The issue is not so much whether or not we have finished our work on time today. The issue is whether or not this snarl that we find ourselves in could have been avoided, and the fact is it could have.

I think we need to ask why we are in this situation today, where we have to extend the budget once again. I think we have to recognize that some people in this body and even those who report on this body, are beginning to believe that legislative train derailments have become as much a part of autumn as football, and I think we have to ask why.

Now, we hear some Members of the majority party saying, ''Oh, the President of the United States has involved himself. He has usurped our power. That is the problem.''

That is not the problem at all. The President has a perfect right to assert his priorities, just as the majority and minority parties in this institution have a right to assert theirs. The President has simply moved into a vacuum created by the fact that this Congress has not done its job. I think we ought to ask why.

We are in the situation we are in today because of the basic decision made 10 months ago by the Republican leadership of this House to try to impose on the Congress a budget resolution which they knew would not work, which we knew would not work, which the public knew would not work, and which the press knew would not work.

They insisted on pretending that by cutting huge amounts over the next 5 years out of domestic appropriations, they could somehow pretend that there was enough room in the budget to finance giant tax cuts, which got progressively larger each year as the cuts in social programs got progressively deeper. I think they were warned all around the horn that that would simply not work.

Now, I understand why they would not take those warnings from people like me, because I am a member of the loyal opposition; but they were warned by people like former Congressman Bob Livingston, who used to Chair this committee. He tried to warn the majority party that, sooner or later, if you are the governing party in any legislative institution, you have to choose between getting your work done and having absolute, total party unity; and sometimes you have to sacrifice the latter in order to accomplish the former.

The problem is simply that the leadership on the other side has never recognized that if there are those in their conference who are too extreme to be part of a broader consensus in this House on controversial matters, then they need to let them go and work out a broad bipartisan consensus between the two parties. Instead, on bill after bill, they chose to proceed along the confrontational road. They chose to try to pass bills with only Republican votes that satisfied their ideology and their political goals, but, in the end, produced no real legislative results. So in the end, they wind up with 11 out of the 13 bills never having proceeded beyond second base, and none of them getting home except the defense appropriations bill.

Now, I think the issue is simple: we are here today facing a day of reckoning because at this point we have a strategy a week coming out of the majority leadership. First of all, we are supposed to live by the budget resolution, which spells out how much is supposed to be cut out of each appropriation bill. The majority party discovers they cannot get the votes to pass any of those bills through both Houses, except the defense bills, and so what happens? They then revert to a different strategy.

Just today I left a conference where they are putting $2 billion additional into the Energy and Water bill above the level as it left the House. I do not know, frankly, whether I should vote for that bill or not, because I have no idea what they intend to do with the other seven remaining appropriation bills that require funding.

Under some circumstances, I would certainly be willing to support that $2 billion add-on, but not if it comes at the expense of our being able to meet our responsibilities in the area of education, in the area of health care, in the area of environmental cleanup, and we have none of the answers to those questions yet because we have no idea how they intend to produce passable bills for Interior, for Labor, Health, Education, Social Services, for HUD, and I submit they do not either.

So it seems to me that sooner or later the majority party is going to have to agree to a bipartisan approach to achieve a broad consensus between the two parties, or else we will be stuck on second base until the cows come home.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that all of the speakers on this issue on both sides have supported this CR and said they would support this rule, so I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.J. Res. 109 and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 591, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 109) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of H.J. Res. 109 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 109

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of Government for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 2000 for continuing projects or activities including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees (not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution) which were conducted in the fiscal year 2000 and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority would be available in the following appropriations Acts:

(1) the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001;

(2) the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001, notwithstanding section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 and, section 313 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103–236);

(3) the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 2001;

(4) the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2001;

(5) the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2001, notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91–672 and section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956;

(6) the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001;

(7) the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001;

(8) the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2001;

(9) the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001;

(10) the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 2001; and

(11) the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001:

Provided, That whenever the amount which would be made available or the authority which would be granted in these Acts as passed by the House and Senate as of October 1, 2000, is different than that which would be available or granted under current operations, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate: *Provided further,* That whenever there is no amount made available under any of these appropriations Acts as passed by the House and Senate as of October 1, 2000, for a continuing project or activity which was conducted in fiscal year 2000 and for which there is fiscal year 2001

funding included in the budget request, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued at the rate for current operations under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 2000.

(b) Whenever the amount which would be made available or the authority which would be granted under an Act listed in this section as passed by the House as of October 1, 2000, is different from that which would be available or granted under such Act as passed by the Senate as of October 1, 2000, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 2001 and under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 2000.

(c) Whenever an Act listed in this section has been passed by only the House or only the Senate as of October 1, 2000, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the one House at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate and under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 2000: *Provided*, That whenever there is no amount made available under any of these appropriations Acts as passed by the House or the Senate as of October 1, 2000, for a continuing project or activity which was conducted in fiscal year 2000 and for which there is fiscal year 2001 funding included in the budget requested, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued at the rate for current operations under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 2000.

SEC. 102. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner which would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 103. No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during the fiscal year 2000.

SEC. 104. No provision which is included in an appropriations Act enumerated in section 101 but which was not included in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2000 and which by its terms is applicable to more than one appropriation, fund, or authority shall be applicable to any appropriation, fund, or authority provided in this joint resolution.

SEC. 105. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any program, project, or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this joint resolution.

SEC. 106. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until (a) enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution, or (b) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act by both Houses without any provision for such project or activity, or (c) October 6, 2000, whichever first occurs.

SEC. 107. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 108. No provision in the appropriations Act for the fiscal year 2001 referred to in section 101 of this Act that makes the availability of any appropriation provided therein dependent upon the enactment of additional authorizing or other legislation shall be effective before the date set forth in section 106(c) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 109. Appropriations and funds made available by or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in section 1513 of title 31, United States Code, but nothing herein shall be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds.

SEC. 110. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the joint resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 111. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, for those programs that had high initial rates of operation or complete distribution of fiscal year 2000 appropriations at the beginning of that fiscal year because of distributions of funding to States, foreign countries, grantees or others, similar distributions of funds for fiscal year 2001 shall not be made and no grants shall be awarded for such programs funded by this resolution that would impinge on final funding prerogatives.

