

side of the aisle is interested in shutting down the government and to point out that there are several major legislative provisions being discussed in the context of the conference on this bill, they could, if not resolved to the satisfaction of the President, cause a government shutdown.

I am confident that the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the most capable manager of this bill, does not intend in any way to cause such a shutdown. In fact, I have heard the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON) and members of the Republican leadership in both Houses make similar statements.

The purpose of taking the time of the House today is to simply point out some of the hurdles that exist in getting this bill into signable form.

The Senate bill contained major new legislation addressing numerous legislative issues. There are other potential extraneous issues we have heard about which are currently not contained in either the House or the Senate bills.

It may be that necessary solutions can be found on all of these issues so that the President can sign this bill. However, in several instances, the administration has indicated its strong opposition to these provisions and at the moment I am not aware of any direct negotiations with them which could lead to a solution of these difficulties.

I do not make this motion myself to speak for or against any of these provisions. However, I am aware of strong opposition on the Democratic side to several of these matters. I have done it to make clear that this bill already has several difficult issues, such as census funding and funding for the Legal Services Corporation, that will be difficult to resolve.

The bill also funds critical law enforcement and international security related matters that should continue without the interruption inherent in a government shutdown. So let us agree on this motion and get to conference and work out our differences so that a government shutdown can be avoided.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as I read the motion, it indicates that the conferees should not take certain actions outside the scope of the conference which could have the effect of causing a government shutdown.

As far as I know, no one, Mr. Speaker, has the intention to take any action to cause a government shutdown; certainly not on this side. We are determined to do our dead level best to keep this government operating.

The Congress is not going to abdicate its responsibilities to legislate on behalf of the American people, but we will send bills to the President. If he chooses to shut the government down, that is his business. We are not going to precipitate that, so no one on this

side is in favor of a government shutdown, and if additional time is needed to work out remaining issues, continuing resolutions will be proposed to assure that there is no government shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, with that understanding, I have no objections to the motion. In fact, I would join in the making of the motion and ask for an immediate vote.

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the motion to instruct.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN).

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ROGERS, KOLBE, TAYLOR of North Carolina, REGULA, LATHAM, LIVINGSTON, YOUNG of Florida, MOLLOHAN, SKAGGS, DIXON and OBEY.

There was no objection.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the motion to instruct, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

#### WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 4(b) OF RULE XI WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 575 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

##### H. RES. 575

*Resolved*, That the requirement of clause 4(b) of rule XI for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported from that committee before the legislative day of October 11, 1998, providing for consideration or disposition of any of the following:

(1) A bill or joint resolution making general appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, any amendment thereto, any conference report thereon, or any amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon.

(2) A bill or joint resolution that includes provisions making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1999, any amendment thereto, any conference report thereon, or any

amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order at any time before October 11, 1998, for the Speaker to entertain motions to suspend the rules, provided that the object of any such motion is announced from the floor at least two hours before the motion is offered. In scheduling the consideration of legislation under this authority, the Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or his designee.

□ 1345

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUNT). The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, for the 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 is yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Committee on Rules met and reported H. Res. 575 providing for expedited procedures in the House. The resolution waives clause 4(b) of Rule XI, requiring a two-thirds vote to consider a rule on the same day it is reported from the Committee on Rules.

The resolution applies the waiver to any special rule reported before October 11, 1998, providing for a consideration or disposition of a bill or joint resolution, making general appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, any amendment thereto, any conference report thereon, and any amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon.

The resolution also applies a waiver to any special rule reported before October 11, 1998, providing for consideration or disposition of a bill or joint resolution, making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, any amendment thereto, any conference report thereon, and any amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon.

Finally, the resolution allows at any time before October 11, 1998, for the Speaker to entertain motions to suspend the rules, provided that the object of any such motion is announced from the floor at least 2 hours before the motion is offered, and that in the scheduling of legislation under this authority, the Speaker or his designee shall consult with the minority leader or his designee.

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, we are in the last days of the legislative session. House Resolution 575, short and simple, allows the House to complete its work for the year in a timely manner.

