

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2547, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 366, nays 34, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 550]

YEAS—366

Ackerman	DeFazio	Houghton
Aderholt	DeGette	Hoyer
Allen	DeLauro	Hulshof
Andrews	DeLay	Hunter
Archer	Deutsch	Hutchinson
Armey	Diaz-Balart	Hyde
Baca	Dickey	Inslee
Bachus	Dicks	Isakson
Baird	Dingell	Istook
Baker	Dixon	Jackson (IL)
Baldacci	Doggett	Jackson-Lee
Baldwin	Dooley	(TX)
Ballenger	Doolittle	Jefferson
Barcia	Doyle	Jenkins
Barr	Dreier	Johnson (CT)
Barrett (NE)	Dunn	Johnson, E.B.
Barrett (WI)	Edwards	Johnson, Sam
Bartlett	Ehlers	Jones (OH)
Barton	Ehrlich	Kanjorski
Bass	Emerson	Kaptur
Becerra	English	Kasich
Bentsen	Eshoo	Kelly
Bereuter	Etheridge	Kennedy
Berkley	Evans	Kildee
Berman	Everett	Kilpatrick
Biggart	Ewing	Kind (WI)
Bilbray	Farr	King (NY)
Bilirakis	Fattah	Kingston
Bishop	Filner	Klecza
Blagojevich	Fletcher	Knollenberg
Bliley	Foley	Kolbe
Blumenauer	Forbes	Kucinich
Blunt	Ford	Kuykendall
Boehlert	Fossella	LaFalce
Boehner	Fowler	LaHood
Bonilla	Frank (MA)	Lampson
Bonior	Frelinghuysen	Lantos
Bono	Frost	Larson
Borski	Galleghy	Latham
Boswell	Ganske	LaTourette
Boucher	Gejdenson	Leach
Brady (PA)	Gekas	Lee
Brady (TX)	Gibbons	Levin
Brown (FL)	Gilchrest	Lewis (CA)
Bryant	Gillmor	Lewis (GA)
Burr	Gilman	Lewis (KY)
Callahan	Gonzalez	Linder
Calvert	Goode	Lipinski
Camp	Goodlatte	LoBiondo
Canady	Goodling	Lofgren
Cannon	Gordon	Lowey
Capps	Goss	Lucas (KY)
Capuano	Graham	Lucas (OK)
Cardin	Granger	Luther
Carson	Green (TX)	Maloney (CT)
Castle	Green (WI)	Maloney (NY)
Chambliss	Greenwood	Manzullo
Clay	Gutierrez	Markey
Clayton	Gutknecht	Martinez
Clement	Hall (OH)	Mascara
Clyburn	Hall (TX)	Matsui
Combest	Hastings (WA)	McCarthy (MO)
Condit	Hayes	McCarthy (NY)
Cooksey	Hayworth	McCrery
Costello	Hill (IN)	McDermott
Cox	Hill (MT)	McHugh
Coyne	Hillery	McInnis
Cramer	Hilliard	McIntyre
Crane	Hinchee	McKeon
Crowley	Hinojosa	McKinney
Cummings	Hobson	McNulty
Cunningham	Hoefel	Meehan
Davis (FL)	Hoekstra	Meek (FL)
Davis (IL)	Holden	Menendez
Davis (VA)	Holt	Miller (FL)
Deal	Hooley	Miller, George

Mink	Reynolds
Moakley	Rivers
Mollohan	Rodriguez
Moore	Roemer
Moran (VA)	Rogan
Morella	Rogers
Murtha	Ros-Lehtinen
Myrick	Rothman
Nadler	Roukema
Napolitano	Roybal-Allard
Neal	Ryan (WI)
Nethercutt	Ryun (KS)
Ney	Salmon
Northup	Sanchez
Norwood	Sanders
Nussle	Sandlin
Oberstar	Sawyer
Obey	Saxton
Olver	Scarborough
Ortiz	Schakowsky
Ose	Scott
Owens	Serrano
Oxley	Sessions
Packard	Shaw
Pallone	Shays
Pascarell	Sherman
Pastor	Sherwood
Payne	Shimkus
Pease	Shows
Pelosi	Shuster
Peterson (MN)	Sisisky
Petri	Skeen
Phelps	Skelton
Pickering	Slaughter
Pitts	Smith (MI)
Pomeroy	Smith (NJ)
Porter	Smith (TX)
Portman	Smith (WA)
Price (NC)	Snyder
Pryce (OH)	Souder
Quinn	Spence
Radanovich	Spratt
Rahall	Stabenow
Ramstad	Stark
Rangel	Strickland
Regula	Stump
Reyes	Sununu

