

surplus. I urge an "aye" vote on this measure.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I think this resolution is accurate but misleading.

The resolution says it's the desire of the House not to rely on funds from the Social Security trust fund for extraneous purposes, and to continue to retire the publicly held federal debt. I think that's accurate, because that is the desire—at least the professed desire—of all or nearly all Members. Certainly it expresses my preference.

However, it is misleading because it suggests that the House can escape arithmetic—and we can't. According to the Congressional Budget Office, some of all of the funds in question will end up being used for purposes other than those cited in this resolution.

That's not all bad, in my opinion. Congress should respond to true emergencies, such as those experienced by the victims of hurricanes and floods, and to other crisis situations at home and abroad. But we should not try to mislead people about what is involved.

We should be straightforward about our arithmetic, and not resort to phony book-keeping devices such as pretending that the constitutionally required census is an unforeseen emergency. We also should be candid about the fact that all these estimates of future surpluses or deficits depend on assumptions, including assumptions about the realism and desirability of the funding levels set in the 1997 budget agreement.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will vote for this resolution because I agree that bolstering Social Security and reducing the federal debts should be our top priorities. But I hope none of the resolution's supporters want to mislead people about what actually has been occurring this year in terms of the tax bill and the appropriations bills. We need to be straight with the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 306.

The question was taken.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 305 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 305

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 68) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes. The joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution

to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from South Boston, Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), my very good and hard working and overworked friend; pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time that I will be yielding will, as usual, be for debate purposes only.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for consideration of H.J. Res. 68, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2000. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the resolution and provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule provides for one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, for 5 years, Republicans in Congress have repeatedly made the tough decisions necessary to get our Nation's fiscal house in order. The hard work of American taxpayers, combined with our commitment to spend their money wisely, has resulted in the first 2-year budget surplus since the 1950s.

I am very proud to say that our victory over irresponsible spending has been so overwhelming that maintaining a balanced budget is now a priority, not only for Republicans, but for the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and other Members on the other side of the aisle who join with us in our quest for maintaining balanced budgets.

Now it is time for us to take the next step and live up to the contract that we have made with America's voters. People will say it cannot be done. People will claim that we are threatening our important national needs. I happen to disagree with that assertion.

□ 1230

We cannot lose sight of the fact that the \$1.7 trillion budget for fiscal year 2000 is the largest amount of Federal spending that we have ever had.

I do not believe that the unexpected tax revenue coming from hardworking Americans is a windfall given to the President and those of us in Congress to spend on nice-sounding, poll-tested programs.

First and foremost, our budget decisions should be made after we set aside the Social Security surplus, and we just had that debate on this resolution, which is obviously key to providing long-term retirement security to mil-

lions of Americans. Just like with balancing the budget, this will require hard work and fiscal discipline.

So far, under the very able leadership of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), who is sitting here to my right, the House and the other body have each passed 12 out of the 13 appropriations bills. One bill, as we know, has already been signed into law, and we hope to have eight more ready for the President's signature before the fiscal year ends on Thursday. I guess we already do have three that are over on the President's desk right now we are hoping that he will sign, although I guess we have heard he is scheduled to veto one of them today.

The bottom line is that we are committed to getting the appropriations work done right here in the Congress. And I think, again, that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has done a superb job in this effort. This continuing resolution will allow the Federal Government to continue its normal operations while we meet that goal that we are pursuing.

Now, it should go without saying that continuing resolutions like the one we are going to be considering here, as soon as we report out this rule, are a normal part of the annual budget process. As my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), knows very well, when they were in the majority, it was routine for many appropriations agreements to get hammered out with the President during the month of October.

While we work in a bipartisan effort to wrap up the appropriations bills just as soon as possible, we on this side of the aisle remain focused on our Nation's top priorities: Saving Social Security and Medicare, which, again, was discussed in the last resolution we just had with us; restoring our Nation's defense posture; improving public education; and providing tax relief for working Americans.

We are making real progress on these fronts, passing the Social Security lockbox, the National Ballistic Missile Defense Act, the Education Flexibility Act, and the Teacher Empowerment Act. Although the President chose to veto the Taxpayer Refund and Relief Act, we remain committed to providing meaningful tax relief to the people who have, in fact, created this anticipated \$3.4 trillion surplus.

Completing the appropriations process is more than just an accounting procedure. Throughout this process, we need to keep our broader priorities in mind. I am very confident that H.J. Res. 68 will give us the time to get that job done within the next 3 weeks.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear colleague and dear friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, here we go again. Every single year as October approaches, my

Republican colleagues remember they were supposed to be passing appropriation bills in order to keep the government open for business. And every single year, we pass continuing resolutions to keep these things going until they can finish the one responsibility that they are given, and that is just passing the appropriation bills.

Now, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has done an outstanding job, but there are just things that are beyond his control. This new fiscal year will start in only 3 days, and just like the past few years, the appropriation bills are not finished. In order to keep the Federal Government open for business, Congress must either pass nine more appropriation bills that the President can sign by October 1, or pass this continuing resolution.

I would hope the bills would be finished on time. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the Speaker, said they would be finished at the end of the summer. Then, on CNN-Late Edition on September 19, he said they would be finished on time. Today, September 28, the fiscal year is 3 days away and one appropriations bill has not even been reported out of committee. There still are nine unfinished appropriations bills, and getting them done even by the time this continuing resolution expires is going to be a very tall order.

In addition to breaking the promise to finish the appropriations bills on time, my Republican colleagues have broken a promise not to raid the Social Security Trust Fund. According to the Congressional Budget Office, not according to me or the Democratic party, the Congressional Budget Office, the House has already spent the \$14 billion budget surplus plus an additional \$16 billion of the Social Security surplus.

And they are only getting started, Mr. Speaker. They have outlined plans to pass supplemental appropriations bills of over \$10 billion. And where will that money come from? It will come from the Social Security surplus.

Once upon a time, my Republican colleagues promised to keep congressional spending under budget caps. They promised to make whatever cuts they needed to stay within the spending outlines that they themselves had set. Now, 3 days before the end of the fiscal year, the promises of cuts have fallen by the wayside.

They are pretending to stay within the caps by using gimmicks like emergency spending and forward funding; treating the census, which occurs every 10 years like clockwork, as emergency spending; treating low-income home energy heating as emergency spending. Hello, George Orwell, here we are.

Still, Mr. Speaker, broken promises aside, we need to prevent another government shutdown. And the only way we can make sure this does not happen is we have to pass this resolution. Once we do that, I hope my colleagues will get serious about passing the remaining nine bills. And I hope that they will pass bills that respond to the American

people, that the President can sign, rather than respond to special interests that the President is sure to veto.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to act responsibly. It is time to get this work done.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, that I am happy to associate myself with many of the comments just made by my friend from South Boston. And, frankly, the one with which I am most proud to associate myself is his strong praise of the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I want to compliment him and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) for the drill that they experienced yesterday in the changing times on their schedule and the interruption during the hearing last night. But they have, as usual, done a very good job.

I will not take any time other than to say there is no reason not to pass this rule. Everyone pretty much agrees on the resolution that we will be presenting here in just a few minutes.

So, Mr. Speaker, again I want to congratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) for the outstanding job he does as chairman of the Committee on Rules, and just suggest that we move this rule and get on with the continuing resolution, because some of us have conference committees to attend today, and we need to get busy finalizing the last few bills that are out there.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman who chaired the Committee on Appropriations the only time it finished the appropriations bills on time in 40 years.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, let me simply say there is nothing new about the Congress not finishing its appropriations bills on time. That has happened many times, and it will undoubtedly happen again in the future. My concern is not so much that all of the bills have not been finished, my concern is the mind-set which has led us to this situation. And that mind-set can be revealed by describing what happened to the appropriations bills over the last 8 months.

First, this House spent 3 months trying to impeach the President of the United States. It then spent the next 8 months trying to pass a huge tax package, which would have prevented us from putting one additional dime into Social Security, into Medicare, and the like. It has, today, just debated a resolution which says we pledge not to spend one dime of the Social Security

surplus at the very moment that papers are being circulated for the agriculture conference report which adds \$700 million to the appropriations bill in the form of so-called emergency spending which will raise to well over \$20 billion the amount of money that has already been spent by this House out of the Social Security surplus.

Then we have one other complicating factor. Seven times the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the Republican majority on the committee worked in cooperation with the Democratic minority to produce bills which were bipartisan and signable. And each time he was cut off at the pass by the militant elements of his own caucus which said, no way, Jose, we do not want that kind of coalition that can pass these bills with a coalition of the great middle, a majority of the people on both sides or in both parties. Instead, we want 13 bills which reflect only our vision of what this country ought to look like. And so they turned seven bipartisan bills into seven partisan war zones. And, as a consequence, we now sit here with only less than 5 percent of the total Federal budget completed by both Houses.

I do not for one moment blame the Republican majority on the Committee on Appropriations for this situation. I do blame a mind-set which has allowed the appropriations process to be hijacked by a militant element within the majority party caucus which says our way or no way time and time again, and leaves us in a situation today where we are still, in my judgment, months away from having a real compromise between the White House and between both parties in this Congress.

In the end, the right people will learn one essential fact; that appropriations bills cannot be passed solely on one side of the aisle. In the end, they will recognize what virtually every Member of Congress has learned before them; that in order to pass appropriations bills, we must have coalitions made up of Members of both parties. Because those bills are too complicated and deal with too many conflicting concerns and values to do otherwise.

So that is the reality we face here today. We have a 3-week CR which will keep the government open for another 3 weeks. The question is whether in that time people will really get serious about passing bipartisan appropriations or whether they will continue the policy of confrontation and the other fictions attendant to the debate that took place in this House just a few minutes ago.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am not a member of the Committee on Appropriations or the Committee on the Budget, and seldom do I come to the floor to speak on appropriations or budget matters. And I would not be here this afternoon but

for the fact that I was sitting in my office watching the debate on the previous resolution that was passed. And that resolution was one where we are pledging to not spend any of the Social Security surplus in this year's appropriations process when I know full well that the appropriations bills that are on the table now have already done that.

