

(c) DEADLINE FOR APPLICATION AND PAYMENT OF FEES.—Subsections (a) and (b) shall apply only if the application for issuance of an immigrant visa or the application for adjustment of status are filed with appropriate fees within 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) REDUCTION OF IMMIGRANT VISA NUMBER.—Upon the granting of an immigrant visa or permanent residence to Tony Lara, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to reduce by one, during the current or next following fiscal year, the total number of immigrant visas that are made available to natives of the country of the alien's birth under section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act or, if applicable, the total number of immigrant visas that are made available to natives of the country of the alien's birth under section 202(e) of such Act.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MALIA MILLER

The Clerk called the Senate bill (S. 2019) for the relief of Malia Miller.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

S. 2019

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS FOR MALIA MILLER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b) of section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Malia Miller shall be eligible for issuance of an immigrant visa or for adjustment of status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence upon filing an application for issuance of an immigrant visa under section 204 of such Act or for adjustment of status to lawful permanent resident.

(b) ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.—If Malia Miller enters the United States before the filing deadline specified in subsection (c), she shall be considered to have entered and remained lawfully and shall, if otherwise eligible, be eligible for adjustment of status under section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act as of the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) DEADLINE FOR APPLICATION AND PAYMENT OF FEES.—Subsections (a) and (b) shall apply only if the application for issuance of an immigrant visa or the application for adjustment of status are filed with appropriate fees within 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) REDUCTION OF IMMIGRANT VISA NUMBER.—Upon the granting of an immigrant visa or permanent residence to Malia Miller, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to reduce by one, during the current or next following fiscal year, the total number of immigrant visas that are made available to natives of the country of the alien's birth under section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act or, if applicable, the total number of immigrant visas that are made available to natives of the country of the alien's birth under section 202(e) of such Act.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSE GUADALUPE TELLEZ PINALES

The Clerk called the Senate bill (S. 2289) for the relief of Jose Guadalupe Tellez Pinales.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

S. 2289

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. PERMANENT RESIDENCE.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.), Jose Guadalupe Tellez Pinales shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act upon payment of the required visa fee.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the private bills just considered.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.J. Res. 117, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 646, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 117) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of House Joint Resolution 117 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 117

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 106-275, is further amended by striking the date specified in section 106(c) and inserting "October 28, 2000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 646, the gen-

tleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

0915

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

The issues that divide us on that bill are five:

First of all, a bill which is supposed to protect our precious coastal land areas from environmental degradation, instead has been turned into a bill which would allow you, literally, to build oil refineries on the sea coast, on the beaches, in the sensitive coastal areas in any State in the Union except Alaska. I am sorry, it would allow it in

Alaska too. What it would not allow in Alaska is to have any Federal money spent to deal with the sensitive issue of coastal zone protection. So that is one anti-public interest problem with that bill.

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

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

One Member stood on the floor yesterday and defended the different way we treat those souls by saying in effect, well, it is different if they fled Central America coming from Nicaragua because they were a communist dictatorship, it is different than if they fled Central America to run away from a right-wing dictatorship that we had in El Salvador at the time.

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

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

Then we have another problem with that bill. That problem is that our Federal Treasury has expended billions of dollars over the past generation paying the costs that have been incurred by American taxpayers because of what tobacco products have done to American veterans and to Americans who are now senior citizens. That has cost Medicare and Medicaid billions of dollars, and yet there is language in the

State-Justice bill which says that not one dime of funding in that bill can be used to pursue in court redress against an industry that lied to the public and lied to the Congress about the effect of their product.

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

Johns Manville knew since 1939 what the problem was on asbestos, and the tobacco companies have known for a long time what the tobacco problem is, and yet the only dollar difference that we had in that bill yesterday between the majority and the minority was whether or not we ought to be able to appropriate a tiny amount of money to pay for the lawsuit that could have the possibility of bringing billions of dollars into the Federal Treasury to help us defray those costs. So the one thing that could have helped increase our surplus, out of all of the things we were doing yesterday, that was knocked out of the bill.

