



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 28, 2001

No. 43

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 28, 2001.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RAY LAHOOD to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: Heavenly Father, quiet our souls before Your throne of grace as we take up the responsibilities of this day. We acknowledge our dependence upon You. Give us this day the strength and wisdom to make decisions that would be pleasing to You.

Grant to the officers and Members of this body Your guidance and wisdom. May they find in You the spiritual resources for the pressures of their duties in this place. Make them conscious of Your will and purpose.

We pray today for our President, Vice President, and all Members of Congress as they work together to lead our country forward into a bright and blessed future.

Lord, thank You for every blessing upon our great country. We pray we might conduct ourselves in a manner worthy of all Your benefits.

This we pray in Your holy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the

last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. GOSS 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces that one minutes will follow the proceedings later today.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 83, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2002

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up H. Res. 100 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 100

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 83) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011. The first reading of the concurrent resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against

consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. The period of debate on the subject of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2002 that occurred on March 27, 2001, pursuant to the order of the House of March 22, 2001, shall be considered to have been debate on House Concurrent Resolution 83, and the time for debate prescribed in section 305 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall be considered to have expired. A further period of general debate shall be confined to the concurrent resolution and shall not exceed 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. After such further general debate, the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment specified in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The current resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. No further amendment shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. All points of order against the amendments printed in part B of the report are waived except that the adoption of an amendment in the nature of a substitute shall constitute the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment. After the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment and a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution, as amended, to the House with such further amendment as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to final adoption without intervening motion except amendments offered by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H1193

achieve mathematical consistency. The concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. Goss) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), my friend; pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 100 is a structured rule, as we have just heard the Clerk read. It is fairly typical for bringing forward the annual congressional budget resolution, for today is budget day in the House.

For a number of years, we have gotten into a very good habit of managing debate on the budget by asking that all amendments be drafted in the form of substitutes so that Members could consider the whole picture as we debate and weigh our spending priorities. This rule continues that tradition and wisely so in my view.

We have gone to great lengths with this rule to juggle the competing needs of having a full debate on a range of issues and perspectives without allowing the process to become so unwieldy that it bogs down in minutia.

In that regard, I think the rule is fair in making four, I repeat four substitute amendments, which means we are going to have good debate today. Those amendments reflect an array of points of view. I should note that three of those have Democratic sponsors.

Specifically, the rule provides for 40 minutes of additional general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. The rule makes in order the concurrent resolution modified by the amendment printed in part A of the Committee on Rules report accompanying the resolution.

The rule further makes in order only those amendments printed in part B of the Committee on Rules report. Those four amendments may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment.

The rule waives all points of order against the amendments except that, and this is important, if an amendment in the nature of a substitute is adopted, it is not in order to consider further substitutes.

The rule provides for a final period of general debate not to exceed 10 minutes, as the Clerk told us, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the Budget to occur upon conclusion of the consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment.

The rule permits the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to offer amendments in the House necessary to achieve mathematical consistency.

Finally, the rule provides that the concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, this budget provides Congress with a unique opportunity. Here we are standing on top of a mountain of budget surplus thanks to the fiscal restraint of the majority party in the past several years. We gaze over endless possibilities rather than being stuck in the depths of a deficit canyon which we were in the early part of the 1990s.

Now, instead of jumping off of a mountaintop into some kind of spending free fall, it is time we firmly plant our feet and decide what we need to get accomplished for the people of the United States of America with our tax dollars.

That is what this budget is about. It is standing firm to ensure that our hard-fought surplus is preserved while providing Americans with necessary and appropriate government programs and security they deserve and count on from the Federal Government.

The surplus, combined with strong leadership from the new administration in the White House, will result from real relief for all taxpayers.

I commend the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) and his committee for devising a budget that will reflect our commitment to fiscal discipline while also ensuring programs like Social Security and Medicare will be available for future generations, properly funded.

As we set forth to debate this budget, it is easy to get bogged down by the large abstract numbers; and I imagine we are going to hear lots of them today. There will be more zeros flying around this Chamber today than there were in the Second World War.

It is important to remember these numbers represent an opportunity to return money to hard-working individuals or, better yet, let them keep it and not have to send it on to Washington on April 15 or in quarterly payments.

I know my constituents in southwest Florida want real relief. They ask for it every time I see them. It is up to this body to reward their hard work, the work they do every day, to admit also that the government is taking more in taxes than it actually needs now. Over the next 10 years, this budget will provide the average American family with up to \$1,600 in tax cuts. That is real relief.

The budget resolution goes further than immediate tax relief. It secures the future for all Americans. This security comes from the pairing of tax cuts with more funds for programs that every American cares about.

I certainly would not stand here and say that we have achieved getting rid of all government waste. I do not know

anybody bold enough to make that statement, nor would it be an accurate statement.

Funds will be allocated, however, for important things, to improve education, to decrease the national debt, to modernize Social Security and Medicare. The increased money for these areas will enable all Americans to plan for the future with the assurance that past mistakes are, in fact, being corrected.

This budget illustrates the dedication of both the White House and the Republican leadership in Congress to fiscal discipline and to identifying, exposing, and excising unnecessary Federal spending. Americans do work hard to make and to save money, and they have a right to demand fiscal responsibility from the Federal Government.

But citizens of this country can rest assured that fiscal discipline will be practiced by following the blueprint this budget resolution outlines, as we will hear in debate today.

Not only will taxes be cut, but we will still stand committed to protecting from frivolous or wasteful spending our surplus which we are so proud of at this point. This is a fair rule. It is a standard rule. I think it is a good budget resolution that it underlies. I urge Members to support both.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume; and I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Goss), my good friend, for yielding me the 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues want to pretend they can give tax cuts to the very rich without hurting Social Security or Medicare, without hurting education or the environment. Mr. Speaker, if it sounds too good to be true, it probably is; and this budget is too good to be true.