□ 1245

And so one of the Members asked the question, Well, what harm does this resolution do? And I just could not sit there any longer and be quiet in the face of absolute dishonesty with the American people. If there is one thing we have an obligation to do, it seems to me, is to at least say to the American people the truth about what we are doing. Otherwise, this House and every Member of this House loses integrity.

It seems to me that, while this may not be germane to the rule that we are debating now or to the appropriations bills that will be coming forward, certainly we should be honest with the American people and tell them the truth about what we are doing.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, every October, without fail, the end of the fiscal year arrives. Yet, ever since taking control of the House, the Republican leadership has failed to meet this October 1 inevitable deadline, this deadline. Every 12 months there is an October 1.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, would the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not have enough time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield time to the gentlewoman. I will just say that that just is not an accurate statement because we have in fact been able to meet the deadline.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, this is my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield the gentlewoman an additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for an additional minute.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, so every year October 1 comes along, every 12 months.

So while my Republican colleagues are running around trying to take care of the fiscal logjam they have again created, I want to know and we have to ask ourselves, all of us, when we do this, who is taking care of our children? Where is today's rule for our children?

Our children do not need political posturing. They do not need budget schemes on Capitol Hill. They need

more funding for education. They need quality, accessible health care. And they need the surplus invested in Social Security and Medicare. And most of all, they need our national debt to be paid down so that we will protect their future, and they need it now.

So again I ask my Republican colleagues, while they are playing games with their future, where is the rule that says our children come first?

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

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

Mr. Speaker, I first heard of concurrent resolutions when I worked in the Pentagon years ago. I remember the assistant general counsel for fiscal matters at the Pentagon, Murray Lamin explaining it this way: this is a confession of failure on the part of Congress. Congress is saying, in effect, we did not get our job done, so keep spending money the way they spent it last year until we catch up with them and tell them otherwise.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the ranking Democrat on the Committee on the Budget to say, this is no way to make a budget. I regret that we have been brought by the majority to this juncture, but I have to say it has been clear since last April that this is where we were headed.

The resolution that we passed, the House budget resolution, was always unrealistic. We tried to make that point in earnest in the well of the House when we took it up last March. We did not succeed. We reiterated the same arguments when the tax bill came before us. And we said, to accomplish this tax bill, \$792 billion, we will have to make cuts in discretionary spending that exceeds anything Congress has ever done before. It is not realistic. These cuts in the 10th year could reach as much as 30 percent across the board in nondefense discretionary spending, as much as 50 percent in discretionary spending non-defense in the items that could actually be cut. We have never done anything like that before.

So what we have before us right now is a reality test, and it is well that it has come, because the reality is that this resolution simply will not work. We cannot get it passed. It cannot be implemented. It is well that we have this reality test before we locked it in place, particularly the tax bill we had before us last August. Because what is happening now just foreshadows the budget difficulties that we would have every year for the next 10 years, at least, had we passed that tax bill premised on deep, unrealistic cuts in discretionary spending.

The majority keeps telling us, they have since last April, that they will not touch Social Security. We all have endeavored to try to minimize the amount of money we have taken out of

Social Security, and each year we have done better and better. But the truth of the matter is, the majority all the time, they were repeating this as if it were their mantra, every one of their leadership has said it different ways, we are not going to take a dime out of Social Security, as they were repeating it, they were doing just that.

As I said earlier on the floor, do not take my word for it. Dan Crippen, Director of CBO, confirmed it to me in a letter August 26. As of that point, they were already \$16 billion in the Social Security surplus. Since then because of other spending they are at least \$11 billion more into the Social Security surplus.

Now, to do what we just did, comply with the resolution we just took up and close this budget on those terms, they have got to take at least 10 of the 13 appropriations bills back up and remark those bills. We cannot even close the budget as it is. Now we are going to send them back, is that what we are proposing to do, did and tell them to take \$30 billion out of the mark already? It is not realistic.

We will all vote for this concurrent resolution. Most of us will vote for this resolution. But I hope it is not an excuse for more delay and more denial. What we need is bipartisan cooperation to close this budget on grounds that are fiscally realistic.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, today we face, as too often we have, an emergency. That emergency is that we have not done our work; and, therefore, we must pass a continuing resolution to make sure that the Government stays in operation.

This is not the first time that has happened. It has happened under the leadership of both Democrats and Republicans. However, we are in a unique situation. And the emergency of which I speak is not a concocted emergency, as some would call the national census. Nor do we face an "emergency," as some like in dealing with LIHEAP, the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program.

One does not have to be a Member of Congress or a meteorologist to understand that, come winter, it is going to get cold outside and in some places it is hot and we need to fund LIHEAP.

These are not, however, the real emergencies facing America today. They are the contrived kind of gimmicks designed to do nothing more than to try to help the majority make its budget add up. The real emergency

we are facing here today is this body's inability to get its work done on time.

Under our Constitution, there is only one major legislative task required of Congress, and that is to pass the spending bills that fund the basic operations of Government. We will fail to accomplish that constitutional duty when the current fiscal year ends at midnight on Thursday and the new year begins at 12:01 on Friday.

I, of course, am for this continuing resolution. I would hasten to add that, in my opinion, had the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), been leading this effort or, very frankly, the chairman of our subcommittees been leading this effort, particularly the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, we would not be in this position today.

It is, however, the thoughts of a minority of this House that have put us in this position, who, as the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget have observed, have demanded that we do unrealistic things that the majority of this House will not do, which is why the Labor, Health markup was put off at least four times, and now has produced a bill which is unrealistic in terms of what the ranking member so eloquently pointed out. There is no excuse for that.

Frankly, I think the 3-week continuing resolution we are considering today is too long, but it ought to be passed and the President ought to sign it.

When the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT) took the gavel on January 6, he said, "We must get our job done. We have an obligation to pass all appropriations bills by this summer." We have not done that. Not because of the Committee on Appropriations was not able to do that, but because this House and the Senate were not able to pass the unrealistic demand of a minority of this House.

Since then, the leaders of the majority party repeatedly have told us that their primary goal was to make the trains run on time. Well, we all know that that budget process is running about as efficiently as the Washington, D.C., area does sometimes during a snowstorm.

Look at the numbers. To date, the President has signed into law only one, only one, of the 13 bills that we are supposed to pass. Two await his signature. And a third, the D.C. appropriations bill, clearly is going to be vetoed.

Frankly, let me say on the D.C. bill, everybody knows that that bill is going to be vetoed. We went through an exercise to make a social point, not a budget point, to make a point on one or more issues and to try to embarrass one or more sides. Frankly, we are almost in as bad shape as we were in 1995, when the Federal Government shut down, not once on November 19, 1995, but twice over the holiday period of Christmas and New Year's.

If my colleagues will remember, back on September 30, 1995, Congress had not

passed a single spending bill. Over the next 7 months, it took 15 different legislative measures, 15, to fund the Federal Government for fiscal year 1996. The last one, an omnibus appropriations bill, was not enacted until April 26, some 8 months, 7-plus months into the fiscal year. The fiscal year was almost half over.

Now that, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, was a real emergency. What the American people and more than, frankly, one million Federal employees who were furloughed during the two Government shutdowns during 1995 want to know is this: Is that where we are headed again today?

Now, I say that in the context of the fact that some people on the majority party, not anybody on the Committee on Appropriations are saying, we are not going to talk to the President.

Let me remind my colleagues of an extraordinary speech that Speaker Gingrich gave to what he called the perfectionist caucus of his party. That is the caucus who said, do it my way or no way, and that led to shutdown and no way.

Speaker Gingrich pointed out, I would remind my friends, that the American public have selected Republicans, Democrats, Senators, and a President and they expected us to work together, and we cannot work together, I say to my friend on the majority side, if you will not talk to the coequal branch of Government, headed up by the President of the United States.

Government is the art of compromise. I say "art" because it is necessary to accomplish the objectives the American public sent us here to do. It is necessary to do that to talk to one another.

I see my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG). I want to tell the American public, if the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) were in charge, this would not happen. We would be finished with most of our work, maybe not all of it, but certainly most of it. And the chairman would have sat down with Chairman STEVENS and President Clinton, maybe not directly, maybe through staff, maybe on the telephone, but they would have sat down and they would have said, how do we make this work, realizing that nobody is going to get 100 percent.

The tragedy, my friends, is that we ought not to be here today passing a CR but for the intransigence of some. A minority of this House, not the majority, a minority of this House, has tied up these bills with unrealistic expectations both from a policy standpoint and from a fiscal standpoint. What great news we have for the American public in the context of 2 years in a row a budget surplus, the first time in 50 years that that has happened, \$115 billion surplus that we have, and yet we are mired in inability to do our work on time.

I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) for yielding me the time. I, obviously, will support

this continuing resolution. But I will say to my friends in this House that I believe we ought not to pass a second resolution 3 weeks from now unless and only if meaningful progress and discussions have been made to reach agreement between those that the people of the United States have elected, the President, the House, and the Senate. We can do our business and we can do it in the next 21 days if that willful minority will let us proceed.

□ 1300

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the comments of my good friend from Maryland, a very important member of the Committee on Appropriations. I agree with him that the branches of government should communicate with each other. In fact, just a few days ago on the conference meeting on the Energy and Water bill, the administration had a problem with part of the language, and we invited them in to talk about it, and we resolved it in a manner that was satisfactory to both branches of government.

I want to say to my friend who has just left the floor that during the meetings that some of us had with the President during the bombing war over Kosovo, we met at the White House, and we all had a chance to discuss certain things with the President. This was back early in the year. On one occasion when the President recognized this Member to make whatever comment I wanted to make, I said directly to the President, "Mr. President, there are budgetary problems for fiscal year 2000 because of the 1997 budget agreement that put caps on our spending at \$17 billion less than it was the year before." And I said, "Mr. President, I think it is important for you personally to be engaged in this dialogue." So I considered that an invitation for the President to be involved in the conversations about the budget and about these appropriations bills.

We have made the opening. We made the offer. We made the request of the President to get engaged. It was his decision not to do so.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

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

During the first 7 months of this year in this Republican House, we met for a total of 87 days. In those 87 days, the House managed to pass a little less than five bills per month that actually have been enacted into law. This is significantly less than even the record-setting do-nothing Republican Congress of the last two years. It is a truly awe-inspiring record of the Republican

leadership working so very, very hard to accomplish so very, very little.

