

to support the rule. The majority is trying to bring the budget to the floor so that the debate we have already heard, some good introductory discussions in this past half-hour, can come to full-blown debate under the conference rules on the floor of the House. So I am going to ask everybody please to support this rule so we can in fact get on with the budget debate tomorrow.

I think that I have heard some concern that was a little puzzling, a lot of conference discussion about this particular budget, which my colleague from New York says is being rewritten by the other body as we speak. If that in fact is the case, then why are we debating a document that is not going to be relevant?

□ 1745

So it seems to me that we should have focused our remarks on the expedition that the majority is trying to bring forth, and that is a journey to the budget debate as quickly as possible in the broad daylight on a beautiful day in Washington, tomorrow, Wednesday, May 9.

I think that those who are still talking about being deprived of the opportunity to see the budget, whether it is the budget we are going to see or not, need to remember that they have had 4 days over the weekend, and indeed, it sounds as if some members have spent some time, and that is useful.

Those who would say that the majority has not been particularly apt or particularly fair in this process are entitled to their opinion, but I think those that come to Washington to look for perfection ought not to be the ones who cast the first stones. I am reminded that I am human and I readily admit I make errors, and I have machines in my office that jam occasionally, they are called copy machines, and if members have copy machines that do not jam, I would like to know what the brand is, because most every brand I have tried jammed, and that, in fact, is what happened. We had a jammed copy machine, and in our interest to try and get the debate started, we were not prudent enough to catch the fact that there were still two pieces of paper caught in the copy machine. We did catch it; but we just did not catch it immediately, so we misfiled.

I know that error takes place, and I do not want to be the one to cast the first stone; but since the stone has been cast, I generally remember in my earlier term here, I think it was back about 1992, there was an embarrassing moment when the present minority was in the majority when somehow or other we lost track of \$25 billion worth of Russian aid and the Speaker of the House went through a very considerable scramble to get it back. I do not recall us making a Federal case out of that, and I think that we solved that problem.

I also believe this problem is a much more minor problem; this only involves

perhaps giving the opportunity of Members 4 more days to review what might, in fact, be our budget document for budget debate.

So I think that we have come out ahead on this. Whether that was by design or by circumstance does not matter. We, in fact, are going to have a good chance to debate this budget; and everybody is going to have a chance to see what is in it.

But all of that is not relevant to what is before us, which is the rule to get on with the same-day provision that will allow us to get on to debating the budget. So without further comment on the fact that I think we have had an interesting preview of what might come in a budget debate, I would urge that we support this rule; and then the Committee on Rules will soon bring another rule which will also get us that much closer to the budget debate. So, if my colleagues will support that rule as well, we will then have two good rules in place to get us to the budget debate tomorrow; and we can vote on the budget rule tomorrow and then on the conference report, if all goes well.

Having said that, I urge the support of all my colleagues.

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 (Mr. GUTKNECHT). The question is on the resolution.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this resolution are postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

□ 1801

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY) at 6 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

HONORING NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION FOR 50 YEARS OF SERVICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 108.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 108.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO THE SAME DAY CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of agreeing to the resolution, House Resolution 131.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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 214, nays 200, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 100]

