

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

they feel like it or not, to earn that money, to send part of it to Washington.

I think as we review what has happened in taxes in this country and the fact that our taxes now are the highest they have ever been in the history of the United States except for 1 year during World War II, it should make us all very conscious of the importance of trying to be a little more efficient, trying to prioritize spending in government. Let us move ahead with supporting this rule and this budget and hope we have the intestinal fortitude to stick with this spending level through the appropriations process.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the veterans of this Nation ought to march on this Capitol in protest to this budget. I heard from a Member from the other side of the aisle that this budget over the next 10 years helps veterans. This does nothing of the sort. This budget barely keeps up with inflation.

This does not honor our Nation's veterans. Our veterans are waiting 2 years to have their claims adjudicated. They are waiting months and months for appointments with doctors. Our research is lagging in all the diseases that have come out of the Gulf and Vietnam. Yet, this budget does not even keep up with inflation.

Even the Republican Members of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs said this number is insufficient to keep up with the needs of the veterans. I challenge the Republican members of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to vote no on this budget. They said in the committee that this number was insufficient. I want them to stand up for what they said to the veterans in committee and vote no on this budget.

I might add that this budget took away a great victory in the Senate for our veterans, something called concurrent receipt where a veteran who had a pension and disability payments could get both. Now they have an offset, and this budget keeps that offset. It is a disgrace to the veterans of this Nation.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), a new Member that we welcome.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule, and I thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) and the Committee on Rules for their excellent work.

The passage of the budget today in the House is a victory for all Americans who, after 4 months of hard work, have finally earned enough to pay their taxes this year. It is written: If one owes debts, pay debts. If honor, then honor. If respect, then respect. This budget pays our debts, honors our vet-

erans, and respects the right of hard-working Americans to keep more of their own money.

Mr. Speaker, under the current system, taxpayers today send a higher percentage of their income to Washington than any time since World War II. I am pleased that, for the first time since 1981, this Congress will provide substantial tax rate reductions for all American families that pay taxes.

Washington is sending America a pro-growth message that helps families, small businesses, and family farms. It is refreshing, Mr. Speaker, that Congress is recognizing that the wealth of this Nation and the size of our surplus is not our creation but a product of the work of every American. This budget is an extraordinary step in the right direction. The best news of all is that this is only the beginning, Mr. Speaker.

In a little over 100 days with a Republican President in Congress, we have prepared a budget that provides \$1.35 trillion in tax cuts, repays historic levels of public debt, strengthens Social Security and Medicare, and bolsters our national defense. Most important of all, we have shown fiscal discipline by reining in the growth of our Federal Government and spending.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) for all he has done to build this budget. I urge my colleagues to support this rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) has 9½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) has 7½ minutes remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, this budget fails to account for the fact it will return us to deficit spending and it will spend money already committed to Social Security and Medicare. That is why the fiscally conservative Blue Dog Coalition voted yesterday to oppose this budget.

Democrats want the largest tax cut we can afford; but, frankly, this budget is unrealistic. It fails to provide for defense spending that we support and that the President will propose. It fails to protect Social Security and Medicare by putting us on a course to raid both programs. It turns our back on our commitment to lockbox Social Security and Medicare surpluses. It fails to fund education even at the lower level the President proposed much less the higher level the Senate agreed upon.

This budget fails to account for the slowing economy and the resulting loss of revenue. It denies America's families and our children the best tax cut we could give them and that is paying off our national debt which would not only lower interest payments in the Federal

budget, but would lower interest payments for every American family.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY).

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, there is a great country music song by Merle Haggard called Rainbow Stew. It says: "When the President goes through the White House door and does what he says he will do, we will all be drinking that free Bubble Up and eating that rainbow stew."

This budget is rainbow stew. Now, to make rainbow stew, the recipe calls first for a rainbow. That is what we have got with this budget is a rainbow.

In the last campaign, the President and the Republicans promised prescription drugs for our seniors. Medicare and Social Security will be protected. We are going to pay off the debt. We are going to take care of education, national defense, agriculture. The list goes on and on.

This is a buckeye. Folklore in Arkansas tells us about if one carries this buckeye. It is a relatively worthless little nut that grows on a bush. I do not know that humans ate it and not too sure that any animals eat it. But I can tell my colleagues that one is supposed to carry that in one's pocket and rub it, and it will bring one good luck and take care of rheumatism. That is what the prescription drug plan by the Republicans are going to amount to.

I urge my colleagues to realize what a ridiculous document this budget is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair advises the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) that the buckeye grows on a tree, not a bush.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL).

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I, like many of my colleagues, would like to support this budget, because who would not want a tax cut along the lines that had been proposed. It is politically popular to support the tax cut, and I would like to do it. I believe that we can offer some kind of tax cut, but this is not realistic. This is something that cannot be done.

I know the American people must be quite confused as to who is right and who is wrong. But let me pull out this chart. Maybe this will clear it up. This is from the President's budget proposal that outlines what the budget surpluses are going to be over the next 10 years.

As my colleagues can see, this tax cut is predicated upon the fact that these surpluses are going to materialize. I do not know of any American family that would go out and buy a new car or a new house based upon income that he was told that he was going to receive for the next 10 years. No common sense person would do this. But, yet, that is what we are about to do in the Congress of the United States, Mr. Speaker.

I think if my colleagues know this fact, they have to conclude that this is a bad idea and that we ought to vote against it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SANDLIN).

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose this budget conference report. As we near the end of the school year, we expect our children to put forth their best effort in school and pass the final exams. The American people have the same expectation of this Congress. As we put forth our finishing touches on the budget agreement, they expect us to pass. Unfortunately, this report earns a failing grade.

I hoped the conference would reach an agreement that I could support. Unfortunately, there was no conference. There was no bipartisanship. The alleged bipartisanship was nothing more than a sham. Not everyone was included. Had there been a true bipartisan effort, we would have met our obligation to our most vulnerable citizens and earned a passing grade from the American public.

We have an obligation to our children. In this country, that obligation requires us to provide them with the best public education that is possible. But this conference report fails to meet that obligation. It does not increase education spending. It does not increase investment in education to our children. In fact, it provides \$21 billion less than President Bush requested for education spending.

We have an obligation to our parents for prescription drugs. This conference report does not provide funds for a prescription drug benefits. In fact, it raids the Medicare fund to pay for money already set aside. That is robbing Peter to pay Paul.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this report.

□ 1130

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, every aspect of this budget and the way that it has been crafted and presented to this House indicate that the same folks who ran this House during the Gingrich years, their same spirit has dominated every aspect; they are still calling all the shots. Bipartisanship has been all pretense and no reality.

Cutting our commitment to educational opportunities for our children, even to a level lower than the limited commitment that President Bush recommended, represents that mean-spirited approach and a true shortchanging of our Nation's future. The full implementation of this budget will mean that we will consume entirely the Medicare Trust Fund and we will deplete significantly the Social Security Trust Fund, returning to a path of

using Social Security contributions to pay for non-Social Security purposes, and that is wrong.

