

Stearns	Tiaht	Weldon (FL)
Stump	Toomey	Weldon (PA)
Sununu	Trafficant	Weller
Sweeney	Upton	Whitfield
Tancredo	Vitter	Wicker
Taylor (NC)	Walden	Wilson
Terry	Walsh	Wolf
Thomas	Wamp	Young (AK)
Thornberry	Watkins	Young (FL)
Thune	Watts (OK)	

NOES—187

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

NOT VOTING—36

Campbell	Jones (OH)	Radanovich
Chenoweth-Hage	Klink	Regula
Clay	Lazio	Rodriguez
Clement	Lewis (CA)	Rush
Conyers	Lipinski	Shays
Davis (VA)	McCollum	Spratt
Dunn	McIntosh	Talent
Franks (NJ)	Miller (FL)	Tauzin
Gekas	Oberstar	Thompson (MS)
Gephardt	Obey	Turner
Gilman	Oxley	Weygand
Hansen	Pickering	Wise

□ 1538

Mr. DIXON and Mr. CONDIT changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

The resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 398

Mr. PASCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of H. Res. 398.

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

There was no objection.

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 the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 114) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes, 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 House Resolution 637, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 114) making further continuing appropriations for 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 114 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 114

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That Public Law 106-275, if further amended by striking "October 20, 2000" in section 106(c) and inserting in lieu thereof "October 25, 2000". Notwithstanding section 106 of Public Law 106-275, funds shall be available and obligations for mandatory payments due on or about November 1, 2000, may continue to be made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 637, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) 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. YOUNG of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the CR before us now should not require much debate, since we did have a very lively debate on the rule on the very same subject, but I am sure the same subjects will be discussed again. But this does extend the funding for the fiscal year until next Wednesday.

It is essential to pass this CR because, although the House has completed its part of the appropriations process quite a long time ago, the part

of the process requiring the other body and the administration has not been completed yet, although we are getting very close. We moved out two more bills today, as my colleagues will remember.

This CR does two things: One, it extends the date from midnight tomorrow night until midnight Wednesday night of next week. In addition, because we are reaching the end of the month, it is necessary that we make provision for funding authority for checks that go out automatically every month to those who are in entitlement programs. The agencies involved need to have the authority to go ahead and print the checks, mail the checks, and have them in the mail so that they arrive by the first of the month. Those are the two things this continuing resolution does.

Hopefully, this is the last one we will have to do. One of the outstanding bills is the bill from Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education. We are having another meeting this afternoon on this bill with the White House and with the Republican and Democratic Members representing the House and the Senate, and we hope to finalize those agreements today.

The District of Columbia bill, as most Members know, is ready to file, however, it is being held because it may be needed as a vehicle for another appropriations bill that our colleagues in the other body have not passed yet. So there is somewhat of a delay there. It is not a delay of the making of the House of Representatives or the House appropriators.

And I want to repeat, Mr. Speaker, as I have said so many times, that the House Committee on Appropriations completed its work very early in the year. We had all 13 of our appropriation bills through the House, with the last one on the floor in July before the August recess. That bill was then withdrawn from consideration and put off, but the appropriators were ready to move.

Anyway, we are near the end. It was theoretically possible that we could have done what the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) wanted and made this CR go to midnight on Monday night. Because it runs until Wednesday, he opposed the previous question so that he could offer an amendment to take us to midnight Monday. But, Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House will not be in session out of respect for the Governor of Missouri who was, along with his son, unfortunately killed in a tragic airplane crash. We respect that and the fact that many of our Members will be traveling to Missouri for that funeral tomorrow.

□ 1545

So there will be no business here tomorrow. Saturday and Sunday the House will not meet for recorded votes. Monday the House will not be in for recorded votes. And so, if we go to the policy of having CR's one day at a

time, that is a big mistake, Mr. Speaker. If we do that, I can guarantee we will be here until Christmas because it will take all day long to do each CR, and we will not get any other work done.

So we need to get this CR passed and then the appropriators will continue the meetings with the White House. And if we can reach the agreements that we think we will in the next few days, we will have this business completed by midnight Wednesday next.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for support of the CR.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Members are reminded that the use of personal electronic communication devices is prohibited in the Chamber of the House, and they are to disable wireless telephones while they are in the Chamber of the House.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this CR.

Mr. Speaker, I have supported the previous CR's. I rise, representing the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member who, unfortunately, has been called off the floor.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of the majority are fortunate. They have been fortunate in September; and they have been fortunate in October. Let me tell my colleagues why. The Olympics were on in September and people were focused on the Olympics. The World Series is just about to start. The playoffs have just completed, and the people have been focused on those. And we have a presidential race. It is a tight race, as everybody knows, and the people have been focused on them. All of those events have captured the public's attention and diverted it from what is not going on in this House.

What is going on here is that one of the greatest deliberative bodies in the world is doing practically nothing. We are at a standstill, Mr. Speaker, and the American people are suffering because of it. No meaningful Patients' Bill of Rights, despite the fact that it enjoys wide bipartisan support. No Medicare prescription drug benefit, despite the fact that our seniors need relief from skyrocketing drug prices. No reasonable gun safety legislation. No Hate Crimes bill. No targeted tax relief for hard-working American families.

Let me say, we could have passed inheritance tax or estate tax or death tax, call it what you will, relief for 98 percent of the estates in this country and the President said he would have signed it. We could pass legislation to relieve married couples from the penalty that they might incur. But because we could not give all of a loaf, we have passed none of the loaf.

As Roll Call stated recently, "If they paid attention," and as I said, they have been distracted because of the Olympics, the World Series, the play-

offs, the presidential debate, they, the public, "surely would be appalled," said Roll Call.

We are now considering our fourth continuing resolution because the Republican leadership has not had us doing anything this week, the previous week, the week before that, the week before that and, yes, the week before that. Look at the RECORD. We have hardly met since Labor Day.

My distinguished chairman references the fact that we got our work done in July. With all due respect to the chairman, we passed 13 bills by July which all of us on this side said were not going anywhere and, very frankly, we were absolutely correct and, very frankly in my opinion, the majority knew they were not going anywhere.

How do I know that? Because they said, well, this is the first inning or the second inning or the third inning, we know this is not the real deal; but at some point in time we will get real. We have not done it yet. We are not there yet. There is still no end in sight.

While negotiations have continued behind closed doors, the fact of the matter is the President has still signed only three of the 13 spending bills that fund the basic operations of our government.

I ask my colleagues, is this any way to run a railroad? Well, I do not know about that, but it is certainly no way to run the people's House. Even many of our Republican friends are hard pressed to say it is.

Last week our colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD), commented, and I quote Mr. SANFORD, not a Democrat, but Mr. SANFORD, "Anarchy reigns at the moment. Nobody is quite sure what comes next."

Clearly we are not, because we are not told. But the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) from the majority side says, "Nobody is quite sure what comes next."

Let me tell my friends on the Republican side of the aisle one thing they can count on. Democrats will never, never, never sell out America's children. Our kids need and they deserve smaller class sizes, which improves their learning and achievement. The Democrats' class size reduction initiative to hire 100,000 new teachers does just that.

