APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE OF TWO MEMBERS TO INFORM THE PRESIDENT THAT THE TWO HOUSES HAVE COMPLETED THEIR BUSINESS OF THE SESSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4 of House Resolution 594, House Resolution 608 is adopted.

The text of House Resolution 608 is as follows:

H. RES. 608

Resolved, That a committee of two Members of the House be appointed to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the House of Representatives has completed its business of the session and is ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4 of House Resolution 594, the Chair appoints the following Members of the House to the committee to notify the President:

The gentleman from Texas, Mr. ARMEY.

The gentleman from Missouri, Mr. GEPHARDT.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4328, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 605 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 605

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 4328) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) is recognized for one hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield one-half my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), my great friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of the resolution, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, passage of this rule will enable us to complete the outstanding work for the 105th Congress and adjourn for the remainder of the year. This rule is traditional for conference reports. It waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration. Further, it provides for the conference report to be considered as read.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report to accompany H.R. 4328, the Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill for Fiscal Year 1999, is serving as the vehicle for an omnibus appropriations package for fiscal year 1999. That is the bill that we have before us.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report before the House contains the following general appropriation bills for fiscal year 1999: Transportation; Agriculture; Labor-HHS and Education; Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary; Foreign Operations; District of Columbia; Treasury-Postal Service; and the Interior appropriations bills.

Mr. Speaker, all of the spending bills in this general appropriation bill are within the discretionary spending caps and are fully paid for. This conference report also contains a number of provisions making supplemental appropriations.

A significant portion of the package, and I think it is important for Members to note, is an $8.4 billion Department of Defense component including funds for missile defense and additional funds for military readiness, so badly needed. This funding is critical to protect the lives of our soldiers and our military personnel who serve overseas in uniform.

I have warned my colleagues many times that we are returning to the very hollow force of the 1970's in our national defense posture. There was a time, that I often recall, when we had hostages being held in a place called Iran. And when we attempted to rescue those hostages being held, we had to cannibalize 14 helicopter gunships just to get 8 that would work, and 3 of those failed, and so did the rescue operation. That was the condition of our military back in the late seventies.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation's Armed Forces are facing the same kind of critical shortages in a number of areas right now.

In terms of personnel, we have lost military personnel. We have commissioned officers and noncommissioned officers who are choosing not to stay in the military. Many of them are being furloughed because of lack of funds. There are shortages of equipment and spare parts, and even ammunition.

Mr. Speaker, all of these indicators of a declining readiness rate are not academic statistics. All of these things contribute to the ability of our Armed Forces to respond rapidly and effectively to a threat from overseas in the manner in which we responded to Saddam Hussein in 1990 and 1991, and today we cannot do that. We do not have the military capability to mount that kind of an operation now. Also these items which are in short supply lead to a greater propensity for training accidents or aircraft crashes, and you see it almost every week now in some part of the world.

Mr. Speaker, the lives of our young men and women who serve in the military are constantly at risk from foreign threats. We should not compound that risk by leaving them in the field with aging or broken or outdated equipment.

Mr. Speaker, the world is a dangerous place, and there are nations and forces who are hostile to the United States and American interests all over this globe. The House should lend its support to our men and women in uniform around the globe who put their lives on the line for the national interests of this country by voting for this package today. I intend to vote for it myself, even though I am a fiscal conservative and do not share all of the purposes of everything in this massive bill.

Mr. Speaker, the United States lives under the constant threat of attack from ballistic missiles launched from China or North Korea or other renegade regimes around this world. It is inconceivable to me that we have not developed a system that would stop incoming ballistic missiles from landing on American cities. Several regimes have a startling missile capability and, when coupled with biological and chemical warheads, these regimes and their devices pose an incredible threat not only to American servicemen serving overseas, but also a direct threat right here to the United States of America.

We all know that the People's Republic of China, which is a hostile nation to this country by their own words, have no less than 13 intercontinental ballistic missiles aimed at American cities right today, yet we are not equipped to do anything about that.

Mr. Speaker, if investing $1 billion for missile defense in this package is not an emergency, I do not know what an emergency is. This funding is absolutely critical.

Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement also contains funds to combat terrorism, including at our American embassies overseas. For those who have traveled there, you know that many of our embassy personnel are in grave danger right today, and we saw that happen just in the last several months. The Congress must support efforts to counter international terror and the cowards who would employ such methods around the world.

Mr. Speaker, this spending agreement also includes important funding for intelligence activities which are critical so that we can know in advance when terrorists are planning to attack America's infrastructure, such as the World Trade Center, bridges, tunnels or American embassies overseas.

Mr. Speaker, this package also contains funding to address the Year 2000 computer problem, or Y2K, a significant portion of which is defense-related. We must ensure that our defense computers are technically capable to meet the challenges of the new century.

□ 1640

Mr. Speaker, this omnibus appropriation package contains something even more important than all the things I have just mentioned, and that is crucial funds for the anti-drug efforts as

well as legislative language to encourage drug interdiction efforts. A vote for this package is a vote to rededicate ourselves to the fight to stop all aspects of the illegal drug trade, supply, use and demand. And I would also note on that subject, Mr. Speaker, that the conference report before us maintains language which passed the House prohibiting Federal or District of Columbia funds for free needles for drug addicts, a program which has not worked in any part of the country, and, Mr. Speaker, it is so terribly, terribly important to set an example for our young people that there is nothing hip, that there is nothing cool, about heroin use or any kind of drug use. Illegal drug use can only lead to a life of failure and misery and even death. Rather than promote desolation and despair, Mr. Speaker, we should promote hope and opportunity for this young generation coming on board now.

And, Mr. Speaker, this conference agreement also contains important funding to assist our Nation's farmers who have faced numerous natural disasters this year. The conference report includes language relating to something terribly important to myself and the gentleman from Louisiana, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations sitting next to me here, and that is called milk marketing orders, which will prohibit the Department of Agriculture from changing the rules until we have gone through both a legislative process and an appropriation process cycle for next year. That would give the incoming Congress time to hold hearings and to deal with this life threatening issue as far as the dairy farmers of this Nation are concerned. The Federal Dairy Program is so very important to the livelihood of my particular district and certainly many of the others throughout this country.

