

very popular. It passed by only one vote in the House and one vote in the Senate, and it gave the American people confidence that Congress would make some tough decisions. It increased some taxes—not many but some.

It cut some spending, and we had a new plan—a new direction. The country moved in the new direction.

The American people had confidence that things were going to change. Our economy rests on a mattress of confidence. If people are confident about the future, they do things that manifest that confidence. They buy a house and they buy a car. They do the things that represent their confidence in the future. If they are not confident, they decide not to do those things, and the economy then contracts.

The point is that we have an economic plan in this country that has worked very well. The results are self-evident.

The question is: What is the plan for the future?

That is why we have this Congress. We have debates in Congress about what to do about the future.

Some say: Well, we expect 10 years of budget surpluses for the next 10 years. I don't know of a group of economists in this country that has been right for 5 years, let alone 10 years.

We would be very wise in this country, in my judgment, to take the conservative course on the question of what we do in fiscal policy. Economists don't know what is going to happen in the next year or in 3, 5, or 10 years from now.

We ought to establish as a priority paying down the Federal debt first. If during tough times you run the Federal debt up, it seems to me that during good times you ought to pay down the Federal debt.

I inquire whether that is a continuing resolution. If it is, I will suspend.

MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. AL-LARD). The continuing resolution just arrived. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: A joint resolution (H.J. Res 118) making further continuing appropriations for the Fiscal Year 2001, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, 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 on passage of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is 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 Montana (Mr. BURNS), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. CAMPBELL), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON), 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 Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. NICKLES), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), and the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON) are necessarily absent.

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

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BRYAN), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), 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 New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) would vote "aye."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 67, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 291 Leg.]

YEAS—67

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

NAYS—2

Leahy	Stevens
-------	---------

NOT VOTING—31

Ashcroft	Gorton	Lugar
Bond	Grams	McCain
Boxer	Helms	McConnell
Breaux	Hollings	Nickles
Bryan	Hutchison	Roth
Burns	Inhofe	Sessions
Campbell	Jeffords	Thomas
Cochran	Kohl	Torricelli
Crapo	Kyl	Wellstone
Durbin	Lautenberg	
Feinstein	Lieberman	

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 118) was passed.

Mr. LOTT. 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.

FIGHTING FOR FUNDAMENTAL FAIRNESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to attempt to put some transparency on what is going on around here.

This summer, the Republicans very successfully convinced the American people that their party was for estate tax relief and marriage penalty relief and that the Democrats were not. Well, my friends, that is simply not the case. The Democrats are for eliminating the estate tax for small businesses and family farms valued at \$8 million and for all other estates worth \$4 million. And, Mr. President, it is the Democratic plan for marriage penalty relief that completely eliminates the marriage penalty found in 65 provisions in the tax code.

So, isn't it a bit frightening that the Republicans have so successfully twisted the debate so as to mislead the American people into thinking that they are actually the party supportive of tax cuts. Reality is, however, that they are the party of political rhetoric and political maneuvering. If the Republicans really wanted to give the American people estate tax relief and marriage penalty relief, they could have—they had many, many opportunities for sending the President real relief. Instead of giving the American people empty rhetoric—we could be sitting here today with elimination of the estate tax and marriage penalty tax relief for virtually all Americans.

Now, why do I bring all this up. Because it is happening over and over again. The Republicans are misleading the American people on a host of critical pieces of legislation, including: patients bill of rights, prescription drug coverage, minimum wage increase, tax cuts, health insurance coverage and education.

Instead of actually providing the American people with real relief—this year—the Republicans prefer the politics.

I have heard from constituents who ask me—"If both Republicans and Democrats want patients bill of rights, then why can't the Republicans and Democrats just work together to get something done?" That is an excellent question. Why?

Why is it that we cannot just reach agreement? Is it that we are missing