAA contract authority)	−30	−10
Subtotal	−7,479	−9,929
Grand total	−43,577	−45,482

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, in this bill, for instance, they have decided now that they are going to declare Head Start to be an emergency. It has only been on the books since 1985. I guess we just found out that it is an emergency to deal with these kids. What they are really saying is they have a political emergency that requires them to hide the real cost of this bill from their taxpayers. That is the real emergency designation that is going on here.

Then they move about \$4.2 billion in outlays into different years. That saves no money. It simply hides money. They have miscellaneous spending, accounting gimmicks all told of \$45 billion on the outlays side, and \$43 billion on the budget authority side. If my colleagues want to go home and explain to their constituents that kind of hide-and-seek attention to fiscal affairs, be my guest. That is not my flavor of ice cream.

Let me make one other comment, Mr. Speaker. One of the reasons that I have been so unhappy with this bill, as I said earlier, is that it stands over 1 foot high. I defy anyone to tell me, and I have a ruler to prove it, I defy any of my Republican colleagues, I defy any of my Republican colleagues to tell me what is in these authorization bills that they are asking us to swallow. How much are we going to hear? How much are the reporters in the gallery going to dig out after we have left that we do not know about? I am afraid, a lot. But I have to say that what bothers me more than anything is that these accounting gimmicks may appear to be funny, but in fact, they are not funny at all. I would not laugh too long, because what we are witnessing here is something that is immensely corrosive of democracy and this institution's role in democracy.

Mr. Speaker, the primary job that the Congress has each year is to pass a budget. If we cannot be honest with the American people about what we are doing in that budget, I think they have a right to question whether we are being honest with them on anything that we say to them. And the fact is that the list of accounting shell games that are in this bill, not for policy reasons, but for political reasons, I think brings discredit on the entire institu-

tion. That is because I guess we are determined to live under a fiction that requires us to pretend that we are spending billions of dollars less than we are actually spending.

Frankly, a lot of this spending is perfectly justifiable. I think that the Republican educational priorities are good. I support them as well as our own. But I do not like the fact that we are hiding what we are doing in the process. I will have more to say about this along the line.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers except myself to close, so I will continue to reserve my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I came to this body this morning prepared to vote for a bipartisan omnibus bill, prepared to support reforms in the quality and in the resources for our education budget and for our schoolchildren across the country; prepared to defend firewalls on Social Security and further reduce the deficit and the debt, which is the best tax cut for all Americans. I have spent the last hour and a half to 2 hours in the parliamentarian's office reading through this bill and getting through a little bit of it; and the more I read of it, the more concerns I have about Social Security and debt reduction.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has said that there are some gimmicks and games, and I think maybe a hope and a prayer in this budget that we do not dip further than CBO has already said, which they have stated that Congress has dipped \$17 billion into Social Security. The most important thing for me in this budget is to not touch Social Security, further reduce the debt, and get quality education reforms. I do not see any firewalls on Social Security in this. CBO has not even scored this. We do not know what it does to Social Security.

Furthermore, when we have Head Start at \$1.7 billion declared as an emergency, I am not sure what that does to Social Security. I am not sure saying that \$2.4 billion becomes available on October 1, 2000, the next fiscal year, what is that impact on Social Security? Delayed obligations, \$3 billion for NIH, \$450 million for the Centers for Disease Control. What is the impact there on Social Security?

So all of these things give me a great deal of hesitation and reservation and concern, and I do not intend to vote for this omnibus bill.

Now, on education, Mr. Speaker, we have \$145 million for public charter

schools. I think that is a step in the right direction. We have \$1.4 billion for more teachers, not just for more numbers; but we say 25 percent of the funds can go to quality improvement, to professional development. That is good progress, and I highly support that discretion and flexibility.

□ 1330

We furthermore have \$335 million for the Eisenhower Professional Development Program, again to try to address the shortage in quality of teaching and too many teachers teaching outside their subject area. So I think there are some high concerns for success in education but I do not think this addresses the Social Security firewalls. It does not get scored by CBO, and I would encourage my colleagues to read this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the budget process obviously allows us to say what is important to the American people. It is a process where we say some are winners and some are losers. It is a process for the Nation to declare what the priorities are. Obviously we cannot win everything we want so it has to be a compromise, but I can say, Mr. Speaker, the people in North Carolina, where there was actually a disaster, never was an emergency declared because it was not politically the right thing. Maybe those who indeed would have said that would have come from Social Security, we are trying to get the kind of basic relief, not all of it, just the basic relief, for our farmers which is in doubt.