And, Mr. Speaker, it is important that we adjourn this Congress in order that Members have a chance to discuss with their constituents the fact that we have produced the first balanced budget in 30 years. We are now cutting rather than increasing spending. We have produced a historic budget surplus for the American people, and, Mr. Speaker, Ronald Reagan's vision has been achieved by our actions. The growth of the federal spending has been slowed to 3 percent a year. I never thought 5 or 6 or 10 years ago that we would be able to accomplish that, but we have, and we should commend both the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on the Budget and the other committees of this Congress for having bit the bullet and dealing with this very critical issue.

We have reformed welfare and made a dramatic difference in the lives of so many Americans encouraging the personal responsibility and dignity that are a part of decent jobs. In New York State alone more than 500,000 people have been taken off the welfare rolls. Those people are now taxpaying citizens, they are good citizens that are contributing to society.

And, Mr. Speaker, we took on the dreaded IRS and brought about long overdue reform to that agency.

Now the conference agreement is not perfect; we all know that. It is a compromise among the House and the Senate and the President of the United States. All Members did not get all the provisions we were seeking, nor did we knock out all the provisions that we wanted to knock out. Nor did the President get all of his legislative agenda in this package. But the spirit of compromise, which is what Ronald Reagan spent a great deal of his time trying to teach me, is that you cannot always have it your own way. One of the most difficult lessons that I have learned in Washington is the fact that we have to compromise. And that is why I urge every Member to come over here regardless of their philosophy, whether they are liberal, conservative or somewhere in-between.

This is a bill we ought to vote for the American people. I urge my colleagues to support it, support the rule and then vote for the omnibus package when it comes before the House.

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 thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), my dear friend, my colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, for yielding me the customary half hour.

Mr. Speaker, at long last we are preparing to vote on this omnibus appropriation bill. This is the bill that contains the eight unfinished appropriations bills and hundreds of extra provisions all the way from duck hunting to stomach viruses, all lumped together in a document that weighs over 40 pounds, stands 16 inches high and has to be brought over here in a box that resembles a Budweiser case. I mean this is a first. I hope that all the people who are listening in will really pay attention to this. This is the largest bill that I can recall lumping all these appropriation bills together in an end of the season rush to get out of here.

Mr. Speaker, we all know the reason the Congress is passing this one enormous bill instead of the individual bills is because the Republicans just could not get their act together, they could not finish their work in time for the new fiscal year. But it turns out that the good news for the Democrats is this bill contains a lot more Democratic provisions than we could have gotten under the regular legislative procedure if that legislative procedure had taken place in its orderly fashion. By sticking together and insisting on our priorities we won very many major victories for the American families of America.

Democrats won 100,000 new teachers for our classrooms, which means, Mr. Speaker, classrooms all over the country will average 18 students fewer per classroom. Children will get more individual attention. It will be easier to discipline and to teach these children. Mr. Speaker, thanks to Democrats, my home State, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, will get $22 million more to reduce our class sizes.

Democrats fought off Republican attempts to raid the Social Security surplus to pay for tax cuts. Democrats won a 14-percent increase in health research in diabetes, cancer, genetic medicine and to develop an AIDS vaccine.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats won the funding for 17,000 new community police officers, and we also won the removal of Republican provisions letting polluters get off the hook scot-free and the addition of investments in cleaner environment.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats and Republicans combined saved the LIHEAP program, which provides energy assistance for the 5.5 million elderly and working people during very cold winters and very hot summers.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is still a lot to do. Our schools are still falling apart. One out of every three American schools needs extensive repair or replacement, and about the same number were built before World War II.

Mr. Speaker, American children should be taught in classrooms and not trailers, and they should not have to eat lunch at 10 o'clock in the morning because the cafeteria just does not have enough tables to feed them all at the same time. But my Republican colleagues refused even to meet on the school construction bill.

Americans enrolled in managed care plans still do not have the protection against the abuses. We need to pass a Patient Bill of Rights. But my Republican colleagues refuse to take it up.

My Republican colleagues buried efforts to reform our campaign system, reduce teen smoking and raise the minimum wage.

Still, Mr. Speaker, despite our small numbers the Democrats have done pretty well. We stopped the Republican attempt to destroy Medicaid back in 1995. We stopped the Republican attempt to use the Social Security surplus for tax cuts, we stopped their efforts to let polluters off the hook, and we kept them from dismantling public education.

So I congratulate my Democrat colleagues for really insisting education be made a priority, and I urge my colleagues to support the rule and support the bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as I begin to recognize our next speaker, I have to call attention to the fact that I will be leaving this body at the end of this year and after 20 years. More important is the gentleman sitting next to me. He is not a Member of Congress, but he is probably more important than any Member of Congress because he is the Chief Counsel of the Committee on Rules. Bill Crosby has been with this body for

27 years. He came here directly out of the United States Navy, and he has served under former members of the Committee on Rules, Representative H. Allen Smith of Glendale, CA, Representative Dave Martin of Nebraska, and of course our old good friend Jim Quillen, who was a Member of this body for 30 some years from Tennessee. We are certainly going to miss Bill. He was my valuable right arm for 10 years on the Committee on Rules, and we wish him well.

Mr. Speaker, having said that, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Claremont, California (Mr. DREIER), the vice chairman and the man I will be turning the gavel over to as chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my very good friend from Glens Falls (Mr. SOLOMON) for yielding me this time, and while we have all engaged in what is clearly a long good-bye, I would like to, as this is the last issue that we are going to be considering in the 105th Congress, join in saying once again how sorely we will miss the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) when he will not be a Member of the 106th Congress and to also join in saying to our good friend, Bill Crosby, ''Thank you very much for nearly three decades of great service to this institution.'' I am particularly honored that he was first hired here by H. Allen Smith, as Mr. SOLOMON has just said, who was the ranking Republican on the Committee on Rules at that time and a fellow Californian, and we were saddened with his passing just within the past several months. But Bill will be sorely missed, and we certainly wish him well in his future endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago the American people gave a Republican Congress and a Democratic President a mandate to do a number of things to balance the federal budget, provide tax relief for working families, create incentives for private sector jobs and job creation, preserve the Medicare program and to promote quality educational opportunities for all children. The 105th Congress accomplished each of these important goals by sticking to fundamental principles while making compromises that reflected the political realities of a divided Federal Government.