They refused to admit that they cannot do it all. They do not want to admit that their \$2 trillion tax cut comes from somewhere, and that somewhere is going to be heating programs for the working poor, prescription drugs, the national defense, family farms, and better schools for our children. Because, Mr. Speaker, there is no way one can afford these massive tax cuts and invest in education, provide prescription drug benefits, help people warm their homes in the winter; that is, not if one stands firm against raiding Social Security and Medicare.

The numbers just will not add up. But I think my Republican colleagues know that. They do not want to confess how much they will shortchange other important priorities to pay for these tax cuts. So instead of a real budget, Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues propose a "3-card monte" budget.

It puts off confronting harsh realities. It postpones the hard choices. It says our numbers might not add up; and when they do not, the Republican chairman of the Committee on the Budget will adjust them.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Budget did not report a budget resolution. It reported a delegation of authority to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE). There are tax cut numbers and total revenue numbers in this budget. But section 10 says ignore them.

Section 10 says the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) will adjust the revenue figures to take account of any additional surpluses projected by CBO. He can increase the size of the permitted tax cuts. He can reduce the appropriate level of public debt, or he can do both.

Last year's budget also allowed the Committee on the Budget chairman to determine how much, if any, additional surplus to devote to tax cuts. Three weeks ago, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) used this authority to adjust last year's tax numbers to make room for this year's first tax bill.

□ 0915

It does not matter that there is a new President, a new Congress, a new set of priorities. Republicans say they do not need to see whether these new priorities fit with tax cuts of this size. The only priorities that count are those of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), and he can decide to devote all of the surplus that is needed to fit this year's bills.

Mr. Speaker, here we go again giving him the same unilateral authority for next year, but this time the Republicans do not stop at tax cuts. There are aggregate spending numbers in this budget. There is an energy number and an education number, and there is a defense number and an agriculture number. Section 6 says ignore all these numbers. Come July the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) will look around and decide for the House what the spending numbers really are.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say, the chairmanship of the Committee on the Budget is looking better every day. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) can rewrite the numbers without a hearing and without a vote of any committee. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman can do it without any House action at all. Make no mistake about it, today we vote to grant the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) extraordinary discretion to change the whole spending side of the budget.

And as if this broad spending authority is not enough, there are plenty of reserve funds to go around, too. There is a separate reserve fund for fiscal year 2001 defense, agriculture and other critical needs, a special fund for education, a fund for emergencies, one for Medicare, another for this, for that, and for the other thing, too.

Years ago Mr. DOMENICI, the chairman on the Senate side, faced a number of questions about a reserve fund in his budget. Frustrated, he tried to explain the notion once and for all with this phrase, "The money is in the resolution and the money is not in the resolution, and if you cannot see that, you must be blind."

Where I grew up, if you could not see through a ruse like that, you lost your wallet, your shirt, your reputation, not your eyesight. A reserve fund means that the numbers in the budget are not worth the paper they are printed on; Republicans can adjust them as they go along.

Mr. Speaker, this turns the budget process on its head. We will no longer use the budget to decide if we can afford one whole set of proposals viewed together. We will no longer enforce the totals we decide on in the budget. Instead, the Committee on the Budget chairman will determine, as each proposal comes up, if he likes it enough to adjust the budget levels to accommodate it. What a mockery.

My Republican colleagues on the Committee on Rules and the Committee on the Budget have said we need a biennial budget, but they cannot even write a budget that will last through July. If we cannot write a budget that will last for 2 months, how can we expect to do one for 2 years?

Mr. Speaker, we do not need these contingency funds and reserve funds and other extraordinary procedures to rewrite the budget as we go along. Republicans should step up to the plate. They should admit that a \$2 trillion tax cut to benefit the rich is more important than anything else. They should admit that they are willing to endanger Medicare, cut heating programs, slash education, and decimate a new prescription drug benefit. But this budget lets them pretend for a while that all is well.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve better. I urge my colleagues to send this budget back and demand a real budget, an honest budget instead.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Chair reminds Members that they are not to make references to statements made by Members of the other body.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think I detected support for the rule in the opening statement of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), among several opportunities we will have to discuss several budgets today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Following along on his comments, I think we will have to put the comments of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) in the undecided column based on the statements he has just provided us.

I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), who has done a superb job here with

this, and I also want to commend the newest member to the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), who has also worked on this issue and done a phenomenal job.

Over the past 6 years, Republican Congresses have been very proud to have made history with budgets that have stopped reckless Washington spending, paid down the national debt, protected Social Security, and, of course, focused resources on our Nation's priorities. Once again, once again, Mr. Speaker, we are about to make history.

I have had the privilege of serving this body for over two decades now. Every single year that a budget has come forward during that time, and I suspect going back all of the way to 1974 when the Budget Empowerment Act was passed, there has been a three-letter acronym put on that budget: D-O-A. "Dead on arrival" has been placed on every budget, but late this afternoon we are going to pass the President's budget, and that is a great testimony to this administration and the fact that President Bush has provided such great leadership.

We know that Republicans have changed the culture of Washington so much that President Clinton was forced over the past several years, as we were pursuing all of these great accomplishments that we had, to stand right here in this Chamber behind where I am and say, the era of big government is over. But today President Bush is at the helm, and he is making a great deal of history.

The Republican budget pays down \$2.3 trillion in national debt. The Republican budget provides tax relief for every American who pays taxes. The Republican budget makes education of our children a top priority. The Republican budget protects Social Security from the spending raids that went on for the three decades before we came to majority here in the Congress, and the Republican budget, of course, does what is our number one priority at the Federal level, and that is rebuild our Nation's military capability.

