

Tauscher	Traficant	Weiner
Tauzin	Turner	Weldon (FL)
Taylor (NC)	Upton	Weldon (PA)
Terry	Vitter	Wexler
Thomas	Walden	Wicker
Thornberry	Walsh	Wilson
Thune	Wamp	Wolf
Tiahrt	Watkins	Woolsey
Tiberi	Watt (NC)	Wu
Tierney	Watts (OK)	Wynn
Toomey	Waxman	Young (FL)

NAYS—70

Ackerman	Hinchey	Pallone
Aderholt	Hooley	Phelps
Bonior	Hulshof	Pomeroy
Borski	Jackson-Lee	Ramstad
Brady (PA)	(TX)	Riley
Brown (FL)	Johnson, E.B.	Sabo
Brown (OH)	Jones (OH)	Schaffer
Capuano	Kennedy (MN)	Stark
Clay	Kennedy (RI)	Stenholm
Costello	Kilpatrick	Strickland
Crowley	Kucinich	Stupak
Deal	LaFalce	Sweeney
DeFazio	Langevin	Taylor (MS)
Dicks	Larsen (WA)	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	Lee	Thompson (MS)
English	LoBiondo	Thurman
Farr	McDermott	Towns
Finler	McGovern	Udall (CO)
Gutknecht	McNulty	Udall (NM)
Harman	Menendez	Velazquez
Hastings (FL)	Miller, George	Visclosky
Hefley	Moore	Waters
Hilleary	Oberstar	Weller
Hilliard	Oliver	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Tancredo

NOT VOTING—25

Abercrombie	DeLay	Peterson (MN)
Allen	Gephardt	Rivers
Baird	Hall (OH)	Schakowsky
Barton	Maloney (CT)	Spratt
Conyers	McCollum	Stump
Crane	Moakley	Whitfield
Cubin	Moran (VA)	Young (AK)
Culberson	Napolitano	
Delahunt	Obey	

□ 1027

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. FOSSELLA 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 would announce that all 1-minutes, with the exception of the introduction of the guest chaplain, will be postponed until the end of the legislative day today.

WELCOME TO RABBI ELY J. ROSENZVEIG AND HIS FAMILY

(Mrs. LOWEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to welcome Rabbi Ely Rosenzveig to the United States House of Representatives. A spiritual and moral leader of the New Rochelle community, Rabbi Rosenzveig brings honor to this body, just as he does to his own congregation. Rabbi Rosenzveig joins us from Congregation Anshe Sholom with his family, his four out of five children, with his in-laws, his parents and 40 members of the synagogue.

The synagogue celebrates its 105th birthday next week. Anshe Sholom has doubled in size during the past 5 years, ensuring that it continues to be one of the anchor congregations of Westchester County.

Rabbi Rosenzveig is a remarkable man, the son of Rabbi Charles and Helen Rosenzveig, both Holocaust survivors. His father, who is here with us today, came straight from a hospital bed; is a leader of the Holocaust Remembrance Movement. Like his son, the elder Rabbi Rosenzveig demonstrates that spiritual greatness is heightened by worldly activism.

□ 1030

A master of economics and student of Talmud, an accomplished lawyer and dedicated Rabbi, a community leader and devoted father, Rabbi Rosenzveig has excelled in all facets of life. More important than his accomplishments, however, is the love he has for his five wonderful children, for his wife, and the model he sets not only for his congregation, but for the entire community around him.

A leader with warmth and respect for all people, Rabbi Rosenzveig teaches by example and lives by the ideal that our actions mean more than words. His presence here today and the large following that has come to hear him speak bear witness to that belief.

It is my distinct pleasure to welcome Rabbi Ely Rosenzveig to the Congress of the United States.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. CON. RES. 83, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 136 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 136

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider 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. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as

read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the conference report to final adoption without intervening motion except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). 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 distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), my friend 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.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us waives all points of order against the conference report to accompany H. Con. Res. 83, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2002 and against its consideration. Basically, this is the rule that gets the budget debate going.

