

immediately complete the transaction at the point of service.”.

CONGRESS STILL WORKING FOR BETTERMENT OF NATION

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

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, we are here Thursday evening, and we all know that we are going to be here tomorrow, Friday. What I would like to tell my colleagues, all of them on both sides of the aisle, is that we are here to continue the process of legislating.

Some of the things that we are trying to work out here, one, for example, is to provide health care prescription drugs for Americans that need that service and do not have it right now.

We are working to create a system where no legal immigrants are turned away from our shores. We are working to ensure worker safety and much-needed, in certain circumstances, compensation for those who are injured in a variety of ways.

We are working to build schools for those municipalities around the country that need new construction. We are working to enhance the economy by stimulating productivity in the private sector. Some of that is by a tax structure. Some of that is opening new markets overseas.

We are working here, Mr. Speaker, to find ways to make this great country energy independent. We are working here, specifically what we will do tomorrow is to ensure that the environment is clean and sustainable.

Now, how do we do all those things while we are here working? Well, it is pretty fundamental. We as Members of Congress, both the Democrats and Republicans, and the two Independents, we come here every day, we exchange information. There is a sense of tolerance for somebody else's opinion. Then we vote. If you get 218 votes, you have the majority. Our fundamental democratic process is based on the majority. So if we have 218 votes, then that bill is passed out of the House and goes over to the Senate.

We hear a lot about gridlock and partisan politics, both here on the House floor and in the media, certainly. Well, I am here to say that partisan politics is actually the strength of our system. That means each of us is allowed to come here and express our deeply felt convictions without fear of any retribution or retaliation.

When we stand here and disagree with the Democrats or Republicans disagree with Republicans, or Republicans disagree with the President, that is the strength of our Nation, which is the diversity of thought.

Now, one cannot express one's difference of opinion in Cuba. One cannot express one's difference of opinion in Iraq to Saddam Hussein because one would disappear and never be seen again. But here on the House floor, the

fundamentals of democratic process is that every individual Member of Congress, whether one is the Speaker or a new freshman, has an opportunity to be a responsible advocate for what one believes. If one can talk to 218 Members, and they see one as credible and one has the right information, then one will get their vote, and one's bill will pass.

So the strength of our country is that we each have the availability to us, because of our Constitution, to express our heartfelt convictions.

There is one other thing that we need to do here on a regular basis, but especially now before this general election, is to tap the energy of the American people with all their diversity and their initiative and innovation. We need to inspire the American people to participate in the democratic process so that all of us collectively together can make the possibilities for this Nation and this world limitless.

PUTTING PEOPLE ABOVE POLITICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PITTS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, we are joined here tonight by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT). What we want to talk about is what we have tried to do in our individual careers, and we believe that this Congress has, and that is putting people above politics.

See, when we were elected in Arizona, in Minnesota, and, in my case, Georgia, we did not go out there and say I am going to be a Republican, and I am going to only be a Republican and I am going to only represent Republicans. We went out there to say the American people want a change. We are going to try to put people above politics. We are going to try to stick to that.

Do my colleagues know what, I have found that a lot of times in these negotiations, the Democrats have a lot of good things to offer. What we try to do is put the best of the Democratic ideas and the best of the Republican ideas forward for the best for the American people.

2000

That is one reason why we are still here in Washington after the Senate has already adjourned. It is one reason we are still here to fight for the things that we believe in. It would be a lot more convenient for us during this election time to be back home pounding the streets in our own districts, but there are some things that we need to fight for.

My wife, Libby, often reminds me that she does not mind driving the car pool alone and being alone at parties and taking care of the kids and sitting

down at the dinner table and seeing my empty chair night after night if I am here to make a difference.

But if I am not making a difference and it is politics as usual, then it is time to go home. But so far we are here to put people before politics.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Georgia for yielding.

As he mentioned his beloved spouse, Ms. Libby, my thoughts turn to home and Ms. Mary and a conversation that my bride, Mary, and I had just last night.

This is a great honor to serve in the Congress of the United States. Evoking the memories of one who served at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue before coming here, John Quincy Adams, he was heard to say, "There is no greater honor than serving in the people's house."

And so, Mr. Speaker, I think back to my conversation last night with Mary when she said, honey, we would love to have you at home. The kids have spelling tests. There is a lot going on. But you and the other Members of Congress need to stay there and complete the work you were sent to do. And as is often the case, Mary provides good advice, the kind of common sense that comes from Main Street, America, that may be disrupted in the Beltway and with the pundits and with the dominant media culture always ready to play a game of gotcha, especially now, Mr. Speaker, when we look at the calendar and see what approaches.

Fast approaching is the first Tuesday following the first Monday, election day, where our constituents, where citizens across America will make a choice. Conventional wisdom, our friends in the fourth estate, indeed our friends on the other side of the aisle, albeit sotto voce, from the other side of the aisle, say, we need to be at home. But the fact is we are here and here we will remain to put people before politics, to complete our work, to understand there are legitimate differences between people of the two major parties and those independents who join us here.

Mr. Speaker, I also think, in a sense, being entrusted with this role is not unlike applying for a job. And I have yet to take a job application and find a place to fill out partisan identification. I never see a spot on the resume or on a job application which asks whether you are a Republican or a Democrat or an Independent.

