

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.J. Res. 117, 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 the provisions of House Resolution 646, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 117) 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 117 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 117

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 28, 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, I would just point out that this is another one of those 1-day continuing resolutions.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, "Groundhog Day." That is what it feels like to me. Last night, almost the last bit of business we did, we passed a 1-day resolution continuing the government. This morning, because there is obviously not much to do on the floor, we have an early motion to again continue the government for another day. This is "Groundhog Day."

How many times have we gone through this now? Is this the seventh time? I frankly have forgotten.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. If the gentleman will yield, I believe this is the third 1-day CR, the seventh overall.

Mr. OBEY. The fifth one. All right. I want to make it clear that I think that

the gentleman from Florida has done everything he possibly could to exercise his responsibilities in a responsible manner. And I think that his counterpart in the other body, the gentleman from Alaska, has also done everything he could to live up to his responsibilities. The problem is that they have been under orders from their leadership since day one of this session to peddle a national fiction. And that fiction has been that this Congress was going to spend about \$40 billion less than it actually intended to spend. And now having spent 10 months passing bills out of this Chamber that the other side knew were fictions, last week we finally came to fess-up time and last week this House voted to raise the allowable spending levels by about \$40 billion. We have been trying to negotiate our remaining differences. We thought 2 days ago that we were very close to closing our differences on the Commerce-Justice bill.

□ 0915

But then, for some reason, the leadership decided to throw away a day yesterday. So, despite the fact they were told the President would veto the bill that the House intended to send to him, they decided to ram it at him again one last time.

The issues that divide us on that bill are five:

First of all, a bill which is supposed to protect our precious coastal land areas from environmental degradation, instead has been turned into a bill which would allow you, literally, to build oil refineries on the sea coast, on the beaches, in the sensitive coastal areas in any State in the Union except Alaska. I am sorry, it would allow it in Alaska too. What it would not allow in Alaska is to have any Federal money spent to deal with the sensitive issue of coastal zone protection. So that is one anti-public interest problem with that bill.

The second is that it also contained language which pretended to do something to assure Americans' privacy on the Internet, but in fact opened up holes big enough to drive 65 foot trucks through. There were 20 of our friends on that side of the aisle who voted with us yesterday against that bill, and some of them indicated that that was the reason, and I salute them for it.

Then the third issue dividing us on that bill is the question of whether or not we are going to treat immigrants who have been in this country for years equally if they come from countries like El Salvador, as opposed to whether they come from Nicaragua.

One Member stood on the floor yesterday and defended the different way we treat those souls by saying in effect, well, it is different if they fled Central America coming from Nicaragua because they were a communist dictatorship, it is different than if they

fled Central America to run away from a right-wing dictatorship that we had in El Salvador at the time.

I remember that right-wing dictatorship. I remember when there were officials going on television and fingering our own ambassador for assassination. The stories have now come out about how General Vides Casanova and others lied through their teeth to every Congressional delegation that went down there, and lied through their teeth to the press, to their own society, and had full knowledge of the assassinations of Salvadorean citizens that were occurring at the hand of that government and that military.

There are some advantages to having been around here for a fair amount of time, because you remember those things, and you take certain lessons from them, and the lesson that I take from that is that if we are to show mercy to people who are in flight from despotic governments, that mercy ought to be even-handed, because you are just as dead if you are killed or assassinated by a right-wing militia as you are if you are assassinated by a left-wing militia. We have seen too much of both in that region. We have got one left that we want to get rid of, and we all know who it is. I do not mean in terms of getting rid of the human being; I mean getting rid of him in occupying the power that he now holds.

Then we have another problem with that bill. That problem is that our Federal Treasury has expended billions of dollars over the past generation paying the costs that have been incurred by American taxpayers because of what tobacco products have done to American veterans and to Americans who are now senior citizens. That has cost Medicare and Medicaid billions of dollars, and yet there is language in the State-Justice bill which says that not one dime of funding in that bill can be used to pursue in court redress against an industry that lied to the public and lied to the Congress about the effect of their product.

I am one of those people who used cigarettes. I used to smoke three packs a day, at the same time that I worked with asbestos. I did not know, but the company did, that asbestos caused cancer, and I did not know that there was a synergistic effect between asbestos and tobacco, which meant that you have probably a four or five times greater chance of getting mesothelioma or lung cancer, one of the two, one of which our former colleague, Mr. Vento, just died from, there was that much greater chance of dying if you used cigarettes and were exposed to asbestos.

Johns Manville knew since 1939 what the problem was on asbestos, and the tobacco companies have known for a long time what the tobacco problem is, and yet the only dollar difference that