NAYS—34

Abercrombie	Hansen	Rush
Berry	Hefley	Sabo
Boyd	Herger	Sanford
Burton	Hostettler	Schaffer
Chabot	Jones (NC)	Sensenbrenner
Coble	Metcalfe	Simpson
Coburn	Miller, Gary	Stearns
Conyers	Moran (KS)	Stenholm
Crook	Paul	Tiahrt
Cubin	Pombo	Toomey
DeMint	Riley	
Duncan	Rohrabacher	

NOT VOTING—32

Brown (OH)	John	Peterson (PA)
Buyer	Klink	Pickett
Campbell	Largent	Royce
Chenoweth-Hage	Lazio	Shadegg
Collins	McCollum	Stupak
Danner	McGovern	Talent
DeLahunt	McIntosh	Thompson (MS)
Engel	Meeks (NY)	Waxman
Franks (NJ)	Mica	Wise
Gephardt	Millender-	
Hastings (FL)	McDonald	
Horn	Minge	

□ 1433

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed

with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4846. An act to establish the National Recording Registry in the Library of Congress to maintain and preserve sound recordings that are culturally, historically, or aesthetically significant, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2772. An act to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to enhance dairy markets through dairy product mandatory reporting, and for other purposes.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTIONS 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, AND 120, EACH MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 646 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 646

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 115) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes. The joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

Sec. 2. upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 116) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes. The joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

Sec. 3. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 117) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes. The joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

Sec. 4. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House

the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 118) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes. The joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

Sec. 5. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 119) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes. The joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

Sec. 6. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 120) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes. The joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 646 is a closed rule providing for consideration of House Joint Resolutions 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, and 120. Each of these joint resolutions makes further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for a period of 1 day.

H. Res. 646 provides for 1 hour of debate on each joint resolution equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of these joint resolutions. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit on each joint resolution as is the right of the minority.

Mr. Speaker, the current continuing resolution expires at the end of the day today and further continuing resolutions are necessary to keep the government operating while Congress completes consideration of the remaining appropriations bills. Because the President refuses to sign any longer duration, the joint resolutions covered by

this rule each simply extend the provisions included in H.J. Res. 109 by one additional day.

Mr. Speaker, after weeks of hard work, the House now just has three appropriations conference reports left to pass. However, as we work to reach agreement over the remaining appropriations bills, we will have to take valuable time away from our negotiations each day to pass 1-day continuing resolutions. President Clinton has threatened to veto any continuing resolution of more than one day's duration, so each day we must take the appropriators away from negotiations and bring them to the floor to vote on these 1-day measures.

Mr. Speaker, if that is what the President wants, it is fine with me. I will come to the floor every day to vote for a continuing resolution to keep the government running. Like my Republican colleagues, I am determined to pass fair and fiscally responsible appropriations bills. We will stay here as long as it takes to do the people's business.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress is responsible for only two-thirds of the appropriations process. The executive branch must also do its job to move the appropriations process along. We would all like to complete our business and go home, but our principles keep us here, and the Republican majority is committed to putting people before politics and passing appropriations bills that reflect the priorities of the American people.

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 confident that the fair, clean, continuing resolutions covered by this rule will give us the time we need to complete the appropriations process in a thoughtful and judicious manner.

This rule was reported unanimously by the Committee on Rules yesterday evening, and 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, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER), my colleague and my friend, for yielding me the customary half hour.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for the consideration of not 1, not 2, not 3, not 4, not 5, but 6 continuing resolutions. Each one ends on a different day beginning tomorrow and going through Halloween. That way my Republican colleagues can finish now or they can finish later. With this rule, they have the continuing resolution they need to, no matter when they finish, without having to get more rules on the continuing resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the 13 appropriation bills were supposed to have been passed and signed into law by October 1. Today only four appropriations bills have been signed into law, Defense, Military Construction, Interior and Transportation. There are 5 bills waiting at the White House: VA-HUD, Energy and Water, Legislative Branch, Treasury-Postal and Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, so in order to keep the Federal Government open, despite the unfinished business, we must keep passing these continuing resolutions until the appropriation bills are finally signed into law.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, the appropriations bills that are still outstanding, Labor, Health and Human Services, Commerce Justice State, Foreign Operations and the District of Columbia, are some of the most controversial. So these bills are not going to be finished without a fight, and that might take some time.

But my Republican colleagues continue to move slowly, and in the last month, the Congress has been in session only a few days a week, and for many of those days, we have been voting on very noncontroversial suspension bills.

Instead of renaming post offices, my Republican colleagues should have been passing real managed care reform. They should have passed the prescription drug program within Medicare. They should have passed campaign finance reform, gun safety legislation; but, Mr. Speaker, they did not. And even Republican Senator McCAIN said, we are gridlocked by the special interests.

Democrats, on the other hand, want to help working families. We want to hire 100,000 new teachers. We want to build new schools and repair the old ones.

We wanted to help school districts with school construction bonds. We want to create after-school programs. But my Republican colleagues just will not let us.