So putting partisanship aside, I think it is important for every Member who can possibly be here to return to this Chamber. And that is why I noted with great dismay tonight, as we cast the vote to make sure our Government was funded for another day, our friend the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), who happens to be the leader of the Democratic party in this Chamber, chose to be out campaigning in Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, how sad it is also that the President of the United States, who a week ago informed the Senate majority leader that due to a fund-raiser in New York, he would be unavailable for consultation until after 1 o'clock in the morning, followed the next day by a round of golf and going in person to the final game of the World Series, he would be unavailable for consultation, now that same President of the United States finds himself not in the resplendent White House but instead 3,000 miles to the west in California out campaigning.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, let us make this very clear. The President of the United States is not our campaigner in chief, he is the commander in chief. He is the Chief Executive. And we should expect nothing less of our President than his presence here in Washington to achieve a hard-won consensus and compromise.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, it is ironic, and I am not trying to give anyone a geography lesson, but it is interesting that here we are in Washington, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is in Washington, the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) is in Washington, 300-some-odd Members of Congress are in Washington, and I will point out 73 Democrats are not, but the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) is in Missouri campaigning, the leader. Mr. Clinton is here in California in the district of the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) politicking. Again, the rest of us, 300-some-odd people, have flown to Washington for negotiations to try to finish up; and yet they have decided to leave Washington. And you cannot get your work done. It takes two to dance, and you have to have two at a bargaining table as well. And you cannot bargain, you cannot negotiate when other people have walked out of negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I just want to first of all say I am really proud of what this Congress has done, and I am proud of what we are doing right now. And I do not know if most people understand what the reason is that we are still here in Washington on just a few nights before the general election, but I honestly believe that there were people down at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue that thought, well, if we just hold them hostage in Washington, eventually we will get the Members to say, we got to go home and campaign, we got a campaign going on, we got to get out of here, we got to get out of here; and the longer they held us hostage, the more that they could extract in terms of more spending, in terms of policy changes.

I am proud of the fact that we said no, no, we are not going to do that. We are more than willing to meet the President more than halfway. We are more than willing to relax the spending caps, which some of us do not think was a very good idea. But we do not

think it is a very good idea to give blanket amnesty to over four million illegal aliens. We think that is a very bad idea. And I think most of our constituents believe that is a very bad idea.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to kind of underscore what we are talking about, four million people who sneaked into the United States illegally against laws, the President wants to give blanket citizenship to. When we say "amnesty," we mean citizenship.

That is the size roughly of Montana, Delaware, Alaska, North Dakota, Wyoming, and Vermont. That is what we are talking about. And on just one stroke of the pen, the President wants to make them citizens.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman mentioned those States, Montana, Delaware, Alaska, North Dakota, Wyoming and Vermont. But he did not say combined, all of those States combined.

Now, I do not think there is anybody in INS who thinks this is a very good idea. I do not think there are many Americans who think that is a very good idea.

The other issue is ergonomics. Certainly we have got to make some allowances for people who have repetitive motion injuries. No question about that. But the policy that was being attempted to be foisted down our throats could have had devastating impacts on small businesses. And so, we are not eager to do that.

We are willing to negotiate. We are willing to meet the President more than halfway. The question is, is he? And so far we have not seen a whole lot of flexibility from the White House. Clearly what they are trying to do is hold us hostage. I am proud of the fact that our leadership said, no, we are not going to do that. We are not going to play that game anymore. We are not going to bust the spending caps the way we have in the past.

So I am glad that we are still here. I would rather be home. My wife would love to have me home. She was so lonely, she hates to fly, but last week she was willing to get on a plane and fly out here she said because she was starting to miss me, believe it or not. But I think the people's business is important, and I think we should not allow the poison of partisan politics right before an election to get us to accept a bad deal for the American people.

So I am proud that we are here. I am proud of what we have accomplished in the last 6 years. And hopefully we will have a chance to continue that kind of progress, whether it is balancing the budget, continuing to make certain that our welfare system encourages work and personal responsibility, a whole long list of things that we have missed over the last 6 years. We cannot turn our backs on that now.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, as we are joined by our friends on the left, and we welcome them in the spirit of

consensus and compromise, I just thought about a comment our own President made in a press conference a few days ago when he said that this bipartisan Congress has accomplished so much. And I think about stopping the tax on earnings limits, what in essence was an unfair tax on senior citizens.

For the record, the gentleman could you put that statement in our CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman referenced this quote. And maybe while we are looking at it, "We have accomplished so much in this session of Congress in a bipartisan fashion. It has been one of the most productive sessions." President Bill Clinton, October 30, 2000.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for reading that into the RECORD. I think it points out that the mantra that was heard heretofore, indeed the mantra that some of our friends on the left came back with tonight of a "do nothing Congress," even our own President, who happens to be a member of the other party, said that this has been one of the most productive sessions.

I think that is something upon which we ought to agree. Certainly we moved in a bipartisan fashion with a prescription drug benefit for our seniors. We moved, as I mentioned earlier, to end the unfair, in essence, tax on Social Security in terms of an earnings limit for those seniors who continue to choose to work past the age of retirement. We have moved in many different areas in terms of educational flexibility, a bill that was backed by every one of the 50 Governors in our United States regardless of whether they are Democrat, Republicans, or Independents.

So we have had consensus, compromise and progress. And it is unfortunate that at this time, at this juncture, when agreement can be so close, and perhaps it is inevitable it is a function of the calendar, that there are those who are tempted either to play a game of gotcha or one-upmanship to say we want to work but instead turn home to campaign.

The President, who we hoped was here to finally work this out, chose to go overfly my State and go to California again to campaign. We respect the fact that people want to get the issues to the folks, but it seems to me they are putting the cart before the horse. Our most important job is to be true to the oath of office that we have taken to be here doing our work regardless of the date on the calendar.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) has joined us. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to participate with my three colleagues tonight. We were talking a moment ago about being here and working, and I heard comments made about we are glad to be here and working.

I would agree with you if we were here working. But can anyone of the

three of you tell me any meeting that has occurred between the negotiators, the leadership since 1:20 Sunday night as far as work to do the things we need to do?

