

such legislation, so I know this is not the proper place or time to be having these discussions.

In contrast, this is now the time to talk about money. We talk so much about money here that it is easy to forget that the money is real and that it really belongs to the taxpayer. It would surprise most Americans to learn that when we here on the floor talk about spending \$1 billion in a year, what we are really talking about is spending well over \$2.5 million per day, \$2.5 million per day.

So I have come to the House floor with a great comfort for each of these continuing resolutions, knowing that every day is another small down payment to the American taxpayer. Each day is another step towards smaller and more efficient government.

Like my Republican colleagues, I am determined to pass fair and fiscally responsible appropriations bills. I will stay here as long as it takes to achieve this goal for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the President will join us in our good-faith efforts to negotiate a fair, bipartisan solution to the disagreements still before us. I am hopeful that the fair, clean continuing resolution covered by this rule will give us the time we need to complete the appropriations process in a thoughtful and judicial manner.

This rule was unanimously approved by the Committee on Rules yesterday. I urge my colleagues to support it so we may proceed with general debate and consideration of this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, even though the fiscal year started 69 days ago, my Republican colleagues still have not gotten all the appropriation bills signed into law. So here we are, meeting on December 8 to consider not the first, the second, or the third, but the 18th continuing resolution in this fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, this continuing resolution will keep the Federal government open through this weekend so the negotiations can resume again next week. Once they resume, I hope the Republican leadership will agree to consider the bipartisan spending agreement that makes the improvements to education. Until then, we need to keep the Federal government open for other business.

So although I think it is well past time that these appropriation bills were finished, Mr. Speaker, I will support this continuing resolution.

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

Mr. LINDER. 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 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 House Joint Resolution 128, 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.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 669, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 128) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of House Joint Resolution 128 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 128

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 106-275, is further amended by striking the date specified in section 106(c) and inserting "December 11, 2000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 669, 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. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today we bring to the House another continuing resolution, House Joint Resolution 128.

This one is different than the ones we have been doing. This is a 3-day extension, so this would keep the government functioning until Monday night.

The leadership of the House and Senate are negotiating with the President, and hopefully there will be some kind of breakthrough soon so we as appropriators can finalize the details of the agreement. We have not reached that agreement yet, but we will be working over the weekend.

I spoke yesterday evening with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, as did my counterpart in the Senate. There is movement, but we are not there yet. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, we will be working over the weekend to see if we can have this concluded for the Members to vote on next week.

As I mentioned yesterday, there are several issues that are still outstanding, most of which are not even appropriations items. Nevertheless, they are attached to this bill.

So, by next week, we hope to have more progress to report.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we are supposed to have our appropriations work done by October 1. We obviously do not have that work done. As I said yesterday, that is not unique. That has happened often in Congress.

But I think something unique is happening which, in my view, no longer justifies voting for these continuing resolutions. I do not intend to vote for this continuing resolution, and I will vote against it.

Continuing resolutions are supposed to be passed to give us more time to get our work done. When they are passed, we are supposed to be resolving our differences. This is now the 19th time that we have had to come to the floor and ask for yet another extension of time.

I would not mind doing that if I thought we really were making progress. I have read several newspaper accounts this morning of the alleged agreements which were reached at the White House yesterday. I have read stories. If I believed that those stories were true, I would then feel fairly optimistic that in fact we could get finished within a few days over the weekend.

But in fact what I know to be going on behind the scenes is at huge variance with the newspaper stories that I have seen this morning, so somebody has fed some information to a number of reporters, information which is simply not accurate. I suspect some of that misinformation has been spread by design, but I suspect that some other of it has been spread simply through honest misunderstandings.

My interpretation of what is going on at the White House is quite different than the optimistic picture painted in the papers this morning.

□ 0915

When I talk to people who are in that meeting, I get wildly varying and differing explanations about what the parties did or thought they were doing.

They all appear to be operating from different financial baselines. So that when they use a specific number, when one party in those discussions uses a specific number, two other parties in the room have an erroneous understanding of what that number means. And as a result, we get the picture when people come out of the White House that everybody has played kissy-face, and it is all nice and wonderful, and we are very close to a deal.