Mr. Speaker, even though my Republican colleagues balk at spending money on education, they are increasing spending on other items faster than ever before, even nondefense spending.

□ 1445

And that increase in spending, Mr. Speaker, is very significant, even if we account for inflation.

So I think it is time Congress enacted some bills for everyday Americans. I think it is time we put education first. I think it is time we finished the appropriation bills instead of stalling for another week. So I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule providing for the six continuing resolutions.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members it is

not in order in debate to refer to statements of Senators occurring outside the Senate Chamber.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, only to offer myself first in line to nominate my friend from Massachusetts as chairman of the national school board.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the Democratic whip.

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

Mr. Speaker, those of us who are from the Midwest are familiar with an insect called the cicada. Now, the cicada is a very fierce bug that lays dormant for years, but at any given time, they seem to wake up from their slumber, they make an incredible racket for a very brief period of time, and then they are gone, they have vanished. Now, how very much like this Republican Congress are the cicada. It is a Congress that for 2 long years has been laying flat on its back and only now is it rising to its feet to give its self-serving speeches.

Now, in the words of Washington Post's editorial, this is an un-Congress. We have heard of the "uncola." They have called this the un-Congress. Quote: "The un-Congress continues neither to work nor adjourn. For 2 years, it has mainly pretended to deal with the issues that it has systematically avoided," The Washington Post.

Now, is this because, Mr. Speaker, there is no work left to be done? Granted, our country is in much better shape today than it was under the last Republican President, but that does not mean that all of America's problems have been solved.

Just consider education. We know that one of the toughest obstacles to learning is the fact that too many kids are stuck in overcrowded, undisciplined schools and classrooms, as the gentleman from Massachusetts has just made clear. Overcrowding has gotten so bad that in some schools it is at the point that classes have been held in converted boiler rooms. We have even heard of roofs caving in on our students. We should be doing something about that. We have a bill to do something about that. In fact, there are Republicans that have sponsored our bill to do something about that. We can pass the Rangel-Johnson bill. We can have safer and modern schools and, by the way, at the same time help cut the property taxes at the local level.

But, it seems the Republican leadership would rather complain about public schools than join with us in helping to fix them. If their leadership put as much time into crafting solutions as they do in passing stopgap measures,

we could have addressed this issue. We could have passed the patients' bill of rights. We could have approved a Medicare prescription drug plan under Medicare. We could have had hate crimes legislation. We could have raised the minimum wage. All of these major pieces lie dormant like the cicada after it raises a racket.

So maybe if we could have done these things we could have earned the right to take some of those extra long weekends we have been enjoying. But, Mr. Speaker, I know I speak for my colleagues on this side of the aisle when I say that none of us ran for Congress because we came here to complain about problems. We came here to help solve them.

If my Republican friends are not willing to roll up their sleeves to stay here to face those four or five issues, to make sure we have the education agenda in modern schools, in lower class sizes, in after-school programs, if they are not willing to do that and they are not willing to do raising the minimum wage and doing the prescription drug benefit under Medicare and making HMOs accountable and passing campaign finance reform, I suggest that they step aside in favor of those who will.

So I urge my colleagues to vote no on this rule so that we can raise these issues in a way that will allow us to have them before us so we can have something to take back to the American people before this Congress adjourns.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE).

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon reluctantly in support of the continuing resolutions that we will be passing, but in opposition to the rule. I would like to speak just briefly about the importance of understanding the current state of our fiscal affairs.

It is important to understand that these measures that we will be voting on are very small infinitesimal steps in a significantly larger process. That larger process is one that has not been very well explained to the American people. The American people understand or expect that we are going to have a budget surplus and that we will be paying down on the debt and that over the next 10 years, that payment may be as much as \$4 trillion. Well, the facts do not really square up with that, and the action here today really gives us reason to pause.

I would like to start by just pointing out with respect to this chart that we have had not a surplus, but indeed we have had an increase in the debt over the last year. The dates here just are from June 30, 1999 to June 30, 2000. We can look and see that the debt went up

by \$40 billion. Now, compared to what it has been in some other years, this is really cause to rejoice, but compared to where we think we are, it is cause for pause, and it is cause to be much more sensible about where we are going.

In this regard, I would like to emphasize that if we look at the spending that has been occurring under the current leadership here in Congress over the last several years, discretionary spending has been going up at a rate of about 5.5 percent a year. And when we look at the Social Security system which we should not even consider in calculating our surplus, and we back out that amount, then we back out this increase that has occurred and projected into the future, we will have approximately \$350 billion of surplus over the next 10 years.

