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 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

conference report paves the way for dramatic improvement in the education of Washington's children, the safety of our streets, and the management of our Nation's Capital.

H.R. 3194 also brokers a responsible compromise on the environment in the Interior appropriations section of this conference report. Republicans rejected attempts to impose the restrictions of the Kyoto global warming regime on Americans without Senate consideration of the treaty. Nevertheless, the bill maintains our high environmental standards and ensures our air and water will be cleaned into the next millennium.

While I will permit the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to describe fully all the contents of the appropriations bill, I did want to note the inclusion of the satellite copyright legislation about which many of our constituents have expressed concerns during the past year. I am pleased that this bill will provide a new copyright license to satellite television that will allow constituents to receive their local television channels over their satellite service.

In addition, this bill will bring real competition, ensure better prices and choices for our constituents, protect existing subscribers from having their distant network service shut off, and make it easier for consumers to get either a waiver or an eligibility test for distant network service in the event the waiver request is denied. This bill is good for our constituents, and I am pleased to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), each of the subcommittee chairmen on the Committee on Appropriations, and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), for their tireless efforts over the past few weeks to reach an agreement on the budget.

This rule was favorably reported by the Committee on Rules yesterday, I think that might have been this morning, at about 3:30 a.m., and I urge my colleagues to support the bill on the floor so we may proceed with the general debate and consideration of this important conference report.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, at 3:20 a.m. this morning the Committee on Rules was convened to report this rule. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), said at that time that he would like to take the time to explain to the committee what was in this conference agreement, but that to do so might take 4 days. While I know he was engaging in a little hyperbole, I cannot think he was too terribly off the mark.

Mr. Speaker, this rule rolls five appropriation bills, agriculture disaster assistance funding, and $576 million for Hurricane Floyd disaster assistance, all into one bill. The conference agreement also contains a much-needed Medicare reimbursement fix for hospitals and nursing homes, the authorization for the Department of State, which contains terms and conditions that must be met in order for U.S. arrearages to be paid, as well as other matters that were not made clear to the Committee on Rules early this morning.

I am perfectly aware that Members are anxious to end the session of the 106th Congress, but could we not wait an extra hour or 2 to give Members an opportunity to find out what is really in this bill? I am also concerned that this enormous bill is only going to get 1 hour of debate when in fact each one of these bills in it should be considered separately. Evidently, the Republican leadership does not think that it is necessary for Members to know what they are voting on.

This is a very bad way to do business, Mr. Speaker. And no one should be surprised if Members raise objections to considering this rule at this time. While the contents of this omnibus appropriations bill might be known to negotiators from Congress, the White House, and a few select others, most of the Members of this body know what is in the bill only through news reports and summaries.

This is not the first time this has happened, nor will it be the last; but, Mr. Speaker, how hard would it be to give Members of this body a few extra hours to ask questions? The Republican leadership is obviously making contingent plans in case the other body does not act quickly on this conference agreement. The Committee on Rules reported a rule making in order two additional continuing resolutions that will carry us through November 23 and December 2. A few hours more today is not an extraordinary request, Mr. Speaker.

So what is in this bill? There are currently some significant improvements over the earlier appropriations vetoed by the President, and these represent a victory for Democrats and for the people of this country. The Commerce, Justice, State appropriation contains increased funding for the COPS program, increases for the Office of Civil Rights, the EEOC, and for Legal Services.

The Foreign Operations appropriation fully fund the Wye Agreement, allowing the United States to meet its obligations in the Middle East. The Interior appropriation contains increases in funding for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and for Indian schools and tribal community colleges, provides funding for the Lands Legacy program, and deletes the most objectionable riders that have been added to the bill in the Senate.

The Labor-HHS, Education appropriation provides $35.7 billion in funding for one of the top Democratic priorities, class size reduction. This is a major victory for the President and for Democrats in Congress; but even more so, it is a victory for parents and their children and for quality public school education. This conference agreement also includes funding for the Maternal and Child Health Block Grant, for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, and for the Older Americans Act programs.

This bill represents a lot of hard work and many hard-won compromises. However, there is one provision that is problematic for many Members of this House. While the bill funds the arrearages owed to the United Nations, these funds have been won at an extraordinarily high cost, a cost that for some Members may be too high. The fact that this bill trades off payment to the U.N. for family planning around the world is tragic. Women's lives and health are being held hostage, Mr. Speaker; and for many of us in this body, such a situation is deplorable. No one should be surprised if Members vote against this conference agreement because of that issue alone.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this bill does contain an across-the-board cut. Granted, it is far smaller than originally proposed by the Republican majority, but the symbolism is hard to miss. Because this bill has only been whole for a matter of hours, it is doubtful that the Congressional Budget Office has had an opportunity to cost it out. But this across-the-board cut is a fig leaf designed to conceal the fact that gimmicks and bells and whistles have been used to mask the fact that this bill most likely does cut into the Social Security surplus. The White House may have bought into this charade, but this is one Member who understands that in this case the emperor and all his men have no clothes.

Mr. Speaker, this agreement is a mixed bag; and Members should really be given the time to look at it so they can intelligently make a decision about how they want to vote. There is a lot at stake here, and surely it is worth a little more time.

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA).

(Mrs. ROUKEMA asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I want to rise in strong support of the rule as well as the bill.

There are numbers of issues here that are well taken care of in this bill, but I specifically want to say for people in New Jersey that we have not only help here for the victims of Hurricane Floyd, but also for New Jersey farmers who have suffered a terrible drought over the past year or more.

The FEMA use of money in this bill, $250 million, to buy out homes that were severely damaged by Floyd, is very, very necessary in New Jersey;

and it will help to not only have mitigation efforts but also do the buyout of some of these homes.

But I rise particularly today to point out, as a member of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services as well as a member of the board of directors of Bread for the World, that we do have in this bill a wonderful effort to help debt burden relief for those poorest countries, and I think that is very important. I want to commend the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), because it was through his efforts that we were able to get this money in there, help the hungry and the poorest countries of the world, and really help put in place reforms for the next year that will address the questions of transparency in the International Monetary Fund.

But for my part, aside from the fact that this is long overdue to help feed those poor people in the poorest countries, I also want to say that I will continue to track the distribution of that debt relief and ensure that it is not being diverted by corrupt government actions. This is a wonderful activity. We cannot forget these poor people, and it is in the grand tradition of our great country, the United States of America.

Although we have spent many weeks trying to get to this point I believe we have a fair compromise for all. Although there are many items in this bill that I could speak about today there are a few I would like to mention today.

First I am pleased that this bill contains extra funding to help victims of Hurricane Floyd and the disastrous drought suffered by our New Jersey farmers.

