

It was an incredible fifty years ago that SID first won his seat in Congress. I was a high school senior at the time, undecided about my future in the post World War II period.

Over the years since, both SID and I have worked hard together in support of numerous projects involving many issues for the betterment of Illinois citizens. And I must say that Chicagoans have long been appreciative of SID's remarkable ability as Chairman of the Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations to bring to the Windy City large allocations of funds for many important projects. Literally he has been able to win billions for the city and for Illinois in projects such as the Chicago Shoreline Project, the Navy Pier Restoration Project, the Indiana Dunes Land Acquisition Project, the Chicago Cultural Center—in addition to many specific public works projects of importance to Chicago.

Moreover, as one of this country's earliest environmentalists, SID YATES will be remembered fondly by many across the land as the prime mover in the creation of many national parks, as well as in the preservation of wildernesses, scenic rivers, seashore and lakeshore projects, for all Americans to enjoy. Each one of these projects stands as a testimony to SID's long dedication to keep America beautiful.

These are just some of the accomplishments of my good friend who has represented the Ninth District of Illinois so ably and for so many years. His record has continually won him the admiration of his Congressional colleagues, who will surely miss him in the years ahead.

Because we were of different political parties, SID and I have not always, of course, concurred on all the issues. Over the years, we have particularly had disagreement regarding the NEA. However, all of our exchanges of opinions on the floor have always been marked by cordiality and comity. Indeed I have always enjoyed our debates in the House chamber.

I rise with my fellow Illinois delegation members to salute SIDNEY YATES for his incomparable half-century of dedication and accomplishment in the halls of Congress—a most admirable record which should well serve as a model for new members as they arrive and take up their tasks in this hallowed House. We hope he will find time on occasion to grace the House floor with this presence, so that those of us who remain may be reminded that his many past examples of collegiality and hard work should still remain important to this body.

Mr. LIPINSKI. I thank the gentleman.

I would just like to say, in concluding this special order honoring SID YATES, that there has not been a finer Member of the House of Representatives in its history than SIDNEY R. YATES of Illinois.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4104, TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 563 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 563

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 4104) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, 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.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), 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, the proposed rule for the conference report to accompany H.R. 4104, the Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Appropriations bill for the fiscal year 1999, waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration. The rule provides that the conference report will be considered as read.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying legislation, which makes the appropriations for the Treasury Department, the Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year 1999, is very, very important legislation. Nearly 90 percent of the activities funded under this bill are devoted to the salaries and expenses of approximately 163,000 employees who are responsible for administering programs such as drug interdiction, Presidential protection, violent crime reduction, and Federal financial management. I would encourage my colleagues to support the rule as well as the conference report.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank my dear friend, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS), for yielding me the customary half-hour.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleagues the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. STENY HOYER) for their very hard work on this bill and congratulate them on nearing the finish line.

This year's Treasury, Postal appropriations conference report provides \$13.44 billion, which is slightly more than last year's bill. This conference report will provide substantial funding for Federal law enforcement, the Customs Service, the United States Mint, the Secret Service, the General Services Administration and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms. It is money that is much needed and will, to a large extent, be put to very good use.

It also fully funds the Office of the National Drug Control Czar, which is so critical to curbing the tide of illegal drugs that is still endangering our

country's economy and our constituents' safety.

Today's conference report also fixes the problem with pay for Federal fire fighters. And without this language, Mr. Speaker, Federal fire fighters would continue to be paid much less than their municipal and civil service counterparts.

After watching Federal, local and State fire fighters battling the huge fires of Florida and elsewhere, to the point of exhaustion, I can say without hesitation, Mr. Speaker, these people do deserve a raise. And if we cannot give them that, the very least we can do is make sure that all fire fighters are paid about the same money. They all risk their lives for our safety, whether the truck on which they ride has a State seal or a Federal seal. This bill will fix that inequality, which I am very happy to see.

But, Mr. Speaker, there are some more serious problems with this conference report, and one of the most troubling aspects of this bill is its provision which will basically fire the general counsel of the Federal Election Commission. It does so, Mr. Speaker, by imposing term limits, but the effect is to fire somebody who has been working very hard to protect the integrity of the American electoral process.

Mr. Speaker, I am sad to say that common wisdom is that this person is being fired because he investigated GOPAC and the Christian Coalition and, in doing so, has angered some very high ranking Republicans. I do not need to tell anybody here, Mr. Speaker, that the Treasury, Postal appropriations conference report is no place to exact political vengeance, particularly against someone who was only doing his job.

The Federal Election Commission is the agency that watches over elections. It polices Federal campaigns, making sure that candidates and interest groups are raising and spending money within the bounds of the law, regardless of which party they represent. The Federal Election Commission and its employees are charged with making sure that our campaigns are fair and that the American people are heard, and its employees should be protected from partisan attacks.

So a partisan firing of upper level staffers could have widespread ramifications for fair elections all across these United States, and I will oppose the bill for that reason.

Also, Mr. Speaker, two members of the other body feel so strongly about this issue that they have promised to filibuster if it is not resolved.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this is the third rule which we have done for some version of this bill. And with every rule, my Republican colleagues promise to address the pending computer meltdown known as Y2K.

□ 1945

Well, here we are again, Mr. Speaker. It has been three months and still

there is no emergency supplemental appropriation bill funding the \$2.25 billion we need to begin solving this problem.

Mr. Speaker, if we ignore this, it is not going to go away. Most Americans believe it is our government's job to deal with this problem. And Mr. Speaker, for us that time has come. If we do not act soon, all sorts of calamities could befall us.

The stock market may drop. Air traffic control systems may falter. Our national defense monitors could lapse. Social Security checks and Medicare payments may not go out. There could be electrical blackouts and brownouts. Telephone bills could be filled with mistakes. Mutual funds and money markets could fail. Medical equipment might not work. The list just goes on and on and on.