Now, I want to vote for this bill because there are good things in it. I know there are winners and losers but I can say, Mr. Speaker, that as we go forward I think it says something about the American people when we ignore that over 72,000 people were affected in the region, farmers lost a tremendous amount of their crops. Many of them are going bankrupt and yet there is not the kind of relief that even responds in a very basic way to their needs, not all the relief because we knew an emergency was not declared.

We were willing to fight for that next year, but we need at least the \$81 million that was there for marketing. So I would urge, Mr. Speaker, that we look at that to try to make sure that this budget process, as we vote on it, indeed is speaking to the basic need. Some will be winners, some will be losers, but the American nation should not lose the principle of responding to those who are most desperately in need, while we go forward with such an enormous amount of resources. Eighty-one million dollars is a pittance; it is what is symbolic of what we stand for that we should make sure that as we consider this bill that at least the

American farmers know that they were part of the consideration in this budget process.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate and thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the distinguished ranking member, for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, as we approach yet another CR, with all of the terrible problems that the ranking member has described, I think it fair to say that none has been more harmed by the procedures of the House this year than the people I represent.

Shall I paraphrase Elizabeth Barrett Browning? How shall I dislike it? Let me count the ways.

What is this bill? The Commerce, Justice, State, Foreign Ops, Interior, Labor, HHS, DC bill, plus? All of our appropriations that remain have been packed on to the tiny D.C. appropriation. Five hundred thousand people are being used to take 300 million, or bills for 300 million, across the finish line, and the Nation's capital be damned; we just have to wait to spend our own money, understand, because almost all of the money in the D.C. appropriation is money raised in the District of Columbia.

Obviously I have to be for it. What kind of position does that put me in? The disgrace as affects the Nation's capital is outflanked only by what the procedures of the House this year have done for democracy itself and how we have displayed ourselves before the people of the United States. We have become, in and of ourselves, a threat to democracy. We have made democratic procedures a living joke on C-SPAN.

We are going to have before us a bill brimming with controversy. There is the international family planning gag rule that is certain to take the lives of countless of the poorest women in the world, with no chance to debate it up and down. There is the dairy controversy we have heard so much about today.

In a democracy, we vote our differences up and down. In a democracy we even vote our compromises up and down. This House has become an embarrassment to itself. However, I am very glad the Nation has been able to see it because maybe when we go home there will be a backlash that will keep us from ever doing this again.

The delay, with another CR, has needlessly harmed the people of the District of Columbia right at a time when we have gotten a new reform mayor and a reform city council. This has not made an ounce of difference to this body. The reputation of the House has been permanently damaged as an institution. We can reclaim it only by returning to regular order and democratic procedures.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

Mr. Speaker, as I understand it section 1001 of the omnibus bill effectively waives the pay-as-you-go rules for all of the authorizing legislation included in the omnibus package. It also effectively, as I understand it, waives the pay-as-you-go rules for the outyear effects of other legislation passed this legislation.

I would like to ask the leadership of this House why these rules are being waived and how much spending is not being counted as a result of that?

We have seen no CBO scoring on the omnibus package. Can anyone tell us the amount of spending covered by these budget waivers?

I would also ask why Members' pay was exempted from this across-the-board cut when it was included in the previous across-the-board cut that was made?

I think those are but some of the questions that Members ought to be asking before they vote on the budget that is coming at us later this afternoon.

I would also say, Mr. Speaker, I regret the time that we have taken but I think every hour that we spend gives Members an additional opportunity to understand what is in these bills, and I think in the end that serves the interest both of every Member and the taxpayers that they are trying to represent.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I listened intently to all of the discussion and the debate from the Members on the other side of the aisle, and if any of that debate related to this CR that is presently before us I would have a lengthy response, but none of that debate relates to this CR. So at this point I would just like to make this suggestion, let us pass the CR and then get on to the appropriations bill that has been the subject of debate using this as a vehicle.

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

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

The joint resolution is considered as having been read for amendment.

Pursuant to House Resolution 385, 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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, under these circumstances, regrettably I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves to recommit the joint resolution to the Committee on Appropriations.