YEAS—214

Aderholt	Crane	Green (WI)
Akin	Crenshaw	Greenwood
Armey	Culberson	Grucci
Bachus	Cunningham	Gutknecht
Baker	Davis, Jo Ann	Hansen
Ballenger	Davis, Tom	Hart
Barr	Deal	Hastings (WA)
Bartlett	DeLay	Hayes
Barton	DeMint	Hayworth
Bass	Diaz-Balart	Hefley
Bereuter	Doolittle	Herger
Biggert	Dreier	Hilleary
Bilirakis	Duncan	Hobson
Blunt	Dunn	Hoekstra
Boehlert	Ehlers	Horn
Boehner	Ehrlich	Hostettler
Bonilla	Emerson	Houghton
Bono	English	Hulshof
Brady (TX)	Everett	Hunter
Brown (SC)	Ferguson	Hutchinson
Bryant	Flake	Hyde
Burr	Fletcher	Isakson
Burton	Foley	Issa
Buyer	Fossella	Istook
Callahan	Frelinghuysen	Jenkins
Calvert	Galleghy	Johnson (CT)
Camp	Ganske	Johnson (IL)
Cannon	Gekas	Johnson, Sam
Cantor	Gibbons	Jones (NC)
Capito	Gilchrest	Keller
Castle	Gillmor	Kelly
Chabot	Gilman	Kennedy (MN)
Chambliss	Goode	Kerns
Coble	Goodlatte	King (NY)
Collins	Goss	Kingston
Combest	Graham	Kirk
Cooksey	Granger	Knollenberg
Cox	Graves	Kolbe

Largent	Pombo	Smith (NJ)
Latham	Portman	Smith (TX)
LaTourette	Pryce (OH)	Souder
Leach	Putnam	Spence
Lewis (CA)	Quinn	Stearns
Lewis (KY)	Radanovich	Sununu
Linder	Ramstad	Tancredo
LoBiondo	Regula	Tauzin
Lucas (OK)	Rehberg	Terry
Manzullo	Reynolds	Thomas
McCrery	Riley	Thornberry
McHugh	Rogers (KY)	Thune
McInnis	Rogers (MI)	Tiahrt
McKeon	Rohrabacher	Tiberi
Mica	Ros-Lehtinen	Toomey
Miller (FL)	Roukema	Trafficant
Miller, Gary	Royce	Upton
Moran (KS)	Ryan (WI)	Vitter
Morella	Ryun (KS)	Walden
Myrick	Saxton	Walsh
Nethercutt	Scarborough	Wamp
Ney	Schaffer	Watkins
Northup	Schrock	Watts (OK)
Norwood	Sensenbrenner	Weldon (FL)
Nussle	Sessions	Weldon (PA)
Osborne	Shadegg	Weller
Ose	Shaw	Whitfield
Otter	Shays	Wicker
Oxley	Sherwood	Wilson
Pence	Shimkus	Wolf
Petri	Simmons	Young (AK)
Pickering	Simpson	Young (FL)
Pitts	Skeen	
Platts	Smith (MI)	

NAYS—200

Abercrombie	Gephardt	Millender-
Andrews	Gonzalez	McDonald
Baca	Gordon	Mink
Baird	Green (TX)	Moakley
Baldacci	Hall (OH)	Mollohan
Baldwin	Hall (TX)	Moore
Barcia	Harman	Moran (VA)
Barrett	Hastings (FL)	Murtha
Becerra	Hill	Nadler
Bentsen	Hilliard	Napolitano
Berkley	Hinchey	Neal
Berman	Hinojosa	Oberstar
Berry	Hoefel	Obey
Bishop	Holden	Olver
Blagojevich	Holt	Ortiz
Blumenauer	Honda	Owens
Bonior	Hoolley	Pallone
Borski	Hoyer	Pascarell
Boswell	Israel	Pastor
Boucher	Jackson (IL)	Payne
Boyd	Jackson-Lee	Pelosi
Brady (PA)	(TX)	Peterson (MN)
Brown (FL)	Jefferson	Phelps
Brown (OH)	John	Pomeroy
Capps	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)
Capuano	Kanjorski	Rahall
Cardin	Kaptur	Rangel
Carson (IN)	Kennedy (RI)	Reyes
Carson (OK)	Kildee	Rodriguez
Clay	Kilpatrick	Roemer
Clayton	Kind (WI)	Ross
Clement	Kleczka	Rothman
Clyburn	Kucinich	Roybal-Allard
Condit	LaFalce	Rush
Conyers	Langevin	Sabo
Coyne	Lantos	Sanchez
Cramer	Larsen (WA)	Sanders
Crowley	Larson (CT)	Sandlin
Cummings	Lee	Sawyer
Davis (CA)	Levin	Schakowsky
Davis (FL)	Lewis (GA)	Schiff
Davis (IL)	Lipinski	Scott
DeFazio	Lofgren	Serrano
DeGette	Lowe	Sherman
Delahunt	Lucas (KY)	Shows
DeLauro	Luther	Skelton
Deutsch	Maloney (CT)	Slaughter
Dicks	Maloney (NY)	Smith (WA)
Dingell	Markey	Snyder
Doggett	Mascara	Solis
Dooley	Matheson	Spratt
Doyle	Matsui	Stark
Edwards	McCarthy (MO)	Stenholm
Engel	McCarthy (NY)	Strickland
Eshoo	McCollum	Stupak
Etheridge	McGovern	Tanner
Evans	McIntyre	Tauscher
Farr	McKinney	Taylor (MS)
Fattah	McNulty	Thompson (CA)
Filner	Meehan	Thompson (MS)
Ford	Meek (FL)	Thurman
Frank	Meeks (NY)	Tierney
Frost	Menendez	Towns