When you put the poster up a moment ago about four million illegal aliens, this Member would join you in opposing that. That is not what we are talking about, and you know it. But it can be negotiated back and this is what we could do. We could work out an agreement on that that I think all four of us would agree to. It could be done.

But my question is this: Can you name one meeting that has occurred since 1:20 Sunday night, or Monday morning actually, that has occurred that has actually been a working meeting that would provide for some hope of resolving some of these difficulties?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Georgia will continue to yield, first of all, let me note a common bond of agreement, since we both represent border States, the concern about how we deal with the real question of uniting families but at the same time not rewarding those who intentionally break the law. I think we have a consensus there. So let me build from there. Because, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to show the American people that there can be some common agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I do this not to be flip-pant, but perhaps my friend from Texas is more aware of the President's schedule. Can he tell me, was the President of the United States available for meetings past 1:20 a.m. Monday?

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, the President was available all day Friday, all day Saturday, all day Sunday, all day Monday, until 1 o'clock on Tuesday, and was available for a period of time on Wednesday.

At no time was there ever any request by the leadership of the House to negotiate on the questions of which you are talking about according to my information.

2015

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I respect the work the gentleman from Texas has done on the budget. Generally speaking, we agree on a lot more things than we disagree on. But on this whole issue of the budget, the four of us, I would suspect, in a matter of a few hours could probably work out the final details of this budget, language on what we are going to do to reunite families and still preserve the basic notion of our immigration policy. Even on ergonomics, I think we could probably work out language that would be satisfactory to the four of us. But that is not the real question. The real question is, would the President sign it? I think that is where we have the real problem. Because the President has basically played this game of chicken, believing that we would ultimately cave on very important policy questions. He was wrong. He miscalculated this year.

Some of us said, no, there is a line beyond which we simply will not retreat.

I think we have spent too much money this year. I think you agree with me on that. I think we should have kept those spending caps. I think we can legitimately meet the needs of the Federal Government and all the people who depend upon it for \$1.86 trillion. That is what our spending agreement was with the Senate. We have gone over those spending caps already. We can point fingers and say it was the Republicans in the Senate or it was the Republicans in the House or it was the administration or it was this guy or that guy. But we could reach that agreement between the four of us, and I suspect within a few hours we could have that agreement worked out. But I will also suspect the President would not sign that bill.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me say, also, I am going to find out if our leaders balked at any meetings. I know in a negotiation dance there are a lot of nuances and people do sometimes do a little head fake this way and that way. It takes place in all negotiations. I do not know all of it, what has not gone on; but I know this, that we were here all last week, including Friday, including Saturday, including Sunday. We were not in session Monday, although I will say my mind is a little bit foggy right now if we were here Monday. I know we were here Tuesday. We were here Thursday.

Mr. OBEY. Would the gentleman like me to give him an instance?

Mr. KINGSTON. I will be glad to yield in a minute. Let me finish. The point is, we are here. The President is in California. If he wants to get an agreement, you got to be there. And he is not here. It distresses me. We had a Member here who ironically represents the town where Mrs. Clinton has bought a house, and they had something in the Treasury-Post Office bill that was vetoed by this President, then he left town. I do not know if that is part of the New York strategy or what. To me he needs to be here.

Mr. OBEY. The gentleman asked a question. Would the gentleman like an answer on that?

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. I would be happy to tell you that on three successive days, the majority negotiators on the appropriation bills in question made it quite clear that representatives from the White House were not welcome in those meetings until other items were first negotiated. And on the night that the agreement was put together, the representatives of the White House, and it was Mr. Lew from the budget office, Mr. Lew was specifically told that he was not welcome in those meetings until after 10 o'clock at night. The President is not a part of those negotiations. He has delegated Mr. Lew to represent him in all instances, and Mr. Lew was available at all times requested by your party. You know that as well as I do.

Mr. KINGSTON. Reclaiming my time, maybe the President ought to delegate the rest of the job on over to somebody else if he does not want to do it. I do not know one person in the United States of America who voted for Jack Lew.

Mr. OBEY. Who did your leadership delegate it to?

Mr. KINGSTON. If the President was in the Middle East or in North Korea avoiding war or in someplace like that.

Mr. OBEY. Who did your leadership delegate negotiating authority to?

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will remember, keeping a little courtesy here, I have the floor. I will try to answer your question.

Mr. OBEY. Do you remember?

Mr. KINGSTON. Here is the point. The President of the United States does not come to these meetings. I came from the private sector.

Mr. OBEY. The President of the United States was specifically excluded from the meetings.

Mr. KINGSTON. I may be naive because I come from the private sector and I do not understand all of Washington and I do not know all the nuances of Washington, but it would appear to me that in the 11th hour of the closing sessions of the United States Congress that the President would lower himself to show up to the meetings and not send some unelected Jack Lew guy. Mr. Lew might be brilliant. In fact, maybe he should be President and maybe that would have been a better choice of a nominee. But the reality is the President was not there.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I just want to come back to this point. Does anybody in this House believe that if we had an up-and-down vote on blanket amnesty for over 4 million illegal aliens, does anybody here believe it would pass? So why are we talking about it in the conference? Where did this come from? I do not think it was our negotiators who said, What we ought to really do is give blanket immunity, blanket amnesty to 4 million illegal aliens. I understand that is one of the sticking points. Maybe I am misinformed. Maybe I do not know what is going on in those conference committees. But our negotiators come back and say, We don't want to do this but the White House is saying we've got to do that.

Mr. OBEY. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is misinformed. That item was not even in the Labor-H appropriations bill.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Where is it then? Who is talking about it?

