

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

point, briefly, it makes no difference what the President says on additional spending, because on the budget Rules of the House, if we spend more than \$645 billion, we will have to sequester next year in order to bring the spending back. That is the discipline that we used to have in this body, but we have thrown it out the window for the last 3 years.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I want to come back to close on my story about the State legislature and about how virtually every governor works with their State legislature. At the end of the session, the legislative leaders and the Governor sit down and they decide how much the pie is going to be, how much the State is going to spend. And once that decision is made and there is an agreement made, it takes a matter of about 48 hours for the various committees to work out how much goes to transportation, how much to education. That is what we need to do here at the Federal level; and hopefully, we can have better bipartisanship next year.

A CONTINUATION OF HOW MUCH IS ENOUGH

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

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, how much is enough?

When we talk about education, it is about where the decisions are going to be made. There are those in Washington who would like to take primary responsibility for building our local schools, wiring our local schools, buying the technology for our schools, hiring our local teachers, developing our curriculum, testing our kids, feed them breakfast, feed them lunch and develop after-school programs. When they get done with taking that decision-making to Washington, they are very willing to step back and say, the rest is now under your control. But in fact, what they have done is they have moved the focal point from our local teachers and our local administrators from taking a look at the needs of our children to taking a look at the bureaucratic requirements coming out of Washington.

How much is enough? We have enough. Local schools get 7 percent of their money from Washington, 50 percent of their paperwork. That paperwork goes to an agency here in Washington that cannot even get a clean set of books, that every time we give them \$1 for education spending at a local level, they consume 35 cents of it before it ever gets back to a local classroom.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out two things. One of the reasons I think we cannot get an answer

to the question of how much is enough is because the President is no longer in town. We know that part of the strategy seems to be keep Washington tied up, keep Congress in Washington, and then I will hit the campaign trail. The President is on his way to Kentucky to campaign against the gentlewoman from Kentucky (Mrs. NORTHUP). Now, that must feel great if one is the President of the United States, but we are talking about children here. We are talking about real business here, and we are talking about, it is time to put people in front of politics.

The gentleman knows, since he has worked real hard on the dollars to the classroom bill by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) that said our efforts on education would go to the teacher closest to the student in the classroom and not Washington bureaucrats. Right now, when we spend \$1 on education, 50 cents never gets out of town. That is not acceptable.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE).

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would just say to the gentleman from Texas, as a past supporter of the Blue Dog budget as well, and someone who did not vote to raise the caps to the \$645 billion level, that I think if the Blue Dog budget had been the one adopted by the House, it would have met probably the same fate that the budget today has met.

We did our work in the House. We passed bills at a \$602 billion level; and the President, as is customarily the case at this point in the legislative process, is extorting us or using I think his leverage at the end game to try and get more money out of the Congress. So that is why this thing keeps getting bid up and bid up and bid up.

We have, in fact, in the past, done some good things here. We balanced the budget. This will be the 4th year in a row. We have stopped the raid on Social Security. We have been paying down systematically the Federal debt over the past 3 years. But all that good work could be for naught if we give the President everything that he wants and everything that he asks for, which, as the gentleman noted, also includes a number of things that we just fundamentally disagree with, like putting more power in the educational bureaucracy here in Washington instead of getting it back in the classroom.

So I appreciate the issues that have been raised by our colleagues on the other side here about the budget; but the reality is, we are still going to be in the same positions that we are in today when it comes to negotiating with the President who wants to spend more and who cannot answer the very simple, fundamental question, and that is, how much is enough?

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

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, it is an interesting question, and it is a sad commentary, I think, on the legislative process in Washington to just see what is taking place here. We have Democrats and Republicans essentially agreeing that we are spending too much money. Why is that?

At this point in the game, it would seem that if we agree we are spending too much money, it seems logical that maybe a few months ago, a few weeks ago, we might have been able to agree on spending less. But we do have to compromise not only with Republicans and Democrats, but we have to compromise with the White House as well, and we have compromised and compromised and compromised, trying to, in good faith, reach agreement with the White House, the President's liberal spending habits, and yet as a result of our efforts, there is a point in time when it is a legitimate question to ask, how much can we spend? How much is enough? That is the point we are at now. We have conceded on issue after issue after issue with the White House.

A CONTINUATION OF HOW MUCH IS ENOUGH

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

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, we have to wonder, when is it going to end? That is the question that is on the minds of all of us here. We are here in Washington on a Sunday night, which is completely out of character, first and foremost, but 3½ weeks beyond the beginning of the new fiscal year. We have debated with the White House so long now that the fiscal year has already started, we are passing these 1-day continuing resolutions, and I am afraid, I would say to my colleagues, that what really seems to be driving the agenda down there at the White House is not a real sincere effort to try to come to some resolution on this budget. I think it is motivated by a political ambition to try to scare the American people to believe that we are not paying enough, that we are not spending enough. I hope that we can send the message down to the White House that we have spent enough, that we have already reached enough.

Before I yield to some of my colleagues, I want to reflect on the comment of a 16-year-old girl that I just met back here in the back of the Chamber. She is from Albert Lea, Minnesota in the gentleman from Minnesota's district, and her name is Sara Schleck, she is a page back here and working for the House. I said, you are here on a