

my colleagues to support it so that we may proceed with general debate and consideration of this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and my friend the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) for yielding me the customary time.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us is the 20th continuing resolution this year. That means that 20 times we have had to pass stop-gap spending measures, these measures to keep the Federal Government running, despite my Republican colleagues' inability to finish the appropriations bills on time.

Mr. Speaker, it is about time my Republican colleagues finished.

The fiscal year began October 1, which means that Congress was to have finished the 13 appropriations bills and have them signed into law by that day some 2½ months ago.

Instead, Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues continue to make virtually no progress on the unfinished appropriations bills and, instead, pass continuing resolution after continuing resolution.

But it really does not have to be that way, Mr. Speaker. Republican and Democratic appropriators and the President have reached bipartisan agreement. That agreement could have made record increases in educational funding, would have helped local school districts hire 12,000 more teachers to reduce class size, it would have provided money to repair thousands of schools that are falling apart, it would have also expanded after-school programs for nearly one million children, and it would have improved Pell Grants and Head Start.

But the Republican leadership does not want us to continue that agreement at this time. Instead, they want to go back to the drawing board.

But, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that patience is growing short. If this 4-day continuing resolution does not settle the issues once and for all, I suspect that Members will be less likely to agree to another continuing resolution.

So I wish my Republican and Democratic colleagues good luck in the negotiations.

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

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

1715

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in

which to revise and extend their remarks on H.J. Res. 129, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

#### FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 670, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 129) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of House Joint Resolution 129 is as follows:

#### H.J. RES. 129

*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 15, 2000".*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 670, 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).

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

Mr. Speaker, H.J. Res. 129 extends the continuing resolution that we have been passing on a regular basis until Friday of this week. I come to the floor today with more optimism than I have in quite a while, Mr. Speaker. There was another meeting with the President this afternoon with the bicameral leadership, Republicans and Democrats, and I have reason to believe that much progress was made. I really believe that by Thursday morning, if Members are able to be back by Thursday morning, we will have a package to vote on.

So I hope that we will pass this CR to give us time to accomplish that.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. This is the 20th time, two-zero, the 20th time that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and I have been forced to come to the floor and ask the Congress for an extension to keep the Government open while others in this institution and in the other body and folks in the administration decide what the budget ought to eventually look like by considering only macroeconomic numbers. After there is agreement between the leadership and the White House, I assume that we will be asked to work out how that money is allocated.

So, in my view, the House leadership will be able to talk in very bright

terms about what they have accomplished in macroeconomic terms, and then we will be asked to make the impossible choices within the dollar limits that are being suggested by the leadership around here. I cannot begin to tell the House how many times I have received letters from Members of this House, including the leadership on both sides of the aisle, asking that we increase funding for AIDS, special education, National Institutes of Health, title VI block grants, LIHEAP, Low-Income Heating Assistance Program. I cannot tell you how many times I have received letters asking us to vote for increases in those programs and demanding that we bring to this floor what they refer to as full funding for some of these programs, while at the same time those same Members vote and those same leaders demand that we provide an overall number for the bill which makes our ability to produce what they ask for at the micro-level an almost impossible act. That in my view is what is happening here.

I am not going to vote for this continuing resolution. Not because the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has not done his job, he and I were here all weekend, but because I believe that the numbers that will be produced in the end will have virtually no room for some of the main priorities which a lot of Members in this body claim that they have. I think that when people put together an agreement about what the overall spending number ought to be in the Labor-Health-Education bill, for instance, that they ought to have some idea what that number will really mean in terms of its impact on low-income heating assistance, its impact on the National Institutes of Health, its impact on Pell grants, its impact on special education, its impact on Head Start, its impact on child care, and its impact on a whole range of programs.

Yet I think the way that this is proceeding, we are going to have a take-it-or-leave-it proposition, where the overall number is going to be agreed to, and then people like the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and I are then going to have to take Members aside one by one and explain to them why we cannot provide the increases for NIH that we promised the country in the campaign we were going to provide, why we cannot provide the increases in the Pell grants that we told people we were going to provide, why we cannot provide the funding for special education that we told people we were going to provide. We have got a winter coming where the Federal contribution to help low-income elderly pay their home heating bills will drop by about 50 percent as a percentage of those folks' income because of the rapidly rising energy costs; and yet this bill is going to be asked to savage that program in the out years.

And this has all come about because we are told by a number of Members on

that side of the aisle that the agreement that was reached before the election is somehow too rich. I want to compare what that agreement would have done with Labor-H, with all the health and education and job programs, what that would have done with what we did in some other bills.

This Congress passed an agriculture bill which was 2 percent above the President's request. This Congress passed an energy and water bill which was almost a billion dollars above the President's request. It passed an Interior appropriations bill which was \$2.5 billion above the President's request, 15 percent above the President's request. It passed a transportation bill which is \$2.3 billion above the President's request.