The rule provides that the conference report shall be considered as read and further provides one hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. This is a fair and standard rule for consideration of the conference report for the budget, and I hope we have the support of all Members.

Mr. Speaker, this is the second time this spring I have had the privilege to stand before the House and address my fellow Americans on our country's budget. While the details may be a little different from the original House position, the sentiments do remain the same.

The budget before the House today provides an historic level of tax cuts, while still providing Americans with needed resources and services. The budget blueprint before us provides more relief than the previous administration ever dreamed possible.

From the beginning of his administration, President Bush has stressed the importance of bipartisan efforts to reach our national goals. This conference report illustrates how working together can benefit all Americans, both taxpayers and citizens who count on Federal programs. Included in the budget are allocations to pay back our country's debt, to fortify our national defense, to improve education, and strengthen both Social Security and Medicare. These are all critical issues. After all these programs have been addressed, there is still money remaining. These remaining funds will result in \$1.35 trillion worth of tax relief over the next 11 years. This is real relief for all taxpayers.

Now, I know some of my colleagues will complain that the tax cut is either too big or too small. We are certainly going to hear plenty of rhetoric and probably some class warfare language today on that subject. But this debate

is not about winning or losing, it is about treating the American taxpayers fairly. Some opponents of the revised budget are overlooking the difference between zero dollars and \$1.35 trillion of relief. Others are saying any tax relief is unthinkable. Both views are radical. They are off the mark, and they are out of the mainstream.

This budget illustrates compromise and bipartisanship, obviously working with the other body, to achieve carefully considered and prudent tax relief. I commend the conferees for their hard work and dedication to reaching an agreement. I am hopeful and I am confident that this budget does set a new tone in Washington. Instead of placing partisan point scoring above real overdue affordable relief, this budget focuses on necessary services for all Americans and tax relief for taxpayers. What a great idea.

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

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

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the definition of "folly" is to repeat what has failed and expect it to succeed, and that is what this underlying budget document does.

We have been down this road before. Twenty years ago Congress enacted massive tax cuts along with increased military spending. The result was a crippling recession and catastrophic deficits from which it took well over a decade to recover, and many regions of the country never really did. That is why I rise in strong opposition to this rule.

I oppose the hasty process the rule embraces. The resolution waives the rule that requires the availability of conference reports for 3 days before their consideration. This House rule allows Members time to read and study the report before they cast their votes. But we will not be able to do that today. Since this conference report that outlines the Nation's budget has been available to most Members for only a few hours, I have grave doubts that most Members have any real knowledge about what it includes.

Moreover, the leadership is developing a habit of adding and taking away crucial documents from the report in the wee hours. Asking for regular order to review what new surprises await Members is not an unreasonable request. In its current form, the conference report is, at best, misguided, and, at worst, a sham.

The numbers do not add up. The bill will fundamentally threaten our Nation's Medicare and Social Security trust funds. This is not political hyperbole, this is grade school math.

Over the next 10 years, the CBO-projected surplus totals \$2.7 trillion. The

tax cuts and new spending expected to be included in the budget agreement, plus defense increases and additional tax cuts not included in the agreement, will well exceed this total and thus must raid Medicare and Social Security.

I do not think anyone believes the much-ballyhooed \$1.25 trillion tax cut over a 10-year period will stay anywhere near that amount. The additional \$100 billion stimulus for the years 2001 and 2002 bring the 10-year total for the tax cut to \$1.3 trillion, and debt service on a tax cut of this size will cost \$300 billion, bringing the overall cost over 10 years to \$1.6 trillion.

Moreover, as the majority is fond of reminding its major donors, this round of tax cuts is simply the first shot, with further tax breaks heading down the pike.

The conference report retains the Senate's interest in Medicare prescription drugs, education, agriculture and other priorities; but the conference spending totals, the debt service that goes with them, and the true cost of the tax cut are likely to tap into the available Medicare surplus in at least 1 of the next 10 years.

Of particular concern to my colleagues should be the presence of big ticket items not included in the budget resolution. For instance, the President is expected to request at least \$300 billion in outlays over 10 years for defense. Moreover, his recent proposal to begin spending billions for a missile defense system should sound budgetary alarms for everyone in this Chamber. They are not included in this budget.