There are so many issues out there that demand the attention of this Congress: public education quality; health care; the repeated requests from all over this country for this Congress to address the matter of the rights of those who are in managed health care organizations; the requests of our seniors from all over this country to provide a mechanism for getting prescription drugs at a reasonable price; the desire of so many Americans to see that their private health care records that contain confidential information that should be just between them and their health care provider, but they see this information spread out across the Internet and shared with others, those privacy rights, very, very great concern. Certainly the question with health care, even a more modest bill but vitally important to many American citizens who are currently disabled, to try to help them keep their health insurance so they can get back in the workforce. These are all measures that this Congress should be considering, should be acting on, but over the last year this Congress has failed to address any of these issues. Questions of environmental quality, of the amount of public lands that are available, whether we are protecting against the devastation of our natural resources and the spoiling of our air and our water. The question of tax equity and tax fairness. I have a bill myself concerning the way that some corporations are cheating and gaming the system and causing the rest of us to have to pay more than our fair share of taxes because they use tax loopholes and exploit their position and think that because they are big enough, they can get away with these corporate tax loopholes that are so abusive, a bill that we have been unable to even get a hearing on in this Congress.

So on one issue after another, and I have named only a few of the issues that this Congress should be attending to, it has not been because this Republican Congress has been attending to other business, to the Nation's business, to the priorities of the American people that it has failed to address the appropriations process, because it has not done anything about any of these problems, either.

And so we find ourselves coming now to the final month and the 11th hour of this Federal fiscal year. And what work has been done? Well, nine of the 13 appropriations bills necessary to prevent the government from having to shut down, nine of those appropriations bills have not even been sent to President Clinton to consider. We know that on some of them because of all the unrelated riders and attempt to change the social policy and overturn the environmental policy that this administration has pursued, that some of those bills will be vetoed and sent back for congressional consideration, but nine of the 13 have not even been sent over

for the President to react to, and here we are literally hours before the end of this fiscal year.

One of those 13 bills has not even had a first draft written. The Republican leadership has scheduled one of the largest appropriations bills for the last day, the 365th day of the Federal fiscal year, they finally decided to meet together as a committee and to try to come up with a first draft, not presenting it now to the President, not even presenting it now for a vote in this House but just to get together amongst themselves and work out that first draft of this important legislation.

It just so happens that that final spending bill contains all the Federal funding for education. It contains the Federal funding for our research and investigation of health care at the National Institutes for Health. It contains much of the funding that is so important to our seniors, such as Meals on Wheels, a program that has been jeopardized by the whole Republican approach to budgeting.

On all of these matters the Republicans have basically said, "That's our last priority," because it is the bill they waited until the last day of the year to even consider.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the gentleman from Wisconsin would agree with the observation that this is a "Congress that has a rendezvous with obscurity."

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, my concern is also that this is a Congress which has a rendezvous with prevarication.

We just heard a lot of debate on the previous bill where Members promised that they would not be dipping into the deficit and promised they would not be dipping into Social Security. We have had a lot of posing for pictures about resisting breaking the budget caps. I want Members to understand when they vote for this continuing resolution, Members who vote for the continuing resolution will be voting to break the caps, because if this continuing resolution were to be carried out on an annualized basis, which is the only prudent way you can score it, it would mean that we would be spending more than \$30 billion above the amount allowed by the caps.

So before people cast these silly, meaningless and in some case prevaricating votes, I would urge them to recognize what in fact they are doing when they support this continuing resolution. It is about time we face reality.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. I would like to begin by praising my friend from Wisconsin, the former chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, now ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. He is correct when he

pointed to the fact that he was able to complete the 13 appropriations bills for fiscal year 1995 when he served as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. There is a big difference, though.

Obviously we know that the work was done in 1989, completing those 13 appropriations bills, and it was done under this majority in 1997. So basically three times in the last two decades it has been done. I again congratulate the gentleman from Wisconsin for having accomplished that. But between 1994 when he completed his work and today, something has happened, and, that is, we are living within amazing constraints that did not exist when he was chairman of the committee. For starters, the United States Senate was in the hands of Democrats, the United States House of Representatives was in the hands of Democrats, and we had a Democrat in the White House, which was an important issue. And as the gentleman last night said, appropriately, he worked with the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations to deal with the 302(b) allocations in a bipartisan way.

But the real difference that has taken place is, as the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) very appropriately corrected his earlier statement, we did not have a balanced budget when we dealt with this in 1994. He did complete the 13 appropriations bills on time, but we did not have a balanced budget.

So what we have done twixt 1994 and today is that we are living with the 1997 balanced budget agreement which was put into place and as we all know has in fact brought about this surplus that we are all arguing over.

Now, a lot of finger-pointing has taken place from my friends on the other side of the aisle towards the Republicans. We are here today with a continuing resolution which the gentleman from Florida is going to be very ably handling in a bipartisan way in just a few minutes when we complete the debate on this rule, because we have been working with the President. We are in fact meeting our constitutional obligations. And while it does not appear terribly likely, even some on our side of the aisle would say it, we are still desperately trying to reach that midnight deadline, day after tomorrow, and have the 13 appropriations bills done.

Now, the gentleman from Maryland was correct when he said that Speaker HASTERT on his opening day said that we would complete our appropriations work, getting these bills out of the House, by the summer. Just before we adjourned in early August for that 5-week period, we had completed the work on 12 of the 13 bills. Unfortunately the day that we adjourned, we received the tragic news of the death of the father of our colleague the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and

Independent Agencies. For that reason we were not able to complete that work just before we went into the recess. So we would have had 12 of the 13 bills accomplished.

And so I think that with again the narrowest majority that we have had in nearly five decades, that Speaker HASTERT was very, very close to being on target in what obviously is a very difficult situation. So we are trying to do our constitutional duty. I think we are doing pretty darn well in accomplishing that. We are here on this 3-week continuing resolution.

I hope, as the gentleman from Wisconsin said and as the gentleman from Maryland said, that we will not have to have another continuing resolution. I hope that we are going to have an agreement which will allow us to move ahead and get this work done and let us adjourn by the October 29 deadline that the Speaker has said he wants us to meet.

I encourage strong support of this rule and the continuing resolution. At this moment, I am going to go back upstairs to the Committee on Rules where we are reporting out the rule on yet another conference report, the Foreign Operations conference report, and we will have that tomorrow here on the floor. So we are on target and doing everything we can. I urge support of this rule and the bill itself.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 305, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 68) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000, 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 68 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 68

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of Government for the fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1999 for continuing projects or activities including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees (not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution) which were conducted in the fiscal year 1999 and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority would be available in the following appropriations Acts:

(1) the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000;

(2) the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000, notwithstanding section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, section 701 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, section 313 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103-236), and section 53 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act;

(3) the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000, notwithstanding section 504(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947;

(4) the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 2000;

(5) the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2000;

(6) the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2000, notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91-672 and section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956;

(7) the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000;

(8) the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000, the House or Senate reported version of which, if such reported version exists, shall be deemed to have passed the House or Senate respectively as of October 1, 1999, for the purposes of this joint resolution, unless a reported version is passed as of October 1, 1999, in which case the passed version shall be used in place of the reported version for purposes of this joint resolution;

(9) the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2000;

(10) the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000;

(11) the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 2000; and

(12) the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000:

Provided, That whenever the amount which would be made available or the authority which would be granted in these Acts as passed by the House and Senate as of October 1, 1999, is different than that which would be available or granted under current operations, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate: *Provided further,* That whenever there is no amount made available under any of these appropriations Acts as passed by the House and Senate as of October 1, 1999, for a continuing project or activity which was conducted in fiscal year 1999 and for which there is fiscal year 2000 funding included in the budget request, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued at the rate for current operations under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1999.

(b) Whenever the amount which would be made available or the authority which would be granted under an Act listed in this section as passed by the House as of October 1, 1999, is different from that which would be available or granted under such Act as passed by the Senate as of October 1, 1999, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 2000 and under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1999.

(c) Whenever an Act listed in this section has been passed by only the House or only the Senate as of October 1, 1999, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued

under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the one House at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate and under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1999: *Provided,* That whenever there is no amount made available under any of these appropriations Acts as passed by the House or the Senate as of October 1, 1999, for a continuing project or activity which was conducted in fiscal year 1999 and for which there is fiscal year 2000 funding included in the budget request, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued at the rate for current operations under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1999.

(d) If the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000, has not been reported in either the House or the Senate as of October 1, 1999, continuing projects or activities that were conducted in fiscal year 1999 shall be continued at the current rate under the appropriation, fund or authority and terms and conditions provided in the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999.

SEC. 102. No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used for new production of items not funded for production in fiscal year 1999 or prior years, for the increase in production rates above those sustained with fiscal year 1999 funds, or to initiate, resume, or continue any project, activity, operation, or organization which are defined as any project, subproject, activity, budget activity, program element, and subprogram within a program element and for investment items are further defined as a P-1 line item in a budget activity within an appropriation account and an R-1 line item which includes a program element and subprogram element within an appropriation account, for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during the fiscal year 1999: *Provided,* That no appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used to initiate multi-year procurements utilizing advance procurement funding for economic order quantity procurement unless specifically appropriated later.

SEC. 103. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner which would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 104. No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during the fiscal year 1999.

SEC. 105. No provision which is included in an appropriations Act enumerated in section 101 but which was not included in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 1999 and which by its terms is applicable to more than one appropriation, fund, or authority shall be applicable to any appropriation, fund, or authority provided in this joint resolution.

SEC. 106. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until (a) enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution, or (b) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act by both Houses without any provision for such project or activity, or (c) October 21, 1999, whichever first occurs.

SEC. 107. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution

shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any program, project, or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this joint resolution.

SEC. 108. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 109. No provision in the appropriations Act for the fiscal year 2000 referred to in section 101 of this Act that makes the availability of any appropriation provided therein dependent upon the enactment of additional authorizing or other legislation shall be effective before the date set forth in section 106(c) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 110. Appropriations and funds made available by or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in section 1513 of title 31, United States Code, but nothing herein shall be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds.