Turner	Waters	Woolsey
Udall (CO)	Watt (NC)	Wu
Udall (NM)	Waxman	Wynn
Velazquez	Weiner	
Visclosky	Wexler	

NOT VOTING—17

Ackerman	Jones (OH)	Peterson (PA)
Allen	LaHood	Rivers
Costello	Lampson	Stump
Cubin	McDermott	Sweeney
Gutierrez	Miller, George	Taylor (NC)
Inslee	Paul	

□ 1824

Mr. SAWYER and Mr. SERRANO changed their vote from “yea” to “nay”.

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.

Stated against:

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 100, I was absent because of mechanical problems with the aircraft I was on. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1613

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of H.R. 1613.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR RECOMMITTAL OF
CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE
CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 83,
CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON
THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2002

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by the direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 134 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 134

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution the conference report to accompany 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 is hereby recommitted to the committee of conference.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), my friend and colleague from the Committee on Rules; 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.

□ 1830

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us grants us a rule that provides that

upon adoption of the rule the conference report to accompany H. Con. Res. 83 shall be recommitted to the conference committee.

Simply put, and in plain English for Members, what we are doing is we are taking care of the necessary procedure to get the budget debate on the floor tomorrow. What is going to happen is we are going to pass this rule, then the matter is going to go to the other body. The Committee on Rules is going to meet a little later in the evening, put out a rule to get the new conference report on the floor tomorrow with an appropriate rule, and the House will go about the business of deliberating and voting on the budget, which we are all anxious to get to after the long opportunity we have had to review it in the past several days.

Therefore, this is somewhat of a technical matter; but it is important that in order to continue our progress towards getting the budget on the floor that we adopt this rule. I do not think there is anything unusual about it or controversial about it, and I urge all Members' support.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule to recommit this flawed document. I urge the leadership to use this opportunity to craft a real budget with input from both Republicans and Democrats.

The infamous two missing pages are hardly the only flaws in this so-called agreement. Other pages are missing as well. For instance, waiting in the wings of this Congress are a number of popular tax cuts, including between \$85 billion and \$115 billion in business tax breaks. Billions more in tax cuts, with the elimination of the estate tax for the Nation's wealthiest citizens, and the elimination of the so-called marriage penalty tax this Congress, are moving through the legislative process. An honest budget would have included these provisions. The House leadership knows full well that at the end of this tax cut frenzy we will surpass the administration's initial proposal of \$1.8 trillion.

Also missing are the President's big-ticket items. For starters, we seem to be missing the page that factors in the likely cost of a missile defense system. Nobody knows if it will work, and nobody knows how much it will cost; but estimates run up to \$300 billion.

We also seem to be missing the page that explains how we pay for the conventional defense buildup being planned by the administration at a cost of \$250 billion over the next decade. How is this consistent with a budget that makes no room for increases in defense spending beyond those already proposed by the Clinton administration?