Now, the point of this brief discussion is that we simply cannot afford all of the things that our colleagues and the leadership have been telling us we must do. For example, a \$292 billion marriage tax bill which was misguided, it was not in the budget, it came up before we even passed a budget. This type of irresponsible legislation is what is going to put us back into deficit spending, back into the Social Security trust fund, and I urge my colleagues, as we consider these continuing resolutions this afternoon, let us be realistic about where we are going long term and let us make sure that we keep our eye on the ball and the ball is to pay down on the national debt.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, rightfully so, the Chair admonished me for using the name of a Senator. I meant to refer to our former House colleague, JOHN MCCAIN, the former Presidential candidate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD).

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to follow up where our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE) has left off and actually rise in opposition to the rule which will give us a series of six 24-hour continuing resolutions.

According to information, Mr. Speaker, compiled by the House Committee on the Budget, the Republican leadership is in the process of busting the spending cap of \$600.3 billion that they set earlier this year. Keep in mind that the Congress has not sent all 13 appropriations bills to the President yet, but if the present trend continues, the Republicans are on track to spend \$620.5 billion, which means they will have busted the spending caps that they set by over \$20 billion. In fact, on the nine bills that Congress has agreed upon, the Republican leadership has agreed to spend over \$11 billion more than the President requested in his budget. Considering the House and Senate have not

even worked out the differences on three of the 13 appropriations bills, including the huge Labor-HHS-Education bill, this number will only get significantly larger.

The really sad thing is that, Mr. Speaker, all of this could have been avoided. The Blue Dog Coalition worked very hard last spring to develop a viable budget plan and reached out and offered to work with the Republican leadership to reach a bipartisan agreement that would receive widespread support on both sides of the aisle.

First, our plan would have locked up 100 percent of the Social Security surplus for future retirees. It would have set aside 5 percent of the non-Social Security surplus for debt reduction over the next 10 years; set aside 20 percent of the non-Social Security surplus for tax cuts, and allowed Federal spending to grow at a rate of 2.5 percent over last year. However, like last year, Mr. Speaker, the Republican leadership was not interested in reaching a compromise. They enacted a completely unrealistic budget that set spending caps on the 13 annual appropriations bills at levels which assured those caps would be ignored this fall.

The fact that Congress is now in the 4th week of a new fiscal year with three of the 13 appropriations bills still not ready for the President's signature, including one that the Senate has not even considered, shows how unrealistic their budget was in March. Because they do not have a sound budget plan, this Republican Congress is on track to spend more money than any other Congress in history, with an increase in non-Defense spending of 5.2 percent over last year. I repeat, an increase in non-Defense spending of 5.2 percent over last year. This is over twice the rate of spending growth proposed in the Blue Dog budget.

This orgy of spending is a result of the poor budget decisions made by the Republican leadership in March of this year. Instead of working to develop a bipartisan budget plan with responsible tax and spending priorities, instead of working to develop a bipartisan plan with responsible priorities, we have passed a budget that made a nice political statement to a faction within the party with virtually no chance of being successfully implemented.

Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying that we use back home: you reap what you sow. When we sowed the seeds that grew into a budget back in March, the Republican leadership rejected every offer of compromise from the Blue Dog Coalition. Now it is fall and the crop has failed. We are 24 days past the end of the fiscal year with the spending caps destroyed, three appropriations bills left to pass, and no idea how much more will be spent.

Mr. Speaker, this is fiscally irresponsible, and it is a direct result of the

failure of the Republican leadership to develop a sound budget plan back in March.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER).

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

Here we are 25 days after the end of the fiscal year, and we still do not have all of the appropriations bills passed to keep the government running. Frankly, that is no way to run a railroad. One would not run one's business that way, one would not run one's household budget that way, but here we are.

Some may say, what is wrong with it? Well, what happens when we get in this predicament is exactly what we see playing out. The back room deals end up being made out of the light of day and we end up spending more money than this Congress should spend.

□ 1500

My friends in the other party always talk about the Democrats as the big spenders. I want to tell my colleagues those old fables just do not work anymore.

The truth is this is the fourth year in a row that the Republican-controlled Congress has passed appropriations bills with higher discretionary spending outlays than the President requested. By contrast, the Democratic-controlled Congresses of the Reagan and Bush years more often than not appropriated less than the President requested.

We all talk about this big budget surplus. The presidential candidates are talking about it, how they want to spend it. The truth of the matter is this Congress is frittering away that budget surplus. It may not even be here if we continue along this path.

We talk about a \$2.2 trillion on-budget surplus, but it is based on a whole lot of iffy assumptions. If we continue increased spending at an annual rate of 5.5 percent as this Congress has done since 1998, we will wipe out two-thirds of that projected surplus.

Now, to put this in context, just a year ago, the Republicans in Congress proposed cutting taxes a trillion dollars. Now, I am for cutting taxes. But the truth of the matter is, if we had passed that legislation, we would have wiped out the surplus, considering the increase in spending that this Congress seems intent to do. The problem that we face today is to pass a budget that preserves our surplus and ensures our future prosperity.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to continue to talk a few minutes here about the Nation's financial picture. But before I do, we are now 25 days into the new fiscal year. Do my colleagues know how many days Congress has met of those 25? We have sat for 12, only 12 of those days.

