

[Roll No. 586]

YEAS—313

Abercrombie Ford
Ackerman Fossella
Aderholt Frank (MA)
Allen Frelinghuysen
Andrews Frost
Armey Gallegly
Baca Ganske
Bachus Gekas
Baker Gephardt
Baldacci Gibbons
Baldwin Gilchrest
Ballenger Gillmor
Barr Gilman
Barrett (NE) Gonzalez
Barrett (WI) Goode
Bartlett Goodlatte
Barton Goodling
Bass Gordon
Bentsen Goss
Bereuter Graham
Berkley Granger
Berman Green (WI)
Berry Hall (TX)
Biggert Hastings (WA)
Billirakis Hayworth
Bishop Herger
Blagojevich Hill (IN)
Bliley Hilleary
Blumenauer Hinchey
Blunt Hinojosa
Boehlert Hobson
Boehner Hoeffel
Bonilla Hoekstra
Bonior Holden
Bono Horn
Boswell Hostettler
Boyd Houghton
Brady (TX) Hoyer
Bryant Hutchinson
Burr Hyde
Buyer Insee
Callahan Isakson
Calvert Istook
Camp Jackson (IL)
Cannon Jefferson
Capps Jenkins
Cardin John
Carson Johnson (CT)
Castle Johnson, E. B.
Chabot Johnson, Sam
Chambliss Jones (NC)
Chenoweth-Hage Jones (OH)
Clayton Kanjorski
Clement Kaptur
Clyburn Kelly
Coble Kildee
Combest Kilpatrick
Cooksey Kind (WI)
Coyne King (NY)
Cramer Kingston
Crowley Kleczka
Cubin Knollenberg
Cummings Kolbe
Cunningham Kuykendall
Davis (FL) LaHood
Davis (IL) Lampson
Davis (VA) Largent
Deal Larson
DeGette LaTourette
DeLahunt Leach
DeLauro Lee
DeLay Levin
DeMint Lewis (CA)
Deutsch Lewis (GA)
Diaz-Balart Lewis (KY)
Dixon Linder
Doggett Lipinski
Doolittle Lofgren
Doyle Lowey
Dreier Lucas (KY)
Duncan Lucas (OK)
Edwards Luther
Ehlers Maloney (CT)
Ehrlich Maloney (NY)
Emerson Manzullo
Engel Markey
Eshoo Mascara
Etheridge Matsui
Evans McCarthy (MO)
Everett McCarthy (NY)
Ewing McHugh
Farr McInnis
Fattah McIntyre
Fletcher McKeon
Foley McKinney
Forbes Meehan

Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas

Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Udall (CO)

Upton
Velazquez
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Weiner

Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weygand
Whitfield
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Young (FL)

NAYS—58

Baird
Becerra
Borski
Brady (PA)
Capuano
Clay
Condit
Costello
Crane
DeFazio
English
Filner
Gejdenson
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hayes
Hefley
Hilliard
Holt

Hooley
Hulshof
Kucinich
LaFalce
Latham
LoBiondo
McDermott
McGovern
McNulty
Menendez
Miller, George
Moran (KS)
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pickett
Ramstad
Rothman

Sabo
Sanchez
Schaffer
Slaughter
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Udall (NM)
Visclosky
Weller
Wicker
Wu
Wynn

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Tancredo

NOT VOTING—60

Archer
Barcia
Bilbray
Boucher
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Burton
Campbell
Canady
Coburn
Collins
Conyers
Cook
Cox
Danner
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Doolley
Dunn
Fowler

Franks (NJ)
Greenwood
Hall (OH)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hill (MT)
Hunter
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Kasich
Kennedy
Klink
Lantos
Lazio
Martinez
McCollum
McCrery
McIntosh
Metcalf
Mica
Mollohan

Ose
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Reyes
Salmon
Scarborough
Scott
Shaw
Shays
Smith (NJ)
Stabenow
Talent
Turner
Waters
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Wexler
Wise
Young (AK)

□ 1025

Mr. KUCINICH and Mr. HILLIARD changed their vote from "yea" to "nay".

Mrs. KELLY changed her vote from "nay" to "yea".

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KILDEE 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.

□

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 H.J. Res. 122, and that I might include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

□

MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 662, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 122) 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 the House Joint Resolution 122 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 122

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 "November 2, 2000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 662, 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, this is another one of those 1-day continuing resolutions. Since the President of the United States refuses to sign more than a 1-day continuing resolution, this is something that we have to do. It is pure and simple. It is no different than what we did yesterday and the day before and the day before and the day before and the day before.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said so many times on so many of these CRs that I am basically through with presenting this continuing resolution. I will be prepared to reserve the balance of my time unless there is some reason that I need to respond to a situation that we did not anticipate.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 11 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, we are stuck here because the major appropriation bill that is yet to be resolved had been brought to a compromised conclusion by the conferees Sunday night; and then when the majority party leadership reviewed that compromise on Monday morning, they said "No way baby".

What blew up the agreement was the objection of the majority party leadership to the language in the conference report that would have, after a 10-year struggle, finally allowed, after yet one more 6-month delay, for the enforcement of a rule by OSHA to protect workers from debilitating, career ending workplace injuries caused by repetitive motion.

□ 1030

I want to review for my colleagues the history of OSHA for those of my friends on the Republican side who were not here when OSHA was created. I was. I want you to know who the sponsor of the OSHA legislation was. It was a man by the name of Bill Steiger, who was my best friend in the House, a Republican from Wisconsin. We went to college together. We were in the legislature together. We served here together. And then he, unfortunately, died at age 40.

It was always my belief that, if he had lived, he would have been the first Republican Speaker. He was a wonderful human being and a very balanced one, a strong conservative. But he was the sponsor of the OSHA legislation. He was the first employer in Washington for a fellow by the name of Dick Cheney. So that ought to give you some idea of Bill's political philosophy. I think the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) served with him. Some of you will remember Bill.

When OSHA was adopted, the Chamber of Commerce insisted that the standards that were used by OSHA be the consensus standards which had been developed by business advisory committees and OSHA simply took those standards and enforced them as their own.

An article on the business page of "The Washington Post" this morning points out that "80 percent of all current OSHA health and safety standards are the same voluntary standards U.S. businesses were using in the late 1960s reflecting a long history of business and political opposition to new OSHA standards." And that is the case.

The history on this floor after OSHA was established has been a 2-decade long effort on the part of the majority party to resist new protections for workers. The cotton dust standard. You fought that for 4½ years and tried to have it delayed twice by legislative limitations. The methychloride standard to prevent leukemia. My brother-in-law died of leukemia and was always convinced it was workplace related. The standard to prevent that exposure in the workplace was resisted, and several times the majority tried to offer legislative language forbidding OSHA from proceeding with this standard.