Yet, when you take a look at the actual differences that are being discussed, we are still miles apart; and I do not believe that passage of this or any other continuing resolution is going to lead to a narrowing of those divisions. I think it will lead to a continuation of the drift, and that drift is in no way the responsibility of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) or anyone else on the Committee on Appropriations.

If I may speak institutionally, I believe if the Committee on Appropriations on both sides of the aisle were allowed to work these agreements out,

we could do so in 1 day. But so far as I know, there are no clean signals being given that we can, in fact, do that.

So I will make a flat prediction. This resolution will pass. It will probably have a majority of votes on both sides of the aisle. And come Monday, we will be here having to pass another resolution because people will have peddled baffle-gab over the weekend without doing very much real work.

I compare some of the numbers being discussed in the papers. I see, for instance, that a number of the papers refer to the possibility of reaching agreement for the Labor-Health-Education bill at the level of \$107 billion. There is not a chance of a snowball in Hades that you would find a majority of votes in this House for that kind of a bill. And it is important for people on both sides of the aisle to understand that.

I am perfectly willing to participate in an exercise which requires flexibility on both sides of the aisle, but I know from talking to a number of my good friends on the other side of the aisle that they themselves would not be satisfied to vote for a bill which came in here at \$107 billion.

Now, people will say, well, that is the number that the President asked for. Well, if you take a look at what this Congress passed so far this year, it increased what the President asked for for agriculture by \$1.3 billion.

It increased what the President asked for for Energy and Water, many for Members' projects, by \$1 billion.

It increased what the President asked for in the Interior appropriations by \$2.5 billion.

It increased what the President asked for in Transportation by \$2.4 billion, and Defense by over \$5 billion, but when it comes to Education, we are now being told that we should go back to 106.

We just had an election and the standard bearer for the majority party, Mr. Bush, indicated that under Republican governance there would be a bipartisan approach to government, and yet the very first thing that we are being asked to do is to break the bipartisan agreement that was reached on funding levels in the Labor-Health and Education appropriations bill before the election.

When that bill came back to this floor, I do not recall a single significant objection to a dollar number in the bill.

I do recall some quite vivid controversy, as the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) indicated yesterday, about what were nonappropriation items in the bill, language items that wanted to be attached by one side or the other; and yet today after everyone ran on the idea that this Congress was going to provide the biggest increase in education since the days of Lyndon Johnson, now we are being told that we have to abandon that 22 percent increase in education funding.

Well, I would suggest to you that weaknesses in our schools are just as important as weaknesses in national defense. I would suggest that weaknesses in our education system are just as important as weaknesses in our transportation system.

I would suggest that weaknesses in education are just as serious as weaknesses in our farm programs.

I would suggest that weaknesses in our education programs are at least as important as weaknesses in our locks and dams and river reengineering programs. And yet, we are being asked to cut the efforts to reduce class size in our schools.

We are being asked to cut the agreement that was reached on after-school programs so that kids when they leave school have someplace to go besides an empty house, because both parents are working outside of the home. We are being asked to cut back on the promises that we have made in that conference report for special education and for education for disabled children.

We are being asked to cut back on the \$500 increase in the Pell grants that everyone claimed to be for earlier and that, in fact, Mr. Bush campaigned on. We are being asked to cut back on teacher quality initiatives so that we can reach the "startling" situation under which the people teaching mathematics to our kids will actually be trained in mathematics, and the people teaching science will actually be trained in science, and the people teaching history will actually be trained in history.

Yet, we are being asked to cut back on those initiatives. We are being asked to cut back on a good many others from the levels reached in that agreement. I am willing to sit down and work out some reasonable adjustments in those programs. But I am not willing to vote for instruments that enable anyone on either side to pretend that we are making major progress when, in fact, we are not.

And what is happening is that we are being slow-danced to the end of the session, when we will be given a choice of accepting a simple status quo education budget when, in fact, the situation on the education front demonstrates that is not what we need. We need some imagination. We need some forward progress, and we need a lot more support for some of these initiatives than we have had so far.

I really believe that if that original agreement was put on the floor, the dollar amounts I am talking about, absent the language items that were at issue, I really believe that if the dollar amounts for education and health care and worker programs contained in that conference were allowed to come to the floor by the Republican leadership, it would pass with a significant majority, and we would have a lot of votes from both sides of the aisle.