SEC. 112. Amounts provided by section 101 of this joint resolution, for projects and activities in the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001, affected by the termination of the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund, shall be distributed into the accounts established in the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001, as passed by the House.

SEC. 113. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, the rate for operations for projects and activities that would be funded under the heading ''International Organizations and Conferences, Contributions to International Organizations'' in the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001, shall be the amount provided by the provisions of section 101 multiplied by the ratio of the number of days covered by this resolution to 365.

SEC. 114. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, only the following activities funded with Federal Funds for the District of Columbia, may be continued under this joint resolution at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate, multiplied by the ratio of the number of days covered by this joint resolution to 365: Resident Tuition Support, Corrections Trustee Operations, Court Services and Offender Supervision, District of Columbia Courts, and Defender Services in District of Columbia Courts.

SEC. 115. Activities authorized by sections 1309(a)(2), as amended by Public Law 104–208, and 1376(c) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), may continue through the date specified in section 106(c) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 116. Notwithstanding subsections (a)(2) and (h)(1)(B) of section 3011 of Public Law 106–31, activities authorized for fiscal year 2000 by such section may continue during the period covered by this joint resolution.

SEC. 117. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, the rate for operations for projects and activities for decennial census programs that would be funded under the heading ''Bureau of the Census, Periodic Censuses and Programs'' in the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001, shall be the budget request.

SEC. 118. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution except section 106, the United States Geological Survey may sign a contract to maintain Landsat-7 flight operations consistent with the President's Budget proposal to transfer Landsat-7 flight operations responsibility from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to the United States Geological Survey beginning in fiscal year 2001.

SEC. 119. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, funds previously appropriated to the American Section of the International Joint Commission in Public Law 106–246 may be obligated and expended in fiscal year 2001 without regard to section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 591, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

(Mr. YOUNG of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before the House, H.J. Res. 109, is a continuing resolution for fiscal year 2001. Legislation is needed because even though the House has passed all of the 13 appropriations bills, all 13 appropriations bills have not completed conference or been approved by the President and will not be so by October 1, the beginning of the fiscal year. So in order to keep the government operating and open the first day of the new fiscal year, we need to enact this continuing resolution.

I do not think there is any controversy relative to the continuing resolution itself. The duration of the continuing resolution that is before the House is until October 6.

Let me briefly describe the terms and conditions of this continuing resolution. It will continue all ongoing activities at current rates under the same terms and conditions as fiscal year 2000. Its remaining terms and conditions are the same as we have used in recent years. It does not allow new starts. It restricts obligations on high initial spendout programs so that final funding decisions will not be impacted. It includes eight funding or authorizing anomalies; four of them were in last year's continuing resolution or have been modified slightly from last year; four are new, and six from last year have been deleted.

Mr. Speaker, this continuing resolution is noncontroversial. I am aware that the President has agreed to sign at least several short-term continuing resolutions, so I urge the House to move this legislation to the other body so that we can be sure that the government will operate smoothly and efficiently and so we can continue our regular work to finish our regular appropriations bills quickly.

Before I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker, I compliment all of our colleagues in the House. While some of the debates took a long time, some of the amendments were difficult to deal with and some of them were hard political votes, despite all of this, the House has passed all 13 of the appropriations bills.

I want to repeat that, Mr. Speaker: the House has passed all of its appropriations bills. So now we wait for conferences that cannot be scheduled because the other body has not passed all of the bills. We have outstanding differences with the President that we are trying diligently to work through. Hopefully, before too many more days have passed, we will have reached agreement and be able to say that all 13 bills have been passed by the House and the Senate and have been approved by the President.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, after we pass this continuing resolution today, only seven legislative days will remain before the Republican leadership's target adjournment date for this Congress.

When it comes to addressing the most pressing concerns of families across the country, the record of this Republican Congress is just as abysmal as it was when we convened nearly 2 years ago. Republicans spent all of last year trying to spend nearly $1 trillion of the people's surplus on a massive package of tax breaks for the wealthiest few; and they wasted this year on a series of tax breaks that, surprise, surprise, would have cost nearly $1 trillion and overwhelmingly benefited the wealthiest few.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, the people's agenda has been shelved. Too many of America's children have returned to school this fall in crumbling classrooms, but Republican leaders are still blocking school modernization. Teachers in overcrowded classrooms still face the nearly impossible task of maintaining discipline and giving their students the individual attention they deserve. But the Republican Congress still refuses to help hire 100,000 new teachers to reduce class size.

Mr. Speaker, almost a year has gone by since the House passed the bipartisan Patients' Bill of Rights, but Republican leaders in the House, as well as the Senate, have kept it from becoming law. Nearly 18 million Americans have been denied or delayed medical care since then.

Mr. Speaker, millions of American seniors, including middle-class seniors, are still being forced to choose between buying groceries and buying needed prescriptions, and it is getting worse. A new Kaiser Family Foundation study found that skyrocketing prescription prices are driving premiums up and increasing the likelihood that people will lose their health coverage altogether. But just this weekend, Republican leaders in the House and Senate declared dead for the year our plan to provide Medicare prescription coverage for all seniors.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats have not given up on helping middle-class families. This Congress can still address priorities, like smaller class size, the Patients' Bill of Rights and prescription drugs. We can still do it, Mr. Speaker, but only if Republican leaders will put aside their partisanship, tell their special interest friends that the people come first and work with us.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

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

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 109. For 30 years before we became a Republican majority, the idea was that we could change everything in education if we just had one more program from Washington, DC., if we had $1 billion more to spend on one more program, if we could cover 100,000 more students. Nobody said anything about quality. It was just if we could just have one more program, and it was well meaning and well intentioned. The problem is, we did not close the achievement gap for the disadvantaged. In fact, it has widened.

So when I became the chairman, we said, let us talk about quality instead of quantity. Let us talk about results instead of process. That was the guiding light during the reauthorization of IDEA, the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act; the Higher Education Act; the Vocational Education Act; the Workforce Development Act; the reauthorization of Head Start; the child nutrition program; and the Reading Excellence Act, just to mention a few.

□ 1530

We changed the whole idea and we talked about quality and we talked about results. And we are beginning to see results, because we are now beginning to see quality programs.

Well, in relationship to this continuing resolution, I am very proud of what we have been able to do as a Committee on Education and the Workforce. I am very proud of what we have been able to do in the House in relationship to education and workforce development.