This legislation allows FEMA to use $215 million to buyout homes severely damaged by the flood caused by Hurricane Floyd. This is very important to my state of New Jersey where many homes were damaged. This will help relocate some of those homes outside of the natural flood plain.

This bill also has additional funds to help our farmers who have suffered from weather related disasters.

I would also like to put my colleagues on notice—we, in New Jersey, are still tallying the price tag of Floyd. When the totality of the damage from this unprecedented hurricane is determined, we will most likely have to address this issue again early next year. And when we do, I strongly urge my colleagues to address the unique circumstances of small businesses that were damaged by the storm. These small businesses are the economic backbone of many of our communities and need and deserve direct grants to help them back on their feet.

Also I am pleased that this bill contains many of the provisions of H.R. 1402 which implements the Option 1-A milk pricing system that is so important to the small dairy farmers in New Jersey and the northeast. It also extends the dairy Compact for two years.

Finally, I am pleased that this bill advances the international plan to provide debt relief to the world's poorest countries.

Mr. Speaker, I am on the Board of Directors of Bread for the World—one of the distinguished and notable groups that have been spearheading the debt relief movement. Indeed, much of the religious community is urging us to write off some of the unpayable debt of the world's poorest countries during the year 2000. And under the right conditions, it's the right thing to do.

The language Majority Leader ARMEY has negotiated with Treasury is very helpful and I commend him for his efforts. It will increase the impact of the funding the House has already voted to appropriate for the relief of debts that very poor countries owe to the United States. This language will ensure that the International Monetary Fund and other governments also help provide for this debt relief. In addition, I believe it will require accountability to ensure that the monies will be directed to feeding the hungry in these poorest countries.

For my part, I will continue to track the distribution of this debt relief to ensure that it is not being diverted by corrupt government actions.

Mr. Speaker, this language will also give Congress another opportunity next year to push for IMF reform. Many Members—from both parties—agree that the IMF should be more transparent and more accountable—to the taxpayer's of the United States and to people in the countries where it works.

There is also widespread agreement on the basic goal of debt relief—to support economic development and the reduction of poverty in the poorest countries. Treasury, the World Bank and IMF have adopted promising new policies and procedures recently, and Congress will need to be vigilant that these changes really do translate debt relief into help and opportunity for poor and hungry people.

Mr. Speaker, this nonomnibus package is far from perfect. Like many Members, I could find certain parts of this bill problematic. But, we must look at the whole picture. And on the whole this bill is fair.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, once again I want to make clear why I have offered the motions that I have offered for the past 2½ hours. I did so because it was the plan of the leadership to bring the rule and the continuing resolution that just passed, to have that up right away at 10 o'clock, whiz it through the House, immediately move to the rule, which we are now on, and then move immediately to the omnibus appropriation bill, which none of us have read and none of us understand. And that vote would have been taken by noon without even having a single copy of that bill on the floor.

□ 1430

What I was trying to do is to give Members, first of all, enough time to simply get a copy on the floor; secondly, to give our staffs an opportunity to try to determine with greater certainty exactly what is in the authorization attachments and what is not; and thirdly, to develop at least some pieces of information available to rank and file Members so that those Members who were not in the negotiations understand just how replete with gimmicks and replete with fraud this upcoming bill is.

Now, we have done I think as much as we could reasonably do. It has never been my intention once the debate on the bill starts to offer further motions because I think both parties are entitled to lay out their views on that bill without interruption, and I have no intention of making future motions once we get to the bill itself.

I do ask the House, on this bill, to vote against this rule because we have no business doing business this way. We have no business adding nine separate authorization bills to the underlying appropriations bill. We have no business hiding from Members the $45 billion in spending gimmicks that are in these bills.

It just seems to me that the way we should proceed is to have an hour's debate on each of the provisions being added to the appropriations bills so that, whether Members are for them or against them, the House at least has an opportunity to understand what it is doing.

Nobody knows what we are doing on these bills except perhaps a few of the staffers who put them together, I will grant that. But I doubt that any Member is fully aware of all of the provisions in these bills. And we are going to regret a good many of them, I am sad to say.

I would simply say, for instance, that there are pieces of this bill, and this is not true of the appropriation items, but there are other pieces of the bill which we will consider which have not yet been scored by the Congressional Budget Office. We ought to know what they estimate the cost to be before we vote on this bill.

So I would urge my colleagues to vote against the rule.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

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

Mr. Speaker, earlier in dissertation on the floor it was mentioned that the President won something in the area of education. I want to make sure, and I will do this several times this afternoon, that everybody understands that the President did not win anything in education.

The chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce did not win anything in the area of education. The children of the United States won a lot in the area of education. And, above all, the most disadvantaged children in the United States won in the area of education.

When I was able to show to the administration that 50 percent of many of the teachers in the schools in New York City and duplicated in large cities all over the country were totally

uncertified and, beyond that, probably not qualified, some that were certified, they agreed there is no reason to put one more teacher in there. We better get those who are there properly qualified.

When they realized that last year 10 percent of all those new teachers that were hired were totally unqualified, they realized putting one teacher in there was not going to help anything, they better get the people who are there more qualified. And so, we say in that legislation agreed to by the administration that any new hires must be properly qualified and anybody that was hired last year that was not qualified must be qualified within 1 year.

That is why the administration agreed that we should move from 15 to 25 percent in the area of flexibility. That is why the administration agreed that we should move it 100 percent in those school districts where they have all the uncertified and unqualified teachers.

That is why the administration agreed that public school choice should be available to the 7,000 schools that are Title I schools who are not doing anything about improving the quality of their education, and they said those parents should have the right, and we agreed.

We brought it up. They agreed. So nobody won except the children of the United States and, above all, those children who are most disadvantaged.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK).

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about the calendar and explain that Thanksgiving does not come until Thursday, a week, and the ''turkey'' that we are about to consider today is stuffed with a lot of horrendous gifts and failures.

For example, stuffed away in this bill, unknown to many of my colleagues, is a gift of over $500 million a year to drug companies who have their pharmaceutical drugs exempted from certain protections under the Medicare bill. But at the same time we are giving $500 million a year to these pharmaceutical companies, members of the Committee on Ways and Means, all of them, all of the Republicans who were there voted to deny seniors a discount on their prescription drugs.

That means that the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY), and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) all voted to deny the seniors in their district a discount on their prescription drugs, which would have cost the Federal Government not one penny. Yet, grandly, they are going to vote to give $500 million a year to the pharmaceutical companies.

Now, this bill is not paid for. There is a $4 billion gift to the medical providers. Yet it shortens Medicare solvency and raises the Part B premium on all of our seniors by $12.