That bill is not being allowed to come to the floor. Instead, we are being asked to renegotiate a deal that was

reached on both sides of the Capitol with both parties. And as I say, in the interests of rational governance, I am willing to help participate to a reasonable degree, but I am not willing to savage these programs in order to get an agreement. I am not willing to pretend that there is major progress when, in fact, there is not.

I want to say again, none of the fault for any of the progress that has not taken place lies at the doorstep of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG). As far as I am concerned, he has been open at all times to suggestions and to requests from everyone regardless of party, regardless of the branch of government.

I think the gentleman has genuinely tried to get us to a resolution of this problem, but there are other people. I will be blunt about this. Every time I was asked by members of the press before the election what I thought was happening to the Labor, Health and Education bill, what I said was that I thought that the Republican leadership was trying to, at all costs, avoid a vote on education until after the election, so that they could hide their long-term intention to cut the amounts in this agreement. Then after the election, they would then feel free 2 years in advance of another election, counting on the public's ability to forget that they would then feel free to make large reductions in the education funding programs that we had agreed to.

Now that is exactly what is now happening. I do not believe that all Members of the majority party agree with that. I think there is a substantial number of Members who do not want to do that, but they have not been allowed to cast a vote on the floor. And until they are or until we can get reasonably rapid progress, I no longer intend to support these CRs. I have supported 18 of them in a row in order to keep negotiations going, but I see no meaningful progress.

I see the leadership of the House and the Senate and the President each trying to compete with each other in public relations terms to show who can be the sweetest in front of the TV cameras or the print press, but I do not see any real decisions being made that reflect the honest view of a majority of people on both sides of the aisle in this House.

And so until I do, I will vote no on this and subsequent continuing resolutions.

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

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) for yielding the time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) for shepherding through a bill and a process that is unbelievable. And I want to associate my remarks with our fine leader of the Committee on

Appropriations, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), who has stated the facts that the gentleman has done a marvelous job.

I also want to compliment the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for fighting some of the salient points that are important to many Americans.

I take this time, not to belabor Congress, but I am concerned about the status of the minimum wage. I would hope that both the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), although this is not totally in your province, assert your tremendous influence to include in that final package the minimum wage that we constructed on the House floor, and, if necessary, to even expand it pursuant to the conditions that exist in the country.

□ 0930

I also voted for a commensurate tax reduction for those business people who must take on that additional burden of the increase in minimum wage. But as my colleagues know, my amendment changed the original language from \$1 over 3 years to \$1 over 2 years. I am asking both of you powerful leaders if you can and, if necessary, to even expand upon that figure considering impoverished areas like mine who desperately depend upon that opportunity. But I know that that is not within your province, but I know that you two have worked so very hard.

If possible, I still support a tax cut for America that would allow those employers the opportunity to raise that wage without laying off our people. But it is very important to me and many Members that represent districts like myself.

So I ask the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) to assert his powerful leadership that he has, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) to continue to asserting his powerful leadership that he has in that regard.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I really believe that, what is happening both on this Labor, Health, Education bill and on the subject that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) just mentioned is a true test of our priorities, our character, our fairness, and our humanity.

We all sit here in comfortable jobs. We fight like the devil to get them. We sometimes pay a heavy physical and emotional price for occupying these jobs because people are often not very fair in their assessment of public officials, and they will use the slightest weakness in any human being and try to use that weakness to define that individual rather than taking a look at the whole. So sometimes politics can be a very discouraging business and sometimes one wonders why one is in it.

The answer to me, for myself, is that I came here because I thought this was the place to be more than any other—I never wanted to be a Member of the

United States Senate, I never wanted to have any job at all except to be a Member of this House—because this is supposed to be the people's House. This is where we are supposed to be, because we have 2-year terms, we are supposed to be closest to the desires and the needs of the American people.

When we come here and cast our votes, these votes are supposed to be about something bigger than just the differences between our parties. There are legitimate reasons to have political parties because we have honest, philosophical, and substantive differences. So we each make a choice about which of those two imperfect vehicles is the best in order to try to put forward the causes we believe in.