If my colleagues do not understand anything else about this budget, remember that those two pages that were supposedly lost in the middle of the night last week did two things: for education, monies that had been added with the support of even a Republican Member, Mr. JEFFORDS, they were cut. Educational opportunities were cut in order, in those same two pages, to have massive tax cuts for those at the top of the economic ladder.

A budget is supposed to be a statement of our national priorities. And this irresponsible budget invades the security of our seniors and those who will be retiring in the future; this budget rejects opportunities for our children. All of this results from an unrealistic tax cut to shower benefits on those at the top of the economic ladder. Vote no!

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) is recognized for 4 minutes.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have been in this House for more than 18 years, and in those 18 years I have served on a lot of conference committees; but I have never been so completely excluded, so totally shut out as in this particular conference. I hope at the end of it all, my colleagues on the other side will allow us at least one thing, and not call this bipartisan. It is by no stretch of the imagination bipartisan. It is the very opposite. And it does not augur well for bipartisanship in the House for the future.

But bad as the process has been, the substance is even worse. Because what is missing from this budget are not two pages, what is missing are real numbers. And let me give the most salient example: the largest account in the discretionary budget, national defense. We pass 13 appropriation bills. The defense bill is as big as all 12 others put together. In this budget there is a number for defense of \$325 billion. That is a place-holder number. That is not a real number.

Now, how do we know that? Number one, we know Mr. Rumsfeld is busy at work doing a top-to-bottom review of defense. And once he has finished that review, he is going to send us a huge plus-up in the defense budget. Number two, read the text of this resolution and my colleagues will find that we give unprecedented unilateral authority to the chairman of this committee to increase the allocation for defense by as much as nearly \$400 billion over the next 10 years. None of us has a say in it. He can add that to the budget.

Let us just make that adjustment, as this chart does, to the reality of this budget, the defense budget we all know that is coming. Let us assume it is \$20 billion to \$25 billion initially and builds up over time. Let us also add back to the budget what the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) was wise enough and right enough to put in it to start with, some allocation for emergencies we know based on experience are going to happen.

When we add those two lines, as we can see from this chart, every year for the next 5 or 6 years the amount of money we need for additional defense spending and the amount of money we need for emergencies exceeds the contingency fund that is left over after we do the puts and takes that are included in this conference agreement.

Now, what does that mean? Let us take education. This budget zeros out education. The Senate had three votes. They added \$300 billion to defense and passed a resolution with that plus-up in it. This budget was then taken behind closed doors in a conference and all of the money for education was excluded; not only the Senate's added to education but also the President's request of \$21.4 billion for education. All we provide for education is inflation.

Now, some may say on the other side that education's day will come. We have a 302(b) allocation process; we will have another occasion when we can plus up for education. Not after we adjust for defense and emergencies. There is nothing left over.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is why I say this is the substance, this is the reality, and this is why we should vote against this rule on grounds of process and substance. Vote against this budget.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) she still has 1 minute left, should she choose to use it.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I advise my colleague from New York that it would be my intention to yield at this time a few minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget and then go to the rotation for her to close and for me to close.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time; and I also thank the gentleman for his leadership, for having to come out here on the floor a number of times over the last few days in order to manage us through this final budget vote. I appreciate his patience and the patience of the Committee on Rules and also his leadership. I also appreciate the chance to speak on this.

I would like to respond briefly to my friend and someone I consider a partner on the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT). Bipartisanship is his concern

and it is my concern. However, we may differ slightly on what bipartisanship means. If bipartisanship means we have to agree on everything all of the time, that is a goal we probably cannot achieve.

This is a country of 260 million-plus people. We are from rural areas, urban areas. We represent districts that have people that farm, that work in factories, that have kids, that are seniors; some who are highly educated, some that maybe do not have as much education. We have many minorities: black, white, Hispanic. What a diverse Nation. How could we possibly all of the time agree on every single thing?

That is not what the founders wanted us to do. They wanted us to come into this Chamber and have a debate. They wanted us to come into this Chamber and send their representatives here to debate the grand issues of the day, and we have a number of them; and we are not going to agree on every single one. But what we try and do is we offer both sides, if in fact there are sides, the opportunity to present their plans.

We did that. And what "we" means now, of course, is that the Republicans control the House. We, at least under somebody's definition, control the Senate, the other body, excuse me, and we control the White House. And so we have an opportunity to present our vision for the country. The loyal opposition has the opportunity to present their plan; and we did so this year, respectfully, in a bipartisan way. But we did not come to agreement.

And so at some point in time we have to have a debate, and we have to have a vote on which vision to accept. Now, because we do not agree does not mean that we are being partisan. In fact, the other side has a number of good ideas within their plan, ideas that they have worked on for many years. But I must say that they are not shared even by the majority of the Democrat caucus.

Let me just give an example of what we do not agree on with the last plan that was presented by President Clinton. In his last year, just as an example, during these next 10 years, compared to our big major tax decrease that everybody is out here lambasting today, and that is fine, that is where the other side is coming from, my colleagues do not believe we ought to cut taxes, but let us compare that to the other plan. President Clinton's last budget had \$237 billion of tax increases. Now, I am sorry we do not agree.

I am not going to be partisan about that. The opposition party can fairly present their side of it. Now they have moved to the other side of the coin. They are saying now we ought to have tax decreases, not as much as the Republicans want; but at least they have moved in that direction, from tax increases to tax decreases.

But just because we still do not agree does not mean that it has to be partisan. We can have a fair debate. It does not have to be personal. I would say by and large it has not been per-

sonal; that we have not heard some of the rancorous debate where people have come out here accusing people of throwing children in the street that we heard maybe 3, 4 years ago. I would hope that continues. But it does not mean that we are not being bipartisan because we do not agree. It is fair in this country to present plans and to allow for the debate.

So let me just briefly go through what it is that we are presenting here today as a result of this rule. I believe that we have a plan that meets the priorities of this country. Let me just run through a few of them.

This is the fifth balanced budget in a row. This is something we believe very strongly in, that our budgets should be balanced, that they should be responsible. And there is still money left over after we balance that budget. We have \$2.4 trillion of debt reduction over the next 10 years, the largest decrease of our national indebtedness that we have had in our country's history over this same period. And we still have resources left over. We are saving the entire Social Security Trust Fund. Only since 1999 has that been a bipartisan agreement here in this House. There is still money left over. The entire Medicare surplus is set aside for modernization and a prescription drug benefit, and there is still tax surpluses left over. We are budgeting for our priorities at 4 percent, and there is still money left over to provide \$1.35 trillion worth of tax relief for the American people. There is still money left over.

There are still resources left over after we have balanced the budget, provided the most debt relief in history, set aside Social Security, set aside Medicare for modernization, provided for America's priorities at a 4 percent growth in spending, and provided for tax relief. And, believe it or not, there is still resources left over to provide for contingencies in the future.