Mr. OBEY. That is in the State-Justice-Commerce bill, and each side has recognized that bill is going nowhere. The only issue that had a chance of passing was the Labor-HHS appropriations bill.

Mr. KINGSTON. Reclaiming my time, there again if the President is so proud about giving citizenship to 4 million illegal aliens, why does he not come here and defend his position instead of having somebody do it for him?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Or bring it to the floor for a vote. That is all I am asking for.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I appreciate the efforts of my friends on the left and certainly the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations to offer his perspective tonight. Certainly he has been involved in a variety of talks dealing with spending and certainly offers his own testimony to his point of view and political philosophy time and again on this floor. We welcome that because it is legitimate to have differences.

The point I would make, and this goes back to our early days in the House. I remember one night when the President and First Lady very graciously welcomed new Members of Congress to the White House for a meeting. As you might expect, Mr. Speaker, and maybe my colleagues remember in their early days of Congress when they had a chance to go to the White House, it is a fairly important occasion. I remember that night, the First Lady started the meeting and the President joined us later because he had to break away from personal negotiations to try and end the baseball strike.

Mr. Speaker, we know baseball is our national pastime; indeed, my friend from Wisconsin and I have discussed baseball time and again, but that is a leisure pursuit. We can talk about the business of sports and how important that may be; but, Mr. Speaker, I think what we are saying tonight is if it was important enough for the President of the United States to insert himself into a negotiation about the baseball strike, if it is important enough for the President of the United States to attempt to take a leadership role in negotiations in the Middle East, if it is important enough for the President of the United States to make a phone call between two domestic partners dealing with the status of their relationship, certainly, Mr. Speaker, it is important enough for the President of the United States to return to Washington and come join us personally to try to achieve an agreement.

Mr. STENHOLM. If the gentleman will yield, precisely. A moment ago the gentleman from Arizona made a statement that he and I agree on. I think upon a proper reflection of the question of how many of those citizens, or non-citizens, illegals, that might need to be reunited with their family, we probably could agree, and it will be considerably less than 4 million. But both of us represent border States, both of us understand that there are certain things that need to be done in that, but not 4 million; and it was never a part of the Labor-HHS discussions. My point here is that reasonable people can work this out. This is what I am suggesting tonight.

Again I want to say to my friend from Arizona, the President was available, at the White House, at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue on Friday, on Saturday, on Sunday, on Monday,

on Tuesday until 1 o'clock, again on Wednesday. At no time did the leadership of my House of Representatives ever make a request to meet with the President.

Mr. HAYWORTH. To your knowledge. Mr. STENHOLM. That is what I say. When I come to the floor, and I appreciate the courtesies given to me, if I ever say anything that is untrue, I would like for somebody to come to the floor and correct me. Therefore, that is what I believe according to what I understand and if anybody can correct me, if you can correct me or if any one of the leadership can come in and say, What he is saying, the gentleman from Texas is all wet, come in and tell me. Otherwise, let us not keep pointing the finger of blame.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I would concur. There is no reason to point the finger of blame. I was simply saying to my friend from Texas, we may not be privy to all the discussions. We may not be privy to all the schedules. Indeed as we have seen with some of the other verbal gymnastics that have gone on in preceding days, while we have not had firsthand knowledge, there has been a very curious process that has continued here of, sadly, not the gentleman from Texas, but perhaps others saying one thing while they would do another. It is not an attack on my friend's integrity. We agree on a great deal here.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Let me just say, I feel a little like Will Rogers. He once said, "All I know is what I read in the newspapers." All I know is I thought we had an agreement on the Treasury-Postal bill. I thought I read, now maybe he was misquoted, that the President was going to sign the bill. In this business we all know that our word is pretty important. I am not privy to the negotiations. I do not know what has been going on in those meetings exactly. But, as I say, all I know is what I read in the newspapers. And when I read that the President said, "I'm going to sign that bill" and then in the dead of night he vetoes it and you have Senators saying that is a declaration of war against the Congress, that is not the way to resolve these differences.

Here is my real point. Because I was in the State legislature for 12 years. I have been frustrated since I came here at the way we end these budget sessions, the way we end a session. Because in the legislature, we had Republican governors with Democratic legislatures and we had Democratic governors where the Republicans controlled half the legislature. But in both cases what we did at the end of the session is the governor brought in the legislative leaders, they sat down like real human beings, they sat down reasonably and said, Okay, guys, let's figure out how big is the pie going to be. That was the first question. You decided how much you were going to spend. We had to balance our budget, so that made it somewhat easier.

Once you knew how much you were going to spend, whether that was \$14.3

billion or whatever the number was, it was relatively easy then to sit down and work out, well, how much goes to transportation, how much goes to education, how much goes to criminal services, how much goes to the various other departments, welfare and so forth.

We have never done that. The President has never brought, as far as I know, the legislative leaders in and said, Let's decide how much we are going to spend. Here is the problem. Because what happens is as soon as we think we have an agreement on how much we are going to spend on Treasury-Postal, first of all he vetoes it but then secondly he says, Wait a second. We've got to have more money over here; we've got to have more money over there. You cannot negotiate a moving target. In my opinion that is a terrible, terrible way to do the business of the people of the United States of America.

We ought to agree, first and foremost, we are only going to spend, and at this point I do not care what the number is, but we ought to all agree that all we are going to spend this year is \$1.91 trillion or whatever that number is. Once we have that number and with just a little bit of leadership from somebody down at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, that agreement could be made in a half an hour. Then we could all begin to work out how much we really need for Treasury-Postal, how much we really need for Energy and Water, how much ought to go for Health and Human Services, how much goes to education. All those other things are relatively easy once you decide how big the pie is. Maybe I am just crazy, because that is the way 50 States do it, and yet it cannot be done here at the Federal level.