Our kids need, Mr. Speaker, and they deserve safe schools, a great number of which now require repair and renovation. The Democrats' and the President's school modernization initiative does just that. Our kids need and they deserve highly trained and highly qualified teachers. The Democrats' teacher quality initiative does just that. Our kids need and they deserve safe and drug-free schools. The Democrats' safe and drug-free school program does just that.

These, however, Mr. Speaker, are not just Democratic priorities. They are the priorities of the American people.

If we fail to enact them by passing a Labor-HHS-Education conference report that looks anything like the bill that passed the House in June, of which my chairman spoke, then we have failed future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote against this resolution. I expect, however, it will pass. I do not want to see the government shut down. Nobody on this floor does. But I do want to see us do our work.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), who has stayed here the last two weekends, has told me that no meetings have been scheduled to work on any of the bills. So that when we go home tonight at some point in time, apparently no work will be done on Friday, no work done on Saturday, no work done on Sunday, no work done on Monday; and we will come back Tuesday at some point in time.

As I said, I will vote against this resolution. But I also want to urge the majority party, the party that wanted to eliminate the Department of Education to take education off the chopping block, we can do better, we should do better, we must do better, and the American people and our children deserve better.

Let us do, I say to my colleagues of this House, what the voters sent us here to do and pass the bills that meet their needs and address their concerns.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) will manage the time previously allocated to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

There was no objection.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), a member of the committee and, of course, also the majority whip.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, this is an election year. Unfortunately, most of the time, the real loser in an election year is the truth.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen the Democrat presidential nominee and the vice presidential nominee travel all over this country taking credit for balancing the budget, taking credit for paying down the debt, taking credit for welfare reform, taking credit for locking up the Social Security surplus and the Medicare surplus.

Yet, the truth of the matter is, when Bill Clinton had a Democrat Congress, they passed budgets that had deficits as far as the eye could see. In fact, their budget they passed, the last one they passed in 1994, said that last year we would have over a \$200 billion deficit. Yet now we have surpluses.

In fact, they would lead us to believe that the shutdown of the Government in 1995 was because the Republican Congress was intransigent. If we really look at the record, the shutdown in 1995 came when the President shut down the Government because he did not want a balanced budget. That is what that fight was all about.

On welfare reform, the President of the United States and most of his people in the House and the Senate voted against welfare reform. We had speeches down here in the well of the House accusing us of starving children and putting children in the grates outside and throwing them out of their homes. Yet it was a huge success, so now they want to take credit for it.

The President vetoed welfare reform twice before he finally signed it a couple of months before his reelection campaign.

Last year, when we decided to stop the 40-year-old Democrat practice of taking the Social Security surplus and spending it on Big Government programs, they fought us every step of the way. Yet we did it for the first time in 40 years and, hopefully, forever more.

This last spring, we said that we were going to do the same with the Medicare surplus, we were going to stop the Government from spending the surplus on Big Government programs. And we did it. Now we are saying that we want to lock up 90 percent of the on-budget surplus and use it to pay down the debt.

In the last 2 years, we have paid over \$354 billion down on the public debt. We are proposing that next year we pay another, in 1 year, \$240 billion down on the public debt that is on the backs of our children and our grandchildren. That is responsible.

The minority and this President have fought us every step of the way while they have taken credit for everything that we have done, and now they say that we are a "do nothing" Congress. "Do nothing" Congress? The 106th Congress is one of the most productive Congresses in recent history.

This is a single-space list of all the wonderful bills that we have gotten signed by this President dealing with reducing the national debt, with Social Security and Medicare, strengthening retirement security, excellence in education, health care, tax fairness, enhancing the national security of our Nation, protecting families from crimes and drugs, ending lawsuit abuse, advancing the high-tech agenda. And it goes on and on and on. That is what we have done.

Now we have reached the end, and we have had to face for 6 years this event every year. The President submits his budget at the first of the year, and then we do not hear another word from him until the very end, and then he wants all this spending.

He has never vetoed a bill because it had too much spending. He has vetoed bills because they did not have enough spending; and he has drug it on and on and on, especially this year worse than ever.

Mr. Speaker, we remain here today because some people simply will not support the principles of fiscal discipline. The House did its job, and it completed its business. The minority chose not to participate. Some of the 13 bills we passed in this House we had to pass with only Republican votes, and we only have a six-vote margin.

Let us remember what happened earlier this year. The leadership of the other party acknowledged that they had no genuine interest in working together to advance any sort of bipartisan agenda. Instead, they resolved to slow down proceedings, drag out the negotiations, and stall progress. That was their strategy that they started out with this year.

Why in the world would they adopt such a strategy? Well, in some unguarded remarks, they admitted that their drive to become the majority party was predicated on a "do nothing" strategy that was designed to stop anything from happening.

□ 1600

It was designed to stop anything from happening, and the indictments that we hear today are indictments on themselves, because they are the ones that have slowed this process down; will not negotiate. We have asked the President for the last 2 months to negotiate these bills with us, and he has chosen not to.

At this point in time, they are holding the bills hostage for issues that have never passed either body, the House or the Senate, because they want their way or they will take their ball and go home. If the President was serious about reaching a reasonable consensus on the budget, he could rapidly conclude the negotiations by finally answering a few simple questions. How much spending is enough? How much money should go for debt reduction? How much money should go for tax relief? He often claims to support tax relief and debt relief but his actions do not reflect these goals. Rather, every effort of this administration, through this budget process, has been to advance his actual agenda and that is spend the surplus.

Support this continuing resolution and let us get our work done.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute and 10 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, the majority whip says the truth has not been told on this side of the aisle. I beg to differ with my friend, and I certainly beg to differ with his recitation of history. He relates that the President has vetoed every one of the bills where they tried to cut spending. Now, if that is the case then the fact is that nothing they did on their side has brought us this surplus.

The CBO says that, in fact, the Republican Congresses have added to the deficit, not cut it. Now I will remind the public that in 1993, the majority whip stood on this floor and said if we pass the President's economic program, the deficit is going to soar, unemployment is going to soar, inflation is going to soar, and the economy will go in the Dumpster. He was 180 degrees wrong.

In fact, we now have the best economy in the lifetimes of anybody in this Chamber because of the leadership of this President and the courage of Members to vote for tough programs, tough spending cuts and tough revenues.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, we heard from the majority whip, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY). We heard from my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER). Some of you may be confused who is correct. Let me just quote, if I can, three editorials that have been written recently about this Congress. The Washington Post, October 10, "The normal role of congressional leadership is to help pass legislation. The principal role in this Congress has been instead to block it."

They go on to say, the Republicans say they have engaged in no more than normal self-defense. They have lost control of their agenda. They have tried mainly to give the impression of dealing with issues that it has systematically finessed. The finessing of them and the blame are part of what this election is now about.

Roll Call, a newspaper which follows the goings on of the Congress, had an editorial recently that said, what a mess.

The Baltimore Sun had similar comments about the ineptitude of this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, one of the great moments in American history was the successful effort to decrease the work week to 40 hours. At the time it was done, it was considered a radical thing to do, but that is nothing compared to the work week the majority has given this House: A 16-hour work week and a 5-day weekend. That is what this is about, and I would like to take those sheets that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) demonstrated just a second ago, and I would imagine that about half of that are filled with the naming of post offices all over this country.

