



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 7, 2000

No. 150

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY).

□

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
December 7, 2000.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MAC THORNBERRY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

□

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:
Lord God, we trust You will resolve our uncertainties and bring about true healing.

We know You can recreate greatness in this Nation and raise up leaders in our day who will guide us with courage and wisdom. Through the prophet Isaiah You have told us You are our redeemer. Breathe the breath of lasting freedom in Your people. Make us confident that You will lead us now and forever. Amen.

□

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

□

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. McNULTY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. McNULTY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

□

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3514. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a system for sanctuaries for chimpanzees that have been designated as being no longer needed in research conducted or supported by the Public Health Service, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4281. An act to establish, wherever feasible, guidelines, recommendations, and regulations that promote the regulatory acceptance of new or revised scientifically valid toxicological tests that protect human and animal health and the environment while reducing, refining, or replacing animal tests and ensuring human safety and product effectiveness.

H.R. 4827. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to prevent the entry by false pretenses to any real property, vessel, or aircraft of the United States or secure area of any airport, to prevent the misuse of genuine and counterfeit police badges by those seeking to commit a crime, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5640. An act to expand homeownership in the United States, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with amendments bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4493. An act to establish grants for drug treatment alternative to prison programs administered by State or local prosecutors.

H.R. 4640. An act to make grants to States for carrying out DNA analyses for use in the Combined DNA Index System of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, to provide for the collection and analysis of DNA samples from certain violent and sexual offenders for use in such system, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5630. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United

States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendments numbered 2 and 4 to the bill (H.R. 3048) "An Act to amend section 879 of title 18, United States Code, to provide clearer coverage over threats against former Presidents and members of their families, and for other purposes"; and agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 96-114, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, announces the appointment of the following individuals to the Congressional Award Board—Galen J. Reser, of Connecticut; and Rex B. Wackerle, of Virginia.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 105-341, the Chair, on behalf of the Democratic Leader, announces the appointment of the following individual to the Women's Progress Commemoration Commission: Ann F. Lewis, of Maryland, vice Joan Doran Hedrick, of Connecticut.

□

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces that 1-minute speeches will be postponed until the end of the day.

□

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of December 6, 2000, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 127) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H12023

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of House Joint Resolution 127 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 127

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 106-275, is further amended by striking the date specified in section 106(c) and inserting "December 8, 2000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, December 6, 2000, 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 within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Joint Resolution 127, 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, House Joint Resolution 127 is one more continuing resolution that is required, inasmuch as several of the appropriations bills have not been concluded. I might say that these bills basically are awaiting conclusion not because of appropriations issues but because of extraneous issues that in my opinion do not even belong in an appropriations bill. But nevertheless, these issues are there, and they are causing some controversy.

So I would point out to our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that we have set a record. This is the largest number of continuing resolutions that any Congress to my knowledge has ever considered. It is not the longest number of days covered by CRs, but this one is No. 18.

The reason that we have had to present so many continuing resolutions is because we cannot get agreement to go beyond 1 day at a time, in most of the cases, so we are here with a one-day CR. Tomorrow, we will have to do another CR. Saturday, we may have to do another one-day CR, unless the negotiations that are taking place at the White House as we speak with the President produce some concrete decisions.

If that is the case, then we will be able to present to the Members a final package of appropriations measures by the middle of next week. But at this point, Mr. Speaker, it remains to be seen what comes from the White House meeting between our leaders, the bicameral and bipartisan leadership, and the President of the United States.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, this is indeed Groundhog Day over and over and

over and over again. As I think most Members understand, we were supposed to have our budget work done by October 1. It is not rare that we do not. That has often happened in the history of the House under both parties.

What is rare is this difference. In the past, in the main, continuing resolutions which keep the government open after the expiration of the previous fiscal year are passed for the purpose of giving the leadership of both parties and those involved in negotiations an opportunity to have more time to complete their work by resolving their differences.

Instead, I am forced to conclude that continuing resolutions in this situation are being used as a tool to shield this institution from doing its work resolving our differences and completing the work needed on the budget for not the coming year but the year that we have been in since October 1.