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

There was no objection.

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

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes 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 Chair would announce that if a vote on passage of the joint resolution is required, pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for votes on final passage and questions incidental thereto.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 1, nays 420, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 606]

YEAS—1

Forbes

NAYS—420

Abercrombie	Capuano	English
Aderholt	Cardin	Eshoo
Allen	Carson	Etheridge
Andrews	Castle	Evans
Archer	Chabot	Everett
Armey	Chambliss	Ewing
Baca	Chenoweth-Hage	Farr
Baird	Clay	Fattah
Baker	Clayton	Filner
Baldacci	Clement	Fletcher
Baldwin	Clyburn	Foley
Ballenger	Coble	Ford
Barcia	Coburn	Fossella
Barr	Collins	Fowler
Barrett (NE)	Combest	Frank (MA)
Barrett (WI)	Condit	Franks (NJ)
Bartlett	Cook	Frelighuysen
Barton	Cooksey	Frost
Bass	Costello	Gallegly
Bateman	Cox	Ganske
Becerra	Coyne	Gejdenson
Bentsen	Cramer	Gekas
Bereuter	Crane	Gephardt
Berkley	Crowley	Gibbons
Berman	Cubin	Gilchrest
Berry	Cummings	Gillmor
Biggert	Cunningham	Gilman
Bilbray	Danner	Gonzalez
Bilirakis	Davis (FL)	Goode
Bishop	Davis (IL)	Goodlatte
Blagojevich	Davis (VA)	Goodling
Bliley	Deal	Gordon
Blumenauer	Defazio	Goss
Blunt	DeGette	Graham
Boehlert	DeLauro	Granger
Boehner	DeLay	Green (TX)
Bonilla	DeMint	Green (WI)
Bonior	Deutsch	Greenwood
Bono	Diaz-Balart	Gutierrez
Borski	Dickey	Gutknecht
Boswell	Dicks	Hall (OH)
Boucher	Dingell	Hall (TX)
Boyd	Dixon	Hansen
Brady (PA)	Doggett	Hastings (FL)
Brown (FL)	Doolley	Hastings (WA)
Brown (OH)	Doolittle	Hayes
Bryant	Doyle	Hayworth
Burr	Dreier	Hefley
Buyer	Duncan	Herger
Callahan	Dunn	Hill (IN)
Calvert	Edwards	Hill (MT)
Camp	Ehlers	Hilleary
Campbell	Ehrlich	Hilliard
Canady	Emerson	Hinchey
Cannon	Engel	Hinojosa

Hobson Menendez Schaffer and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Hoefel Metcalf Schakowsky

Hoekstra Mica Scott

Holden Millender-S McDonald So the motion to recommit was rejected.

Holt Sessions Serrano

Hooley Miller (FL) Sessions

Horn Miller, Gary Shadegg

Hostettler Miller, George Shaw

Houghton Minge Shays

Hoyer Mink Sherman

Hulshof Moakley Sherwood

Hunter Mollohan Shimkus

Hyde Moore Shows

Inslee Moran (KS) Shuster

Isakson Moran (VA) Simpson

Istook Morella Siskiwy

Jackson (IL) Murtha Skeen

Jackson-Lee Myrick Skelton

(TX) Nadler Slaughter

Jenkins Napolitano Smith (MI)

John Neal Smith (NJ)

Johnson (CT) Nethercutt Smith (TX)

Johnson, E. B. Ney Smith (WA)

Jones (NC) Northup Snyder

Jones (OH) Norwood Souder

Kanjorski Nussle Spence

Kaptur Oberstar Spratt

Kasich Obey Stabenow

Kelly Olver Stark

Kennedy Ortiz Stearns

Kildee Ose Stenholm

Kilpatrick Owens Strickland

Kind (WI) Oxley Stump

King (NY) Packard Stupak

Kingston Pallone Sununu

Kleckza Pascrell Sweeney

Klink Pastor Talent

Knollenberg Paul Tancredo

Kolbe Payne Tanner

Kucinich Pease Tauscher

Kuykendall Pelosi Tauzin

LaFalce Peterson (MN) Taylor (MS)

LaHood Peterson (PA) Taylor (NC)

Lampson Petri Terry

Lantos Phelps Thomas

Largent Pickering Thompson (CA)

Larson Pickett Thompson (MS)