So to sum this up, Mr. Speaker, this Republican budget is a fair and balanced American budget that fully funds our shared priorities while reforming taxes and paying down the national debt. This is a very fair rule; and as the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) said, he suspects that underneath the statement of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), there was support of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, as was pointed out by the gentleman from Florida, we make in order three Democratic substitutes, one Republican substitute. We should have a rigorous and interesting debate today. But at the end of the day, I am very, very proud that we will pass the President's budget, which is the right thing to do.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, we have just been told that we are about to pass the President's budget today. That is simply not true. The President is not even planning to send his budget down to the Congress until a week from Monday, and yet the Congress is so hell-bent to pass a tax bill before the public understands the consequences of that tax bill that we are passing it before we even have the full budget sent down by the President. That to me is a disgraceful institutional advocacy of responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, there are three reasons why we should vote against this "budget" and this resolution. First of all, this so-called budget resolution and the tax cuts contained in it are based upon flimsy, foggy guesses about what we are going to have in the Treasury 10 years from now. We do not have the faintest idea what we are going to have by way of surpluses 10 years from now. The numbers on which this budget is based have changed by 75 percent in 1 year. To commit to 10-year tax cut numbers on the basis of a guess about how much money is going to be in the Treasury 10 years from now is patently ridiculous. Daffy Duck might pass that kind of budget; we should not.

Secondly, I would like to point out, as has been pointed out by the gentleman from Texas, that the tax cuts contemplated in this budget are so large that they leave no room on the table to deal with fixing Social Security long term, to deal with fixing Medicare long term, both of which are going to be in deficit in the long term. They leave no money left on the table to have a real attack on educational inadequacy or do a real alternative on prescription drugs, or to meet many of the other national priorities that our people have.

Mr. Speaker, worse, it risks repeating what happened in 1981, the last time this Congress rammed through a tax package before they had a budget. In 1981, we were told by President Reagan: "If you just pass my tax bill, we will have a balanced budget in 4 years." The green bars on this chart demonstrate what we were told we would have. Deficits would go down to zero in 4 years. Instead, the red bars demonstrate that we wound up with deficits tripling and quadrupling over that time, and interest rates went up by two full percent, and 4 million people lost their jobs. This resolution risks making the same mistake that we made in 1981, and I do not think that we ought to do it again.

This resolution makes a number of changes in the budget process that further detaches this Congress from economic reality, and I do not think that we ought to do that. It is a shell game, as the gentleman from Texas has indicated.

Mr. Speaker, thirdly and most importantly, this budget speaks to our values as much as it does to our accounting, and it tells a sad story. The fact is that this budget places supersize tax

cuts for people over \$200,000 ahead of our obligations, our prior obligations, to fix Medicare, fix Social Security or do anything significant on education.

My colleagues know there is a direct link between how well you do in the classroom and how well you do in the world economy afterwards, and yet this President, while talking as though education is his priority, instead cuts in half the increases we have had in the last 5 years to strengthen education. He puts the needs of taxpayers who make more than \$200,000 a year ahead of the needs of all of the school children of this country.

Mr. Speaker, this budget resolution, because it refuses to cap tax cuts at \$6,700, because it insists giving people who make over \$200,000 a year much larger tax cuts than \$6,700 a year, because it insists on doing that for the 2.3 million taxpayers who make more than \$200,000 a year, it gets in the way of our being able to revolutionize education for the 47 million kids who need it.

Mr. Speaker, for the \$280 billion that we could save by simply capping tax cuts at \$6,700 for people who make over \$200,000, we could do three things: We could, first of all, reduce the class size for every class in America down to 18. That is the size at which the research shows kids learn the best. Secondly, we could pay teachers enough so we could close the gap between what teachers get and other professionals. Thirdly, we could eliminate the construction backlog for every dilapidated school in America.

We ought to put those priorities ahead of the tax cut, above \$6,700 for the wealthiest 1 percent of people in the country. The fact that we do not say something very sad about the values of this Chamber.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, might I make an inquiry about the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) has 20½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) has 19.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and the underlying legislation. As a member of both the Committee on Rules and the Committee on the Budget, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman on the Committee on Rules, on a very fair rule allowing for open debate.

Mr. Speaker, I also thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, for a budget resolution that recognizes a need to rein in Federal spending while ensuring that our Nation's needs are met.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we have crafted a resolution that will allow the Committee on Appropriations to responsibly allocate money to the subcommittees and to ensure that we maintain fiscal discipline throughout this whole process.

Mr. Speaker, today I would like to highlight one very important aspect of this resolution that affects many of us throughout the country. The Department of Energy's Environmental Management Program is at a critical juncture this year. I am pleased that the Committee on the Budget has highlighted the very real need for increased funding by including language that I authored, recognizing a need for approximately \$6.65 billion for this program for fiscal year 2002.

□ 0930

This language is a strong signal to both the Committee on Appropriations and the administration of the importance of the nuclear cleanup funding for fiscal year 2002. I encourage OMB to take a note of Congress' support for this program as evidenced by the pending passage of the budget resolution today and to provide funding as suggested by the report language.

I am very concerned about recent reports that rather than increase the funding for this program the administration at least in appearance had proposed to cut this cleanup effort, but what we have seen in the past is a dramatic increase in cleanup success throughout the Nation as we focus more on cleanup and less on bureaucracy.

Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat that because at the sites throughout the country we indeed have focused more on cleanup rather than just adding more people to the whole process.

I am confident this trend can and must continue through continued funding for the PM program. A failure to fully fund this program will result in increased costs, delays and legal battles with States throughout the country that will further drain essential cleanup dollars away from the complex and simply delay progress. Many have highlighted the need for reform in the Department of Energy's management practices. I fully support this desire and pledge to work as chairman of the nuclear cleanup caucus to work with my colleagues and the administration to find ways to reform, continue to reform, the Department and ensure the program management's success.

However, I do not think that we can afford to not fund the cleanup program which has both contractual and legal funding requirements while these reforms that are badly needed take hold. We must recognize that our field offices are enacting reforms and contract discipline successfully on their own and that we must continue to fund their needs this year, and as reforms are identified and implemented the additional savings be focused on this cleanup work.

For example, at the Hanford Nuclear Reservation in my district, and also throughout the complex but particularly here, the Department has recently completed contracts with most of the major contractors that are new commercial-type contracts. These contracts put an impetus on the contractor to deliver on their projects or lose their fees. This is a big departure from what has happened in the past.