I would also remind my colleagues that the American people in poll after poll have remained remarkably sensible about their budget priorities. They want an honest, fiscally responsible budget plan that balances America's priorities, from tax relief for all families to support for our military, from education to a prescription drug benefit for our seniors. They want a fiscally responsible budget that will protect the economy by paying down the national debt, by strengthening Social Security and Medicare, and investing in our future; and this budget threatens all of those priorities.

The vote today is the beginning of the raid on Social Security and Medicare and the return of big deficits as far as the eye can see, and I urge my colleagues to defeat the rule.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am genuinely sorry the gentlewoman is opposed to the rule. We think it is an excellent and traditional rule, and do not think we can proceed to the budget debate without it. I hope Members will support the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the distin-

guished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Sanibel for yielding me time and for the fine work he has done on this very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule. As my friend has just said, this is the standard rule for dealing with a conference report; and it is deserving of the full support, I believe, of both sides of the aisle.

I want to start out by congratulating our great new chairman of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), for the fine job that he has done in laying the groundwork for us to once again make history.

Over the past 6 years, since we Republicans have been in charge, we have been able to make history on this whole issue of the budget. We have been able to pay down the national debt, we have been able to protect Social Security, and we have focused resources on our Nation's priorities.

Once again, today, we are going to be making history, because even though over the last 6 years we have succeeded in doing those things that I have just mentioned successfully, we also have every year had a President's budget come to the Congress, and, frankly, every year since I have had the privilege of serving here over the last 2 decades, every President's budget which has arrived here has been designated with that moniker "dead on arrival." The acronym DOA has been placed over every President's budget.

Yet today we are going to make history for the first time in at least 2 decades and possibly since passage of the 1974 Budget Impoundment Act, we are going to actually pass the President's budget. It is the right thing to do, and that is the reason that we are going to be doing it.

It is the right thing to do, because this budget is fair, it is balanced, and, as with these past budgets we have reported out of here since we have been in the majority, it successfully focuses on our Nation's priorities.

It is true that this budget conference report does not have a tax cut which is as large as the one that was reported out of the House, but it still is a very important and historic move that we have made to bring about the kind of reduction in the tax burden on working Americans that we are going to with the \$1.35 trillion level. This budget also pays down \$2.3 trillion in national debt, it does provide tax relief for every American who pays taxes, and it does something that really was the highest priority in this past Presidential campaign, focuses on this very important issue of education.

We all know that if the young people who are being educated today in this country are going to be able to be competitive as we look at this global economy, we must do everything we can to improve the quality of education. We want decision-making to be handled at

the local level, and we want teachers to be empowered to make decisions. That is exactly what this measure will do, and we are going to be, in the not too distant future, considering a very important education bill that I think will also do that.

Then going from education to an issue that is near and dear to everyone, especially as we look at baby-boomers who are aging, and that is Social Security, I am very, very pleased that this budget, which has been carefully crafted, does protect Social Security. It ensures that we are not going to be going in and spending Social Security dollars for a wide range of other issues, which, frankly, was done for years up until we won the majority again.

We are going to be doing everything that we can, as well as focusing on retirement, to make sure that the number one issue that is focused on in the U.S. Constitution as far as our responsibility here, that being national security, is addressed.

□ 1045

Those 15 words in the middle of the preamble of the Constitution that provide for the common defense are the words which really state clearly that all of these other issues that we address can be handled at other levels of government, but our national security is the one issue that must be addressed here at the Federal level; and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) in this budget has very effectively focused on the issue of our national security.

So I am very, very proud of the work that has been done by the Committee on the Budget. We are very proud of the Committee on Rules to have been able to move this forward. Obviously, we have run into a challenge in the past week, but today we are finally going to pass the President's budget. It is the right thing to do. I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the budget itself.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR).