Mr. Speaker, the money to address this problem was in here once. There was \$2.25 million in this bill to prevent that chaos that might reign from the airports to the hospitals, from the stock market to the grocery stores, when that ball drops in Times Square on December 31.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the House even voted for a motion to instruct conferees which directed them to have the money for Y2K, but still the money is not there. In fact, they even went so far as to take it out, Mr. Speaker. They took it out of this bill. They took it out of the defense bill.

However, Mr. Speaker, I do commend my colleagues on the Treasury, Postal conference committee for their hard work. They have had to juggle a lot of competing programs in many ways. In many ways this otherwise could be a very good bill.

But, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill for its attacks on our electoral integrity, and its failure to address the computer problem which is threatening to bring every aspect of American life to its knees.

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

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I see we are off to a energetic evening here with the nice buzz words, "term limits" and "Y2K." Of course those are words that the American public understands.

But let us clarify exactly what we are talking about here. First of all, we are not imposing term limits. What we are saying is, hey, every 4 years their job performance is going to be reviewed, and if they have 4 votes in the majority that say they are doing a good job, they keep their job. If they do not, they are out of work.

Now, the average person that is watching us today, the average person that we represent out there goes through a job performance review. And we are saying, with the Federal Election Commission, they are going to go through a job performance review. Just because they oversee our elections does

not mean that they are immune, that they somehow get tenure over there. We are not for granting them tenure. We are saying, do their job and they keep their job. So do not say it is term limits.

Now this Y2K problem, Mr. Speaker, come on. In my opinion that is a cheap shot. It is in the emergency funding bill. The Democrats over there know it is coming. They have not exactly scrambled to help us out. It is coming in the emergency funding bill. It is not being ignored, my opinion, by any side of the aisle. It is a significant problem in this country. And for one side of the aisle, the Democrats, to jump up and start parading around that the Republicans are ignoring this is unfair. It is patently unfair for they to make a statement like that.

Both of us have a problem. Let us not spend our time attacking each other, saying the other party is not doing anything about it. Let us focus on it. We are putting the money in the emergency funding bill. Be fair with the people here and let them know. Sure, it is not in this rule, but it will be here in two days.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in a few moments, after we have heard from some others, I am sure I will have a few things to say about some of the negative things that are going to be said about this rule and this conference report. But I would like to start off, I hope, on a constructive note and one in which I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the conference report because I believe that it should be passed.

This is a good piece of legislation. Even the ranking Democrat of the Committee on Rules agreed that this is an important bill that funds vital, necessary parts of the Federal Government. Let me just highlight a few of these.

As agreed by the conferees, we have \$13.4 billion in discretionary spending for the coming year. That is an increase of \$700 million in budget authority over the current fiscal year. The conferees, working together in a bipartisan way, have fashioned this bill to target three critical areas: enhancing the drug efforts of the Office of National Drug Control Policy and the U.S. Customs Service; second, supporting ways to reform the way IRS interacts with the taxpayers; and third, ensuring that our judicial system can respond to its increased work load by making sure that we have secure and adequate space by providing courthouse construction.

In the interest of time, let me just highlight a few of the key provisions in the bill. One, we provide \$1.59 billion for drug-related activities. That is an increase of about 1 percent over 1998 levels. Included in that is \$185 million for the second year of the National

Media Campaign to prevent youths from using drugs, something that we know is vitally important. We have \$20 million for the Drug Free Communities Act, which Member after Member has told us how important this is for their communities.

For the Customs Service, we provide \$1.8 billion. That is down slightly from the President's request. It includes \$54 million for new narcotics detection technologies for both sea and land ports of entry, as well as \$15.2 million to address badly needed maintenance needs of the air and marine interdiction program, including, Mr. Speaker, \$14.2 million to return 3 Blackhawk helicopters to operational status, to increase flight hours for the entire Customs Blackhawk fleet from 18 hours to 30 hours per month. We need to get those Blackhawks up and flying. We need to use them in this interdiction effort, and this bill provides the funds to do that.

We provide \$7.9 billion for the Internal Revenue Service. This body, by an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote earlier this year, voted to reform the IRS, and we provide the funds to make that reform work so that it will be more user friendly, more consumer friendly, more taxpayer friendly.

We have \$128 million over the current fiscal year for the IRS. Included in that is \$21 million for ongoing efforts to revamp the IRS computer system, which is so badly in need of being upgraded; \$25 million to restructure the way the IRS does business with taxpayers; \$103 million for improved customer service activities; and, as my colleague from the Committee on Rules said earlier, the money for Y2K will come in a separate bill.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot say how many Members have spoken to me about their new courthouse construction projects. This is not pork barrel construction. This list comes right from the list provided to us by the Judiciary. We do not add any projects. We take just the first 14 courthouses that they have ranked as the most important ones in the United States to construct.

Last year we had a moratorium on construction. We just did not have the money in the building fund. We have been able to find it this year and we have been able to support the requests of the Judicial Conference for the coming year.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we do have a number of legislative provisions in our bill. We have a restriction on the use of funds for abortion. That has been in this legislation for a long time. We have a requirement for the Federal Employees Health Benefit Program to provide coverage for contraceptives. We have a new title on child care services within Federal agencies. We have a new title granting lawful permanent resident status to current Haitians and, yes, as the first speaker on the

other side has already said, we have revisions to the appointment and re-appointment authority of the general counsel and staff director of the FEC.

We will have more time to discuss that, and I hope that there will be some more discussion about the good provisions in this bill and why we should get this conference passed so that we can provide for the vital functions of the government to go forward.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry if my dear friend, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) thought I implied that the Republicans were ignoring Y2K. I know they have not ignored it, because they knocked it out of one bill and did not protect it in the other, so I know they are not ignoring it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, this rule should not be before us tonight and neither should this bill. The conference report was just signed about an hour ago, and now under a martial law approach it is before the House. No Member has had a chance to examine what is in that conference report, and there is one provision in the conference report which is absolutely outrageous. The best way to deal with that is to simply defeat this rule.

