

other individuals affected by the INS ruling are left out. Also, of those people who are actually covered by this plan, less than 40 percent are expected to prevail.

Republicans acknowledge that the 1986 law was implemented unfairly. It is wrong and inconsistent to deny a remedy to all who were affected. It is wrong to help only those who were able to hire the right attorney, and who filled out the right forms. All eligible individuals should receive relief.

Governor Bush praises his trillion dollar tax break for the wealthy, and criticizes Democrats for supporting targeted tax relief that helps some individuals, but not others. It's obvious that Republicans don't care about uniformity when the issue is immigration. It's unfair and unjust to pick and choose among immigrants who will receive this well-deserved and long-overdue relief.

We have welcomed these individuals to the United States. They are part of our communities. We have come to know them as neighbors, friends, and colleagues. We should support those who have come here in their search for freedom, equality, and a better life. These are the same dreams our ancestors came here to find in the past.

It is essential to pass the real Latino and Immigrant Fairness Act and treat immigrants fairly. Hard-working immigrant families deserve this long-overdue relief, and they deserve it now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority controls the remainder of the time.

Mr. REID. I yield that time to Senator DORGAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 9 minutes 17 seconds.

#### THEY HAD THEIR CHANCE

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I am not going to talk about Texas. There has been plenty of discussion about that tonight. I am going to talk about this country. I saw this morning an interview in which Governor Bush said: "They had their chance," talking about Vice President GORE, of course. "They had their chance." I want to talk about what has happened in the last 8 years.

It is important to remember exactly what the Clinton-Gore administration inherited and where we are. They had their chance. Let's talk about President Clinton and Vice President GORE.

In 1993, when they took office, we had a \$290 billion deficit that year, and it was rising. That deficit was exploding. Our economy was in trouble. Economists predicted slow anemic growth for an entire decade ahead. That is what the Clinton-Gore administration inherited.

Now, instead of the largest deficit in history, we have the largest surplus in history. Is that an accident? I don't think so. We had a vote in this Senate and they had a vote in the House on a

new plan to take this country to a new direction, and it passed by one vote—one vote in the House and one vote in the Senate. Not one member of the majority party voted for that in either the House or the Senate. We moved this country to a new direction. Now instead of the largest deficits in history, we have the largest surpluses in history.

This is a chart which shows what these deficits and surpluses were when Governor Bush said: They had their chance. This is what we inherited from President George Bush in 1992 and 1993: red ink that was growing every year. This country was choking on deficits, and every year, when we changed direction and created a new economic plan to give people hope that we would make the tough decisions to turn this country around, we have seen lower and lower deficits and finally surpluses. That is not an accident.

They had their chance, Governor Bush said. They turned the biggest deficits into the biggest surpluses. How about economic growth? In the 12 years prior to the Clinton-Gore administration taking office, average economic growth was 2.8 percent. Since then, economic growth has been on average 3.9 percent.

Jobs: 1988 to 1992 was one of the worst 4-year periods in history for the creation of jobs. In fact, I have a chart that I think will be useful to show in terms of the creation of jobs: In the Bush administration, 1988 to 1992, 2.5 million new jobs in 4 years. In 8 years, the Clinton-Gore administration had an economy that rebounded, and we had 22 million new jobs created in this country. They had their chance.

How about the unemployment rate? In 1981-1982, Reagan-Bush averaged 7.1-percent unemployment. Currently, there is 4.1-percent unemployment, the lowest level in 30 years.

Home ownership: From 1982 to 1992, home ownership fell in this country. Now it is the highest in history.

Welfare rolls increased 22 percent from 1981 to 1992. Now they have decreased by 53 percent.

The Dow Jones was 3,300. Now it is over 10,000.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DORGAN. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. TORRICELLI. I think the Senator is making an important point, but I would like him to supplement it because I, too, have been startled in hearing Governor Bush explain they had their chance to enact a Patients' Bill of Rights. Indeed, it is my memory that on more occasions than I can remember the Clinton-Gore administration, with support of Democrats in this House, attempted to have a Patients' Bill of Rights.

I heard Governor Bush say on prescription drugs that we promised it and had not delivered it; we had our chance. Indeed, the Clinton-Gore administration supported prescription

drugs and Democrats supported it in the Congress but failed.

Is my recollection of this correct, that we had our chance, we have attempted to do it but, ironically, the people who have stopped it are now the same people who constitute the Bush campaign?

Mr. DORGAN. The Senator is absolutely correct. They had their chance. What about the issue of the Patients' Bill of Rights? We were blocked by the majority party.

What about campaign finance reform? We have tried, tried, and tried and were blocked by the majority party.

What about a prescription drug benefit for the Medicare program? We have tried and tried and were blocked by the majority party.

How about the issue of education and providing some help to reconstruct and renovate and provide for better schools and better classrooms?

Mr. TORRICELLI. If the Senator will yield, can we focus on that one as well because I heard in debates Governor Bush said on education Clinton-Gore had their chance. Indeed, the President proposed 100,000 new teachers repeatedly and has been fighting for it every year—got it enacted at one point—including right up to tonight on school reconstruction, which has not been supported, to my knowledge, by Governor Bush, certainly not supported by his party in Congress. So indeed they had their chance on education, and the Clinton-Gore administration led on education as they led on health care.

Mr. DORGAN. The Senator is absolutely correct. We have had the longest economic expansion in American history. That did not happen by accident. Governor Bush says: Well, gosh, that's due to the American people. The American people worked hard in 1981, 1982, 1983, and 1984. The American people had as much ingenuity, as much tenacity to work hard then. But you need public policies in place that help them as well.