The lead standard. We know what lead does to brain development. We know what it does for brain damage. The majority party tried to stop that standard. And for a decade they have been trying to stop the standard on repetitive motion injuries so that human beings do not go around with this kind of problem.

At first the actions taken by the majority party in the Committee on Appropriations in the form of an amendment by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) centered around denying OSHA the opportunity to even gather information about the occurrence and incidence of repetitive motion damage in the workplace.

Then after they failed to stop the gathering of information, then they switched rationales and said, "Oh, we do not have enough information." And so, no matter how much information was developed by OSHA, they still said, "Oh, we need more. We need more. Do not know enough. Do not know enough." And so that standard has been delayed for years and years.

Now, we finally reached, after four successive delays imposed by this House and after a promise a year and a half ago that you would impose no more delays, the majority leadership is once again trying to promote delay of both the implementation and the promulgation of the standard to protect people like the woman in this picture.

And so, what happened? We finally reached agreement after 4 hours of going word by word over language. Both sides left the room numerous times to consult their lawyers. Senator STEVENS did. The White House people in the room did. It was scrubbed by lots of lawyers who were outside the room, but it was checked repeatedly. We finally had a deal. As I said last night, it was even sealed with toasts of Merlot.

And then what happened? Well, what "The Washington Post" reports this morning that "Fierce lobbying by powerful corporate groups with considerable sway among the GOP leadership helped kill a deal sealed with the Republican negotiators early Monday. Led by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers, the industries include groups representing trucking companies, bakeries, soft drink makers, and parcel delivery companies."

And then it goes on to say, "Business leaders have also bankrolled political ads over the workplace rules. In recent weeks, the National Association of Manufacturers has been running radio ads in key congressional districts." So on and so forth.

The article ends by quoting a 32-year-old woman, Heidi Eberhardt, who said, "I do not know if I will ever be able to type again. I will always have to be careful with my hands. If I had had any kind of ergonomic knowledge back then, I would not be injured today."

What we are trying to do is to prevent that from happening to other Heidi Eberhardts in the future.

Now, in my view, there is only one reason for what happened that night. It was my position, and in that conference, I opposed the conference deal that the White House cut with the Republican majority because I felt that after all these years there should be no further delay, none whatsoever. The compromise that was cut is that it was finally agreed to allow a standard to be promulgated but it could not be enforced in any way until after July. So that, if a new President was elected who disagreed with that standard, he would have time to go through the Administrative Procedures Act and repeal it; and he could, incidentally, suspend it the day he walked into office. We

feel that within 45 days, certainly within 60, he could shut it off.

I am convinced that the only reason the majority party leadership is doing this is because, if their party leader wins the White House, they want him to be able to stop that regulation without ever having to publicly stand up and oppose it.

Now, as we used to hear when there was a Republican President, we used to hear there is only one President at a time. Well, there is only one President at a time; and in my view, this President, after over 10 years of analysis and study and review, he has the right to impose a standard which was called for for the first time by a Secretary of Labor by the name of Libby Dole. She is the one who started this process, and she is the one who initially said that this was needed and crucial for the safety of people in the workplace. I would urge you to remember, that is why we are stuck here on the CR.

If the majority party leadership wants to get out of town, there is only one thing they have to do. All they have to do is take the D.C. bill, the Treasury-Post Office, and the Legislative appropriations bill and, by reference in the Labor, HHS bill, put it together, stick to the original deal on Labor, HHS, and so far as appropriations are concerned, we could be out of here in one day. That would leave only the Commerce, Justice State bill remaining.

For the life of me, I do not see how those differences are going to be bridged in this short period of time. But all other appropriations work could be done. That is what the leadership could do. All it has to do is to honor the agreement that was reached, reference those other four bills, and we could be out of here in a day and a half going back and reintroducing ourselves to our constituents.

So that is what I would hope the majority leadership would do in the interest of ending this session with some degree of comity. But I am afraid that the same principle that is operating here to prevent helping this woman in the picture is the same principle that had been operating here for months on other issues. We have been trying to get prescription drug coverage all year long. But in the end, the majority party has decided that a tax cut that primarily benefits the top 2 percent of people in this country outweighs the need for millions of Americans to have prescription drug coverage. The same principle.

Who wins in the end? Money. That is what this is about. It is about money. Shame.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my friend who just spoke in the well in reference to his statement that the majority party wants to get out of town, well, we would all like to get home. But I want him to know and I want everybody to know we are here for the

long haul, we are here to get the job done, we are here to do the people's business however long it takes.

And these 1-day CRs, one after the other after the other after the other, use up a lot of time. We could be productive in other ways. We are not anxious to get out of town and leave the business undone. We are anxious to get out of town when the business is complete, and we are not going until we are finished and we have done it in a responsible way.

Now, the gentleman has made a substantial case about this agreement on ergonomics. I want to remind the Members what I have reminded them of before when the gentleman makes that argument. We reached an agreement. We started Sunday about 4 o'clock and we finally ended up about 1 o'clock Monday morning.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) was there and I was there, Senator STEVENS and Senator BYRD were there. Senator HARKIN was there. Jack Lew from the White House was there. We negotiated in good faith and we reached an agreement, and we have not gone back on that agreement.

Now, the agreement was to allow the new President adequate time to make a decision. We do not know for sure how it is going to go either way regardless of which Presidential candidate is elected. But that was the agreement we reached, and nobody has gone back on that agreement.

Here is where the difference is. The difference is the language that was written that was checked by the White House lawyers. I do not know that we left the room. I did not leave the room to consult with any lawyers. But we took the word of the White House that that language did what they said it did.

Now, Senator STEVENS is a lawyer. The gentleman from Illinois (Chairman PORTER), the chairman of the subcommittee, is a lawyer. We wrote the language at least eight or nine times to try to make sure that it did what the agreement said.

Now for someone to suggest that we are going back on our agreement just is not accurate. We are not trying to change the agreement with you one iota. All we are trying to do is make sure that the language that is finally written actually does what the agreement was supposed to do.

Now, what is wrong with that? That, in my opinion, is being responsible to make sure that our actions and our words are the same. Actions speak louder than words.

□ 1045

Actions speak louder than words, and action should at least be the same as the words. That is where we have the disagreement. We are trying to work it out.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that they will

be able to work out the language to reflect the agreement that they came to so that this House could move forward. But I think it is very important, too, for the body to think carefully about what is at stake in these ergonomic regulations because this controversy does go to very fundamental principles and it is true. Those fundamental principles are part of the Presidential election going on around us. I do not believe as a Republican, and I am proud of this but I also know that there are many Democrat friends of mine who agree with me, that the Federal Government should mandate on State governments that somebody injured as a result of an ergonomics injury should get 90 percent of wage replacement and full benefits when someone working right beside them but injured by a piece of steel falling on their foot and crushing all the bones in that foot gets the State compensation under workmen's comp rules, usually about 75 percent, I believe, in Connecticut. Why would we mandate inequitable compensation rules? Why would we mandate compensation rules that depend on what kind of injury you got?