Latham Pitts Thorneberry

LaTourette Pombo Thune

Lazio Pomeroy Thurman

Leach Porter Tiahrt

Lee Portman Tierney

Levin Price (NC) Toomey

Lewis (CA) Pryce (OH)

Lewis (GA) Quinn Traficant

Lewis (KY) Radanovich Turner

Linder Rahall Udall (CO)

Lipinski Ramstad Udall (NM)

LoBiondo Rangel Upton

Lofgren Regula Velazquez

Lowey Reyes Vento

Lucas (KY) Reynolds Vitter

Lucas (OK) Riley Walden

Luther Rivers Walsh

Maloney (CT) Rodriguez Wamp

Maloney (NY) Roemer Waters

Manzullo Rogan Watkins

Markey Rogers Watt (NC)

Martinez Rohrabacher Watts (OK)

Mascara Ros-Lehtinen Waxman

Matsui Rothman Weiner

McCarthy (MO) Roukema Weldon (FL)

McCarthy (NY) Roybal-Allard Weldon (PA)

McCullum Royce Weller

McCrary Rush Weygand

McDermott Ryan (WI) Whitfield

McGovern Ryan (KS) Wicker

McHugh Sabo Wilson

McInnis Salmon Wise

McIntosh Sanchez Wolf

McIntyre Sanders Woolsey

McKeon Sandlin Wu

McKinney Sanford Wynn

McNulty Sawyer Young (AK)

Meek (FL) Saxton Young (FL)

Meeks (NY) Scarborough

NOT VOTING—13

Ackerman Conyers Meehan

Bachus Delahunt Visclosky

Brady (TX) Hutchinson Wexler

Burton Jefferson

Capps Johnson, Sam

□ 1359

Messrs. TANNER, HEFLEY, BATEMAN, DAVIS of Illinois, MOLLOHAN, LINDER, CLYBURN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ

and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1400

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the House voted to reject the motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Did the gentleman from Wisconsin vote on the prevailing side of the question on the motion?

Mr. OBEY. Yes, I did, Mr. Speaker.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF FLORIDA

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. 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. YOUNG) 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.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. An insufficient number having arisen, a recorded vote is not in order.

So a recorded vote was refused.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the joint 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 403, noes 16, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 607]

AYES—403

Abercrombie	Biggert	Calvert	Hansen
Aderholt	Bilbray	Camp	Hastings (FL)
Allen	Bilirakis	Campbell	Hastings (WA)
Andrews	Bishop	Canady	Hayes
Archer	Blagojevich	Cannon	Hayworth
Armey	Billey	Capuano	Hefley
Baca	Blumenauer	Cardin	Hill (IN)
Bachus	Blunt	Carson	Hill (MT)
Baird	Boehlert	Castle	Hilleary
Baker	Boehner	Chabot	Hilliard
Baldacci	Bonilla	Chambliss	Hinchey
Ballenger	Bonior	Chenoweth-Hage	Hinojosa
Barcia	Bono	Clay	Hobson
Barr	Borski	Clayton	Hoefel
Barrett (NE)	Boswell	Clement	Hoekstra
Bartlett	Boucher	Coble	Holden
Barton	Boyd	Collins	Holt
Bass	Brady (PA)	Combest	Hooley
Bateman	Brown (FL)	Condit	Horn
Becerra	Brown (OH)	Cook	Hostettler
Bentsen	Bryant	Cooksey	Houghton
Bereuter	Burr	Costello	Hoyer
Berkley	Burton	Cox	Hulshof
Berman	Buyer	Coyne	Hunter
Berry	Callahan	Cramer	Hutchinson