The public policies that the Clinton-Gore administration and the Democrats in Congress put in place in 1993 said we were going to stop these Federal deficits. We had a new fiscal policy. We turned this country around.

The American people understand that when they have hope for the future, they do things that reflect that hope. They buy cars; they buy homes; and they take vacations. They do the things that represent their hope for the future.

There was not much hope for a long while because every year the deficit was getting worse and no one wanted to do much about it, but the Clinton-Gore administration came in and said: We have a new plan and it will be a little tough. It was hard to vote for—in fact, so hard that not one member of the majority party voted for it.

I see on the floor my friend from Texas, Mr. GRAMM, whom we have quoted many times. He said: If you

pass this plan, this country is going to go into a tailspin. Those are not his exact words, but it is exactly what he meant.

Of course, he was wrong. This country passed a new economic plan and gave the American people confidence about the future. Guess what happened. The largest deficits in history turned into the largest surpluses in history. We have had the longest economic expansion on record—welfare rolls are down, home ownership is up, inflation is down. Almost every basic index in this country is better.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DORGAN. Yes, I will yield.

Mr. DURBIN. When the Senator from Texas—Governor Bush's home State—voted against the Clinton-Gore plan in 1993, he said: "This program is going to make the economy weaker, hundreds of thousands of people are going to lose their jobs as a result of this program."

Was the Senator from Texas correct as a result of the Clinton-Gore plan? Did hundreds of thousands of people lose their jobs?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois asked a question about job creation. This administration, during these 8 years, has seen 22 million new jobs created in this country. In the 4 years prior under President George Bush, 2.5 million new jobs were created. You will see this is one of the most robust periods of economic expansion in this country's history. Is it an accident? No. This administration had a new economic plan that said let's move away from growing and choking deficits and give the American people some confidence about the future. The result of it was that confidence manifested a growing economy that created new jobs and new opportunities. Every single feature of this economy has become better in the last 8 years, every single one. Unemployment, inflation, welfare, home ownership—in every single instance, things are better in this country.

This morning, when I heard the Governor say, "Well, you have had your chance," I would say, yes, this administration had its chance and it inherited a weak and troubled economy and turned it into a strong, vibrant, growing economy, and good for them.

It did not happen because they took the easy road. This was not the easy thing to do. In 1993, when they had the vote on the new plan, it passed by only one vote in the House and the Senate. We did not get even one vote on the majority side. We took our licks for voting for it, but history shows that what we created was the strongest economy in this world, and I think Vice President GORE and President Clinton and those who voted for that new plan in this Congress can take some pride in what the result of that plan has been.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time allotted to the distinguished Senator has expired.

#### MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I understand the Senate has received the continuing resolution. I ask that the previous order now commence, and the clerk report the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the joint resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 119) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been considered read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mr. ASHCROFT), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. CAMPBELL), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST), the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR), the Senator from Florida (Mr. MACK), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. THOMPSON), are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS) would each vote "yea."

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN), and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 67, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 292 Leg.]

YEAS—67

Abraham	Feingold	Murray
Akaka	Fitzgerald	Nickles
Allard	Graham	Reed
Baucus	Gramm	Reid
Bayh	Grassley	Robb
Bennett	Gregg	Roberts
Biden	Hagel	Rockefeller
Bingaman	Harkin	Santorum
Breaux	Hatch	Sarbanes
Bryan	Hutchinson	Schumer
Bunning	Hutchison	Sessions
Byrd	Inouye	Shelby
Chafee, L.	Johnson	Smith (NH)
Cochran	Kennedy	Smith (OR)
Collins	Kerrey	Snowe
Craig	Kerry	Specter
Daschle	Landrieu	Thurmond
DeWine	Levin	Torricelli
Dodd	Lincoln	Voinovich
Domenici	Lott	Warner
Dorgan	Mikulski	Wyden
Durbin	Miller	
Edwards	Moynihan	

NAYS—1

Stevens

NOT VOTING—32

Ashcroft	Frist	Lieberman
Bond	Gorton	Lugar
Boxer	Grams	Mack
Brownbak	Helms	McCain
Burns	Hollings	McConnell
Campbell	Inhofe	Murkowski
Cleland	Jeffords	Roth
Conrad	Kohl	Thomas
Crapo	Kyl	Thompson
Enzi	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Feinstein	Leahy	

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 119) was passed.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

#### EUROPEAN SECURITY AND DEFENSE POLICY

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, on October 10, 2000, the Center for Strategic & International Studies (CSIS) hosted an important luncheon discussion on the European Union's evolving European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP). The guest speakers at that luncheon were Ambassador Christopher Meyer of Great Britain, Ambassador Juergen Chrobog of Germany, and Ambassador Francois Bujon de l'Estang of France. Senator LEVIN and I were privileged to sponsor this luncheon on Capitol Hill, in the Senate Armed Services Committee hearing room. Attendees at this luncheon included a prestigious group of former ambassadors and administration officials, representatives from industry, policy and research organizations, and senior congressional staff from both the House and Senate.

Since December 1999, when the European Union (EU) Heads of State announced at a summit meeting in Helsinki their "determination to develop an autonomous capacity to take decisions and, where NATO as a whole is not engaged, to launch and conduct EU-led military operations in response to international crises," there has been a great deal of discussion and debate about the development of a common European defense identity. While I commend our European allies for their