I have had ergonomic problems. I have had carpal tunnel syndrome in both my wrists, and I have had operations on both my wrists and, thank you, it worked beautifully. But why when I was home recovering should I get 90 percent of wage replacement when my friend severely injured in a fall at a construction site would get the State's rate which is always in every case at least below that 90 percent? Why would we mandate inequity on working people? Why would we do that?

Furthermore, one of the plants in my district was a research site for these ergonomic regulations, and the researchers from the government as well as the workers as well as the management found certain repetitive motion problems that they could not find a solution for. Yet under these regulations you do not even have to have a pattern of problems. You can have one single incident and then you are mandated by law to adopt an incredibly costly and burdensome administrative process and fix the problem. Now, if we have already seen problems in the research process that we do not know the answer to, why would we penalize every small business in America?

This is going to be extraordinarily costly, extraordinarily burdensome to small business. This is not only a very good example of the difference between the parties on the issue of local control and respect for State and local government but it is a very good example of the difference between the parties on the issue of small business. Small business is the engine of America's economy. It is the job creator. It is the inventor. It is our strength. Yet we would lay over it this program that would begin to suffocate it. I have to say that this President has been absolutely blind to the value of small business. He

wanted to go in and inspect your home office, have the government come in and inspect your home office to be sure that you had a correct chair. He has no respect for privacy, no respect for small business, and these ergonomic regulations are about fundamental principles of the role of the Federal Government and fairness to working people in America. They are a big issue.

Ironically, this President has fought against riders on appropriations bills. Riders are legislating on appropriations bills. Often I have agreed with him on those riders and said, Let's get the riders off the appropriations bills. This is a big issue in environmental areas. This is a big issue in choice areas. But now in your areas you want riders. You not only want this rider, you want a mammoth health program that has received not one single hearing and that is going to knock the stilts out from under private sector health insurance. Mark my words. Already employers in my district are beginning to drop family coverage because now it is \$7,000 a year because their kids can go into our Huskie program under CHIP. That is not a bad solution. But not even to have a hearing on whether your big expansion of CHIP to all families in all situations, what impact that is going to have on the private insurance system, how much weight that is going to transfer from the private sector to a taxpayer-funded program is grossly irresponsible.

Mr. Speaker, this is about principle. It is about the principle of local control and State responsibility in our society. It is about the principle of a sound legislative practice governing authorizing of major programs. It is about the principle that a free market depends on that allows small business to be inventive, nimble and strong. I stand firmly behind our leadership in negotiating appropriations bills and not legislating new programs and creating standards that vary and treat working people unfairly.

I would call on all of us to move forward. We should have overridden the President's veto. We should resolve the issues on HHS, and we should move forward and go back home and campaign and let this be fought out on the level that it should be fought out, on the Presidential level.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Let me say, first of all, I do not believe it is the role of the Congress to debate the substance of a rule which is not yet promulgated, because I think that this body is primarily influenced by political decisions rather than on the basis of merit. It is a political institution. OSHA does not get campaign contributions based on how they rule. A lot of Members of Congress do get campaign contributions on the basis of how they vote.

The gentlewoman is mixing apples and oranges. The fact is that States, different States have different standards. Some of them use 75 percent of

gross pay and others use 90 percent of net pay. The fact is when OSHA comes down on the side of using 90 percent of net pay, that is virtually the same as using 75 percent of gross pay. The gentlewoman in my view is simply confusing the issue when she tries to suggest that there is a great variance here.

But what is really at question is this: in the Washington Post article this morning, we have a very interesting quote that answers what the gentlewoman just said. She said the issue is whether State or Fed should rule. That is not the issue here. I want to read what Harley Shaiken, labor relations specialist at the University of California said. He said,

The question is whether the best role in this field is to have the government essentially set the rules of the game in some circumstances versus putting a much heavier reliance on corporations to police themselves in an increasingly competitive globalized economy.

Now, we all know what will happen to workers if the government does not serve as an umpire to protect the weak from the powerful. With all of the pressure that globalization brings on corporations for a profit, with all due respect to my friends on the majority side of the aisle, I am not about to trust the self-policing of some of these industries given the fact that their self-policing for years has led us to a situation where we have 600,000 Americans who suffer from these injuries every year.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time.

I also appreciate the passion and the sincerity of the Democratic and the Republican leadership and the appropriators in trying to work out this situation. I know that you have been hard at it, and I know that you have worked hard over the weekend. But as I sat there listening to you, it was curious to me. I kept hearing about some unelected guy, Jack Lew or somebody, and I kept hearing this vague generic reference to the White House, but I did not hear about the President, and I am concerned. Maybe the gentleman from Florida could tell me. Was the President of the United States negotiating with you or not? I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida or maybe somebody could help me from the Democrat side in these very, very important, high-level negotiations which the President is keeping Congress in town at the cost of millions of dollars to the taxpayers that of course could be going to health care or education or worker safety.

What was the President doing? Was he there Saturday night? He was not

there, was he? Was he there Sunday night? He was not there again, was he? Was he there Monday night? He was not there Monday night. Well, surely he showed up Tuesday night. No, wait. He was in Kentucky.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. This President, I will tell you, and I have been here for a long period of time, has been more engaged in working with Congress than any of his predecessors. Period. The gentleman has not been here as long as some of the rest of us have been, but this President is more engaged in the legislative process than any President I have had the experience of serving with.

I will tell you further in response to your observations that the principals were not in the room. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) apparently was not in the room. That was one of the problems because he is the one that after an agreement was reached apparently took the deal back and said, "I won't agree."

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me reclaim my time. The gentleman is right. I have not been here as long as some of these in-town government people. I know, for example, the Vice President is very proud he has been here 24 years. He came straight from the hotel room to the floor of the Congress. But to a lot of us being in the private sector is a badge of honor, and I am glad I have not been here all my life because I am proud that I have had private sector experience.

My question was, is the President who is so engaged, was he here for these negotiations Saturday, Sunday, Monday, Tuesday?

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

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday after this deal fell apart and we were trying to get it back together, and clearly the President's help would have been very essential, the President was unfortunately engaged in campaigning in Kentucky in a congressional race and then in New York. I believe there is a Senate race there he has some interest in that he was fundraising for. So the President has not been available throughout this time for these negotiations.