At the same time, this bill has failed to give Medicaid to children of legal immigrants. Young children are denied medical care if they came to this country after 1996.

Yet, we had a great gift to the Blue Cross/Blue Shield company by weakening quality control standards for managed care under Medicare. We weakened the standards when this same Congress has been unable to finalize the managed care bill of rights. We are doing nothing under the Republican leadership except giving big dollars to the pharmaceutical companies in exchange for their donations, giving big gifts to Blue Cross and for-profit managed care plans who are reaming our seniors.

And yet, in the next bill to be considered, if this turkey that we will consider in the extenders happens to have a bowel movement, we are going to spend $40 million or $30 million a year turning the results of that activity into energy.

I would suggest, if we are going to put up with all this Republican alchemy, why do we not ask these same poultry producers to turn that by-product into gold; and then they might find the $17 billion they cannot find to pay for in this bill and, so, it is going to come out of the Social Security trust fund.

All in all, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) is correct. It is a bill we should not be voting on in the dark. Vote ''no'' on the rule and the bill.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS).

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, the Chairman of Appropriations, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, we are supposed to be talking about a rule. But, obviously, we are into the substance of these measures. There has been a characterization of some of that substance by the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK), and I would like to take just a couple of minutes to set the stage for those of our colleagues who may be nervous about the fact that the body does not know what we are doing in terms of the Medicare reform or that items have been slipped into this bill.

Perhaps the gentleman does not remember that we had a subcommittee mark-up on October 15. We examined the bill at that time and voted it favorably to the full committee.

In between subcommittee passage and the full committee vote, the President wrote a letter to me dated October 19 and said, ''Dear Mr. Chairman, I am writing to respond to your request about administrative actions.''

He goes on and provides an outline for what the administration has been trying to do notwithstanding the Y2K computer problems that the administration has had the day after he signed the Balanced Budget Act of 1997. We were not aware of them prior to signing the bill, but they discovered them immediately after they signed the legislation.

His next-to-last paragraph said this: ''We believe that our administrative actions can complement legislative modifications to refine BBA payment policies. These legislative modifications should be targeted to address unintended consequences of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 that can expect to adversely affect beneficiary access to quality care.''

That was exactly what we did. We targeted it. This is a refinement bill. And on October 21, it passed the full committee with a bipartisan vote. This is not something that was done in the dead of night at 3 a.m. in the morning. It went through the subcommittee. It went through the full committee. And then it came to the floor on November 5. And with 388 Members of the House supporting the very specific provisions that have been characterized as insidious or give-backs or rip-offs, 388 Members of the House voted for it.

But beyond that, after we worked with our sister committee on this side in jurisdiction, the Committee on Commerce, with the Senate Finance Committee, and with the White House to craft an agreement that looked virtually exactly like the House bill, there was a comment by White House representative Chris Jennings, who is identified as the health policy coordinator at the White House, in news stories published on November 11, Mr. Jennings said, ''This is an honorable compromise. It lays down a foundation for more significant Medicare reforms next year.''

It is quite true that the gentleman from California tried to offer a number of killer amendments to fundamentally alter Medicare, to change the entire structure on a modest bill that the President agreed needed to correct some flaws in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 refinements.

No refinement bill could carry the kind of amendments the gentleman from California offered. And clearly, the purpose of those amends was to be able to stand up on the floor and then make a statement that somehow we refused to provide prescription drugs to seniors.

It seems to me that if less of that kind of hyperbole were employed and more of a willingness to work together, as has been indicated by the White House, health care coordinator, we could accomplish much. In a letter dated November 15 that was addressed to the Speaker signed by John Podesta, Chief of Staff to the President of the

United States, in which he said, for example, in the third paragraph, ''As Office of Management and Budget Director Lew indicated in his letter to Mr. Thomas on October 18, findings or clarifications by Congress do not change the law and do not result in scoring. Therefore, the attached clarifying language on the hospital outpatient department policy would not be scored by the OMB. With this in mind, we would not characterize such legislation as having an adverse effect in any way on the Social Security surplus.''

A letter from the White House says it does not affect the Social Security surplus. The comments from the White House people we worked with said it was an ''honorable compromise''. CBO has scored it, and I will put it in the RECORD in terms of the dollar amounts on a 1-year, 5-year, 10-year, in fact, a detailed scoring.

Why anyone would stand up on the floor of this House and characterize the Medicare legislation as reckless or inappropriate, when Democrats that we worked with to put the package together, such as the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), White House representatives, Chief of Staff John Podesta and their health care coordinator say this is an honorable agreement, that we have it scored that it does not affect the important hospital outpatient area, any adverse effect on Social Security, I have got to say it sounds a little desperate on the part of some individuals who voted no in subcommittee, no on the floor, and are voting no now that, frankly, their colleagues do not agree with them.

This is a good package. People are pleased to and it is endorsed by Republicans, some Democrats, most Democrats, 388 votes on the floor of the House, and the White House.

I am pleased to work together with those who want to improve Medicare to make sure that it is better for our seniors today and tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following for the RECORD:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, November 15, 1999.

Hon. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Capitol Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: We are pleased that we have been able to work out a strong, bipartisan agreement on the Balanced Budget Refinement Act of 1999. All parties to the agreement, in particular Mr. Thomas, Mr. Bliley, Mr. Dingell, Mr. Rangel, Mr. Stark, Mrs. Johnson, Mr. McCrery, Senator Roth, Senator Moynihan and Senator Nickles, played critical roles in achieving this outcome. We know that this was as high a priority for you as it has been for the President and we appreciate your leadership.

As you know, a technical drafting change in the BBA has resulted in some confusion over the outpatient payment formula that could result in a reduction in payments. Aside from correcting a payment formula flaw, the hospital outpatient PPS was not designed to impose an additional reduction in aggregate payments. We continue to believe that such a reduction would be unwise. During our deliberations on the balanced Budget Refinement Act, we agreed to resolve any confusion through a Congressional intent clarification provision. Earlier today, language to this effect was worked out between the White House and Mr. Thomas.

As Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Director Law indicated in his letter to Mr. Thomas on October 18, findings or clarifications by Congress do not change the law and do not result in scoring. Therefore, the attached clarifying language on the hospital outpatient department policy would not be scored by OMB. With this in mind, we would not characterize such legislation as having an adverse effect in any way on the Social Security surplus.

Achieving a bipartisan consensus on addressing the unintended consequences of the BBA is an important accomplishment. The President hopes that we can build on this achievement and pass legislation to strengthen and modernize Medicare.

Sincerely,

JOHN D. PODESTA,
Chief of Staff to the President.

Enclosure.