Now, my colleagues may not agree with that budget. I invite them to vote against it if they do not. But just because they are voting against it, I will not call them partisan. I will suggest that they have a different view of America and our future. That is not partisan; that is what it means for them to be in the opposition.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for closing.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, let me quickly respond to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), that if he wants an example of model bipartisanship, 1997 is a good year to refer to. That year the White House was controlled by Democrats, the Congress was controlled by Republicans, and we sat down and had a process that lasted several months and then came up with something called the Balanced Budget Agreement of 1997. I think what we learned from that experience is that regardless of the outcome, just putting it through the process, where everybody participates, develops a better product.

The gentleman does not have to go back to Mr. Clinton's proposals. We did not bring his budget to the floor. He is no longer President. We had a budget in the well of the House just a few weeks ago which called for an allocation of a third of the surplus to tax cuts. We were supporting that. We came forth with the idea in our resolution for a tax stimulus this year and next year using the surplus we know we have in hand. That has come out in this final product.

The other side could have had the same sort of result if we had had a real give and take. We could have had a real free market of ideas. We would not have let our colleagues get away with coming to the floor with nothing for education in their budget. We would have insisted the defense number be realistically represented in this budget. I think we would have had a better budget and we might have had an opportunity, one of those rare opportunities, for a bipartisan budget for the next 10 years.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to make some closing remarks.

I think this has been actually a very good warm-up for the next debate that is coming on this. Sure, we have heard some of the scare stories and we have heard some of the rhetorical questions we have expected. And I think that we are going to continue to hear those because rhetorical questions perpetuate shibboleths and shibboleths are what you do when you do not have anything else to do.

I am sorry that there is not a feeling that this has not been a carefully thought-out effort. I believe it has, and I think it has gone through conference and had a great deal of discussion not only in the Congress of the United States but in the executive branch and across America. And I certainly have found that in my district when I have gone home.

I know we have done scare tactics before, and I guess some people think scare tactics are an excuse not to vote for tax relief; and that is okay if you really do not believe in tax relief. I remember very well that scare tactics do not last very long. I remember experiencing them some years ago; that somehow our party was going to stop school lunches and then we were going to stop Meals-on-Wheels for elderly. And all that did was cause anxiety for a lot of Americans, and it was never true. Now I guess we are going to have school lunches that are going to have arsenic and salmonella in them, listening to some of the latest opposition party ads about what we are doing.

I do not think the falling-sky scenario does very well for America or is positive in getting the program or the business of government done. I think even The Washington Post editorialized a few years ago that Medicare was a tactic that was not worthy of the honorable Democratic Party when we were trying very hard to find ways to

resolve the trust fund issues, which in fact we did on a bipartisan basis, just like we found a way to protect Social Security. And I would say that that was under a Republican-led Congress, but it was certainly at a time when there was a Democrat in the White House.

So I think when we do work together, we come out with a pretty good product. And I think in this case we have a pretty good product. I do not think we ignore our veterans, and I do not think we ignore any Americans. This is an honest effort, and I urge everybody's support for the rule so we can continue this debate.

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.

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 218, nays 208, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 103]
YEAS—218

Aderholt	Diaz-Balart	Hunter
Akin	Doolittle	Hutchinson
Armey	Dreier	Hyde
Bachus	Duncan	Isakson
Baker	Dunn	Issa
Ballenger	Ehlers	Istook
Barr	Ehrlich	Jenkins
Bartlett	Emerson	Johnson (CT)
Barton	English	Johnson (IL)
Bass	Everett	Johnson, Sam
Bereuter	Ferguson	Jones (NC)
Biggert	Flake	Keller
Bilirakis	Fletcher	Kelly
Blunt	Foley	Kennedy (MN)
Boehlert	Fossella	Kerns
Boehner	Frelinghuysen	King (NY)
Bonilla	Gallegly	Kingston
Bono	Ganske	Kirk
Brady (TX)	Gekas	Knollenberg
Brown (SC)	Gibbons	Kolbe
Bryant	Gilchrest	LaHood
Burr	Gillmor	Largent
Burton	Gilman	Latham
Buyer	Goode	LaTourette
Callahan	Goodlatte	Leach
Calvert	Goss	Lewis (CA)
Camp	Graham	Lewis (KY)
Cannon	Granger	Linder
Cantor	Graves	LoBiondo
Capito	Green (WI)	Lucas (OK)
Castle	Greenwood	Manzullo
Chabot	Grucci	McCreery
Chambliss	Gutknecht	McHugh
Coble	Hansen	McInnis
Collins	Hart	McKeon
Combest	Hastings (WA)	Mica
Cooksey	Hayes	Miller (FL)
Cox	Hayworth	Miller, Gary
Crane	Hefley	Moran (KS)
Crenshaw	Heryger	Morella
Culberson	Hilleary	Myrick
Cunningham	Hobson	Nethercutt
Davis, Jo Ann	Hoekstra	Ney
Davis, Tom	Horn	Northup
Deal	Hostettler	Northwood
DeLay	Houghton	Nussle
DeMint	Hulshof	Osborne

Ose	Royce
Otter	Ryan (WI)
Oxley	Ryun (KS)
Paul	Saxton
Pence	Scarborough
Peterson (PA)	Schaffer
Petri	Schrock
Pickering	Sensenbrenner
Pitts	Sessions
Platts	Shadegg
Pombo	Shaw
Portman	Shays
Pryce (OH)	Sherwood
Putnam	Shimkus
Quinn	Simmons
Radanovich	Simpson
Ramstad	Skeen
Regula	Smith (MI)
Rehberg	Smith (NJ)
Reynolds	Smith (TX)
Riley	Souder
Rogers (KY)	Spence
Rogers (MI)	Stearns
Rohrabacher	Sununu
Ros-Lehtinen	Sweeney
Roukema	Tancredo

NAYS—208

Abercrombie	Gutierrez
Ackerman	Hall (OH)
Allen	Hall (TX)
Andrews	Harman
Baca	Hastings (FL)
Baird	Hill
Baldacci	Hilliard
Baldwin	Hinchev
Barcia	Hinojosa
Barrett	Hoefel
Becerra	Holden
Bentsen	Holt
Berkley	Honda
Berman	Hooley
Berry	Hoyer
Bishop	Inslee
Blagojevich	Israel
Blumenauer	Jackson (IL)
Bonior	Jackson-Lee
Borski	(TX)
Boswell	Jefferson
Boucher	John
Boyd	Johnson, E. B.
Brady (PA)	Jones (OH)
Brown (FL)	Kanjorski
Brown (OH)	Kaptur
Capps	Kennedy (RI)
Capuano	Kildee
Cardin	Kilpatrick
Carson (IN)	Kind (WI)
Carson (OK)	Kleccka
Clay	Kucinich
Clayton	LaFalce
Clement	Lampson
Clyburn	Langevin
Condit	Lantos
Conyers	Larsen (WA)
Costello	Larson (CT)
Coyne	Lee
Cramer	Levin
Crowley	Lewis (GA)
Cummings	Lipinski
Davis (CA)	Lofgren
Davis (FL)	Lowe
Davis (IL)	Lucas (KY)
DeFazio	Luther
DeGette	Maloney (CT)
Delahunt	Maloney (NY)
DeLauro	Markey
Deutsch	Mascara
Dicks	Matheson
Dingell	Matsui
Doggett	McCarthy (MO)
Dooley	McCarthy (NY)
Doyle	McCollum
Edwards	McDermott
Engel	McGovern
Eshoo	McIntyre
Etheridge	McKinney
Evans	McNulty
Farr	Meehan
Fattah	Meek (FL)
Filner	Meeks (NY)
Ford	Menendez
Frank	Millender-
Frost	McDonald
Gephardt	Miller, George
Gonzalez	Mink
Gordon	Moakley
Green (TX)	Mollohan

Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Traficant
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—5

Cubin	Rivers	Weldon (PA)
Pomeroy	Stump	

□ 1211

Messrs. INSLEE, MEEHAN, and DEUTSCH 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 for:

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 103, I was outside the Electronic Paging Zone. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 136, I call up the conference report on 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 Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Pursuant to House Resolution 136, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of May 8, 2001, at page H1957.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) each will control 30 minutes.

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU), the distinguished vice chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by commending the members of the Committee on the Budget, the conferees, for putting together what I think is a very strong budget proposal, the most realistic and certainly the most enforceable budget resolution that we have had come through this body since I have been a Member of Congress. It does not include everything that every Member of the House would like to see in a budget resolution, but I think it reflects real balance and a real sense of priorities.

We will balance the budget with this resolution for the fourth year in a row. That is a historic achievement in and of itself. And we are doing it without using any of the Social Security surplus. Members on the minority side can find fault with just about any document that comes to the floor, but let us step back and at least recognize that we are doing the right thing for the American people by balancing the budget, by setting aside funds for Social Security, and by paying down debt.

□ 1215

Balancing the budget for 4 consecutive years, that is something this House should be very proud of.

We control the growth in government spending. We increase discretionary spending by about 4 percent. There are many that would like to see government explode, 8, 10, 12 percent growth in spending. That is not sustainable. It would be nice to be able to fund every program, to double the funding for every program we have at the Federal level, and go home and tell the American people we are spending money on good deeds; but the fact is that is not sustainable.

It is not fiscally responsible and this body has refused to do it. Four percent growth, that is about what the average household budget will grow this year.

We have cut taxes. It is a compromise. The President proposed a \$1.6 trillion tax cut. We have compromised at a little bit more than \$1.3 trillion. It is realistic to expect that after we have increased the size of government, after we have set aside for Social Security and balanced the budget, after we have funded important priorities, we give what is left over back to the American taxpayer that sent it here in the first place.

We have balanced the budget, controlled the growth in government spending, cut taxes to make the Tax Code more fair, and we have funded the right priorities: an 11 percent increase for education; more funding for men and women in uniform; increased funding for basic scientific research.

This reflects a compromise, sure, but it also reflects a budget that we should all be proud of that sets the right priorities for the country and continues the process of retiring debt and keeping our economy strong.

If one wants to explode the size of government, this is not for them. If one is opposed to tax relief, this resolution is not for them. But if one wants to set the right priorities, lower taxes and keep our country going in the right direction, I ask my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report to the fiscal year 2002 budget resolution.

When I became chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, I pledged that Congress would stand shoulder-to-shoulder with America's farmers and ranchers, to see them through tough times and to strengthen U.S. farm policy. This conference report is the cornerstone of that commitment.

I thank President Bush and the House and Senate leadership for their commitment to U.S. farmers and ranchers. Mr. Speaker, I especially thank the chairman of the Committee on the Budget. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) knows what our farmers and ranchers are up against so he rolled up his sleeves and he did

something about it. The fruit of that labor is what we consider today, and its timing is crucial.

Conditions in farm country are serious. Net cash income over the last 3 years has fallen in real terms to its lowest point since the Great Depression. The magnitude of this problem reaches beyond farms, ranches, and rural America. It is a national problem.

The ad hoc help Congress has provided each year since 1998 has helped, but it is only a year at a time. A long-term farm policy is what this country needs. The conference report gives the Committee on Agriculture the tools to make it happen and, as chairman of that committee, we will get it done.

I urge my colleagues to support this report.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the minority leader.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to vote and speak against this conference report and ask Members on both sides of the aisles to do the same thing. This is not a good budget for America.

We did not get to vote the other night because we did not have two pages, but now that we have seen all of the pages, the problem was not the lack of the right pages. The problem with this budget is that it does not have the right numbers. It does not fulfill the priorities of the American people. It is a budget that is deficient in terms of fiscal responsibility and in terms of the right priorities that I think people have.

In many ways, this budget is a definition of what we want the country to be in the next 10 years. So it is a momentous decision that we are making.

I believe this is a day that we give up on fiscal responsibility. I thoroughly believe that if this budget is followed, that in the days ahead we will return to deficits.

First of all, there is no cushion. The cushion that looks like is here is not here, and when the tax cuts go up, as they inevitably will, when other tax cuts that are not contemplated in this budget are actually passed, the deficits will start. We will invade Social Security and Medicare, which we said we did not want to do.

We have had innumerable votes here on lockboxes, but I predict that if this budget is passed we will be into Social Security and Medicare.

This is the day that we return to high deficits and high interest rates. Why in the world would we want to do that? For 20 years in this country all we ever talked about was deficits and what deficits meant to our ability to fund anything that people wanted to fund; what it did to high interest rates; what it did to high inflation. Now, with this budget, I believe we are back into

deficits and back into invading Social Security and Medicare.

This is the day that we give huge tax cuts to the wealthiest special interests in the country, and we cannot seem to figure out how to get a decent tax cut to the middle-income Americans who really need it. Again, half of the tax cuts contemplated here go to the top wage earners in our country, and there is not enough for the hardworking families that really need tax relief.

This is a budget that turns its back on education. This is probably the most remarkable trade-off in this budget. The President sent a budget that asked for \$21 billion over 10 years above inflation for education programs. The budget that the Democrats here on the House had asked for was \$150 billion over 10 years above inflation for education. In the Senate, in a bipartisan way, they added \$300 billion above inflation for education, for after-school and pre-school; give us more teachers, repair the school buildings, all the things that Americans are asking for across the country to improve public education. Yet, this budget takes out every cent of the increases that the President asked for or we asked for or the Senate asked for. We are at a flatline budget for education if this budget is voted for.

How in the world do we explain to anyone what we have done on education? We are right back to where we started, after a long trip of public relations saying to people we want to help education, and now we are not doing that.

Then I think if this budget is passed, there will not be a Medicare prescription drug program. In fact, I do not think there will be a prescription drug program of any reasonable kind that will affect the people in this country. When I go home now on weekends, people come up to me and say, "Hey, where is the prescription drug program?" Everybody had ads in the campaign, Republicans and Democrats alike. We all said we wanted a prescription drug program. I defy anyone to find that program in this budget.