Continuing resolutions are supposed to be used to buy time to find compromises. Yet, we see gross evidence that in fact there are other plans afoot. I do not care if we take a look at the Washington Post today or if we take a look at the Wall Street Journal or if we take a look at the New York Times or if we take a look at the AP report, which I have seen today, we see that the distinguished whip on the majority side of the aisle, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), is in essence counseling that what the majority party ought to do is to push the President into a position where he is forced to choose between shutting down government agencies and accepting what he describes as Republican priorities, including a very large scale-back of education funding which was in the budget agreement which was negotiated and agreed to before the elections but was never brought to the floor by the leadership of the House.

I deeply believe that there are the votes to pass that proposal if it can ever reach the floor of the House, but permission to bring it to the floor of the House is being withheld.

We are being told that what must happen in order for us to complete our work is that many billions of dollars in education funding which were agreed to in that conference report should now be stripped out of that bill as a price for its passage. Until that happens, we are being asked to pass a series of continuing resolutions a day at a time or two days at a time that slowly click the clock down to the point where there is no time left to do anything to provide this funding for this year. That is why we are now on the 18th continuing resolution since October 1.

I would ask those who are urging that the education funding be cut back in the bill that we negotiated, I would ask whether they really do believe that we ought to back away from what I regarded as one of the best achievements of this Congress, a negotiated agreement that provided a 22 percent increase in support for education over the previous year.

If Members do not like those increases, I would ask, which ones do they want to cut back? Do they want to see the class size reduction program cut back, so we can slack off on our effort to reduce the size of classes?

Do they want to reduce the after-school learning programs that we are trying to ramp up so that children from families with two parents working outside the household can spend the after-school hours in a meaningful learning experience with adult supervision, rather than either roaming the streets or going home to an empty house?

Would they prefer that we eliminate some of the funding for the Title I program under which 900,000 disadvantaged students are supposed to receive extra help in reading and math, for instance?

Would they propose that we scale back the hard-won increase of \$500 per child in the Pell grant program in the maximum grant?

Would they propose that we scale back the work study program?

Which of these education programs is it in the national interest to scale back on from the amounts that were negotiated on a bipartisan level between both houses of the Congress and the administration?

Should we scale back on the efforts to improve the quality of teacher instruction in some 15,000 school districts in this country?

Do we really want to have physical education teachers continuing to teach math and English teachers continuing to teach science? I do not think so. Do we really want to scale back on the effort to help huge, humongous-sized high schools redesign themselves into smaller, more intimate learning centers? I do not think we want to do that.

It seems to me that we have a majority in both parties that would support that agreement if it could be brought to the floor. I would urge the leadership of the House to allow that agreement to come to the floor. It was negotiated in good faith, and that apparently is what is preventing us from completing our appropriations work.

I cannot address the other non-appropriation items that are still at issue in this Congress, but I really believe that if the committee were allowed to do so, we could reach a reasonable compromise on the immigration issue in a very short period of time, and I think that we could produce a majority of votes for an agreed-upon compromise on education funding.

But if we are to be confronted by ultimatums such as that suggested by the distinguished minority whip, suggesting that the President should be backed into a corner where he has to accept what the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) defines as Republican priorities or else see a shut-down of an agency's ability to perform, then I think we are in a most destructive atmosphere.

I find it ironic that the majority party campaigned and their standard-bearer campaigned on the theme that they would pursue a course of bipartisanship, and yet the very first act they are asking us to engage in is to back out of a bipartisan agreement that was negotiated shortly before the election but never brought to the floor for a vote.

I would urge that that approach be reconsidered. I, for one, have supported all of these continuing resolutions in the hope that they would give us more time to resolve differences.

□ 1415

Mr. Speaker, but when they are simply provided as a tool by which those differences are shielded from being resolved, then I see no purpose in voting for further continuing resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote for this one, but I see no reason to vote for any continuing resolution beyond tomorrow, because we ought to be able to wrap this up in a day or a day and a half.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to advise the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) that I will have two speakers for brief periods of time. After that, then the gentleman may wish to respond; and then I will have a closing statement and that will be the extent of our debate for today.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the gentleman that if, in fact, the President of the United States would be agreeable to a compromise package that will be presented to him today, the gentleman from Wisconsin is correct, we can finish this in a day and a half. But that has not been too easy to get that agreement.

As a matter of fact, on July 27 of this year, we concluded the conference on the Labor, HHS appropriations bill, and then October 29, we finally came to an agreement on a bipartisan fashion in a sort of a conference agreement, but the next morning, that agreement fell apart not because of something that had to do with appropriations, but something that was not related to appropriations. And that is one of the problems that we are facing.