BUDGETARY IMPACT OF THE ''MEDICARE, MEDICAID, AND S–CHIP BALANCED BUDGET REFINEMENT ACT OF 1999''

[In billions of dollars]

Program refinement	CBO estimate	
	5 year	10 year
House-Senate agreement:		
Hospitals	3.4	5.3
Skilled Nursing Facilities	2.1	2.1
Outpatient Therapy Services	0.6	0.6
Home Health & Hospice	1.3	1.4
Dialysis & Durable Medical Equipment	0.3	0.8
Pap Smears & Immunosuppressive Drugs	0.2	0.4
Medicare+Choice	1.9	2.5
Medicaid	0.7	1.2
S–CHIP	0.2	0.4
Part B Interaction and Medicare+Choice Interaction	0.8	1.8
Total spending (reflecting House-Senate agreement) [1]	12.4	17.1
Addition per administration's request:		
Administration's Request for Hospital Outpatient PPS Clarification [2]	3.9	9.6
Total spending (reflecting Administration's request) [1]	16.0	27.0

[1] Components may not add to total due to rounding.
[2] Request detailed in letters from the OMB (10/18/99). Clarification will not be scored by OMB on its baseline.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise reluctantly in opposition to this rule because I believe that it is not fair and it is not in keeping with the great tradition of this House for us to have an open debate and for Congress to work its will on important matters that affect our country.

□ 1445

There are at least nine bills rolled into this bill that this rule is for, five appropriations bills. I do not like to spend a good deal of time talking about process, but when the rule for a bill for at least nine pieces of legislation allows for 1 hour of debate, one-half an hour on each side, that is not serving the American people well.

One of the issues that I wish we could debate more fully if our bill on foreign operations were brought up separately, which it should have been, is the issue of international family planning. I think it is very instructive to the American people to see that the Republican majority in this House was willing to hold hostage the United States international role in the world. The Republican majority was willing to hold hostage the poorest women in the world and their access to family planning. They were willing to hold hostage our position at the United Nations at a time when we are calling out for multilateralism and not the U.S. carrying the full burden.

I think it points to the extremism of the Republican Party that this is, and I point out, my colleagues, this is not about abortion; it is about family planning, that a majority of the Republicans have voted to oppose all funding for all international family planning, that they would take that position and use it against the administration and force the administration's hand to agree to their position in order for us to maintain our vote at the U.N. while we paid our dues.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this rule in the hopes that we could bring back the substantive matters before this House in a fair and open and democratic way.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and wish to set the record straight on the swirling misperceptions that have surrounded the West Virginia delegation's efforts to provide a balance between protecting jobs so essential for our Nation's energy security and protecting our environment at the same time. Over the past several weeks, the national media, environmental organizations, and the White House have engaged in a campaign of misinformation regarding a proposal by the West Virginia congressional delegation to address a coal mining crisis in our State.

Over the years, litigation in the State of West Virginia has resulted in some of the toughest mining reclamation laws in the Nation. Indeed our coal industry in West Virginia operates under greater environmental scrutiny than the industry does in any other State in our Nation. As a result of litigation, environmental plaintiffs entered into a settlement agreement with the United States on matters involving both the Clean Water Act and the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act.

On October 20 of this year, a Federal court decision rendered a rather unique interpretation of the relationship between provisions of the Clean Water Act and SMARA. This interpretation in my view is contrary to congressional intent in enacting the applicable statutes. Our delegation has sought to reaffirm the interpretation of these provisions of law and regulations that have been upheld by the EPA, the Corps of Engineers and the Interior Department. Nothing, and I repeat, nothing in our efforts have sought to undercut the

Clean Water Act. In fact, the provision of our legislation clearly states, and I quote, ''nothing in this section modifies, supersedes, undermines, displaces or amends any requirement or any regulation issued under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.''

I do not know how to better state it, how to make it more clear. Yet despite these facts, a campaign of misinformation has been trumpeted around this Nation and has been unfair to our West Virginia congressional delegation. The White House certainly is to blame. This is unfortunate, because the White House and the President's senior advisors particularly have turned their back on the many hundreds of hard-working men and women whose livelihoods, whose families and whose futures now hang in the balance. These are the individuals who have toiled beneath the surfaces of this Nation in order to provide us energy security that lights this very chamber today.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. WISE).

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and to the final spending bill. There may be many laudable provisions, but unfortunately this bill does not include the important Byrd-McConnell mining amendment that the West Virginia delegation has sought so hard to include. Failure to include the West Virginia delegation's language which would rectify a Federal court decision means months, perhaps even years of uncertainty, uncertainty about whether to enter into coal contracts, uncertainty about whether to make investments in future mining, uncertainty in families' lives about whether they will continue their jobs in the mining industry and, finally, uncertainty, yes, even for the environmental advocates, because there are no final rules of the road.

If this day ends without the important Byrd-McConnell language, I believe, though, we must continue working. First, all parties must agree that the present stay of the court decision has to remain in effect. Second, the DEP and Federal agencies must work together to analyze the full impact of the court's decision. And, third, all parties, mining, State and Federal officials, and environmental representatives must undertake serious negotiations to see if agreement can be reached to deal with the most severe impact of the court's decision.

But, Mr. Speaker, let me make a point. Great progress has been made in improving surface mining. As a result of environmental legislation and a sweeping environmental settlement just months ago, surface mining will never be the same again in the State of West Virginia. So great progress has been made. The question is whether balance will be preserved. And the court's decision takes it too far the other way. The important Byrd-McConnell language would guarantee that there would be balance, that gains in regulating mining would be preserved and at the same time the important mining jobs, particularly in those areas of high unemployment, would be preserved.

Mr. Speaker, mountaintop removal will never be conducted the same again. That is already a given. The Byrd-McConnell language, though, would guarantee that as we improve regulation in mountaintop removal, we do not automatically result in job removal. I wish this language had been included.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me this time.

I reluctantly have to rise in opposition to this rule. I want to at least explain why. Early in the process we were told that there was not going to be an omnibus bill. We now know that that is not true. We were also told that very controversial issues would not be included in the final bill. We know that is not true, either. But part of the reason I have to rise in opposition to this rule is I remember several years ago when one of my favorite Presidents stood right there and he held up a bill that weighed about 45 pounds and he dropped it on the desk right here with a big thud, and he said, Congress should not send bills like this to my office, and he said, and if they do, I will veto them. He did not keep that promise. He probably should have.

But in many respects, we all know, everybody in this body knows it is wrong to have these omnibus bills where we throw almost everything into it. If anybody here can say with an honest expression on their face that they know what everything is in that bill, well, God save you. We know that there is a lot of stuff in that. We are going to read over the next several months about issues that are in the bill, and we are going to be embarrassed by it.

