plan will protect Social Security and restore fiscal responsibility in Washington. This is just a common-sense proposal that gives the Department of Education and agency heads leeway to trim the waste, fraud, and abuse they find in their budgets. We are not mandating specific cuts, so if important programs get slashed and the administration suggests that it is the right thing to do, then because they have decided to do it, let it be.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that fat should be cut from the bloated Washington bureaucracy, and we can protect Social Security and Medicare by making sure the savings do happen.

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION CANNOT COUNT**

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

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the Department of Education will make an announcement that should concern every one of us. The Department will announce that since 1998, its books are unauditable.

This is an agency that receives an annual appropriation of $35 billion and manages another $85 billion in a loan portfolio. A $120 billion agency that cannot account for its spending.

Now, I suggest that the President, when he comes back, is in Turkey this week, and the minority leader when he comes back from the West Coast from his fund-raising expedition, when these folks come back to work, that they join the Republicans here to correct the mismanagement of the Department of Education. Because, Mr. Speaker, the children of America do count. Unfortunately, the Department of Education cannot count.

**MINORITY LEADER SHOULD COME HOME AND JOIN THE FIGHT TO SAVE SOCIAL SECURITY**

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am so sorry the gentleman from New York left the Chamber, because I would be happy to offer a current events quiz. Here is the question: Where was the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPPERT) , minority leader of the United States House, yesterday?

Answer: Raising campaign funds on the West Coast.

But I thought he wanted to reform campaigns. Oh, but not necessarily so. And besides, we all know, Mr. Speaker, that for that crowd to talk about campaign finance reform is a bit akin to having Bonnie and Clyde come out for tougher penalties against bank robbery.

But at any rate, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPPERT) was away. How can we get our work done? He should have a seat at the table, and he should join with us to save one penny on the dollar for every dollar of discretionary spending, so that the government can live within its means and quit the raid and continue to cease the raid on the Social Security Trust Fund.

Mr. Speaker, I would invite the minority leader to come back to town and go to work and join with us and realize that a penny saved is retirement security

**PARTIES TO THE BUDGET NEGOTIATIONS ARE AWOL**

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

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I find it disappointing. As we try to bring this budget to conclusion, as we try to finalize the negotiations, we have major people that are a part of this process that are AWOL. They are absent.

How does the Speaker of the House who has to negotiate with the President stay up late at night every night so he can call the President in Turkey? Is that the way to negotiate?

In Pennsylvania where I come from, if the governor or if his cabinet left town during those final negotiations, the press would have been all over them. Why is it possible for the President, the minority leader, who was away yesterday who is the one who is posing any kind of trimming of waste or fraud, he is the one who is holding out, but he is not available to negotiate yesterday? That is why this process has run on. The President is just finishing his second trip abroad since October 1, and this is when we have been trying to finalize the budget.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, it is important for those who are a part of this negotiating process to stay in town, get the work of the American people done, so we can pass the budget that does not rob Social Security.

**CONGRESS HAS MORE TIME THAN TAXPAYERS HAVE MONEY**

(Mr. THUNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, it is November 17, and we are still here for one reason, and that is that we have got more time than the American taxpayers have money.

This Congress has passed all 13 appropriation bills. The President has chosen to veto 5 of those bills. Why did he veto them? Because they did not spend enough money. So we are still here negotiating with all the President’s men since he is trying negotiations that this Congress has more time than taxpayers have money.
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 381, I report the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 80) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000, 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 80 is as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 106-62 is further amended by striking “November 17, 1999” in section 106(c) and inserting in lieu thereof “November 18, 1999”. Public Law 106-46 is amended by striking “November 17, 1999” and inserting in lieu thereof “November 18, 1999”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 381, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) each will control 30 minutes.

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

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. 80, 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.

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

Mr. Speaker, this a 1-day continuing resolution, which I do not think is going to be adequate because the negotiations on wrapping up our appropriations work are still somewhat delayed, although the Speaker of the House and the President did speak with each other late last night, and we are hopeful that we can come to a conclusion.