This is the fourth CR, continuing resolution, to keep the government going. We just heard from the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) before he yielded the time to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), that they will not be meeting on Saturday and Sunday. We are 19 days past the date that the fiscal year began and we have not done our work. They have only had 3 of the 13 bills that make the government work signed into law by the President. The rest have not reached him, Mr. Speaker.

So I would say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, do your work. Let me remind you, let me remind you of something, that no one elected us to work 2- and 3-day weeks. Let me remind you of something else; that if a policeman or a fireman or an auto worker or a nurse or any other American can put in a full week's work on the job, we can as well.

There is not a working man or woman in this country who has a right to walk away from their job and say, well, I will come back and finish it

maybe next week, Tuesday or next week Wednesday, but that is exactly what the majority is telling us. Mr. Speaker, it is high time that we stop that kind of schedule, and that kind of nonsense. Instead of passing one stop gap measure after another to keep the government from shutting down, it is time for all of us to roll up our sleeves, to lock the doors, to stay here and to do the work of the country.

It is not as if we do not have work to do. The main issues that this election is being fought on, the issues that the people are responding to, have not been addressed. Instead of leaving town, we could be putting together a bipartisan bill on prescription drug care. You are campaigning on it. You are running ads on it. Let us do something about it. You are in the leadership. You control what goes on in this body and in the other body. Bring something forward. Instead of complaining, going home, putting a sign on the door saying gone fishing or maybe gone out to the golf tournament there in Manassas, we could be staying here this weekend and dealing with things like the HMO reform bill. You are running ads on it. Let us get it done. Or hate crimes, or the minimum wage. We can find money for the top 1 percent in a tax bill. The top 1 percent making \$319,000 a year under your bill would get about \$46,000 a year. All we are asking is that the 10 million Americans who go to work every day, who take care of our children, who take care of our aging parents and who make \$5.15 to \$6.15 an hour, all we want is a minimum wage for them and that has gone nowhere.

How about Latino fairness, to give fairness and justice for those who are here who are doing those jobs I have just described? And what about, of course, education? We will not leave this floor, we will not leave this body, until we get what we want in education; and that means lower class sizes for our children so they can get a better disciplined education. That means school construction so we do not have faucets leaking and roofs falling on top of children in schools, and children learning in mobile units outside the main building. That means as well, Mr. Speaker, after-school programs so our children have a place to go so they do not go home to an empty home where temptation leads them to drugs and alcohol and teen pregnancies and all the other maladies that flow when there are not people there loving them, teaching them, mentoring them; an after-school program that we think, when we fund, can put an additional 1.6 million kids into an after-school program where they can get that attention.

We are not leaving here until those things are done. These are tough issues. They deserve our attention. They deserve our time, and I urge my colleagues to vote no. This is a 5-day CR. We ought to be doing it one day at a time forcing us to stay in this building.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). Without objection, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) will manage the time for the majority.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, if we did one CR every day that is all we would get done. We would not have time to do anything else except the CR one day after another. We would be here until Christmas.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS).

(Mr. THOMAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting the way people deal with history around here. For more than 40 years this party was the majority. As recently as 1993 they owned the government. They had the House; they had the Senate. They had the Presidency and yet they have the gall to stand up and say what we should be doing about children in schools. They owned the place. What did they do when they were here? I will tell you. In 1992 and in 1993, this House was in scandal and when the Republican majority took over we said we want a third party audit. It took us 5 years, no question about it. This House now gets a clean audit from the third party private sector. Do you know why we have a surplus? It is very simple.

In 1993, they held the House, they held the Senate and they held the Presidency. They passed the largest tax increase in history, and then the American people in November of 1994 voted Republicans for the first time in half a century a majority in the House. And guess what? We did not spend it.

Now, if you want to know where the surplus came from, they raised taxes; and we did not spend it. That is how we got the surplus. So if you listen to these people telling you all of the things that need to be corrected, with our small majority we passed a prescription drug provision; we are moving forward on Medicare reforms. And we are making changes while they are complaining about things they never ever did when they were in the majority.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) makes an impassioned statement, but the fact of the matter is almost every independent analyst agrees that the reason we have the surplus is the 1990 bill for which most of his colleagues did not vote and excoriated their own President, President Bush, for proposing; the 1993 bill and then the 1997 bipartisan agreement. So that the gentleman's reading of history is sorely wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

(Mr. MENENDEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, we heard a few minutes ago that truth has been a victim in this election. I would submit that it has been a victim today on this floor. The fact of the matter is it was Democrats and Democrats alone that passed the votes for the President's deficit reduction program that brought us the first balanced budget in a generation and now the Federal surpluses that we argue about on this floor.

That is a good argument to have, but let us not forget that the truth of the matter is not one Republican in this House, not one Republican in the Senate, was willing to make the difficult decisions on the deficit reduction program that President Clinton put forth. I have never seen how the majority that runs both this House and the other body can claim that it is the responsibility of the minority to be able to achieve that for which they control the entire legislative process of this House and the other body. I do not know where in America the majority does not run and rule, and the majority in this House is a Republican majority.

Now we have had the whole year to finish our budgetary work, and we have not. We Democrats want to stay here and work until we complete the important business of the people. The real purpose of this continuing resolution, which by the way is a one-page resolution for which the date is changed so it is not that complicated to have it on a daily basis to keep the pressure to make us complete the people's business, is not to help America's working families; it is to allow Republican Members to go home and avoid a battle of public opinion they know they will lose.

Now Governor Bush keeps talking about bipartisanship. Well, I hope he makes some phone calls here to the House and to the other body where his party rules, because we want bipartisanship, too; but that does not mean abdicating our principles and letting one do simply what they want.

□ 1615

We believe that we will have bipartisanship, but not at the expense of reducing class size for our children or giving children the modern schools they deserve or hiring 100,000 qualified teachers. There are some battles we are fighting, some principles worth going to the mat to defend. For me, for Democrats, educating our children and giving our seniors a secure and decent retirement, are just those kinds of principles, the right principles for America.

Governor Bush keeps talking about bipartisanship. But look at what Republicans cannot accomplish when they control both Houses of Congress. They cannot pass a strong Patients' Bill of Rights; they cannot pass a Medicare prescription drug benefit for all

seniors; they cannot provide class size reduction legislation for our children; they cannot pass campaign finance reform to preserve our very democracy; and that is the failed record, in part, of this Republican Congress. And they want the presidency too.

If the Republican majority cannot get a budget done at the height of prosperity, how can you govern when tough decisions have to be made?

To my colleagues on the other side, I say it is time to stop the delaying and get the work done. Working families need our help now, and if Republicans cannot provide the leadership to do so, we Democrats are more than ready to take the reins and get the job done: pass a strong Patients' Bill of Rights; pass a prescription drug program under Medicare; pass an education process that raises standards, but helps reduce class size; modernize our schools and provide for technology connections; ensure that we pay down this debt over the next 12 years; and have tax cuts for working families. That is an agenda. If we had been working together, we could get it done. That is an agenda that your Members are campaigning upon. That is an agenda we have been fighting for.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle speak as if they know the facts. I would say that the gentleman is factually challenged. Let me be specific.