Mr. KINGSTON. Of course I am saying that I know where the President was. He was out campaigning. He was out fundraising. But this is a legitimate question. If it is worth the taxpayers to pay millions of dollars to keep the Congress, 435 Members and 100 Members of the Senate, in town to negotiate, then certainly it is worth his time to be here. I do not think you are negotiating in good faith when you are not here, when everybody else is coming to the bargaining table to try to work something out but the President

is in New York campaigning, he is in Kentucky campaigning, he is, I understand, on his way to California campaigning. Now, if he were in the Middle East, I would say that is understandable. If he was in North Korea, I understand that. But, instead, he is campaigning.

Here is where we are on all our bills. This is the appropriations rundown. We have come up with levels of spending for Agriculture, for Commerce, State and Justice, for Defense, Energy and Water, Foreign Operations, Interior, VA-HUD, and we are pretty much where the President is. I will say sometimes we are up and sometimes we are down, but this is the chart. It is open for public record. We are trying to work things out. But it is not enough. It is never enough with this President.

I want to quote and close with a question by 16-year-old Sarah Schleck from Albert Lea, Minnesota, to why are we still in town because the President wants to spend more money. She said, the 16-year-old wisdom, "Isn't our government big enough already?" Must we really stay in town so that we can spend a couple of more billion to pay off one constituency group or another? I do not think we should do that. I think that this House, the Democrat and the Republican leadership, ought to come to its own conclusion, give it to the President, and then maybe we can go back home and tell the folks what we are up to.

□ 1100

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself a minute and a half.

Mr. Speaker, the previous gentlemen has given the most off point speech that I have heard on this floor since the last time he addressed this body.

Let me simply say, Mr. Speaker, that the reason the President was not in the room is because since the President stole Mr. Gingrich's socks the last time they negotiated together, your leadership has refused to sit down in an omnibus meeting with him and put it together. That is why he was not there. You very well know you would not even let the President's representative come into the room until 10:00 at night. You first insisted we negotiate all other remaining items. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) further ought to know, even if you do not, you ought to know there is not a single dollar difference remaining in this issue. This has nothing to do with how much we spend. The issue is who we spend it on and which side are we on. Big business, big business or the working people of America?

We ought to have a decent balance between the interests of both, but you want it all one way for the top dogs in this society. No way. No way.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the minority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, "The New York Times," considered one of the most authoritative papers in the country, even in the entire world, and the

gentleman over here said oh, right, and laughed, well, I just want to remind the gentleman that earlier this year the Vice Presidential nominee, Mr. Cheney, even described one of "The New York Times" reporters as big time.

Well, today that big time newspaper has offered its opinion of this Congress, and I quote, "the 106th Congress, with little to show for its 2-year existence, has all but vanished from public discourse on almost every matter of importance: Gun control, patients' bill of rights, energy deregulation, Social Security, Congress has done little or nothing."

Mr. Speaker, it goes on to say, "if Congress has done a lousy job for the public at large, it is doing a fabulous job feathering its own nest and rewarding commercial interests and favored constituencies with last minute legislative surprises that neither the public nor most Members of Congress have digested," end of quote.

But, Mr. Speaker, if one asks me, the story of this Republican Congress is not only being written by The New York Times editorial page, listen to what others are saying around the country. The Baltimore Sun, "The Republicans in Congress still cannot get their act together." Roll Call, "What a mess. House leaders have been utterly uninterested in working with House Democrats." The Washington Post, "Gagging the Senate. It has been a time-serving Congress in which the majority, having lost control of the agenda, has mainly tried to give the impression of dealing with issues that it systematically has finessed."

"The un-Congress," The Washington Post, "the un-Congress continues neither to work or adjourn. For 2 years, it has mainly pretended to deal with the issues that it has systematically avoided."

The Baltimore Sun, "Republican Gridlock Again in Congress. Whatever happened to the fine art of compromise," they say. "It seems to have vanished from the lexicon of the Republicans on Capitol Hill."

The USA Today, just a couple of days ago, "This Congress is a monument to fiscal irresponsibility."

The Los Angeles Times today, "A Sputtering Finale. It is fitting that as it sputters toward an end, this Congress is engaged in an unproductive game of political brinkmanship with the President. This 106th Congress will not be missed."

Well, those are people who are looking from the outside and judging the catastrophe that has befallen all of us here in this Chamber in this Republican-led Congress. If you want the real story of the 106th Congress, just talk to the millions of families that the Republican leadership has turned its back on. Talk to the older people who desperately need prescription drugs. Talk to young parents who want to send their kids to safe, modern public schools. Talk to the men and working

women of this country who work in restaurants and child care centers and work to take care of our elderly and our sick; and the janitorial crews, all of those folks struggling to earn a decent wage.

Talk to the patients and doctors and families battling against HMO executives for their right to quality health care. That is who is paying the true price for the failure and the indifference of this Republican Congress; not the K Street lobbyists or the crowd down at the country club. It is the American working families, Mr. Speaker. That is who we are here to serve, and I would tell my friends on this side of the aisle, if the Republican leaders cannot understand that, it is high time they step out of the way in favor of us who do understand it.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, what I am hearing today is a lot of political campaigning. The problem is the minority does not like the majority. We love them in the minority, and we hope that they stay the minority for many, many years.

There is a difference between the parties. There is a reason that one party is a majority and the other party is a minority, but here is an interesting point. We have come together. There are arguments about whether the President was in the room or not. He was represented but he was not in the room. He was busy doing other things. We understand that. The President is looking for whatever he is looking for out there around the country, mostly money for campaigns, but let me say what the President thinks about this Congress.

Some heard me read this last night. I am going to read it again today, in view of some of the rather strong diatribes that I have heard here. The President said on Monday in his press conference, he said, "Again we have accomplished so much in this session of Congress in a bipartisan fashion. It has been one of the most productive sessions." Now, if only we could get to the bipartisanship that he talks about here. I am glad he feels that way because on the majority side we have tried to be bipartisan. We get really excited when the minority leader comes to the floor and says, come on guys, we have to get together. We have to be bipartisan and get the work done. But speaker after speaker after speaker who followed the minority leader's admonition brought out their vicious partisan attacks on the majority party.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we are the majority; and we have made a decision on what we believe is the right thing to do, and we are satisfied that we agreed with President Clinton when he said the era of big government is over, standing right there in the well of the House.

The era of big government is over. We are tired of the government being everything. There is a responsible role for the government, but it is not to run everybody's life. Whatever the govern-

ment does should be done in a responsible fashion, and not one that meets the whims of somebody's political campaign. Political campaigns ought to be back home on the campaign trail, not here in the people's House. It is our job to get the people's work done and put their work ahead of politics. People above politics, and that is what we are going to stand for every day. We are not going to be stampeded by the political rhetoric that comes out of the minority party who is so anxious to become the majority party again.