SEC. 111. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the joint resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 112. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, for those programs that had high initial rates of operation or complete distribution of fiscal year 1999 appropriations at the beginning of that fiscal year because of distributions of funding to States, foreign countries, grantees or others, similar distributions of funds for fiscal year 2000 shall not be made and no grants shall be awarded for such programs funded by this resolution that would impinge on final funding prerogatives.

SEC. 113. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, the rate for operations for projects and activities that would be funded under the heading "International Organizations and Conferences, Contributions to International Organizations" in the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000, shall be the amount provided by the provisions of section 101 multiplied by the ratio of the number of days covered by this resolution to 366.

SEC. 114. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, the rate for operations for the following activities funded with Federal Funds for the District of Columbia, shall be at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate, multiplied by the ratio of the number of days covered by this joint resolution to 366: Corrections Trustee Operations, Public Defender Services, Parole Revocation, Adult Probation, Offender Supervision, Sex Offender Registration, Pretrial Services, District of Columbia Courts, and Defender Services in District of Columbia Courts.

SEC. 115. Activities authorized by sections 1309(a)(2), as amended by Public Law 104-208, and 1376(c) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), may continue through the date specified in section 106(c) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 116. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, the rate for operations for reimbursement of past losses for the Commodity Credit Corporation Fund shall be \$11,500,000,000.

SEC. 117. Notwithstanding section 235(a)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2195(a)(2)), the authority of section 234(a) (b) and (c), of the same Act, shall remain in effect during the period of this joint resolution.

SEC. 118. Notwithstanding sections 101, 104, and 106 of this joint resolution, funds may be used to initiate or resume projects or activities at a rate in excess of the current rate to the extent necessary, consistent with existing agency plans, to achieve Year 2000 (Y2K) computer compliance and for implementation of business continuity and contingency plans.

SEC. 119. Notwithstanding sections 101 and 104 of this joint resolution, not to exceed \$189,524,382 shall be available for projects and activities for decennial census programs for the period covered by this joint resolution.

SEC. 120. Notwithstanding section 101 of this joint resolution, the rate for operations for projects and activities funded by accounts in the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000 as passed by the House and Senate affected by the foreign affairs reorganization shall be at the current rate for the accounts funding such projects and activities in the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999, distributed into the accounts established in the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000 as passed by the House and Senate.

SEC. 121. Notwithstanding section 309(g) of the United States International Broadcasting Act of 1994 (22 U.S.C. 6208) and section 101 of this joint resolution, the rate for operation for Radio Free Asia shall be at the current rate for operations and under the terms provided for in the fiscal year 1999 grant from the Broadcasting Board of Governors to RFA, Inc.

SEC. 122. Public Law 106-46 is amended by deleting "October 1, 1999" and inserting "November 1, 1999".

□ 1315

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Pursuant to House resolution 305, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.

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

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 the consideration of House Joint Resolution 68, 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.

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

Mr. Speaker, there are several reasons why we bring this resolution today. One reason that has been aptly pointed out is that all the appropriation bills have not completed the process. Secondly, we anticipate that there will be several vetoes by the President which would require additional time to deal with the appropriation matters. We have asked for this resolution to be effective until the 21st of October. The President preferred the date of the 15th; the Speaker of the House preferred the date of the 29th; so we thought the 21st was a good com-

promise, and that date is in the resolution that we present today.

Mr. Speaker, it is a clean resolution. It does not include any Christmas tree ornaments or add-ons or any projects or anything of that nature. To the contrary, it says that there will be no new projects until such time as the regular appropriations bills have been completed.

Now I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) who is the ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations, for the cooperation that he has given as we proceed with this continuing resolution. We provided him with copies early in the process, as well as the White House, as well as our colleagues in the Senate, and I think, except for whatever dialogue there might be of a political nature, we are pretty much in agreement on this resolution. So I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for the cooperation that he has given through the process and last night in the Committee on Rules as we proceeded to seek the rule that has just been adopted by the house.

Mr. Speaker, there is not a whole lot more to be said about the resolution itself.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 12 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, I do not in any way blame the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) or his colleagues in the majority party on the Committee on Appropriations for the fact that we are here with only about 5 percent of the budget passed for this year because I think they genuinely tried to perform in the tradition of the Committee on Appropriations, which is to try to reach bipartisan agreement on all appropriation bills.

The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, indicated that when I was chairman of the committee that the committee had finished its work on time and no continuing resolution was required. That is true. He cited some reasons for that. I would suggest that there is a very different reason for that.

The reason that we got our work done on time that year is because the first thing I did when I became chairman was to walk across the partisan aisle, sit down with my Republican counterpart, then Congressman McDade, and suggest that we in a bipartisan way determine how much could be spent by each of the subcommittees, and we did that. That was the only time in the history of the Budget Act that that was done in a bipartisan way, and because we worked out our differences ahead of time and agreed to compromise ahead of time, we were left only to argue about the details, and we were able to finish all of the budget on time.

I am sure that if the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) had been left to

his own devices, he would probably have done that again this year, but we are in a very different atmosphere.

We do have in this House a good many Members elected in very recent years, many of whom have term limited themselves and who believe that, if things do not happen on their watch, they do not happen at all, and as a consequence, the majority party caucus has been split into three factions, and one of those factions has come to govern political strategy when it comes to budgets. That faction has decided that they will resist all attachment to reality and they will continue to pursue the idea that somehow, even though they control only one branch of government, that they can somehow force their will on all of the branches of government including the President.

Mr. Speaker, it is that kind of mentality which led to the famous government shutdown of a number of years ago, and while I think some members of the majority caucus have been sobered by their sad experience with that chapter, I think a good many others still feel that they simply do not want to go through the hassle of resisting the militants within the Republican caucus, and so they continue to pretend that the Congress is living within the limits set by the budget agreement 3 years ago, and they continue to pretend that Congress has not already spent substantial amounts out of the Social Security surplus for the coming year.

The fact is that while they may pretend that, I have yet to run into a single member of the press, I have yet to run into a single member of the general public, certainly not in my district, who believes that propaganda. I think objective observers recognize that what is going on here is that an adherence to mythology is requiring all kinds of gimmicks that further discredit the Congress in the eyes of the American people, and I would like to quote from a few editorials to demonstrate my point.

Washington Post, in an editorial entitled "Fake Debate," September 23, 1999, said as follows about the Republican leadership in the House:

What they are doing now is pretending otherwise, not by cutting spending, but by shifting it around so that under budget conventions it won't count against next year's fiscal total. They have designated billions of dollars for the census, agriculture and Defense's emergency spending, they propose to move billions more into either the current fiscal year by hurrying it up, at least on paper, or into the fiscal year after next by delaying it even for a few days, but that matter is only in the world of accounting. In the real world the money still will be spent, and the more that is spent, the less will be available for debt reduction. When they move the money into the adjacent years, they merely eat into those years' likely Social Security surpluses in order to keep up the appearance that next year's will be left intact, but it is merely show.

Then they go on to say,

The Congressional Budget Office recently estimated that Congress has already used

about \$11 billion in Social Security funds. That's without the pending \$8 billion plus in emergency farm aid and without the \$8 billion to \$9 billion that Congressional leaders themselves now acknowledge will be required to complete the appropriation process.

When we add up that 11 billion, that 8 billion, and that 9 billion, we come to the conclusion that they have already committed to spend \$28 billion out of that Social Security surplus.

Then the editorial goes on to say,

Missing also was the money, about 3 billion, that the administration is expected to seek to cover peacekeeping costs in Kosovo. Nor were allowances made by the Congress for Hurricane Floyd, the earthquake in Turkey the stub of a tax bill that is still likely to pass,

et cetera, et cetera.

Then the editorial concludes:

In that real world, they are already past 30 billion and counting.

Then it says:

What does the harm is not the money they are about to spend. It's the fake debate they continue to conduct,

and I would fully subscribe to that.

Mr. Speaker, I will insert in my remarks the text of editorials from the Washington Post, an article from the New York Times and an editorial from USA Today, all of which make the similar points that I have just described.

Mr. Speaker, I think we are all living in a fiction. I did not vote for the budget that passed 3 years ago, the great budget deal that was described as the so-called Balanced Budget Act of that year, because I knew it was a public lie, and I called it a public lie at the time. I still call it a public lie; and if it is not a public lie, it is the largest fib that I have seen in a good long time because it was premised on the idea that this Congress would in the future make spending cuts in education, in health care, in Medicare care, in all kinds of programs that we know neither side of the aisle really in the end would have the votes to carry out, and that is problem number one.

Problem number two is that that has been compounded by the compulsion of the majority party to pursue a tax cut of immense proportions which, if it were passed, would prevent us from adding one dime to Social Security, one new dime to Medicare. It would prevent us from meeting our obligations in the area of health care and education, and it would in the end produce huge reductions in what is known as the people's bill, the Labor, Education and Health appropriation. If we had continued that fiction, that pursuit of that tax bill was, in fact, a rational policy goal. Education and health and worker protection programs would have had to have been cut by 32 percent in real terms, and I do not believe in the end that any responsible Congress would propose those kinds of reductions in those programs.

So what I guess I would simply say is:

We have seen the charades, the gimmicks, the advanced funding, the de-

layed funding; we have seen them call a 24-year-old program to help people, old folks, pay their heating bills in the wintertime, we suddenly see them declare that an emergency; we have seen them declare the census, which has to, by law, take place every 10 years in accordance with constitutional mandate, we have seen them claim that is \$4 million in emergency spending; and whether it is emergency spending or not, Treasury still has to write the checks, and so that money will be spent no matter what they label it.

So it seems to me that the sooner this House and the leadership of the other body sits down with the White House and works out its differences, the better off we will be and the better off the country will be.

Now, I know that speaking to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) I am probably speaking to the choir because I am sure that he has made some of the same arguments, certainly not all of them because I am sure he disagrees with some, but I am certain he has made at least some of these same arguments within his own caucus. If members of his caucus had listened 8 months ago, we would not be in the fix we are in today; and I must say I am baffled by the fact that when I was at the White House picnic last week I had three different members of the Republican majority in this House come up to me and say:

"Now look. We understand we made a wrong detour when we followed the cats down this road, but you know we can still climb back on board and put things together."