The Fiscal Year 1999 Omnibus Appropriations conference report which we are addressing here today does look at many of those very important national needs. In particular, I would like to applaud the negotiators for the $7 billion included to overcome the rapid diminishment and the readiness of our military forces. It also provides new funding to protect American cities from a limited nuclear missile strike, to fight terrorism, avoid the Year 2000 computer problems in government and to help victims of national disasters.

While this final budget package is worthy of support, make no mistake. We all have acknowledged that it does have real shortcomings. The President, his supporters in Congress have proven extraordinarily resilient in treating every federal spending program as a sacred cow, and unfortunately opposing tax cuts at every turn, using the very specious argument that this poses a threat to the solvency of the Social Security system.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that more should be done to provide tax relief to working families and to ferret out wasteful federal spending and out-of-date government programs. I look forward to the next Congress including more Members who are committed to those policies that represent these values of hard-working Americans.

With that I thank my friend for having yielded this time to me, and I urge support of both the rule and the conference report.

□ 1645

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, who has labored so diligently on this massive, massive piece of legislation.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, this bill is here because of a massive institutional failure on the part of the Congress.

Now, it is true that there are some major victories for the President and for my party in this package. In my judgment, those major victories are here because we had a large portion of the Republican Caucus, known as the CATs, who early on this year indicated that they did not like the way the Congress handled appropriations bills the year before when we had a relatively bipartisan approach, and they decided they wanted a much more partisan approach; they wanted the bills to be written only on the Republican side of the aisle. They did not want the minority party included; they did not want to hear what our views were; they wanted to bring their agenda to the floor, so they did.

They cut $1 billion out of the President's education program. They eliminated the Low-Income Heating Assistance Program. They eliminated the Summer Jobs Program. They laced the appropriation bills through with antienvironmental riders. They proposed all kinds of measures which they thought they could impose on what they perceived to be a weakened President, and then something happened. What happened is that the moderate Republicans decided they could not support that package, and the Senate Republicans also decided that some of these bills were so extreme that they would not vote for them. And so we wound up in a colossal end-of-the-year, after-the-deadline negotiation on more than half of the budget.

Now, as a result of that process, a lot of the decisions that were made were made by four people. They were made by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON), the chairman of the committee, my good friend; by me; by Senator STEVENS, who represents the majority party in the Senate, and by Senator BYRD, who represents the minority party in the Senate. We made hundreds of decisions on the specific appropriation items. But then a laundry list of other items were kicked upstairs and there judgments were made by only one person in this House so far as I know, that being the Speaker, and they were made on the other end of the avenue by representatives of the President.

We are in this mess because this Congress did not do its job. We are in this mess because the Congress passed only a tiny number of the 13 appropriation bills that we were required to pass by the end of the year. And now we have this god awful mess on the floor, which while it contains a number of, I think, needed victories for us on education and on other items, still represents an incredibly outrageous way to do the country's business.

So we have as a result of this process some 70 extraneous provisions laced through this bill. We do have a bill which is now $2.6 billion above where the House was on education, and for that the President deserves credit and so do the minority party negotiators. We did restore fuel assistance, we did restore summer jobs, we did protect the National Labor Relations Board, we did keep the full IMF funding, and we did get a number of other victories. We did get $1.6 billion additional funds to help our farmers. We did get language which extends contraceptive coverage under Federal health benefits for women. We stopped the punitive action that the majority party wanted to take against the Federal Elections Commission. But in the process, an awful lot of garbage stuck to this bill.

The most outrageous action taken of all was action that was insisted upon by the Committee on Ways and Means. There was a provision in this bill which would have allowed the brother of the Unabomber to get the full reward that was promised for solving that crime without being taxed. He wanted to give the full amount of that reward to the victims of the Unabomber, but because of jurisdictional dumb Hill considerations, the Committee on Ways and Means decided they would not allow that money to be provided to the victims of that crime tax-free.

I have never seen a more disgraceful action on the part of anyone in this Congress than that action in denying those funds to the victims of the Unabomber, and yet that is one of the pieces of garbage that we had to swallow in this bill in order to get the bill that would be supported by the majority.

We have a number of other items on tax legislation that were added to this. We have $4 billion added to the defense budget without a dime of that $4 billion going into readiness. It goes into a lot of the Speaker's pet projects, into a lot of third-tier, third-rate intelligence

activities, (one good one), and yet none of the funds go directly to military readiness. It is really a lousy way to prioritize national needs.

So I am going to ask Members to do the only thing we can under these circumstances, because the country does need a budget. I will ask them to vote for the bill when we finally get to it, because thanks to the incredible mismanagement that we have seen in this Congress all year long, we have no other choice. But that does not mean I am proud of the product.

I think this product, at least the process by which we got here, is a national disgrace, and I think the House ought to be ashamed of itself for all of the decisions that led to this ridiculous process. I want to make clear in my criticism that I make no criticism of the majority party on the Committee on Appropriations. They did everything possible to work under these ridiculous circumstances to bring a decent bill to the House. But I have to tell my colleagues, wait until you see the stories that the press will write for weeks and weeks on some of the provisions that are in this bill, and more importantly, some of them that are not, and we will get a clear idea of just how low this Congress has sunk.