Why do I say that? I say that because I think the budget tries to get to \$300 billion over 10 years for a prescription drug program. The problem with that is it spends the Medicare surplus. It is really taking the money out of the Medicare surplus to give it to prescription drugs. I do not think we are going to do that. I do not think we are going to have a prescription drug program if this budget is our budget.

I did not even get to low-income energy assistance, COPS on the beat, conservation and renewable programs for energy. If one goes out in America today, all anybody can talk about is \$3 gasoline and not having enough electricity. If one goes out on the West Coast, they are having brownouts and blackouts.

People are focused on energy and there is nothing in this budget to deal with the energy issue, which is on the lips of every American today.

Let me sum up by saying just one thing. This budget is a farce and it is a fraud. At the end, America deserves better than that. We can do better than that. I would pray we could send this budget back to the committee. Let us have a real bipartisan process where ideas from both sides are incorporated into a final product. Let us give America a budget that is worthy of this great country.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond.

Mr. Speaker, the legacy of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) when he was the majority leader is as follows: tax increases, underfunding special education, absolutely no energy policy for this country, raids on the Social Security Trust Fund, and no prescription drug policy. So to come to the floor here today and to call this a fraud, when for years as the majority leader he did nothing to promote the policies he now comes to the floor and lambastes, is an atrocity.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, after listening to the last two exchanges, I am reminded of what John Adams told us over two hundred years ago: Facts are stubborn things. I think the more the American families learn about the facts of this budget, I think the more they are going to like it.

Let us look at what it really does. This is a budget that works for every family. The maximum debt elimination; we are going to pay off the redeemable publicly held debt over the next 10 years; tax relief for everybody who pays taxes; improved education for our children, an 11.5 percent increase. Some of us think maybe that is a little too much. A stronger national defense; health care reform that modernizes Medicare. Is it not about time?

We set aside \$300 billion to start a prescription drug plan for those people who fall through the cracks.

Finally, we are going to save Social Security not only for today but for the future.

Our friends on the left are going to say, well, this is irresponsible. Well, Mr. Speaker, this was said already today, that according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics the average family budget will go up at a rate of about 4.2 percent.

This budget increases the Federal budget by less than that number. I think that is great news for American families.

Some people say we cannot afford this tax relief. Well, Mr. Speaker, if we look at the economy today, we look at energy prices today, I say we cannot afford not to give tax cuts to the American people.

Let me just share a couple of numbers. Last year, when the economy was growing at 5.5 percent during the first

quarter, we generated a surplus of \$40 billion. This year, with the economy slowing to about a 1 percent growth rate, we generated a surplus of \$74 billion. Mr. Speaker, we cannot not afford to give tax cuts this year.

I would also suggest that the numbers we are using are incredibly conservative. In fact, I asked Mr. Daniels of the Budget Office, and these are the words: "So if revenue growth just equals the 40-year average, we will actually have revenues in excess of \$2 trillion more than we are currently using in your budget projections, is that correct?"

His answer was, "Yes, sir, that is correct."

We can afford this budget. It makes common sense. It is good for American families. It is good for our future.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that we have never said we should not have tax cuts. We said when we brought our budget resolution to the floor, unlike theirs, that we should have some this year, take the whole surplus this year and rebate it to the American public, and we set aside \$800 billion to \$900 billion for additional tax relief.

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

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the budget today, but with a sense of disappointment. I am disappointed because I do recognize the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) made an outreach, but his leadership chose not to abide by it.

In the spirit of compromise, we in the Blue Dogs were prepared to support a tax cut higher than the budget we proposed, providing there was a strong enforceable commitment to debt reduction. This budget we vote on today does nothing for debt reduction, and I defy anyone to show how it does.

This resolution we vote on today literally bets the ranch that the surpluses will continue to grow. If they do not grow, or if they are off just a little bit, we will be forced to dip into the Medicare Trust Fund before we even start dealing with increases for defense or other needs the resolution does not address.

□ 1230

This resolution sets an unrealistic spending level. Based on the history of the majority over the last 6 years, I predict we will have another train wreck. But that is up to the majority.

I rise in the strongest opposition to this budget resolution today because it does not accommodate Social Security reform. I sent a letter to our President commending him for the Social Security Commission. I have worked for the last 5 years with the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) on the other side and others in a bipartisan way in set-

ting the groundwork for Social Security reform. This resolution provides zero funding for Social Security reform.

If I need one reason to strongly oppose this and why I am so proud of the Blue Dog Democrats for voting to oppose it, as it takes a two-thirds vote for us to oppose anything, to take any position, we took that position, and I am so proud of our Blue Dogs because we are still standing for the same principles of debt reduction, saving Social Security and Medicare first, providing for the needed spending in the area of defense, health care, education, our veterans. I agree on the agriculture numbers, they are much better.

This is a borrow-and-spend resolution. It borrows from our children and grandchildren in order to pay the political needs of today. I suggest you select carefully your words, my friends on the majority, because tomorrow you will either enjoy them, or you will eat them.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished Chair. I would like to commend the chairman and commend him for his determined advocacy on behalf of our Nation's veterans.

As the chairman knows, the House-passed budget resolution included a significant increase compared to 2001 levels in total spending for veterans' benefits and services. The total increase for this function was \$5.6 billion over the fiscal year 2001 budget authority level, providing a total of \$52.3 billion for fiscal 2002. It is my understanding that the conferees accepted the House-passed mandatory spending level for function 700, a total of \$28 billion, which assumes a phased-in increase in the Montgomery GI Bill and other benefit improvements contained in H.R. 801.

Is that the chairman of the Committee on the Budget's understanding as well?

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, before I respond, let me thank the gentleman for his leadership. There is no one in this House that stands ahead of the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs when it comes to advocating for our Nation's veterans.

In response to the chairman's questions, yes, the conference report reflects the House levels for mandatory spending, and it also includes the House proposals for increases above current law levels.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, let me

just ask, it is my further understanding that the conferees agree to an overall level of discretionary spending that would allow veterans' discretionary spending to go as high as \$26.2 billion in budget authority for fiscal years 2002, a level consistent with the Senate approved level. This level would accommodate major increases in spending for VA health care and for claims processing and could be as much as \$3.6 billion above 2001. In any event, the increase would be no lower than the House-passed \$1.7 billion.

Is that the chairman of the Committee on the Budget's understanding?

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, again, the answer is correct. The increase was not explicitly reflected in the budget function for veterans because the discretionary increases in the conference report were distributed across all budget functions. As the distinguished chairman knows, it is the Committee on Appropriations that makes the final determination of exactly how those resources are distributed, and the gentleman and I will be visiting the Committee on Appropriations to make sure that they hold to the highest possible level for our veterans.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I want to thank the chairman for those clarifications. I congratulate the chairman on an outstanding budget.

Mr. SPRATT. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. TANNER.