Mr. Speaker, that is one of the problems that we have been faced with on appropriations bills through this whole season. The appropriations part of the process was the easy part of the job. Where we found great difficulty was on those riders that were attached to appropriations bills.

Why is that the case? Because appropriations bills, Mr. Speaker, have to pass. Congress has to pass appropriations bills. Members, whether they are rank and file Members or whether they are leadership Members, see a vehicle out here that has to pass. And since a regular authorizing vehicle might not be available, they say hey, here is a good chance to do what I want to do on

the appropriations bill that has to pass.

Those are the kind of controversies that have caused us time problems. And I say again, the appropriations part of these bills have not created most of the controversies that we have experienced.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE).

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I may ask a question of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, but there are those of us who are rank and file Republicans who frankly were somewhat alarmed by what we saw in the newspapers of the statement by the distinguished majority whip that we should have a 1-year continuing resolution. Agreeing with what I think the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has said and what the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has said, it is the judgment of a lot of us that this has been worked on very hard by both parties, a lot of good input has gone into it, a lot of progress has been made. We are pretty close to the end.

These various programs would be good for this country, and we should try to do it as rapidly as possible. Let me point out, we are, I think, 2 months and a week beyond the beginning of the fiscal year for which this should have been done. I think personally it should be done by this particular Congress and this particular President and not by the next President and the next Congress.

I would glean from the comments of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) that the gentleman is in agreement with this and that is the direction which the gentleman continues to go, in spite of what I read of the statements of the majority whip.

I assume that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the Speaker of the House, is still in that position, and just the comforts to us who feel this is what we are waiting for and that we are having continuing resolutions for and we have been waiting for, I would like to get the gentleman's view of that.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASTLE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would say that the gentleman is exactly correct. I agree with the statement that he made. I believe that the 106th Congress should complete the business of the 106th Congress.

I think it will be a tragic mistake to try to run this continuing resolution until the end of the fiscal year. I would strongly object to that, and I certainly cannot speak for the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the Speaker of the House. That gentleman will speak for himself. And as far as the majority whip, I might tell you that he enjoys the same frustrations that we all experience, but the gentleman is trying to

find a way to get things moving, just like all of us are.

Why he said what he said certainly is in his own mind, but I can tell the gentleman that his motives are to get this work concluded. And if he uses the tactic to get our attention, that may be what he is doing. I am not sure, but I know that he wants this job concluded.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say that regardless of all of that, I agree. It is our responsibility to conclude the business of the 106th Congress, and we must do it as expeditiously as possible. But I must remind everyone that we are not only dealing with ourselves here in the House, Republicans and Democrats. We are also dealing with the United States Senate, Republicans and Democrats. We are also dealing with someone with a very big stick, a veto pen, who resides at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

It is not easy to bring these very divergent groups together, but that is what we are trying to do. And I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), one day CRs, in my opinion, are ridiculous.

We ought not be wasting the time of the Congress doing that. We should be using the time to conclude our business, but I am definitely opposed to a year-long continuing resolution.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, the comments of the gentleman give me comfort, and I thank the gentleman a great deal.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON).

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I have not been in negotiations in the White House. I am not a Member of the Republican leadership, but I am a concerned citizen, and I also am a Member of a bipartisan group which met with the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) yesterday and Members from both sides to try to find a way to bring our two parties together.

We have gone over and over the issues. We have gone over and over the dollar amounts. We have had things on the table and off the table and back on the table, and it just seems to me that we do a job in the amount of time we allow ourselves to do it in, and we are about at that point.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, because I think he has done an extraordinary job, are the issues such that we can, within a reasonable period of time, I say 24, 48 hours, solve these things and vote on them?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the issues are serious, and the issues are dealing with numbers that are very high in one area to some members, very low with another group of Members, also with the President, but some of the issues as I mentioned are not even related to appropriations.

The gentleman will recall we had the argument over the ergonomics issue, and then we had quite an argument over the question of granting blanket amnesty to those who are here in the United States illegally.

Those are two big issues that are not appropriations issues, but are being considered using the appropriations bill as a vehicle for their enactment. So things like that are causing us problems.

Can we get together? I do not see why we cannot get together. What needs to happen is everybody needs to realize that no one is going to get their way exactly the way they wanted it.

I am chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, but I cannot get my way all the time, and chairmen of our subcommittees cannot get their way all the time, but what we all have to recognize is there has to be a consensus.