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have been congratulating themselves for changing the tone here in Washington, D.C.; and just a few weeks ago, the Senate reached a bipartisan agreement on increasing funding for education. But where in this Republican budget are the additional funds that America needs for special education? Gone. What about the money we need for early childhood education? Gone. What about the funds for a better after-school program for our children so that they have a safe haven when the school day is over? Gone. What about the money so kids have smaller class sizes so that there is a better ratio and more discipline and more attention for our children? Gone. What about the money to improve school safety? It is not there either. The entire bipartisan agreement on education: gone, vanished, as if it was not worth the paper it was written on

when it was negotiated. In fact, this budget cuts education \$21 billion below the President's request, the President of their own party.

Now, let me ask my colleagues, what is bipartisan about that?

The Republicans are not presenting us with a budget; they are conducting an elaborate shell game, a shell game where working families lose on every score. Where is their commitment to affordable prescription medicine? Where is their commitment to quality health care? Where is their commitment to the environment? Do not look for it in this budget. It is not in the budget; it is not in the two lost pages that they could not find last week. It is nowhere.

While this administration refuses to cut the amount of arsenic in Michigan's drinking water, they are happier to cut funding for the Environmental Protection Agency. While the Republicans hold back-room meetings with oil industry to map out their energy policy, they are gutting Federal support for conservation and renewable resources. Last year, the Republicans said they had a lot of compassion, and they might; but this budget proves it is not for America's working families. They cut education and the environment to pay for huge tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans.

Mr. Speaker, do my colleagues know what? They will rob the Social Security and Medicare trust funds as well. They will rob the Medicare and Social Security trust funds to put this together. We are 7 years from the retirement of the baby boomers; yet we are squandering every penny of the surplus that could be used to strengthen our retirement security. And even worse, they are using Social Security and Medicare as a piggy-back to fund their special-interest tax breaks.

And the surplus, heavens, we should talk about the surplus. There is no surplus. The budget projections are from last year, before the economy slowed. We are betting the farm on wild projections that cannot possibly be accurate. A new bipartisan tone in Washington, Mr. Speaker? No way. Not with this budget, not with the way we were treated in putting it together, not with excluding us from this budget.

Let us reject the cuts in education. Let us reject the cuts in the environment. Let us sit down and write a budget that will take care of our children first and the special interests last.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the gentleman's comments on the budget, I hope we will have his support on the rule so that we can get to the debate on the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), a member of the committee.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, first of all, this is a very fair and standard rule that is going to allow us to have a substantive debate on the budget, and I certainly hope all of my colleagues will

vote "yes" to pass this rule, because then we can get on to the substance of the budget itself, and it is a terrific budget that we have before us today.

First of all, as all of my colleagues in this Chamber know, Mr. Speaker, we have walled off the Social Security and Medicare surpluses. We are devoting over \$2 trillion in the next 10 years to paying off all of the available national debt. We have responsible restraints on the growth of Federal spending and, at the same time increasing, where it is appropriate, such as in health care research and the national defense, which badly needs an increase. Best of all, from my point of view, this budget provides the framework for providing meaningful tax relief from the record high taxes that are being carried by the American people.

Frankly, it is modest tax relief. Certainly, if we look at it historically, certainly, if we put this in the context of the size of our economy, this is modest tax relief; but it is very important in that it is tax relief for all taxpayers. It is still the most sweeping tax relief of a generation.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, this tax relief is about freedom. It is about the question of who is going to get to decide how to spend that marginal dollar they earn, the American people who earn it, or politicians in Washington who would like to hoard that surplus tax money and spend it themselves. I am going to be voting for the American people on this one.

It is also about economic growth because when we lower marginal tax rates, when we eliminate the death tax, hopefully lower capital gains rate and eliminate a number of other tax reductions, we will take an enormous step forward in providing long-term prosperity for our Nation. Every single time in American history that we have had sweeping tax reduction, we have seen a corresponding acceleration in economic growth and activity. The economy accelerates, take-home wages go up, productivity rises, living standards rise.

There is no coincidence; there is no mystery as to why this happens. It is simple. When we increase the rewards of working and saving and investing, we increase the incentives to work and save and invest, and when we increase the incentives, we get more work in savings and investment. That is why this tax relief will help to spur economic growth, that is why it is so good for the American people, and that is why we should adopt the rule and the budget.