House rule 27 normally limits House consideration of suspension bills to Mondays and Tuesdays. But now, in the final weeks of the session, there is no reason to put off noncontroversial legislation until next year.

In addition, H. Res. 575 allows for the same-day consideration of urgent appropriations bills. Without congressional action, the funding for many

Federal agencies will expire on October 9. While the House and Senate continue to negotiate spending priorities, it is important that the House be able to act immediately to pass any measure that keeps the government working for the taxpayers.

H. Res. 575 is a reasonable measure that will allow us to finish our work for the year on time.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) for yielding me the customary half-hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, the fiscal year started just 6 days ago and my Republican colleagues have not finished, have not finished, 9 of the 13 appropriations bills. So unless this Congress gets to work on something other than investigating, the Federal Government may end up closing up for business.

This rule will enable them to bring up appropriations conference bills and continuing resolutions more quickly, but it could reduce the amount of time that Members have to read through these bills before they go to a vote. But, Mr. Speaker, without martial law, conference reports have to be available for at least 3 days before they are considered on the House floor. Otherwise, we may have only moments to look over very important appropriations conference reports as they come up for votes, and as members of the minority party, that is just unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, the rule we are considering today is limited to the appropriations conference reports and it is further limited to the end of this week. This rule will also enable my Republican colleagues to bring up suspension bills with 2 hours notice. Mr. Speaker, they asked for this authority last week and they promised 2 hours notice, and they kept their promise, and I feel that they will keep their promise this time.

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

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH).

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

I rise today with some serious questions about this rule, chiefly focusing not on the question of suspensions which I think many Members would like to have in this what is hopefully our final week here; not on the question of most of the bills that will be coming out, but a question on what is being labeled the omnibus appropriations bill, the final, large bill that will supposedly wrap all of those that we have not been able to pass in this House and the Senate and have signed by the President into one large spending package.

In previous years, that bill has been used to negotiate a lot of different

issues, some of them having to do with spending, some of them having to do with totally extraneous matters, some of them having to do with tax cuts, which this House passed a little over a week ago. Unfortunately, it appears to me that right now, the likelihood of that bill coming out in a way that Republicans, conservative Republicans in particular, can be proud about is very nil, because the President has already indicated he is looking for a veto fight. He is hoping to veto that large spending bill, as he has indicated he will do with the agriculture appropriations bill that was passed in this House last Friday, simply to have more spending and to have his priorities in the way this government is operated. Many of us fear that that may be only part of the motive for why he would veto that and possibly engage in a strategy where he might shut down parts of the government in order to have that type of disagreement over priorities in that bill.

Mr. Speaker, conservatives want to avoid that type of shutdown. We also want to avoid a bill that would give away many of the priorities that this Republican Congress has laid out in the last 8 months.

Let me mention for the body some of those priorities that are at stake in this bill. The reason I talk about this bill and the rule is this rule would waive the 24-hour notice for consideration of that bill. So I think it is important that we know what we may be waiving notice about in order to allow us in a rush to leave town to give up on some of these important policy issues.

The first would have to do with the spending caps that were negotiated last year in the budget agreement. There is already on the table proposals from somewhere between \$9 billion to \$15 billion additional spending beyond those caps. In the agriculture bill, we in this Congress spend \$4 billion above those caps. The President in his veto message indicates he wants to spend an additional \$3 billion or \$4 billion. So the total will be somewhere between \$15 billion and \$25 billion in one year above the budget deal that was agreed to just one year ago.

The second issue is on IMF spending, whether we will provide funds for the IMF to the full \$18 billion. These are technically loans, but many of us realize that they may never be paid back, and so therefore, the American taxpayer will be paying the bill.

Another key issue is what we do on the so-called Mexico City policy, the question of whether this government will spend United States taxpayer funds in order to support lobbying for abortions around the world.

A fourth issue that is of importance to us is whether we will have a policy of national testing in our schools or whether we will continue the policy that says, we cannot spend taxpayer dollars to develop that national test here in Washington; we see testing as better done by the States and local community schools.