Mr. Speaker, my only comment is I wish they would quit saying that to me privately if they do not do it publicly because until we get private and public rhetoric to match, we are not going to get out of this box, and we will be spending a lot of time on false motion.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would simply urge that Members recognize that we really have no choice but to extend this or to pass this continuing resolution extending authority for the government to remain open.

□ 1330

But I really hope that folks will come back to reality, because otherwise the additional 3 weeks will do no good, and we will be back here 3 weeks from now chewing the same cud, as they say in farm country; and I do not think that will do anybody any good.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I do not disagree with everything that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) said, but I do disagree with some, and he knows that. We have had these discussions many times before. A lot of these comments should have been, and, in fact, were made at the time we discussed the budget resolution, because the issues

that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is talking about really relate to the overall issue of the budget.

Once the budget is approved by the Congress, then we, as appropriators, we deal with only our part of the budget that has to do with discretionary spending. So most of that debate that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) just presented really belongs at the budget level.

But we are talking today about a continuing resolution. What we are trying to do is to avoid what happened last year when we ended up in negotiation with the White House in an omnibus appropriations bill that we are still sorry we ever did. We are trying to avoid that by handling each bill separately. We are doing a pretty good job at that.

This year we did two emergency supplementals requested by the President. They were signed into law. We did the Military Construction appropriations bill. It went through conference, was signed into law. The Legislative Branch conference report is awaiting the President's signature and has been there for a while. The Treasury-Postal conference report, again, as passed by the Congress, is on the President's desk waiting for his signature.

The District of Columbia conference report is on the President's desk. We understand that will be vetoed, and that is one of the reasons we do need a CR, because the veto will take time to negotiate out with the President.

The conference report on the Energy and Water appropriations bill was passed yesterday in the House and will be on its way to the President's desk very shortly. The Agriculture bill is in conference, and the conference signature sheets are being circulated to be signed and it will be ready to be filed shortly. The Foreign Operations conference report is completed and is in the Committee on Rules today.

We have three other bills in conference. The Defense conference expects to wrap up their business tomorrow, Commerce-State-Justice is having some problems because of a lot of major differences between the House and the Senate, and the Transportation conference will meet tonight. So we are actually moving.

On the other two, Interior and VA-HUD, we cannot go to conference until both bodies have passed the legislation. The Senate has just recently passed those last two, and we expect to be able to appoint the conferees sometime today. Of course, the real problem is the Labor-HHS bill, which we will mark up in the full committee on Thursday.

So we do the continuing resolution to make sure that the Government does not falter in the meantime.

Continuing resolutions are not new to the Congress. We all complemented the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for the year that he chaired the committee, and he did have his bills done on time without any continuing resolution. But that year he had a lot more money than they had the year be-

fore. It is easier when you have a lot of money. This year we have \$17 billion less than we had the year before. That makes it tough.

But a little history. Let me take a few years while the party of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) was still the majority party. In fiscal year 1994, we had three continuing resolutions for a total of 41 days. In fiscal year 1993 we only had one, for a total of 5 days. In fiscal year 1992 we had three CRs for a total of 57 days. In fiscal year 1991 we had 5 CRs for a total of 36 days. In fiscal year 1990 we had three CRs for a total of 51 days.

Then when the Budget Impoundment and Control Act was enacted by the Congress, under the Democratic majority, for some reason, I guess because they could not get the job done on time, they changed the fiscal year. Many Members were not here when that happened, but the fiscal year used to begin on the first of July, but the majority party then was not able to meet the deadline, so they just changed the fiscal year. Talk about fiction, they just changed the fiscal year.

So, anyway, we do have a CR today to avoid an omnibus appropriations bill and to get these bills individually to the President's desk. Sometimes I wish that this were fiction, but it is not. It is the real world. Appropriations bills, of all the bills we consider, appropriations bills must be completed.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for the cooperation he has given us throughout the year. I know there have been major differences, and we have explored those differences, but still he has cooperated and helped us move the process, and I say to him thank you very much for that.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of affection and respect for the gentleman from Florida, but I do think that he should not be rewriting history, as he just did.

He just indicated that in 1974, when the Congress was under Democratic control, it added 3 months to the fiscal year, implying that it did it simply for some fiscal gimmick reason. That is nonsense. He and I were both here at that time, and we ought to both remember what happened.

We had a new budget act passed that year. What that Budget Act did was change the fiscal year. The fiscal year used to start on July 1; and because Congress could not get its work done since it only came in in January and had just a very few months to do its work, what they did was to change the fiscal year so that in the future, instead of running from July 1 to July 1, it would run from October 1 to October 1, recognizing the reality of the Congressional schedule.

We did not do, as the majority party at least in the Senate suggested doing, we did not add a 13th month to the fiscal year in order to hide the spending

of \$20 billion, as is now being done on the Labor-Health-Education bill.

Mr. Speaker, I also will insert in the RECORD an article in USA Today dated September 28th which is entitled "Congress Looks to Gimmicks to Bend Budget Rules."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to return to some of the thoughts that I was trying to complete a few minutes earlier. We have heard a great deal of debate today about whether or not Congress is going to be invading the Social Security surplus in the coming year or not.

I want to lay out what the facts are. The Congressional Budget Office on July 1 indicated that we would have for the coming year a surplus of about \$14 billion. That was based on the assumption that Congress would stick to outlay caps for appropriations bills which were in existing law. But the Congressional Budget Office, which is, after all, the fiscal referee and the chairman of which is appointed by the Republican majority, that Congressional Budget Office says that the House Committee on Appropriations has already allocated \$17 billion above the caps for non-emergency spending.

Then, on top of that, they are well down the road to allocating \$14 billion more to the various appropriations subcommittees, pretending that the \$14 billion surplus which existed in July still exists. It does not, as CBO makes quite clear.

Then if you add to that the \$4 billion which they have set aside for the so-called emergency census, and if you add to that the funding which the majority party leadership has already indicated it supports for supplementals totaling about \$10 billion in outlays, and if you add to that the tax extenders which they intend to pass and the Medicare give-back package which they intend to pass, you can see why virtually every major national newspaper already recognizes that this Congress is spending \$35 billion or so out of that Social Security surplus.

I am not criticizing the individual decisions made by the majority. I am simply suggesting that if those decisions are to be made, they ought not be masked behind a smoke screen of false rhetoric; and, in my view, that is what is happening on this issue.

I would simply point out as a practical person that when we get rid of these artificial constructs, if we handle things right, we will still be in a position where next year we will pay down the deficit by about \$10 billion. No matter what phony Social Security construct or what phony budget cap construct is put on it, in the end, when this Congress comes to its senses, recognizes it cannot gut the President's priorities and that it cannot fool the public into thinking that these gimmicks that they are engaging in do not spend money, what I am saying is, in the end, if we negotiate this outright, we will still bring down that public

debt this year by about \$120 billion; and we will have done the same thing this year in a fairly similar amount.

We all ought to be able to recognize that that is a reasonable achievement, and if we would just recognize that, rather than wasting immeasurable time building these phony constructs, I think, in the end, we would produce a better budget and we would have more time to focus on what works, rather than focusing on which accounting gimmick is the most sly, and, in the process, just by accident, we might even improve the public's ability to believe what we say.

So I would say in closing, I think rather than listening to the false rhetoric that we heard on the floor earlier today on the Social Security proposition, I think the public, in judging what this Republican-controlled Congress is doing on the budget, ought to take the advice of that well-known defender of liberty, John Mitchell, the former Attorney General under Richard Nixon, who said once that to understand what the Republicans were doing, it was necessary to "watch what we do, not what we say."

I think the press has been doing that; I think the public has been doing that. And that is why their false arguments are falling on fallow ground.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the articles referred to.

[From USA Today]

GOP LEADERS FALL SHORT ON FISCAL PROMISE

Republican congressional leaders have spent the past year promising the public that they've reinforced their commitment to fiscal discipline. They vowed they'd pass the required budget bills on time, live within agreed-upon spending caps and resist raiding the Social Security trust fund.

But with three days left before 1999 funding for every government agency runs out, the script has hit some snags. The GOP majority hopelessly has blown the first two promises and shows little of the self-discipline needed to keep even its oft-repeated Social Security pledge.

And instead of revealing the flaws behind their fiction, Republicans still are scrambling to manipulate a happy ending.

Only four of the 13 annual spending bills for the new year starting Friday have been sent to the president. House Speaker Dennis Hastert finally acknowledged over the weekend that a stopgap measure will be required to avoid another government shutdown like the one that backfired on the GOP four years ago.

Further, the spending approved so far and in the congressional pipeline will exceed the 2000 spending cap agreed to in 1997 by roughly \$30 billion, swallowing the much heralded \$14 billion surplus while leaving the government's non-Social Security accounts \$15 billion overdrawn.

What happened? Despite talk about economy in government, lawmakers have been unable to resist throwing more money at weapons purchases, military salaries, hometown projects and other favored causes.

Paying for all that without cheating would require dipping into surplus Social Security income, as Congress has done for decades. So much for the promise of putting Social Security surpluses into a "lock box" untouchable for other purposes.

To avoid acknowledging reality, Congress has tried one bookkeeping gimmick after another:

Declaring fully predictable costs like the 2000 census and a long-established program of winter-heating aid for the poor "emergencies," and thus outside spending limits.

Trying to charge politically potent spending, like more than \$5 billion in new aid to farmers, against this year's books even though it won't reach anyone until next year.

Snatching back, at least for a year, \$3 billion in federal aid promised to the states as part of the 1996 welfare reform.

Disguising still-unknown billions in 2000 spending by charging it against a hoped-for surplus in 2001, exploiting an established loophole to create in effect a 13-month year.

Republicans are not unique in their gamesmanship. Democrats have been fully complicit in fudging budget caps in recent years, and President Clinton's spending proposal for 2000 had its own similarly surreal qualities.