To me, the glue that holds this country together is our ability to be concerned about what happens to every individual in this country, not just those who are well connected enough with us to be able to get through on a phone call or to grab us on the street and say, "Dave", or "Clay", or "Bill", how are you. When we come here, our priorities are supposed to represent a judgment about who needs help the most.

The Labor, Health, Education bill is the bill that is supposed to help meet those shortcomings. We live in a capitalist system, and I think that is the best of any economic system that can be devised. We reward initiative. We reward imagination and hard work. Through entrepreneurship, we see people with talent and drive help build economic opportunities for themselves and for a lot of people who come to work for them in their firms or their businesses.

I salute everyone with that talent. But there are a lot of people in this country who need help to get on that train to success. There are a lot of people in this country who need help when they fall off that train, sometimes for bad luck and sometimes for other reasons.

We do not meet our responsibilities to those folks when we define ourselves going out the door at the end of this session as commanding cuts in agreements we have already reached in education and in health care. We certainly do not meet our obligations if we do not pass a significant minimum wage, as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) has just indicated. We do not meet our obligations if we have not completed action to provide a prescription drug benefit under Medicare. We do not meet our obligations if we do not find ways through a combination of public and private systems to provide decent health care for every person who needs it.

The place where we come the closest to meeting those obligations is in this bill, and this is the bill that we are now being asked to shred so we can all go home early.

I am not going to do that because I do not want to go through a Christmas season enjoying all of the pleasures of that season, being reminded every day

of the opportunity that we took away from people in education, of the mercy help that we took away in terms of health care.

I do not think that is what most Members of this House want to do. But if we continue on the course we are going, that is exactly what we will do in the Christmas season. That is exactly opposite of what the Christmas spirit is supposed to lead us all to do. That is why I am voting against this resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would respond to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) who mentioned minimum wage increases, and I would say to him that I hope that he knows that our leadership is considering and is willing to consider minimum wage legislation, but they believe that, at the same time, tax relief should be considered; and that is what they are trying to work out.

Now, I am not part of the negotiations there. I do not believe that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is. That is a different group of negotiators because those are not appropriations issues. On the appropriations bill negotiations, sometimes we do get sidetracked and get off on tangents that do not relate to appropriations, but that is just part of the appropriations process. But anyway I would say to the gentleman that he raises an important issue that is being considered by our leadership.

We have a very large surplus. At a time of surplus, whether it is in our government life or whether it is in our family life or our business life, when one has a large surplus, one's economy is very good, there are several things one ought to do. One can indulge oneself in some of those things that one has not had but would like to have. Well, the government is doing that as well.

But something else that one should do is pay down some of one's debts. If one's credit card bills are too high, one ought to pay them off. If one's car payments are too high, one ought to pay them off, if one's economy is that good, if one has that extra money available. So that is one of the things that we are trying to do here. We are indulging the government because the spending for this year is increased over last year.

In the area of education, even at the number that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) objects so strongly to, our investment in education is dramatically larger than it was last year and over the President's budget request. The same thing for medical research, which is over the President's budget request and over last year's amount.

So we are indulging ourselves. Also, we are making a stronger investment in our national security, trying to compensate for the excessive deployments that American troops have been

experiencing in the last 8 years; deployments all over the world that are very, very costly, not only in time and manpower and womanpower, but in personnel costs. We wear out equipment. Spare parts cost. All of these things cost. So we are indulging the government and providing a little extra money.

At the same time, we should be doing something for the taxpayers, the people who make this money available. So paying off that debt becomes important to them, as it should be important to us, because I agree with what the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) said. This is the people's House. We represent the people of America.

I do not know how many realize this, but in the entire huge Federal Government system, there is only one place that one must be elected to serve, and that is here in the House of Representatives. One can be a President by appointment. Remember, Gerald Ford was never elected President, but he served as President. One can be a Vice President by appointment. One can be a United States Senator by appointment. One can be a member of the Supreme Court or anywhere in the judicial system by appointment. And in all of the many, many jobs in the agencies all over this Federal system, one can be appointed to those jobs.