When the Democrats controlled the White House, the House and the Senate, they said not a single Republican voted for their tax increase, \$265 billion in tax increase, \$320 billion in new spending. How did they get the new spending with the tax increase? They stole every dime out of the Social Security trust fund. AL GORE was the deciding vote on that, to take the money out of the Social Security trust fund.

Why did we not vote for it? First of all, it increased the tax on Social Security. That is a fact. It took every dime out of the Social Security trust fund and put it up here with new taxes for increased spending. That is a fact. They talked for a year about a targeted middle class tax cut. The leadership over here demagogued for a year. "What we want is a targeted middle class tax cut." They could not help themselves, because money in the Federal Government is power to the Democrats, their ability to rain down money and spend it on their constituents. And yet they increased the tax on the middle class, that is a fact, when they had the House, the White House, and the Senate.

Another one of their priorities, they cut the veterans' COLAs. They cut the military COLAs in 1993. And they ask why we did not vote for it? I would not vote for it today.

They talk about the minimum wage. Did they pass a minimum wage in-

crease in 1993 when they had control of the White House, House, and Senate? Absolutely not. Alan Greenspan said there are three issues which have stimulated the economy the most: one is the balanced budget, the other is welfare reform, and the other was capital gains.

Balanced budget, my liberal Democrat leadership fought tooth, hook and nail against a balanced budget, every single time. Even when we passed it and the President signed it, the liberal leadership on that side still fought against it.

Welfare reform, that was vetoed twice, and after the President signed welfare reform, my liberal friends on that side of the aisle still fought against welfare reform.

Capital gains, they said, oh, that is a tax break for the rich. Alan Greenspan says that is what stimulated the economy, along with a balanced budget, that lowered interest rates and allowed jobs. But yet my colleagues on that side of the aisle fought against it.

Why did not we vote for the 1993 bill? Because it was anti-economic progress. It was anti-economic progress, 100 percent.

They talk about school construction. I went to 18 districts 3 weeks ago. Every district had at least \$1 million from their unions put against our candidates. Why would not they vote for school construction with Davis-Bacon taken out? Why would not they vote for school construction and waive Davis-Bacon? I will vote for it if you do. It saves 35 percent, and we can allow those schools to keep the money that it takes, the extra, for the union to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I would tell you, they said we need a living wage. Ninety-five percent of all construction in this country is done without the union, and they earn a good wage. But my colleagues get all of their campaign funds from the liberal trial lawyers, from the unions, and do you think that they would do that in the name of education? Absolutely not.

You did not talk about quality of education for 40 years; you just put more money into it. It was the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), the chairman of the committee, that talked of quality education. Your 100,000 teachers from the last time, half of them were not even qualified. We had to say if you are going to put those teachers in, they have to be qualified and the school has got the flexibility to use the money. If they want technology, if they want teacher training, if they want class size reduction, we will do that. But yet my colleagues on that side want government to tell everything.

Those are the facts, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 40 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, I do not have time to correct all the misstatements of the gentleman from California. Suffice it to say, however,

as he leaves the floor, that from 1981 through 1992, not a penny was spent in the United States from Social Security, from anyplace else, that was not approved by Ronald Reagan and George Bush. Not a penny. Why? Because we never overrode a veto of a spending bill that asked for more spending of Ronald Reagan. Never.

So the fact of the matter is that it is Presidents who make policy. We make the laws, I understand that. But in your lament that Bill Clinton will not sign the bills you want signed, your tax bill of 1998 would have wiped out that surplus that you now so proudly say you want to pay down the debt with. It has been Bill Clinton and the Democrats in Congress that have brought us this surplus.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Texas, made the assertion at that podium that often in an election year the first casualty is truth; and then, over the course of the next several minutes, he went on to prove that, at least in some cases, that assertion can be true.

He asserted that a couple of years after President Clinton and Vice President GORE took office, the budget deficit was still \$200 billion. You can hurt the truth and kill the truth by acts of omission as well as commission, and that is what happened in that particular case.

What he failed to observe was that when President Clinton and Vice President GORE came to the White House, the annual budget deficit that year was almost \$300 billion; and so, yes, a couple of years later it was already reduced by \$100 billion, and it was continuing to go down.

He used the phrase "budget deficits as far as the eye could see." That is a phrase that was coined by the Office of Management and Budget, the Budget Director, of the outgoing Bush Administration, and the outgoing Bush Administration predicted that under the policies of former President Bush, that the deficit today would be \$445 or \$450 billion. That is "deficits as far as the eye can see."

Yes, unquestionably, it was in fact the budget resolution of 1993, added on to the previous one in the Bush Administration, that has brought this Nation back to fiscal sanity and brought the budget back into balance, and in fact brought the budget this year into a \$211 billion surplus; a \$500 billion turnaround in the 8 years that President Clinton and Vice President GORE have been in the White House. Those are the facts.

Mr. Speaker, the facts today are these: we are fighting now over a budget here, and the issues are these. You want a tax cut for the richest people in the country; we want services for the American people. We want a Patients' Bill of Rights; you do not. We want a

prescription drug program for people who have to pay for their prescription drugs out of their pocket; you do not. We want an increase in the minimum wage; you do not. We want a reasonable and modest middle class tax cut, which will provide the majority of the benefits to the working people of this country; you want to give \$1 trillion to the richest people in the country.

Those are the issues upon which we differ, and those are the issues that need to be decided, and they will not be decided by passing a continuing resolution. They will only be decided by staying here and debating these issues, and bringing the bills out on the floor so that they can get honest and fair votes, and so far you have refused to do that.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), a real fighter. He was a fighter pilot in Vietnam, and the first ace, having shot down a lot of the enemy's aircraft. I would like to yield to him to respond, because he is a fighter; and I think I see a fight developing here.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, no fights, just facts. In 1993, I mentioned that the Democrats raised Social Security taxes. We did away with that. They took every dime out of the Social Security trust fund. Republicans put it into a lockbox. AL GORE was the deciding vote to take the money. Every budget that Clinton-GORE sent us stole the money out of the Social Security trust fund. Now he is saying, oh, I want a Social Security trust fund.

The middle class tax that they increased, we gave it back in a \$500 deduction. We gave IRAs for school education. That was a "tax break for the rich," and the liberals fought against it, tooth, hook and nail; but we gave it. We gave middle class tax relief.

If you take a look at the veterans' COLAs that they cut, we rescinded that. We gave back the veterans' COLAs. The military active duty COLAs, we gave back. Not a single one of the White House budgets or economic policies have passed either the House or Senate.

So when they claim credit for the economy, the 1993 bill, we rescinded it, and none of their bills passed since. Those are the facts.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), chairman of one of our important appropriation subcommittees.

(Mr. KOLBE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting here listening to this debate, and there are a couple of things that I thought we might want to correct just for the record here.

There have been speakers on the other side that have talked about how they are concerned about class size reduction, how they are concerned about

the infrastructure of our schools and making sure that we have money for that. And we are too. But perhaps the public does not know that in the conference that has been worked out on the Labor-HHS bill, there is every single dollar that the President has requested for classroom size reduction, \$1.4 billion, and for new school construction, \$1.3 billion. Every one of those dollars is in there. The difference, of course, is that in the conference report, it is in a block grant to the schools.