This bill, pure and simple, if this rule is approved, will put the general counsel of the Federal Elections Commission out of business come January. Section 514 of the bill establishes term limits for the general counsel and the staff director of the Federal Elections Commission by requiring an affirmative vote of 4 of the 6 commissioners every 4 years. This is a blatant Republican political maneuver aimed at removing the Federal Elections Commission's current general counsel, Lawrence Noble.

Why? Because during his tenure, Mr. Noble has aggressively sought to enforce election laws and has been willing to punish violators of the law from across the political spectrum. The Federal Election Commission's general counsel, Mr. Noble, suggested that the FEC crack down on soft money, because he has had to take some of these cases to court recently; for example, GOPAC and the Christian Coalition.

Section 514 would undermine the bipartisan nature of the Commission by requiring the Commission to reappoint the staff director and the general counsel every 4 years by an affirmative vote of 4. That means, in plain English, a vote along party lines would enable the commissioners of either party to dismiss the senior staff. That is wrong, and that is why editorial boards and reform minded organizations throughout the country have rightly attacked this provision as an attempt to further weaken the Federal Elections Commission and ensure that the election laws go unenforced.

The New York Times recently stated, "This change is nothing more than an attempt to install a do nothing enforcement staff."

In my judgment, what this would do is simply require the counsel to deal with kid gloves in dealing with either party, because if they did not satisfy both parties they would not stand a chance of being reappointed.

The best way to satisfy both parties, obviously, is to do nothing, and that is not what we need in the Federal Elections Commission. We do not need a pussycat. We need a tough tiger. We do not need a paper tiger at the FEC, but this is a prescription for creating just that.

The recent Washington Post editorial comment was correct. It said that this FEC provision is, "In keeping with the rest of the record on campaign finance this year. The unifying theme has been hypocrisy."

Section 514 is an unwarranted retaliatory provision aimed at undermining the professionalism and independence of the Federal Election Commission general counsel's office. It ought to be rejected.

This Congress ought to be standing for election reform. It should not be putting impediments in the way of further election reform, and that is what it does when it disarms the Federal Election Commission.

There are many good provisions in this bill, but this is not one of them. The best way to correct the problem is defeat this rule, and have the committee go back to conference and eliminate this and other egregious provisions that Members may be concerned about. I urge a "no" vote on the rule.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILCHREST). The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) has 22 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) has 18½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, I cannot let the previous comments go without some call to question about those kind of comments. First of all, let us clarify it for the American public. It is not a term limit. It is a job performance. These people will keep their job if they pass their job performance.

The gentleman over here who just previously spoke is up for election every 2 years. Under his term, under his logic, because he has to face election every 2 years, he calls it a term limit. It is not a term limit. It is like what we ought to do a lot more of in this Federal Government, and that is say to our employees, your performance has to be up here. If you do not have job performance, you can lose your job.

□ 2000

That is exactly the point we are making here. You can sure tell in my

opinion it is an election season when you start throwing "job performance" around, calling it a "term limit," and then turning it around and saying "Gosh, you are trying to get rid of the Federal Election Commission."

I think we all have an obligation when we stand up here. Let us be accurate with the terms we use. We are not saying term limit. We are saying job performance. Job performance. If you do not perform, you are out. I want to remind the previous speaker that the majority of constituents that he represents face job performance review. If they do not perform their job, they are out. That is what you ought to face.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, let us not kid ourselves: This does not have diddly-squat to do with term limits. What you want to do is to make sure that you can dismiss whoever is the general counsel of the FEC by a simple party line vote. That is what the proposal does.

The only way the general counsel can stay in office under those conditions is if he rolls over and place kissy-face with both political parties. We do not need an Election Commission that does that. We need an Election Commission that is going to police both parties, not one that is going to cave in to both parties, and you know very well that is exactly what this provision does. Quit kidding people.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Colorado has said on two occasions that this is just like every employee. It is not. This bill terminates the employment of Mr. Noble. That is what this bill does. It has a provision in it that he can be rehired by a vote of four to three. The commission is made up of three Republicans and three Democrats.

Do not kid anybody. This bill fires a Federal official for doing something that you did not like, and that is going after GOPAC and the Christian Coalition.

The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is right, we need to be accurate on what this bill does. That provision should not be in this bill. There are three Republicans and three Democrats, and you are correct, if four of them believe that Mr. Noble is not performing, they ought to remove him from office. But it ought not to be done on a partisan vote. That is the reason for this provision in current law, to protect the counsel and the executive director from partisan attack.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that the other gentleman there said this does not have, I forget what kind of

word he used, "diddly-squat" he says, about term limits, and he spent five minutes talking about how it is term limits. So I am glad that the gentleman has acceded to my point.

I would say to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), this is not about term limits or about anything. It is about tenure. And I am saying, by gosh, these guys, I know they look at what we do for elections, but that does not entitle them to a lifetime of employment. When do we have job performance? How do you question what these people are doing?

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and I both face our job performance here in about five weeks. By the way, we have to get an affirmative vote in about six weeks for the gentleman and I to be back here in January. And what makes him any different? We are saying you have to be like other employees, just like the working Joe and working Jane out there. You have to come up with some job performance.

It does require one Democrat or one Republican, depending on the makeup, to come over and say your job performance is such that you should retain your job.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK).

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor today to support the rule on the Treasury conference report. I rise in strong support of it. There has been a lot of work that has gone into this bill. It is not going to satisfy everyone. It is not going to satisfy everyone on this floor. But I say to you, a lot of work has gone into this. It has touched some very important points.

Number one, the money that has been allocated for drugs. They are overrunning our communities and it is time we continue to do something about it. Customs in the area where I come from is extremely important. If we do not have Customs officials, then we do not guard our borders and guard our water, and certainly our quality of life will be decimated by the wrong people coming in through Customs.