Mr. STENHOLM. Here again, we keep talking about, the sign is up again, "How much is enough?" The majority party set a new set of caps at \$645 billion when you attached it to the Foreign Operations bill. I did not vote for it because that is too much. But you did.

2030

You keep pointing the finger of blame. I am not here tonight to point the finger of blame. What I am trying to say is the \$645 billion is set; and if in the final negotiations on all the appropriations, whatever the President makes us do, if we spend more than \$645 billion, you know, all of us know, we will have to sequester and we will have to cut across the board in order to bring it back to \$645 billion, unless the new Congress is like the past three Congresses, we do not live up to the budget rules.

We all understand that.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me claim some time here and say these are some of the things in the President's budget: 2,300 new jobs at the Department of Agriculture; 2,800 at the IRS, like we all want that; almost 3,400 at the Department of Veterans Affairs, that might

be a good idea there, after years of this administration cutting it; 1,300 at the Department of Interior; 1,000 at the Department of Commerce; 2,700 at the Department of Transportation.

Some examples of the President new spending proposals, \$15 million to increase food stamp spending for migrant children; \$85 million for the Clean Air Partnership Act; \$30 million for information immigration initiative; \$4.25 million for the international environmental monitoring program; \$15 million for money laundering strategy; \$100 million for nongame wildlife grants to States; \$30 million for the Delta Regional Authority; \$100 million for the long-term Russian initiative. I do not know if that was alluding to a document of Mr. Chernomyrdin; but \$10 million for the fishery vessel buyout; \$5.5 million for the Global Disaster Information Network; \$4.5 million for the Indian Country Tourism Development; \$10 million for gun destruction. These were all in the President's budget proposal, which was dead on arrival. I do not think any of the Democrats even voted for it.

What concerns me in these back rooms when you have somebody negotiating from the White House is how many of these are sneaked back into the budget? That is where I get concerned.

The gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. I would like to simply state that, first of all, your leadership made clear at the beginning of the year that they had no intention of getting in a room with Bill Clinton because they said that when Newt Gingrich got in a room to negotiate with Bill Clinton that the President stole his socks, I think was the term of your majority whip.

With respect to some of the items you just mentioned, is the gentleman aware that the item in conference to add the funding for food stamps for the children of immigrants was offered by a Republican subcommittee chairman? The gentleman has questioned the expenditure for money laundering. Is the gentleman for illegal money laundering?

Mr. KINGSTON. Actually, I am a Republican. I do not know that much about money laundering, particularly foreign money.

Mr. OBEY. Well, Richard Nixon knew an awful lot about it, did he not?

Mr. KINGSTON. There must have been some students of Nixon who are alive and well today in Washington.

Mr. OBEY. Is the gentleman suggesting the President should not try to deal with the laundering of drug money?

Mr. KINGSTON. Here is not what I am suggesting. Here is what I am saying. The President's budget was full of all kinds of new spending initiatives and new fee proposals. Some of those may be very good. But I know this, that his budget was voted down on a bipartisan basis by this House of Representatives.

Mr. OBEY. No, it was not.

Mr. KINGSTON. What my concern is, is some of this back on the table. The gentleman, with his knowledge knows, how in conferences things do pop back on the table; some very good, some with lots of merit, but there are also things that do not have that much merit and need to be vetted a little, and that is my point.

Mr. OBEY. Would the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KINGSTON. Yes, and then let me yield to the other gentleman.

Mr. OBEY. What I find amusing is that the majority party insisted on raising the military budget by \$20 billion above last year. They insisted on passing appropriation bills that had some \$9 billion above the President's level for a variety of items, especially projects for Members in their districts, but then when it comes to education, which is where the final division lay, you were objecting in conference, or your representatives were, to our raising Pell grants to the amount that you yourself said you wanted them funded at in May. And your representatives were objecting to our raising funding for special education to the same level that you said on the floor you wanted it raised to in March of this year.

So we were simply trying to prevent hypocrisy from having a bad name.

Mr. KINGSTON. I appreciate the gentleman standing up for the Republican House Members in those conferences.

The gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. It begs a larger question. My friend from Wisconsin mentioned special education. Indeed, what we have done here in terms of funding, IDEA, has been to increase by some 100 percent the amounts of funds there. What we have also done under the leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, was to fulfill a promise made when my friend was here much earlier. Almost a quarter century ago when I was still in high school, when this Congress went on record saying it would supply 40 percent of the total funding for that program, it took this Congress, the same Congress that balanced the budget, the same Congress that kept its hands out of the Social Security money, the same Congress that kept its hands out of the Medicare cookie jar, it took this Congress to achieve that promise.

So I appreciate my friend's point of view from his inside view of the Committee on Appropriations, but I think from time to time we need to step back and take a look at the big picture.

Mr. OBEY. If the gentleman would yield, he is misinformed on that.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I would yield to my friend from Minnesota.

Mr. OBEY. Would the gentleman yield on that question, because those numbers are wrong.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Let me pose another question. Then I would be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KINGSTON. The gentleman from Minnesota and then the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. The gentleman has taken some umbrage at us asking the question, how much is enough?

Mr. OBEY. I would be very happy to answer that question, if you would yield me some time.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Let me just complete my thought here. Our colleague from Texas was quite upset that we had raised the spending caps, and so am I. But as far as I can remember, the President has signed the Defense bill. He did not quarrel with that. So we really are left with this question. Perhaps the gentleman from Wisconsin can tell us how much would be enough? How much more spending do we have to agree to?

Mr. OBEY. If the gentleman would yield time so I can answer the question.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I would be happy to. What is the final number?

Mr. OBEY. Would the gentleman yield me some time so I can answer the question?

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me say this.