Well, people of America are going to make that decision. They are going to decide whether they want to go back to the old days of decades of deficit spending, interest payments on the national debt that almost exceed the investment in our national defense; whether they want to go back to the days of raiding the Social Security trust fund to spend for their big spending programs. We have stopped that. Our majority party, the Republican Party, has stopped that. We are not spending money out of the Social Security trust fund. We are paying down the debt. We have balanced the budget, and, oh, we had a lot of opposition to what we had to do to accomplish all of these things, but we stood fast. We are going to continue to stand fast for what we believe in, and the ideals that the American people agreed with when they made us the majority party.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), who has an interesting chart that I think will demonstrate this.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, in an attempt to improve the atmosphere here, I do want to reach out in a bipartisan way and indicate to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) that he has had extensive legislative experience here in this body. He has seen a number of Presidents in terms of the way they have performed. He has indicated that this current President has been more active, more involved than any other President that he is aware of. So I guess I am a little confused, and I would like to reach out because why would quotes from third parties then be relied on, the liberal fourth estate newspaper folk who have not been in the room, to try to characterize the way in which we have operated? Why would the quote from the gentleman who has been most involved of any Presidents be relied on?

So instead of looking at what some editorial writer writes, who has never been in the room, let us take a look again at what this President, who has been the most active President working with Congress in the minds of people who have been here a long time, and he said, quote, President Clinton, on October 30, just a couple of days ago, "we," we, kind of an encompassing word, the government, the executive

branch, the legislative branch, "we have accomplished so much in this session of Congress in a bipartisan fashion."

Now I take him at his word, the guy who has been more involved than any other President, we have accomplished so much in this session of Congress in a bipartisan fashion.

"It," this Congress, "has been one of the most productive sessions."

Now I know he has only been around 8 years, and others who have been around longer can grade how productive the sessions are, but if this President has been the most active of any President we have seen, I will accept his judgment. His judgment is, we have done a lot in a bipartisan fashion. This has been one of the most productive sessions ever. Why rely on third parties? Go to the horse's mouth.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to congratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), because that is the largest stretch I have ever seen. I want to congratulate them. They have been so desperate to find any way to suggest that they have accomplished anything of significance in this session of Congress that they even have stretched to rely on their old reliable friend, President Clinton, the man to whom they have given so much substantive support when in a moment of conciliatory weakness he engaged in a little bit of rhetorical hyperbole to say something nice about the majority.

If that is the best that you can find, be my guest. The people who serve in this Chamber know what you have accomplished. The people waiting for prescription drugs know what you have accomplished. The people waiting for a patients' bill of rights know what you have accomplished. The people waiting for a minimum wage bill know what you have accomplished. On the big stuff, the result unfortunately is zip. You passed a lot of stuff through here that would help the very wealthiest 2 percent on the Tax Code. Outside of that, you are still dragging behind about 8-to-0 in terms of meeting your major responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT).

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this continuing resolution, our twelfth in 5 weeks, to keep the government operating; but I deeply regret that we have reached this point and I am deeply disappointed by what has happened to America's education priorities in the last 72 hours.

On Sunday night, after 3 days of no negotiations, Republicans met face-to-face with Democrats on a good faith basis to resolve our differences on education. Democrats asked Republicans whether they had full authority to negotiate a final deal and they answered,

yes. In an example of bipartisan compromise, both sides came together and both sides sought common ground. Negotiators toiled late into the evening. Each side made concessions, as must be done in a bipartisan compromise, and consensus was reached through sensible dialogue. I give great credit to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), and I give great credit to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), and the Senators who were involved. The bill that came out of that room was a bipartisan bill that would have lifted up every community and every school in this country. This bill included full funding for 100,000 new teachers, teacher training, after-school programs and a billion dollars for school repair and school modernization.

Less than 12 hours after the agreement was reached, the leaders of the Republican Party ripped this deal apart as a favor to a business lobby.

□ 1115

The Republican leadership bowed to business lobbyists who, according to the Washington Post, were making, and I quote, "urgent calls to the Hill to try to block this compromise," simply because they did not like worker safety provisions that protected workers from repetitive stress injuries. This Republican-led Congress scuttled a bipartisan agreement that would have provided local districts with the means to hire new teachers and build new classrooms so that we could get smaller classroom sizes, so that our children could be better educated.

Mr. Speaker, I guess it is not a surprise, because Republican leaders have spent the last 6 years frustrating America's agenda, a bipartisan agenda, by giving in to special interests. On every one of these issues, the Republican leadership has taken the side of the special interests over America's agenda.

We tried to get an affordable, effective prescription medicine program; we forced it on to the agenda with the help of Republican members, and it was scuttled in conference; and it is not going anywhere, because I guess the pharmaceutical companies did not want it.

We worked with Republicans to force on to the agenda of this House an effective and enforceable Patients' Bill of Rights, and it has been stifled in a conference committee because I guess the insurance companies did not want it.

We could have had targeted tax cuts for college and long-term care and child care, but instead we passed huge tax cuts for the top 1 percent of Americans instead of getting something done in a bipartisan way that we could have gotten done.

We fought for sensible gun safety legislation, but it is stifled in a conference committee, I guess as a favor to the National Rifle Association.

We have tried to get a sensible increase in the minimum wage; but it too

is stifled, even though it has strong bipartisan support.

We forced on to the agenda of this House campaign finance reform, which is desperately desired by the people of this country, and it too passed by a bipartisan vote in this House, and it has been stifled in a conference committee.

There is a pattern here, Mr. Speaker. There is a pattern. Bipartisan efforts, which even passed by bipartisan votes on the floor, are being held hostage by the special interests of this country and by the Republican leadership that is running this Congress.

The Speaker said 2 years ago that the trains were going to run on time and that we would finish our budget in regular order. Well, it is 4 weeks into the fiscal year, we are 6 days away from a general election, and we have not gotten the work done that we could have gotten done if the leadership of this Congress would have simply let the bipartisan majority that was trying to break out and do these things to be able to do them. And as a result, we have a dysfunctional Congress; we have an ineffectual Congress.

Education is our most important priority. We have schools with cracked walls and no air-conditioning and leaky windows. We have cornices falling off of buildings. We have kids in temporary structures, in movable classrooms, in inadequate facilities in the wealthiest Nation on Earth. Our children deserve our help in getting them the world-class education that every child in this country deserves.