For example, I rise also because for the first time since I have been in the Congress the Haitians receive some kind of recompense in this bill. They did not receive everything that everyone wanted, but they did receive some recognition, and about 40,000 of them, perhaps, if this bill goes through, will get a chance to get equal rights in this country and get green cards and be able to work.

I say to you that this particular rule is one that we should stand up for, and I stand here not unafraid to say that this Treasury report is one that we need. We need it to be able to pay our government workers, we need it to be able to have our borders protected, as

we have always wanted, and I want to say to the rest of my colleagues, sometimes you have to vote for a thing because it is right to vote for it.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, it has saddened me to see issues unrelated to the funding of the Postal Service and the Treasury Department, those two extraordinarily important Federal agencies that must be funded, and that is our responsibility. Before we get out of Washington, we must fund the Federal Government. I am saddened to see collateral issues put in jeopardy this rule. If this rule goes down, the underlying legislation will not be able to be reached tonight.

As my colleague from south Florida stated, there are 40,000 political refugees in this country, most of whom fled Haiti after the 1991 coup there because of political persecution, and they are looking at us tonight with an extreme amount of hope and faith, and I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to remember those 40,000 human beings who are watching us tonight.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) and I want to thank all of those who have worked on this legislation. I want to thank Jeb Bush in my state of Florida who has called our leadership time and time again and made it a top priority of his to get this legislation for justice for those 40,000 human beings passed.

I would say to Members, let us not bring this rule down and not be able to get to the underlying legislation. It is a fair rule, it is fair legislation. There are 40,000 human beings looking at us that need this legislation to pass. Please support this rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the conference report because it permits Congress to micromanage the very agency that is charged to police our elections.

It takes an organization, the Federal Election Commission, that has been called a toothless tiger, and turns it into a helpless kitten. It allows the accused to become the jury.

The provision permits just three commissioners or just one party in a partisan way to fire the top officers at the Federal Election Commission. That means that the staff at the FEC had better not annoy anyone of either party or they are going to find themselves in an unemployment line.

I believe that some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are just plain going after general counsel Lawrence Noble because he is doing his job,

investigating GOPAC, investigating many campaign finance abuses.

It is very frustrating to speak out against this appropriations bill because I am pleased that we won a victory for women's contraceptive rights, and I am pleased that the FEC will be fully funded. But how can the FEC go about its business of investigating campaign finance violations with a sledge hammer being held over its head?

Mr. Speaker, we spent a great deal of this spring and summer months debating campaign finance reform. It passed the House; it was filibustered and killed in the Senate. Instead of moving forward with changes that would aid reform, this House leadership is rolling back reform. It is working to fire the one person who is actually trying to enforce the law in a bipartisan manner, and it is being done under the cover of night in this rule and this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I truly do believe that there is a vendetta by the leadership on the other side of the aisle against the FEC, and many, many editorial boards across this country agree. The Washington Post accuses Republicans of giving Mr. Noble "the brush-off." The New York Times calls it "an arrogant attack." The Minneapolis Star Tribune calls Noble a "watchdog about to be muzzled by the Republican attack."

I urge my colleagues to leave the FEC with the small amount of bite it has left by voting against this conference report and voting against this rule that would muzzle and defang the Federal Election Commission.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, first of all to address the previous comments made up there. I always get enjoyment out of hearing those buzzwords, "under the cover of night." I would concede that the hours are moving quicker now towards darkness, it is dark outside, but I would remind the previous speaker that obviously we are televised throughout the country. There is no secrecy going on there.

We have the Committee on Rules, and, obviously, all these newspapers, the three or four that the gentlewoman cited, that have been busy in their editorial pages. This is not something "sneaking by."

This is a good rule. I think the gentleman from Florida has a very pertinent point, Mr. Speaker, and that is there are a lot of good things that this bill will fund. This rule is important so that we can get to that; Postal, Treasury, drug interdiction and so on.

Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman probably should not yield me any time, because I guess sometimes I tell it too much like it is.

I am upset with some Republicans. Usually I am upset with you Democrats. But when I first came here 20 years ago, I was so principled, I just

thought there was not such a word as "compromise." You had to have it your own way, and, if you did not, you voted against it.

Well, you know, we had a President of this country elected in 1980 who was a great man, and he was a great compromiser. His name was Ronald Reagan. He vetoed very few bills. He had a Democrat Congress to work with, most of the time a Democrat Senate and always a Democrat House, but, you know, to govern he knew you had to sit down and you could not always have it your own way, and he vetoed very few bills.

Well, I am standing up here tonight, and I am hearing Democrats over there, and they are complaining because there is one thing in this massive bill, hold up that bill over there, would you. There is one little paragraph in this bill, and they are so upset they are going to vote against this bill.

Then I hear my Republicans over here, and they are going to come on this floor and they are going to vote on this rule, and they are going to try to vote the rule down, our Republicans, because they do not have it their own way.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if they ever served in the military. Not many of them did, but that is not a criteria. I wonder if they ever played on a football team, and the quarterback called a play where the wide receiver was going to go out and make a sharp left. Well, the play takes off, and the wide receiver says, "I don't like that play; I am going the other way." The quarterback throws the pass, there is nobody out there, and they lose the game.

That is what you Republicans are going to do, my friends, because I can tell you that five years ago the Democrats were divided over here, and we defeated five or six or seven of their rules in the last two years they were here and they fell apart.

Do you remember that, guys? That is why you are in the minority.

Do you want to be in the minority over here? That is exactly what is going to happen. We have got a conference report here that the other body has agreed to, we have agreed to, and nobody got their own way. But there is no conference to go back to. You defeat the rule, the bill is dead.