At the beginning of the fiscal year this year, on October 1, only two of 13 appropriation bills had been completed and signed by the President. Today only four, there are five more waiting, but we are still three or four away from even having something to negotiate to send to the President.

Now, if one ran one's business in that manner or if a physician practiced medicine in that manner, I would suggest that a suit for malpractice, legislative malpractice would apply. This is not the way to conduct the Nation's business. It was done and the seeds were sown, as the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD) said earlier, back in March when a political statement was enacted called a budget that was unrealistic and was never intended to be followed.

We are now in a situation where the Republicans say, well, we have to stay in session here to keep President Clinton from demanding all of this money to be spent. If we look at history, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) just alluded to it, and the Blue Dogs went back and looked at this when we compiled our budget, over the 12 years Reagan-Bush, Bush-Quayle, the Democratic-controlled House at that time, part of that time, of course the Republicans had the Senate, spent less than those Presidents asked the Congress to spend.

For the last 4 years, the Republican Congress has spent more on nondefense items than President Clinton has asked for. We now are in a never-never land 25 days into a new fiscal year with no idea in sight of how we wind up the business of the country for the previous fiscal year. We are in a position where the surplus is a projection and the spending is a fact.

Now, we are going to support a CR to keep the government open. But this rule is a sham to get by for another 6 days, trying to keep this ball in the air before the November 7 election day so that no one can definitively and affirmatively state what this Congress did or did not do. I have been here 12 years. This is as poor a way to run the Nation's business as I have witnessed in those 12 years.

Yesterday or 2 days ago, we were not only not consulted, we are told 2 days ago there is a tax package out there, and the leadership is going to brief the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and the chairman of the Finance Committee in the Senate about what is in it.

We are supposed to be a legislative body. I tell my colleagues, the country

needs to know that whatever may happen November 7, this situation is not the way to conduct their business in a responsible manner.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying at home, the proof of the pudding is in the eating. Well, take a good look at what we are talking about today. We continue to hear a lot of rhetoric from the other side of the aisle about Republicans standing up to big spending demands of the President and Democrats in Congress.

Before my colleagues point fingers about big spenders, they should take a good look in the mirror or better yet at the record. Eight of the nine appropriation bills that Congress has passed so far this year and sent to the President would spend more than the President has requested.

The nine bills Congress has sent to the President would result in \$11.4 billion in outlays above the President's request. This is the chart. According to estimates of the Congressional Budget Office, the nine appropriation bills that this Congress, under Republican majority, has sent to the President would spend \$498.6 billion, \$11.4 billion more than the \$487.1 billion requested by the President on those bills.

I do not know how my Republican colleagues can continue to honestly explain that Democrats are big spenders for asking for \$5 billion in additional spending for education when they have already voted for appropriation bills spending \$11 billion more than the President has requested.

According to one rather prominent Republican who has been a leader in fighting against pork barrel spending, the nine appropriation bills that Congress has sent to the President contain \$21 billion in programs and projects which he identified as low priority, unnecessary or wasteful spending for programs and projects that have not been appropriately reviewed in the normal merit-based prioritization process of the Congress.

I do not understand how voting to increase spending by \$21 billion on programs that some have identified as pork is acceptable, but asking for \$5 billion more for education makes someone a big wasteful spender.

Everyone who voted for the rule on the Foreign Operations conference report earlier today voted to increase total spending by \$13.3 billion in budget authority and \$8.3 billion in outlays above the President. Let me repeat that. If my colleagues voted for the rule on the Foreign Operations bill, they voted to increase spending substantially above the amount requested by the President. No Member who voted for that rule can honestly continue to claim that the President is responsible for increased spending.

According to the bipartisan Concord Coalition, if discretionary spending continues to increase at the same rate it has over the last 3 years under Republican Congress for the next 10 years, nearly two-thirds of the projected \$2.3 billion on-budget surplus everybody has been talking about will be wiped out.

I will again say to any of my colleagues on this side, if they wish to challenge me on anything I am saying as to the accuracy and authenticity of what I am saying, I will yield to them.

By contrast, discretionary spending increased by just 1.2 percent, the rate of inflation, under Democratic Congresses after the budget was created.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman's chart of the President's request include the additional demands he is making upon closing this process or only his original requests?

Mr. STENHOLM. The original requests, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LINDER. Which does not include the coverage for fires in the West, for example.

Mr. STENHOLM. That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LINDER. And did not include the coverage, the additional programs and spending he asked for right now at the end of the process.

Mr. STENHOLM. The numbers in our chart represent the original Republican requests, the original President's request, and the Blue Dog request that we have begged and pleaded with those of you on the other side to agree with us on numbers that we could stand together.