Let us pass this resolution, let us stay here in these next days, and let us get the job done for America's children. We may not be able to do the health issues, campaign reform, gun safety or the minimum wage; but in the name of common sense, let us get done something in these last 2 or 3 days for the children of this country. Let us get them better classrooms, let us get them more teachers, let us get them a better education.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like Members to know that I have a great respect for the minority leader who just spoke, but some of the things that he said I do not disagree with. I think there is either a misunderstanding about what the situation is, or there is misrepresentation of the situation. Now, the items that the minority leader just talked about that were in this package that we negotiated until the wee hours of Monday morning, the good things that were in that package, they are still there. To try to imply that they are not there is just not accurate, and it is not fair, because the good things that he said were in there are still there.

What is the major change? We have gone over it and over it and over it. We will go over it again. The major change was on the ergonomics language. We reached an agreement. We continue to this minute to have that same agreement. The difference is, we are trying

to make sure that the language actually does what the agreement says. But as far as the other items that the minority leader said got blown apart, that is not true. They did not get blown apart. They are still in the package. So either it is being misunderstood, or it is being misrepresented. Misunderstanding, we can understand that; but misrepresenting, we are not prepared to accept that.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, maybe the gentleman can help me understand something.

Sunday night, you ostensibly had an agreement, and now the gentleman tells me it is just some legal language. I practiced for about 22 years, most of it in business law, contracts, things of that nature, as well as others. So I guess what the gentleman is telling us is that all night Monday, all day Tuesday, all night Tuesday, and then on Wednesday, the gentleman's lawyers have yet to come up with language that would be acceptable to accomplish the purposes that are wanted, so therefore, we are still here, and we are going on and on. Is that what I understand to be the case?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, let me suggest to the gentleman that their own lawyers at the White House either misunderstood or misrepresented. The lawyers from the White House that were checking, because Jack Lew called his lawyers, at least he told us he called his lawyers, and they said, yes, this language does what the agreement says. Now, if their lawyers cannot figure it out, and our lawyers did not figure it out, maybe we ought to take a little bit of time to do it and to do it right.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY MILLER).

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, this is an interesting debate today. The gentleman from Georgia, a good friend of mine, stood up and asked a simple question: Was the President of the United States in the meeting, and he was attacked when he left the podium, because that is an unreasonable question to ask. Then the gentleman from California, good friend of mine, comes before this honorable body and puts a quote before us about what the President of the United States said, and he was attacked. I would never stand on this floor and accuse the President of the United States of being a liar. Yet, members of his own party did that, because they said he did not mean what he said. Obviously, we would never impugn what the President said in that fashion.

Then, the Republican leadership was attacked because they are running this House. Well, let me read to my colleagues from the Hill newspaper, what the Hill newspaper says today: "Despite President Clinton's pledge to stay

here with you and fight for his legislative priorities, not one House Democrat leader was present last weekend for all 7 votes taken on session-ending procedural matters."

My Democrat colleagues might attack the Republican leadership, they might impugn the Republican leadership; but if it were not for the Republican leadership on this floor, there would be no leadership at all.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to lower the tenor of the debate and accept a couple of offers, correct one statement, and accept one offer today to see if we might find a way to take this restless herd and not start a stampede, but start it in a slow walk to a solution.

The first thing I hope everybody will understand and stop bringing the posters to the floor saying how much is enough when we all should know by now, \$645 billion is enough. We are not talking about money. Anybody that proposes spending more money is going to have to find it somewhere else, because the appropriators have got their orders. I think the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, is doing a good job. My fuss is not with him, but it is with the leadership of the House that seems to not be willing to bring this thing to a culmination.

Now, it seems to me, and I have listened today, there is an agreement within reach on ergonomics, there is an agreement within reach on school construction, in the appropriate places by the appropriate leaders. There is an agreement in place on immigration, if we can just find that appropriate place. The one area that we do not have an agreement though, and it seems from what I have heard said, is in the area of Medicare and the BBA fix. That is what we are saying.

To the gentleman from California, the chairman of the committee that made the speech a moment ago, there is a willingness on this side to reopen that particular part of the tax bill and do a little better job for our hospitals, our rural hospitals, our nursing homes, and others. There is some additional knowledge in this House, other than the chairman of the committee, the same man that wrote the BBA fix in the first place in 1997, that had to be convinced to do more at that time, and I see the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) on the floor who has been a tremendous leader in the Rural Health Care Coalition. We know this. We can have a better agreement, and that is one that we must get done, or we will not finish by the election, or by January 1, unless we can do more.

So in the spirit of bipartisanship, there is a large number of Democrats; in fact, there are 137 on my side of the aisle that said we should not spend \$645 billion this year, we should only spend \$633 billion.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time for a closing statement.

Mr. OBEY. I yield myself the remaining time.

Mr. Speaker, when we are in negotiations, the only way that we can reach agreement is to reduce those agreements to writing, and that is what we did. It took 4 hours to get the language right for both sides, because the lawyers who were in and out of the room talked to each other, and this was the language that they came up with. The only thing that changed was the amount of heat that the majority party leadership took from the big business lobbyists in this country. That is the only thing that changed.

It has been clear to me from the beginning that the majority leadership did not ever want us to conclude action on this bill, and what is going on now to me is very clear. This session is over. This session is over. The leadership is going through the pretense that something else is likely to happen, but behind the scenes, what they are trying to do is to get negotiated a longer-term CR so that they can get out of here, leaving undone this issue, so that they do not have to face the issue of education funding before the election, and they do not have to ever vote on scuttling the deal on protecting workers' health, which we had in this bill.

So what they may do is to send up some meaningless let-us-pretend compromise language to the White House, language that has probably already been rejected. But the fact is, they want to slip out of town. If they cannot do that, then the next best thing to do is to pretend that they expect something to happen in the future. It is clear to me that the majority party leadership will not let anything further happen on this bill if it means antagonizing their big business lobbyist friends. That is the problem.

The solution on this issue that we had in the conference was a balanced one. It said, the rule could be promulgated to protect workers from repetitive motion injury, but that the future President, if he wanted, would have 6 months to repeal it. That was the balance between the interests of business and the interests of workers who have no one to rely upon but us. It is clear the leadership pulled the plug on the deal because they do not want that, and they do not want this bill to go forward. That is sad.

□ 1130

So we will wind up not only with the workers not being protected, but we will wind up without the education achievements that we could have had in this bill, without the health research achievements we could have had in this bill, without the worker protections we could have had in this bill.

This could have been a bipartisan closure for the Congress. Thanks to the leadership's genuflecting to special interests, it will now not be. That is the saddest thing of all about this session.

Mr. Speaker, 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, with all of the rhetoric we have heard here this morning, the truth of the matter is that it all revolved around one issue. That is the issue of the language trying to comply with the agreement that we reached early Monday morning, on the issue of the language relative to ergonomics.