The only place where one will never serve without being elected by the people is in this House of Representatives, and so this is the people's House. That is why we should be paying attention to recognizing that, if the people have contributed a lot more money to the government than the government needs, we ought to give some of it back.

That is why we are so committed to providing tax relief for the American taxpayer, who is substantially overburdened with their tax obligations, and then paying down the debt.

I mentioned that if one has a lot of money, a windfall, one's personal economy is good, one's business economy is good, one's government economy is good, pay down the debt or at least pay down part of it. That is what we have been doing.

We have been paying down the debt. Billions and billions of dollars of national debt, of public debt is being paid down. That has a lot of beneficial effect. One of the beneficial effects is, the smaller that debt becomes, the less interest the American taxpayer has to pay on that debt. The interest payment on our national debt has been over a quarter of a trillion dollars a year.

Now, can one imagine how much we can do for our veterans, how much we can do for our school students, how much we can do for medical research, how much we can do for the military, how much we can do for a renovation of our infrastructure in America if we had that extra quarter of a trillion dollars to use rather than pay interest on the national debt. So that is also an important part of what we do.

But now let us go back to the part where we are going to indulge the government a little bit. One of the bills that is higher than last year, if we ever get it passed, is this bill on Labor, Health, Education and Human Services.

Now, this bill, when it passed the House of Representatives the very first time early in the year, it was right at \$100 billion. We have had two sets of negotiations. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I have worked with our counterparts in the Senate; and in July, we came up with a conference report that we thought that the House and the Senate would accept and that the President would sign. We really believed that. But higher authority decided on one side that it was too high and higher authority on the other side said it was too low. So we went back to the negotiating table.

In October, we came up with another package. We thought we really had done it this time, and higher authorities again shut it down. But that is why we are here, to work out these negotiations.

Now, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) objects to the agreement that he believes was reached at \$107 billion, which is \$7 billion more than the House had originally passed.

Mr. OBEY. No. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. OBEY. No, Mr. Speaker, I do not in any way believe there was an agreement reached at \$107 billion. I know absolutely for a fact that there was not an agreement reached. The White House denies that there was an agreement reached at that number. The Democratic leadership denies that there was an agreement reached at that number. There was no agreement at that number. The continuing repetition of the mantra that there was one is one of the things that is going to stand as an obstacle to our getting any progress around here.

□ 0945

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman just got a little ahead of me because I was getting to that point. There was no agreement on the \$107 billion figure that the gentleman used.

One area where I do agree with the gentleman is what he said about press reports. The newspapers this morning, which were overly optimistic, did not represent the meeting at the White House yesterday. I agree with him. The information that I have was that there was no reason to be optimistic based on that meeting at the White House yesterday, whether we are talking about \$107 billion, which there was no agreement on; there was also no agreement on the \$112 billion, which is the high number that is being considered by some; and definitely there is no agreement on the \$100 billion, which is what the House passed.

So I say, in as friendly a way as I can to my friend from Wisconsin, that is why we should not communicate through newspapers or media. We ought to communicate with each other directly. And the gentleman from Wisconsin and I do that. Regarding his concern about what might have appeared in the newspaper, he should understand that that is not always necessarily the way that it really is.

Mr. Speaker, we have had a lot of conversation about this continuing resolution that we probably did not need to have, but we have done it; and now we are going to vote on this continuing resolution. It takes us until Monday. I would have preferred that we had a continuing resolution that would take us at least until Wednesday of next week, because I honestly believe that Members could go home this weekend and come back next Wednesday. By then there would be a package that I believe would be acceptable to at least a majority of the Members of the House and the Senate.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. That is the point that I want to raise.

As the gentleman knows, because the gentleman was here last night, and I was here last night, at 4 o'clock in the afternoon all of the leaders on high wanted us to get together last night, first at the staff level so that we understood what each other's proposals were, and then at the Member level. That did not take place, I think largely because there is still such a tremendous lack of clarity coming from the top that it is hard to sit in a room when we are being given three different descriptions of what we are actually expected to do.