The Education Flexibility Act passed the House. And what we said is that we want to give local schools an opportunity to make decisions that affect their students as long as they can show us that every child's academic achievement has improved.

I was thrown a bone of six States when I was not a member of the majority, and then it became 12. And a couple of those States just did an outstanding job and so it became easy on a bipartisan way in this session of Congress to say, okay, all 50 States will have the flexibility if they will sign the contract to show us that, as a matter of fact, they will improve the academic achievement of all students. It is working. We have lost so many years and so many students because we did not use that approach.

We passed the Teacher Empowerment Act out of committee and on the floor of the House. See, it does not matter what the pupil-teacher ratio is if we cannot put a quality teacher in the classroom. It does not matter if there are 50 there or whether there are two there. The only difference is we have saved 40-some others from having a lack of a quality teacher in their classroom.

So, again, the very first 30 percent of the 100,000 teachers had no qualifications whatsoever. No qualifications whatsoever. What we did is reduce class size and put them in with a totally inadequate teacher; destroyed their opportunity to ever get a piece of the American dream. What have we said? In the Teacher Empowerment Act it should be a guidepost for whatever is done next year to ensure that we have a quality teacher in every classroom.

Mr. Speaker, when we were negotiating this last year with the White House, that very day an article in a New York newspaper, big headlines, a whole front page said, ''Parents do you realize that 50 percent of your teachers have no qualifications whatsoever to be teaching your children?'' What a tragedy.

So, again, the pupil-teacher ratio is not important. What is important is having a quality teacher in each classroom. That is why we passed the Teacher Empowerment Act. That is why we passed the Student Results Act. That is why we passed the Academic Achievement for All Act, and 2 weeks ago we passed the Literacy Involves Family Together Act. It makes several quality improvements in Even Start family literacy programs. We know that if we do not deal with the entire family, we cannot break the cycle. So I am very proud of that reauthorization.

And, yes, we made great strides in doing what we should have done a long time ago before I ever became a part of the majority, and that was deal with the 40 percent that we said many years ago, many years ago, that we would supply from the Federal level 40 percent of the average per pupil expenditure to assist States in educating children with disabilities. They would be getting $2,600 instead of $750 or $780. But I am pretty proud of the fact that we have seen dramatic increases in the last couple years, $2.6 billion as a matter of fact.

But, Mr. Speaker, if we could have done this from day one, we take care of maintenance of school buildings. We take care of school construction. If all

of these years, Los Angeles would have been getting the $95.5 million more. If they would have gotten the 40 percent, they would have no problem with buildings. If New York would have gotten $170 million each year, New York City, they would have had no problems with maintenance and school construction. Chicago, $76 million more each year. Think of that over 25 years. And D.C., $12.5 million more.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud in the area of higher education, Pell Grants which enable youngsters who could otherwise not pursue higher education to do so. Pell Grants are an exception to my rule, because quantity does matter in this case. Since 1995, under our leadership we now have an increase, an annual rate of 7.1 percent. For fiscal year 2001, our appropriators are going to break their own records and provide an increase of at least $350 more per student maximum, making it the largest increase in the history.

The naysayers in this Congress are to be expected. November 7 is not far off. But we have a record and we have a record that we could be proud to stand on and I am proud to stand on that record.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), our ranking member, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for this continuing resolution, as I presume most of us will. But let us recognize what we are doing for what it really is. It is the budgetary cap stone to 6 years of the Republican's Perfectionist Caucus.

I do not remember how many remember Speaker Gingrich's speech to the Perfectionist Caucus in 1998, but it was a compelling and accurate speech as to why we are here right now.

Now, my very close friend for whom I have great respect, and I emphasize that because I want the public to know that in a bipartisan way, I think the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of our committee, does an excellent job. And, frankly, had his caucus listened to him and the other appropriators as to what we should be doing, we would not be here now.

But the Perfectionist Caucus moniker was born 2 years ago when then Speaker Gingrich walked on to this floor and chastised his Republican colleagues, the Perfectionist Caucus, not all of these Republican colleagues, for urging the defeat of an omnibus spending measure. Perhaps they would do so again this year.

After 4 years in the majority, it seems Mr. Gingrich had finally seen the light. But not before these things had happened:

The GOP failed to pass a budget at all in 1998. The first time we had not passed a budget since the adoption of the Budget Act in 1974.

And not before the GOP dared the President to veto a disaster relief bill in 1997 to which Republicans had attached controversial policy riders.

And not before the GOP provoked two Federal Government shutdowns in 1995 and 1996.

Pleading for compromise 2 years ago, Mr. Gingrich who was pleading for compromise, Mr. Gingrich stated and I quote: ''Surely,'' this is Mr. Gingrich's quote, in case anybody missed it. ''Surely those of us who have grown up and matured in this process understand after the last 4 years that we have to work together on the big issues. If we do not work together on big issues, nothing gets done.'' So said Mr. Gingrich, the Speaker of the House.

Well, now we know that common sense advice went in one ear and out the other. With all due respect to the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) who gets on the floor and says we have passed all 13 appropriations bills, the gentleman is absolutely right. And we knew at that time that at least 11 of those appropriation bills were not real and could not pass, and would bring us to an impasse. The gentleman knew that. I do not expect him to get up on the floor and say he knew that. But I know that in his heart, he knew we were right.

Mr. Speaker, today we are living with those results. With only 5 days left before the start of the fiscal year in 2001, we have failed to complete our work on 11 of the 13 must-pass appropriation bills.

Continuing resolutions, of course, are not unusual. Since 1977, we have completed our work on all 13 spending bills on only four times in that period of time.

But in the 6 years under this majority, we have completed our work on two or fewer appropriation bills by October 1 four separate times. That is 4 out of 6 years, less than two. In 1995, none were completed in time. Not one. In 1997 and 1998, we completed one bill each. So my colleagues on the Republican side are 100 percent ahead of where they were in 1995 and 1996. I suppose that is some sort of progress.

And this year we finished just two. The die for this end-of-the-year budget debacle was cast 6 months ago. It was inevitable. It was predictable and we all knew, at least on the Committee on Appropriations, on both sides of the aisle, that we were going to be here today doing exactly what we are doing. As the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), my good friend, the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, correctly predicted in April when the GOP passed its budget resolution, and I quote, ''This resolution puts us on a track for another budgetary train wreck in September.''