For example, Clinton's claim to a balanced budget was based on increased tobacco taxes and other changes that were clear non-starters.

But the majority party in Congress controls the legislative agenda and carries prime responsibility for enacting a budget.

So far, GOP leaders can't muster the discipline to keep their promises, or the courage to explain why not. So they shouldn't be surprised if voters who were promised a surplus and a safe Social Security hold them responsible when they discover neither exist.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 24, 1999]

HOUSE G.O.P. ON CREATIVE ACCOUNTING SPREE

(By Tim Weiner)

WASHINGTON, Sept. 23.—Creative accounting by Congress reached new heights today as House Republican leaders, desperately seeking money for their spending bills, used budgetary devices to manufacture nearly \$17 billion out of thin air.

First they ordered appropriators to tap \$12.7 billion from the budget for the year after next, the 2001 fiscal year. Then they declared \$1.1 billion for a long-established program to help the poor pay their heating bills as an unforeseen "emergency," taking the money off the official ledger.

And then, apparently breaking a pledge made by the former Speaker Newt Gingrich, they moved to rescind \$3 billion in welfare funds for state governments.

The moves were part of a plan to help finance a bill for labor, education, health and human services programs that nonetheless cuts or eliminates so many health and education programs that President Clinton vowed tonight to veto it.

The leadership's effort to take back welfare money provoked protests from the nation's governors, Republicans and Democrats alike. They issued a statement calling it "a drastic departure" from a deal between Congress and the states.

That deal, sealed by Mr. Gingrich in a letter on June 5, 1998, pledged that the Republican-led Congress would not touch the welfare money, known as Temporary Assistance for Needy Families.

"I gave you my word that T.A.N.F. funding will be guaranteed for five years," he said. "Rest assured that I will stand by that commitment."

There had been talk in Congress last year of a similar plan to tap into the states' welfare coffers, and Mr. Gingrich's letter sought to quell the governors' suspicions.

The chairman of the National Governors' Association, Gov. Michael O. Leavitt of

Utah, a Republican, said the current Republican leadership in Congress had privately assured the governors that Mr. Gingrich's word was still good. "We took them at their word and still hope they'll maintain the integrity of their decision," Mr. Levitt said.

The loss would be temporary, Republican leaders say. They promised to replace the funds in the 2001 fiscal year. "It's just a temporary relocation," said John P. Feehery, a spokesman for Speaker J. Dennis Hastert. "They'll get the money back."

Congress has completed work on only four of its 13 spending bills. It appears certain to fail to complete them, with one week left until the new fiscal year begins on Oct. 1.

But Congress is on track to drain a projected \$14 billion surplus for the 2000 fiscal year and to break the spending caps it imposed on itself. It looks increasingly likely to tap into surplus Social Security payments to finance its spending bills, something the Republican leadership has said repeatedly that it will not do.

The Republicans' deepening dilemma was apparent in the moves to borrow heavily from the 2001 Budget, to declare a 24-year-old home-heating program an unforeseeable emergency, and to try to take back the welfare money.

Congress has used borrowing from future years, a process called forward funding, in the past. But it has never used more than \$12 billion in a single year for all Government programs combined, let alone a single spending bill, the Senate Budget Committee said.

And it has not declared programs like home-heating assistance to be fiscal emergencies, a category usually reserved for wars and natural disasters, not the coming of winter.

Nor has it asked and states to give back welfare money. At least 38 states would be affected if the welfare recession becomes law. New York would lose \$508 million in welfare funds in the fiscal 2000 year, and California would lose \$47 million.

The \$89 billion bill labor, education and health and human services was approved today by a House appropriations subcommittee on a party-line vote, with eight Republicans in favor and six Democrats opposed.

The subcommittee's chairman, Representative John Edward Porter, Republican of Illinois, made it plain that the creative accounting measures to finance the bill had been dictated by the Republican leadership. "I work with what they give me," he said. "Decisions have been made that I'm not a part of."

In other legislative action, negotiators from the House and the Senate worked toward a compromise that would require more flight tests for the F-22 fighter plane, a \$70 billion program, before allowing the plane to begin production. The House voted to withhold \$1.8 billion to build the first six F-22's; the Senate wanted the planes built next year.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 20, 1999]

CONGRESSIONAL TIME CRUNCH WILL PLAY IN DECISIONS REGARDING SPENDING BILLS

(By David Rogers)

WASHINGTON.—As Republicans prepare for a year-end confrontation with President Clinton regarding budget priorities and tobacco taxes, they are trying to clear the decks this week of spending bills affecting everything from Lockheed Martin Corp.'s F-22 to emergency farm aid.

Under a revised spending plan adopted Friday, Senate Republicans agreed to billions more for defense in anticipation of the House restoring funds for the purchase of F-22

fighters as test planes for the Air Force. Senate Appropriations Committee Chairman Ted Stevens (R., Alaska) wants the full complement of six aircraft under contract with Lockheed. F-22 critics want fewer, but some purchases seem certain and GOP opponents in the House are being undercut by their own leaders, who are anxious to move bills.

Toward that end, the GOP hopes to complete negotiations tomorrow night on an emergency farm-aid bill that has grown to nearly \$8 billion. The House is retreating from deep Energy Department cuts opposed by Senate Budget Committee Chairman Pete Domenici (R., N.M.). And hundreds of millions of dollars more will be restored for space-science programs cut by the House less than two weeks ago.

The targets would lift spending above what either chamber has approved. The GOP no longer appears to be clinging to the pretense of staying within prescribed budget caps and instead would allow spending to go about \$14.5 billion higher.

That number matches the on-budget surplus projected by the Congressional Budget Office, although there is serious doubt it still exists. CBO's estimates show the surplus has been exhausted, given spending commitments by Congress. But by keeping what amounts to two sets of books, Republicans have clung to the claim that excess spending under \$14.5 billion won't require borrowing from the Social Security trust fund.

The collapse of the budget caps and shift of focus to Social Security changes the technical nature of the spending debate. The multiyear caps—first adopted as part of the balanced-budget plan in 1997—govern the level of appropriations, which may be spent out during several years. By comparison, the claims and counterclaims about Social Security focus more narrowly on the direct outlays that result from these bills only in the 12-month period that begins Oct. 1.

To the extent Republicans ignore CBO as Congress's scorekeeper, the GOP becomes that much more dependent on the Office of Management and Budget, which is allied with the president. Yet the two sides also have common interests at times in playing down the costs of their actions.

A case in point is the farm package, which would lift total aid to agriculture to more than \$20 billion this calendar year. Republicans are desperate to see the money distributed before Oct. 1 so it won't appear that seems unrealistic, it might be to the president's advantage to score the costs as committed in fiscal 1999, so as to minimize any threat to Social Security in fiscal 2000.

The reason why is that Mr. Clinton wants to keep the numbers manageable himself. He will want more spending, for everything from foreign aid to education. But the administration wants to keep the total in additions to less than \$8 billion so it can pay for the costs and protect Social Security with tobacco taxes.

The chief accomplishment of the GOP plan is to minimize House and Senate differences. The goal is to produce passable bills: between \$9 billion to \$11 billion is allocated to try to expedite committee action this week on a long-delayed bill funding the departments of Labor, Education, and Health and Human Services. But by pumping so much into defense—about \$6 billion over Mr. Clinton's request—the plan doesn't leave enough for other priorities to receive the President's signature.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 23, 1999]

FAKE DEBATE

On the budget, the Republicans continue unaccountably to set themselves up to fail in this Congress. They set goals that derive

from a mythic view of government rather than the reality. Then reality intrudes, and they turn out to lack the votes to attain the goals even within their own caucus.

They began the year by saying they could cut domestic spending for all programs but Social Security deeply enough to produce a \$1 trillion surplus over the next 10 years, most of which they proposed to use to pay for a major tax cut. They passed the tax cut, though narrowly, but can't produce majorities for even the first phase of the corresponding spending cuts—and the president is about to veto the tax cut, having made the case that the spending cuts would do serious governmental and social harm.

Their new goal, if they can't have the tax cut, is to hold down domestic spending anyway by invoking Social Security. They propose to outdo the Democrats as protectors of the giant program by using none of the Social Security surplus next fiscal year to cover other governmental costs, as has regularly been done in the recent past. It would all be virtuously used instead to pay down debt. But that requires that spending for everything but Social Security be financed out of non-Social Security taxes, a tight constraint, and they don't have the votes for that either.

What they're doing now is pretending otherwise, not by cutting spending but by shifting it around so that, under the budget conventions, it won't count against next fiscal year's total. They've designated billions of dollars for the census, agriculture and defense as emergency spending. They propose to move billions more into either the current fiscal year, by hurrying it up, at least on paper, or into the fiscal year after next, by delaying it, even if only a few days.

But that matters only in the world of accounting. In the real world, the money still will be spent, and the more that is spent, the less will be available for debt reduction. When they move the money into the adjacent years, they merely eat into those years' likely Social Security surpluses in order to keep up the appearance that next year's will be left intact. But it's merely show.

The projected Social Security surplus for the year that will begin next week, Oct. 1, is about \$150 billion. A realistic accounting suggests that at least a fifth of that will be used to cover other governmental costs. Strictly speaking, Social Security will be no worse off; the same IOUs will be placed in the Social Security trust fund whether the money is used to cover other costs or pay down debt. The Congressional Budget Office recently estimated that Congress already has used about \$11 billion in Social Security funds. That's without the pending \$8 billion-plus in emergency farm aid, and without the \$8 billion to \$9 billion that congressional leaders themselves now acknowledge will be required to complete the appropriations process.

Missing also was the money—about \$3 billion—that the administration is expected to seek to cover peacekeeping costs in Kosovo. Nor were allowances made for Hurricane Floyd, the earthquake in Turkey, the stub of a tax bill that still is likely to pass, some money for the hospitals to make up for Medicare cuts of a couple of years ago that sliced deeper than anticipated, etc. In that real world, they're already past \$30 billion and counting.

The Republicans will try to make it seem the president's fault, and he, theirs. But it's no one's fault that they're breaching a limit that has nothing to do with the true cost of government and was never more than a political artifact. What does the harm is not the money they're about to spend. It's the fake debate they continue to conduct.