Now, the only reference in that negotiating session to having checked with a lawyer is from the Office of Management and Budget. They are representing the President, who suggested that he had checked with his lawyers and that they decided that the language actually did what the agreement supposedly did.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would tell the gentleman, I am sorry but that is just not true. Both Mr. STEVENS and the White House left the room on at least two occasions to check the language with their legal experts. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I do not know that. I do not know that the Senator checked with his lawyers. I do not know that.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. STEVENS said he did. I take his word for it.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I might have been talking to the gentleman at the time. I did not hear him say that.

I did hear the Director of OMB say that he checked with his lawyers and that this was their understanding. Misunderstanding is one thing and misrepresenting is something entirely different.

On the issue of ergonomics, just let me suggest one thing. I asked the staff of the Committee to give me a dictionary description of the word "ergonomics." It goes something like this: "The science of doing the same thing over and over until the simple act of repetition causes bodily harm."

That is what we have been doing here in the House for the last couple of weeks, over and over again, continuing resolution after continuing resolution, the same arguments over and over again, most of which do not have anything at all to do with this continuing resolution.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for the last time on that, that is a great line. The difference is that, for the workers we are trying to protect, it is no laughing matter because it is their livelihood.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. The gentleman and I, as he knows, while we tend to be good friends and I have every confidence in his trustworthiness, when he tells me something I know that I can believe it, and I think that he feels that he can be-

lieve what I say to him, but we have some strong disagreements, general philosophical disagreements.

He knows that and I know that. That is why we have the two political parties, rather than just one.

But anyway, the deal, as the minority leader referred to it as "the deal," and I refer to it as a conference report, the conference report continues to contain all of the items that the minority leader talked about that were in that deal that were so good that fell apart. They did not fall apart, they are still there. They are still in the package. They are still part of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I have just 2 minutes left, and I do not know if we are going to have this argument again tomorrow, though we probably will. But something offended me yesterday that I did not really have the time to respond to in the way that I wanted to. That was when one of the speakers on the minority side accused and referred to our leadership as legislative terrorists.

I thought about that overnight and I really got upset about that, Mr. Speaker. Our leadership are not legislative terrorists. They are firm, they are strong, they have their commitments, and they have their convictions.

I want to tell Members about the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT). He is a very strong man of great integrity. He leads this House the best that he can, realizing that he has one of the smallest majorities that has ever existed in this House in its entire history.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) is not a legislative terrorist, by any means. The gentleman from Illinois has done everything that he could to keep this House together, to keep it moving, to get our job done, while remaining true to the principles upon which the majority of this House was elected.

So I did take offense at that. I try to ignore most of the offensive things that I hear in these debates, but I could not let this go without having made some comment about this suggestion that our leaders were legislative terrorists.

They are strong and they are determined. They have tremendous conviction. They are committed. They are going to do their job regardless of the accusations and the rhetoric that comes from their opposition.

I say amen to that, because that is why we are here. We are here to do a job for the people of America. We are here to put people above politics. We are here to do our job and then go home and do our campaigning on the campaign trail, not in the House of Representatives, where all of the people should be represented here.

So Mr. Speaker, I just hope that the House will pass this continuing resolution. I hope that we can find a way to get this business completed without having to spend hours and hours every day just on one more CR because the

President of the United States refuses to be realistic and sign more than a 1-day continuing resolution.

Mr. Speaker, we are here to cooperate, we are here to serve in a bipartisan fashion, but we are not here to yield or compromise on our principles.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 662, 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 371, nays 13, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 587]

YEAS—371

Abercrombie	Cannon	Eshoo
Ackerman	Capps	Etheridge
Aderholt	Cardin	Everett
Allen	Carson	Ewing
Andrews	Castle	Farr
Armey	Chabot	Fattah
Baca	Chambliss	Filner
Bachus	Chenoweth-Hage	Fletcher
Baker	Clay	Foley
Baldacci	Clayton	Forbes
Baldwin	Clement	Fossella
Ballenger	Clyburn	Frank (MA)
Barcia	Coble	Frelinghuysen
Barr	Coburn	Frost
Barrett (NE)	Combest	Gallegly
Barrett (WI)	Condit	Ganske
Bartlett	Cook	Gejdenson
Bass	Cooksey	Gekas
Becerra	Cox	Gephardt
Bentsen	Coyne	Gibbons
Bereuter	Cramer	Gilchrest
Berkley	Crane	Gillmor
Berman	Crowley	Gilman
Berry	Cubin	Gonzalez
Biggart	Cummings	Goode
Bilirakis	Cunningham	Goodlatte
Bishop	Davis (FL)	Goodling
Blagojevich	Davis (IL)	Gordon
Bliley	Davis (VA)	Goss
Blumenauer	Deal	Graham
Blunt	DeGette	Granger
Boehlert	DeLauro	Green (TX)
Boehner	DeLay	Green (WI)
Bonilla	DeMint	Gutierrez
Bonior	Deutsch	Gutknecht
Bono	Diaz-Balart	Hall (OH)
Borski	Dixon	Hall (TX)
Boswell	Doggett	Hastert
Boyd	Doolittle	Hastings (WA)
Brady (PA)	Doyle	Hayes
Brady (TX)	Dreier	Hayworth
Bryant	Duncan	Hefley
Burr	Edwards	Herger
Burton	Ehlers	Hill (IN)
Buyer	Ehrlich	Hilleary
Callahan	Emerson	Hincheey
Calvert	Engel	Hinojosa
Camp	English	Hobson