Then you get to our differences on Labor-HHS and Education. There we have an argument about what the spending levels ought to be for education. This Congress has spent billions of dollars above what the President has asked in a variety of areas. Some of that I think is defensible, and some is not. But we are now being told, sorry, we are not going to put one dime above what we have already put in the education bill to meet your additional requirements for education. That is what we are being told. So we continue to have an argument about what level of funding we ought to have for special education, for teacher training, for smaller class size initiatives, for school modernization, for Pell and a number of other issues.

Then we have the issue that the President is trying to get attended to by this Congress on the issue of school construction as opposed to modernization. There we have a \$125 billion backlog. The President is trying to attack 20 percent of that backlog, and so far he is meeting resistance.

Then we have the issue of whether or not workers are going to be protected from the dangers associated with repetitive motion injury in the workplace, the single most expensive problem in American industry today, the lost time and the costs associated with repetitive motion industries.

This is despite the fact that this committee, the Committee on Appropriations, passed out to the House last

year and the House adopted legislation which promised that we would not again delay the efforts of OSHA to promulgate the regulation to protect those American workers. Despite that promise in writing, this House welched on that promise. It is trying to bar going ahead with that provision.

Then we have several other issues that still divide us. On that score, the House sent the President a tax bill yesterday which was doomed from the start. It was a blind alley piece of legislation, because the President said he is going to veto it, because far too many of the benefits, again, go to the cream, the folks at the top layers, and all too few of those dollars go to low income people, and the minimum wage hike is being held ransom to many of those re-wards.

There are a lot of items in that tax bill I do not have any objection to, but there are some that are outrageous. And that bill is a Trojan horse. It is a Trojan horse.

So, we are stuck here, passing these one day resolutions, because this House still refuses to come to a compromise mode and work out differences with the White House. So we have no choice but to pass this resolution. But I thought it was important before we relinquished the floor on this issue to summarize what the main issues are, and the main issue on the appropriations side as I see it is still education, education, education.

Here I think we have something interesting going on in the country. We have a stealth campaign being run by the other side. This is a Congress under the leadership of our friends on the other side, this is a Congress which over the last 5 years has tried to cut presidential budgets for education by \$13.5 billion. Lest you say, oh, we are just talking about increases, they also tried to cut the education budget below previous years' spending levels by over \$5.5 billion. On four different occasions they tried to make those cuts in existing spending levels for education.

Now, because the polls show that education is an important issue, all of a sudden they have got a presidential candidate out there who is sort of a Trojan horse, who puts a benign face on the party, in hopes that people will look at that genial smile, rather than looking at the record of his fellow party members in this institution over the past 5 years.

I think the fight we are having on education now dramatizes, once again, what you folks on the other side of the aisle would really do if you had full power to govern. I think the last 6 years, in terms of you are trying to abolish the Department of Education, in terms of you are trying to cut back on education funding, in terms of you are trying to squeeze every opportunity you could out of the session to pass anti-environmental riders on appropriation bills, it is clear to me that that is what your road map is, long-term.

So we are not fighting here about a day or two or three; we are continuing to try to fight for the priorities that we think are important to meet the needs of the American people. We are going to have more than 1 million additional kids in schools over the next decade. We are not doing enough about it. That is what we are trying to correct. And as soon as the majority recognizes that the President is serious on this issue, we may finally have a resolution of those issues.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, and I thank him for the points that he raised, both about the legislation yesterday and the Commerce-State-Justice bill, which I join him in urging the President to veto.

As one who represents a coastal state whose district is on the edge of San Francisco bay, it is a tragedy that that legislation did not provide the funding necessary so that we can implement our Coastal Zone Management Plan to deal with non-point source pollution, the runoff that comes from our cities, our farmlands, from the logging areas upstream, that are devastating water quality in our rivers, in our bays, and along our coast.

Last year, California had beach closures over 3,000 times, some as long 6 to 12 weeks, and a few that were in fact permanent. The impact of that on our economy and tourism is the same kind of impact where they have had that kind of situation along the East Coast, where beaches have had to be closed because of water quality.