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

The other night my wife was up in our home in the Adirondack Mountains, she was watching C–SPAN, and my next speaker was on the floor. He was telling it like it is, and as soon as he finished she called me and she says, my goodness, he sounds just like you. I do not know whether she was being critical or heaping praise.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Metairie, Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON). He is truly one of the commendable Members in this body. In the last 4 years, he is one of the reasons that we have a balanced budget here and we have gotten our fiscal House in order.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from York (Mr. SOLOMON), the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, the very distinguished, outgoing chairman of the Committee on Rules. He is my friend. He is a gentleman with whom I have enjoyed working with throughout the time that I have had the opportunity and the honor and privilege to serve the American people in the United States Congress. I do not think that there have been any better served than those served by the gentleman from New York who is leaving. This is his last presentation of a rule not only before the 105th Congress, but before the Congress as a whole. I just want to take this opportunity to wish him and his lovely wife, Freda, many, many years of happy retirement, although I know he is not planning on retiring, he is simply leaving Congress. We will be able to see him in other roles, and we wish him lots of success and happiness. Likewise, I would like to wish lots of success and happiness to his sidekick, Bill Crosby, who has done a remarkable job for the Congress over the last 27 years as a public servant, plus his time in the Navy. So we wish him well and thank him for his dedicated service over the years.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to stand here and defend the process, because I think it has been ugly, but I will say that we are ahead of the game when we look at the last 15 years. We are actually completing our business ahead of the schedule of all but 5 of those last 15 years. In 10 other instances we have gone later in the calendar year, longer in the legislative season than we are today. So even though we have a 40-pound pack of paper sitting there before us comprised of some 8 bills and 4 emergency sections, the fact is we are completing our business. If the good Members of this House have the wisdom and good judgment to vote as a majority for this package, we will go home, complete the campaign season, and have a victorious time on behalf of the majority, I hope, in November.

□ 1700

That being said, let me say that we have comprised a great deal in this package. We not only include eight regular appropriations bills, but we address the Y2K emergency problem that threatens Government computers and virtually all computers of this country in every walk of life as we change into the next millennium.

We address the needs for increasing the safety for our diplomats and their staff in embassies and consulates all around the globe to provide some protection against terrorism.

We include money for agricultural emergencies reaped by natural and other disasters around this country, and we provide much needed funding that replenishes the readiness accounts and the needs for our Defense Department to provide defense against incoming missiles to this country through a viable missile defense system and various other priorities that are so extraordinarily important to the armed forces and the men and women that serve in them.

I might say that we do all of that, eight appropriations bills, including the agriculture appropriations bill, which was passed by the Congress and vetoed by the President and redrawn in this package, within the caps provided us by the Committee on the Budget.

There may be some criticism about how we get there, but the fact is the Congressional Budget Office, notwithstanding current press reports, the Congressional Budget Office has proclaimed that we are under the caps allotted to us which agrees with the budget process as agreed to in last year's budget agreement. So nobody can say that this package is out of kilter in terms of overall spending.

Finally, I would say that it is a fair rule which allows us to debate this issue. We have an hour not only on the rule, but an hour to debate the entire package. While there will not be any amendments allowed, we are satisfied that the rule is appropriate and should be adopted. We are hopeful that the Members of the body will come and vote as a majority for the entire package, because they should not concentrate on the process. They should concentrate on the substance.

The fact is that the House of Representatives using the normal appropriations process passed all but one of our bills before the end of the fiscal year. The Labor-HHS-Education bill was not passed in the House or the Senate, but it was conferenced informally between our Members of both bodies. We worked our way through the process.

Mr. Speaker, all I would say is that whether Members like this process or not, the fact is that we have had a chance to finish all of the individual bill packages in their entirety, bundle them together in that very large bundle, and submit them to the membership so they can vote on it.

Once they vote on it, it will be virtually the last vote they cast for this Congress, and we will go home knowing that we have achieved the first balanced budget in 30 years.

Last year we passed the first tax cut in 16 years. We have virtually frozen the cost of government across the board, stopped the growth of government in all of the departments, agencies, and programs. We have saved about $125 billion under what the President projected we would have spent some 4 years ago at this time. So we can take confidence in the fact that we have restored fiscal integrity to the United States Treasury for the first time in a generation. I think that is no small accomplishment. I urge the Members to vote for this, and go home with great pride.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I just flew over 3,000 miles from the central coast of California to support this important bill. This budget bill is a victory for the American people. It is a victory over mindless partisanship, and it is a terrific victory for education.

Providing our local school districts with additional qualified teachers is an important step in the right direction. Next year we must come back and help our local communities to build new classrooms and to modernize their schools.

This budget is a victory in the fight against disease. As a nurse, I am thrilled that Congress is giving vigorous support to critical research on Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, diabetes, and ALS. Next year we must come back, take on the HMOs, and pass a strong patient's bill of rights.

This is a good bill. I urge my colleagues to pass it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the do-nothing Congress is limping to a pathetic end, one final $500 billion bill. Just to my left there is a copy bound with twine 2 feet tall. It weighs 40 pounds. Who among the rank and file Members of the House can say they have read and understood the entire package? Half the Members here could not even lift it, let alone read it.

The chairman of the Committee on Rules said it was about readiness. For once we are in vague agreement. This bill is about readiness, campaign readiness. It is stuffed to the gills with election-year goodies. The gentleman meant military readiness, but from the quarter of a million dollars that the Pentagon is going to be forced to spend to study the effect of stay-awake gum on the troops, to the C–130J airplanes that they are going to be forced to buy that will be built in the Speaker's district, and they will have to retire other good planes 10 years early to accommodate them, it is much more of an assault on the orderly readiness of our troops than it is a help.

Of the $7.5 billion stuffed into the Pentagon budget in this bill, perhaps $1.1 billion, 14 percent, can be said to truly be going to the readiness needs of our men and women in uniform. Is $1 billion more for the Star Wars fantasy that has wasted $50 billion, so far with no successful experiments, is that the readiness that our troops need? I think not.

Is $2 billion more for intelligence agencies what they need? Just 3 years ago the National Security Agency lost $4 billion in its budget. That is right, it misplaced $4 billion, because it was trying to hide it from our enemies, and they had a bunch of different bank accounts around. They forgot they had the money until a new auditor came in and found it, and they need another $2 billion? I do not think so.