Mr. OBEY. I did not think the gentleman wanted a real answer.

Mr. KINGSTON. I am going to yield time. I do want to remind my friends that as somebody who does special orders, never have Republicans received so much time during the Democrat hour, just to say that for a little advertising. And in the spirit of Hershey, let me yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman. Let me point out with respect to IDEA, the fact is what was at stake in conference is whether or not we would be allowed to add an additional \$300 million to the level that you appropriated in the House-passed bill. Your negotiators consistently resisted that until the last day when we finally obtained support for an additional \$300 million above the House bill.

That means that we are still only funding 17 percent of the promise that the Congress made on IDEA when we should be under 40 percent under the authorization.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Would the gentleman yield? That is exactly the point.

Mr. OBEY. You do not want an answer, do you?

Mr. HAYWORTH. That is the point I made to my friend from Wisconsin, who for a time chaired the Committee on Appropriations. The fact is, the problem is, the promise was made nearly a quarter century ago. My friend from Wisconsin raises what should be considered a triumph, that after long and hard negotiating an agreement was reached. But the question was begged nearly a quarter century ago. Where was the funding then?

Mr. OBEY. I see. If the gentleman would yield, when you want to raise IDEA it is okay; but when we want to add money to special education, then it is not okay. Is that it?

Mr. HAYWORTH. If my friend would yield the time, this is precisely the point.

Mr. OBEY. I see.

Mr. HAYWORTH. This is precisely the point. I think my friend misunderstands the historical context because my friend had margins of votes in excess of 100 and could have, during the days when he controlled the purse, could have fully funded IDEA had he chosen to with other Members of the majority party then. That was then. This is now.

I think it is profound, Mr. Speaker, that we have moved to fund the program, and I champion the fact that my friend sat down to negotiate.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me claim some time here because I really think this is a good dialogue; and I would say amongst those who are on the floor tonight, as long as we are talking we can move the ball further down the road and we can get somewhere with it.

I want to shift just slightly the focus, though. As I see the President's proposal to federalize school construction, one of the things that is disturbing to me, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) somewhat agreed the other night, and I will let him restate whatever his position is, is the President's insistence, apparently a union payoff, to have Davis-Bacon part of local school construction, which means the cost of local school construction will be up 25 percent. And that item is on the table, as I understand it. And that is something disturbing to me because when I go back to Glynn County, Brantley County, Wayne County, Georgia, they do not want to know, hey, the good news is the Federal Government is going to have more money for school construction; the bad news is it is going to cost you 25 percent more, and you probably should have just done it without the Federal Government's help.

Could the gentleman from Wisconsin enlighten us where that is in the negotiation?

Mr. OBEY. I would be happy to, if the gentleman would let me respond, and I thank the gentleman for the time.

As the gentleman knows, there are two pieces to the school construction and school modernization proposals. In the bipartisan agreement, which your leadership blew up, in that bipartisan agreement, the construction modernization program was included in the bipartisan agreement.

The school construction item was not. The school construction item under that agreement was moved to the tax bill, and the argument was left to the tax bill and to whatever fate the tax bill would experience.

So in the package that your negotiators and I, representing the Democrats, agreed to, we have the school modernization program that was funded at a level of, I believe, \$1.3 billion, and then 25 percent of the overall amount that originally had been aimed at school modernization was, at the in-

sistence of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) and Republicans, provided for other programs. It could have been used for either technology or it could have been used for special education. That was a bipartisan agreement which we agreed upon, and your leadership then blew up.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me say this: As I understand it, the reason why there was agreement on it is it was in exchange for other concessions which the White House was offering, and when the White House reneged on their part of the bargain then our House leadership said, okay, if that is the case then we are going to go back to square one.

Mr. OBEY. That is a totally false statement.

Mr. KINGSTON. That is what we understand from our leadership, and they have said that so far.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. OBEY. As is often the case, the gentleman's understanding is faulty.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Let me just come back. I am trying to keep a running total here, and you said all we needed was an extra \$300 million for IDEA above and beyond what we already spent.

Mr. OBEY. No, I believe we need \$4 billion additional in IDEA.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. If I could just finish here, then you said but we also want another \$1.3 billion for school construction. Is that all we are talking about?

Mr. OBEY. No.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Because I understood that we were about \$8 billion apart. Now back in Minnesota and Wisconsin, \$8 billion is a lot of money. There must have been more money somewhere else.

Mr. OBEY. I would be happy to give the gentleman the rest of the list if you would yield.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. If you could just give us the numbers. How far apart are we in the numbers?

Mr. OBEY. We were not apart on any number. Every number in the bill had been agreed to by the negotiators. There was no disagreements left on the numbers.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. They may have been agreed to by the negotiators, but ultimately you have to get 218 votes around this place. Some of us are a little upset about how much we have spent already, as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) indicated already.

Mr. OBEY. You do not want to hear the answer, do you?

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me reclaim the time here. One of the problems that we are having here is that it does appear often that when questions are answered they go on into speeches, and if we could just answer the questions it would probably be a lot faster.

The gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I think we, Members of the House, members of the general public, need to understand how

much is enough? I mean, at what point do you see, yeah, that is all we want to spend. Is it \$645 billion? Is it \$660 billion? Is it \$700 billion? We never get a clear answer to that question.

Mr. OBEY. Would the gentleman yield so I can respond?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Yes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Yes.

Mr. OBEY. I repeat, there was not a single difference remaining on numbers.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. But I did not hear a number.

Mr. OBEY. We had an agreement.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. What is the number? How much?

Mr. OBEY. Of what? The number of what?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. How much you want to spend? That is the question we have been asking all week. How much is enough?

Mr. OBEY. I will be happy to answer.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Is it \$670 billion? Is it \$700 billion?