My question is this. I will certainly be here every day from now until the cows come home, if necessary, to get an agreement. I feel I have full authority on my side at this point to negotiate. I would like to know whether the gentleman yet feels that he has that authority on his side; and if he does not, or if he knows of any other party that does not in this situation, then is the leadership going to be in town over the weekend so that if they want to again second guess our work that they can do that with some speed so we do not have to waste another 3 days and have to come in here and ruin yet another week before we finally get out of here?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, once again reclaiming my time, the gentleman from Wisconsin, through this entire process, has been here when it was necessary for him to be here. This gentleman from Florida, through this entire process, has been here when this gentleman was required to be here, and that means that neither one of us got home to our districts very much this year because we have been here a lot.

Mr. OBEY. That is why my margin went up.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. That may be true. But anyway, the answer to the gentleman is, I will be here. I do not have the authority to settle on a top number. I think the gentleman understands that. That number is going to be decided by a higher authority than mine or his, and it is going to be decided along with the President of the United States. Now, if that number is agreed upon by that higher authority, then the gentleman from Wisconsin and I can work out the balance along with our counterparts in the Senate without any great difficulty.

Mr. OBEY. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I would like to correct one thing the gentleman said. I do have the authority from my leadership to negotiate all numbers on appropriation items, including the overall amount. And I would respectfully urge the gentleman's leadership to do the same thing on his side. Because the problem I see is that I think the gentleman's leadership and my leadership are starting from different baselines, and so, therefore, they think they are talking to each other but in fact they are talking past each other.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Well, then, I would ask the gentleman this question, and I will yield for his answer. What number is the gentleman prepared to start at?

Mr. OBEY. I am starting at the conference agreement that we reached agreement on and shook hands on and toasted with Merlot, as the gentleman knows. I am willing to come down from that.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. That is my question. How much is the gentleman prepared and authorized to come down.

Mr. OBEY. Let us get in a room in 1 hour and start that process.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, let me get back to my point that we would have been much better served if we could have had a continuing resolution that would take us at least until the middle of next week so that these negotiations that the gentleman from Wisconsin and I are both trying to negotiate here on the floor, which does not work. We need that little extra time, and we need those with that authority to establish that number, whatever it is going to be.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield once again, my concern is that the gentleman has just said he does not have the authority to negotiate the top number; and yet it is not my understanding that his leadership, who evidently is retaining control over that top number, it is not my understanding that they will be here this weekend. Now, are they or are they not?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Well, I would suggest that the gentleman ask them to yield and ask them that question. I do not know what their plans are going to be. But I would say this, throughout

this entire process my leadership has been available to me any day, weekend, weekday, night or day. I have no difficulty whatsoever communicating with my leadership because they are committed to completing this job, but they are committed to doing it in a responsible fashion.

We are just not going to sit down and agree to \$112 billion, and the gentleman might as well understand that. He can debate about it all he wants to, but we are not going to go to the figure of \$112 billion.

Mr. OBEY. I am not asking the gentleman to.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. That is a far greater investment than is required for this legislation. I have made the case that we have already increased education considerably over the President's budget request. We have increased the medical research through NIH dramatically over the President's budget request. But we are not going to go to the \$112 billion that this administration wants. We are just not going to do it.

We have a responsibility to the people of America who sent us here to balance the budget, who sent us here to pay down the debt, who sent us here to give a little tax relief to our constituents, the taxpayers who have been overburdened; and, by God, we are going to do that. We have done it, and we are going to continue to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a "yes" vote on this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). All time for debate has expired.

The joint resolution is considered read for amendment.

Pursuant to House Resolution 669, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on engrossment and third reading of the 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 the 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 284, nays 37, not voting 111, as follows:

[Roll No. 602]

YEAS—284

Abercrombie	Ballenger	Bereuter
Aderholt	Barcia	Berkley
Allen	Barr	Berry
Andrews	Barrett (NE)	Biggart
Armey	Barrett (WI)	Bilirakis
Bachus	Bass	Bishop
Baldacci	Bentsen	Bliley