Mr. Speaker, he said that in April. He predicted then we would have a train wreck in September. He said that their budget ''calls for deep cuts in domestic programs to make room for very large tax cuts.'' Let me be precise. The GOP's budget resolution calls for $175 billion tax cuts over 5 years. That is 12 percent more than the Congress passed and the President vetoed the year before. Nobody was surprised at what the outcome of these proposals was going to be. They just did not care. Inevitably, we are here.

Yet in urging passage of the budget resolution conference report on April 13, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Kasich) stated, and I quote, ''I am disappointed that we do not have four times as much tax relief in this bill.''

I do not know where he thought he was going to get the votes to pass appropriation bills under that circumstance. It is one thing to hail huge tax cuts. We all like to say that. It is something all together different to explain how one would actually pay for them, how we would get there.

The huge tax cuts in this year's budget resolution would have necessitated cuts in non-defense discretionary of $121.5 billion over 5 years, in education, in health care, in law enforcement, in all of the work that the Federal Government does. There were not the votes on that side of the aisle to accomplish those cuts. Period. And certainly not in the Senate on that side of the aisle.

However, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there is a soul in this body who thought for a minute that such Draconian cuts would ever happen. Notwithstanding that, we passed these bills knowing that we would be here in this situation 5 days before the end of the fiscal year. Thus, this ill-conceived budget resolution which made a shambles of our appropriations process this year put us in this predicament.

As The Washington Post observed, and I quote, ''The appropriation process is again a charade in which the Republicans pretend to be making cuts in domestic spending that in the end they know they will lack the votes to sustain, and with good reason; some of the cuts would do real harm. The first round of appropriation bills,'' they went on to say, ''is mainly for show.''

The distinguished gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG), my friend, knew that. He characterized that as: Well, we are in the second or third inning. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what inning we are in now, but it is obviously getting late in the ball game.

The gentleman said then that: ''We will get real then. We will fix these bills.'' I think he was right and hopefully we are going to.

Mr. Speaker, the blame for this budget mess lies squarely with Members of the Republican's Perfectionist Caucus, so coined by your predecessor, the Speaker of the House, Mr. Gingrich, who failed to heed the advice of their Speaker 2 years ago and instead adopted an unrealistic budget this year that disrupted the entire appropriations process.

After 6 years in the majority, I really have to wonder just how long, in the words of the former Speaker, it takes to grow up and mature in this process.

Notwithstanding that, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this continuing resolution.

□ 1545

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

I wanted to thank my friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), for the history lesson on continuing resolutions and who did what and when did they do it.

I would say to my friend who asked about what inning are we in, I would say we are in the 9th inning and probably the bottom of the 9th. And in 4 days, I suggest that we are going to go into overtime because of a tie, a 3-way tie.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. I did not know that you had overtime in baseball games.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I think we are going to have overtime here.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) meant extra innings, we know what the gentleman meant.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. We are going to go into overtime, that overtime will soon start. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) has just gone through the history of the 6 years of the Republican control of the House, so I thought I would come back with the last 6 years of the Democratic control of the House.

Let us go back starting in fiscal year 1990, because that would be 6 years back. Under the Democratic leadership in the House, they had 51 days of continuing resolution. The one we present today asks for only 6 days.

In fiscal year 1991, they had 36 days; in fiscal year 1992, they had 57 days of overtime under CRs; in fiscal year 1993, they did a little better, because they only had 5 days; in fiscal year 1994, they had 41 days. In fiscal year 1995, and I give my colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) credit, that was the year that he chaired the committee, the bills were all completed on time.

During the 6 years of the Republican control, during one year no CR was needed. But the truth is we have had CRs, except for 2 years, in the last 12 years. The 1 year that our friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), chaired the committee, he had the bills done on time; but, the gentleman had 81 more Democrats in the House than there were Republicans, and that makes the job a little bit easier.

Mr. Speaker, with our breakdown today, the way I read it, there are 222 Republicans, 210 Democrats and two independents. Now, that makes our job a little bit tougher, and that is why it even took longer to get the bills through the House. I am glad my friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), repeated it again. We have passed all 13 bills in the House. That is the first thing that has to be done, and then we confer with our colleagues in the Senate, then we relate it to the White House and finally try to get a package.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I wish the gentleman would not take down the chart, because I want to read from his very beautiful chart. He read 1990, 51; 1991, 36 days; 1992, 57 days; 1993, 5 days; 1994, 41 days, then came 1995 which, of course, we passed in 1994, the last year the Democrats were in charge. And he gave correctly the credit to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for having 0 days, but then he stopped.

As I read the gentleman's chart, the next year, which was the first year that the Republicans were in charge, the gentleman, of course, was not chairman of the Committee on Appropriations at that point in time, we were at 208 days, which was more than all the other years combined that the gentleman read. I wondered why the gentleman stopped at that.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Reclaiming my time, I would remind the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) that was the year that there were a few items that were held over until April of the following year, and the majority of basic fundamental appropriations for the government were completed prior to that; but those few items that we had agreed to hold over until the next spring caused the 208 days.

But the gentleman covered the Republican history well enough, I thought, that I should cover the Democratic history, to point out that there is a problem in our process, to point out, if I had my big chart here, which the gentleman has seen, how many days the Committee on Appropriations loses in a fiscal year before we ever get a budget resolution.

Mr. Speaker, that is a very telling chart, because the actual workdays available to appropriators after we receive the budget resolution are very limited.

Mr. HOYER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to yield.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, to make a serious point, I have commended every time I have stood on this floor the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, for his leadership. The gentleman, I think, on our side of the aisle is perceived to be one of the fairest, kindest, most responsible Members of this House. I share that view in great measure; and I think the serious point here is, as we will hopefully pass this CR, is that we really ought to get away from first innings, second innings, and third innings; and we ought to start, and that is my real point, Mr. Speaker, sitting down together, as we are now.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and I sat down on the Treasury-Postal bill. I think we have agreement on where we ought to be. I think we need to start that process earlier and be real earlier and stop making political points as to who is saving money or who is not saving money when we know the inevitable result will be we will attempt to fund appropriation bills at levels that are consistent with what we think our responsibilities are.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), because I think the chairman's leadership has been for that proposition, and I admired him for that. He has not always prevailed.