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

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I want to rise in a sense of disappointment also. I want to thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE). It is too bad his leadership has chosen the route it has chosen today, because there were some of us that wanted to reach out, do a bipartisan budget for this country that, albeit the tax number was a little higher than we thought and there was not enough debt retirement as the Blue Dogs thought, but the real kicker in all of this is the House leadership has not only taken us out of play, they have taken their own Members out of play. It does not matter what the House does.

Do you know if you read the budget document, the House will not even agree to reconcile to the same number that their White House agreed to with the Senate. I have never seen a conference report like that before. But if you read it, it is there. The intransigence of this House leadership is destroying the House of Representatives when it comes to public decisions made for and on behalf of this country.

Let me say one other thing. When I came here 12 years ago, all I heard was, JOHN, do something, please, about the horrendous debt of this nation that we are passing on to our children, a 13.5 percent mortgage on this country.

Every dime of debt reduction that they talk about comes from the Social

Security surplus money. You know what that is like? That is like you or I paying off our Visa charge with a MasterCard. It alone does nothing to reduce the obligation that the next generation has to pay and has to come up with, and that is plain and simply morally, generationally bankrupt.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), a distinguished member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank the service of my chairman, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), and also my ranking minority member, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the soul of discretion in this debate. But I do want to correct the record.

There were two pages missing in this budget. They are now here. But what else is missing from this budget? Last year President Clinton proposed a \$237 million increase in taxes between 2000 and 2010. That is missing from this budget. This year, leaders on the other side proposed a one-third plan, calling for \$740 billion in new spending, with little details. That is missing from this budget. Last year President Clinton proposed the creation of 84 new Federal programs and the expansion of 162 others, and that, Mr. Chairman, is missing from this budget. Their one-third plan would pay millions of dollars in prepayment penalties from working taxpayers to the most wealthy bondholders. That is missing from this budget.

So what is in this budget? What is in this budget is that we are on track for doubling resources to the National Institutes of Health; what is in this budget is the President's immediate Helping Hand prescription drug plan with the flexibility to expand that plan; what is in this budget is an 11 percent increase for education; and what is in this budget are the 1999 reforms that we did for the budget that protect Social Security.

So, for me, I rise in strong support of this budget. There are 1,000 reasons why you could argue against a budget from all sides, but this is an historic agreement where we complete the Congress' action, and we do it on time.

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

Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman, I would say what is missing from this budget is any sense of priority that education is the number one challenge facing our country. There is not an 11.4 percent increase. That is what Mr. Bush claimed when he was offering \$21.4 billion. That increase is not included in this budget. The Senate added \$300 billion. It is not there.

The only thing in this budget for education is inflation, the same thing everything else gets. So the dominant priority here is not for education, that is for sure.

Mr. Speaker, to back up what I have just said, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr.

PRICE), to talk about education, the missing piece in this budget.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, our budget reflects our values, and Democrats want to provide tax relief. We also want to take care of other priorities, like paying down the debt and strengthening Social Security and adding prescription drugs to Medicare and making the investments we need in education and research and the environment, safe communities, affordable housing, military readiness. Quite simply, this Republican budget falls short on all of those counts, but nowhere more than in education.

We need to be reducing class size in this country and building and modernizing schools and recruiting and training teachers and boosting Title I aid for disadvantaged districts, closing the achievement gaps between majority and minority students and increasing Pell Grants and meeting our obligation to special education students and expanding Head Start.

This budget falls short even of what the President asked for, and that was already inadequate. For example, with this budget, President Bush and the Republicans break their promise to increase the maximum Pell Grant to \$5,100. Candidate Bush promised to do that for freshmen. Unfortunately, President Bush and the Republicans have fallen at least \$1.5 billion short of the amount needed to fulfill that promise.

The President's budget provides only enough funding to raise the maximum award of \$3,750 by a mere \$150, far less than Pell Grant increases in recent years, and the budget before us today does even less than what the President proposed.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is terribly important that we debate the facts here, and the fact which has been stated over and over again, which has not been rebutted, is that the House is adopting today a budget that is \$21 billion less than what the President proposed for education. What does that say about our priorities?

In my home State of Florida and in many growth States throughout the country that leaves us high and dry in dealing with the growing problem of school construction. We need that to reduce class size so we can return control of the classroom back to our teachers.

We are left with having to raise property taxes or raise sales taxes that are much too high in Florida and many other States. There is a solution at hand if we will get our priorities straight. It is the Johnson-Rangel bill that provides tax credits to school districts to fix crumbling schools, to build new schools the right size the first time, where we can provide Federal funding to fix that problem.

We are missing a golden opportunity. If we simply will return to where the President was, at least \$21 billion higher, we can pay down the debt, we can have a tax cut, but we can get our priorities straight and begin in Florida and other States to fix crumbling classrooms and reduce class size.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank my colleague for underscoring the need to get our kids out of these trailers and into modern effective classrooms where they can learn and where teachers can teach.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and pointing out that each day this debate goes on, education is losing ground. We started off with a number that was not as good as the President had proposed. Now it comes back from conference committee with even less than that. So whether it is Pell Grants or school modernization, we are just not keeping up.

An area that concerns me greatly is teacher recruitment. We need 2.2 million new teachers in the next 10 years just to stay even. Whatever incentives we use to recruit those teachers, whether it is debt forgiveness or other financial aid, it is not here. And we will pay. Schools all across the country will pay.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, in my State alone we are going to need 80,000 new teachers in the next 10 years. We do not know where those are coming from. The gentleman is correct, this budget has no investment in recruiting and training and improving the preparation of teachers.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, and for the continuing professional development of existing teachers.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon, a great champion of special education.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things you do in a budget is you set priorities. That is what a budget is all about. One of the things you do when you set priorities is you put money where you say your priorities are. I mean, we do that in our home budgets; we need to do it in this budget.

Again, this budget has been cut. It is even less than what the President asked for. The President's budget was inadequate.

We have an opportunity at this time to fund special education. We promised about 26 years ago to our schools and to our children that we would provide up to 40 percent of the funding for special education. We have not done very well. We have only provided 14.9 percent.

This is an opportunity to provide the funding we need for special education, and, in doing that, we help every single child, every single school district. But we need to make sure that our priorities are funded, and this budget does not do that.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, is it not true that our colleagues in the other body actually put additional funding in the budget for special education, and now as this budget comes back to us, those funds have been stripped out. Those funds are gone. This is an obligation which our local districts feel very acutely.

Mr. Speaker, without new resources, these crumbling classrooms cannot be repaired, new schools cannot be built, teachers cannot be hired and Pell Grants cannot be increased. We must do better. We must defeat this budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond.

Mr. Speaker, if it was spending that we needed to solve education in this country, the District of Columbia schools would be the best in the Nation. This is not a county sale barn, where we are bidding on a prize heifer. Spending more money on education is not the only thing we need to do. I stipulate the fact that you will spend everything you want here. That does not mean it is a responsible budget. We got to have reform. That is what is in this budget.

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

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, the people of the State of Georgia strongly believe that the Federal budget policies should be based on guidelines of limited government, lower taxes, and increased local control of local affairs.