But I am most embarrassed about what is happening to the dairy farmers in the upper Midwest. Every morning at 4:30 lights go on all over the upper Midwest, 3,000 in my district. Nobody works harder than dairy farmers, and this is a knife in the back to those people. For 62 years they have labored under the yoke of an unfair milk marketing order system, and this leadership has knifed them in the back in the 11th hour in a back-room deal. I can live with the outcome if we have regular order. I understand democracy. If we have an honest up or down vote and we lose in the House; we have an honest up or down vote and we lose in the Senate, I can live with that. That is called democracy. But when it is done at the 11th hour by a handful of leaders in a back-room deal, well, I cannot live with that, and I cannot vote for a rule that would support it.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support this conference report and to commend my colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) specifically, and those in the administration for their efforts. Bringing this package to the floor has not been easy. I want to applaud the patience and the determination both sides showed in reaching this agreement. I reluctantly opposed the conference report for the Interior appropriations bill earlier in the year because of numerous anti-environmental provisions that were attached by the other body. Thankfully we have removed or modified nearly all of those riders and significantly improved the Interior bill.

Additionally, though, through our negotiations with the White House, we were able to increase funding levels for some key programs that will better protect our environment. In the last few weeks, we negotiated millions of additional dollars for the President's land legacy initiative to protect sensitive or threatened lands in this country. The administration and Congress should be proud of the benefits this compromise means to our public lands.

Funding was included in both the Commerce Department as well as the Interior Department to help my State and three other West Coast States address the recent salmon listings under the Endangered Species Act. Funding for these programs was my top priority. I want to sincerely thank the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) for working with me to provide these critical funds that will help our State protect and restore West Coast salmon provisions.

Additionally, funds were included to help implement the recently negotiated treaty between the United States and Canada that will aid our efforts to recover these fish by substantially reducing their harvest. I regret that the conference agreement did not provide the requested increase for the National Endowment for the Arts, but appreciate the modest increase for the National Endowment for the Humanities. I believe there is strong public support for both of the endowments and wish the funding levels to the arts better reflected that support.

Again I wish to warmly thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) for his tireless work on the Interior appropriations bill. These negotiations were lengthy and tedious, but he demonstrated extraordinary leadership and was instrumental in bringing this agreement to the floor today.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak out in opposition to not only this rule but to this final

bill for many reasons, but chief among those reasons why I am opposing this rule and why I am opposing this bill is because of the dairy policy provisions contained within this bill. Blame can be spread all over the place. The President did not adequately protect his own agency's reform. The majority of Congress swept against us.

The point is this: we are preserving a 62-year-old antiquated program that pays a farmer more for the price of milk he produces the farther away from Eau Claire, Wisconsin, he lives. This Congress, which is elected to defend the Constitution, freedom, this Congress which contains most Members of Congress who proclaim to be in favor of free market principles, are voting in this bill to destroy those very free market principles. What I say to those Members of Congress from the Northeast, from the South, you like milking cows, I understand that, ''Just don't milk our dairy farmers in the upper Midwest.''

The problem with this bill is that half of this dairy policy never came to this body. It did come to the Senate and it was defeated. So why on earth are we dealing with this legislation in this big appropriations bill? This should be done through regular order. It should not be done in this appropriations bill. Worst of all, it pits one, two, three regions of dairy farmers against one region, the upper Midwest. We simply want a chance to compete fairly on a level playing field in the upper Midwest, and we are being deprived of that because of this legislation that is being tacked onto this bill like a giant, ugly ornament on a big Christmas tree.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members of this body to vote against this bill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. There is so much to say and so little time, but I would like to focus on two specific items of importance to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I consider the health-related provisions of this bill to be a mixed bag. I am extremely pleased to see that Congress is continuing its commitment to double the budget of the National Institutes of Health over 5 years. This is the lifesaving research which families fighting cancer and other dread diseases are depending on. The bill increases the NIH budget by another 15 percent, raising it from $15.6 billion last year to $17.9 billion in fiscal year 2000.

□ 1500

But, unfortunately, the shell game continues in order to pay for this spending.

The bill delays the release of $4 billion of the NIH appropriations until September 29, 2000. Twenty of our colleagues wrote to the conferees urging them not to take this action, because medical research is not a faucet that can be turned off and on. No disease will wait for a clinical trial to get to the next round of funding. A colony of bacteria is not going to hibernate until the researcher receives the promised grant. Frankly, I am not too sure the researcher will stick around either. I am deeply concerned about the impact of this delayed appropriations on vital medical research.

In addition, I am appalled that Congress and the administration have conspired to imperil the health and welfare of women across the world by attaching onerous conditions to international family planning spending. Under this bill, United States funds are not only barred from going to groups that perform abortions directly or indirectly, but also to any group that lobbies in any way regarding governmental policies on abortion. An organization could even be barred from informing a government how many women were being harmed by unsafe or botched abortions, not just lobbying for abortion rights.

If the President uses his authority to waive this provision, international family planning funds are cut by 3 percent. At that point, thousands of women will not receive birth control, leading to unintended pregnancies and abortions. It is simply beyond my grasp how abortion opponents believe that policies like this one help their cause.

This provision will not prevent a single abortion. It will only cause more and more dangerous abortions to occur. A woman in the Third World dies every 3 minutes. Surely that is the harshest kind of birth control, and we will be prevented from telling them how to prevent unintended pregnancy.

I am pleased that the bill makes progress in restoring the unexpectedly deep cuts made in Medicare reimbursement to hospitals, home care and other facilities under the Balanced Budget Act. Although the relief provided itself is modest, it will make a major difference in my district of Rochester, New York, in enabling our health care community to continue to provide world class care.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, what I think is important to note today as this House appears poised apparently to vote for this bill with the anti-dairy reform in it, is it is important to point out why it was added to this bill.

It was added to this bill because these anti-reform provisions could not pass Congress in the normal fashion. Extension of the compact and 1(a) have not passed both Houses of Congress. Right now, there is a fight going on in the Senate that I think proves that point. Because they could not pass it in the normal fashion, they had to add it in the wee hours of this debate. That is unfortunate, but maybe it means that there is hope for those of us who believe in free market reforms. Maybe it shows to us, the fact that they have to try to get it done this way, maybe it shows us that there are more people behind us than we realized.

I can only hope that in the future, if given a chance to proceed in the normal order, maybe, just maybe, we will prevail, and maybe, just maybe, we will have true dairy reform.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and to the final bill. Where does a promise mean nothing anymore? Right here on the floor of the House of Representatives. Where is one of the last remaining vestiges of a Soviet style, state-controlled economic industry? Right here in the blessed United States of America, with a depression-era Federal milk marketing order policy. Unfortunately, because of a last minute deal brokered behind closed doors, the first significant step to reform an antiquated, senseless dairy policy will be blocked by language contained in this bill.