And I think what Mr. Gingrich was really trying to say and I said it somewhat facetiously tried to do it lightly, but it was a serious point that we can on each side posture and say, well, we want it our way. But if we all go forward saying we want it our way, we end up as we are today and, that is, having at the last minute to try to come to agreement.

I want to congratulate the chairman, the gentleman from Florida, because I think that is what he has tried to do, wants to do and is leading in a direction of doing right now; and I thank him for yielding.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments, and that is why I like him. I would be happy to yield him more time if he wants to compliment the Chair any more. But that is the process. There are 435 Members of this House and 100 Members of the other body, and that means there are 535 different opinions on almost any issue.

It takes a while to resolve those differences because each House is equal to the other, and then when the President gets to the point that he can either accept or veto a bill, he becomes as powerful, understand this, he becomes as powerful as two thirds of us, because if he does not agree with something that we have done, it takes two thirds of us to override that veto. And so it is a process that is full of obstacles and pitfalls along the way. We do the best we can to work through them.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 19½ minutes remaining and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), my good friend, indicated that the year that I was chairman we were able to pass all of our bills on time because we had 80 more Democrats. That sounds like a pretty good recommendation to me. I hope that he is willing to endorse it.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Give us 81 more Republicans than there are Democrats, and we will show you a real whirlwind of activity here.

Mr. OBEY. God help us all if that were to happen. Let me simply say, Mr. Speaker, you know, the President has not vetoed any of these bills. The last time I looked, our Republican friends were in control of both Houses; and yet they have been able to pass only two appropriations bills through both Houses and both of those have been signed.

They all relate to the funding of one department, the Defense Department, but four of the bills that have yet to be passed have not even yet passed the other body, in the real world known as the Senate; and that means that the main problem has been that the majority party has not been able to reach agreement with itself.

As the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) indicated earlier, every time an appropriations bill came to the floor, we were told, ''Well, we know it has problems, we know that this cannot be passed until it is fixed, but pass it on. This is only the first inning, we will fix it later.'' And now, because of that, we have all of those runners piled up on second base, and none of them are going home. That is why the government is again off the track, or the train is off the track.

I repeat what I said earlier, the reason we are in this position is because early on, the majority party leadership decided that above all else, they were going to keep their party together and they were going to pass each of these bills on their side of the aisle alone, if necessary. And they fashioned them in such a way that they were acceptable to the most rigid elements within their caucus, and that meant that those bills were not acceptable, either to us or to a lot of their fellow Republicans in the other body.

Mr. Speaker, now we are facing the logical consequences of the majority party pretending for the last 10 months that they could cut education, they could cut health, they could cut environmental cleanup, they could cut job protection programs all deeply below the President's budget and still find the votes to pass these appropriation bills on time and leave a lot of room for very large tax cuts. Now, that has all been demonstrated to be untrue; and we all knew it was untrue from the beginning, including many of my friends on the majority side of the aisle who would privately admit that it was not true.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at the numbers, the problem is that the budget resolution, which the majority passed at the beginning of the year, was $20 billion below the amount needed to simply stay even with inflation, and $28 billion or nearly 10 percent below the amounts requested by the President, and it called for even deeper reductions in each of the next 5 years to finance the ever-escalating outyear costs of their tax package. Most of it was aimed at providing the relief for folks at the very top of the economic ladder.

Mr. Speaker, so now reality has caught up with us; and we are here just a few weeks before the election still stuck on second base, still trying to wave some of those runners home. And I have to come to the conclusion that, from time to time, I look around, and I do not see anybody in the batter's box. I cannot figure out what signals are coming from the bench from whoever is coaching today, because we started with one strategy and now, all of a sudden, 2 weeks before we are supposed to be adjourned, we are told, ''Oh, we have this new approach, this 90–10 approach.'' We are going to use 90 percent for deficit reduction and use the other 10 percent for tax cuts and for other appropriations and other financial expenditures.''

But when you look at it that way, that puts $80 billion of new money on the table, a huge amount; and all of a sudden, we have subcommittees meeting in each separate room all working out their own deals. And we have no idea how they relate to each other, no idea what the spending level is going to be in the end, no idea what the rules are, no idea what the discipline is. So we wind up seeing a process which has no discipline.

It has no order. It does not even have priorities; and, to me, that is an incompetent way to try to put together a Federal budget or any other piece of legislation. I do not blame the majority party members on the Committee on Appropriations, because most of them warned early in the game that this would be the case if we followed this course. And so I guess we will have to continue to try to do the best we can under these circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, I, for the life of me, cannot figure out what the strategy is to either finish these bills or to get signable bills down to the White House. I think maybe we have a shot at Interior. I am hoping that we can close on Interior very, very soon; but beyond that, I am mystified about how we intend to proceed.

□ 1600

All I can say is that I hope that sooner or later we can get everyone in the same room so that we know what is happening with respect to all of the pieces. Because until we know that, all of these pieces are going to be spinning, all of these pieces are going to be going in circles rather than going in any discernible direction; and that serves no one's interest. All it does is bring further discredit to the institution and make people think that chaos is the norm around here. Having served in this place a long time, that was not my impression until recently.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH).

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) for yielding me 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am always interested in the talk that goes around this time of year. We have just heard that we are now in the ninth inning, and our friends on the Democratic side of the aisle have actually called out their relief pitcher, Newt Gingrich. They are bringing up Newt Gingrich. I cannot believe I am hearing my ears.

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is saying we need to follow the advice of Newt Gingrich and not be members of the Perfectionist Caucus. He goes on to say, as do so many others, that, if we were not just such perfectionists, and if we had listened to the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG), perhaps we would have gotten our business done.

Well, we have gone 13 for 13. We listened to the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG). We listened to the appropriators on the Republican and the Democratic side. We have gotten all 13 bills passed. I think we have done a great job.

While we are talking about history lessons, why do we not talk about the fact that the House and the Senate are two completely different animals. Why, I remember my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle passing a BTU tax in 1993 that they thought was a great idea. Well, their colleagues in the Senate did not agree. Well, that is the way this process works. We hope that our friends in the Senate will agree with us and come together and pass the bills.

I think the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) has done a great job. I disagree with the statement that this process has brought disorder to the House and shown chaos. I think he has done a fantastic job from the very beginning.

But we have a challenge even beyond the Senate. Even if we pass these bills in the Senate, the New York Times has reported that the President of the United States is considering a government shutdown strategy. We cannot control that either.