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

Mr. FROST. Today, Mr. Speaker, the budgets of the President and the Republican Congress are perpetuating a fraud on the American people, one that threatens the economy and Medicare and Social Security, and one that sacrifices priorities like education, prescription drugs, and paying down the debt.

Republicans are spinning the ridiculous notion that this budget conference report represents some sort of compromise. What kind of compromise, Mr. Speaker, guts education like this, sacrificing priorities like smaller classes and more qualified teachers? This so-called compromise takes a giant step backward in education, eliminating the \$294 billion the Senate added to the House bill, and even cutting education below what the President requested.

What kind of compromise guts conservation and renewable energy programs at a time when the American people are crying out for relief from skyrocketing gas prices and an electricity crisis across the West? What kind of compromise, Mr. Speaker, ignores vital defense needs? What kind of compromise, Mr. Speaker, ignores skyrocketing prescription prices and raids the Social Security and Medicare trust funds?

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it. Let us understand what is happening here. This is not a real document. Later in the year the Republicans will be back before this House seeking greater tax cuts, more money for defense, and more money for education; and when they do that, as they inevitably will, that money will come from the Social Security Trust Fund and the Medicare Trust Fund, because there is no other place to get it.

This is a fraudulent document set up to fail. The Republicans know it, and they are doing a disservice to the American public.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), a distinguished member of the Committee on Rules and a distinguished member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time. I would inquire if the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, would engage in a colloquy with me.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity as chairman of the Nuclear Cleanup Caucus to thank the gentleman from Iowa for working with me to increase the funding for the Department of Energy's Environmental Management Account. As the gentleman is aware, the administration's budget request falls well short of the necessary funding to meet the needs throughout the entire DOE complex.

Specifically, at the Hanford Reservation in my district, the administration's budget request will jeopardize momentum at the Richland Operations Office and delay construction of the waste treatment plant at the Office of River Protection.

Recognizing this shortfall, is it true that the budget resolution recognizes the urgent need for up to a \$1 billion increase for the EM account and the

cleanup at these former defense nuclear sites for the government to meet its legal, contractual, and moral responsibilities?

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct. I would first like to commend the gentleman for his hard work on this issue. This is a tough issue, and this has been a tough issue for the gentleman and a number of other Members; and I appreciate his leadership in ensuring that this increase was included in the conference report.

As the gentleman stated, the resolution provides specific language highlighting the recognition by Congress that up to an additional \$1 billion is necessary next year, and I look forward to working with the gentleman to ensure that this increase is included in any final appropriations bill that moves this year.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for his leadership not only on this; but I would like to also add my congratulations to the gentleman, because this is his first budget. I think the budget that we will be voting on here soon is an excellent budget. It sets a blueprint really for well into the next century. We have heard that over and over again. But I think the gentleman has done an excellent job.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this fair rule and also the underlying legislation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, we are here for the charade budget number two. The question is, why? Because it has been run through the House so rapidly that they lost two pages, and they are trying to get it past the American people as quickly as possible.

The view is this was constructed because they believe that all of the American people are yokels that can be fooled by an old game they play in the county fairs.

Now, this shell that we have here represents the defense budget, the tax cut, and the rest of the budget. And we have under this pea, we have the surplus from Social Security and Medicare. And what they are doing is moving it around so fast that they lost two pages.

Now, they have gone back, and they are going to start moving these shells around. We heard the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) talk about the shell game. That is the shell game we are talking about. They think the American people do not understand that we cannot have an enormous tax cut, protect Social Security and Medicare, and have a big defense budget, and everything else they want in the budget. They cannot do it, unless they move these shells so quickly that people do not recognize this.