Just a couple of months ago, Mr. Speaker, I had a meeting with some of the leaders in the Republican Party on the House floor, where they promised me and other representatives that they would not allow any anti-dairy reform legislation to be attached to one of the year-end spending bills. But we wake up this morning and, lo and behold, there it is. Promises made, promises broken. And you would think an administration whose own reform proposals are under attack after three years of exhaustive work would stand a little more firm and fight for it, but that did not happen.

Now, it is never fun or pleasant to hold up the business of the House with delay tactics, and it is unfortunate we have had to resort to that tactic today. But I for one am willing to stay here until the cows come home, until we get this budget right, right for the American people, and right for the family farmers across the country.

For those of you who believe in budget integrity and fiscal discipline, there are a number of reasons for voting against it. It is $35 billion over the spending caps from the 1997 budget agreement. We are dipping into the Social Security surplus by $17 billion to $18 billion according to our own Congressional Budget Office. We have done absolutely nothing to extend the solvency of Social Security and Medicare by one day in this budget. To top it all off, we are milking family farmers across the country and consumers and taxpayers with this 11th hour, backroom deal that will prohibit reform of a depression-era national dairy policy.

We can do a lot better. I think the American people demand that we do a lot better.

I would encourage my colleagues to vote no on this budget agreement. Let us start over, let us get it right, and then let us go home.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the bill, and particularly want to call attention to the Medicare ''salvation'' section. It is really a testament to the vitality of our democracy.

This Medicare salvation section is the direct result of a lot of us getting out there, visiting our nursing homes, talking to the people who run them and hearing from seniors who were being denied critical care because of mistakes made in past legislation or in administration policy.

Let me tell you, democracy is not a spectator sport, and this bill reflects that truth. Members of the subcommittee were out there, other Members of Congress were out there, and our chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), whose very bright mind and big heart wrote this bill, also took the time to get out there into the facilities and talk with the seniors. That enabled us to build a very precise effective package, providing relief to hospitals, home health care agencies and nursing home facilities.

And it is a very fine job we've done. It helps all of our providers, but it does not fundamentally step back on this Congress' commitment to save Medicare in the long run, from financial crisis, and to be there for our seniors with quality health care.

I just want to say that while the administration was very helpful and has really worked with us in many ways, it is unfortunate that the process, because it costs money, does not allow them to make specific proposals to help us. We did all of this, and it was heavy lifting, just as Members, listening to seniors and care providers and putting together an honest package that goes right to the heart of the problem and addresses it.

Members can take great pride in having saved Medicare quality health care for our seniors. As we go home, we can help our hospitals, nursing homes and health care agencies understand this expansion of resources and provide the care our seniors richly need and deserve.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 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 thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, this is what I have been trying to do in the last few minutes, is to review what this House has brought to the American people and calling it a budget, that has who knows what and does not address many of the concerns that the American people have asked them to address.

Just as an example, Mr. Speaker, this is what part of the bill looks like, lines drawn through, scribbles being made, and no one knows what was in it and what is out of it.

My concern, Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, and this rule concerns me and I rise to oppose the rule, is that what we have is a mishmash that includes a number of addendums that have nothing to do with the appropriation process.

The satellite issue is an important issue that I would argue that we needed to support. The State Department authorization is likewise very important, and I have fought long and hard for Medicare help for our hospitals and health providers and will continue to fight for that. But we do not have a Patients' Bill of Rights, we do not have the protection of seniors for prescription drugs, and we have two inserts on the family planning issue typed up that deny family planning for women around the world.

Though I am certainly concerned about those who have a different view from me, I am likewise concerned about developing nations where women will be violated, intimidated, forgetting family planning because of this legislation.

I can say that I am gratified that my office worked to increase the amount of money for mental health services in the Community Mental Health Program, but I do say we are doing a tragic injustice to have Members be responsible for voting for a bill whose paperwork has yet to come to the floor and who has given us the responsibility of reading this within the few hours that we have.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad rule, this is a bad process, and I am sorely disappointed that this is what we have come to. We need to go back to work and present to the American people the kind of legislative initiative that will be warranted of this country and this Congress.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT)

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and support of the bill. First of all, I want to say how much I appreciate the work of the appropriators. The new chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), has done a tremendous job at a time when we are really laying out some new rules for appropriations, and all the members of appropriations on both sides of the aisle have worked hard to try to redefine this culture of what we are trying to achieve: A balanced budget, without spending Social Security.

We have heard a lot of debate about whose numbers may be right, whose predictions may be right. We really did not debate those things. Apparently the Congress did not debate them for 40 years, because we did not have a balanced budget without spending Social Security and nobody seemed to care.

It is great that we are down now to debating whose projection about income may be the closest to accurate next September, because that is really the projection date that counts. I am convinced we are not going to spend for the second year in a row a penny of Social Security income.

I like the way the committee put this package together. It is a big package, but it is a package of individual bills. You can go to each of those bills and see exactly what was in them, and what is in them are the items that should be in them. This is not a package that people have put things in that should not be there or are not understood to be there.

Social Security was not spent. That gives us a chance to really look at the future of Social Security. We cannot really talk about Social Security reform if we cannot stop spending the trust fund.

Somebody said the problem with the Social Security trust fund has been there was no trust and there is no fund. Well, this restores both of those concepts.

The balanced budget adjusters do tremendous things for home health care, for rural hospitals. This is a good bill, this is a good rule. I urge my colleagues to support both.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY).

Mr. FOLEY. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, for my colleagues who insist they do not know what is in this bill, they have not been paying attention during regular order, because within this bill are the multitude of bills that have been discussed in committee, discussed on this floor, and now rolled into one bill as we leave this process.

The others that suggest somehow we are dipping into the Social Security trust fund, the only reason we are here still is because the President keeps asking for more money, more spending, more funds for programs that he needs.

Now, some have suggested somehow we have been held hostage on international family planning. The President of the United States agreed to that provision in the bill.

Now, let us talk about why some people will vote against the fine bill here today. I challenge them to vote against increasing funding to Medicare choice. Organ transplant patients will have an extended coverage on anti-rejection drugs. Vote no to that today. I urge you to today.

Rehabilitation services, increasing therapy caps, something we have heard complaint after complaint from our citizens about, the need to increase physical therapy and rehabilitation.

Women's health. Pap smear tests now and cervical cancer screenings. Go ahead and vote against those fine initiatives. I challenge you to do it.

Increased flexibility for rural hospitals. Cancer hospitals, ensures that cancer hospitals will not face any reduction due to new outpatient prospective payment systems.