The single biggest polluter at this point is non-pointed source pollution, the runoff, whether it is the Chesapeake Bay or Santa Monica Bay or the Gulf of Mexico, where that runoff is collected in the Mississippi River, sent down to the Gulf of Mexico and has created a dead zone in the Gulf of Mexico that is thousands of square miles, where simply life cannot live in those sections of the Gulf of Mexico.

0930

I would hope that the President would veto that.

The gentleman also mentioned immigrants. I find it rather interesting on the front page of the Business section of the Washington Post, it says "Sweet Harvest for Virginia's Vintners", for the wine industry in Virginia, a Sweet Harvest.

When we open up the paper on the inside and we see who is harvesting those grapes, it is Gerardo Chavez. Gerardo Chavez is harvesting those grapes. Yet the other side decided that they were not going to provide for the fair treatment of immigrants; they were going to distinguish between those people who came here from Cuba and Nicaragua and El Salvador.

The gentleman quite correctly points out, we now see that they were fleeing

governments in El Salvador that not only were involved with fingering, and we were involved with fingering El Salvadorans citizens who then disappeared, were tortured and killed, but now, of course, we see the direct relationship between their involvement and the killing of the religious women from America.

Those families have had to live with that tragedy now for over a decade as we have tried to get to the bottom of that case. And it turns out now, of course, high Salvadoran officials and the security police and armed forces knew about that and covered it up all of those years. That is the government that these people were fleeing.

Many of those people who fled those governments now are working very hard in the American economy and, yet, we are going to deny them the rights to try to provide for legal and permanent residency and give them the right to prove their situation, rather than send them off back to the country and let them try to prove that from overseas. That treatment of immigrants is inexcusable.

We could not run the economy of this country for a day if the immigrants decided to sit down. We could not run the economy of California for 5 minutes if the immigrants did not show up for work, whether it is our tourism economy, whether it is our agricultural economy, whether it is our manufacturing economy, that is the simple fact of the matter. We ought to start dealing with these people in a fair and equitable fashion.

The gentleman also mentioned the continued attack. Many times people ask, what are we arguing over? What is it? We are just bickering. We are just arguing back and forth. This is about whether or not people who go to the workplace will be protected from damages to their nerves and to their muscles and to the skeletal system from the repetitive motion in the workplace.

We are all familiar with this. Members of Congress are familiar with this. Flight attendants now wear braces on their wrists and on their arms and on their hands because of repetitive motion. The checkers in the supermarket wear braces on their hands and their elbows because of repetitive motion.

If we go to Home Depot, we will see people wearing back braces to try to prevent repetitive motion. We will see people wearing braces on their hands, machine operators, lathe operators, people who go to work everyday and work very hard, and, yet, the Republicans are absolutely committed to not letting those regulations go in place, that not only will save those companies millions and millions of dollars in worker's compensation claims, but it will extend these individuals work lives so they can provide for their families so they will not have to take a job that pays them less, or they will not have to leave the workforce and live on disability.

Yet, in spite of what the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) pointed out,

in spite of the written promises, they are reneging on that, and they are fighting the President on that matter.

We are staying here for very real reasons that impact American's families, whether it is the kind of schools that their children go to and the failure to provide some help for those districts that want to construct schools but may not have the resources to do it, to provide them some interest breaks on those bonds so they can construct those schools.

Because the evidence is very clear, you can take a child from almost any economic or socioeconomic setting, from any background, and you put them with the first-class qualified teacher, with a first-class curriculum and in a first class school, and they learn like just about anyone else. We ought to, in fact, make sure that we can carry that out.

These fights are real, but they are about the future of the American family. It is about whether or not Medicare is going to be there for them, or whether or not we are simply going to reimburse the HMOs and the insurance companies that overpromised and failed to deliver to the senior citizens or those that just simply closed up shop and left hundreds of thousands of senior citizens in different regions of the country without a health care plan.

Let us remember what the original plan was. The original plan by the Republicans was if we joined an HMO, a Medicare HMO, we could not come back to the regular system. We almost shut the government down over that debate, but we prevailed and President Clinton prevailed to make sure that senior citizens that went to an HMO if it did not serve their needs could come back to the Medicare system.

If that law that they wanted then, that we fought and extended to Congress over, was in place, those people would be with no health care, no Medicare, because they would have chosen to go into a system that turned out to be a fly-by-night operation.