Now, how do they do that? First they come out here and say, we put all of the money for Social Security in a lock box, so that is protected. Right? And then they come out and say, and now we have passed a big tax cut. I ask my colleagues, how many Americans will actually know if they got a tax cut? They have been told it here in the well 10,000, 100,000 times, or I do not know how many times, by people who say, every American is going to get a tax cut. But if they move that shell around quick enough, no one will ever know if they got one or not. Then, when it comes to their schools and there is no money, and there is no money for the environment, and they have made no provision whatsoever for energy prices going on, in this budget, there is no recognition of \$3-a-gallon gas.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members to vote against this rule, go back and do an orderly process on a budget resolution that has hearings and actually has a vote in the House and in the Senate on a real bill.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER), a distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I really enjoyed my friend who spoke last because he said how many Americans know they got a tax cut? The answer is zero, because we have never given them a tax cut. Last year, we came before this body and the leadership who was speaking today talked about our \$373 billion tax proposal, and what did our colleagues on the other side say? It is a risky tax scheme. We cannot afford it. It will hurt Social Security, it will destroy Medicare, it will put homeless on the street.

□ 1100

Mr. Speaker, it does not matter what we do. My colleagues do not like it. The problem is, my colleagues say we cut education; the budget allows for an 11½ percent increase in education. That is not rhetoric. That is a fact. Read the budget.

When my colleagues talk about people needing to pay energy bills, we have people out there who cannot afford the energy bills. Why? Because we confiscate their money through taxation.

What is wrong with changing a punitive Tax Code and letting the American people keep more of their hard-earned money? This budget sets aside 100 percent, 100 percent of the Social Security Trust Fund over 10 years. It is not spent. All of the rhetoric in the world will not spend that money.

It says we are going to pay off all of the available debt, \$2.4 trillion. That is all we can pay off because that is all that is due. The problem is when we talk about educating children, what about allowing people to keep their own money so they can help educate their own children? It is ridiculous.

Our Tax Code builds a wall between people who work for a living and success. And my colleagues say we are just benefiting the rich.

Let me tell my colleagues, people work, people go to school to become educated, to better themselves in life; what we have is a situation when people move up the ladder, we confiscate the money through taxation.

If my colleagues want to help people, want to help them make their house payment, want to help them make their car payment, want to help them feed their families, try a noble idea, let them keep more of their hard-earned money.

I believe the American people know where their money should be spent, but my good friends on the other side of the aisle believe that they know where the money should be spent. There is no limit to how large the government should grow from my colleagues' perspective.

This is a reasonable rule, a reasonable budget, and I ask for an aye vote.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the rule and I oppose the budget. The reason I oppose this budget is it is more complicated than the 2 pages that were missing from this budget, it is the lack of commitment of education that is missing in the 150 pages that remain in this budget.

President Bush stood right here, the Republican President, in this House 2½ months ago, and he said to the Nation and to the Republican and Democratic parties, I want to spend \$21 billion more on education, for an 11 percent increase. That commitment is gone from this budget.

The House of Representatives is right now working on a bipartisan bill called the Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. We have proposed doubling of Title I for the poorest kids in this country. The President wants to test them. We need to remediate and help them with these tests.

That commitment is gone in this budget. The United States Senate has proposed helping our local communities with one of the biggest burdens and responsibilities, helping our children with disabilities; one of the biggest tax cuts we can give our schools and the American people. That commitment is missing from this budget.

As America says, as Americans say, we need to do more in innovative new ways to reform with vision our education system. This budget does less. I would hope that we would come back and redo our commitment to education for our children and for new ideas.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), a distinguished colleague and a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support not only the rule, but ultimately to support this budget. I do this on behalf of the thousands of taxpayers that live in my district.

In Florida, where I live, yesterday we celebrated what we call Tax Freedom Day; that is the day that people can stop working just to pay their taxes and begin to start working to actually do some things they want to do. In other words, in Florida, and it is different in other States, but in Florida, in January and February and in March and in April and part of May, people, the average taxpayer, has been working just to make enough money to pay his or her taxes. So yesterday was Tax Freedom Day.

Today in Florida, people can begin to work to do the things they need to do, like buy new clothes for the kids, maybe buy a new washing machine, maybe pay college tuition for their son or daughter, pay that mortgage down a little bit and pay off some of those credit card bills. And so I think it is very fitting on this day, as we begin in Florida to be able to work for ourselves, that we pass this budget resolution which is going to let all Americans keep more of what they earn.