□ 1630

Because as we know, in one school district, there may not be a problem with new school construction. It may be teacher development, and in another school district, there may not be a problem with class sizes, it may be a community where the population is shrinking. They may need to have new computers and renovation.

What we suggest is give the money back to the school districts, to the local districts, to the teachers, to the parents, to the administrators to make the decisions about how the dollars will be spent; but the other side says no, we, here in Washington, the bureaucracy in Washington, we, in Congress, we will dictate exactly how you are going to spend those dollars. We know best.

That is the fundamental philosophical difference between the minority and the majority. We believe that the dollars should go back to the schools, back to the parents, back to the teachers, back to those who need it, get into the classrooms.

They believe it should go to the bureaucracy to determine how it will be spent, and we will direct exactly how those dollars will be spent.

One other point, Mr. Speaker, it was mentioned here earlier that the only thing different about this CR is the date is changed. Well, there is another difference, the previous CR did not give the authority to the administration to write the checks beginning for November 1 for Social Security benefits and for veterans' benefits and all other entitlements, but mainly for Social Security and for veterans' benefits. This continuing resolution does give them that.

Mr. Speaker, a vote against this continuing resolution, make no mistake about it, a vote against this continuing resolution is a vote against writing the Social Security checks for the beginning of the month. It is a vote against the benefits for veterans. It is a vote to say no, we will not make the payments for veterans or for Social Security beneficiaries. That is what the vote against this continuing resolution would do, because it is not the same as the previous continuing resolution.

So I think those points need to be kept in mind here as we move forward with this debate.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Florida for yielding me the additional time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) for making that point on the entitlement checks, because in my opening comments, I did refer to the entitlement checks that are prepared in advance. I did not specify that they were Social Security checks. And I did not specify that they were veterans' checks, but that is, in fact, what they are. If my colleagues watched television last night, there was a big program about that. These checks are printed in advance of the time that they are mailed out, and if we do not give the administration, the Social Security Administration, ample time to prepare and print those checks, they will not get delivered on time.

I thank the gentleman for making that point. I think it is essential that we include, and we did include, in this CR the provision that the affected agencies could go ahead and prepare those checks and mail them out so they get in the hands of the Social Security recipients and the veterans and anyone else entitled to an entitlement check at the appropriate time, at the beginning of the month.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, is it the proposition of the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) if we did not pass this CR and we still continue another 24 hours, because the CR expires, as the gentleman said 24 hours from now or 36 hours from now, that the agencies, both Social Security and the Veterans Administration, would not go ahead over the next 24 hours or 36 hours and prepare to send out these checks?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would respond to the gentleman that that is the reason we put that language in this continuing resolution. It is there so that there would be no question they had the authority to do just that.

If the gentleman would like to discuss the 24-hour period CR, we are not going to be here tomorrow. Many Members of this House are going to show their respect to the former Governor of Missouri and go to his funeral tomorrow. So we are not going to be here tomorrow.

Last week we paid tribute to and honored one of our own Members who had passed way, and we were not here that day either. So we lost those legislative days, but it was proper and appropriate that we honor the memory of Congressman Vento. It is certainly proper that we honor the memory and the service of the Governor of Missouri. The 24 hour CR just does not work.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER).

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that the gentleman from

Florida (Chairman YOUNG) has refocused and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) has refocused this debate on exactly what we are debating about here right now on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the measure before us, which is H.J. Res. 114, which is designed to keep the government open till Wednesday. I would prefer to keep it open, even if we cannot come to an understanding among Republicans and Democrats and people on both sides of the aisle on appropriation bills. Unfortunately, the Gekas amendment, to keep the government open under these circumstances, was defeated in this House earlier this year. Perhaps some of my colleagues, even on my side of the aisle, might have second thoughts on the Gekas amendment now that we find ourselves in this predicament.

But notwithstanding that, what we have before us is a measure to keep the government open through next Wednesday. Now, who could oppose that? Yes, that is right. What we have here is a situation where people are opposing that. In order to accomplish what? People are opposing that in order to accomplish, and I have heard the debate, I hope my colleagues listened very closely, spending proposal after spending proposal after spending proposal.

What we have are people who are willing to hold the American people hostage, even hold Social Security checks and veterans' checks hostage in order to get more government spending on specific ideas that people on that side of the aisle support, particular government spending.

All right. We have may have a difference on agreement on priorities. Republicans may want to spend a little bit less than. Democrats may want to spend a little bit more. It is not right to hold the American people hostage under this circumstance.

Let me say one of the issues at hand that the President is demanding that we put into the Commerce, State and Justice appropriations bill, he is threatening to veto that bill and close down the government, what is that issue the President is demanding? It is for us to have an amnesty for millions of illegal aliens, which would again push up spending in the United States and the spending requirements that we have.

This is not right. It is not right, number one, to hold us hostage and to demand things. It is not right to hold the American people hostage under these circumstances.

We can have honest disagreements here. But the fact is that we have turned this into a political debate. We have gotten way off course, because, I am sorry, my friends on the other side of the aisle made this into a political debate. This is about whether or not we should keep the government open until Wednesday and not shut it down and not put our veterans and our Social Security recipients in jeopardy, and not to hold those things in hostage in order

to force us to spend more money on illegal immigration and all these other spending proposals.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I responded to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) about the need to have the authority for the entitlement checks, and I did double-check and it was the President's Office of Management and Budget who advised us that this had to be done, and that is why it is here

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, one or two points I might make here is that, quite frankly, the continuing resolution is enough time for us to try to do our business here if we have not accomplished it. But the fact of the matter is that this is going through next Wednesday. We will not be here. They are letting us out of here. There will be no work done on the issues that we have to focus on until we get back next Wednesday. So it is really a little bit disingenuous about the amount of time that we need in order to get business done, when no business will be done on prescription drugs, on Social Security, on any other issue that is important to the people in this country.

Secondly, to my good friends across the aisle, quite frankly, the only people, the only people who have shut this government down, not once, but twice, have been my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle. So that if any one wants to talk about jeopardizing Social Security or veterans' benefits, take heed my friends, because my colleagues did it not once, but twice.

But I will just say that here we go again, another week comes, another weeks goes, and this Republican Congress continues inaction on a specific issue, I might add, in my view, which is a critical priority for this country, and that is education.

Mr. Speaker, instead of trying to fashion a bipartisan agenda, where we invest in our schools and our teachers, reduce class size, increase accountability and standards, the Republican leadership today is going to push through another stopgap measure that only preserves the status quo, the fourth, fourth stopgap measure that the House will consider. Quite frankly, it ought to be the last.

Instead of working only 2 days a week naming post offices, this Congress ought to stay here every single day until the work of the American people is done. My friends, that is what we are paid to do. That is what we get elected to do in this body, and we should do it, it is what our obligations are.

Mr. Speaker, the final budget for this year is now 2½ weeks late. It did not have to be this way. We could have moved forward by crafting a bipartisan

budget that reflects the values of this great country, which paid attention to America's number one priority, the education of our children.

The Republican leadership rejected bipartisan progress. They drafted a budget that puts tax cuts for the wealthy at the very head of the line, and they pushed education to the bottom of the list. We are left with their misplaced priorities. This House has passed \$750 billion in tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans. They have spent not one dime to modernize America's crumbling schools, not one dime to hire 100,000 new teachers to reduce class size, increase discipline and to hold schools accountable for the results.