If we are so concerned about the President's request for spending, why did my colleagues never at one time, their leadership, ever come to the Blue Dogs and say we accept your numbers which is between the President and you.

So the point of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) is well taken except I think my point still stands. We are spending more because my colleagues have voted for it. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's point he is making because it is a valid point and is one which more people need to understand. But the finger pointing needs to stop. It needs to stop.

The problem is not today with the Budget Act, as some would say. The problem is with a leadership in this House that has made the budget process irrelevant by proposing unrealistic budgets, refusing to work in a bipartisan manner on a realistic budget that would have held down spending to less than what the President has requested. That is the problem.

As I said this morning, I have no quarrel with the Committee on Appro-

priations, and I see the chairman here and the ranking member. I have no problem here. Mine is with the process and the finger pointing that has gotten into the political process, which it is ridiculous.

The problem is with the leadership of this House. We now absolutely can show big spending originates in the House. Presidents do not spend money. Congress spends money. We are in the minority. I am in the minority. I am a part of the minority party. We cannot be responsible. The majority has to assume that responsibility.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, would the Chair be kind enough to inform the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) and me how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) has 27½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for the time.

Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) just said is exactly on point. My friend Archie the cockroach said once that what happens to men or to mankind is not determined by the system that they have. He says, what happens to mankind is determined by what they do with whatever system they happen to have in hand. I think that is the case with the budget resolution.

As the gentleman from Texas has said, the problem we are facing now is not due to defects in the budget resolution, per se, although it certainly has some giant ones. The problem is that the budget resolutions have been used to deceive the American people about the true intention of this Congress for over 10 months. They have been used to deceive the American people about what is intended, what is affordable, and what is doable under that resolution.

Because those resolutions have been so deceptive, that is what has enabled the majority to pretend that there was enough room within their spending caps to provide the tax package that they tried to pass over the last 10 months. Most of the benefits in that tax package went to those in this society who were already the most comfortable and the most blessed.

Now we have the chickens coming home to roost time. We have just seen the passage of a provision in the previous bill which admits that the fiction that this Congress is going to spend only \$600 billion this year on discretionary spending was a giant public fib.

So now we have proceeded to pass a number of bills, and we are down to

two of them. The main issue that divides us on those two remaining appropriation bills is education. As the gentleman from Texas says, we are now being told that, after this Congress has exceeded the President's request on a number of those appropriation bills, after we have seen large amounts of money, \$19 billion above last year put into the military budget, and, again, I find that amusing because the majority party said that there was not enough in that budget for readiness. Then they cut the readiness portion of the defense budget by \$1.4 billion, either 1.4 or 1.6, I have forgotten which, in order to make room for congressional projects.

Now we are told, after we have done all of that, that there is not room in the inn to meet the President's budget request on reduced class size so that teachers are teaching classes rather than zoos.

□ 1515

We are told there is not enough room in the inn to train teachers, even though we are going to need well more than a million new teachers because so many are close to retirement nationally.

We are told there is no room in the inn to have a significant school modernization construction program. We have a \$125 billion backlog in the need for school reconstruction in this country. The President is asking us to support a proposal that pays for less than 20 percent, and we are being told by the majority there is no room in the inn.

Well, I have to tell my colleagues something. There is no room in the schools, and we are going to have more than a million additional children attending our public schools and we are not ready for that challenge. We are not ready in terms of buildings, we are not ready in terms of technology, we are not ready in terms of teacher training. One out of every 10 teachers in this country is not qualified to teach the subject that they are teaching. We are certainly not meeting our responsibilities with respect to either Pell Grants so that we measure up to our pretense that we are providing equal opportunity for people to attend college, and we are certainly not meeting our obligations with respect to special education. I believe we are only spending about 17 percent, or at the 17 percent level in terms of the requirements in order to meet the mandates sent down by the Federal Government.

So now we are here having to pass these day-after-day CRs because the majority refuses to meet our national needs in education, after we have seen so much money poured into other bills. That is our problem. That is what needs to change if we want to go home.

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 SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the resolution.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 205, nays 191, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 551]