We are almost evenly divided in this House and in the other body, so it is time to recognize each side has to give a little. If you want to get something, you have to give something, and that is what it is going to take to conclude our business.

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the, I think, thoughtful and bipartisan comments made by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, my good friends in a new bipartisan coalition that we have recently formed, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON), the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), and certainly with I think the wise remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) that he made to start this debate.

It seems to me that we have two questions here: A question of process and a question of bipartisanship.

On the question of process, the American people have hired us in the 106th Congress to do a job and to finish a job and to not shirk, to not neglect, to not ignore those responsibilities for either reasons of politics and Presidential elections or reasons of convenience and push off those decisions to the 107th Congress.

We have been paid to make those decisions. We should make those decisions in this 106th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the second question that I think is important is a question of bipartisanship. Do we have one individual, a Speaker or a President, that can stand up and say either stand down and I want it my way 100 percent or shut down the government? That is not

the way this process and this body works. Nobody is going to get exactly what they want nor should they.

A number of bipartisan Members of this body, Democrats and Republicans, have signed on to a letter stating that "we urge you to ensure that the FY2001 budget is finalized and approved before the 106th Congress adjourns. We strongly believe that the passage of a continuing resolution in the next year would only serve to provide this Congress with an excuse to shirk its duty to the American people." That is signed by the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON), the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FORD), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD).

We want to see this process work. If we can make this final process on two of the most important bills that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) have worked in a bipartisan way, if we can make this work in a bipartisan way, we can then have a steppingstone to the 107th Congress to begin the needed and necessary and vital bipartisan work that we are going to require to get the people's business done.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we would sit back down together in a Democratic and Republican way and finish the job of the 106th Congress on education and health issues.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD, the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 6, 2000.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER AND MR. LEADER: We applaud your recent efforts at the highest levels of our congressional leadership to reach across the aisle and renew a meaningful dialog. As you know, our group of rank-and-file Republicans and Democrats is also dedicated to finding practical, bipartisan solutions to the issues facing the Congress.

Accordingly, we urge you to insure the FY 2001 budget is finalized and approved before the 106th Congress adjourns. We strongly believe that the passage of a continuing resolution into next year would serve only to provide this Congress with an excuse to shirk its duty to the American people.

Today we offer the support and encouragement of our membership in whatever ways might be helpful in realizing this important goal. We look forward to working with you on a common agenda in the 107th Congress.

Sincerely,

TIM ROEMER.
MIKE CASTLE.
HAROLD E. FORD, Jr.
RON KIND.
AMO HOUGHTON.
JIM DAVIS.
JAMES C. GREENWOOD.
FRED UPTON.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FORD).

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for yielding the time to me and I thank all of my colleagues.

As I listen to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON), as I have listened to the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG), I would hope that we can deal with what some of the realities are here.

There is going to be a closing statement where some of these matters will be discussed, but we cannot reach a compromise nor can we advance government if leaders on both sides are not willing to work together, nor can the other side expect this side to believe we can reach an agreement if top leaders on your side can scuttle a deal if they go back to their office and learn they were not consulted, or learn that they were not part of a meeting and suggest to Americans, suggest to this Congress that they have no problems with shutting down this government.

Mr. Speaker, it seems fitting that the majority whip's name is DELAY, because that is what is happening here. And I have great respect for the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY). And I certainly do not mean to cast aspersions on his person or on him. But we have to deal with this reality.

I say to my friends on the other side, if you can bring the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) to the table to agree to work to compromise and to reach some agreement, not for Republicans or Democrats, but for the people, then we can all go home.

We are willing to deal. The President is willing to deal. From the newspaper accounts, Mr. LOTT is willing to deal. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) is willing to deal. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) is willing to work to try to find agreement, but if the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) is going to make all of these decisions, then perhaps he ought to be the only one in the room when an agreement is trying to be reached.

Mr. Speaker, I say to all of my friends on the other side, I am proud to be a part of any organization that seeks to move government forward. I say to all of my friends, bring the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) to the table, let him lay out what it is exactly he wants, other than blaming Mr. Clinton for shutting down the government and, perhaps, we can start from there, move from there, and conclude from that point.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, to recapitulate, there are a number of appropriation bills which still have not passed, but a number of them primarily because they just got caught up in accidents that started out to happen to somebody else, and we can fix those in about 5 minutes. No problem with those.