Mr. OBEY. You asked what the differences were on the table, and I told you there were no dollar differences.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. How long do we have to wait? Lord, Lord, how long will it be? When will they tell us how much is enough? We have already gone over the spending caps.

Mr. OBEY. The gentleman is debating himself.

2045

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I think this is indicative of the process. I appreciate the good-faith efforts of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, who has served with distinction for going on 3 decades in this Chamber, but here is the quintessential difference. My friend from Minnesota is asking, what is the bottom line? My friend from Wisconsin wants to revisit a process which he knows full well also entails sitting down and achieving consensus, not only with those at the table, but also with those in the White House who earlier tonight he said could negotiate for the President, in lieu of the President, the same way it works here, where your side has a point of view, our side has a point of view, and we attempt to reach a consensus.

So I would again be interested to hear if there was, in fact, a number, rather than a process. What is the number? Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, how much is enough?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to answer that, if the gentleman will yield. The gentleman asked me two different questions. I answered the first and the gentleman would not let me answer the second. Would the gentleman let me answer the second?

If the gentleman wanted to know what we were asking for on education, what we were asking is that we add \$4.2 billion above the conference bill for education. That is what we were asking for. We were asking for additional funding for after-school centers, additional

funding for smaller class size, additional funding to correct the fact that one out of every 10 teachers is not certified to teach the subject that they are teaching, and additional funding to provide the largest increase in the Pell grants in the history of the program. And we had agreed, Republican and Democrat alike, on ever single one of those dollars. The Republican leadership blew it up, over a totally different issue not involving money at all.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, what was the issue?

Mr. OBEY. The gentleman knows very well what the issue was.

Mr. HAYWORTH. No, we do not.

Mr. OBEY. The issue was whether or not the Congress should be allowed to block the President's effort to institute protection for workers against repetitive motion injuries.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Georgia will yield, because that is something very different. The President of the United States came out and said that it was the special interests who stopped this, not a legitimate question of policy. I am glad my friend from Wisconsin brought up the fact, and we affirm tonight, that there was a legitimate difference in terms of protecting small business people, and employers, and claiming that somehow people are captive of the special interests. I yield back to my friend from Georgia.

Mr. OBEY. No, no.

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Again, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin is talking a policy issue, and we are trying to solve the appropriation bills.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the other side are not trying to solve anything tonight.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, whether it is illegal aliens or ergonomics, they are policy questions which I am not certain would pass.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, as I understand it, the House level of the Labor, Health and Human Services bill was about \$106 billion, and the gentleman wants to add \$4.2 billion.

Mr. OBEY. No, that is not correct.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman tell me what the number was?

Mr. OBEY. The number is \$608.2, the House number.

Mr. KINGSTON. Okay. Plus, then it would be \$108. But then what we are arguing about are the riders that the President wants to put on there.

Mr. OBEY. No, no, it was a Republican item. That was a Republican rider which the gentleman voted for.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. OBEY. The President was opposing your rider.

Mr. KINGSTON. It is a rider, and the President is wanting to put the rider on the bill.

Mr. OBEY. And your leadership voted to blow it up.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas has been standing here politely, and I yield to him.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. If we can kind of get back to the basic thesis of the whole 1-hour tonight that the gentleman from Georgia has started. On the question of how much is enough that my colleagues keep asking, but they are not listening to what is being said by someone who is on the Committee on Appropriations. The \$645 billion has been set as a cap. Any additional fussing about additional money is going to have to be resolved under the House rules, which I assume you all will support; I certainly will.

Now, when we start talking about ergonomics, let the record show, that was a rider added by your side of the aisle, which I supported. And let the record show that on school construction, I do agree that Davis-Bacon should not be applicable to local bond issues. But that was a rider that your side put on, not our side, but I happen to agree.

Immigration, we have already talked about that one. I think we can find a middle ground that will treat people of our country who are doing tremendous service to our country fairly by finding an agreement, and I think the gentleman from Arizona and I would agree on that. But the \$4 million is an erroneous number and should not be coming out on the House floor.

The one area that I really disagree with the majority party on is in the area of hospitals, home health, nursing homes and other health care providers, the BBA fix. I happen to totally disagree with what your side has put together regarding how we are going to deal with a very serious problem facing our rural hospitals, which is my district, nursing homes; and I suspect we all agree to that. But you put together a package, your side put together a package, which you allowed no one on my side of the aisle to have any input into, and no one in the administration to have any input into, and you said, take it or leave it. Some of us said we think we can do better.

If there is one reservation that I have about us going home before completing this, it is in this area, because it is giving a tremendous amount of uncertainty; but we are not going to finish that, because the Senate has gone home. But that is one area in which, again, I think, I think that reasonable people on both sides, once we get away from this rhetoric, the blame game, and I am not here defending the President, or defending my leadership, or defending anybody else, except when I think they are right, and in this case, I think they are right.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, let me reclaim the time, because we are going down to the wire and the gentleman has made his point.

I want to point out that that bill was endorsed by the Rural Hospital Asso-

ciation and the American Hospital Association, and I believe the American Cancer Society. There was a whole list of associations who endorsed that.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, there is another important point. I appreciate my friend from Texas and his version of events, and I understand how he perceives this, but if I am not mistaken, the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Ways and Means offered that, and we can go back and check the vote, but I believe it was unanimous.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, it was the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. HAYWORTH. There actually is joint jurisdiction.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, it was the Committee on Commerce, it was not the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I stand corrected.

Well, then, the Commerce section of the jurisdiction was cosponsored in bipartisan fashion by the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON), and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LUTHER), and there was bipartisan consensus bringing that out and bringing it to the floor.