I just have one question to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). Continuing resolutions, this one for 24 hours or for 48 hours, we had one a few days ago for 4 days, the last continuing resolution was for 4 days and everybody went home. I thought continuing resolutions were supposed to be the President gave us some additional time to get the work done.

People are saying now that we are going to pass these continuing resolutions and people are going to go home again. I just do not understand how we go forward with these kinds of continuing resolutions that basically enable everyone to go home. I would hope that we would take that into consideration as Members vote on this CR.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), who just left the well, that we are doing 1-day CRs because

the President of the United States has told us that he would not sign anything other than a 1-day CR; so that is their decision.

We understand the power of the Presidency, and so we are prepared to accommodate that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I do not think our side was even going to talk on this. The partisan bickering, the rancoring that goes on here, I think that the American public can see what we are facing from our colleagues on the other side. They want to stay, all right. They want to stay not over policy, but for politics.

Do you know what I am most resentful about? That the other side and the last few speakers that talked about said that Democrats are the only ones that really care about education. The Democrats say they are the only ones that really care about school construction or Medicare or Medicaid or prescription drugs.

I worked most of my life here on this House floor. I fight, every ounce of my survival, to make sure that those issues are taken care of, not only for our children, but for our seniors as well.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the Speaker of the House, is a teacher and a coach. In his heart and in his mind and in his soul, he cares deeply about education.

I was a teacher and a coach both in high school and in college. It is one of the main focuses that I have. And for the other side to say that, we are so mean and rotten because of our policies. Well, let me tell you what the politics of this are. We will stay and fight for education. We will stay and fight for prescription drugs and for our seniors and health care.

I will not allow the other side to mislead, for example, on school construction. We could have school construction today. Our schools are crumbling. For 30 years, they had control of the education process. What is the outcome? We have some very good teachers and very good schools, which I am very fortunate in my district to have, in North San Diego County.

I have been to teacher awards, but across this Nation, we are last in math and science. That is a crime.

Mr. Speaker, we have to hire outside people with Ph.D.s to come in to our country to take over high-level and high-tech jobs because we do not have enough Ph.D.s; that is a crime.

But my colleagues on the other side would rather cater to the unions than to come out with education dollars.

Let me give you an idea. Why do you think they want school construction out of Federal dollars? Their campaigns are loaded with union boss money. I was in 18 districts over the last 3 months, the minimum amount that the unions had put against any

one of those candidates was a million dollars. They do not want to give up that lifeblood.

School construction out of Federal dollars falls under Davis-Bacon, the union or the prevailing wage, that costs about between 15 percent to 35 percent more for those States that have it. Let us waive Davis-Bacon just for school construction. Let us let the schools keep that money and build more schools or teacher training or teacher pay or class-size reduction.

But do you think my colleagues would do that? Absolutely not. We had it on the D.C. bill. Do you care about children? Do you care about schools, or do you care about your union bosses?

Well, I think it is very evident, because they will not. They know that many Republicans have union districts. When we bring it to a vote, we lose it because of the unions.

"The power," they talk about campaign finance reform; what a joke. What a joke.

I ran out of time the other day on education. But just like Goals 2000, they wanted the power for education to reside here in Washington, D.C. Goals 2000 is a good example.

There are 14 wills in the previous bill. A will for a lawyer means you will do this. One of those wills, you have to establish boards to see if you fall in the guidelines of Goals 2000. They say it is only voluntary, but only if you want the money.

Well, you establish a board to see if you are within the guidelines, then they send it to the regular Board of Education. The board sends it to the principal. The principal sends it to the superintendent. Then you have to send all of that paperwork, hours of labor, to Sacramento, CA.

Now, think about all the schools in California. Sending all of that paperwork to Sacramento. Think of the bureaucracy you have to have in Sacramento just to go through the paperwork. Then where do they send it? They send it back here to the Department of Education.

Now, think about all the schools in the United States sending all of that paperwork back here to the Department of Education. Think of the bureaucracy that they have to have back here. Then there is paperwork flow back and forth.