The gentleman spoke about fiscal responsibility. This bill is financed with $20 billion out of the future social security trust fund, the so-called surplus in emergency spending. That is not fiscal responsibility.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell the gentleman that we received this bill up in the Committee on Rules at 9:30 last night. I was there. It was ready for any Democrat to come upstairs and see it. I will tell the gentleman, if he would have come up at 9:30 last night, he would have found that the State of Oregon is the real beneficiary, and so is the gentleman's district. He ought to be here praising this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I will probably not have this opportunity again to congratulate my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) for the work he has done as the chairman of the Committee on Rules in representing his party's way. He and I, although we have disagreed probably on 90 percent of the matters that came before us, we never disagreed about our friendship. I hold him to be a very dear friend of mine.

Also, Mr. Crosby has been a great, great person, never butting into things, but always there as a font of information any time we needed some information, even though he represented the majority and we were in the minority. So I wish him well on his new endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican leadership's process which has brought us to the vote we cast today, a vote which merges eight separate appropriations bills into one huge 4,000-page omnibus bill which will spend some $500 billion with one vote.

Within this huge bill there are some excellent and important provisions which are good for my State of Vermont and which are good for this country, but there are some awful provisions and wasteful provisions which are going to cost taxpayers billions and billions of dollars. It is a travesty and an insult to the democratic process that Members have not been able to vote separately on these provisions to maintain what is good, to get out what is bad, and to end up with the best legislation that would serve the interests of the American people.

I would hope that regardless of our political point of view or the party we may be in, that we will work together to make sure that a process like this does not take place again.

Within the positive aspects of this bill, there is some real help for dairy farmers in the State of Vermont and throughout this country in terms of the extension of the Northeast Dairy Compact. There are some very important provisions for our Gulf War veterans, who have never gotten the kind of treatment that they need, and this bill will provide them with some real help now and in the future.

There is some good help for those home health care agencies in Vermont and throughout this country who have suffered severe cuts as a result of the balanced budget agreement last year. There is good legislation extending the Cancer Registry Act, helping those people who are victims or hurting from cancer. There are some good provisions, but the process has not been good.

Mr. MOAKLEY. 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 for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chairman of the Committee on Rules for bringing this rule to the floor today. I believe it is long overdue for us to do our jobs to make sure that the government remains open and the American people are taken care of. Let me thank the appropriators for long and hard work.

Needless to say, I would have preferred a deliberate study of each individual appropriations bill, but frankly, I want to say to the American people, we want their business done. I am grateful that those who are on waiting lists across this Nation, waiting on Section 8 housing, these are the working poor, will now have over a 2-year period and 100,000 extra vouchers for people to live throughout the country and continue working.

I am very pleased that AmeriCorps, that has helped educate any number of our young people, has now been funded. They go into communities and help senior citizens and help preschool children and help rebuild communities, and yet then have funding to go to college.

Frankly, I am delighted that we recognize that the Census is one of the most important tasks that we have, and therefore, we will extend the time for sampling, as well as the other form that is now being utilized by the Census agency so we can get the most accurate count.

I am very pleased, as rains pour in Texas, that we have 12 million for the Simms Bayou in my district and other districts to make sure that we provide for those taxpayers who send money to this government.

But most of all, I am proud for the incremental increase in helping children suffering from mental disabilities, moving up $5 million, so we can go into communities and draw in their families and the children, and begin to rebuild lives of children who are suffering from mental illnesses.

I am not pleased, however, in helping seniors who are homebound and those home health care agencies. Yes, the IPS will be delayed now from 1999 to 2000, but I wanted to give retroactive help. Though we are boosting the payments, Mr. Speaker, I think we can do more. My commitment is we will do more to help those seniors and those home health care agencies.

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

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member of the Committee on Rules for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. I intend to vote for it, but I think that never, in all my life, in a long legislative career, have I ever done anything so much on faith as signing this conference report.

For the people who are wondering, this is a conference report on the transportation bill. I think that is

probably less than 10 percent of the bill, but the conferees who have signed it are those of us on that particular bill. So I put my signature on that conference report, and 90 percent of it is something that I am taking on faith. I know there are some good things in it, but I am really not taking responsibility for everything that is in it. It is sort of what one would call an institutional obligation, to move the process on.

Mr. Speaker, within the transportation bill I commend my friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF). I think we have produced a good bill within the restraints of the budget deal and with the fundamental transportation problems in this country.

□ 1715

I also have to say, Mr. Speaker, I guess this is it, this big pile of paper representing all of these bills that have been combined in a process such as I have never seen, really with very minimal involvement of many of the Members who were involved in writing the specific bills. We have this huge bill now before us. Clearly, it is hard to ask somebody to vote for it. That I cannot do.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think we have no other choice at this time but simply to vote ''yes'' and move this bill forward.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) has 8 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to one of outstanding Members from Morris, Illinois (Mr. WELLER).

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding time to me.

First, I want to salute the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and thank him for his leadership. I realize tonight is his last official vote in the House of Representatives, and I want to thank him for his friendship and wish him well.

I rise in support of this rule, and I rise in support of the bill. As I look back over the last 2 years, I look back at a Congress that has accomplished a lot of things. I remember when we were sworn in 2 years ago, there were a lot of the naysayers that said this Congress could not accomplish what we wanted to do. They said we could not balance the budget. They said we could not provide tax relief for middle-class families. They said we could not reform the welfare system. They said we could not restructure and retain the IRS. Well, we did.

As I look back over the last 2 years, we did all those things we were told we could not do. We balanced the budget for the first time in 28 years. We cut taxes for the middle class for the first time in 16 years. We reformed welfare for the first time in a generation. We tamed the tax collector for the first time ever.

Tonight we are in the final hours of this session of Congress. Now there is this omnibus bill before us. It is a bipartisan compromise. There are things in it some of us do not like. There are things in it some of us do like. But it is a good bill, in general, and it helps fight against drugs, puts more money into the classroom, helps family farmers with disaster relief, helps small businesses by quicker phase-in of the 100 percent deduction for self-employed for health insurance, provides flood relief to the Chicago south suburbs.