For example, one company in my district at Hanford agreed contractually to complete \$2.5 billion worth of work for \$2.2 billion through efficiencies and technology; and if they do not do that, they surrender their fee. I have to say this is a refreshing change to DOE contracting practice in the past and one that will greatly increase accountability throughout the complex.

Further, by incentivizing contractors to save money by giving them a small percentage of the savings that they attain, we are finding ways to increase cleanup and reduce the cost to the American taxpayer. This new contracting structure must continue and must be expanded. However, without adequate funding, these contracts will be altered; and the American taxpayer will lose out on the benefits that they are entitled to.

So, again, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank both of my chairmen, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), for their work on this legislation before us; and I ask all of my colleagues to support the rule and the budget resolution.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR).

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, back when he was running for President, Mr. Bush often said trust the people. But when it comes to the public health and the environment, fewer Americans trust this President's agenda and for good reason. He has called for oil drilling in the National Arctic Wildlife Refuge. He has broken his campaign promise to cut carbon dioxide emissions. He has even repealed new standards to get arsenic out of our drinking water.

In my State of Michigan, out of 3,000 wells, 450 have high levels of arsenic, which we know is a killer. It is used in pesticides. It is used in weed killers. It kills people and it causes serious health problems.

Now, the White House presents us with a budget that cuts or shortchanges every important environmental initiative. We heard a very good statement from the gentleman from Wisconsin talking about what this budget does to education, that it devastates the environment.

Let me give one example. Today, millions of American families depend on water treatment facilities so decrepit and so outdated that the water they process is not always safe to drink. That is why people are walking around this country with bottled water. In the State of Wisconsin in Milwaukee, 104

people died of cryptosporidium, a bacteria that got into their water supply. Naturally, EPA says it is going to cost \$1 trillion over the next 2 decades to improve our sewer systems. That is about \$23 billion a year more than is already being spent by State, local, and ratepayers, governments and ratepayers. So it is going to take \$20 billion alone over the next 30 years to fix water and sewer systems in southeastern Michigan alone, where we have a huge problem.

Our State has a water problem. One would think Michigan, the Great Lake State with all the freshwater, 95 percent in the world, would be doing well but we have 11,000 inland lakes in our State. Every one of them is contaminated with mercury to the point if one is a pregnant woman she cannot eat the fish.

I have beaches in my district that are closed on a constant basis throughout the summer because of undertreated or not treated waste that comes down river and into Lake St. Clair and Lake Huron of the Great Lakes. We are not paying attention to our most vital of resources, our water resources.

In southeastern Michigan, 4.2 million men, women and children depend on those systems. But instead of investing in the treatment plants America needs, this budget, like it does in education, like it does for senior prescription drugs, squanders money on tax cuts for the super rich. It does not take care of those basic needs of education, of health care, and the public health and the environment on the issues that I have talked to.

This may not be this administration's priorities but I want the American people to know it is our priorities. Most families depend on facilities built in large part with Federal dollars. Good sewers and water systems may not make for good photo-ops but they are essential to protecting the environment and the public health.

It is one thing to say the people are trusted. It is another to have policies and agendas and a budget that is worthy of our trust.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, when I look at the Republican budget, it is absolutely clear to me who is taking care of the billionaires in this country. What I want to know is who is taking care of our children? The Republican budget puts children and their needs behind a \$2 trillion tax cut that gives 45 percent of the benefit to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans.

In fact, a third of our children are part of families that would receive zero benefit from the proposed tax cut. Let me say that again. One-third of the children in this Nation live in families that would benefit nothing from the proposed tax cut.

In recent months, we have all heard the Republicans talk about helping children. Now is the time to support those words with actions in this budget. They will not do it. They are not doing it.

The Democrats, however, invest in our children by providing tax cuts for the families that need them the most, by protecting Social Security and Medicare, by improving the schools for these children and, most importantly, by paying down the national debt for their future. By voting for the Democratic alternative, we will make good on a promise not to leave children behind, and we will then invest in our children. Hence, we will be investing in the future of this Nation.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, as a new member of the Committee on the Budget, I rise in support of this resolution. We have a problem facing our country and that is the economic forecasting which is an inexact science and mistakes start at the program level. For example, when Congress added the recent national dialysis benefit to Medicare in 1972, forecasts used at the time predicted that the program enrollment would level out at 90,000 patients by 1995. Medicare actuaries now expect enrollment to exceed 400,000 by 2005 at a per-patient cost of \$37,000.

Another example is the V-22 Osprey. DOD estimated in 1986 that the cost would be \$32 million each, measured in 2000 dollars. That has now doubled to \$83 million. DOD has kept total project cost overruns to only 40 percent above original estimates by reducing the number of aircraft from 913 to 458. Add the uncertainty of forecasting of general economic conditions such as program level errors and the very ability of budget forecasts, even one year out worsens the problem.

In January 1999, CBO predicted a \$131 billion surplus for FY 2000; fully \$100 billion below the \$236 billion actually achieved. This year, CBO states that its estimated \$281 billion surplus for fiscal year 2001 could either be \$50 billion too high or too low. We need to reduce the swing in budget projections.

The Committee on the Budget must base its decisions on more accurate information. One important step in accuracy is to learn from the mistakes of the past. In the Committee on the Budget, we have bipartisan support for President Bush's testing under his education initiative, and that would have annual testing for students. We need to apply the same testing principle to the assumptions we use in budget forecasting.

Another source of error in the economic forecasts have been the omission of real world economic responses to the estimates that assess the changes in government spending or taxing policy. The chairman of the Committee on the

Budget needs the ability to request supplemental estimates from CBO to accurately assess the impact of policy changes enacted during the fiscal year on estimated Federal revenues and expenditures.

These are decision tools needed by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget. In the recent hearing that we had on this rule, I proposed a change that would empower the chairman, in consultation with the ranking minority member, to get that data. I look forward to working with the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), and other members of the subcommittee, on legislative and budget process, to improve budget forecasting in the models that we use so that we make better decisions here in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this measure.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), who serves on the Committee on the Budget with me, that I agree with him indeed that our projections are an imprecise science and I want to add to that scenario why this makes this a process we are not prepared to move with. Just think of Medicaid as one of the instances of an unpredictable number that indeed costs so much to our citizens but also costs to this government. We are not prepared because it is indeed an unpredictable number and we are not able to plan as we should.