There are only two real problems left. One is to find some reasonable language compromise on the immigration question, which the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) points out correctly, is not an appropriations issue. The second is to deal with the Labor, Health and Education appropriation conference report.

□ 1430

I would remind Members that, when that bill came back from conference, there were objections raised on both sides of the aisle to one language provision in that bill, namely, the language provision that related to ergonomics. I was highly unsatisfied with the results, from my perspective. A number of Members on that side of the aisle were highly unsatisfied with the results from their perspective.

But with that exception, I do not recall a single stated objection to any of the dollar agreements in the bill. I do not recall any arguments about any of the appropriation decisions on funding levels. To me, education ought to be the top priority of both parties.

I had said consistently in this debate that, if one looks at the history of how different programs were increased as they moved through the process of the education area, that there were some areas such as special education which were Republican priorities. There were other areas that were Democratic priorities.

It seems to me, given the realities of the changes in the economic circumstances that we have seen with these larger surpluses available, that the one area that deserves top priority for funding is education; and that if we truly are going to deal in a bipartisan manner, there ought to be room for the education priorities of both parties within the same bill.

I think that is the kind of bill that was put together with the help of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) in that conference report. I would still renew my request to the House leadership to allow that bill to come to the floor. I am confident that if they did, there would be enough votes on both sides of the aisle to pass it in a truly bipartisan fashion, and we could, at least so far as appropriation items are concerned, conclude our business on an honorable note.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I, again, agree with what the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) said about the appropriations items. I want to assure the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and all of the Members that, in the final package, the latest package that we have provided to the leadership, education is still a high priority for the dollars that would be appropriated. Medical research through NIH, again, is a very high priority. The dollars are

larger than last year and larger than the President's request. But we understand the importance of these, and we want to get these items concluded.

We do not want to continue on a continuing resolution because that does not provide the additional investment that we need in medical research, that we need in education, and that we need in the other people's programs. But we do have to come to an agreement with people who are very far apart as we speak today.

Of all of the many issues that are out there, most of them are related one to another. There are one or two keys. If those two keys can come together, everything else falls into place. So I am optimistic, and I try to be optimistic all the time. I am optimistic today.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), my friend, said that this is like Groundhog Day over again. Most people think that Groundhog Day is that day in February where Punxsutawney Phil comes out of his little cave, and if he sees his shadow, winter is going to last for a certain period of time. If he does not see his shadow, it will last for another period of time.

But what the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) was referring to when he said this is like Groundhog Day all over again is a movie named "Groundhog Day." It had to do with a weather forecaster from a Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, television station who was in Punxsutawney to cover the emerging Punxsutawney Phil, the groundhog.

Through some fluke, he got into a situation where he repeated every day. Day after day after day, he repeated the same day. I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) that it sort of seems like Groundhog Day here when we are doing continuing resolutions day after day after day.

I do not know how long this went on, but for this newscaster, it went on a long time. But he learned so much about so many things in that period of time. The way the "Groundhog Day" was concluded and the day and the way that he got back into a cycle was he fell in love with the producer of his program who he was very hostile with in the beginning.

So if he and that producer could fall in love and end this cycle of continuous Groundhog Days day after day after day, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I can love each other. We can all love each other. The Congress can love the President. We can have our differences. But if we could just show a little love and compassion here and some understanding, we can conclude this business and finish the work of the 106th Congress.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to note that I have heard a number of Members come up to me and say about this impasse, this cannot go

on. I remember Herb Stein, who was the head of the council on economic advisors to President Nixon. I remember Herb Stein saying once in testimony before the Joint Economic Committee, "People say this cannot go on." He said, "My experience is, if something cannot go on, it stops." I would hope that this incessant number of continuing resolutions would stop and that the sparring would stop, and tomorrow we can bring a bill to the floor reflecting the bipartisan negotiations which we have already agreed upon and pass it and end this session.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would say that I hope that happens. It could happen. A lot of it is going to depend on what comes out of the meeting that is taking place at the White House as we speak.

Mr. Speaker, today, some time after the election on November 7, the Nation is pretty much divided right down the middle. In the House, the political differences are almost 50/50. In the Senate, they are 50/50. In the country on popular vote for President, 50/50. The Nation is politically pretty much divided.