Mr. Speaker, there is something very important that is missing. I have often stood in the well of this House and I have often asked a very simple question: Is it right, is it fair that under our tax code a married working couple with two incomes pays more in taxes than an identical couple, identical income living together outside of marriage? It is wrong that our tax code punishes marriage with higher taxes.

Earlier this fall, the House of Representatives passed a tax cut providing marriage tax relief for 28 million married working couples; $243 a year they would have received. Unfortunately, they have been left at the altar.

Mr. Speaker, let us make elimination of the marriage tax penalty a number one priority of next year's tax provisions.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in objection to the rule.

As many speakers have said before me, this is a horrible process. It was just a year ago that this House, in a bipartisan vote, passed the Balanced Budget Act of 1997. Now, as we head into a time of surplus, which we do not know how much it is going to be, we have already started to spend that surplus without planning for the future. Earlier this year we passed a highway bill that was at least $20 billion over the Balanced Budget Act. This bill, while there is some emergency spending in it, which I think would qualify as emergency spending and I agree with the concept, I am afraid may well set a precedent going forward where everything we cannot get under the spending caps we are just going to call an emergency and do.

I know parts of Texas have agricultural emergencies and we need to fund that. I know there is a readiness problem. But I have some concerns about funding more for this Star Wars project.

The bill has some good things in it, the increase in NIH, which I support, and there are offsets for that. It has some things that are very important to my State. But overall the bill sets a very bad precedent. It shows the failure of this Congress.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I just do not understand the protest here. The gentleman has not been around here very long. Back in 1983, we had 7 appropriation bills rolled into the continuing resolution. That was under Democrat leadership. In 1985, we had 8 rolled into one bill. In 1986, we had 7. And guess what happened in 1987 and 1988? All 13 were rolled into one continuing resolution. Let us stop kidding ourselves and come over here and vote for the rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands, (Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN).

(Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed feelings and some disappointment that today I nevertheless support H.R. 4328, although I do have some reservations about the rule.

While many hail it as an example of what can be accomplished when both political parties put their personal agendas aside to reach compromise, and rightly so, the final outcome of this bill is a bittersweet victory for the people of the Virgin Islands. While no bill is perfect and there are winners and losers in every compromise, the failure to even extend the rum rebate at its current level will deal a hard blow to the treasury of the Virgin Islands.

This being said, I still join my colleagues in applauding President Clinton and the Democratic leadership in this Congress for fighting and winning vital new investments for the children of America. I want to thank also President Clinton, his staff and the Democratic leadership and my colleagues, many of them, who helped in securing an increase in children's health care funding for the children of the territories, and Senator CAROL MOSELEY-BRAUN for introducing a companion bill to mine which will breathe new life into a fledgling watch industry.

Before I close, let me just say I also ask for support to continue to work on those taxes for the territories.

Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed feelings and a great deal of disappointment that I rise today to nevertheless support H.R. 4328. While many hail it as an example of what can be accomplished when both political parties put their personal agendas aside to reach compromise, and rightly so, the final outcome of this bill is a bittersweet victory for the people of the Virgin Islands.

While no bill is perfect, and there are winners and losers in every compromise, the failure to even extend the rum revenue rebate at its current level has dealt a hard blow to the treasury of the Virgin Islands.

While we did achieve some of our goals, this very important measure met with such unexpected, inexplicable and adamant opposition, that important capital projects, and programs needed to spur our lagging economy will now go undone.

The hard working people of my district who have served this country in large numbers as

far back as the revolutionary war, and who have made their contributions to this country in other ways are deeply disappointed, but it is an issue that we will continue to pursue because it is a very necessary part of our economy's revitalization.

That being said, I must still join my colleagues in applauding President Clinton and the Democratic Leadership in Congress, for fighting for and winning vital new investments for the children of America.

The President's proposal to hire 100,000 new teachers will help to reduce class sizes in the early grades thereby enhancing individual attention and increase student learning. And by so doing, we will also be preventing more kids from getting in trouble.

The President and Congressional Democrats also secured very important investments in child literacy, college mentoring, after-school programs and summer jobs in this bill.

And finally green cards will be made available to Haitian refugees. Like the majority, while Democrats made strides, we did not get everything.

In addition to being saddened by what we see as a major but only temporary setback on V.I. produced rum, we feel similarly about the loss this year of the school construction initiative, of the ''Patients Bill of Rights'' bill as well as an increase in the minimum wage for working families, and last but not least, the killing of the comprehensive anti-Tobacco legislation which would have saved millions of young Americans from early and avoidable deaths.

In closing I want to thank President Clinton and his staff, the Democratic Leadership, and my colleagues, Appropriations Committee Ranking Democrat DAVE OBEY, my friend from Maryland, STENY HOYER, Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO, Congressman LOUIS STOKES, my Chairwoman MAXINE WATERS, Senator GRAHAM of Florida and all those too numerous to mention who helped in securing an increase in Children's Health Insurance funding for the children of the territories.

This additional funding will mean that the Children of our territories will have the same opportunities for better Health Care as their family and friends on the mainland.

I also want to especially thank Senator CAROL MOSELY-BRAUN for introducing a companion bill to mine which would breathe new life in a fledging industry in my district by instantly creating approximately 400 new jobs on St. Croix. For this effort as well, I must thank Ways and Means Committee Chairman BILL ARCHER and Ranking Democrat CHARLIE RANGEL. Also Trade Subcommittee Chair, PHIL CRANE and Ranking Democrat BOB MATSUI for their help in getting this bill passed today.

And I also ask for your support as we continue to work for the return of funds to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands as the law provides.

And last but not least, Finance Committee Chair BILL ROTH and Ranking Democrat PATRICK MOYNIHAN for their support of the proposal also.