Blumenauer	Holden	Porter
Blunt	Holt	Portman
Boehkert	Hooley	Price (NC)
Bonilla	Horn	Pryce (OH)
Boswell	Hostettler	Quinn
Boucher	Hulshof	Radanovich
Boyd	Hunter	Rahall
Brady (TX)	Hutchinson	Ramstad
Brown (FL)	Inslee	Rangel
Burr	Isakson	Regula
Buyer	Istook	Reyes
Callahan	Jackson (IL)	Reynolds
Calvert	Jefferson	Riley
Camp	Jenkins	Rivers
Campbell	Johnson (CT)	Rodriguez
Canady	Johnson, Sam	Roemer
Cannon	Jones (NC)	Rogers
Capps	Jones (OH)	Roukema
Cardin	Kanjorski	Roybal-Allard
Carson	Kelly	Royce
Castle	Kildee	Ryun (KS)
Chabot	Kind (WI)	Sabo
Chambliss	Kleczka	Salmon
Clayton	Klink	Sanchez
Clyburn	Knollenberg	Sandlin
Coble	Kolbe	Sawyer
Collins	Kucinich	Saxton
Combest	Kuykendall	Schaffer
Condit	Lampson	Sensenbrenner
Cook	Larson	Serrano
Cooksey	Latham	Sessions
Cox	LaTourette	Shadegg
Crane	Lazio	Shaw
Cummings	Leach	Shays
Davis (FL)	Lee	Sherman
Davis (VA)	Levin	Sherwood
DeLay	Lewis (KY)	Shimkus
DeMint	Linder	Shows
Deutsch	LoBiondo	Simpson
Diaz-Balart	Lucas (KY)	Sisisky
Dicks	Lucas (OK)	Skeen
Doggett	Luther	Skelton
Dooley	Maloney (CT)	Slaughter
Doolittle	Maloney (NY)	Smith (MI)
Doyle	Manzullo	Smith (NJ)
Dreier	Markey	Smith (TX)
Duncan	Mascara	Snyder
Dunn	Matsui	Souder
Edwards	McCarthy (MO)	Spence
Ehlers	McGovern	Spratt
English	McHugh	Stabenow
Etheridge	McIntyre	Stearns
Evans	McKeon	Stenholm
Everett	McNulty	Stump
Ewing	Meek (FL)	Sununu
Fletcher	Meeks (NY)	Sweeney
Foley	Menendez	Tanner
Frank (MA)	Metcalf	Tauscher
Franks (NJ)	Mica	Tauzin
Frelinghuysen	Millender-	Taylor (MS)
Frost	McDonald	Terry
Ganske	Minge	Thomas
Gekas	Moakley	Thompson (CA)
Gephardt	Mollohan	Thornberry
Gibbons	Moore	Thune
Gilchrest	Moran (KS)	Tiahrt
Gilman	Moran (VA)	Toomey
Gonzalez	Morella	Traficant
Goode	Murtha	Turner
Goodlatte	Myrick	Udall (CO)
Goodling	Nadler	Udall (NM)
Gordon	Napolitano	Upton
Goss	Nethercutt	Velazquez
Green (TX)	Ney	Vitter
Green (WI)	Northup	Walden
Gutierrez	Norwood	Walsh
Gutknecht	Nussle	Watt (NC)
Hall (TX)	Ortiz	Watts (OK)
Hastings (WA)	Ose	Weldon (FL)
Hayes	Pallone	Weldon (PA)
Hayworth	Pascrell	Weller
Herger	Pastor	Wexler
Hill (IN)	Payne	Whitfield
Hilleary	Pease	Wilson
Hilliard	Peterson (MN)	Wolf
Hobson	Pickering	Wu
Hoefel	Pitts	Wynn
Hoekstra	Pombo	Young (FL)

NAYS—37

Baird	DeLauro	Kilpatrick
Baldwin	Dingell	Lowe
Barton	Farr	McDermott
Bonior	Ford	Mink
Brown (OH)	Hinchee	Oberstar
Capuano	Jackson-Lee	Obey
Conyers	(TX)	Olver
Coyne	Johnson, E. B.	Owens
DeGette	Kennedy	Paul

Pelosi	Stark	Visclosky
Sanders	Strickland	Waters
Schakowsky	Stupak	Woolsey
Scott	Thurman	