And so what happens? We get less money for education because of the bureaucrats in Washington, DC, because of the rules and the regulations. Federal education only covers about 7 percent of the funding, but it controls much of the funding from the State and local districts, and that is what my colleagues want.

They want government control of education, government control of private property. You want government control of health care. You want government to control everything. Not mean-spirited, that is what you believe. We believe in people, and we are willing to stay here and fight for peo-

ple of this country and have the rights of choice decisions for themselves.

Yes, we will stay back and fight, Mr. Speaker. We will fight for the people, not the union bosses.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Members are reminded that remarks in debate should be addressed to the Chair and not to others in the second person or by name.

Members are further reminded that they are to refrain from the use of profanity in debate.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1¼ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing partisan about citing the record. The public needs to know if there are any real differences between us, and I think I cited those differences without rancor and with accuracy and without questioning motives.

Mr. Speaker, let me simply say that I do find three things strange.

Our friends on the majority side brag about the fact that they raised education 50 percent during the time they have controlled the Congress, that is only because we defeated them in their efforts to cut education by huge amounts. We eventually forced them to add \$15 billion back to education spending.

On prescription drugs, they say they are for prescription drugs. But the record demonstrates they have been trying for a year to block a comprehensive benefit under Medicare and would target their package only to those at the near poverty level.

As far as the patients' bill of rights is concerned, their Presidential candidate claimed that he had been in support of the patients' bill of rights when, in fact, as Governor of Texas, he vetoed it, and then the second time around, when his tail feathers were being singed by public opinion, he let it become law without his signature.

Mr. Speaker, I think the record is clear on the divisions that are keeping us here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the distinguished Minority Leader.

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

0945

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this continuing resolution, our seventh in 5 weeks. But I deeply regret that we have reached this point. We should never have found ourselves in the mess that we are in, and we must stay here and work each day until we complete the business required by the law and for the American people.

Let us do the rare thing and come together in a bipartisan fashion to accomplish some meaningful things for the American people. Let us stop closed-door partisan meetings. No more sending up bills at 7 a.m. with only a few hours for review.

No more tax breaks for special interests and lopsided bills that we know the President will not sign.

There is a list of missed opportunities in this Congress. Republicans killed the bipartisan hate crimes law supported by large majorities of both houses. They support the pharmaceutical companies by refusing to let us even vote on a bill that puts prescription drug benefits in the reliable world of Medicare. Partisan tax packages are put together without consultation or negotiation with the President or Democrats in Congress.

Just yesterday, Republicans brought up a tax package that gave a lot to the HMOs and not enough to patients, people, hospitals, nursing homes, and home health care agencies.

Minimum wage increases are put in bills that give maximum benefit to special interest. And this week, Republicans tried to give more tax help to wealthy bondholders through school construction bonds that do not give public schools the incentives or the help they need to modernize their schools.

So we have amassed a record of partisanship with virtually no accomplishments. We still have time in the few remaining days of this session to work until the last hour of the last day. We can pass the Latino and Immigrant Fairness Act. We can pass the bipartisan hate crimes bill. We can pass a school construction credit that will really help local districts relieve the burden on local property taxpayers who may be willing to vote for bonds under those circumstances so that we can get smaller classroom sizes.

We can pass an enforceable, effective Patients' Bill of Rights. We can pass a prescription medicine program under Medicare that will allow everyone in a voluntary and universal way to be able to access that very important benefit.

We could pass campaign reform that gets rid of the flood of soft, non-Federal money in the campaigns. We could get meaningful gun safety legislation that would take the danger out of our classrooms and our other public institutions.

We still have an opportunity in these last days to get all of those things done, or at least some of them done. And so I plead with my friends on the other side of the aisle, and my side of the aisle, let us work together in the remaining hours of this session. Let us produce legislation that will be signed by the President and that will help all the people of this country.

Time is not yet up. We can do this. But to do it, it takes a spirit of bipartisanship and communication and working together to get these things done.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the minority leader again today, as I did the last time that he made this same speech calling for bipartisanship and all working together. I am all for that. I think we ought to do that. But

it is interesting. Almost immediately after he made the speech last week, all we heard from his side of the aisle was more partisan attacks, not even related to the issues that we were dealing with.