The analysis on their tax cut is as follows: 43 percent of their tax cut goes to the richest 1 percent of the people in this country, that is folks making an average of about \$915,000 a year, and for those folks, they are going to get \$46,000 a year in a tax cut. And by his own admission, Governor Bush, 2 nights ago, said yes, in fact, that the tax cut was going to the richest 1 percent of the people in this country. Yes, in fact, a trillion dollars was coming out of this Social Security.

Let me just say, it is, in fact, in their own words, we need to do the people's work in this House; that is what it is about, and we need to look at what we are doing about education, what we are doing for retirement security. These folks need to really understand what the priorities are.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, there has been back and forth about who is responsible for this and who is responsible for that. Unfortunately, we do not have the time to fully develop those issues. We ought to in the long run. This is about passing a CR.

Everybody on my side of the aisle has voted for the last three CRs. They passed overwhelmingly. Keep the government functioning. We ought to keep the government functioning, but we ought to also, as the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) said, do the people's business.

What this debate is about, Mr. Speaker, is about the fact that we do not think we are doing the people's business. With all due respect to the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG), the issue is not the funeral on Friday of my good and close friend and a great leader of this country who was tragically lost to us in an airplane crash, Governor Mel Carnahan, Saturday is available to us, Sunday is available to us, Monday is available to us, Tuesday is available to us. But we are not coming back until Tuesday at 6 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, essentially what our side of the aisle is saying, through the debate on this continuing resolution, is we ought to address some of the critical issues that had been pending in this House for 8 months and pending in

the Senate, pending in the Congress for 8 months. Yes, my colleagues have heard us talk about prescription drugs. Everybody says they are for prescription drugs, because we know the costs of drugs is driving seniors to Draconian choices in their lives.

□ 1645

But we are not passing a prescription drug bill, we are having a CR on going home for 5 days. We do not think that is right, Mr. Speaker. That is what this debate is about.

We talk about a Patients' Bill of Rights, so that HMOs are not telling doctors and patients what kind of medical care they ought to get, and that they have access to emergency care and they can make choices.

The gentleman from Arizona says our educational debate is about who makes the choices, "bureaucrats," used as an epithet, or the people at home. The fact of the matter is on the school construction program, guess what, who makes the choices? The people at home. If they do not build schools, that is their choice. If they do not want to put on more classrooms, that is their choice. We do not force them to do anything. If they do not need teachers and do not hire teachers, we do not force them to.

Get off my back with this rhetoric that is phony on choices. None of these programs we are talking about force locals to do anything, and the gentleman knows it, but he thinks it is good political rhetoric. I understand that.

This CR is about whether we are going to do the people's business. That is what this debate is about. I think, as I said, that this CR may pass. If it does not pass, then we ought to pass a second CR until Monday night and come back Saturday, after we observe the funeral for Mel Carnahan, and do our work on Saturday; and yes, go to church Sunday morning, come here in the afternoon, and do the people's business.

Mr. Speaker, that is what this debate is about, not about a CR which says we have not done our business, and therefore we are going to continue government in operation until Tuesday night or Wednesday night. We all agree on that. It is about whether we are going to go away from here 2½ weeks after we said we were going to adjourn without doing the critical business on the public's agenda.

That is what this debate has been about, that is what this discussion is about; not to look at the past, at what has been done and who is responsible or who is not. It is about, Mr. Speaker, whether we are going to pass these critical programs: prescription drugs, campaign finance reform, education, more teachers, more classrooms, smaller sizes, particularly for young children, which all the experts say need specific attention.

If they get it, we will lift them up and make them better students in the

upper grades. We will therefore have a better America and a more competitive America. That is what this discussion on this CR is about.

I would hope we would defeat this CR, Mr. Speaker. I would hope we would defeat this CR. Then, Mr. Speaker, because I know the gentleman is a man of such good will and purpose and responsibility, I would ask the chairman that we come back on the floor, pass the CR until Monday night, as the gentleman from Massachusetts wanted to do, come back here Saturday, do our work, come back here Sunday afternoon, do our work, come back here Monday, and perhaps be able to leave.

If the gentleman does not agree with the President, fine, send him a bill. Let him veto it, and criticize him. I do not know why Members do not send the bills. I have a hunch that they are afraid that the American public will say he is right and they are wrong, so they do not send the bills down. I hope this CR is defeated, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, one of our speakers spoke in favor of an automatic CR. One of the reasons that I have opposed the automatic CR is because it would deny my friends on the minority side the opportunity to take 2 hours today for their political platform.

I was really happy last week when I heard the minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), stand in the well and say, we really ought to cut out all of this partisanship, and we ought to work together.

Mr. Speaker, it is amazing what we can do when we work together. I will have to admit that it is tempting to rejoin the political argument here. But this is not the place for campaign politics. The place for campaign politics is back home in our districts, not on the floor of the people's House, where we are supposed to put the people's business above politics.

We have talked about appropriators being here or not being here. When the House leaves, I think everybody ought to know the appropriators do not necessarily leave. The appropriators in the House on both parties work really hard. Whether the House is in session or not, the appropriators that have business before them are here, whether it is a weekend, whether it is late at night.

I know sometimes our colleagues will say, this was done or that was done in the dark of night. That is a fact. We do a lot of work in the dark of night, because if we start here in the morning at 9 o'clock, and we are still going at midnight or 1 or 2 o'clock in the morning to get our business done, we are working in the dark of night. If we did not do that, we would be here until next spring.

We would need a 2-year budget cycle, which I think is probably a good idea anyway. As the gentleman from Maryland knows, I have supported that strongly.

But appropriators do not leave Washington just because everyone else does. There will be appropriators here this weekend working on finalizing decisions, making decisions, writing the bills, reading the bills, getting them ready to file.

As I pointed out earlier in my comments on the rule, we only are one-third of the process here. If we were the entire process, we would have been done back in July, but we are only one-third of the process. Our colleagues and friends at the other end of the Capitol are one-third, and the President of the United States is one-third.

Mr. Speaker, we have a great prosperity in this country today. There are a lot of people who want to take credit for it. I think that the confidence that we have created in the industrial community by balancing the budget is one reason we have a strong prosperity. Investors are willing to invest because they think that government might not be on their back as much as it has been in the past, so they are willing to invest. It creates prosperity. It creates movement in the economy.

There is another reason. One of my colleagues on the minority side mentioned it and one of my colleagues on the majority side mentioned it: welfare reform. I do not think Congress has gotten nearly as much credit for what welfare reform has contributed to our economy as it should.

For years, there were families who had been on welfare for generations. We changed that. We changed it, and we reformed welfare to the point that we encouraged people to go to work. Mr. Speaker, many Americans who had been on welfare for all of their lives went to work. They started to earn money. They were able to buy homes, buy automobiles. They actually felt good about the fact that they were working. They were making an income. They were doing something for their wives and children.

Besides that good feeling, those people for years had been taking money out of the system. Once they went back to work, they were putting money back into the system. They paid taxes, like everyone else. They paid payroll taxes, social security taxes, income taxes. They paid into the system, so we are getting two for one benefits. They are no longer taking out, they are putting in, so there is a tremendous economic advantage to that.