And now we are being told that we have committed a mortal sin and we are all going to go to hell because we passed a Labor-Health-Education program that was a few billion dollars above the President's request. I make no apology for that. I make no apology for that. I think that those increases when compared to the increases in the energy and water bill or in the transportation bill are eminently defensible. Yet we are being told now, oh, we don't have enough room. We may add 7 or \$800 million in more money for the Middle East; but, no, if we do, we have got to take that money out of education and health and worker protection programs. I have a funny feeling that is not going to go down well with the American people.

I do not have any objection to our meeting our international responsibilities in the Middle East or any other area of the world, but I do think that if that is financed out of reductions in the people's bill for programs here at home, that that action will unnecessarily turn even more people in this country toward an isolationist track. And I think it will encourage more people out of frustration to say, Well, if we have to make those kinds of choices, then I'm not for providing funding for various regions of the world. That is the proposition that we are going to be backed into.

I apologize to the House for taking this time. No, I do not. I do not apologize at all for taking this time. Because we were told that this debate would come up at 6, and instead it has come up at 5, so almost no one is here to discuss it. I really have not had a chance to think through what a more thoughtful response would be if I had an hour to look at what is going on around this town. But I do want to say that I think that this process of extending continuing resolutions time and time and time again has served only one purpose. It has enabled the majority party leadership to avoid voting on education and health until after the election. And having now escaped the election season, it is now free to pursue the cuts that it apparently wants to pursue in those programs. I think that that is unfortunate.

So I will vote against this resolution. I do not expect that there will be many people who will. But I do not think I am going to like the kind of priorities that are going to come out of this shakedown. And this has been a shakedown. This is what it has been. I do not think I am going to like the priorities very much when I see that we are going to be asked to squeeze these programs because we have at an earlier date on other bills provided very large increases in the President's budget, and now people seem to feel that we have to recoup that on this bill. I just do not happen to agree with that.

When I was walking the streets in Wisconsin Rapids or Wausau or Superior, Chippewa Falls or anywhere else, I did not find many people who were asking me to have large increases in military spending, to have large increases in the transportation budget, to have large increases in Interior while we were neglecting our child care needs, our family planning needs, our National Institutes of Health and medical research needs. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has provided a lot of needed leadership in the defense area, for instance, on the Subcommittee on Defense in providing supplemental funding for health programs, for bone marrow transplant and other programs.

I am simply going to vote against this continuing resolution because I think that it is simply giving people more time to do bad things.

1730

That is not my bag.

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

Mr. Speaker, I first want to confirm what the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) said, that he and I were here this weekend. In fact, we communicated with each other throughout the weekend just in the event that we had some agreement between the legislative leadership and the White House so that we could begin to complete the bill.

I have been briefed by my leadership, and I believe that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has been briefed by his leadership. My understanding is that the agreement would be substantially higher than the House passed Labor HHS bill, and that it is higher than the President's actual request. I believe that if we come together in a bipartisan fashion here, that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), who is the very distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, will be able to fashion a bill within that overall number. We will be able to guarantee that the promise that we made to medical research through NIH can be and will be kept; and that the promise we made in increasing the educational funding can and will be kept.

So we have some work to do between now and hopefully the day that we are going to have the vote on this bill,

which we hope will be on Thursday morning. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) and I have a lot of work to do and with our counterparts in the other body, but I am satisfied that we can do it. Everybody, I believe, wants to get this job done and we are going to produce a bill here that probably everyone could look at and say, gee, I do not like this or I do not like that; but there will be a lot of good in this bill that I do like.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor because I want to remind the Members, and I hope to remind the White House, that it is time that we wrap up our business. It is very important that we, as a body, deliver to the executive branch a plan for spending and for funding the priorities of the next year.

I wanted to remind my colleagues that while there is some debate about the exact level, it is a rather minor number of millions and billions that have to be dealt with; that, in fact, in this bill are many, many things that many of us have fought long and hard for. There is a big increase in funding for teacher quality. Now that we know more about the lack of certified teachers in many of our classrooms, the lack of subject matter preparation of many of our teachers, particularly in the inner cities, it is really imperative that we pass a budget that puts that money out there so we can make some of the progress in public education that we know needs to be made.

In this bill is 575 million more dollars for after-school programs, and I would like to say that in my little town of Enfield, the Enfield after-school care program that provides after-school care for only at-risk children has already had 10 of its children referred to DT out of our children family agency for neglect. This will be the security of these children as they move through a difficult time in their families and hopefully be the difference between these children. These are K through 6 kids. These are not high school kids. Six of the kids have already been referred to a juvenile review board only in the first 3 months of the school year. These really are at-risk kids, and this wonderful program has given these kids stability, is helping them improve their school performance and will be their security and their ticket out of juvenile crime, under achievement, low self-esteem and catastrophic consequences.