Of all of the things that we have heard talked about today, I do not think more than one or two of them had to do with appropriations. We are here today to deal with an appropriations matter, not all of these other issues, these authorizing issues, these legislating issues. I find it difficult to keep track of what bill is before the House when we hear all of the rhetoric that in my opinion is purely campaign rhetoric.

I think that those campaign speeches that we just heard this morning, I think that is about the 69th time that I have heard those same speeches in the last 60 days, and I think we should give them all a number. We could save the time of the House so that we could get about our business if we just took each one of their arguments and gave it a number. When they stand up, say "Argument Number 2, Argument Number 10," we could save a lot of time, because we have memorized their speeches. Those speeches that should have been reserved for the campaign trail, because that is where they belong, not in this House where the people's business has to come first.

We are also criticized for working at night. We work a lot of nights. We work all day long. And we work at night too. And not only the Republican side; the Democrats do too. Despite some of the accusations about secret meetings, in all of the negotiations the Republican Majority and the Democratic minority have been involved together and most of them have included representatives of the President from the White House.

We have tried to be as totally fair as we possibly could be. We did not learn that was the right thing to do from the time that we were the minority, because we were never given those kind of opportunities. We were never allowed to participate in the decision-making, and so we vowed that the minority party would have the opportunity that we did not have as a minority when we gained the majority. And I think we have been pretty true to that. I do not think that there is any room for any criticism that we have excluded the minority from any of these conversations.

Now, it is suggested that we ought to do everything that the President wants. Well, we are trying to accommodate the President, because he is the President and he has as much power at this stage of the appropriations process as two-thirds of this House and two-thirds of the Senate. Because if he decides to veto a bill, it takes two-thirds of the House and two-thirds of the Senate to override that veto. So he becomes very powerful in this process and that is why we have worked very diligently with the President's rep-

resentatives to try to accommodate him to the best of our ability.

Mr. Speaker, I will give an example on education. We have proposed in our legislation to provide considerably over a billion dollars more money for education than the President requested in his budget. The big holdup has been, we believe, that the local school officials, the elected school boards, in our counties and our districts should have the opportunity to decide if they need new school buildings? Do they need more teachers? Do they need more special education? Do they need books? Do they need supplies? They should make those decisions, not somebody sitting here in Washington.

The minority side would like people to believe that Republicans really do not support education. That is just as phony as it can be. We are strong supporters of education. Let me give an example. Most of my colleagues in the House are very much aware that for all of the years that I have been here, I have spent most of my time dealing with national defense issues, national security and intelligence. And that is a fact. I have spent a lot of time on that because that is important to our Nation. If we do not have a secure Nation, we do not have much else.

But after making all the speeches about national defense, let me suggest this. If we are going to sustain our position in the world due to high technology and state-of-the-art weapons and systems, and if we are going to sustain the ability of our young men and women to function with these systems and to operate them, we have got to have the best educational system possible. And I know that our strong national defense, our strong intelligence capabilities, our strong state-of-the-art technology, and the creation of new technology, do not happen if we do not have a strong and effective educational system.

Republicans believe that. That is why we are so committed to having a very strong educational system.

One of the issues that the minority leader mentioned just a few minutes ago was about the tax bill. That is not what is before us this morning. But he mentioned some of the groups that might have been affected by that tax bill. But one of our colleagues on our side, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) just the other day read off a list of the people and the groups who supported the tax bill, and the groups that he mentioned were all supporters of the tax bill. They did not oppose it. They supported it.

It is interesting when the government has a huge surplus of money, there are those who believe that surplus belongs to the government. Wrong. Wrong. That surplus belongs to the taxpayers of this great Nation. And just because it is there does not mean that the government should spend it. So the tax bill I think is supported dramatically by the American people.

Now, if we have a large surplus, how did it come about? We came into this

Congress as a majority party a few years back determined to balance the budget. We met all kind of resistance. We were told that we cannot do it, and we did not get much support from the other side to balance the budget. But we balanced it, and today they will stand and take credit for it.