Changing the prospective payment system for hospital outpatients. Nursing home skilled facilities will be, in fact, have increased patients.

Home health care, reduce the scheduled reduction and increase benefit caps for some citizens.

Hospice care. Matt Lauer and I and several others were with hospice this week in Palm Beach County raising money for hospice.

□ 1515

This bill includes an increase in hospice coverage. Tell your hospice friends that you rejected this bill today because, I do not know why, but increased funding for them.

Teaching hospitals for New York and other places who have been belly-aching about not enough money for teaching hospitals. Thanks to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) and the Committee on Ways and Means, we have increased money for teaching hospitals. Durable equipment, increased senior access to durable equipment. Rural health care. On and on goes the list. For my Floridians who say they are going to vote against the bill, they are going to be voting against $142 million for Everglades restoration. Go back and tell that to the Floridians who depend on the Everglades for water. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and go home and explain that.

Indian programs. You name the list of things that are accomplished in this bill through the hard work of the committee in order to make this a better country. Money for national forests, bettering education, continuing our commitment to block grants. On and on goes the list of fine things in this bill.

Those that live in rural farming areas, please pay special attention, because in this bill is a $178 million loan authorization for disaster relief, okay? My colleagues can go home and face their farmers this weekend and explain to them that they voted against this very important provision, if they have experienced a drought. Anyone from North Carolina, anyone from Florida, I urge you to go home and tell your farmers you had a chance to help them today and you chose not to from a partisan perspective. Juvenile accountability. On and on goes the list.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support the rule, support the bill. It is a good bill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, let me simply address two points, since other Members have also addressed the dairy issue.

I believe that in this House a handshake is as good as a contract, and I believe that the day that one's word ceases to be one's bond is the day that we lose something very precious in this democratic institution.

I was told in August and again in September, and this was confirmed by one of the two Members of the Republican leadership 3 days ago in a conversation with me, I was told that if I would cooperate procedurally on appropriation bills with the majority, they would assure me that no extraneous dairy provision would be attached to any appropriation vehicle. The three key words were ''any appropriation vehicle.'' That promise has now been violated. I think that says more about the people who violated it than it says about anybody else in this institution. I deeply regret it.

I find it incredibly ironic that at a time when people are cheering with great huzzahs over the World Trade Organization-China deal, when they are earnestly pushing for free trade internationally, they are supporting internal trade barriers to the free flow of dairy products in the United States. That is absurdly old-fashioned, and no self-respecting free marketeer should be supporting it.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 18, 1999]

LOTT HAS A COW

There are a million stories inside the Beltway, most of which the pols don't want you to know. But we thought you might be amused by the one about Trent Lott, dairy queen.

As Public Works Chair . . . sorry, Senate Majority Leader, Mr. Lott has already built himself a pork-barrel legacy for the Mississippi ages. But who would have thought his largess was big enough for all New England? There's apparently nothing the guy won't do to re-elect a fellow ''singing senator,'' in this case the liberal James Jeffords of Vermont.

Vermont has lots of dairy farmers, most of whom are much less efficient than those in the Upper Midwest. Worse yet, Congressional permission for a six-state price-fixing dairy cartel known as the Northeast Compact is about to expire. So Mr. Jeffords who is running for a third term next November, got hold of Mr. Lott, who promised to jam an extension past an otherwise reluctant Senate.

Never mind that this milks consumers to the tune of about 20 extra cents a gallon. (Milk consumed by the same ''poor children'' who liberals like Mr. Jeffords and Vermont Democrat Pat Leahy are constantly invoking to sell their new programs.) Never mind that the Senate voted down and extension earlier this year.

And never mind that in the process of helping Mr. Jeffords, Mr. Lott is sticking a shiv in the back of another vulnerable GOP incumbent, Rod Grams of Minnesota. ''I guess Jeffords is in a tough race,'' Mr. Grams told us ruefully. ''But it can't be tougher than mine. And this is going to hurt me back in Minnesota, because it will hurt our farmers.''

Mr. Lott likes to complain that he lacks a real conservative majority. Yet Mr. Jeffords is a routine apostate, agreeing with Ted Kennedy on demand, while Mr. Grams is a reliable conservative. It's nice to know how much Mr. Lott values ideological loyalty when he's doling out backroom favors.

Not that Mr. Lott deserves all of the credit. He has help in the House, where Speaker Dennis Hastert has caved in to Missouri Rep. Roy Blunt's attempt to gut the free market dairy reforms that Congress urged on a reluctant Clinton Administration as recently as 1996. Mr. Blunt's affront would add another 16 cents or so to a gallon of milk around the country. Mr. Lott wants to ram this into the end-of-session budget bill too.

Beyond the muscle politics, all of this is one more embarrassing sign that Republicans seem to have kicked over the reform stool. They're mainly into incumbent protection now. Messrs. Blunt and Lott are supposed to be GOP leaders. But the difference between them and Dick Gephardt is more and more a matter of whose special interest gets gored.

As of this writing, Mr. Grams and Wisconsin Democrat Herb Kohl were promising to filibuster the Lott-Jeffords-Blunt cartel plans. But the way these things usually go, the dissenters get run over by the Members stampeding to leave town to brag about all of the pork they just voted to deliver. Cowabunga, Trent.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 17, 1999]

GOP CHIEFS SOUR ON MILK REFORM—WHITE HOUSE, WISCONSIN'S KOHL BALK AT LOTT-HASTERT AGREEMENT

(By Michael Grunwald)

Three years after Congress ordered the Agriculture Department to revamp the nation's convoluted system for setting milk prices, Republican leaders agreed yesterday to send a new message to the department: Never mind.

Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott (R–Miss.) and House Speaker J. Dennis Hastert (R–Ill) settled on language undoing the department's modest market-oriented dairy reforms and largely preserving the depression-era ''Eau Claire system'' that sets milk prices according to distance from Eau Claire, Wis. They also agreed to a two-year extension of the controversial Northeast Dairy Compact, a regional milk cartel that sets prices even higher in New England.

But the last minute maneuvering faced stiff opposition from the White House, which warned that plans to attach the dairy provisions to a giant year-end spending bill could jeopardize the entire budget deal. ''It would create all sorts of obstacles,'' said presidential spokesman Jake Siewert, who noted that Clinton had promised to veto other spending bills including the milk language.

The upshot of the proposal—which lott pushed on behalf of Sen. James M. Jeffords (R–Vt.), who is up for reelection in 2000—would be a bitter defeat for dairy farmers in the upper Midwest, a huge victory for dairy farmers in the Northeast, and a status-quo solution to a battle that could have resulted in lower prices for consumers. Sen. Herb Kohl (D–Wis.) yesterday vowed a last-ditch effort to hold up congressional business to block the deal, and he could have assistance from the administration.