Mr. Speaker, we have to compromise around here. If I catch one Republican coming over here and voting against this rule, I am going to invite you to go outside, because you are not a team player. This is what it is all about. So come over here and talk to me about it, but you do not vote against rules of your party.

□ 2015

One votes to bring the bill to the floor, and if one does not like the bill, then one votes one's conscience. One votes any way one wants to, but one does not disrupt the House and kill the legislation. Think about that, I say to my colleagues. I love you all.

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

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

I was very astounded to find out how my chairman felt about Republicans. If he wants, he can bring his football and play on our side of the team.

I would just like to read at this time, Mr. Speaker, just the first sentence of a Washington Post editorial of September 28. "Powerful Republicans are still trying to twist the appropriations process to oust longtime general counsel of the Federal Election Commission, Lawrence Noble, whom they regard as too aggressive an enforcer of the law."

Now, that is not the Democratic committee saying that, that is not the President of the United States, that is not the leadership of the minority, that is the Washington Post.

Sure, many people may vote against this bill because of a couple of little things like this, but why did they put a couple of little things like this in the bill in the first place? They do not belong there.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule on the Treasury Postal Conference Report, because the conference report includes an important women's health provision: the requirement that FEHB plans which cover prescriptions also cover prescription contraceptives.

The language passed the full Committee on Appropriations with support from Democrats and Republicans, pro-life and pro-choice. The Committee on Rules stripped it out of the bill, but I offered a rewritten amendment on the House floor, which passed. Then the same coalition of pro-choice and pro-life Democrats and Republicans defeated an attempt to weaken the language by my good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Unfortunately, the conference report also includes a politically vindictive attack on the bipartisan Federal Election Commission, and I think this is disgraceful, has no place in this legislation, and I do hope this will be eliminated in the Senate. However, because of the importance of contraceptive coverage for women across America, I will vote for the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, we are all in agreement that we want to reduce the number of abortions. Close to half of all unplanned pregnancies end in abortions. Many of these unplanned pregnancies could be prevented with better access to contraception. Contraception is basic health care for women. It allows couples to plan families, have healthier babies when they choose to conceive, and it makes abortion less necessary, which is a goal I thought we all shared.

Yet, 80 percent of FEHB plans do not cover all of the 5 most widely used con-

traceptives. Ten percent cover none of the 5 most widely used contraceptive methods. Meanwhile, all but one of the FEHB plans cover sterilization. Is it not clear that women and men who want to have families, who want to plan pregnancies, need better options?

It is important to understand, I say to my colleagues, what we are talking about when we talk about contraceptive methods. We are not talking about abortion, we are not talking about RU486 or any other abortion method. No abortions will be covered by this amendment. This is, in fact, clearly stated by the language in the conference report.

I just want to make it very clear to my colleagues that we are talking about providing women with the full range of contraceptive options. Women need the full range of options because not every woman can use one form or another form of birth control. Many women cannot use the pill. Its side effects, such as migraines, can be truly disabling for some. Other women choose not to go on the pill because they may be at special risk for stroke or breast cancer or something else.

So I urge my colleagues to support this rule, support this bill, and I hope we can change it in the Senate.

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

I guess there are a couple of points that I would like to make about the previous speaker. First of all, she very eloquently and correctly supports the rule. That is what is important here. We have lots of time to debate the bill this evening or whenever that debate takes place. Mr. Speaker, there is not a partisan split on this bill, there is support. This bill covers drug use, supporting law enforcement efforts, and so on.

The other point I would like to make is that I hope the Democrats that are over there that are giving a lot of weight to these editorials of recent, I also hope they have that same kind of enthusiasm on the other editorials out of these newspapers, a couple hundred of them that have come out in the last couple of weeks on another subject.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE).

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me this time.

I am pleased that here on the first day of the new Federal fiscal year we are debating one of the appropriations bills, but the tragedy is this is the first day of the new fiscal year and we do not have a concurrent budget resolution in place.

How does it happen that this body, which has committed itself to abiding by its own rules and by the legislation in the Budget Act, has not been able to work with the body at the other end of the building and develop a concurrent budget resolution? We do not have a road map for the budget process. It is a failure of leadership.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first time in the 24 years that we have had a Budget Act on the books that we have not produced a concurrent resolution. Last Saturday, we stayed in session and we debated and we voted on tax cuts. I think virtually every Member in this body would like to see tax reductions. The question was, do it now or defer it until we have balanced the budget without using Social Security. It was an important debate. But it certainly would have been helpful, again, if we had had a concurrent budget resolution to provide some guidance as to how we are to make decisions regarding Federal fiscal policy. It is unfortunate that we are debating appropriations bills for 1999 without a budget resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that each Member of this body press upon the leadership the importance of our having a budget resolution. Hardly a week goes by that we are not telling State and local governments, the United Nations, International Monetary Fund, the World Bank or others that receive Federal funds that they ought to have a sound budget process, and here in Congress, we do not even have the wherewithal to adopt a current budget resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we proceed with these appropriations bills and do the best we can under the circumstances, but hopefully we will not repeat this tragic situation in 1999, but instead, we will move forward and have a budget resolution and provide guidance for where we are headed with this country and its fiscal policies into the next century.

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

I cannot help but note the gentleman's comments about failure of leadership. I would challenge the gentleman: let him try and get together a body that has 535 different Members from 535 different locations around this country with 535 different philosophies, with thousands and thousands of different projects, whether it is Social Security or highways or military or the Y2K funding, and let him try and pull them all together. It takes some challenge.

I think we have leadership out there, the fact that we are here at this point. Of course it tests leadership.

The key here is that we always get into this kind of crunch time on an appropriation process. It is just like a family budget. In my family, my wife exercises her leadership pretty toughly, I might add, towards the end of a month when it gets to crunch time, but that is not a failure of leadership, that is a presentation of leadership.