But I want to remind my colleagues that this is America. This is the United States of America. There is something special about that. Remember, 59 years ago today, Pearl Harbor was attacked. The Nation did not have any real direction. We were an emerging industrial Nation. But, then Pearl Harbor was attacked. Americans came together with such a powerful statement, such a profound statement, and put together one of the most fantastic military capabilities in the world eventually.

It took a while, but we came together. We overcame all kinds of differences, different opinions, different challenges, different industrial challenges, different political challenges. We came together as a strong and powerful Nation. Ever since that day, we have been an outstanding example for the rest of the world of freedom, of justice, of the ability to work together in the best interest of the people of the United States and for those in the world that we are called upon to help.

If that could happen in America, it can happen here in this Congress. If we all settle down and recognize we have got to come together, we do not necessarily have the opportunity to go our own individual ways, but we have got to come together, if we do that, we will come together, and we will conclude the business of the 106th Congress and get ready for the 107th Congress, which is going to begin in just a few short days.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, December 6, 2000, the previous question is ordered.

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

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

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 359, nays 11, not voting 62, as follows:

[Roll No. 601]

YEAS—359

Abercrombie	Crowley	Hefley
Aderholt	Cubin	Heger
Allen	Cummings	Hill (IN)
Andrews	Cunningham	Hilleary
Baca	Davis (FL)	Hilliard
Bachus	Davis (VA)	Hinchey
Baker	Deal	Hinojosa
Baldacci	DeGette	Hobson
Baldwin	Delahunt	Hoefel
Ballenger	DeLauro	Hoekstra
Barcia	DeLay	Holden
Barrett (NE)	DeMint	Holt
Barrett (WI)	Deutsch	Hooley
Bartlett	Dicks	Horn
Bass	Doggett	Hostettler
Becerra	Dooley	Houghton
Bentsen	Doolittle	Hoyer
Bereuter	Doyle	Hulshof
Berkley	Dreier	Hunter
Berman	Duncan	Hyde
Berry	Dunn	Insee
Biggert	Edwards	Isakson
Bilirakis	Ehlers	Jackson (IL)
Bishop	Ehrlich	Jackson-Lee
Bliley	Engel	(TX)
Blumenauer	English	Jefferson
Blunt	Eshoo	Jenkins
Boehler	Etheridge	John
Boehner	Evans	Johnson (CT)
Bonilla	Everett	Johnson, E.B.
Borski	Ewing	Johnson, Sam
Boswell	Farr	Jones (NC)
Boyd	Fattah	Jones (OH)
Brady (PA)	Fletcher	Kanjorski
Brady (TX)	Foley	Kaptur
Brown (FL)	Forbes	Kelly
Brown (OH)	Ford	Kennedy
Burr	Fowler	Kildee
Burton	Frank (MA)	Kilpatrick
Buyer	Franks (NJ)	Klecza
Callahan	Frelinghuysen	Klink
Calvert	Frost	Knollenberg
Camp	Ganske	Kolbe
Campbell	Gejdenson	Kucinich
Canady	Gekas	Kuykendall
Cannon	Gephardt	LaFalce
Capps	Gibbons	LaHood
Cardin	Gilchrest	Lampson
Carson	Gilman	Larson
Castle	Gonzalez	Latham
Chabot	Goode	Lazio
Chambliss	Goodlatte	Leach
Clayton	Goodling	Lee
Clement	Gordon	Levin
Clyburn	Goss	Lewis (CA)
Coble	Green (WI)	Lewis (GA)
Collins	Greenwood	Lewis (KY)
Combest	Gutierrez	Linder
Condit	Gutknecht	LoBiondo
Conyers	Hall (OH)	Lofgren
Cook	Hall (TX)	Lowe
Cooksey	Hansen	Lucas (KY)
Cox	Hastings (FL)	Lucas (OK)
Coyne	Hastings (WA)	Luther
Cramer	Hayes	Maloney (CT)
Crane	Hayworth	Maloney (NY)