□ 1245

The budget resolution before us today closely follows those guidelines.

First, this budget plan establishes a limit on the growth of Federal spending that closely follows the rate of inflation. Second, we provide real reduction in taxes for wage-earners. Third, the budget resolution makes room for future consideration of reform bills such as education reform that will focus on returning more control to the local level.

Mr. Speaker, why is tax reduction important? In developing a budget plan, we must answer the question, what makes up the economy? It is not the government. The Federal Government does not manufacture, it does not have a product for sale, it is not and should never try to be the engine that runs economic growth.

The economy is made up of people, workers, taxpayers. They are the ones earning the wages and spending or investing portions of their paycheck. Each time they do, they create economic activity. The more they spend or invest, the more economic growth we

have. In many ways the budget debate is about cash flow, the cash flow of the government and the cash flow of individuals and families.

The Federal Government has a cash flow which is funded by the paychecks of working people. It creates its own income by collecting a portion of all private sector earnings. Today, that collection level is excessive. Over the next 10 years, the government will collect from wage-earners over \$3.1 trillion more in non-Social Security taxes than it needs to fund the operation of government.

The budget resolution takes a responsible look at the Federal books and recognizes the fact that it is time to slow down the collection of the government cash flow and return those excess funds to the cash flow of individuals and families. In the words of the President, the taxpayers have overpaid their bill; and this budget resolution will provide a refund on their collected earnings that they so well deserve.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, this is the people's House, not the special interests' House, not the billionaires' House, not the oil companies' House, but the people's House. The budget we pass tells the people what this House stands for.

The problem is, this Republican budget tells them we want to return to the days of budget-busting deficits and away from investing in our future. This budget shortchanges the agency that keeps our air clean and our water pure, while President Bush gives a free pass to oil and gas companies who want to rob our public lands for private profits; and it raids the Social Security and Medicare trust funds to pay for new tax breaks for millionaires while denying many working families even a dime in tax relief.

Budgets represent values. They tell the American people what we stand for. This House must stand for more than just doling out tax breaks to the wealthy. This budget does not represent the values of the American people; it represents the values of a few special interests. It is a sham, it is a disgrace, it is the real atrocity, and it should be defeated.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), a distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support this budget resolution, and there are an awful lot of good reasons why we ought to all support it. Again, it lets the taxpayers keep more of what they earn; and it begins to pay down the national debt, a great legacy to leave to our children and our grandchildren. It sets aside Social Security and Medicare to make sure that they are in a lockbox, that they are off the

table. They are going to be there for not only our senior citizens, but for their kids and their grandkids.

But maybe most important about what this budget resolution does is it recognizes that we need to make America strong again. The only way to keep America safe is to keep America strong, and that is not the case today. We have watched the last 8 years while our military has been hollowed out, overdeployed and underfunded; and this budget recognizes that and puts more money into the military. It puts it in a place where we need it. Because there are so many young men and women in our military today who have really kind of lost their sense of direction. Their morale is lower than it has ever been. This budget puts additional money to give pay increases to our young men and women in uniform. It says that we are going to provide additional benefits in terms of health care for those young men and women in uniform, and it says that because so many of our young men and women live in substandard housing, we are going to make the housing better for them to give them a sense of respect and honor.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a safe world in which we live today. The Cold War is over; but we still have nuclear proliferation, we have non-State terrorist groups, we have criminal elements with worldwide tentacles, and we need to recognize that.

So if there is just only one reason, and again, there is an awful lot of reasons to vote for this budget, but just the reason alone to make America strong again is reason enough. I urge adoption of this budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

(Mrs. CLAYTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. Some of us, including myself, take the budget process seriously; and we also take the budget as an important document.

We consider the Federal budget an important document because it is the document that we use to speak to the needs and the priorities of the American people, whether that is defense, education, Social Security, environment, agriculture, any of these. Also it is an important document because it says where we are getting the resources from, whether it be taxes, will it be trust funds like the Social Security trust fund, or what programs will we reduce. Indeed, it is an important document that when we have a surplus, we should use it to pay down the debt.

In all of these areas, we indeed do not take the process seriously; but we say that the budget indeed is an important document. The chairman says it is a guide. A guide for what? A guide for new priorities or simply a statement to get it out on the floor?

Mr. Speaker, I say we failed miserably, but in no more important place

than education. Indeed, the commitment to education is undergirded by taking away not only what the President asked for, but also the additional funds.

I say we ought to reject this budget. We can do much better for the American people. We can say we are serious, and the budget itself is an important document.

Mr. Speaker, today I would like to urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H. Con. Res. 83, the conference report on the budget.

As a senior member of the Budget Committee, I take the budget process seriously. If the two pages had not been missing from the budget, this blunder never would have been exposed, and we would not have allowed us to see the reality of this process and what was really being concealed.

Some of us, including me, take the budget process seriously. We consider the federal budget to be an important document that provides for the priorities and needs of the American people. This document should show how and what activities the government will support (i.e. defense, prescription drugs for seniors, environment, medicare, social security, education, and agriculture). A serious budget would clearly indicate how we are going pay for these priorities. It would indicate: What are the resources? What are the tax cuts? What programs are reduced? And yes, a serious budget should help pay down the national debt when in surplus, and we do have a surplus. This conference report on this budget resolution fails miserably on being a serious or important document for many reasons.

Education. The most important and serious priority to American people clearly is education. However, this conference report on the budget does not reflect this commitment. It completely eliminates the \$294 billion in education that the Senate approved. In fact, the budget reduces the education budget below the President's request by \$21 billion. We take seriously the commitment and statements of the President, and the majority that "no child should be left behind". These cuts in education are egregious.

Health. The health needs of American people are also serious. This budget makes a mockery of our commitment to help senior citizens secure prescription drugs and help prevent HIV or care for AIDS patients or respond to other health care needs. Most Members in both Chambers clearly know that it will take at least \$300 billion or more for a meaningful prescription drug program. The budget provides \$61.4 billion less than the Presidents requested for appropriated health care programs such as Ryan White AIDS treatment grants, maternal and child care grants, the Centers for Disease Control, and the Food and Drug Administration.

National Debt. Instead of paying down the national debt, this budget has left a margin of error so narrow that we very well will raid the Medicare and Social Security Trust funds in order to pay for the tax cuts as early as next year. Do we really want to be accused of gambling with our nations resources? We are literally betting on our projections and hoping that the numbers turn out right.

This agreement also includes the amount of the contingency reserve in its claimed totals for debt reduction. This budget is a sham and a farce because they are utilizing "double

counting" when considering the contingency reserve fund. This means that every dollar of the contingency reserve that is spent also diminishes the amount of debt that is reduced by a dollar, plus the cost of interest. This conference report obviously places a low priority on debt reduction. Presuming assumptions and projections prove to be correct, the conference report would pay about \$300 billion less than the amount of debt reduction provided by the House Democratic budget alternative budget resolution. A budget process that would have included Democrats, would have allowed for such deliberation rather than tapping into the Medicare and Social Security surplus funds.