Now, good people can disagree. My vantage point is, also representing rural hospitals, I took a look at that \$31 billion package, realizing that the bulk of the funding goes to the hospitals; some \$11 billion, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, that is not hay, that is real money, going to help people. My friend has a different point of view, but I do not see how we can turn our backs on that.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I just want to come back. Apparently we are very close to an agreement on how much is enough: \$645 billion, is that right? The gentleman from Wisconsin, is that the final number, \$645 billion?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman totally misses the point. The issue is not how much was going to be spent, it was where it was going to be spent and what the priorities were going to be. There was no disagreement on the total amount of funding.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I do understand that, that there are differences in priorities. I understand that. I come from a different district than the gentleman from Wisconsin, and we all have different priorities, but we still have never gotten to the point as far as I am concerned of how much do we want to spend? What is the total number? Because then ultimately, reasonable people, and it happens in every State legislature, once they agree on how big the pie is, they can all sit down and decide how much is going to go to these various different programs.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, but the problem is, my Republican colleagues passed a budget resolution which pretended that they were going to spend \$40 billion less than they knew they were going to spend.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I guess we are not going to get an answer.

Mr. OBEY. That is the problem.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, how much is enough? \$645 is the number. We can fuss about how we spend it, but \$645 billion is the number. So let me remind everyone now when we are talking about numbers, when we started this year, the Republican budget said 627 was enough. The President said 637 was enough. The Republicans said that was too much. The Blue Dogs came in at 633 and said that is a reasonable compromise.

Well, where would we be tonight had the Republicans accepted our version and we would have been standing here tonight, and I suspect the gentleman from Wisconsin would have been agreeing with us on the 633, just like we are saying on the 645.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if I can claim some time, having come from the State legislative ranks and now serving on the Committee on Appropriations, one of my big disappointments is that it seems that regardless of who is in charge, the budget is ignored; and I think we have to all hold the line on spending. I do not know why we ignore it year after year.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, again, I thank my friend from Texas for bringing up a point and for his unending advocacy of the position of the Blue Dog Democrats. We look forward to working at a conservative governing coalition with my friend, provided that those who decide who comes back to this institution see fit to return to us, and we look forward to that.

Yes, I think it begs a larger question of budget reform; but it still does not change the dynamic, which is even if we were to agree on a number, is there any guarantee that our President would likewise agree? And therein lies the problem: a continual moving target.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the President does not sign the budget resolutions. The President has no authority under the law to sign budget resolutions.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Again, I thank my friend from Wisconsin who is a master of process. However, there is a larger question.

Mr. Speaker, I extended to the gentleman the courtesy of not interrupting his speech, and I would appreciate the chance to respond, and then if my friend from Georgia chooses to yield the gentleman time, he can do so accordingly.

Mr. Speaker, the American people want to know, can we come to an agreement. I think there are many different alternatives there, many different ways to get there. But I would hope that in the immediate days ahead, the President will return from the campaign trail, and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the

Democratic leader, will return from the campaign trail, and that working together, we can find a way to put people before politics.

I have a great deal of respect for my friends on the other side of the aisle. There is not total agreement, but then again, that is the virtue, even with the challenge of serving in this institution; and I hope that we can put people before politics and people before process.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy, and I will be very brief.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me say one thing about the courtesy. I appreciate you all mentioning that, but we are here, as my Democratic colleagues all are here, because we really do want to resolve this. We have philosophical differences, but I think everybody in this Chamber knows that the people want a product here. So I think we are all here because we want to do the right thing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I totally agree. When we talk about process, for 16 years of my 22, I was in the majority party, and many on the Republican side blamed me as a Democrat for being part of the big spending problem. And I had to accept it, because we were in the majority.

My frustration with the Republican side, with the Republican leadership, not with my colleagues here tonight, but my frustration is, the Republicans continue to point the finger of blame at the minority side, and everyone that understands the process, understands that minorities cannot achieve that which the majority does not go along with.

Mr. Speaker, a little constitutional reminder: when the President is of the other party, the President has sufficient power, and the only way we can beat a President is with a two-thirds vote override. When we have a very small majority, it is important that we work to achieve some help on the other side.

My frustration is that at no time during the last 2 years has the Republican side ever attempted to work to override the President.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, we only have 2 minutes remaining. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, in summation, I think people of goodwill ought to be able to resolve this. I think the American people are really pretty tired of the partisan bickering. I have said from the beginning, it would seem to me that reasonable people could come up with a final number and then work out these differences.

I do not think they are that big, but apparently some people believe that they could gain some political advantage by holding the Congress hostage through the month of October, and that strategy has not worked. Now,

maybe after the break, we can come back and get this thing resolved.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Georgia, and I thank my friends from the other side of the aisle who have taken the time to come down and offer their insights, their perspectives. I think even as frustrating as it gets, I think we ought to give thanks that we bring to this Chamber honest opinions and convictions, deeply held; and in an imperfect world, we attempt to find some sort of consensus and compromise. I think it is worth noting, as my friend from Texas has pointed out time and again, we have exceeded in terms of spending; and as my friend from Minnesota points out, the target tends to change, and again the question is, how much is enough?

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the participants of this Special Order and thank everyone for trying to keep working on these things dark into the night. Maybe, if we can get a few of our colleagues back here with us, we could resolve this.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 123. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 160. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives.

2100

ISSUES OF CONCERN TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE NOT ADDRESSED BY THE 106TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PITTS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, earlier this evening I was concerned because I think the impression was being given by the Republican leadership and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that if we stayed here the next few days, that we were going to be able to accomplish something.

I think that was a false impression, because we all know that the other body has already gone home and passed a continuing resolution that brings the other body back I think on November 13 or 14. So as much as my House colleagues and the Republican leadership