''This is a very big thing for us, and I'm going to do whatever I need to do to try to make sure this doesn't happen,'' said Kohl, who noted that his state has 25,000 dairies, compared with 3,000 for all of New England.

The byzantine Eau Claire system was designed to ensure that every region of the country maintained a local supply of fresh milk, at a time when it was not possible to transport milk long distances in refrigerated trucks. The 1996 farm bill, touted as an effort

to introduce free-market principles to America's farm economy, required the Clinton administration to propose a replacement for the Eau Claire regime. And while it authorized the Northeast Compact, it set its expiration date for this year.

Now Congress appears set to change its mind.

The Agriculture Department plan, which was supposed to go into effect last month before it was held up by a lawsuit in Vermont, would have smoothed out the formulas that favor farmers farther away from Eau Claire. Consumer advocates estimated that it would have cut milk prices by at least 2 cents a gallon nationally, saving consumers $185 million to $1 billion a year and saving taxpayers $42 million to $149 million on food programs. But the House passed a bill last month to suspend the new plan, and congressional leaders have agreed to include a version of that bill in the overall budget agreement. And yesterday's deal will extend the compact until February 2001.

Kohl complained that maintaining the status quo would mean maintaining an unfair playing field, providing government protection to help inefficient dairies compete with midwestern farmers. John Czwartacki, a spokesman for Lott, cautioned that no deal is final until the budget agreement is complete, but he suggested that midwestern senators such as Kohl and Rod Grams (R–Minn.), who also is up for reelection, will be unable to stop it.

''It's all done but the fireworks,'' Czwartacki said. ''I'm sure people will voice their unhappiness in tried and true ways. But on this issue, you can't make everyone happy.''

Not even the regional alliance of compact supporters—who include likely New York Senate candidate Hillary Rodham Clinton, but not her husband—got everything it wanted. It did not get a permanent extension of the Northeast Compact. And the agreement did not create a Southern Compact. Still, Kohl vowed yesterday to protest the deal by filibustering anything that hits the floor. And Grams warned that he might force the Senate clerk to read the entire budget bill aloud, which could take days.

''We have the government picking winners and losers, and that's wrong,'' Grams said. ''It's the whole country ganging up on the Midwest.''

The Agriculture Department proposals, while somewhat more market-oriented that the current system, would have maintained the government's guarantee of a minimum milk price in all regions. But according to Christopher Galen, spokesman for the National Milk Producers Federation, they would have cost dairy farmers across the country about $200 million a year, at a time when prices have dropped precipitously after several good years.

''We know people are upset in the Midwest, but we think this deal would create a rising tide that will lift almost all dairy farmers,'' said Galen, whose organization took no position on the compacts.

I also want to note that this bill is replete with gimmicks. This bill walks away from the majority party commitment to stick to the budget caps; it walks away from their ''let-us-pretend'' argument that they are saving Social Security; it hides $45 billion in budgetary sleight of hand.

We have in this bill, first of all, in spending that is not counted by Congress, $17 billion, $17 billion. We then have in so-called emergency spending, which is another way of avoiding the spending caps, we have over $11 billion in outlays; again, spending that is hidden in terms of whether or not it is going to be counted against the so-called budget limits that my Republican colleagues promised to live by in their own budget resolution.

Then we have what is called ''delayed outlays.'' What this really means is that we legally delay spending until the final days of the fiscal year, so it is not counted this year, but it is still spent. That accounts for $4.2 billion. Then we have what is called ''advance appropriations,'' spending that illegally counts spending against last year, even though it is available for this year, and that comes in at $2.4 billion. Then we have other gimmicks worth $9.9 billion. This from the new centurions who came in this place 5 years ago promising that under the Republican Party, things were going to be different. They are different. They have gotten worse.

So it seems to me, as I said earlier, this would be laughable if it was not so corrosive of the public's ability to believe what we are doing.

LIST OF GIMMICKS IN APPROPRIATIONS BILLS

[in millions of dollars]

	BA	O
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:		
DOD—Delay contractor payments	0	−1,250
Labor HHS—Delayed Obligations $5.0 B in BA delayed until 9/29/00	.....	−1,674
VA medical care delay obligation of $900 M	.....	−720
FO—Delayed obligations	.....	−104
CJS—Delayed availability of balances in Crime Victims Fund until after FY 2000	−485	−485
Rescind section 8 housing funds	−1,300	0
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 billion)	−10,100	−532
HUD—section 8 advance appropriation for FY 2001 (37% of program total)	−4,200	0
Subtotal	−16,136	−2,368
Miscellaneous Special Accounting Gimmicks		
Across the Board cut 0.38%	−2,143	−1,206

LIST OF GIMMICKS IN APPROPRIATIONS BILLS—Continued

[in millions of dollars]

	BA	O
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—HEATH loan recapture	.....	−27
United Mine Workers Combined Benefit Fund	−68	−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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time of the minority has expired.

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) has 30 seconds remaining.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LINDER

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LINDER:

At the end of the first section of the resolution add the following:

The conference report shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the conference report to final adoption without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the amendment to the rule, and I move the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin will state it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am trying to understand what the import of the previous motion was. I understand that this is the method which will gag us and prevent any further motions being offered in protest to the rule that is brought before us. That is the effect of the gentleman's motion. It is, in fact, a new gag order, which will prevent us from doing anything except obediently moving toward passage of the bill. I am not going to contest it, but I think people need to know what it is. It is another symptom of how this House is run.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman from Georgia managing the rule is offering an amendment to the rule.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the amendment and on the resolution.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 204, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 608]

YEAS—226

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boucher
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Coble
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Foley
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
Meek (FL)
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pastor
Paul
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—204

Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coburn
Condit
Costello
Coyne
Crowley
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dickey
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Forbes
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sherman
Shows
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—4

Brady (TX)
Capps
Conyers
Wexler

□ 1543

Messrs. BONIOR, DICKEY, MATSUI, FLETCHER, BALDACCI, HINCHEY, WEYGAND, Ms. MALONEY of New York and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1598

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1598.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

□ 1545

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 386, I call up the conference report on 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, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of November 17, 1999, Part II.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany H.R. 3194, 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.

Mr. Speaker, we are coming to the successful conclusion of a long road toward completion of our fiscal responsibilities. I thank my friend and colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for calling for order in the House. I want to say ''thank you'' to him for the many, many long hours and long days we have spent together during this process as the House concluded its work on 13 separate appropriations bills.

Mr. Speaker, the bills that are included in this conference report today, all of these bills, have gone before the House in one form or another. They have also gone before the House as part of a conference report. Most of those bills have not even been changed to