As we plan a budget now, we should indeed have that budget to be a statement of our priorities. It should be a statement of who is important and what is important to us. It should be an opportunity of making choices.

I say our budget says some profound things to us. It says that our first priority is to make sure we give a big tax break and yet we do not say that. We say that our first priority is our children or education or defense and agriculture, but when we look at this budget we see that everything else is indeed determined by how much we give back in the tax cut. Then we begin to say what is left we will say in our priorities. So we made a choice. The choice was to give back to those indeed who had the most, and that means that this budget is not fair.

Furthermore, when we say we are committed to our farmers, in the Committee on the Budget, I offered an amendment that would allow this budget to be a statement based on soundness and fiscal reality. For the last 3 years, we have been funding our farmers \$9 billion in emergency funds for the last 3 years. That is \$27 billion, but this budget refused to take that re-

ality into consideration, again making this document at its very inception mean it is worthless.

□ 0945

If we are going to make this budget a statement of facts and priorities and choice and soundness, we indeed need to rewrite it.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose the resolution that is before us.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me this time.

The words of the administration and particularly President Bush during the campaign were: "leave no child behind." I rise today to say those words are, at best, very hollow in this budget that is being offered by the Republicans and allegedly by the administration.

For example, this budget gives no tax relief to families and less than 1 percent of this expands the earned income tax, while 45 percent of the tax cuts benefit those people who are in 1 percent of the income bracket. That leaves our children behind.

The Republican budget only provides 5.7 percent of an increase to educate the Nation's children, less than one-half the increase Congress has provided in the last 5 years. This means that we jeopardize class size reduction, school construction, teacher recruitment, title I and Pell grants, after-school programs and Head Start, where the Democratic budget provides \$129 billion for that program.

Mr. Speaker, do my colleagues realize that children today go to bed hungry in America? Fifty-nine percent of all eligible families and just 47 percent of all eligible working families are able to participate in the food stamp program. The Democratic budget increases that by \$381 million. It also increases the women and infant children program, but yet in the Republican budget we say that not only do we leave you behind; but we allow you to go to bed hungry and we allow you to get up hungry.

We know that working families need something very vital, Mr. Speaker, and that is child care. Whenever I go to my district, whether it is two-parent families or single-parent families or families that are children being raised by grandparents, they all need child care. Republicans cut child care by cutting out CDBG funds by \$200 million. Democrats increase it by a \$2.3 billion increase over 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, this budget is a faulty budget for our children. This budget should not pass. I ask my colleagues to support the alternatives that are put before us and provide for and promote our children of this Nation.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE).

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise with some concern about this particular rule for sort of a reason most people are not even familiar with, but it is the rainy-day fund or the budget reserve which was set up. I thought the chairman of the committee did a wonderful job of setting it up. The fact that we were going to have a strict way of handling emergency appropriations in this Congress which we have just never had before, it has always been a Christmas tree in the past. And unfortunately, as it wended its way to the floor here today, it has been watered down substantially in terms of leaving the definition up to the Committee on Appropriations and essentially they can spend it on whatever they want and then save the real emergencies for a separate appropriation.

I do not think that is right. Frankly, I think this is an issue that we have to address in this Congress. I have introduced legislation to do this. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, has supported that legislation. He has supported the concept of what we are doing, and I think it is something we should do. So for that reason I am vitally concerned about the rule here today, and I have some great difficulty in supporting it.

I will say about the budget itself, I think it does some good things in terms of tax reduction and education and other things; and I am sorry this point comes up, but the bottom line is that this is an area I think we need to address.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, some budgets are more important than others. Some years the budget is routine, even inconsequential. This budget this year is a watershed budget, much like the budget we did in 1993. It will determine the path we take for many years to come.

Let me say to the committee that the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) has endeavored to do a diligent, methodical job to cover the waterfront of the budget. We have done more work, the kind of work we should do, this year than we have in recent years, but the job is not done. That is not really to criticize him. The truth of the matter is, the facts are not in.

We do not have the budget backup data; it is still to come from the Office of Management and Budget. We do not know what the number for agriculture will be, a very big add in discretionary and mandatory spending. We do not know what the real number for defense is. Instead, what we have is a budget

with placeholder numbers for these two large and critical accounts. As to defense, for example, that is more than half of discretionary spending. We asked for Mr. Rumsfeld to come over and testify. He declined. He is in the middle of his study for the transformation of the United States Armed Forces. So what did we do?

This resolution contains extraordinary authority for the chairman of the committee, acting unilaterally, by himself, to come over and plug in a number for defense once that number is determined at any time up until July 25. We suspect that that time will be after the tax cuts. So what we are doing is authorizing substantial tax cuts, huge tax cuts, historically high tax cuts in this particular resolution, without knowing what two of the largest spending categories are going to be.

There is an appearance that because of the surpluses we have we can have our cake and eat it too. We can have these huge tax cuts and not really have to cut essential programs elsewhere in the budget. But among other things, because we do not have this budget detail, there are implied budget cuts coming that will be revealed once the budget documents get here and hit the street after April 3.

Let me mention just one: the President has plussed-up NIH by \$2.8 billion. So do we. It is important. However, the President's plus-up comes at the expense of other programs within the Department of Health and Human Services. It is not additional money; it is money that comes out of the hide of the rest of that department. There are other agencies like the CDC equally as important as NIH. We have not yet seen the documents, but we are told from documents that have been leaked or released that among other things, in order to pay for the NIH plus-up, we will cut, number one, the child care development block grant by as much as \$200 million; number two, the account for abused and neglected children.

That is why this budget should not be considered today; it should be put off until we have the detail to make the right kind of judgment about the fundamental decisions we make today in this budget resolution which will affect us for some years to come.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, the rule before us today does to the budget resolution what we thought would happen in the Committee on the Budget. It takes this contingency reserve, this strategic reserve that the President had in his budget and, in effect, creates a slush fund for the majority to fund what they want.