[From USA Today, Sept. 28, 1999]

CLINTON ANNOUNCES \$115 BILLION SURPLUS

(By Laurence McQuillan)

WASHINGTON.—President Clinton said Monday that the projected federal budget surplus for fiscal 1999, which ends Thursday, will be at least \$115 billion, the largest in U.S. history.

Clinton, who last week vetoed a GOP plan to cut taxes by \$792 billion over 10 years, said the revised budget estimate amounted to "a landmark achievement for our economy." He urged Republicans to work with him on cutting taxes and shoring up the Medicare and Social Security systems.

Although the administration had previously predicted a \$99 billion surplus, the Congressional Budget Office had projected a \$114 billion figure for the current fiscal year.

"More surplus money for Washington means less money for families and workers across our country," said House Ways and Means Chairman Bill Archer, R-Texas.

Fiscal 1999 will be the second consecutive year there has been a surplus, the first time that has happened since 1957. There was a \$69 billion surplus last year.

Virtually all of the surplus is the result of the government collecting more in Social Security taxes than it is paying in benefits.

[From USA Today, Sept. 28, 1999]

CONGRESS LOOKS TO GIMMICKS TO BEND BUDGET RULES

(By William M. Welch)

WASHINGTON.—Declare the Census an emergency. Add a 13th month to the year. Delay mailing government checks to the poor. Take money from the states.

Whether Orwellian or Scrooge-like, these ideas and more have been offered with straight faces in Congress in recent weeks, and some stand a good chance of being passed.

Why? It's budget crunch time in Washington.

As usual, the approach of the federal government's new fiscal year, which begins Friday, is bringing a mad rush to pass the 13 spending bills that are required to finance the normal operations of government.

This time, the strain is higher than ever because Congress and its Republican leaders must make the package fit within the tight budget confines they've set for themselves.

Paradoxically, the political tension comes after both parties have spent most of the year fighting about what to do with \$3 trillion in budget surpluses forecast to materialize during the next decade.

But lawmakers in both parties, particularly majority Republicans, have painted themselves into a budget corner with a pair of political vows:

To live within the tight budget limits, called "caps," that both sides agreed to in a balanced-budget deal in 1997.

Not to spend any of Social Security's money on other programs.

The federal government is projected to enjoy a record surplus in fiscal 2000 of \$161 billion. Yet if Congress strictly follows the spending limits set in 1997, it would have to cut spending in many programs.

So Congress has been looking for ways to get around both of those commitments.

After failing to find any other good solution, Republican congressional leaders acknowledged recently that they cannot live within the spending limits set two years ago and will approve more spending.

"You have to be honest and acknowledge we're not going to meet the caps," Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott says.

That decision ensures that billions more will be available for education and health

programs, but it doesn't resolve the problem created by their second commitment not to spend any of the budget surplus that is tied to Social Security, which accounts for all but \$14 billion of next year's expected surplus.

So lawmakers have reached new levels of creativity in their search for ways to spend money without having it count in budget bookkeeping—in other words to tap the Social Security surplus while denying they are doing so.

"The only question is, which gimmicks are we going to use and which new ones are we going to invent?" says Stan Collender, a former budget aide on Capitol Hill and head of the Federal Budget Consulting Group, a fiscal watchdog organization at public relations firm Fleishman-Hillard.

Congress has completed only four of the 13 spending bills, and the most controversial one—for education, labor and health programs—began to take shape only late last week. An \$89 billion version of that bill proposed by House GOP leaders is on the cutting edge of budget gimmickry.

Among the examples of creative accounting:

Declare an "emergency" so the money isn't counted against spending limits. Congress has done that liberally with floods, hurricanes, drought and military operations. Now it's considering declaring the \$4 billion cost of the 2000 Census an emergency, as well as a \$1.1 billion program that helps the poor pay heating bills.

Spend in a 13th month. Congress often uses a device called "advance funding," in which spending in one year is moved to another to keep the books in balance. Clinton proposed doing it in his own budget plan. But this Congress is taking that device to new lengths by shifting nearly \$13 billion in the health and education bill into the next year. Senate critics derided the plan as declaring a 13th month of spending.

Whack the states. After assuring governors they wouldn't do it, House GOP leaders now propose to reclaim \$3 billion in federal welfare payments to the states that the states haven't spent.

Tap the poor. Another proposal GOP leaders have floated is to delay income tax credits to qualifying low-income families, sending out refunds in a series of checks over the course of the year rather than in one lump sum, as is done now. That would allow the government to hold the money longer.

Congressional Democrats and the White House reacted to each idea with ridicule.

"They can't make their budget work without resorting to cheap gimmicks," Senate Democratic leader Tom Daschle says. "Now reality is meeting rhetoric."

And in the end, some of the proposed gimmicks might be dropped.

"You test them out and see if they've got legs," House Majority Leader Dick Armey, R-Texas, says.

Congressional Republicans acknowledge they won't resolve the budget squeeze before the new fiscal year begins Friday. They're making plans for a stopgap spending measure to keep programs going for another month. That would give both parties time to work out differences and avoid a repeat of the government shutdown in late 1995 and early 1996.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I just hope that all Members will come to the floor and vote for this continuing resolution so

that we can continue the appropriations process.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, after discussions with the White House, it is my and Congressman GENE GREEN's understanding that H.J. Res. 68 continues the moratorium placed on the Department of Interior from implementing final rulemaking regarding the valuation of crude oil for royalty purposes.

Section 101(a) of H.J. Res. 68 states: "Such amounts as may be necessary under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 1999 for continuing projects or activities including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees (not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution) which were conducted in the fiscal year 1999 and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority would be available in the following appropriations acts: (7) the Department of Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000;"

I appreciate this clarification from the White House.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 305, the joint resolution is considered read for amendment and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on 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 joint resolution.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 421, nays 2, answered "present" 1, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 453]

YEAS—421

Abercrombie	Biggert	Campbell
Ackerman	Bilbray	Canady
Aderholt	Bilirakis	Cannon
Allen	Blagojevich	Capps
Andrews	Bliley	Capuano
Archer	Blumenauer	Cardin
Armey	Blunt	Carson
Bachus	Boehler	Castle
Baird	Boehner	Chabot
Baker	Bonilla	Chambliss
Baldacci	Bonior	Chenoweth
Baldwin	Bono	Clay
Ballenger	Borski	Clayton
Barcia	Boswell	Clement
Barr	Boucher	Clyburn
Barrett (NE)	Boyd	Coble
Barrett (WI)	Brady (PA)	Coburn
Bartlett	Brady (TX)	Collins
Barton	Brown (FL)	Combest
Bass	Brown (OH)	Condit
Bateman	Bryant	Conyers
Becerra	Burr	Cook
Bentsen	Burton	Cooksey
Bereuter	Buyer	Costello
Berkley	Callahan	Coyne
Berman	Calvert	Cramer
Berry	Camp	Crane
Crowley		
Cubin		
Cummings		
Cunningham		
Danner		
Davis (FL)		
Davis (IL)		
Davis (VA)		
Deal		
DeGette		
Delahunt		
DeLauro		
DeLay		
DeMint		
Deutsch		
Diaz-Balart		
Dickey		
Dicks		
Dingell		
Dixon		
Doggett		
Dooley		
Doolittle		
Doyle		
Dreier		
Duncan		
Dunn		
Edwards		
Ehlers		
Ehrlich		
Emerson		
Engel		
English		
Eshoo		
Etheridge		
Evans		
Everett		
Ewing		
Farr		
Fattah		
Filner		
Fletcher		
Foley		
Forbes		
Ford		
Fossella		
Fowler		
Frank (MA)		
Franks (NJ)		
Frelinghuysen		
Frost		
Gallegly		
Ganske		
Gejdenson		
Gekas		
Gephardt		
Gibbons		
Gilchrest		
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		
Hefley		
Hergert		
Hill (IN)		
Hill (MT)		
Hilleary		
Hilliard		
Hinchey		
Hinojosa		
Hobson		
Hoefl		
Hoekstra		
Holden		
Holt		
Hooley		
Horn		
Hostettler		
Houghton		
Hulshof		
Hunter		
Hutchinson		
Hyde		
Inslee		
Isakson		
Istook		
Jackson (IL)		
Jackson-Lee		
(TX)		
Jefferson		
Jenkins		
John		
Johnson (CT)		
Johnson, E. B.		
Johnson, Sam		
Jones (NC)		
Jones (OH)		
Kanjorski		
Kasich		
Kelly		
Kennedy		
Kildee		
Kilpatrick		
Kind (WI)		
King (NY)		
Kingston		
Klecza		
Klink		
Knollenberg		
Kolbe		
Kucinich		
Kuykendall		
LaFalce		
LaHood		
Lampson		
Lantos		
Largent		
Larson		
Latham		
LaTourette		
Lazio		
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		
Martinez		
Mascara		
Matsui		
McCarthy (MO)		
McCarthy (NY)		
McCollum		
McCrery		
McDermott		
McGovern		
McHugh		
McInnis		
McIntosh		
McIntyre		
McKeon		
McKinney		
McNulty		
Meehan		
Meek (FL)		
Meeks (NY)		
Menendez		
Metcalf		
Mica		
Millender		
McDonald		
Miller (FL)		
Miller, Gary		
Minge		
Mink		
Moakley		
Mollohan		
Moore		
Moran (KS)		
Morella		
Murtha		
Myrick		
Nadler		
Napolitano		
Neal		
Nethercutt		
Ney		
Northup		
Norwood		
Nussle		
Oberstar		
Obey		
Oliver		
Ortiz		
Ose		
Owens		
Oxley		
Packard		
Pallone		
Pascarella		
Pastor		
Payne		
Pease		
Pelosi		
Peterson (MN)		
Peterson (PA)		
Petri		
Phelps		
Pickering		
Pickett		
Pitts		
Pombo		
Pomeroy		
Porter		
Portman		
Price (NC)		
Pryce (OH)		
Quinn		
Radanovich		
Rahall		
Ramstad		
Rangel		
Regula		
Reyes		
Reynolds		
Rivers		
Rodriguez		
Roemer		
Rogan		
Rogers		
Rohrabacher		
Ros-Lehtinen		
Rothman		
Roukema		
Roybal-Allard		
Royce		
Ryan (WI)		
Ryun (KS)		
Sabo		
Salmon		
Sanchez		
Sanders		
Sandlin		
Sanford		
Sawyer		
Saxton		
Schaffer		
Schakowsky		
Scott		
Sensenbrenner		
Serrano		
Sessions		
Shadegg		
Shaw		
Shays		
Sherman		
Sherwood		
Shimkus		
Shows		
Shuster		
Simpson		
Sisisky		
Skeen		
Skelton		
Slaughter		
Smith (MI)		
Smith (NJ)		
Smith (TX)		
Smith (WA)		
Snyder		
Souder		
Spence		
Spratt		
Stabenow		
Stark		
Stearns		
Stenholm		
Strickland		
Stump		
Stupak		
Sununu		
Sweeney		
Talent		
Tancred		
Tanner		
Tauscher		
Tauzin		