Other issues of importance will be the choice provision in the D.C. bill that allows scholarships to go to parents here in the District of Columbia so that they can afford to send their children to a good school; the ban on needle exchanges in drug programs that this House has passed; the ban on adoptions by 2 unmarried individuals for the District of Columbia. The question of whether there will be parental notification, which this House has not yet been able to address because we have not been able to bring the Labor-HHS Appropriations bill to the floor, and we hear rumors that perhaps that will never come to the floor, it will be part of this omnibus bill, presumably without that parental notification provision that the committee put into its draft of that bill.

So there are many weighty issues that will be resolved in these final days in negotiations between the White House, the Senate, and the House leadership, and there are many of us who have grave concerns about how those issues will be resolved.

One of the things that we have as a concern about this rule is whether we will have sufficient time to know what it is we will be voting on in this final day of this session. How will those issues be resolved? Will we bust the budget caps? Will we give \$18 billion to the IMF of American taxpayer dollars? Will we allow needle exchanges in this country? Those are issues that we need to know about before we can make our decisions on how to vote on that final bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have grave reservations about that provision in this rule that governs our processes for the remaining days of this session. As I say, the other provisions in it, particularly allowing suspensions to occur, I fully support, and those of us on the Conservative Action Team fully support. But I think we need to have answers on how we as a body will be notified about these contentious issues with enough time to make our decisions on how we would vote in the final days of this session.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to tell the gentleman that I share his concerns and very much hope that we can deal with those issues in a way that is satisfactory to all of us.

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

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

Mrs. MYRICK. 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 vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 206, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 484]

YEAS—218

Aderholt	Gekas	Packard
Archer	Gibbons	Pappas
Armey	Gilchrest	Parker
Bachus	Gillmor	Paul
Baker	Gilman	Paxon
Ballenger	Goodlatte	Pease
Barr	Goodling	Peterson (PA)
Barrett (NE)	Goss	Petri
Bartlett	Graham	Pickering
Barton	Granger	Pitts
Bass	Greenwood	Pombo
Bateman	Gutknecht	Porter
Bereuter	Hansen	Portman
Bilbray	Hastert	Quinn
Billirakis	Hastings (WA)	Radanovich
Bliley	Hayworth	Ramstad
Blunt	Hefley	Redmond
Boehlert	Herger	Regula
Boehner	Hill	Riley
Bonilla	Hilleary	Rogan
Bono	Hobson	Rogers
Brady (TX)	Hoekstra	Rohrabacher
Bryant	Horn	Ros-Lehtinen
Bunning	Hostettler	Roukema
Burr	Houghton	Royce
Burton	Hulshof	Ryun
Buyer	Hunter	Salmon
Callahan	Hutchinson	Sanford
Camp	Hyde	Saxton
Campbell	Inglis	Scarborough
Canady	Jenkins	Schaefer, Dan
Cannon	Johnson (CT)	Schaffer, Bob
Castle	Johnson, Sam	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Jones	Sessions
Chambliss	Kasich	Shadegg
Chenoweth	Kelly	Shaw
Christensen	Kim	Shays
Coble	King (NY)	Shimkus
Coburn	Kingston	Shuster
Collins	Klug	Skeen
Combest	Knollenberg	Smith (MI)
Cook	Kolbe	Smith (NJ)
Cooksey	LaHood	Smith (OR)
Cox	Largent	Smith (TX)
Crane	Latham	Smith, Linda
Crapo	LaTourette	Snowbarger
Cubin	Lazio	Solomon
Cunningham	Leach	Souder
Deal	Lewis (CA)	Spence
DeLay	Lewis (KY)	Stump
Diaz-Balart	Livingston	Sununu
Dickey	LoBiondo	Talent
Doolittle	Lucas	Tauzin
Dreier	Manzullo	Taylor (NC)
Duncan	McCollum	Thomas
Dunn	McCrery	Thornberry
Ehlers	McDade	Thune
Ehrlich	McHugh	Upton
Emerson	McInnis	Walsh
English	McIntosh	Wamp
Ensign	McKeon	Watkins
Everett	Metcalfe	Watts (OK)
Ewing	Mica	Weldon (FL)
Fawell	Miller (FL)	Weldon (PA)
Foley	Moran (KS)	Weller
Forbes	Morella	White
Fossella	Myrick	Whitfield
Fowler	Nethercutt	Wicker
Fox	Ney	Wilson
Franks (NJ)	Northup	Wolf
Frelinghuysen	Norwood	Young (AK)
Galleghy	Nussle	Young (FL)
Ganske	Oxley	