The key here is the rule, and that is what we have to come back and focus on. The gentleman from Florida and the chairman of the Committee on Rules said, look, I thought his football example was excellent. We are going to throw I mean a bill that has a lot of good things about it, a lot of merit in it. There are Democrats and Repub-

licans that support this bill. But if we kill this rule, which some people are set on doing this evening, we set those needs and those issues for a lot of those districts and a lot of people in this country back a few steps. It is not necessary. Let us go through this rule, let us pass the rule, and let us have fair debate following the rule, and that is what passing the rule will give us the opportunity to do.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE).

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to emphasize that here we are in the 24th year of a process in which we have required of ourselves a concurrent budget resolution, and this is the first time in 24 years that we do not have one. That is why we have a failure of leadership.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the remaining time for my dear friend from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) and myself?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILCHREST). The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) has 5½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman from Colorado how many speakers he has remaining?

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, at this point it would be myself and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), and I intend to yield him the last 5 minutes, so it depends on the number of speakers on the other side.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I just have one speaker, so if the gentleman would yield to one of his speakers, and then I will yield to my speaker.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, what I would prefer instead is for the gentleman to go ahead with a speaker, and then I will comment and we can wrap it up with yielding the balance of the time to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

Mr. MOAKLEY. But, Mr. Speaker, I understand that the gentleman from Colorado has only himself and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I think I understand.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult being a ranking member on a committee where the bill that confronts us is a good bill. I said that in the Committee on Rules, I said that to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), I said it to others, and I will say it when we consider the bill. It is a good bill because as the Committee on

Appropriations is required to do, if it is responsible, it gives the necessary resources to agencies to accomplish the objectives that the American people expect of them; and indeed, that this Congress expects of them.

In particular, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), the chairman of our subcommittee, for his tenaciousness in ensuring that agencies can effectively carry out their responsibilities. That is particularly the case as it relates to law enforcement and the fighting of the drug scourge on our borders and within our communities.

Mr. Speaker, this bill almost, I believe, is the best bill that this committee has reported out in the last 3 years. In part that was because we had sufficient resources to fund agencies. Not all they wanted, but sufficient.

□ 2030

Mr. Speaker, therefore, it is with a great deal of regret that I rise, because we have included in this bill a number of extraneous provisions. All of them, without fail, were argued in a bipartisan fashion. That is to say that there were some Republicans for them and some Democrats for them, some Republicans against them and some Democrats against them.

One provision, however, is, I believe, without exception opposed on our side of the aisle because it is, I believe correctly, perceived as a totally partisan, inappropriate attack on the FEC.

I have heard my good friend, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) say that this was just like any other employee. He and I disagree on that proposition. In point of fact we have an individual, Lawrence Noble, a staff member, not a commissioner, who can take no action without having four votes, which means that he needs at least one Republican to authorize action of the Commission, because there are only three Democrats, and four votes are required.

Mr. Noble has taken some actions which have annoyed just about everybody on both sides of the aisle. In fact, more complaints have been made against Democrats, 38 percent, than Republicans, 32 percent. In fact, 80 percent of the Democrats have paid their fines, 51 percent of the Republicans have paid their fines. So in point of fact, it ought to be Democrats from that perspective who ought to be more annoyed at Mr. Noble, because he apparently has been tougher on us.

But in the performance of his duties, he concluded that actions were appropriate to be initiated against GOPAC and against the Christian Coalition for campaign actions which they had undertaken, just as he would take it against the Clinton campaign or the Bush campaign or other Republican and Democratic campaigns.

It is our belief, notwithstanding the fact we have been told we are in error on this, but it is our belief that this bill and the provision regarding Mr.

Noble, which terminates Mr. Noble's tenure, because by this bill his tenure is terminated as of January 1, 1999, 90 days from today, I do not recall a bill firing a Federal employee before. Perhaps there has been, but I do not recall it. I do not recall it.

We would have hoped that during the consideration of this bill, that some compromise could have been reached. I brought to the attention of the conference that one of the Senators in the other body has indicated that he is going to filibuster this bill if this provision is in there, so the conference report probably cannot pass the other body.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote against this rule. I regret that, but I see no other way to indicate my opposition to this provision. I do not know what I am going to do on final passage, because the chairman has worked very hard, and I repeat again, this is a good bill. I would hope that my colleagues would join me, and that this provision would be taken out of this bill before, again, it is offered to us for passage.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is an exceptionally bright, very capable gentleman, but I would point out that he says that he cannot think of another Federal employee who has ended their tenure like that. There are 435 sitting on this floor. In 30 days, every Member in this House has to, by affirmative vote, prove to the constituents that he or she has done the kind of job performance that would allow them to continue. We do the same thing. We go out to our judges.

What we are saying here, the gentleman can pull out of the air the Christian association or some of these other examples. That is not this. We are saying here, hey, one party, by the way, with three votes could get this guy a job for the rest of his life, or some gal a job for the rest of their lives. We are saying, job performance. If they perform, they keep the job. That is what we have to say. Right now, there is no accountability, in my opinion, from the Federal Election Commission. We are asking for accountability.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding time to me. I want to especially thank the chairman of the Committee on Rules for the comments that he made earlier. I think he is right on target.

Mr. Speaker, this is about getting a bill to the floor. This is about the necessary compromises that have to be made in the legislative process that all of us learn very painfully as we go through this process. We do not get everything we like. There are things in here which I would prefer not to see in here.

Mr. Speaker, this is about compromise. It is about teamwork. But as

I listened to the arguments from the other side for the last hour, I think the comment that was made by the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules at the outset put it right into perspective. He said, this is really about firing one person. This is about one person. This whole bill, this whole rule, is about one person.

Who here tonight is going to say that this one individual, this general counsel of the Federal Elections Commission, is not a powerful person? Here we are, threatening to take down a \$27 billion appropriation bill that supports 163,000 good working men and women in the Federal Government. We are going to take it down because we do not like what it is doing to one single person. We want to save the job of one career bureaucrat.