As we see here, while they outline some things they want to fund, most of what they want to fund of the President's new spending, we do not know

where it is. The President has asked for \$260 billion in new spending and more to come later, and we do not know how we are going to fund it.

The problem with this budget is they cut it a little too close to the line. Because as we see here, they leave themselves no room for error to end up spending Medicare and Social Security funds to fund the President's tax cut and the President's spending priorities that he has.

This budget is too tight. The numbers do not work. What we are going to end up doing is spending Social Security and Medicare funds and shortening the life span of those two very important programs to all of our constituents.

Mr. Speaker, we should reject this rule, we should reject the budget, and we should go back and start over in writing a real budget for the American people.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

(Mrs. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in opposition to the Republican budget. Let me focus for a moment on the whole issue of small business. Small business had been funded at a level of \$900 million. Under the Republican proposal, it will be reduced to \$539 million. Let me tell my colleagues what they are going to get rid of. They are going to reduce funding in programs that previously had provided access for small businesses in our country that are going to require them to pay up-front fees to get into some of the programs. It is a claim that they are going to reduce redundant programs. The redundant programs that they are going to reduce are the new market venture capitalists and the new market initiatives that were proposed under the past administration, programs to go into areas that are disadvantaged and unfunded previously.

I say to the Republican administration and to the President, you claim to be a President for the business folk. The real business folk in our country are those who run small businesses. If you reduce those dollars, you kill small business.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE), a distinguished member of the Committee on Rules.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), my colleague on the Committee on Rules, for yielding me this time. I rise in strong support of this balanced rule for the Republican budget resolution. The rule provides for a full and free debate of our Nation's budget priorities.

Mr. Speaker, the budget before us today is the hard-earned reward for

years of fiscal discipline exercised by this Republican-controlled Congress. I am proud to say that this budget makes historic strides in paying down the Federal debt to its lowest level in more than 80 years, while investing in priority areas that will guarantee security for every generation of Americans.

What I am talking about is a better education for every child, the prescription-drug plan for every senior who needs it, and the return of the tax surplus to the American people. This plan also provides the funds necessary to rebuild our defense readiness and fulfills the commitment to our Nation's veterans.

This budget plan further promotes a sound economy by holding the rate of spending at the level of inflation, and by providing for critical reforms in Medicare and Social Security, by including a prudent emergency set-aside for natural disasters.

I would like to commend the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking member, and all of the Members on the House Committee on the Budget for their hard-working commitment to produce a thoughtful bill that meets our most important priorities.

Mr. Speaker, the budget resolution that this fair rule will bring to the floor is a responsible budget; and it will keep us on the path of fiscal responsibility and economic prosperity. I support the rule, and I urge its support by the rest of this House.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of things that this rule on the budget resolution could have done to prevent us from going into another decade of deficits comparable to what happened after the 1981 tax cut, but it does not allow any such protections to even be debated and voted on.

For example, it could have put in triggers that said that if the surplus estimates do not materialize, then we will not cut taxes as deeply as is envisioned in this budget resolution, but it kept those triggers out. What this budget resolution says is that if the surplus estimates go up, we can increase the tax cut; but if the surplus estimates go down, we cannot reduce the tax cut. That is a recipe for financial ruin, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, since the tax cuts passed the House floor last month, the stock market has lost trillions of dollars of equity; corporations have come in with dramatically reduced earnings. None of that has been incorporated into the Congressional Budget Office estimates.

Those stock market losses are going to be deducted against next year's income taxes due, and yet we are acting today as though the rosy economic sceneric of the last eight years is going to continue indefinitely. If the

CBO growth estimate is off by even eight-tenths of a percent, \$4 trillion of this projected surplus vanishes.

□ 1000

The fact is that we have a very different economy, a worse economy, a slower economy than is estimated in the 16 year surplus estimates upon which this budget resolution is based.

All we are saying is, do not cut taxes if it means that our kids are going to have to pay off more debt, if our kids are going to have to provide for our Social Security and our Medicare because we have had to raid the trust funds in order to pay for a tax cut. That is fiscally irresponsible and it is selfish for the baby boom generation to reward ourselves and pass the bill onto our kids.

All we are saying is, cut taxes, but only cut taxes if we can afford to, only if our kids do not have to pay for those tax cuts.

This budget resolution does not do that. This budget resolution puts us right back into where we were in the 1980s, but this time the baby-boom generation is not around to pay off that debt, to put us back onto a road of fiscal responsibility. This time the baby-boom generation retires after this 10-year projection is over. In 2011, the baby boomers retire. They are going to want their Social Security and Medicare, and they will have the votes to make their children pay for those benefits. Our kids are going to have to come up with that money. This is so irresponsible to do to the next generation of Americans. The rule should be defeated.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, recalling that the debate is on the rule itself, I am happy to yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say that I support this rule because I support ultimately the budget.

I support the budget for a number of reasons. Number one, I think it is time that we in this Congress address the national debt. I have four children. I want the national debt gone. I am glad that this budget takes a very serious look at it.

I also believe that it is time to decrease the taxes on our citizens. When I was growing up in the 1970s, the tax burden on my parents and their generation, the income tax, was about 16 percent. Now, the generation before that in the 1950s had a 5 percent income tax burden. Today, that average tax burden is 24 percent. I think for middle-income Americans it is time to have tax relief. I am glad this budget takes a swing at that.

Then finally, Mr. Speaker, I support this budget because it has common-sense spending. It keeps the priorities of education, Medicare, Social Security, important social service programs

which government should be funding, and yet at the same time it says, after we take care of those obligations, those priorities, after we take care of those normal, important functions and obligations of the government, after we pay down the debt, we are going to return and we are going to rebate to the American people the money which is theirs.