Crane	Hyde	Ose
Crowley	Insllee	Owens
Cubin	Isakson	Oxley
Cummings	Istook	Packard
Cunningham	Jackson (IL)	Pallone
Danner	Jackson-Lee	Pascrell
Davis (FL)	(TX)	Pastor
Davis (IL)	Jefferson	Payne
Davis (VA)	Jenkins	Pease
Deal	John	Pelosi
DeFazio	Johnson (CT)	Peterson (PA)
DeGette	Johnson, E. B.	Phelps
DeLauro	Johnson, Sam	Pickering
DeLay	Jones (NC)	Pickett
DeMint	Kanjorski	Pitts
Deutsch	Kaptur	Pombo
Diaz-Balart	Kasich	Pomeroy
Dickey	Kelly	Portman
Dicks	Kennedy	Pryce (OH)
Dingell	Kildee	Quinn
Dixon	Kilpatrick	Radanovich
Doggett	King (NY)	Rahall
Dooley	Kingston	Ramstad
Doolittle	Kleczka	Rangel
Doyle	Klink	Regula
Dreier	Knollenberg	Reyes
Duncan	Kolbe	Reynolds
Dunn	Kucinich	Riley
Edwards	Kuykendall	Rivers
Ehlers	LaFalce	Rodriguez
Ehrlich	LaHood	Roemer
Emerson	Lampson	Rogers
Engel	Lantos	Rohrabacher
English	Largent	Ros-Lehtinen
Eshoo	Larson	Rothman
Etheridge	Latham	Roukema
Evans	LaTourette	Royal-Allard
Everett	Lazio	Royce
Ewing	Leach	Rush
Farr	Lee	Ryun (KS)
Fattah	Levin	Sabo
Filner	Lewis (CA)	Salmon
Foley	Lewis (KY)	Sanchez
Ford	Linder	Sanders
Fossella	Lipinski	Sandlin
Frank (MA)	LoBiondo	Sanford
Franks (NJ)	Lofgren	Sawyer
Frelinghuysen	Lowey	Saxton
Frost	Lucas (KY)	Scarborough
Gallegly	Lucas (OK)	Schaffer
Ganske	Luther	Schakowsky
Gejdenson	Maloney (CT)	Scott
Gekas	Maloney (NY)	Serrano
Gephart	Markey	Sessions
Gibbons	Martinez	Shadegg
Gilcrest	Mascara	Shaw
Gillmor	Matsui	Shays
Gilman	McCarthy (MO)	Sherman
Gonzalez	McCarthy (NY)	Sherwood
Goode	McCollum	Shimkus
Goodlatte	McCrery	Shows
Goodling	McDermott	Shuster
Gordon	McGovern	Simpson
Goss	McHugh	Sisisky
Graham	McInnis	Skeen
Granger	McIntyre	Skelton
Green (TX)	McKeon	Slaughter
Greenwood	McKinney	Smith (MI)
Gutierrez	McNulty	Smith (NJ)
Gutknecht	Meek (FL)	Smith (TX)
Hall (OH)	Meeks (NY)	Smith (WA)
Hall (TX)	Menendez	Snyder
Hansen	Metcalf	Spence
Hastings (FL)	Mica	Spratt
Hastings (WA)	Millender-	Stabenow
Hayes	Stark	Stark
Hayworth	McDonald	Stearns
Hill (IN)	Miller (FL)	Stenholm
Hill (MT)	Moakley	Strickland
Hill (PA)	Minge	Stump
Hill (SD)	Stupak	Stupak
Hill (VA)	Sununu	Sununu
Hinchey	Moore	Sweeney
Hinojosa	Moran (KS)	Talent
Hobson	Moran (VA)	Tancredo
Hoefel	Morella	Tanner
Hoekstra	Reynolds	Tauscher
Holden	Raderhacher	Tazin
Holt	Rogers	Taylor (MS)
Holston	Rohrabacher	Taylor (NC)
Horn	Rush	Terry
Hostettler	Saxton	Thomas
Hoyer	Scarborough	Thompson (CA)
Houghton	Shaw	Thompson (MS)
Hoyer	Sununu	Thornberry
Hulshof	Sweeney	Thune
Hunter	Tanner	Thurman
Hutchinson	Velazquez	Tiahrt

Tierney	Walden	Weller
Toomey	Walsh	Weygand
Towns	Wamp	Whitfield
Traficant	Waters	Wicker
Turner	Watkins	Wilson
Udall (CO)	Watt (NC)	Wise
Udall (NM)	Watts (OK)	Wolf
Upton	Waxman	Wu
Velazquez	Weiner	Wynn
Vento	Weldon (FL)	Young (AK)
Vitter	Weldon (PA)	Young (FL)

NOES—16

Baldwin	Manzullo	Petri
Barrett (WI)	Miller, George	Ryan (WI)
Coburn	Oberstar	Sensenbrenner
Forbes	Obey	Souder
Green (WI)	Paul	
Kind (WI)	Peterson (MN)	

NOT VOTING—15

Ackerman	Delahunt	Porter
Brady (TX)	Herger	Price (NC)
Capps	Jones (OH)	Visclosky
Clyburn	Meehan	Wexler
Conyers	Mink	Woolsey

□ 1408

Mr. COYNE changed his vote from "no" to "aye".