Manzullo	Phelps	Smith (WA)
Markey	Pickering	Snyder
Mascara	Pitts	Souder
Matsui	Pombo	Spence
McCarthy (MO)	Pomeroy	Spratt
McCollum	Porter	Stabenow
McDermott	Portman	Stearns
McGovern	Pryce (OH)	Stenholm
McHugh	Quinn	Strickland
McInnis	Radanovich	Stump
McIntosh	Rahall	Sununu
McIntyre	Ramstad	Sweeney
McKeon	Rangel	Tancredo
McKinney	Regula	Tanner
McNulty	Reyes	Tauscher
Meehan	Reynolds	Tauzin
Meek (FL)	Riley	Taylor (MS)
Meeks (NY)	Rivers	Terry
Menendez	Rodriguez	Thomas
Metcalf	Roemer	Thompson (CA)
Mica	Rogers	Thornberry
Millender-	Rohrabacher	Thune
McDonald	Rothman	Thurman
Minge	Roukema	Tiahrt
Mink	Roybal-Allard	Tierney
Moakley	Royce	Toomey
Mollohan	Ryun (KS)	Trafigant
Moore	Sabo	Turner
Moran (KS)	Salmon	Udall (CO)
Moran (VA)	Sanchez	Udall (NM)
Morella	Sanders	Upton
Murtha	Sandlin	Velazquez
Myrick	Sawyer	Vitter
Nadler	Saxton	Walden
Napolitano	Schaffer	Walsh
Neal	Schakowsky	Wamp
Nethercutt	Scott	Waters
Northup	Sensenbrenner	Watkins
Norwood	Serrano	Watt (NC)
Nussle	Sessions	Watts (OK)
Oberstar	Shadegg	Waxman
Obey	Shaw	Weiner
Olver	Shays	Weldon (FL)
Ortiz	Sherman	Weldon (PA)
Ose	Sherwood	Weller
Owens	Shimkus	Wexler
Oxley	Shows	Weygand
Pallone	Shuster	Whitfield
Pascarella	Simpson	Wilson
Pastor	Sisisky	Wolf
Payne	Skeen	Wu
Pease	Skelton	Wynn
Pelosi	Slaughter	Young (FL)
Peterson (MN)	Smith (NJ)	
Petri	Smith (TX)	

NAYS—11

Baird	Dingell	Stupak
Barton	Miller, George	Visclosky
Bonior	Paul	Woolsey
Capuano	Stark	

NOT VOTING—62

Ackerman	Fossella	Miller, Gary
Archer	Galleghy	Ney
Armey	Gillmor	Packard
Barr	Graham	Peterson (PA)
Bilbray	Granger	Pickett
Blagojevich	Green (TX)	Price (NC)
Bono	Hill (MT)	Rogan
Boucher	Hutchinson	Ros-Lehtinen
Bryant	Istook	Rush
Chenoweth-Hage	Kasich	Ryan (WI)
Clay	Kind (WI)	Sanford
Coburn	King (NY)	Scarborough
Costello	Kingston	Smith (MI)
Danner	Lantos	Talent
Davis (IL)	Largent	Taylor (NC)
DeFazio	LaTourette	Thompson (MS)
Diaz-Balart	Lipinski	Towns
Dickey	Martinez	Wicker
Dixon	McCarthy (NY)	Wise
Emerson	McCrery	Young (AK)
Filner	Miller (FL)	

□ 1504

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 601, I was in my Congressional District on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 601, unfortunately, due to an unavoidable weather delay I missed today's rollcall vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

□

PAUL COVERDELL NATIONAL FORENSIC SCIENCES IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2000

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the Senate bill (S. 3045) to improve the quality, timeliness, and credibility of forensic science services for criminal justice purposes, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, was the request just to have the bill considered?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) asked unanimous consent to discharge the Committee from further consideration of S. 3045 and to pass the bill in the House.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) to explain the purpose of his motion.

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

Mr. Speaker, the bill, S. 3045, is the Paul Coverdell National Forensic Science Improvement Act of 2000. It was introduced by Senator JEFF SESSIONS in the other body as a tribute to the late Senator Paul Coverdell. Senator Coverdell had introduced similar legislation earlier this Congress but did not live to see it acted upon. S. 3045 passed the other body by unanimous consent last Thursday.

S. 3045 is similar to a bill, H.R. 2340, introduced in the House by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP). It addresses the most pressing problems facing law enforcement today, the critical backlog of work in our State crime labs.

The crisis in our forensic labs is acute. According to a report issued in February by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, as of December 1997, 69 percent of State crime labs reported backlogs in the analysis of DNA samples alone. And of course, these backlogs also affect all types of evidence being prepared for trial.

The delays in conducting autopsies and crime scene evidence often delay the trial of a case, which means that victims have to suffer longer waits for justice to be done. And it also means