We are willing to take down this bill, this appropriation bill, because one person, the minority says to us tonight, may not be able to muster up four votes to save his job; a majority, that is how we pass bills around here, a majority of the Federal Elections Commission, to save his job. That is what this debate tonight is all about.

Mr. Speaker, we are willing to defeat this bill, that gives the Customs Service another \$15.2 million to put 16 Black Hawk helicopters in the air, to increase their flying time from the current 18 hours to more than 30 hours each month. We need those Black Hawks along the border, I can tell Members that. I represent one of those areas. We need those in the drug interdiction fight. This bill gives us the money to put those helicopters back in the air, to give them the time to fly, to help them interdict against the drugs.

Who says the general counsel of the FEC does not have power? He can ground the entire Customs Service fleet of Black Hawk helicopters in order to save his job.

The Democrats are willing to sacrifice \$7.9 billion for the Internal Revenue Service, including \$103 million for customer service initiatives, \$25 million in restructuring and reform, to keep one man in his job. By a huge bipartisan vote earlier we passed IRS reforms on this floor. This gives us the money to put those into place, to make the IRS a more taxpayer-friendly, a more consumer-friendly place. But no, some people are willing to sacrifice this bill and the money it has for IRS reforms to save the job of one career bureaucrat.

The fact is, we do not fire the current general counsel, we simply require that he has to get a majority of the votes from the Federal Election Commission in order to stay on the job every 4 years. The FEC is supposed to be a bipartisan group. If the general counsel cannot get a bipartisan vote in order to stay on this job, then why should he stay on for a lifetime? Why should he not find other employment? The fact is, the House of Representatives here is debating the job security of one single person in the United States govern-

ment who apparently cannot get four out of six people to think he is doing a fair job. That is unconscionable.

What else are we going to sacrifice? Are we going to sacrifice \$3.4 million to stop cybercrime and the smuggling of child pornography? We are talking about giving up \$3.2 million for the support of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, \$20 million for drug-free communities. Letter after letter I have had from the majority and minority side saying how important this money for drug-free communities is.

There is \$185 million for the second year of a national media campaign to keep our kids off of drugs. We have a good start on that program this year, but no, we are willing to give that up to save the job of one career bureaucrat if he cannot get four votes, a majority of votes, the same thing we have to have to pass any bill in the House and Senate, the same thing we have to have to confirm any person in the cabinet or in the Federal government, when he is confirmed by the United States. No, we are willing to give that up to keep that one person.

There is \$183 million for high-intensity drug trafficking areas, in areas like Dallas and Fort Worth, and a new one that is very important, central Florida; Washington and Baltimore; Miami; the Midwest, for the methamphetamine reduction. All of these are in danger.

In Southern California, Mr. Speaker, in Los Angeles, in San Francisco, in Detroit, in Chicago, in El Paso and Arizona, and yes, along the Arizona and southwest border, all of those high-intensity drug trafficking areas could be endangered, and certainly the new ones will be endangered by not passing this rule and this bill.

And oh, yes, to save this career bureaucrat's job, we are willing to give up low-income taxpayer clinics we provide for in the IRS legislation, so that low-income taxpayers can get some service from the Internal Revenue Service; and yes, provisions that Members of this body have come to me about for land transfers in Racine, Wisconsin, and a very important one in Dade County, Florida. That, too, will be lost as a result of defeating this rule tonight.

A 3.6 percent pay increase for Federal employees could be in danger as a result of defeating this rule.

Finally, we are willing to zero out the funding for courthouses, not courthouses put in here as pork barrel projects, but courthouses that come from the Federal judiciary, as their list of priorities. I am looking down here, and I see that the majority of them are in Democratic districts. These are the ones that the Federal judiciary have said are important in Little Rock, Arkansas; in San Diego; San Jose; Denver, Colorado; Jacksonville, Florida; Orlando, Florida; Springfield, Massachusetts; Biloxi, Mississippi; Cape Girardeau, Missouri; Brooklyn, New York; Eugene, Oregon; Greenville, Tennessee; Laredo, Texas; Wheeling, West

Virginia. All of those could be in danger by failing to do this.

We could lose the money for the anti-gang grant program, \$13 million for that, and \$27 million for the youth crime gun interdiction initiative. These are just some of the things, Mr. Speaker, that are jeopardized by the failure to pass this rule this evening.

Mr. Speaker, we should not let this rule go down, because we should not let this conference report go down. It is, as my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) just said, a good bill that we have worked hard on. I urge my colleagues to support the rule, support the conference report. Pass this tonight.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

Mr. MCINNIS. 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 106, nays 294, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 475]

YEAS—106

Abercrombie	Frelinghuysen	Moran (KS)
Aderholt	Ganske	Morella
Archer	Gekas	Myrick
Army	Gibbons	Neal
Bass	Gilchrest	Nethercutt
Bateman	Gillmor	Northup
Bliley	Gilman	Olver
Blunt	Greenwood	Owens
Boehlert	Gutierrez	Parker
Boehner	Gutknecht	Pastor
Bonilla	Hastert	Paul
Boswell	Hastings (WA)	Paxon
Brown (FL)	Hobson	Porter
Burr	Houghton	Price (NC)
Burton	Hulshof	Radanovich
Camp	Hutchinson	Ramstad
Campbell	Istook	Rangel
Castle	Jenkins	Regula
Coble	Johnson (CT)	Ros-Lehtinen
Collins	Kelly	Salmon
Conyers	Kim	Scarborough
Cox	Kingston	Schumer
Davis (VA)	Knollenberg	Shays
DeLay	Kolbe	Solomon
Diaz-Balart	LaTourette	Spence
Dicks	Lazio	Stump
Doggett	Lewis (CA)	Taylor (NC)
Dreier	Linder	Upton
Dunn	Lowey	Weller
Ehrlich	McCarthy (NY)	White
English	McCollum	Wicker
Ensign	McCrery	Wilson
Everett	McInnis	Wolf
Foley	McKeon	Young (AK)
Forbes	Meek (FL)	
Fox	Miller (FL)	