NOT VOTING—111

Ackerman	Forbes	McKinney
Archer	Fossella	Meehan
Baca	Fowler	Miller (FL)
Baker	Gallegly	Miller, Gary
Bartlett	Gejdenson	Miller, George
Becerra	Gillmor	Neal
Berman	Graham	Oxley
Billray	Granger	Packard
Blagojevich	Greenwood	Peterson (PA)
Boehner	Hall (OH)	Petri
Bono	Hansen	Phelps
Borski	Hastings (FL)	Pickett
Brady (PA)	Hefley	Pomeroy
Bryant	Hill (MT)	Rogan
Burton	Hinojosa	Rohrabacher
Chenoweth-Hage	Houghton	Ros-Lehtinen
Clay	Hoyer	Rothman
Clement	Hyde	Rush
Coburn	John	Ryan (WI)
Costello	Kaptur	Sanford
Cramer	Kasich	Scarborough
Crowley	King (NY)	Shuster
Cubin	Kingston	Smith (WA)
Cunningham	LaFalce	Talent
Danner	LaHood	Tancredo
Davis (IL)	Lantos	Taylor (NC)
Deal	Largent	Thompson (MS)
DeFazio	Lewis (CA)	Tierney
Delahunt	Lewis (GA)	Towns
Dickey	Lipinski	Wamp
Dixon	Lofgren	Watkins
Ehrlich	Martinez	Waxman
Emerson	McCarthy (NY)	Weiner
Engel	McCollum	Weygand
Eshoo	McCrery	Wicker
Fattah	McInnis	Wise
Filner	McIntosh	Young (AK)

□ 1015

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.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 602, I was in my Congressional District on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 602, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been here I would have voted "yea."

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY,
DECEMBER 11, 2000

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 5 p.m. on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR
WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON
WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

SUPPORTING AMERICA'S FAMILIES

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, as the 106th Congress comes to a close, we look to the future; and I see great opportunity before us.

Together, we should work to ensure that the 107th Congress meets the needs and fulfills the goals of America's families. For example, currently our families must work until mid May of every year just to pay off their tax bills. Nothing up to that point goes toward savings, investment or other personal expenses. This overbearing tax burden is simply unfair. We need to give American families a break and allow them to keep more of what they earn.

It is my hope that the 107th Congress will grant needed tax relief to America's families as well as pass other necessary legislation, including a Medicare prescription drug benefit and real, local-based education reform. I look forward to continuing to work as we begin this session on these issues, and I encourage all Members to join with me to support America's families in the 107th Congress.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, yesterday December 7, 2000, I was unavoidably detained in my district and missed rollcall vote 601.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

CHRISTMAS DAY IS APPROACHING

(Mr. EHLERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to take a moment at this time of year to recognize that we do have a major holiday approaching. I wore a Christmas tie today for that purpose. This is just an effort to first of all remind my colleagues and our Nation about the great blessings we enjoy in this Nation, that we are true to our religious heritage as individuals, that we recognize the major holiday which is of extreme importance to the majority of our population, and also in a slightly humorous way to remind my colleagues that we really are past the time of adjournment, that we should be at home meeting with our constituents, reminding them of all that we have done, and also to make certain that we spend some time with our families and enjoy our Christmas holiday together.

TIME TO COMPLETE THE BUDGET PROCESS

(Mrs. LOWEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I was sitting on the floor of the House as we were debating the continuing resolution. Frankly, I was puzzled. I would like to appeal to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. The budget process should have been completed by October 1. Several weeks ago, our distinguished chair of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG); our distinguished chair of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), sat with Democrats and worked in a bipartisan way to get a bill completed.

There was a lot of time, my colleagues, on the floor of the House talking about whether it is \$107 billion, \$110 billion, \$113 billion. You get to a point around here where it is a billion here, a billion there and soon we are talking about real money. But I want to make it clear to those who may be watching this process, that every day we wait, children are waiting for moneys for after-school programs, for moneys for smaller class sizes, for moneys for modernization of our schools, for Head Start, for those who are waiting for a Pell grant. We are talking about \$500 more for a Pell grant. For those who are desperately waiting for answers for cancer research, we are talking about funding for the National Institutes of Health.

My colleagues, I hope we would take the numbers of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and complete this process now.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded that remarks are to be addressed to the Chair and not to those who may be watching on television or elsewhere.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

(Mr. METCALF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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