We turned the tables on those who were downsizing our national defense, and we began to rebuild. We began to replace spare parts that were needed. We began to create a much better quality of life for people in our military. We gave them the largest pay raise last year, another pay raise this year that the Congress initiated, but the administration is taking credit for it. We balanced the budget. We have a surplus.

Mr. Speaker, since I became chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, we have not spent one dime out of the Social Security Trust Fund, and yet there are those candidates running around the country today saying, "Oh, be careful of those Republicans. They are going to destroy your Social Security." Not true, Mr. Speaker. That is a phony argument and a phony accusation. We are the ones who stopped the raid on the Social Security fund.

We have a record to be proud of in our appropriations bills. We are proud of that record too because this House of Representatives under our leadership passed all of our appropriations bills a long time ago. The holdup and the delay has not come from the House. The additional spending, the additional projects have not come from the House.

But, Mr. Speaker, one of the biggest problems is all of the extraneous material, the 69 campaign speeches we have heard in the last 2 months. Those campaign speeches have talked about policy issues that some people would like to decide on in an appropriation bill. Well, there is a regular order in this House of Representatives on how we deal with those issues. We have numerous authorizing committees that have the jurisdiction and the responsibility to deal with those big issues. It has long been a practice that appropriation bills are appropriation bills and we do not legislate on appropriation bills, unless there is an exceptionally valid reason to do so.

But now they want us to take all of the philosophical issues that are out there and lump them on to an appropriation bill without hearings, without the opportunity for the House to deal with those issues directly. They want to lump them on to an appropriation bill. And why is that? Because appropriation bills have to pass. If appropriation bills do not pass, then the government does not function.

Mr. Speaker, we have approached our responsibilities in what I think is a very responsible way. I would prefer not to be here today with this one-day continuing resolution. We tried to meet yesterday with representatives from the President's office. They were not available to us yesterday so that we could work on the last bill. There is

only one bill left out there. We hope to meet all day today with the administration and with the minority party on that one bill. And if we have to, we will go into the night. And if it takes going into the night, we are going to do it. And then we will be accused, of course, of doing something in the dark of night. But if we are going to work 16 or 18 hours a day, a lot of that time is dark time.

We are going to work to get the people's job done. We are not here to make political campaign speeches in this House. We are here to do our job in a responsible fashion. We are here to put the people's business above politics. When we leave here, we will go home and that is where we will do our politics.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a "yes" vote on the CR, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The joint resolution is considered as having been read for amendment.

Pursuant to House Resolution 646, 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 the 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. OBEY. 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 366, nays 13, not voting 53, as follows:

[Roll No. 563]
YEAS—366

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggart
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich

Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson

Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combust
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Coyne
Crane
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
DeLahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint

Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inlee
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Klecza
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuykendall

LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley

Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Townes
Traffant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watt (NC)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—13

Baird
Capuano

Costello
DeFazio

Dingell
Ford

Frank (MA)	Miller, George	Visclosky
Hilliard	Pastor	
Kaptur	Stupak	

1018

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE—IN THE MATTER OF REFUSALS TO COMPLY WITH SUBPOENAS ISSUED BY COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES

Mr. GUTIERREZ 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:

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 563, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House and, by direction of the Committee on Resources, I call up a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-801).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the report.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONTEMPT OF CONGRESS

REPORT ON THE REFUSALS TO COMPLY WITH SUBPOENAS ISSUED BY THE COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES

NOT VOTING—53

Barr	Hefley	Mollohan
Barton	Hinchey	Olver
Bilbray	Hutchinson	Peterson (PA)
Campbell	Isakson	Regula
Chenoweth-Hage	Jefferson	Sanders
Clay	Johnson, Sam	Serrano
Cox	Kasich	Shays
Cramer	Kingston	Spratt
Crowley	Klink	Stark
Danner	Kolbe	Talent
Dickey	Lazio	Tauzin
Dixon	Martinez	Thompson (MS)
Dunn	McCollum	Watkins
Fattah	McCrery	Watts (OK)
Fowler	McInnis	Waxman
Franks (NJ)	McIntosh	Weiner
Ganske	McIntyre	Wise
Gilchrest	Metcalf	