Hoefel	Meek (FL)	Sanford
Hoekstra	Meeks (NY)	Sawyer
Holden	Menendez	Saxton
Holt	Metcalf	Schaffer
Hooley	Millender-	Schakowsky
Horn	McDonald	Sensenbrenner
Hostettler	Miller (FL)	Serrano
Houghton	Miller, Gary	Sessions
Hoyer	Minge	Shadegg
Hulshof	Mink	Sherman
Hunter	Moakley	Sherwood
Hutchinson	Moran (KS)	Shimkus
Hyde	Moran (VA)	Shows
Inlee	Morella	Shuster
Isakson	Murtha	Simpson
Istook	Myrick	Sisisky
Jackson (IL)	Nadler	Skeen
Jefferson	Napolitano	Skelton
Jenkins	Nethercutt	Slaughter
John	Ney	Smith (MI)
Johnson (CT)	Northup	Smith (NJ)
Johnson, E.B.	Norwood	Smith (TX)
Johnson, Sam	Nussle	Smith (WA)
Jones (NC)	Oberstar	Snyder
Jones (OH)	Obey	Souder
Kanjorski	Olver	Spence
Kaptur	Ortiz	Spratt
Kelly	Owens	Stabenow
Kildee	Oxley	Stark
Kilpatrick	Packard	Stearns
Kind (WI)	Pallone	Stenholm
King (NY)	Pascrell	Strickland
Kingston	Pastor	Stump
Klecza	Paul	Sununu
Knollenberg	Payne	Sweeney
Kolbe	Pease	Tancredo
Kucinich	Pelosi	Tanner
Kuykendall	Peterson (MN)	Tauscher
LaHood	Peterson (PA)	Tauzin
Lampson	Petri	Taylor (MS)
Largent	Pickering	Taylor (NC)
Larson	Pickett	Terry
Latham	Pitts	Thomas
LaTourette	Pombo	Thompson (CA)
Leach	Pomeroy	Thornberry
Lee	Porter	Thune
Levin	Portman	Thurman
Lewis (CA)	Price (NC)	Tiahrt
Lewis (GA)	Pryce (OH)	Tierney
Lewis (KY)	Quinn	Toomey
Linder	Radanovich	Towns
Lipinski	Rahall	Trafficant
LoBiondo	Ramstad	Udall (CO)
Lofgren	Rangel	Udall (NM)
Lowe	Regula	Upton
Lucas (KY)	Reyes	Velazquez
Lucas (OK)	Reynolds	Vitter
Luther	Riley	Walden
Maloney (CT)	Rivers	Walsh
Maloney (NY)	Rodriguez	Wamp
Manzullo	Roemer	Watkins
Markey	Rogan	Watt (NC)
Martinez	Rogers	Weiner
Mascara	Rohrabacher	Weldon (FL)
Matsui	Ros-Lehtinen	Weldon (PA)
McCarthy (MO)	Rothman	Weller
McCarthy (NY)	Roukema	Weygand
McDermott	Roybal-Allard	Whitfield
McGovern	Royce	Wicker
McHugh	Rush	Wilson
McInnis	Ryan (WI)	Wolf
McIntyre	Ryan (KS)	Woolsey
McKeon	Sabo	Wu
McKinney	Sanchez	Wynn
McNulty	Sanders	Young (AK)
Meehan	Sandlin	Young (FL)

NAYS—13

Baird	Ford	Stupak
Barton	Hilliard	Thompson (MS)
Capuano	LaFalce	Visclosky
Costello	Miller, George	
DeFazio	Phelps	

NOT VOTING—49

Archer	Dooley	Lantos
Bilbray	Dunn	Lazio
Boucher	Evans	McCollum
Brown (FL)	Fowler	McCreery
Brown (OH)	Franks (NJ)	McIntosh
Campbell	Greenwood	Mica
Canady	Hansen	Mollohan
Collins	Hastings (FL)	Moore
Conyers	Hill (MT)	Neal
Danner	Jackson-Lee	Ose
Delahunt	(TX)	Salmon
Dickey	Kasich	Scarborough
Dicks	Kennedy	Scott
Dingell	Klink	Shaw

Shays	Waters	Wexler
Talent	Watts (OK)	Wise
Turner	Waxman	

□ 1159

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.

□

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

□

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4986. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the provisions relating to foreign sales corporations (FSCs) and to exclude extraterritorial income from gross income.

H.J. Res. 84. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes.

□

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on rollcall vote 580 and rollcall vote 581.

Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall vote 580 and no on rollcall vote 581.

□ 1200

“THE LONG PARLIAMENT”

(Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, sometimes we can get wisdom from the ages. I am not a fan of Oliver Cromwell. His semi-genocidal attacks on the Irish was certainly one of the low points in history. But even he occasionally got something right.

During the 1650s, there was a Parliament in England which could not seem to find a way to leave London. Oliver Cromwell decided they needed some encouragement. Some of what he said in his gentle way, waiving a sword seems to me to be not entirely inappropriate. So I would, therefore, like to read some excerpts from Oliver Cromwell’s speech to what was called “The Long Parliament.”

It is high time for me to put an end to your sitting in this place . . .

“Ye are grown intolerably odious to the whole nation. You were deputed here to get grievances redressed; are not yourselves become the greatest the grievance? Your country therefore calls upon me to cleanse the Augean stable by putting a final period to your

. . . proceedings in this house and which by God’s help and the strength he has given me I am now come to do. I commend ye therefore upon the peril of your lives to depart immediately out of this place. . . Go and get out, make haste ye venal slaves be gone. So take away that shining bauble there and lock up the doors.

□

HOUR OF MEETING ON THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 2000

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 6 p.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. 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 239, nays 130, not voting 63, as follows:

[Roll No. 588]

YEAS—239

Abercrombie	Crane	Hoefel
Aderholt	Cubin	Hoekstra
Armey	Davis (IL)	Holt
Bachus	Davis (VA)	Horn
Baker	Deal	Hostettler
Ballenger	DeLay	Houghton
Barr	DeMint	Hunter
Barrett (NE)	Diaz-Balart	Hutchinson
Bartlett	Dixon	Hyde
Barton	Doolittle	Isakson
Bass	Dreier	Istook
Bereuter	Duncan	Jackson (IL)
Berman	Ehlers	John
Biggart	Ehrlich	Johnson (CT)
Bilirakis	Engel	Johnson, Sam
Bishop	English	Jones (NC)
Blagojevich	Eshoo	Kanjorski
Bliley	Etheridge	Kelly
Blunt	Everett	King (NY)
Boehrlert	Ewing	Kingston
Boehner	Fletcher	Klecza
Bonilla	Foley	Knollenberg
Bono	Fossella	Kolbe
Borski	Frank (MA)	Kuykendall
Boswell	Frelinghuysen	LaHood
Boyd	Gallegly	Largent
Brady (PA)	Ganske	Latham
Brady (TX)	Gekas	LaTourette
Bryant	Gibbons	Leach
Burr	Gilcrest	Levin
Buyer	Gillmor	Lewis (CA)
Callahan	Gilman	Lewis (KY)
Calvert	Goode	Linder
Camp	Goodlatte	Lipinski
Cannon	Goodling	LoBiondo
Capps	Gordon	Lucas (KY)
Cardin	Goss	Lucas (OK)
Castle	Graham	Manzullo
Chabot	Granger	Martinez
Chambliss	Green (WI)	McHugh
Chenoweth-Hage	Gutknecht	McInnis
Clement	Hall (TX)	McKinney
Coble	Hastings (WA)	Meehan
Coburn	Hayes	Meeks (NY)
Combest	Hayworth	Miller (FL)
Condit	Hefley	Miller, Gary
Cook	Hergert	Moore
Cooksey	Hilleary	Moran (KS)
Cramer	Hobson	Morella