My colleagues, while not have all we might have wanted, this bill deserves our support. I urge all to put aside narrow partisan interest and vote in favor of this good bill for America.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many of my colleagues would sign a $100,000 mortgage without reading it. I wonder how many of them would take out a $10,000 business loan without reading the terms. I wonder how many of my colleagues would profess to tell their constituents that they know what is in these 4000 pages.

I can tell them there is a $100 million visitors center for here, the Capitol. There is another $104 million for our protection. But I cannot also tell them there is a buyout program for the Pollack industry that I do not know why we need to buy those vessels. That costs us about $50 million.

This spends 500 billion of the taxpayers' money, not our money. And no one in this room can tell us everything that is in it. We have been here all year. I think we can wait a few more days to see to it that Members have the opportunity to study this. If we are not given the opportunity to study this, then I think the only businesslike and responsible thing for the Members to do is to vote against it.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I was in my office at 9:30 last night, right up there, when this bill was delivered. No Democrat came up to pick it up until after 9:30 this morning. I would say to the previous speaker, where was he for 12 hours when the bill was up there ready to be read?

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the reason that nobody came and picked it up is because they could not find a hand truck big enough to handle the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), our Democratic leader.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, Ronald Reagan stood in this Chamber nearly a decade ago and attacked the Congress for sending him a massive last-minute appropriation bill. Well, here we go again.

This bill is 4,000 pages long and weighs over 40 pounds. And at that time Ronald Reagan said, Congress should not send another one of these and, if you do, he said, I will not sign it.

Well, here they go again. This bill is a symbol of the wasted time and misguided priorities of a Republican Congress whose leadership consumed our agenda with investigations instead of legislation. Thanks to the Republican leadership, we have worked the fewest days and passed the fewest bills in decades. We did not even pass a budget resolution in this House of Representatives, the first time since the Budget Act passed 24 years ago.

For the last year Republicans in Congress have tried to focus the debate on anything except what is really significant to our future. They have had far more enthusiasm for subpoenas than for schools, and they would rather talk about the FBI than the IMF.

We were able to convince a reluctant and unwilling Republican majority to include funding for 100,000 new teachers in this bill, teachers that will help reduce class size and improve the quality of our children's education. While Democrats may not be satisfied with what was not included in this bill today, we will come back and fight again and again for a Patients' Bill of Rights, anti-teen smoking initiatives and an increase in the minimum wage. And a Democratic majority will hopefully enact the reforms to guarantee the future of Social Security and save the surplus for Social Security, which the Republican majority tried to spend before it could be saved, to save that program.

Ronald Reagan was right. It was a bad way to do business in 1988, and it is a bad way to do business in 1998.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for a change. It is time for a Congress that works full time to help meet the challenges of our future instead of skipping town with unfilled promises and unmet priorities, and one that fulfills its constitutional role to produce a budget in a manner befitting of us all.

If we want to change the agenda, it should be very clear. We have to change the leadership of this Congress. I believe the American people will do that, and I hope for the sake of the people they do.

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

I do not want the minority leader to take this wrong, but he has been standing up here emulating my great hero, Ronald Reagan. Let me just say to the gentleman, I know Ronald Reagan. He is a friend of mine. And the minority leader is a great guy and a great friend of mine but he isn't quite the same as Ronald Reagan.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) was just complaining about being opposed to the bill. I am looking at the conferees here. Every Democrat conferee signed this bill: SABO, TORRES, OLVER, PASTOR, CRAMER. And the President of the United States is for the bill. I do not understand the protest here.

□ 1730

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Sanibel, Florida (Mr. PORTER GOSS), a very valuable member of the Committee on Rules. He is also the chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this rule, the last rule of the year. The last rule of this Congress. This is a fair rule, it is an appropriate rule and, under the circumstances, it is about the only rule we could come up with, and I think we all know it.

This is a debate about the rule, but we are getting into process. Many people have talked about budget process tonight. I want everyone, all the Members, to understand that we have developed a bill, a bipartisan bill, with some very innovative new ideas for budget

process reform. I say this not because we are all proud of the process that we have just seen and we are experiencing tonight, but that we think we can do better. More important than that, there is an opportunity for Members to take that bill and read it, and I would suggest that Members do that because there are some good ideas and we should discuss them in the next Congress.

I would also like to point out the obvious. There is much in this bill. There is much I like, there is much that others like, and there is much that some of us are not so sure about at this point. That is the way it is because we have, right now, a situation of shared power in this country. That is what the voters have dealt us. We also have a separation of powers. That is what the Constitution has given us. And we have certainly something here that is a product where we should not be worried about winners or losers on a partisan basis, we should be worried about whether America wins.

I suggest America is going to win in a number of ways with this piece of legislation. Certainly in education, as we have heard. Certainly in intelligence, as we have not heard. We are reinvesting in the future, so some of the tragedies that were witnessed around the globe this year hopefully will not catch us by surprise or happen again. Certainly in defense. Certainly in the war on drugs. Certainly in a number of other areas that will be of interest to all Americans in their quality of life and in their pocketbook.

So I think this is a good piece of work, even though I would admit the process has been a little unusual.

The final thing I want to do is to pay my public respects to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), chairman of the Committee on Rules. I have followed the gentleman, who has been a great mentor and a great leader. He lead while we were in the minority, as a ranking member, when we were badly outnumbered. He has led in the majority, as the majority leader and chairman of the Committee on Rules, when we are also badly outnumbered on many occasions. I want to thank him, share my respects, and to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) as well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) has 2 minutes remaining. The minority leader yielded back 2 minutes to the gentleman. The gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) has 3 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time just to briefly say that there is nothing unusual about considering a group of appropriation bills in an omnibus bill. The Democrats controlled this body for 40 years. All during the 1980s they lumped in 7 bills, 3 bills, 8 bills, 7 bills; and then, in 1987 and 1988, they lumped in all 13 of the appropriation bills. So there is nothing unusual about doing this. We have to compromise, we have to govern.