Also in this legislation is a significant increase in the child care block grant. This body prided itself on passing welfare reform, but if we do not do things like we are doing this year, and this bill is \$817 million more for those

very child care certificates that working women coming off of welfare depend upon, if we cannot provide child care subsidies to a woman coming off of welfare into a roughly minimum wage job or just above she is not going to make it; not because she is not trying but because she has such heavy child care costs that she could not possibly make it on those entry level salaries.

So in this bill we are following through on many initiatives in human services, in education, that do, in fact, give our people the support and the opportunity, whether they are children or adults, that frankly this body has striven long and hard to create on a bipartisan basis.

So I would urge my colleagues to remember that in here is fuel assistance, a big increase for fuel assistance, going into a winter when we know things are going to be very tough; health care; education, and it is our responsibility to pass it.

I would also remind my colleagues that it is going to be well over the President's request, over anything this House passed, and so we have the ability to rationally agree on some modest reductions from one agreed-on level and get this bill to the President. I hope that we can get an agreement before he leaves for Ireland so by the time he gets back we will have it passed and his signature on it very promptly. We owe it to those people who work for our government so they can deliver consistent quality service in a knowing, established context of supported funding.

I thank the gentlemen for their hard work on both sides of the aisle, and I ask that we move forward and this be the last CR we be asked to support because I will support it only reluctantly.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I know there might be some debate between the floor and the parliamentarian's office today and may demand a recount as to how many CRs we have done in this Congress. Is it 19 or is it 20? I hear from the parliamentarian's office it is 19. Regardless if it is 19 or it is 20, that is an all-time record in the history of Congress. That is a record that I do not think there will be a single press release on back in our districts. That is a record that I do not think we are too proud of, and that is a record I do not think future Congresses are going to want to break.

We need in the future to not only come together in this 106th Congress on an agreement on the budget but we need to do it in a bipartisan manner.

The second point I want to make is that when we do reach a bipartisan agreement on some of the most important issues that we handle in the 106th Congress, we should look at how these

issues are treated in the waning days of this 106th Congress. How does this budget treat education with Pell grants? As education and the cost of education becomes more important and higher in costs, we want to make sure we get Pell grants to those that need it.

The second issue is how this budget treats the poor. In my home State of Indiana, we have seen natural gas prices go up by 50 percent, and our families are having a tough time, as it is snowing right now back in the Midwest, affording much of this. This budget deals with that. Let us look at how we treat LIHEAP.

Thirdly, the NIH budget, how do we treat research for Alzheimer's, research for Parkinson's, research on cancer? These are three issues that are highly important to me and my constituents and highly important to the country, and I hope we will arrive at a bipartisan solution in this Congress.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no other requests to speak on this turkey, and so I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just suggest that, whether we like it or not, we need to vote for this continuing resolution today. As I said earlier, I hold out the hope and I am very optimistic that now that our leadership has arrived at an agreement with the President that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), and I are going to be able to work out a bipartisan solution that will take care of most of the concerns that we have heard expressed on this bill throughout the season.

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

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 670, 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, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 5630) 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, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) will suspend temporarily while we consult with the minority.

1745

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 5630) 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, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Senate amendments:

Page 3, in the table of contents, strike out "Sec. 501. Contracting authority for the National Reconnaissance Office."

Page 3, in the table of contents, strike out "502" and insert "501".

Page 3, in the table of contents, strike out "503" and insert "502".

Page 48, strike out lines 4 through 16.

Page 48, line 17, strike out "502" and insert "501".

Page 49, line 7, strike out "503" and insert "502".

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) so he might explain more fully how the legislation covered by his unanimous consent request differs from the bill sent to the Senate on November 13, 2000.

Mr. GOSS. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me, Mr. Speaker. I am very happy to explain to her why on December 11 the House is again considering the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001.

As Members will recall, the President vetoed an earlier version of the legislation on November 4. In doing so, the President indicated that his objections were limited to a single section of the bill, the so-called "leaks provision," and he asked Congress to return the same bill to him with the "leaks provision" deleted.

It had been my hope to do exactly that. In fact, the day the veto message was received by the House, Mr. DIXON, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), and I introduced H.R. 5630, a bill identical to the previous conference report, save for the leaks provision, which was removed in its entirety.

The same day the House passed H.R. 5630 and sent it to the Senate for what I had hoped would be speedy consideration, passage, and transmittal to the President for his signature.

I am deeply disappointed that this is not exactly what transpired. The other body did last week pass H.R. 5630, but in doing so removed an additional provision. That provision, which was agreed to in our House-Senate conference and approved by the full House