Somehow, somewhere along the way to Washington, many of us have forgotten this is not our money, it is the money of the hard-working taxpayers, and they deserve to keep as much of it as possible.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to respond to my colleague from Georgia to say that he will have an opportunity to vote to pay down the national debt, and he will have an opportunity to vote to ensure that we meet our obligations, but it will not be in the underlying resolution. It will be in the separate substitute that will be offered that will pay down more debt than the President proposed and more debt than the Republican budget resolution would pay down.

In addition, the gentleman is correct that we do need to meet our obligations first. Our obligations include not only paying down the national debt, but they also include meeting the obligations that we have made to the American people who have paid their FICA taxes for Social Security and Medicare.

Unlike the Republican budget and unlike the President's budget, the Democratic budget substitute does not spend any of those proceeds on other programs. The Republican budget and the President's budget, which are basically one and the same, would spend proceeds in the Medicare and Social Security Trust Funds, thereby shortening the life span of those programs for current and future beneficiaries. The gentleman will have that choice today to vote for the separate substitute.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is very clear what we have before us. We have basically a sham budget on the other side with the equivalent of the magic asterisk of 20 years ago giving the chairman of the Committee on the Budget the authority to change great portions of the budget.

Why can we not have a real budget? That is all that is asked on our side. Let us do this on the up and up. Unfortunately, the other side has not chosen to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge people to vote against the budget and for the Democratic substitute that is a real budget.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would certainly encourage people to vote for the rule, because that is actually what is before us. I am not sure where my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas, comes down on that, but I think he supports it because he wants to get to the substitutes that the rule does carry and provide for.

I would point out that it is a fair rule. It certainly is going to allow for extensive, full debate, I think, in a very thorough way. We have the Progressive Caucus substitute, the Blue Dog substitute, the Republican study substitute, and a Democratic substitute, in addition to the original work of the Committee. That is a plentiful to consider today, and it certainly provides a number of options.

I do not know how we on the Committee on Rules can do much better than that, although I understand the concern of the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) that there were some specific single amendments brought to the Committee on Rules by individual Members who care very much about these levers and controls to guarantee that we do not overspend, which I am very sympathetic with, but did not find place on this rule because of the size and nature of having to deal with a budget resolution and the idea that we like to use the substitute amendment process.

We have already heard in a debate on the rule some very colorful language, some very vivid verbs and adjectives and adverbs; some scare, some inflammatory language, a little hyperbole. I suspect we are going to hear a lot more of that before the day is over.

I have heard phrases like "raiding the trust fund," billionaires starving children already, a little reminiscent of the days that the Republicans allegedly canceled the school lunch program. In fact, the Republicans plussed up the school lunch program, and it is in better shape now than it was.

I think we need to be careful of the rhetoric. I understand that when we are dealing with budgets, that it is hard to be absolutely correct about numbers because we are projecting into the future. If we knew everything exactly, it would be a lot easier to do.

But the idea that somehow we cannot go forward with a budget because we do not know exactly every number, it seems to me we will never get a budget done if we are going to wait for all those numbers to come in, because I would point out this is a prospective budget for the next fiscal year, and we are planning in order not to overspend. This is a prudent, responsible fiscal exercise to do that well.

We know that government cannot do it all. Most of us know that government should not do it all. When it comes to jobs, people depend on jobs. Our quality of life depends on jobs.

That requires risk-taking by business and entrepreneurs; small business, big business, all kinds of enterprise. It is the way we do it in our country.

We know that business is complaining, that enterprise is complaining about being overregulated. We also know it is complaining about being overtaxed. Today we are going to try to do something for Americans who are overtaxed. We are going to try and send a budget forward that says that we recognize we are taxing too much, and now is the time that we can afford to do all the things government should appropriately and properly do for Americans in need who are counting on those programs, and we will still have the ability to reduce taxes on hard-working Americans so they can save and spend their own money instead of having us do it for them in Washington.

I think one of the questions we have to ask regularly when we are talking about the Federal budget is, is the expenditure that is being considered appropriate for the Federal Government, or are there other ways to spend money? Because when we get into questions of spending Federal dollars, what we are really asking is who pays and how much.

We know the answer to who pays: It is the taxpayers. How much? We know the answer to that now in America, too. We are taxing too much.

I urge my colleagues to pay close attention to the debate today. We have put good debate potential on the floor under this rule. I urge support of the rule.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. FROST. 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 282, nays 130, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 65]

YEAS—282

Abercrombie	Berkley	Bryant
Aderholt	Biggart	Burr
Akin	Bilirakis	Buyer
Armey	Bishop	Calvert
Baca	Blunt	Camp
Bachus	Boehlert	Cannon
Baird	Boehner	Cantor
Baker	Bonilla	Capito
Ballenger	Bonior	Capps
Barcia	Bono	Cardin
Barr	Borski	Chabot
Barrett	Boswell	Chambliss
Bartlett	Boucher	Clement
Barton	Brady (PA)	Coble
Bass	Brady (TX)	Collins
Bereuter	Brown (SC)	Combest