The appropriations part of this negotiation has been completed for some time. The offsets, the pay-fors, are what are holding up the negotiations. We expect to have that completed today. We expect to file the bill in the House today, and we expect to consider the bill in the House today; and, hopefully, the other body will be able to expedite it as well.

So maybe the 1-day extension may be enough, but probably not. But nevertheless, this is what we have before us today.

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

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I notice we have flights going overseas all the time, and I know this will have to be flown to the President. I cannot imagine, from what the
Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) for his comments. And of course, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) does not do that. I know that he understands how the system works and as I do, too.

As a matter of fact, they suggested to me that we should ask for a vote. I am not sure I even know the procedure of how to ask for a vote because it has been so long since I have asked for a vote.

But having said that, I know that we have to get our business done. I am hopeful negotiations will end today. I am not as optimistic as the chairman is. But the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) that, if he and I had been able to deal without them, whoever it is that is not doing this kind of work when, as the chairman suggested in the first week or next week or Thanksgiving or Christmas time we will be done.

As past history shows, sometimes we have delicate negotiations. I hope it is not an across-the-board cut. I worry so much. Because even the four-tenths of 1 percent cut would mean we would cut $500 million out of O&M. With the two units that are C4, I realize there is not a big threat out there to the Army right now, but it worries me that we are doing this kind of work when, as the chairman suggested in the first place, if we had passed an adequate budget resolution, we would have been all through with this thing early in the year. We would not have had to resort to the kind of gimmicks that have been so disagreeable to those of us on the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) that, if he and I had been able to resolve this issue as we have been able to deal with the defense issues for many years, we would have concluded our business a long time ago.

I would like to say this, that the Committee on Appropriations in the House has done a good job. We basically completed our part of the business in July. Then we had the negotiations with our counterparts in the Senate. I would like to compliment our counterparts in the Senate. Senator STEVENS is a dynamic leader, a tough negotiator, and very knowledgeable. He does a really good job. And of course his partner there, Senator BYRD, is also very determined in what it is that he seeks to do.

But the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) and I have always been able to get things resolved early on. We have not been able to do that on the wrap up appropriations work. But today we are close to that conclusion now. I will say again the appropriators have done a good job. The appropriations part of this package is complete. The agreement will have some extraneous material, some riders, and the offsets that are holding us up. But, we do plan to file that bill today.

I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.
SEC. 2. HOLDING OF COURT AT WHEATON, ILLINOIS.

Section 93(a)(1) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding after Chicago "and Wheaton".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) each will control 20 minutes.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on S. 1418.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1418, as amended. It contains two small but important provisions that will improve the efficiency of the administration of justice in our Federal court system.

Section I was approved in the House by unanimous consent. This section proposes to allow the holding of court in Natchez, Mississippi, in the same manner as court is held in Vicksburg, Mississippi. It would eliminate a provision in current law that limits the authority of the Federal courts to lease space in order to convene proceedings in Natchez, Mississippi.

While only a small number of Federal court cases are now tried at Natchez County Court facilities, it is important that the Federal Government be able to continue using the facility.

I have a manager's amendment that adds Section 2 to the bill. Section 2 designates Wheaton, Illinois, as a place of holding court for the Eastern Division of the Northern District of Illinois.

Wheaton is the seat of DuPage County, Illinois. Because of the large population growth in DuPage County and the area surrounding Chicago, it would be beneficial to designate Wheaton as an additional place of holding court.

Mr. Speaker, these are simple yet significant improvements to the Federal judicial system. I urge my colleagues to support S. 1418.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1418, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAILROAD POLICE TRAINING AT FBI NATIONAL ACADEMY

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1235) to amend part G of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to allow railroad police officers to attend the Federal Bureau of Investigation National Academy for law enforcement training.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1235

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, SECTION I. INCLUSION OF RAILROAD POLICE OFFICERS IN FBI LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING.

(a) In General.—Section 701(a) of part G of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3771(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking "State or unit of local government" and inserting "State, unit of local government, or rail carrier"; and

(B) by inserting "including railroad police officers" before the semicolon; and

(2) in paragraph (5)—

(A) by striking "State or unit of local government" and inserting "State, unit of local government, or rail carrier";