

that we are wrestling with with the president at this time.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Following the tradition of our friend from Texas, I gladly yield him some time to visit on these issues.

Mr. STENHOLM. I thank the gentleman for agreeing. Let me say I happen to agree with you on the Davis-Bacon provisions. I have agreed in the 22 years I have now been fortunate to serve here.

□ 2145

I think it is a terrible mistake to include, especially the new provisions that will allow local board decisions to have Davis-Bacon applied. It has nothing to do with prevailing wage. I have always agreed that Federal contracts ought to receive the prevailing wage. But I have spent a good part of my career attempting to first repeal and then reform the Davis-Bacon act, to no avail. But I happen to agree with my colleagues on that.

I do not agree on creating a new revenue-sharing program for schools. I think we ought to concentrate the money for school construction. So I disagree with my Republican colleagues on that, but here reasonable people ought to be able to work that out, have the legislative process be allowed to work.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for that. I think again it typifies much of what we have heard about, in the midst of this so-called political season where there are honest disagreements.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTIONS 121, 122, 123, and 124, EACH MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. DREIER (during the special order of Mr. KINGSTON), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-1015) on the resolution (H. Res. 662) providing for consideration of certain joint resolutions making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 2485, SAINT CROIX ISLAND HERITAGE ACT

Mr. DREIER (during the special order of Mr. KINGSTON), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-016) on the resolution (H. Res. 663) providing for consideration of the Senate bill (S. 2485) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance in planning

and constructing a regional heritage center in Calais, Maine, and providing for the adoption of a concurrent resolution directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make certain corrections in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 2614) to amend the Small Business Investment Act to make improvements to the certified development company program, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

A CONTINUATION OF HOW MUCH IS ENOUGH

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I want to come back to this question. I will be happy to yield time to any of my colleagues who are here on the floor, but I really do think this is the question: how much is enough? I say that because I was a member of the State legislature in Minnesota; and I must say, since I came to Washington 6 years ago, and we have always had a situation where the President was of the Democratic Party and the Congress, since I came, has been in control by the Republicans, and that has caused more friction perhaps than it really should. But I was in the State legislature when we had a Republican Governor and a democratically controlled legislature, and we were somehow able to get things done. I mean I do not understand why it is that we have to have this grid lock. I do think this is part of the question, and I also agree that there are other questions that need to be resolved. But it seems to me, and I agree with my colleague from Texas, reasonable people ought to be able to work this out.

We said originally in our budget resolution, we thought we could legitimately meet the needs of the Federal Government and all the people who depend upon it for about \$1.86 trillion. My colleague has pointed out that we have already exceeded those spending caps. That bothers me. But we are all now saying, at least most of us are saying, that what we at least ought to do as we see more and more surpluses piling up, this year, at least, that 90 percent of that surplus ought to go to pay down debt. I think just about everybody agrees with that.

When we look at basic things, there is not that much to argue about. It comes down to some simple things, as we saw on the chart. The numbers we have in terms of education are almost identical to what the President asked for. This is not a debate about how much we are going to spend on children. It is a debate about who gets to do the spending. We simply believe more of those decisions ought to be

made by people who know the children's names. I do not think that is an unreasonable thing.

Then we are having this debate about whether or not we ought to grant blanket immunity to illegal aliens. I do not think many people in this room right now think that is a very good idea. In fact, I think if we polled the people back in southeastern Minnesota, they would say that is a crazy idea. But now the President is threatening to veto the Commerce, State, Justice appropriation over that issue.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, just to reiterate what has been agreed to, and I think it is important for those of us who hail from Arizona, Texas, other border States, what we have agreed to is a family unification process, because we do not want to see families separated, but by the same token, when it comes to this notion of blanket amnesty, we have a problem when we are dealing with ignoring what is already illegal. And that is where the sticking point comes, and while we have had a reasonable approach, bipartisan, to deal with family unification, I would just make that key distinction as we are dealing with the amnesty question.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I want to go back again to the gentleman's "How much is enough?" and remind everyone again, that question has been decided.

The House spoke by majority will that \$645 billion is enough; therefore, it is not a relevant argument. The immigration question is a relevant argument. Davis-Bacon applications to school is a relevant argument. There are other relevant arguments, but there is no argument now, at least on the majority side, and I will say not with me either, because once the House has spoken and it is October 29, we cannot go back and redo the budget. Mr. Speaker, \$645 billion is the number, and that is more than the President requested.

My only point, had we had this kind of conversation early on and more had joined, as the gentleman from Oklahoma joined with us earlier, we would not be arguing about \$645 billion would be enough, we would be arguing that \$633, and perhaps we would still be arguing about the other questions, but reasonable people can work those out, and surely our leaders, negotiating as we speak, are finding a compromise on those issues that will be acceptable.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, my colleague from Texas says that we are agreed, but I do not know if the President is agreed, because he has never told us exactly how much he wants to spend in some of these areas that are still being negotiated.

Let me just come back to my point about the State legislature.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield again on that