NAYS—206

Abercrombie	Berman	Brady (PA)
Ackerman	Berry	Brown (CA)
Allen	Bishop	Brown (FL)
Andrews	Blagojevich	Brown (OH)
Baesler	Blumenauer	Capps
Baldacci	Bonior	Cardin
Barcia	Borski	Carson
Barrett (WI)	Boswell	Clay
Becerra	Boucher	Clayton
Bentsen	Boyd	Clyburn

Condit	Kanjorski	Peterson (MN)
Conyers	Kaptur	Pickett
Costello	Kennedy (MA)	Pomeroy
Coyne	Kennedy (RI)	Price (NC)
Cramer	Kildee	Rahall
Cummings	Kind (WI)	Rangel
Danner	Klecza	Reyes
Davis (FL)	Klink	Rivers
Davis (IL)	Kucinich	Rodriguez
DeFazio	LaFalce	Roemer
DeGette	Lampson	Rothman
Delahunt	Lantos	Roybal-Allard
DeLauro	Lee	Rush
Deutsch	Levin	Sabo
Dicks	Lewis (GA)	Sanchez
Dingell	Lipinski	Sanders
Dixon	Lofgren	Sandlin
Doggett	Lowey	Sawyer
Dooley	Luther	Schumer
Doyle	Maloney (CT)	Scott
Edwards	Maloney (NY)	Serrano
Engel	Manton	Sherman
Eshoo	Markey	Sisisky
Etheridge	Martinez	Skaggs
Evans	Mascara	Skelton
Farr	Matsui	Slaughter
Fattah	McCarthy (MO)	Smith, Adam
Fazio	McCarthy (NY)	Snyder
Filner	McDermott	Spratt
Ford	McGovern	Stabenow
Frank (MA)	McHale	Stark
Frost	McIntyre	Stenholm
Furse	McKinney	Stokes
Gedensson	McNulty	Strickland
Gephardt	Meehan	Stupak
Gonzalez	Meek (FL)	Tanner
Goode	Meeks (NY)	Tauscher
Gordon	Menendez	Taylor (MS)
Green	Millender-	Thompson
Gutierrez	McDonald	Thurman
Hall (OH)	Miller (CA)	Tiahrt
Hall (TX)	Minge	Tierney
Hamilton	Mink	Torres
Harman	Moakley	Towns
Hastings (FL)	Mollohan	Trafigant
Hefner	Moran (VA)	Turner
Hilliard	Murtha	Velazquez
Hinchee	Nadler	Vento
Hinojosa	Neal	Visclosky
Holden	Neumann	Waters
Hooley	Oberstar	Watt (NC)
Hoyer	Obey	Waxman
Istook	Olver	Wexler
Jackson (IL)	Ortiz	Weygand
Jackson-Lee	Owens	Wise
(TX)	Pallone	Woolsey
Jefferson	Pascrell	Wynn
John	Pastor	Yates
Johnson (WI)	Payne	
Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi	

NOT VOTING—10

Calvert	Kilpatrick	Riggs
Clement	Linder	Stearns
Davis (VA)	Poshard	
Kennelly	Pryce (OH)	

□ 1418

Messrs. EVANS, HEFNER, and STRICKLAND, and Ms. WOOLSEY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 483, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 483

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 483.

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

There was no objection.

#### HASKELL INDIAN NATIONS UNIVERSITY AND SOUTHWESTERN INDIAN POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEMS ACT OF 1998

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 576 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 576

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4259) to allow Haskell Indian Nations University and the Southwestern Indian Polytechnic Institute each to conduct a demonstration project to test the feasibility and desirability of new personnel management policies and procedures, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Each section of the bill shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington State (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)