Taylor (MS)	Udall (CO)	Weiner
Taylor (NC)	Udall (NM)	Weldon (FL)
Terry	Upton	Weldon (PA)
Thomas	Velazquez	Weller
Thompson (CA)	Vento	Wexler
Thompson (MS)	Visclosky	Weygand
Thornberry	Vitter	Whitfield
Thune	Walden	Wicker
Thurman	Walsh	Wilson
Tiahrt	Wamp	Wise
Tierney	Waters	Wolf
Toomey	Watkins	Woolsey
Towns	Watt (NC)	Wynn
Trafigant	Watts (OK)	Young (AK)
Turner	Waxman	Young (FL)

NAYS—2

DeFazio

Paul

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Kaptur

NOT VOTING—9

Bishop	Miller, George	Rush
Cox	Moran (VA)	Scarborough
Hoyer	Riley	Wu

□ 1405

So the joint resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I was unavoidably detained by official business and, as a result, missed roll call vote number 453. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on this resolution.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.Res. 292, by the yeas and nays;

H.Res. 297, by the yeas and nays; and

H.Res. 306, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE REGARDING EAST TIMOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 292, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H.Res. 292, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 390, nays 38, answered "present" 1, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 454]

YEAS—390

Abercrombie	Allen	Bachus
Ackerman	Andrews	Baird
Aderholt	Armey	Baker

Baldacci	Ewing	Lewis (CA)	Rothman	Smith (NJ)	Udall (CO)
Baldwin	Farr	Lewis (GA)	Roukema	Smith (TX)	Udall (NM)
Ballenger	Fattah	Lewis (KY)	Roybal-Allard	Smith (WA)	Upton
Barcia	Filner	Linder	Royce	Snyder	Velazquez
Barrett (NE)	Fletcher	Lipinski	Rush	Spence	Vento
Barrett (WI)	Foley	LoBiondo	Ryan (WI)	Spratt	Visclosky
Barton	Forbes	Lofgren	Ryun (KS)	Stabenow	Vitter
Bass	Ford	Lowey	Sabo	Stark	Walden
Bateman	Fossella	Lucas (KY)	Salmon	Stearns	Walsh
Becerra	Fowler	Lucas (OK)	Sanchez	Stenholm	Wamp
Bentsen	Frank (MA)	Luther	Sanders	Strickland	Waters
Bereuter	Franks (NJ)	Maloney (CT)	Sandlin	Stupak	Watkins
Berkley	Frelinghuysen	Maloney (NY)	Sanford	Sununu	Watt (NC)
Berman	Frost	Markey	Sawyer	Sweeney	Watts (OK)
Berry	Galleghy	Martinez	Saxton	Talent	Waxman
Biggert	Ganske	Mascara	Schakowsky	Tanner	Weiner
Bilbray	Gedden	Matsui	Scott	Tauscher	Weldon (FL)
Bilirakis	Gekas	McCarthy (MO)	Serrano	Tauzin	Weldon (PA)
Bishop	Gephardt	McCarthy (NY)	Shadegg	Taylor (MS)	Weller
Blagojevich	Gibbons	McCollum	Shaw	Terry	Wexler
Bliley	Gilchrest	McCrery	Shays	Thomas	Weygand
Blumenauer	Gillmor	McDermott	Sherman	Thompson (CA)	Whitfield
Blunt	Gilman	McGovern	Sherwood	Thompson (MS)	Wicker
Boehlert	Gonzalez	McHugh	Shimkus	Thornberry	Wilson
Boehner	Goodlatte	McInnis	Shows	Thurman	Wise
Bonior	Goodling	McIntosh	Simpson	Tiahrt	Wolf
Bono	Gordon	McIntyre	Sisisky	Tierney	Woolsey
Borski	Goss	McKeon	Sisk	Toomey	Wynn
Boswell	Graham	McKinney	Skelton	Towns	Young (AK)
Boucher	Granger	McNulty	Slaughter	Trafigant	Young (FL)
Boyd	Green (TX)	Meehan	Smith (MI)	Turner	
Brady (PA)	Green (WI)	Meek (FL)			
Brown (FL)	Greenwood	Meeks (NY)			
Brown (OH)	Gutierrez	Menendez			
Bryant	Hall (OH)	Mica			
Burr	Hastings (FL)	Millender-			
Buyer	Hastings (WA)	McDonald			
Callahan	Hayworth	Miller (FL)			
Calvert	Herger	Miller, Gary			
Camp	Hill (IN)	Miller, George			
Campbell	Hill (MT)	Minge			
Canady	Hilleary	Mink			
Cannon	Hilliard	Moakley			
Capps	Hinche	Mollohan			
Capuano	Hinojosa	Moore			
Cardin	Hobson	Moran (VA)			
Carson	Hoeffel	Morella			
Castle	Holden	Murtha			
Chabot	Holt	Myrick			
Chambliss	Hooley	Nadler			
Clay	Horn	Napolitano			
Clayton	Hostettler	Neal			
Clement	Houghton	Nethercutt			
Clyburn	Hulshof	Northup			
Coburn	Hunter	Norwood			
Condit	Hutchinson	Nussle			
Conyers	Hyde	Oberstar			
Cook	Inslee	Obey			
Cooksey	Isakson	Olver			
Costello	Istook	Ortiz			
Cox	Jackson (IL)	Ose			
Coyne	Jackson-Lee	Owens			
Cramer	(TX)	Oxley			
Crane	Jefferson	Packard			
Crowley	Jenkins	Pallone			
Cummings	John	Pascrell			
Cunningham	Johnson (CT)	Pastor			
Danner	Johnson, E. B.	Payne			
Davis (FL)	Jones (OH)	Pease			
Davis (IL)	Kanjorski	Pelosi			
Davis (VA)	Kaptur	Peterson (MN)			
Deal	Kasich	Peterson (PA)			
DeFazio	Kelly	Phelps			
DeGette	Kennedy	Pickering			
Delahunt	Kildee	Pickett			
DeLauro	Kilpatrick	Pitts			
DeLay	Kind (WI)	Pombo			
DeMint	King (NY)	Pomeroy			
Deutsch	Kingston	Porter			
Diaz-Balart	Kleczka	Portman			
Dicks	Klink	Price (NC)			
Dingell	Knollenberg	Pryce (OH)			
Dixon	Kolbe	Quinn			
Doggett	Kucinich	Radanovich			
Dooley	Kuykendall	Rahall			
Doyle	LaFalce	Ramstad			
Dreier	LaHood	Rangel			
Dunn	Lampson	Regula			
Edwards	Lantos	Reyes			
Ehlers	Largent	Reynolds			
Ehrlich	Larson	Rivers			
Emerson	Latham	Rodriguez			
Engel	LaTourette	Roemer			
English	Lazio	Rogan			
Eshoo	Leach	Rogers			
Etheridge	Lee	Rohrabacher			
Evans	Levin	Ros-Lehtinen			

Rothman	Smith (NJ)	Udall (CO)
Roukema	Smith (TX)	Udall (NM)
Roybal-Allard	Smith (WA)	Upton
Royce	Snyder	Velazquez
Rush	Spence	Vento
Ryan (WI)	Spratt	Visclosky
Ryun (KS)	Stabenow	Vitter
Sabo	Stark	Walden
Salmon	Stearns	Walsh
Sanchez	Stenholm	Wamp
Sanders	Strickland	Waters
Sandlin	Stupak	Watkins
Sanford	Sununu	Watt (NC)
Sawyer	Sweeney	Watts (OK)
Saxton	Talent	Waxman
Schakowsky	Tanner	Weiner
Scott	Tauscher	Weldon (FL)
Serrano	Tauzin	Weldon (PA)
Shadegg	Taylor (MS)	Weller
Shaw	Terry	Wexler
Shays	Thomas	Weygand
Sherman	Thompson (CA)	Whitfield
Sherwood	Thompson (MS)	Wicker
Shimkus	Thornberry	Wilson
Shows	Thurman	Wise
Simpson	Tiahrt	Wolf
Sisisky	Tierney	Woolsey
Sisk	Toomey	Wynn
Skelton	Towns	Young (AK)
Slaughter	Trafigant	Young (FL)
Smith (MI)	Turner	

NAYS—38

Archer	Everett	Ney
Bartlett	Goode	Paul
Bonilla	Gutknecht	Petri
Brady (TX)	Hall (TX)	Schaffer
Burton	Hansen	Sensenbrenner
Chenoweth	Hayes	Sessions
Coble	Hefley	Shuster
Collins	Hoekstra	Souder
Combest	Johnson, Sam	Stump
Cubin	Jones (NC)	Tancredo
Dickey	Manzullo	Taylor (NC)
Doolittle	Metcalfe	Thune
Duncan	Moran (KS)	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Barr

NOT VOTING—4

Hoyer	Scarborough
Riley	Wu

□ 1425

Messrs. GUTKNECHT, SOUDER, HOEKSTRA, METCALF, SHUSTER, MORAN of Kansas, and ARCHER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: "A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the referendum in East Timor, calling on the Government of Indonesia to assist in the termination of the current civil unrest and violence in East Timor, and supporting the United Nations Security Council-endorsed multinational force for East Timor."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time