Just like back in 1995, I do not know how many people remember, but the President of the United States vetoed nine appropriation bills. One of those bills which was a Legislative Branch bill, when he got it, he said, ''Well, I am going to veto it.'' He vetoed it. They asked him why. He said, ''I agreed with the bill, I just wanted to send a message.'' Then he sent a message on eight other bills, and then we had a government shutdown. He did it before, and he did it back then in 1995 because he said our plan to balance a budget in 7 years would wreck the economy.

Now we went through the appropriation process. The gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG), then the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON), the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman KASICH), several others said it was the right thing to do. We had a very ordered process. Unfortunately, at the end, the President and our friends on the left decided to get involved and in a destructive way vetoed nine appropriation bills.

Again, according to the New York Times, the President is considering doing that again. We cannot do anything about that. If the President wants to operate under a shutdown strategy in the year 2000, that is the President's prerogative. As the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) said, he has got the power of two-thirds of us. I certainly hope he does not do that. I think we have to continue doing the people's business.

Talking about working for the middle class, I have got to tell my colleagues, when we came here in 1995, we were mired under debt, we were mired under deficit. The appropriations approach taken by the Committee on Appropriations back then and this House, it was to get rid of the deficit. It was to pay down the debt. We were told it would destroy the economy. It did not do it.

Chairman Greenspan came and testified before the Committee on the Budget back in 1995. He said, ''If you follow this blueprint, you will see unprecedented economic growth.'' We followed the blueprint. Because of it, the President vetoed nine bills. We continued to fight then. What happened? History shows that by forcing the President to continue down the path of fiscal responsibility and to balance the budget in 7 years that the economy exploded because of it. I think it is great news.

As far as these charges that somehow we have been held hostage to extreme tax cuts, which I have got to give you guys credit, you sure stay on message and have for 6 years, the extreme tax cuts were approved by over 260 people. You call the marriage penalty relief tax extreme. I do not. Over 260 Members of the House, both Republicans and Democrats agree with me. Same thing with death tax relief. It is called extreme tax relief at the end of the session. But I have got to tell my colleagues, during the middle of this session, over 260 Republicans and Democrats agreed with it. The majority of Americans agreed with it. So the only reason those were not enacted into law was because you all were able to hide behind a President's veto, which, again, he can do.

But let us look at who is really being extreme here. We are doing what polls show the American people want, but more importantly what we said we would do when we got elected in 1994. I am proud of the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) for his work. I disagree with the fact that anything that has happened here has brought discredit to this House. I think he has done a great time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply point out to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH) that is a very interesting and a very amusing and not very relevant rewrite of history.

But I would simply ask him, he raises this great specter of the President following a veto strategy. Which appropriations bills has the President vetoed this year? To my knowledge, he has not vetoed any appropriations bills this year. My colleagues have not been able to get four bills through their own party in the other body, and they have got the gall to claim that the President is the reason that the Congress has not done its work. Grow up.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. Surely I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Well, again, I am just saying the President is laying in wait, waiting to veto these bills. Second, as I mentioned on the Btu issue, sometimes one cannot control what Senators do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The time is controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman can go back to 1993, ancient history, if he desires. That still does nothing to change the fact that the President has vetoed no bills.

The reason this continuing resolution is here is not because he has not done his work; it is because this body has not done its work in reconciling its differences with the Senate so that you can lay bills on the President's desk. It was not the President who blew up the Treasury-Postal bill, it was the United States Senate. It was not the President who designed a strategy which produced appropriation bills you could not get past your own party in the other body, it was your own leadership. Accept the consequences of your own actions. That is what adults are supposed to do.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members it is not in order to cast reflections on the United States Senate.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I share the amusement of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), my ranking member, at the recitation of history. First of all, CBO, your CBO that you appointed the chair of 2 years ago came down and said the reason we have cut the deficit is not because of anything that was done on the Republican leadership, it was because of the 1993 economic program that was adopted by Democrats only, not one Republican voted for it, and the 1990 program signed by President Bush, which was excoriated by that same Speaker Gingrich and a number of the rest of the Members of his party.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH) also has a selective memory, I suggest to my colleagues, about what Mr. Greenspan said before the Committee on the Budget, the Joint Economic Committee, and every other committee before which he has testified about the tax cuts. Then you take out each individual item. You were smarter this year. You said people like this, people like that, so we will take it in small bites, and maybe they will not notice that the total is more than the one they did not like a year ago August when you thought you were going to go to the American public and say, ''Do you believe the President of the United States is going to veto this bill?'' And, guess what, the American public said, ''Yeah, not only do we believe he is going to, we think he ought to because we think it puts Social Security and Medicare at risk.''

Now, this year you cut it up in little pieces and thought maybe you could nibble it through. But it would have had the same consequence. Mr. Greenspan whom you quote said, ''Uh-uh, you ought not to do that.''

Let us go back a little more in history in the 1993 bill. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) said that, if we passed the 1993 bill, the economy would fall off the precipice. Mr. Gingrich said, if we enacted the 1993 bill, the economy would go in the tank. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) said that it would create high deficits, high inflation, and economic disaster. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) said that it would create unbelievable unemployment and unbelievable deficits.

Now what has happened, Mr. Speaker, is exactly 180 degrees opposite of what every Republican leader said in 1993 would happen as a consequence of the adoption of the President's economic program. In fact, we have the best economy in the lifetimes of anybody in this room, low inflation, more employment than we have ever had, and the fastest creation of jobs at any time. Healthy, robust economic growth. Most houses owned by American citizens ever in history. Every indicator is positive as a direct result.

Now, going back to what CBO said. CBO said that, not only did you not bring down the deficit, but in 1995, 1996, 1997 and 1998, the net effect of those 4 years was to increase by $12 billion the deficit. So the net reduction was approximately 140 if you put those two bills together.

So let us tell it like it is. I would repeat the gentleman from Wisconsin's (Mr. OBEY) admonition when you say veto strategy. The President has not vetoed anything this year.

Now, we are going to pass the CR. It is the responsible and right thing to do. I am for it. We have done it in the past because we have not reached agreement. But I tell the gentleman from

Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH), the reason we have not reached agreement is because the budget resolution was a resolution for political sake, not for substance sake.