Everybody that pays taxes is going to see their tax burden lessened, and that is awfully important. But it does other things as well, because some people say we ought to pay down the national debt. This budget does that. In fact, it pays down virtually all the redeemable debt that we can pay down over the next 10 years, over \$2 trillion.

It funds education, which is important. It begins to rebuild our military, which has been hollowed out over these last 8 years. We are going to begin to make America strong again. And, most important, we are going to make sure that Social Security and Medicare are there. They are lockboxed. They are set aside. We are not going to touch those dollars. It is a great budget, Mr. Speaker, and I urge its adoption.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK).

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

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, do the math. This Congress says we will have a surplus of nearly \$5 trillion over the next 10 years. But we have a budget that is before us, and I am opposed to the flawed rule, as well as the flawed conference report that has been brought to us.

It does not even allow us the customary 3 days to look over the numbers. It is a nearly \$2 trillion budget. We have heard about the surpluses. This budget has nothing in it for school safety; no more dollars in it to reduce class size; no dollars for special education; no new dollars. If there is a surplus, why not? No new dollars for school construction. Why not?

This budget cuts community development block grants that would help

communities all over America. Why? This budget cuts funding for public housing and drug programs for public housing. There is a surplus; why no money?

This budget cuts nearly a million dollars, excuse me, that is a billion dollars, to our veterans who have served this country. There is a surplus. Why no money in these programs?

This budget is nearly \$2 trillion. Our country is enjoying the surplus that we built over the last 8 years. Do we not want some of our dollars into education and those categories I mentioned? Do we not want some of those dollars back into our communities to help our community development?

This budget is a charade. The process was a charade. With the popular vote in America, Democrats got more than the other side. They did not let our Democratic leader into the budget negotiations. Come on, America, let us hear it from you.

It is a flawed rule, it is a flawed budget, and I urge my colleagues to vote no.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to another gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM), a distinguished colleague and a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this, and I appreciate the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), our great chairman of the Committee on the Budget, and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking member, for their hard work on this budget.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the principle-based budget that we will take up this afternoon after we have passed this rule, the principle that you do not tax people at the same rate as a portion of the economy in peacetime as we did in 1944; the principle that taxpayers deserve to have hard-earned relief delivered back to them in the form of tax cuts; that marriage and death should not be taxable events; the principle that we will not burden our children and grandchildren; that we will not burden young workers and young families with trillions of dollars in debt; and that we will do everything we can to pay off all of the redeemable debt to the tune of \$2.4 trillion over the next 10 years; the principle that we will make our soldiers and sailors strong again to give them the training and support and respect that they deserve, and that this Congress will stand behind them and give them the deserved funding that they have earned; that veterans who have paid so much, who have given so much, who have sacrificed so much, will receive the benefits that they have earned, and deserve, to the tune of \$7 billion in increases over the next decade; that senior citizens who have worked hard all of their life and paid into Social Security and Medicare deserve to be safe and secure and independent and to be cared for and have the government keep its promise and

Congress keep its promise by locking those surpluses away, and making sure that those programs are relevant to today by providing the prescription drug benefit.

Mr. Speaker, we take care of our children to the tune of an 11½ percent increase. Now, much has been made about this. But back home in central Florida, an 11½ percent increase, a double-digit increase in tens of thousands of dollars is still real money.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, there is some good news and some bad news in this budget process. The good news is our Republican colleagues, indeed, did find the missing 2 pages, and that is good news. The bad news is that it allowed us the time and the American people to the time to find out the dollar figure that our Republican friends across the aisle cut out of the education budget that was put in by the Senate.

We have had the time and America has had the time to figure out what that number was, and that number is minus \$294 billion, \$294 billion for smaller classes that America wants, \$294 billion for more teachers that America wants, \$294 billion for better quality in our education that America wants.