NAYS—294

Ackerman	Baldacci	Bartlett
Allen	Ballenger	Barton
Andrews	Barcia	Becerra
Bachus	Barr	Bentsen
Baesler	Barrett (NE)	Bereuter
Baker	Barrett (WI)	Berman

Berry	Hill
Bilbray	Hilleary
Bilirakis	Hilliard
Bishop	Hinchey
Blagojevich	Hinojosa
Blumenauer	Hoekstra
Bonior	Holden
Bono	Hooley
Borski	Horn
Boucher	Hostettler
Boyd	Hoyer
Brady (PA)	Hunter
Brady (TX)	Hyde
Brown (CA)	Inglis
Brown (OH)	Jackson (IL)
Bryant	Jackson-Lee (TX)
Bunning	Jefferson
Buyer	John
Calvert	Johnson (WI)
Canady	Johnson (E.B.)
Cannon	Johnson, Sam
Capps	Jones
Cardin	Kanjorski
Carson	Kaptur
Chabot	Kasich
Chambliss	Kennedy (MA)
Chenoweth	Kennedy (RI)
Christensen	Kildee
Clayton	Kilpatrick
Clyburn	Koburn (WI)
Coburn	Klecza
Combest	Klink
Condit	Kucinich
Cook	LaFalce
Cooksey	LaHood
Costello	Lampson
Coyne	Lantos
Cramer	Latham
Crane	Leach
Crapo	Lee
Cubin	Levin
Cummings	Lewis (GA)
Cunningham	Lewis (KY)
Danner	Lipinski
Davis (FL)	LoBiondo
Davis (IL)	Lofgren
DeGette	Delahunt
DeLauro	Luther
Deutsch	Maloney (CT)
Dickens	Maloney (NY)
Dingell	Manton
Dixon	Manzullo
Dooley	Markey
Doolittle	Mascara
Doyle	Matsui
Duncan	McCarthy (MO)
Edwards	McDermott
Ehlers	McGovern
Emerson	McHale
Engel	McHugh
Eshoo	McIntosh
Etheridge	McIntyre
Evans	McKinney
Ewing	McNulty
Farr	Meehan
Fattah	Meeks (NY)
Fazio	Menendez
Filner	Metcalf
Ford	Mica
Fossella	Millender-McDonald
Frank (MA)	Miller (CA)
Franks (NJ)	Minge
Frost	Mink
Furse	Moakley
Galleghy	Mollohan
Gejdenson	Nadler
Gephardt	Neumann
Gephard	Neumann
Goode	Ney
Goodlatte	Norwood
Gooding	Nussle
Gordon	Oberstar
Graham	Obey
Granger	Ortiz
Green	Pallone
Hall (TX)	Pappas
Hamilton	Pascrell
Hastings (FL)	Payne
Hayworth	Pease
Hefley	Pelosi
Hefner	Peterson (MN)
Herger	Peterson (PA)

NOT VOTING—34

Callahan	DeFazio	Hall (OH)
Clay	Fawell	Hansen
Clement	Fowler	Harman
Deal	Goss	Kennelly

Petri	King (NY)	Oxley	Tauzin
Pickering	Klug	Packard	Thomas
Pickett	Largent	Poshard	Towns
Pitts	Livingston	Pryce (OH)	Walsh
Pombo	Martinez	Roukema	Yates
Pomeroy	McDade	Shuster	Young (FL)
Portman	Moran (VA)	Smith (OR)	
Quinn	Murtha	Stark	
Rahall			
Redmond			
Reyes			
Riggs			
Riley			
Rivers			
Rodriguez			
Roemer			
Rogan			
Rogers			
John			
Rohrabacher			
Rothman			
Roybal-Allard			
Royce			
Rush			
Ryun			
Sabo			
Sanchez			
Sanders			
Sandlin			
Sanford			
Sawyer			
Saxton			
Schaefer, Dan			
Schaffer, Bob			
Scott			
Sensenbrenner			
Serrano			
Sessions			
Shadegg			
Shaw			
Sherman			
Shimkus			
Sisisky			
Skaggs			
Skeen			
Skelton			
Slaughter			
Smith (MI)			
Smith (NJ)			
Smith (TX)			
Smith, Adam			
Smith, Linda			
Snowbarger			
Snyder			
Souder			
Spratt			
Stabenow			
Stearns			
Stenholm			
Stokes			
Strickland			
Stupak			
Sununu			
Talent			
Tanner			
Tauscher			
Taylor (MS)			
Thompson			
Thornberry			
Thune			
Thurman			
Tiahrt			
Tierney			
Torres			
Traficant			
Turner			
Velazquez			
Vento			
Visclosky			
Wamp			
Waters			
Watkins			
Watt (NC)			
Watts (OK)			
Waxman			
Weldon (FL)			
Weldon (PA)			
Wexler			
Weygand			
Whitfield			
Wise			
Woolsey			
Wynn			

□ 2107

Mr. MICA, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Messrs. WAMP, EHLERS, HILL, CRANE, METCALF, PEASE and PICKERING changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Messrs. LAZIO of New York, PASTOR, UPTON, SCHUMER, and MORAN of Kansas changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the resolution was not agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4274, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

Mr. MCINNIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-762) on the resolution (H. Res. 564) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4274) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on the last vote. Had I been here, I would have voted "no."

□ 2115

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILCHREST). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE CHARLES D'ARRIGO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, since taking office last November, I have spoken before this House many times on the critical issues and decisions that face our nation. I would like to depart from my usual practice and speak before you this evening on an all-together different matter.

It is without question that the United States is the greatest nation in the history of the