

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			
Gilchrist	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	Hooey
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”.

Page 19, line 20, strike "cal" and insert "fiscal".

Page 43, move lines 4 through 13 two ems to the left.

Page 44, line 6, strike "\$153,000,000" and insert "\$153,000,000,000".

Page 46, line 10, "\$3,871,000" and insert "\$3,871,000,000".

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2002

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 100 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 83.

□ 1032

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the 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, with Mr. LATOURETTE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the concurrent resolution is considered as having been read the first time.

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 debated 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.

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE).

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes for the purpose of opening the debate.

Mr. Chairman, good morning. We are in the midst of continuing the debate on the budget for fiscal year 2002, and let me review what our plan has in store. We wrote a budget that has six principles that we think are pretty important as we stand on this very important threshold of the 21st century.

In our budget, we have maximum debt elimination, a historic \$2.3 trillion of paying down the public debt by 2011 during this 10-year period.

Tax relief for every American taxpayer: \$1,600 on average income tax break for the average family of four.

Improved education for our children: \$44.5 billion commitment in fiscal year 2002 alone, an 11.5 percent increase for our kids. But we also recognize that it is not just the money, it is also reform of education.

A stronger national defense is our fourth principle: \$14 billion increase, not only in 2001, but a \$5.7 billion increase for pay, housing, and health care in 2002.

Health care reform that modernizes Medicare, provides for a prescription-drug benefit. It modernizes our Medicare benefit, because it is not just about the current Medicare and the current trust fund, it is about extending the life of the trust fund, extending the solvency through modernization. It is not a zero-sum game as some of my friends on the other side would have it.

Finally, saving Social Security. Third year in a row, the Republicans are setting aside all of the Social Security trust fund for exactly what we pay the FICA taxes for, for Social Security, for the retirement of our seniors. It is totally protected in this budget.

We have a good plan. These are the six principles that make up the plan.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, to talk about improved education for our children.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to stand before the House this morning in support of a budget blueprint that represents America's families and America's priorities.

Our colleagues on the Committee on the Budget have presented us with a common sense plan to improve education, strengthen the economy, and secure America's future. It reflects President Bush's efforts to close the achievement gap in education between disadvantaged students and their peers, and to work with States to push America's schools to be the best in the world.

Despite a decade of economic growth in the 1990s, the achievement gap between students, Anglo and minority, remains very wide. Washington has spent more than \$130 billion since 1965 in a well-intentioned effort to close this gap. We spent more than \$80 billion on that goal since 1990 alone; and, unfortunately, those efforts have not worked. Nearly 70 percent of inner city and rural fourth graders cannot read on a basic level, and low-income students lag behind their counterparts by an average of 20 percentile points on national assessment tests.

The hard lesson of the last 35 years is that money alone cannot be the vehicle for change in our public schools. There must also be accountability.

To ensure that Federal education dollars are being used effectively, we must ask States to assess student achievement in academics. One cannot correct a problem if one does not know that it exists; and for far too long, we have been spending Federal tax dollars in education without being able to track our students' progress and make certain that they are learning.

The budget before us today provides a framework for the most important change in Federal education policy since President Johnson. It paves the way for us to rededicate the Federal role in education to helping students who might otherwise fall through the cracks. It provides the resources needed to implement a system of accountability so parents will be able to know whether their children are learning.

This budget provides the resources necessary to accomplish these bold goals. It provides money to States to develop the test to track student performance each year, the centerpiece of the President's plan to leave no child behind. It targets resources to those who need it most by providing substantial funding for title I which provides aid to low-income students. Federal education funding for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the principle Federal law to aid disadvantaged students, is increased significantly.

Funding for reading programs is tripled, increasing to \$5 billion over 5 years. This program will help reduce the number of children placed in special-education classes simply because they have not learned to read, moving the Federal Government closer to its original promise of providing up to 40 percent of the average per-pupil expenditures in IDEA to the States.

This budget also provides \$2.6 billion for States to improve teacher quality through high-quality professional development, recruitment, and retention activities.

It addresses other educational priorities as well in higher education. An additional \$1 billion is included for Pell Grants, increasing the maximum award for all students to provide more need-based grant aid to low-income college students.

Mr. Chairman, until we have a real system of accountability in place, it is truly unfair to our children to enact massive increases in Federal education spending beyond the reasonable steps outlined in this budget resolution. Spending without accountability is the approach that Washington has followed in the past; and as a tragic consequence, many children have been trapped in chronically failing schools and denied the opportunity to realize the American dream.

This budget provides a framework that allows Republicans and Democrats to work together to close the achievement gap and to improve education quality and hope to our Nation's most disadvantaged students.

I commend the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) for his leadership in