Cooksey	Hunter	Portman	Kilpatrick	Moakley	Scott
Cramer	Hutchinson	Pryce (OH)	Kind (WI)	Mollohan	Serrano
Crane	Hyde	Putnam	LaFalce	Moran (VA)	Sherman
Crenshaw	Inslee	Quinn	Langevin	Nadler	Slaughter
Crowley	Isakson	Rahall	Lee	Napolitano	Solis
Cubin	Israel	Ramstad	Levin	Neal	Spratt
Culberson	Issa	Regula	Lewis (GA)	Oberstar	Stark
Cummings	Istook	Rehberg	Lipinski	Obey	Stupak
Cunningham	Jenkins	Riley	Lofgren	Olver	Tanner
Davis (CA)	Johnson (CT)	Rivers	Lowey	Owens	Tauscher
Davis, Jo Ann	Johnson (IL)	Rodriguez	Luther	Pallone	Thompson (MS)
Davis, Tom	Johnson, Sam	Roemer	Maloney (CT)	Payne	Thurman
Deal	Jones (NC)	Rogers (KY)	Markey	Pelosi	Tierney
DeLauro	Keller	Rogers (MI)	McCarthy (NY)	Peterson (MN)	Towns
DeLay	Kelly	Rohrabacher	McCollum	Price (NC)	Udall (CO)
DeMint	Kennedy (MN)	Ros-Lehtinen	McDermott	Ross	Udall (NM)
Diaz-Balart	Kerns	Roukema	McGovern	Roybal-Allard	Velazquez
Dingell	King (NY)	Royce	McIntyre	Rush	Visclosky
Doggett	Kingston	Ryan (WI)	McNulty	Sabo	Waters
Dooley	Kirk	Ryun (KS)	Meehan	Sanchez	Watt (NC)
Doolittle	Knollenberg	Saxton	Meek (FL)	Sanders	Waxman
Doyle	Kolbe	Scarborough	Meeks (NY)	Sandlin	Weiner
Dreier	Kucinich	Schaffer	Millender-	Sawyer	Wexler
Duncan	LaHood	Schrock	McDonald	Schakowsky	Woolsey
Dunn	Lantos	Sensenbrenner	Miller, George	Schiff	Wu
Ehlers	Largent	Sessions			
Ehrlich	Larsen (WA)	Shadegg			
Emerson	Larson (CT)	Shays			
Engel	Latham	Sherwood			
English	LaTourette	Shimkus			
Eshoo	Leach	Shaw			
Etheridge	Lewis (CA)	Simmons			
Everett	Lewis (KY)	Simpson			
Ferguson	Linder	Skeen			
Flake	LoBiondo	Skeltton			
Fletcher	Lucas (KY)	Smith (MI)			
Foley	Lucas (OK)	Smith (NJ)			
Ford	Maloney (NY)	Smith (TX)			
Fossella	Manzullo	Smith (WA)			
Frelinghuysen	Mascara	Snyder			
Frost	Matheson	Souder			
Gallegly	Matsui	Spence			
Ganske	McCarthy (MO)	Stearns			
Gekas	McCrery	Stenholm			
Gibbons	McHugh	Strickland			
Gilchrest	McInnis	Stump			
Gillmor	McKeon	Sununu			
Gilman	Mendeniz	Sweeney			
Gonzalez	Mica	Tancredo			
Goode	Miller (FL)	Tauzin			
Goodlatte	Miller, Gary	Taylor (MS)			
Goss	Moore	Taylor (NC)			
Graham	Moran (KS)	Terry			
Granger	Morella	Thomas			
Graves	Murtha	Thompson (CA)			
Green (WI)	Myrick	Thornberry			
Greenwood	Nethercutt	Thune			
Grucci	Ney	Tiahrt			
Gutknecht	Northup	Tiberi			
Hall (OH)	Norwood	Toomey			
Hall (TX)	Nussle	Trafficant			
Hansen	Ortiz	Turner			
Hart	Osborne	Upton			
Hastings (WA)	Ose	Vitter			
Hayes	Otter	Walden			
Hayworth	Oxley	Walsh			
Hefley	Pascarell	Wamp			
Herger	Pastor	Watkins			
Hill	Paul	Watts (OK)			
Hilleary	Pence	Weldon (FL)			
Hinojosa	Peterson (PA)	Weldon (PA)			
Hobson	Petri	Weller			
Hoekstra	Phelps	Whitfield			
Holden	Pickering	Wicker			
Horn	Pitts	Wilson			
Hostettler	Platts	Wolf			
Houghton	Pombo	Wynn			
Hulshof	Pomeroy	Young (FL)			

NAYS—130

Ackerman	Conyers	Harman
Allen	Costello	Hastings (FL)
Andrews	Coyne	Hilliard
Baldacci	Davis (FL)	Hinchey
Bentsen	Davis (IL)	Hoeffel
Berman	DeFazio	Holt
Berry	DeGette	Honda
Blagojevich	Delahunt	Hooley
Blumenauer	Deutsch	Hoyer
Brown (FL)	Dicks	Jackson (IL)
Brown (OH)	Edwards	Jackson-Lee
Capuano	Evans	(TX)
Carson (IN)	Farr	Jefferson
Carson (OK)	Fattah	John
Castle	Filner	Johnson, E. B.
Clay	Frank	Jones (OH)
Clayton	Gephardt	Kanjorski
Clyburn	Green (TX)	Kennedy (RI)
Condit	Gutierrez	Kildee

NOT VOTING—20

Baldwin	Kaptur	Reyes
Becerra	Klecicka	Reynolds
Boyd	Lampson	Rothman
Burton	McKinney	Shaw
Callahan	Mink	Sisisky
Cox	Radanovich	Young (AK)
Gordon	Rangel	

□ 1030

Messrs. BENTSEN, ALLEN, KIND, SAWYER, EDWARDS, LUTHER, and OWENS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. RIVERS, Mr. TAUZIN and Mr. KUCINICH changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADOPTION OF FURTHER AMENDMENT TO H. CON. RES. 83, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2002

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during consideration of H. Con. Res. 83, pursuant to House Resolution 100, the further amendment that I have placed at the desk be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole; and that the amendment I have placed at the desk be considered as read for the purpose of this request.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 26, strike “\$2,378,000,000,000” and insert “\$2,387,000,000,000”.

Page 3, line 4, strike “\$5,800,000,000,000” and insert “\$5,800,000,000”.

Page 5, line 14, strike “\$5,903,000,000,000” and insert “\$5,875,000,000,000”.

Page 5, line 15, strike “\$6,394,000,000,000” and insert “\$5,928,000,000,000”.

Page 5, line 16, strike “\$6,972,000,000,000” and insert “\$5,969,000,000,000”.

Page 5, line 17, strike “\$7,596,000,000,000” and insert “\$5,988,000,000,000”.

Page 5, line 18, strike “\$8,623,000,000,000” and insert “\$6,344,000,000,000”.

Page 5, line 19, strike “\$9,436,000,000,000” and insert “\$6,721,000,000,000”.

Page 13, line 11, strike “\$28,000,000,000” and insert “\$28,800,000,000”.