Nobody on the Committee on Appropriations, I tell my friend the gentleman from Florida, nobody on either side of the aisle in the Committee on Appropriations thought for one minute that the Committee on the Budget's resolution was going to be carried out in appropriation bills, not because of the President, but because you cannot get it through the Congress of the United States. We said that in April. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) said that in April. That is why I quoted the gentleman from South Carolina. In fact that is what has happened.

Let us work together. Let us not have the Perfectionist Caucus prevail.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, the subject of Presidential vetoes has been raised here several times by my two friends who have just spoken. During the Committee on Appropriations work, we were told time after time after time by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) ''If you do it this way, the bill is going to be vetoed.'' How many times on the floor when we were considering the appropriations bills did the gentleman from Wisconsin say, ''If you do this, the bill is going to be vetoed,'' or ''If you do not do that, the bill is going to be vetoed.'' He is speaking for the administration. But we have had veto threats on almost every appropriations bill that we have considered here.

When the gentleman tells us that a bill is going to be vetoed, then we will take the time to try to work with the White House and work together, as the gentleman suggested, and see if we can find a way to make that bill signable by the President rather than vetoed. But we take the gentleman from Wisconsin at his word. The gentleman tells us the bill is going to be vetoed. We are going to try to find a way to make that bill acceptable to the President if we can.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH).

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am relieved that order has been returned to the universe. They have now benched Newt Gingrich again and going back to 1993 and say maybe we should not follow his strategy.

I do not know if my colleagues were listening, though, to the same testimony that I heard Greenspan give before the Committee on the Budget in 1995, but what Alan Greenspan said very specifically, not talking about the tax cuts that we have enacted this year, he said, if we would enact our plan to balance the budget in 7 years, specifically, he said starting in 1995, if we enacted that, we would see interest rates drop by 2 percent. And he predicted in 1995, if the Republican plan was followed, that we would see unprecedented economic growth not seen in peacetime. Do my colleagues know what? He is exactly right.

Mr. Speaker, we stuck to our guns. We followed the advice of the voters we heard in 1994. We followed what Alan Greenspan said. I am glad we are having this debate.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 6½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

□ 1615

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations for yielding me this time.

As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations, I have to say that although we are, in a way, forced to vote for this continuing resolution for the sake of the American people, what has happened inside this institution really is not healthy.

I can tell my colleagues that all day I have been in my office fielding calls from Members in this Chamber asking me where our bill is, where the different provisions are. Whether it is biomass provisions relating to switchgrass in Iowa or whether it is water-related projects in the West, it really does not matter. I, as a Member, cannot tell them because our conference committee has not met.

We have been getting calls from the other body. We had reached agreement on certain amendments which we now understand are pulled. For example, on prescription drugs. We had passed different measures here to allow reimportation of prescription drugs so our people could get the same price as if they go over the border into Canada. We had reached agreement that we would put $23 million in this year's bill to ensure the public safety on those drugs. Now we are told this provision has been lifted from the agriculture appropriation bill, wherever it is in the institution, and the leadership is going to be handling that.

The same is true with the provisions dealing with Cuba, which, granted, are very controversial, but we wanted to be able to move product into Cuba; allow our businesses to sell there; allow our farmers to move product. Now we are told that is lifted out of our bill. We are receiving phone calls in our office; and we have to tell Members, sorry, we are not being called as conferees.

I have the greatest respect for the chairman of the full committee. I know if it were only up to him, our subcommittees would be allowed to meet. But this is really not the way to run the Congress of the United States nor the government of the United States.

As a related issue, Mr. Speaker, and as a Member from Ohio who has workers dying from exposure to beryllium, we were told today that the Subcommittee on Defense has not allowed, because of the leadership, any provision in any bill that would take care of people dying of exposure to beryllium, nuclear-related radiation or gaseous diffusion. I think that is absolutely wrong when we have it within our power to meet the needs of the American people.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I particularly thank him for the education he has given a new Member in a short period of time on this process.

Mr. Speaker, I respect both the gentlemen and the debate they are having today. But to be honest, hearing politicians argue about how they have revised history makes little difference at all in the 9th inning of any baseball game. And with all due respect, my interest and my knowledge in this budget process is pretty much limited to education, which has taken a beating from the minority side today.

So I want to forget about history, forget about who introduced what, forget about who created what program. I think it is fair for us to know what the tentative agreement on the Labor-HHS budget, for this year in this Congress today, is in the United States of America.

It is not a cut, but it is a $562 million increase over President Clinton's budget. And that is a fact. It is not a cut, but it is a $1 billion increase in special education over the President's recommendation. And amazingly, it is a $3.1 billion title VI improvement offering the opportunity for flexibility for school construction at the local level. We would never know in a million years, by listening to the other side, that everything priority-wise that they debated for local schools to have the opportunity to do within good fiscal sound policy exists.

Sure, other recommendations were made in the past, but the past is history. I appreciate the gentleman's mentioning my predecessor, Mr. Gingrich. The only history I remember that is lasting is that we as a majority are, fortunately, because of him, debating from a position of balanced budgets today and not deficits. A lot of people deserve credit for it, but he certainly deserves a lot.

Mr. Speaker, it is not right for the American people on September 26, 2000, to believe that this Congress is doing anything other than the following: increasing education by $562 million; special education by $1 billion; and offering local schools the opportunity for

school construction and other programs at their choice. And stating anything else to the contrary is wrong.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman is correct, that what is present is the most important. But it is also important to understand, I tell my friend from Georgia, how we got to the present. Because the bill that I believe he initially voted for was $3.5 billion under the President's budget.

Now, hear me. Originally, when we passed the bill through this House, it was $3.5 billion on education under the President's request. So that, yes, we are here; but the reason we are here is a little bit of what the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) said. The President said he was not going to sign that kind of bill.

The gentleman is right. He has not vetoed it because my colleague has not sent it to him. He said, I am not going to sanction that kind of cut in education. So, yes, we do readily admit that we have a budget that is now presumably going to come out of the Labor-Health conference much better, but it is much better because the President of the United States said he was not going to sanction that House product.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, Members on both sides of the aisle have repeatedly stated that it is time to get past politics, yet as we consider a continuing resolution to keep the government functioning, debates become more political and perhaps less substantive.

Today's vote is not about partisan rhetoric, it is about results. This Congress has tried to work in a bipartisan way, and on a number of issues that matter to every-day Americans it has been able to. It has certainly done this under the leadership of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) in trying to get our bills passed on time.