The U.S. Senate put that money in for better schools. The Republican Party took it out. The President just recently asked an important question. He asked, "Is our children learning?" In this budget, they is not.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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, yesterday, the City of Cleveland issued a \$338 million bond for Cleveland school children; \$500 million matched by the State of Ohio. We talked about what about the children? We passed it 60 to 40, by the way.

Our theme was, what about the children? Remember when we were children; if it was not for those who loved us and those who cared enough to show us, where would we be today? With this budget, what about the children? Elementary and secondary education reauthorization, what about the children? School construction, what about the children? Smaller classes, more teachers, what about the children? Low-income programs, temporary assistance to needed families, what about the children? Social service block grant, what about the children? Section 8 vouchers, what about the children? Drug elimination programs, what about the children?

Remember when we were children; if it was not for those who loved us and

those who cared enough to show us, where would we be today?

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The Chair would remind persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House of Representatives, and signs either approving or disapproving of any speaker's remarks are against the Rules of the House.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I was congratulating the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) for getting more substance into 1 minute than I have heard in the Congress before.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, today the Congress has a very important decision to make. We are voting on our budget. Many of us believe that our Federal budget should be a statement of our national values. What is important to us should be what we commit our resources to.

Clearly, this Republican budget before us is not. It disproportionately gives a tax break to the top 1 percent in our country at the expense of our children. All scientific research shows us that children do better in smaller classes and, indeed, yes, in smaller schools.

□ 1115

The American people have made education their highest priority. Why, then, does this budget just play lip service? It talks the talk, but it does not walk the walk for education.

Children are smart. If one tells them that education is important, the key to their future, important to the competitiveness of our country internationally, and then not commit the resources to education and send them to school in dilapidated schools that are not clean, well-lighted places, wired to the future, they get a mixed message from us.

So let us reject this budget which rejects the notion of school modernization by not committing funds for smaller classes and more teachers. This budget only gives an increase of inflation for education. It does not even recognize student growth and the growth in our population of our students.

So let us ask the question: Is it a statement of our national values to give a tax break at the high end at the expense of our children? Is it a statement of our national values to ignore the infrastructure needs of our children and their needs for qualified teachers to give a tax break to the high end? I think not.

I urge our colleagues to reject this budget and to get real about it. This is a charade. We want a real budget that addresses the needs of the American people and serves our national values.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to yield 3 minutes to the gen-

tleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), a distinguished member of our conference.

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, through the Speaker to everybody that might be listening, how does one make the best decision on how much to spend and how high taxes should be? It would seem reasonable that the first thing policymakers might do is say, look, how much, how high, should taxes be for the American people?

Right now, the average American taxpayer pays about 41 cents out of every dollar they earn. Here at the Federal level, our budget, in terms of total income, is approaching 21 percent of GDP.

So if we are going to have a reasonable budgeting process then we say, look, at what point are taxes so high that it discourages economic expansion in our free market economy? It is the system that has made this country great, rewarding those people that try, that start new businesses, that get a second job?

But we have sort of evolved into a tax system of penalties and punishment for some of those people that really try and save and invest. That young couple that, maybe, goes out and gets a second job; we not only tax that person on the additional income, but we say, in effect, if you are going to earn more money, we are going to increase the rate of taxation.

I would suggest to my colleagues to consider that we should not have Federal Government spending that exceeds 18 percent of total income or GDP in this country. We are now approaching 21 percent.

I applaud the Committee on Rules. I congratulate the Committee on the Budget for moving ahead with the most reasonable budget we've had in years, even though this budget increases spending twice the rate of inflation. We have gone in past years as high as five times the rate of inflation as we expanded the Federal Government.

Just imagine for a moment a graphic projection of what inflation is every year and the fact that the Federal Government is increasing the size of the Federal Government two to five times the rate of inflation. Someplace out there, it is going to catch up with us.

So let us not talk and suggest that this program could use more money or that program could use more money. Let us decide what is reasonable and fair to those people that are working and decide how much money they should be allowed to keep in their pockets to decide how they want to spend it.

The big spenders in Congress can always say we need more money for this program or that program or we need more programs. But the fact is that government spending through the appropriation process is not free. It is not magic. Somebody is working hard, getting up and going to work, whether