YEAS—205

Aderholt	Gillmor	Paul
Archer	Gilman	Pease
Armey	Goode	Petri
Bachus	Goodlatte	Pickering
Baker	Goodling	Pitts
Ballenger	Goss	Pombo
Barr	Graham	Porter
Barrett (NE)	Granger	Portman
Bartlett	Green (WI)	Pryce (OH)
Barton	Gutknecht	Quinn
Bass	Hansen	Ramstad
Bereuter	Hastings (WA)	Regula
Biggert	Hayes	Reynolds
Bilbray	Hayworth	Riley
Bilirakis	Hefley	Rogan
Billey	Herger	Rogers
Blunt	Hill (MT)	Rohrabacher
Boehlert	Hilleary	Ros-Lehtinen
Boehner	Hobson	Roukema
Bono	Hoekstra	Royce
Brady (TX)	Horn	Ryan (WI)
Bryant	Hostettler	Ryan (KS)
Burr	Houghton	Salmon
Burton	Hulshof	Sanford
Buyer	Hunter	Saxton
Callahan	Hutchinson	Scarborough
Calvert	Hyde	Schaffer
Camp	Isakson	Sensenbrenner
Canady	Jenkins	Sessions
Cannon	Johnson, Sam	Shaw
Castle	Jones (NC)	Shays
Chabot	Kasich	Sherwood
Chambliss	Kelly	Shimkus
Coble	King (NY)	Shuster
Coburn	Kingston	Simpson
Combest	Knollenberg	Skeen
Cook	Kolbe	Smith (MI)
Cooksey	Kuykendall	Smith (NJ)
Cox	LaHood	Smith (TX)
Crane	Latham	Souder
Cubin	LaTourette	Spence
Cunningham	Leach	Stearns
Davis (VA)	Lewis (CA)	Stump
Deal	Lewis (KY)	Sununu
DeLay	Linder	Sweeney
DeMint	LoBiondo	Tancredo
Diaz-Balart	Lucas (OK)	Tauzin
Dickey	Manzullo	Taylor (NC)
Doolittle	Martinez	Terry
Dreier	McCreery	Thomas
Duncan	McHugh	Thornberry
Dunn	McInnis	Thune
Ehlers	McKeon	Tiahrt
Emerson	Metcalfe	Toomey
English	Miller (FL)	Traficant
Everett	Miller, Gary	Upton
Ewing	Moran (KS)	Vitter
Fletcher	Morella	Walden
Foley	Myrick	Walsh
Fossella	Nethercutt	Wamp
Fowler	Ney	Watkins
Frelinghuysen	Northup	Watts (OK)
Galleghy	Norwood	Weldon (FL)
Ganske	Nussle	Weldon (PA)
Gekas	Ose	Weller
Gibbons	Oxley	
Gilchrest	Packard	

Whitfield	Wilson	Young (AK)
Wicker	Wolf	Young (FL)

NAYS—191

Abercrombie	Gordon	Oberstar
Ackerman	Green (TX)	Obey
Allen	Hall (OH)	Oiver
Andrews	Hall (TX)	Ortiz
Baca	Hill (IN)	Owens
Baird	Hilliard	Pallone
Baldacci	Hinchey	Pascrell
Baldwin	Hinojosa	Pastor
Barcia	Hoeffel	Payne
Barrett (WI)	Holden	Pelosi
Becerra	Holt	Peterson (MN)
Bentsen	Hooley	Phelps
Berkley	Hoyer	Pickett
Berman	Inslee	Pomeroy
Berry	Jackson (IL)	Price (NC)
Bishop	Jackson-Lee	Rahall
Blagojevich	(TX)	Rangel
Blumenauer	Jefferson	Reyes
Bonior	John	Rivers
Borski	Johnson, E.B.	Rodriguez
Boswell	Jones (OH)	Roemer
Boucher	Kanjorski	Rothman
Boyd	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Brady (PA)	Kennedy	Rush
Brown (FL)	Kildee	Sabo
Capps	Kilpatrick	Sanchez
Capuano	Kind (WI)	Sanders
Cardin	Kleczka	Sandlin
Carson	Kucinich	Sawyer
Clay	LaFalce	Schakowsky
Clayton	Lampson	Scott
Clement	Lantos	Serrano
Clyburn	Larson	Sherman
Condit	Lee	Shows
Conyers	Levin	Sisisky
Costello	Lewis (GA)	Skelton
Coyne	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Cramer	Lofgren	Snyder
Crowley	Lowe	Spratt
Cummings	Lucas (KY)	Stark
Davis (FL)	Luther	Stenholm
Davis (IL)	Maloney (NY)	Strickland
DeFazio	Markey	Tanner
DeGette	Mascara	Tauscher
DeLauro	Matsui	Taylor (MS)
Deutsch	McCarthy (MO)	Thompson (CA)
Dicks	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	McIntyre	Thurman
Dixon	McKinney	Tierney
Doggett	McNulty	Towns
Dooley	Meehan	Turner
Doyle	Meek (FL)	Udall (CO)
Edwards	Menendez	Udall (NM)
Eshoo	Millender-	Velázquez
Etheridge	McDonald	Visclosky
Evans	Miller, George	Waters
Farr	Minge	Watt (NC)
Fattah	Mink	Weiner
Filner	Moakley	Wexler
Forbes	Moore	Weygand
Ford	Moran (VA)	Woolsey
Frank (MA)	Murtha	Wu
Frost	Nadler	Wynn
Gejdenson	Napolitano	
Gonzalez	Neal	