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.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 329

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 329.

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

There was no objection.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER
AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT
ON H.R. 3194, CONSOLIDATED APPROPRIATIONS AND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 386 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 386

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany 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. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of the conference report addressed in the first section of this resolution, the House shall be considered to have adopted a concurrent resolution consisting of the text printed in section 3.

Sec. 3. The text of the concurrent resolution addressed in section 2 is as follows:

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the enrolled copy of the bill (H.R. 2466) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes,

shall not be presented to the President, to the end that the bill be, and is hereby, laid on the table."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 386 is a typical rule providing for consideration of H.R. 3194, the conference report for the District of Columbia appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and its consideration and provides that the conference report shall be considered as read.

H. Res. 386 also provides that, upon the adoption of the conference report, the text of the concurrent resolution printed in the rule tabling the conference report accompanying the Department of Interior appropriations bill shall be considered as adopted.

Finally, House rules provide 1 hour of general debate divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority member on the Committee on Appropriations and one motion to recommit with or without instructions as is the right of the minority.

Mr. Speaker, this rule and this conference report bring the budget process for the fiscal year 2000 to a close by implementing a bipartisan compromise on the remaining appropriations bills, District of Columbia, Interior, Commerce-Justice-State, Foreign Operations, and Education, Labor, Health and Human Services.

Only three times in the last two decades has the Congress passed all 13 appropriations bills by the fiscal deadline. I point out one was recently when the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) was chairman. It is true that we did not make this deadline this year. However, it is also true that keeping our fiscal house in order does take a little longer than the free-wheeling, big-spending days of the past because we must ensure that all funding is spent efficiently and where it is needed the most.

□ 1415

The conference report before us this afternoon not only holds the line on the President's additional spending requests, but also responsibly funds areas important to every American citizen and protects the American people from waste, fraud and abuse across the entire Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year the Republican Congress made a commitment to end the 30-year raid on Social Security and, according to the Congressional Budget Office, we have now completed that task. The President began the budget negotiations by taking a large step toward our position on the

Social Security issue and joined us in locking away every penny of Social Security. We worked with him in a bipartisan fashion to protect retirement security. We were determined to protect American seniors and this Congress and its leadership denied any piece of legislation on the House floor that spent one penny of it.

To achieve our goal of protecting American seniors and responsibly funding important programs, we are including in this bill a plan to direct every Federal agency to reduce spending by less than one-half of one percent, .38 percent of 1 percent, by routing out waste, fraud, and abuse. Surely the government can save less than about half a penny out of every dollar. This Republican Congress is simply asking those who run Federal agencies to make fiscally responsible budgeting decisions with the money taxed out of our paychecks. We all know the agency directors and executives know where the waste is, and I am relatively certain they will be able to weed out at least that much in savings with this sensible plan.

In addition to meeting the fiscally responsible objectives, this conference report also ensures that our principles of quality and flexibility in the funding for teachers have been met. In the Labor-HHS section of the bill, this Congress ensures that funding may no longer be used to hire unqualified teachers, provides that schools will have more flexibility in using their funding for improving the quality of uncertified teachers, and increases the amount of funding that may be used for professional training for teachers.

The administration pushed for a one-size-fits-all mandate in which Washington controlled the 100,000 New Teachers program. Not every district needs new teachers. Some need better-trained teachers. Other districts need books, high-tech equipment, and updated math and reading programs. I think it is foolish for the Washington bureaucracy to tell every school district in America that Washington knows best how to spend tax dollars to educate our children.

The debate in Washington is not only about money. It is also about how that money should be spent. This bill moves us closer to the right balance of education funding by providing additional funds for America's students through programs like Pell grants and special education while lowering the bureaucratic burden imposed by Washington through programs like Goals 2000.

The Commerce, Justice, State section of the conference report maintains our commitment to enhancing local law enforcement without involving Washington bureaucrats. We also provide funding for 1,000 new border patrol agents, funds for increased criminal and illegal alien detention, and the resources necessary to end the severe naturalization backlog at the INS.

The District of Columbia continues to receive the high level of funding provided in each round of this process. The