Upstairs earlier I posed the question, why would a fiscal conservative like myself support this kind of measure when it does have a lot of excess spending that I do not agree with? And I pointed out there are three reasons:

Number one is that the growth of Federal spending has been slowed to 3 percent. That is something that we fiscal conservatives have been fighting for for years, and we finally have succeeded in this bill that is before us today.

The second reason is that the bill raises the overall spending for our military preparedness, something that is so terribly, terribly needed today. That is the reason I am going to vote for the bill.

And, finally, it increases both the level of spending and gives legislative clout to programs to deal with the most important issue facing this Nation today, and that is the illegal drug war that is taking away a whole new generation of Americans. We have to do something about it. This bill does it.

That is why we should all come over here and vote for the rule, and then we should vote for the omnibus bill.

I salute the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOB LIVINGSTON), for an outstanding job on bringing this to the floor today, and I urge support for the bill.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address some concerns on the Rule in H.R. 4328, the Omnibus Appropriations for the FY 99 Conference Report.

Although many of us are satisfied with the bill, we are very unhappy with the process that got us here. This bill contains over half of the appropriations necessary to keep this country going next year, including the funding for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Commerce, Justice, State, Agriculture, and Interior. It represents the most vital programs for our elderly, our disabled, our impoverished, and most importantly, our children. We simply cannot afford to play partisan politics with these people's lives, and hope that next year we will have a Democratic Congress so that we do not have to play these games.

Throughout this 105th Congress women's concerns have been repeatedly ignored. The Republican leadership has with one exception voted to reduce women's choices for adequate health care and has attempted to disempower us. It should be no surprise that once again women Federal prisoners are once again denied the right to choose an abortion. Women who discover they are pregnant after incarceration, have no option but to have a child which they will not have custody to, during their prison term.

The option to choose abortion, is one that is not available to them, and this is wrong and unfair.

In addition, here in the District of Columbia, the use of local and Federal funding for needle exchange programs in the District have been banned. Needle exchange programs which reduce the spread of HIV and hepatitis, can help to save lives, to cut this funding will exacerbate an already desperate situation for many D.C. residents. Not surprisingly, here in D.C. the use of Federal and D.C. funds used to provide women with access to abortion services are also denied, except in cases where the life of the mother is threatened, or in cases of rape or incest.

It should also be no surprise that gays and lesbians were denied important freedoms under the D.C. appropriations bill. In light of the hateful and violent crime against Matthew Shepard during this pat month, it should be clear to all of us, that our gay and lesbian constituents deserve the same equal rights as all of us.

I am also dismayed that a crucial provision of the foreign appropriations bill reduces funds for international family planning assistance. The elimination of funding by the United States for the U.N. Population Fund will deprive several hundred thousand women of effective contraception and put many of these women at risk for life threatening illnesses and injuries during an unwanted to unplanned pregnancy. More than 1,000 women will die as a result of these cuts. This simply is not acceptable.

Under the Labor HHS bill, this Congress has voted not to cover Federal funding for needle exchange programs, prohibit the use of Federal funds for embryo research, and expand the Hyde language to cover Medicare funding, meaning that women dependent on Medicare will not be able to access abortions. All of these decisions are harmful to women and to our less powerful members of society. Those who cannot fend for themselves should find protection through our Government. Yet, to refuse poor women on Medicare the choice to an abortion, and to vote not to provide our sick citizens with access to clean needles is shameful.

The Treasury Postal appropriations bill provision continues a prohibition on the use of funds for abortion in connection with any health plan under the Federal employees health benefit program, except where the life of the mother is threatened or where the woman is a victim of rape or incest. Under Supreme Court decisions, women have been allowed the choice for abortion and reproductive freedom, yet the leadership in this Congress has done everything within its power to erode these import rights.

Furthermore, this bill has come to the floor without adequate time for review. The bill itself, along with the conference report total well over 1,000 pages,

The way that this bill comes to the floor; however, should not surprise any of us. This is the same majority that passed a ''martial law'' resolution last week, which allows them to bring a bill to the floor without notice, without preparation, and without adequate time for deliberation. This is the same majority that brought the Labor-HHS appropriations bill to the floor for debate on just one issue, family planning, to appease their supporters on the far-right. This is the same majority that did not include Democratic representatives in their Conference Committee meetings. Having seen how the majority has handled this appropriations process, should we be surprised by the manner this bill has come to the floor? No. Are we outraged? Yes!

I urge all of you to vote against this rule, to reaffirm our commitment to the Democratic process.

Mr. SOLOMON. 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 ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. 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 SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote on H. Res. 604 after this vote.

There was no objection.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 333, nays 88, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 536]

YEAS—333

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Clay
Clement
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (VA)
Deal
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Kilpatrick
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Mink
Moakley
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryun
Sabo
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tierney
Torres
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—88

Allen
Andrews
Barrett (WI)
Bentsen
Bonior
Borski
Brown (CA)
Cardin
Carson
Christensen
Clayton
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Deutsch
Doggett
Edwards
Ensign
Etheridge
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hilliard
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kildee
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lee
Lipinski
Lofgren
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Martinez
McCarthy (MO)
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
Menendez
Miller (CA)
Minge
Nadler
Neal
Olver
Owens
Payne
Peterson (MN)
Rahall
Rivers
Rush
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Scarborough
Shays
Sherman
Skaggs
Stupak
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thurman
Tiahrt
Towns
Vento
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Woolsey
Yates

NOT VOTING—13

Becerra
Fazio
Hansen
Kennedy (RI)
Meehan
Mollohan
Oberstar
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Smith (NJ)
Stark
Tauscher
Weygand

☐ 1753

Messrs. WEXLER, VENTO and OLVER changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. STUMP, HINOJOSA and PORTMAN changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 1132, BANDELIER NATIONAL MONUMENT ADMINISTRATIVE IMPROVEMENT AND WATERSHED PROTECTION ACT OF 1998 AND S. 2133, PRESERVATION OF THE ROUTE 66 CORRIDOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The pending business is the question of agreeing to House Resolution 604, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 189, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 537]

YEAS—229

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boswell
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paul