NOT VOTING—36

Bonilla	Gutierrez	Meeks (NY)
Brown (OH)	Hastings (FL)	Mica
Campbell	Istook	Mollohan
Chenoweth-Hage	Johnson (CT)	Peterson (PA)
Collins	Klink	Radanovich
Danner	Largent	Shadegg
Delahunt	Lazio	Slaughter
Ehrlich	Maloney (CT)	Stabenow
Engel	McColum	Stupak
Franks (NJ)	McDermott	Talent
Gephardt	McGovern	Waxman
Greenwood	McIntosh	Wise

□ 1537

Messrs. MURTHA, FARR of California, and EDWARDS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I was absent and unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of the motion to suspend the rules and pass H. Res. 646 (roll-call No. 551).

#### 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. 115 and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). 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. Pursuant to the rule just adopted, I call up the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 115) 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 the joint resolution is as follows:

#### H. J. RES. 115

*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 "October 26, 2000".*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 646, 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, H.J. Res. 115 is a continuing resolution, and it continues the funding of our Government for one day until midnight tomorrow night.

I am not sure that is the smartest way to go. I think that, with the progress that we are making now, that we could probably be finished by Friday or Saturday. I would have preferred to have introduced a resolution to go to at least Saturday. However, the President of the United States has told us that he would only sign CR's for one day at a time. And, of course, that is his prerogative. He is the President and he has the veto pen; and unless we have a two-thirds vote to override him, he prevails. And so, he prevails in this case, and we have a 1-day CR. If we do not finish our business tomorrow, we will have another 1-day CR.

Where we are on the progress of our bills is, after having passed the Foreign

Operations appropriations conference report today, there are only two outstanding conference reports, one of which we intend to file tonight, that is the District of Columbia appropriations bill along with the Commerce, State, Justice bill. And then the one remaining bill is the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education bill, which we hope to be able to file by tomorrow night and move to consideration of it Friday or Saturday.

Then we will have completed our appropriations process. All this CR does is extend the continuation of the Government from midnight tonight to midnight tomorrow night.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my ranking member for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say I want to thank the President of the United States for insisting that this continuing resolution be for only 24 hours and that we operate with these 24-hour resolutions from now on.

And the reason is simple. Most of the discussion right now is over the fact that the Republican leadership refuses to move on the Democratic education initiatives that include funding for school modernization and also for more teachers and more money that goes back to the local towns and school districts to hire more teachers. I just want to say how important those initiatives are.

In the State of New Jersey, we rely mostly for our school funding on local property taxes; and increasingly we find that the towns are unable to afford more money for educational purposes. And so, what we have is that the class sizes continue to rise; the school buildings, in many cases, do not receive the necessary repairs; we have overcrowding where we cannot even in a lot of the school districts build a new school because we do not have the money.

So when the Democrats talk about an initiative that allows these towns to have more money to hire teachers, to reduce class size, or to pay for school modernization or for new schools, these are real problems, these are real issues that affect people every day and affect children in New Jersey and throughout the country every day.

□ 1545

The bottom line is the Republican leadership talks about the need for discipline in the classroom. How are we going to have discipline in the classroom if we have a class that has 25, 30, or even 40 students? If we give money back to the school districts to hire more teachers, they can reduce the class size. I think the President's sug-

gestion is down to 18 students at the elementary level. That means better discipline in the classroom, better learning opportunities for these kids in the public schools.

And the same thing goes for the school modernization initiative. How can they learn if they are in a building that is falling apart? I have been to school districts in my district where the roof was collapsing. Or in other situations where they have to have two shifts and kids go to school starting at 7:00 in the morning to noon and then 12:00 noon to 5 o'clock, or something like that.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats are talking about something that is real here. This is not pie in the sky. All we are saying is that we have the money now, let us make it available for these towns, because it helps with their property taxes. But most importantly, it helps with these kids and their lives.

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

Mr. PALLONE. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments. Am I correct that if we passed the initiative that we have been hoping to pass on making sure that we have more classrooms and more teachers to bring class sizes down and have safe and clean, healthy schools to teach in, am I correct that if a local subdivision did not want to have more teachers, or did not want to do any school construction, that this legislation would not force them to do anything? Am I correct?

Mr. PALLONE. Absolutely.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, so it would be the local school board's choice, the local citizens' choice whether or not to utilize these resources.

Mr. PALLONE. Absolutely.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services and Education.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, if I could say to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the money for both classroom size reduction and for school construction has been included in the conference report since July 27. It is fully available under title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Under this title the school district, if it decides it does not need the money for school construction, can use the money for other purposes like teacher training or equipping classrooms with technology and computers.

So there should be no dispute about the money being available. The dispute is about whether money is to be mandated by Washington to be spent for a particular purpose, or whether the local school district and the parents in that school district will decide the use for that money. The money is there;