Now, if I might allow myself something that might sound a little political, I listened to the speeches of both candidates for president. I was impressed. I watched the Vice President when he made his acceptance speech at his convention, and on two occasions he mentioned how he fought for this welfare reform that I think is a major contributor to our strong economy.

I sat there and scratched my head, because I remember being here in the House when we passed the welfare reform bill the first time. We sent it to their administration. They vetoed it.

Then I remember we came back and fought again to pass welfare reform legislation. We sent it to the administration, the President and the Vice President. They vetoed it again.

So we went back to work and wrote it the third time. We sent it to the administration, the President and the Vice President, and this time they finally said, we will sign it. We do not like it. They told their friends who opposed it, we do not really like it, but we are going to sign it. They did. They signed it.

Then I heard the Vice President in that speech say how he had fought for welfare reform after his administration had effectively killed it twice after Congress fought to make it happen, and the third time it happened.

There are other things that have been mentioned in this debate that have nothing to do with the CR, that are political issues that are out there in the presidential debates. I would say to those who make those arguments, why do they not make them where they belong? They do not belong on this CR. This CR has nothing to do with what they were talking about.

Then I would repeat words that I have said and many of my colleagues have said: Where were they for the last 8 years? They have owned the administration for 8 years. Where were they? Why did they not do it? Why did they not get it done during that 8-year period?

That comment has nothing to do with the CR, just like most of the comments from the minority side have nothing to do with the CR. Mr. Speaker, let us pass this CR and then get about finishing the few appropriations matters that still lay out there to be completed.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Continuing Resolution, the fourth resolution in as many weeks to keep the government open. I call on Republicans to stop the delays, stop the obfuscation, and keep Congress in session so we can finish our work. We must do the people's agenda, and we must do it now.

We are now three weeks beyond the start of the fiscal year, and the light at the end of the tunnel is still not shining brightly. We do not meet. We take off days at a time. We spend our time on the floor naming courthouses, voting on suspension bills.

And the American people are not seeing any results.

Education is America's number one priority. But this Congress has failed to meet the challenge. Republicans have refused to dedicate funding to reduce class size and for school construction. They are unwilling to fund critical priorities so communities can hire more teachers, improve teacher quality, and provide more after-school programs. Instead, they support block grants with no accountability that a single teacher will be hired or a single classroom fixed. They also let the Elementary and Secondary Education Act expire for the first time in 35 years because of their extremism.

The time has come to stop the delays, stop the foot-dragging, and act on the education priorities of the American people. We should

not neglect the people's agenda for personal politics. This Congress should stay in session and finish our spending work. We should take a first step to make every public school a great public school.

Democrats want funding dedicated to emergency school repairs; the bipartisan Johnson-Rangel tax credit to help schools districts on school construction bonds; funding to hire 100,000 highly-qualified teachers to reduce class size, and for teacher training and recruitment and after-school programs that are an essential part of any school reform.

We are in an Information Age. Every child needs to know how to read and write. Parents are working more and they are commuting more, and they have less time for children. And our public schools are not equipped to fill the breach. What we are asking for is a sensible, first step toward filling the holes in our education system. And I believe there is still time to work together, in a bipartisan way, to meet this challenge.

Let's stop neglecting our work, stop passing these stopgap measures, and do what any sensible legislative body would do: finish our spending bills, fund the priorities of our people, and get away from the special interests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 637, the joint resolution is considered read for amendment and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. HOYER. 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 262, nays 136, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 539]
YEAS—262

Abercrombie	Bilirakis	Capps
Aderholt	Bishop	Castle
Archer	Blagojevich	Chabot
Armey	Bliley	Chambliss
Bachus	Blunt	Coble
Baker	Boehler	Coburn
Baldacci	Boehner	Collins
Baldwin	Bonilla	Combest
Ballenger	Bono	Condit
Barr	Boswell	Cook
Barrett (NE)	Boucher	Cooksey
Barrett (WI)	Brady (TX)	Cox
Bartlett	Bryant	Coyne
Barton	Burr	Crane
Bass	Burton	Cubin
Bentsen	Buyer	Cunningham
Bereuter	Callahan	Danner
Berkley	Calvert	Davis (VA)
Berman	Camp	Deal
Biggert	Canady	DeLay
Bilbray	Cannon	DeMint

Dickey	Kasich	Rogers
Dicks	Kelly	Rohrabacher
Dooley	Kind (WI)	Ros-Lehtinen
Doolittle	King (NY)	Roukema
Dreier	Kingston	Royce
Duncan	Klecza	Ryan (WI)
Dunn	Knollenberg	Ryun (KS)
Ehlers	Kolbe	Salmon
Ehrlich	Kucinich	Sandlin
Emerson	Kuykendall	Sanford
English	LaHood	Saxton
Eshoo	Largent	Scarborough
Everett	Latham	Schaffer
Ewing	LaTourette	Sensenbrenner
Farr	Leach	Serrano
Fattah	Lewis (KY)	Sessions
Fletcher	Linder	Shadegg
Foley	LoBiondo	Shaw
Fossella	Lucas (KY)	Sherwood
Fowler	Lucas (OK)	Shimkus
Frelinghuysen	Luther	Shuster
Gallely	Maloney (NY)	Simpson
Ganske	Manzullo	Sisisky
Gekas	Martinez	Skeen
Gibbons	McCrery	Smith (MI)
Gilchrist	McHugh	Smith (NJ)
Gillmor	McInnis	Smith (TX)
Gilman	McIntyre	Smith (WA)
Goode	McKeon	Snyder
Goodlatte	Metcalf	Souder
Goodling	Mica	Spence
Gordon	Miller, Gary	Stabenow
Goss	Minge	Stearns
Graham	Mollohan	Stump
Granger	Moore	Sununu
Green (WI)	Moran (KS)	Sweeney
Greenwood	Morella	Tancredo
Gutknecht	Murtha	Tauscher
Hall (TX)	Myrick	Tauzin
Hastings (WA)	Nethercutt	Taylor (MS)
Hayes	Ney	Taylor (NC)
Hayworth	Northup	Terry
Hefley	Norwood	Thomas
Henger	Nussle	Thornberry
Hill (IN)	Ose	Thune
Hill (MT)	Packard	Tiahrt
Hilleary	Paul	Toomey
Hobson	Pease	Trafigant
Hoefel	Peterson (MN)	Upton
Hoekstra	Peterson (PA)	Vitter
Holden	Petri	Walden
Holt	Pickering	Walsh
Horn	Pickett	Wamp
Hostettler	Pitts	Watkins
Houghton	Pombo	Watts (OK)
Hulshof	Porter	Weldon (FL)
Hunter	Portman	Weldon (PA)
Hutchinson	Pryce (OH)	Weller
Hyde	Quinn	Whitfield
Inslie	Radanovich	Wicker
Isakson	Rahall	Wilson
Istook	Ramstad	Wolf
Jenkins	Regula	Wynn
Johnson (CT)	Reynolds	Young (AK)
Johnson, Sam	Riley	Young (FL)
Jones (NC)	Roemer	
Kanjorski	Rogan	