One shining example is the fact that we repealed the 60-year-old earnings limit imposed on working seniors. We worked together because it was the right thing to do. It made sense. It mattered to Americans. That should be our standard every time we come into this Chamber, what is the right thing to do, what makes sense, and what matters to Americans. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that the answer to each of these questions is one in the same.

We must pass the continuing resolution to keep the government functioning and get to work on issues that matter to our families, issues like paying down the debt and providing prescription drugs to our seniors. The practice of passing continuing resolutions is not unusual. It has taken place under Democrat and Republican control both. It is what we need to do today.

The issues we are addressing in the final days of this Congress are important and complex. Completing our work will require cooperation. We need good-faith efforts at results, not roadblocks. We need every Member of the Congress, every Senator, and the White House to do the right thing, to do what makes sense and address the issues that matter to Americans.

Let us stop playing politics, pass this resolution, and get back to the business of addressing our Nation's problems.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 3½ minutes, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The issue is not what has happened in the past; the issue is what ought to happen now. I am amused by our friends on the other side of the aisle who claim that all of a sudden the Republicans are the new-found friend of education. Over the last 6 years, since they have taken control of this House, they have tried to cut, in 4 different years, they have tried to cut education funding below the previous year—not below the request, but below the previous year funding—by about $5.5 billion.

Now they are discovering that that is not so popular. And so, belatedly, they are beginning to grudgingly give ground; and instead of calling for the abolition of the Department of Education and eliminating Federal influence in education, they are now grudgingly recognizing that there needs to be a Federal role. Yet it is very grudgingly given ground indeed.

If my colleagues want to see our support for the Labor, Health, and Education bill, for instance, all they need to do is to get rid of the anti-worker riders; get rid of the anti-environmental riders in the Interior bill; get rid of the anti-education riders in the Labor-Health-Education bill, get rid of the anti-health riders that they have. And what they need to do is to recognize that if we are going to fund education programs fairly, we ought to fund Republican priorities as well as Democratic priorities.

So we welcome the fact that our friends on the other side of the aisle have decided they want to increase funding for special education. We are asking them to also do what they said they would do in May and raise that amount by another $700 million to meet the amount they promised the American people in May.

The Republican presidential candidate, Mr. Bush, claims that he is now belatedly for an increase in the Pell Grants, after he pooh-poohed that very idea in Eau Claire, Wisconsin, just a month ago. What we are asking is this: If he is for that, then why do you not vote for that additional increase in Pell Grants that we put on the table in the conference?

We are asking that our colleagues recognize that there is a crying need in this country to repair dilapidated school buildings and to keep the President's dedicate funding. We are asking our colleagues to recognize the need to reduce class size. We are asking that the Republicans recognize that 93 percent of education funds in this country are spent the way local school districts want them to be spent. We are asking our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to use the other 7 percent that the Federal Government provides in order to target issues of national importance and national need in the interest of quality of education and social justice. That is what we need.

We need to fund both Republican and Democratic priorities in the area of education if we are to have the kind of bipartisan support for that bill that it ought to have under any Congress, no matter who is controlling the Congress.

So I would simply say, Mr. Speaker, I would urge a vote for this resolution, because we have no choice if we want to keep the government open, and we do. But I would ask the majority, instead of continuing to insist that they please the most rigid elements of their caucus on all of their appropriation conferences, I would ask that they recognize we need a bipartisan approach to all of these bills, or we will need another continuing resolution and yet another one; and we will indeed be stuck here until the cows come home.

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

Mr. Speaker, my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), has mentioned education; and this has been an ongoing debate and argument in the Congress. We believe that we have been more generous to the educational appropriation than the President requested. But the major difference has not been so much the numbers and the dollars. The major difference is how is the educational money going to be spent: Is some guru here in Washington going to sit down here and determine what is best for the school districts and the schools in every one of our counties and cities throughout America; or are the people elected at the local level going to make the decision on how they should use the money available to them?

For example, in some case we need more buildings. In other cases we need more schoolteachers. In other cases we need computers. In other cases we need special education. There are so many, many different needs in education. And I think that it is far wiser to allow the people elected in the local school systems to make the decisions on what their needs really are to best educate the children in those schools. We are not arguing about the money; we are arguing about who makes the decision on how that money is used.

And now, Mr. Speaker, after having nearly 2 hours of good political debate,

many of the topics not having anything to do with this resolution before us, I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), for his support of this resolution and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER). We would all prefer not to have to do this. I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin, that it would be better if all 13 bills were signed by the President. But we find ourselves today needing this continuing resolution until the 6th day of October in order to make certain of the smooth continuity of our Federal Government.

□ 1630

So just let me ask the Members to support this continuing resolution. And then we will get back to the bargaining tables, negotiate, and find the solutions that are acceptable to the House, to the Senate, and to the President and then get on about the business of the Congress.

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

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 591, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 415, nays 2, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 493]

YEAS—415

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—2

DeFazio
Stark

NOT VOTING—16

Campbell
Clay
Franks (NJ)
Gillmor
Gutierrez
Horn
Jones (OH)
Klink
Lazio
McCollum
McIntosh
Paul
Rogan
Smith (MI)
Vento
Watkins

□ 1652

Mr. KANJORSKI and Mr. CAPUANO changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SMALL BUSINESS LIABILITY RELIEF ACT

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5175) to provide relief to small businesses from liability under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5175

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Small Business Liability Relief Act''.

SEC. 2. SMALL BUSINESS LIABILITY RELIEF.

(a) LIABILITY EXEMPTIONS.—Section 107 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9607) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(o) SMALL BUSINESS DE MICROMIS EXEMPTION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), a person (including a parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of the person) that, during its 3 taxable years preceding the date on which the person first receives or received written notification from the President of its potential liability under this section, (A) employed on average not more than 100 full-time individuals (notwithstanding fluctuations resulting from seasonal employment) or the equivalent thereof, and (B) had, on average, annual revenues of $3,000,000 or less, as reported to the Internal Revenue Service, shall be liable under paragraph (3) or (4) of subsection (a) to the United States or any other person (including liability for contribution) for any response costs incurred with respect to a facility only if the total of material containing a hazardous substance that the person arranged for disposal or treatment of, arranged with a transporter for transport for disposal or treatment of, or