NAYS—136

Allen	Doggett	Kilpatrick
Andrews	Doyle	LaFalce
Baca	Edwards	Lampson
Baird	Engel	Lantos
Becerra	Etheridge	Larson
Berry	Evans	Lee
Blumenauer	Filner	Levin
Bonior	Ford	Lewis (GA)
Borski	Frank (MA)	Lofgren
Boyd	Frost	Maloney
Brown (FL)	Gejdenson	Maloney (CT)
Brown (OH)	Gonzalez	Markey
Capuano	Green (TX)	Mascara
Cardin	Gutierrez	Matsui
Carson	Hall (OH)	McCarthy (MO)
Clayton	Hastings (FL)	McCarthy (NY)
Clement	Hilliard	McDermott
Clyburn	Hinchee	McGovern
Costello	Hinojosa	McKinney
Cramer	Hoolley	McNulty
Crowley	Hoyer	Meehan
Cummings	Jackson (IL)	Meek (FL)
Davis (FL)	Jackson-Lee	Meeks (NY)
Davis (IL)	(TX)	Menendez
DeFazio	Jefferson	Millender-
DeGette	John	McDonald
DeLaunt	Johnson, E. B.	Miller, George
DeLauro	Kaptur	Mink
Deutsch	Kennedy	Moakley
Dixon	Kildee	Moran (VA)

Nadler	Rivers	Tanner
Napolitano	Rothman	Thompson (CA)
Neal	Roybal-Allard	Thurman
Obey	Sabo	Tierney
Olver	Sanders	Towns
Ortiz	Sawyer	Udall (CO)
Pallone	Schakowsky	Udall (NM)
Pascrell	Scott	Velazquez
Pastor	Sherman	Visclosky
Payne	Shows	Waters
Pelosi	Skelton	Watt (NC)
Phelps	Slaughter	Waxman
Pomeroy	Stark	Weiner
Price (NC)	Stenholm	Wexler
Rangel	Strickland	Woolsey
Reyes	Stupak	Wu

NOT VOTING—34

Ackerman	Hansen	Rodriguez
Barcia	Jones (OH)	Rush
Brady (PA)	Klink	Sanchez
Campbell	Lazio	Shays
Chenoweth-Hage	Lewis (CA)	Spratt
Clay	Lipinski	Talent
Conyers	McCollum	Thompson (MS)
Diaz-Balart	McIntosh	Turner
Dingell	Miller (FL)	Weygand
Forbes	Oberstar	Wise
Franks (NJ)	Owens	
Gephardt	Oxley	

□ 1717

Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. NADLER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. KLECZKA changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 539 on H.J. Res. 114, I was unavoidably detained, Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 640 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 640

Resolved, That it shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of Thursday, October 19, 2000, for the Speaker to entertain motions to suspend the rules and pass, or adopt, the following measures:

(1) the bill (H.R. 2780) to authorize the Attorney General to provide grants for organizations to find missing adults;

(2) the resolution (H. Res. 605) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that communities should implement the Amber Plan to expedite the recovery of abducted children;

(3) the bill (H.R. 4541) to reauthorize and amend the Commodity Exchange Act to promote legal certainty, enhance competition, and reduce systemic risk in markets for futures and over-the-counter derivatives, and for other purposes;

(4) the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 271) expressing the support of Congress for activities to increase public awareness of multiple sclerosis; and

(5) the bill (H.R. 2592) to amend the Consumer Products Safety Act to provide that low-speed electric bicycles are consumer products subject to such Act.

SEC. 2. House Resolutions 615 and 633 are laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), 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, yesterday, the Committee on Rules met and passed this resolution, providing that it shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of Thursday, October 19, for the Speaker to entertain motions to suspend the rules and pass or adopt the following measures:

The bill H.R. 2780, to authorize the Attorney General to provide grants for organizations to find missing adults; the resolution, House Resolution 605, expressing the sense of the House that communities should implement the Amber Plan to expedite the recovery of abducted children; the bill H.R. 4541, to reauthorize and amend the Commodity Exchange Act to promote legal certainty, enhance competition, and reduce systemic risk in markets for futures and over-the-counter derivatives, and for other purposes; the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 271, expressing the support of Congress for activities to increase public awareness of multiple sclerosis; and, five, the bill H.R. 2592, to amend the Consumer Products Safety Act to provide that low-speed electric bicycles are consumer products subject to such an Act.

Finally, the rule provides that House Resolutions 615 and 623 are laid upon the table.

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, we are coming to the end of the congressional session and floor time is at a premium. This resolution allows us to consider several bills today under the expedited suspension procedure. I must stress that we have had all day to examine these bills, four of which are totally noncontroversial. These suspensions are not a surprise.

In addition, this resolution is within the spirit of the House rules. Under clause 1 of rule XV of the rules of the House, the Speaker may only entertain motions to suspend the rules on Mondays and Tuesdays and during the last 6 days of the session.

The House has not yet passed an adjournment resolution, but I think all of us hope and expect that we are in the last 6 days of this session. This resolution simply abides by the spirit of the standing rules of the House.

One of these bills is a bill I introduced in honor of Kristen Modafferi, a college student from Charlotte, North Carolina, who disappeared after her 18th birthday. When Kristen's parents called the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children to ask for help, they were told, "No, we can't help you because Kristen is 18 years old." If we pass Kristen's Act, that will never happen again.

The National Center for Missing Children has been an incredibly effective resource for the recovery of minors. Kristen's Act would create the same type of center for missing adults. It is just common sense. We should build upon the success of the National Center for Missing Children.

H. Res. 640 also allows the House to consider H.R. 4541, the reauthorization of the Commodity Exchange Act under suspension of the rules. H.R. 4541 will lift a portion of the regulatory burden from our commodity and futures exchanges, allowing them to compete within the world's modern financial markets.

I must state, though, that I am disappointed with one aspect of the measure. While the intent of H.R. 4541 is to deregulate U.S. markets, it actually places retroactive regulation on some of our newest and most innovative electronic markets.

Foreign countries are taking advantage of electronic technology at a more rapid pace and with less red tape than our domestic market. With this in mind, the House Committee on Banking and Financial Services placed language in its version of the bill that would have ensured freedom from regulation for U.S. companies that are developing and implementing new electronic technology within the swaps market.

I was extremely disappointed to see the Committee on Banking and Financial Services language stripped from the bill we are considering today. We should encourage business innovation and not stifle new companies with regulatory uncertainty. If we fail to restore the Committee on Banking and Financial Services's language, we will place our domestic electronic exchanges at a relative disadvantage to their foreign competitors.

I am confident our colleagues in the Senate will take care of the problem. If not, our homegrown companies will have to move overseas.

Now, Mr. Speaker, despite my disappointment with part of H.R. 4541, I strongly support this rule and urge my colleagues to do the same. With this resolution, we will consider five bills before we adjourn for the year.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I will not actively oppose the rule. The underlying suspension bills that the rule make in order are important for many of our constituents. But it is astonishing that the Committee on Rules must generate resolutions such as these to create the illusion that Congress is diligently performing its obligation.

This body is floating in a Never-Never Land 2 weeks into the fiscal year, considering suspension bills at a time when only 7 of the 13 spending