Tax Cuts. The final budget and tax package calls for tax cuts in the amount of \$1.269 trillion for the years 2002 through 2011, and allows for an economic stimulus consisting of \$100 billion in outlays that may occur any time from 2001 through 2011. Due to the two pages mission, it was disclosed that the Republicans had stripped \$70 billion from the "so called bipartisan deal announced by the President two days earlier—which cut education—the President's "number one" issue that was to "leave no child behind". This ten-year tax cut is larger than the \$1.25 trillion cut Republicans publicly accepted earlier this week because of the revenue affects of the reduction of the bill recently passed on the Securities and Exchange fees included in that package. Believe me, this is the beginning of many tax bills to come that will slowly prey upon the Medicare and Social Security trust funds, and threaten our economy. The true cost of the tax cut with its impact on the surplus over a ten year period, including added spending for interest on the national debt, realizes a grand amount of \$1.668 trillion.

This budget is a fraud, and an empty shell leaving out inevitable tax cuts and spending proposals publicly announced by the administration and Republican leaders. This agreement does not provide for the funds needed for the administration's national missile defense proposal or any other increases in the defense budget that may be recommended as a result of the administration review of defense policy and requirements. Nor, does it include almost \$1.0 trillion in tax cuts beyond the \$1.35 trillion reconciled, including terms left out of reconciliation and proposals like the \$300 billion to fix the AMT, extension of the R&D credit, a variety of health-related tax cuts, the Portman-Cardin pension/IRA bill that the House passed, a capital gains tax cut and small business tax cuts that Republicans want to pass with an increase in minimum wage. Last week's budget faux pas was an attempt at procedurally rushing through a dishonest and deceptive budget shell that would ease the passage of excessive tax cuts. The deception backfired and allowed the American people to at least examine the conference agreement and to uncover its many flaws. Repeating the mistakes of the past would be foolish for this body knowing the predictable outcome of increasing the public debt and triggering a deficit.

To pass this budget means breaking our commitments to our senior citizens by robbing the Social Security and Medicare trust funds; denying our youth and children the best educational opportunities possible; and depriving the poor the money and resources needed to provide for their welfare.

We must make hard choices about how to allocate the resources of the American people. We need a conference agreement, that provides sensible tax relief for all Americans, pays down the national debt, and adopts the priorities of the American people. My fellow colleagues, I urge you to vote "no" on the conference report on H. Con. Res. 83. It is not the right decision for most Americans, and we will all pay a dear price if it is passed.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. FLETCHER), a member of the committee.

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

I appreciate the opportunity to rise and speak in support of this conference committee, the budget conference committee. As we can see, it helps us set the priority of paying down the national debt at record levels to ensure that we do not leave our grandchildren and children in debt.

Tax relief for every taxpayer. Improved education. It gives us the opportunity to not just put more money into education, but actually make some structural changes that will improve the education for our children. Stronger national defense, health care reform and modernization of Medicare, with up to \$300 billion for Medicare reform, including prescription drugs which is needed for our seniors.

Last year in the House, we passed the first prescription drug bill for our seniors out of this House, and we are going to continue to work to make sure that happens so that no senior has to choose between their food and medicine. We are going to save Social Security in the sense that we are setting aside Social Security and Medicare and making sure we are keeping that in a lockbox.

The other side talks a lot about putting more money into priorities. What does that do? We have held the spending at 4 percent. They would like to increase it 5, 6, 8 percent, we have heard, depending on who speaks. What is that? Now we have heard they want tax relief; but let me tell my colleagues, any increase in spending as it goes above inflation is a taxation on the next generation, because that becomes the baseline for next year.

We have all heard in our accounts of compound interest and how that works, how we can double our money over a period of years. Well, what I call the increased spending above inflation, what the other side would like to do is compound taxation on our children and grandchildren, because we require future revenues to be increased in a compounded way to increase the spending, or to fund the increased spending that they want every year.

Mr. Speaker, that is not good for America, it is not good for our children, and it is certainly not the kind of tax relief and freedom that we need to return to our American families.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that there is no money set aside in this budget for So-

cial Security and Medicare, except for the money that is set aside for a prescription drug benefit, but not to make the program solvent; and there is certainly no lockbox. It is not in this bill at all.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO).

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this budget. It has a lot to do with philosophical issues, but it really has a lot more to do with telling the truth to the American public.

The budget that we passed out of committee, though I disagree with many philosophical issues, at least told the American public where we stood. The budget we are about to vote on today does not, and it does not because at the end of the budget, there is something I have never seen before, a negative slush fund of \$67 billion because we could not get it all in. We could not make the numbers add up. What that means is that we will be back later on this year to straighten these numbers out.

This is the first time I believe that we have heard before a lot of talk about the President's budget we had a Democratic President and a Republican House being dead on arrival. This budget is dead on exit. We will be back in the fall to straighten it all out. The numbers will be meaningless, and we will be back here arguing about what the numbers should be. That is in addition to all the philosophical arguments. We will be back in the fall; we will be telling the people the truth about how much money we put into education and research and the defense department. Right now, no one can answer those questions.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as we can see, Washington hates to change, and this Congress and this President is intent on making Washington change the way it works. Look at its impact on the American people today. Tax Freedom Day just occurred May 3. That means for most of our families, we have worked from New Year's Day to May 3, just recently, just to pay our State and local and Federal taxes. That is the highest, that is the longest date ever; and that means that for most families, because we are not working for ourselves until the fifth month, we pay more in taxes than if we put our house payments, all of our groceries and our clothing together. We pay more than that in taxes. No wonder it is hard for families to make ends meet.

We wonder, how much of the money we send here actually gets to the people who really need it. Washington recently has funded, and we have read about it, we funded \$1 million that the Park Service used to build a two-hole outhouse. We spend \$5 billion a year to help salmon swim upstream. In fact, we spend so much we could buy each of

those fish a first-class ticket on a plane, fly them to the top of the river and save money doing it. Not only that, we paid one group \$350,000 a year to kill the same salmon. We waste dollars up here day and night.

This President is intent on Washington not going on a spending spree, on tax relief that grows as we pay off the debt and as our surplus grows, tax relief grows. This President is intent on helping education between the teacher and the student and the student and the parent where it really counts. Washington needs to change, and this budget and this President is intent on doing it.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

In the time that remains I would hope the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) would explain a few things to the American people. Number one, how is a Nation that is \$5,661,347,798,002 in debt, how does that Nation have a surplus? How does a Nation that owes its Social Security Trust Fund \$1.103 billion of unfunded liability, money that has been taken from people's paychecks and squandered on other things, how can we say we have a surplus? How can a Nation that has taken 235.5 billion of people's tax dollars, promised to spend it towards Medicare and spent it on other things, and tell people we have a surplus? How can a Nation that has taken \$160.5 billion out of the military budget over the past 15 years, set it aside with the promise that we are going to spend it on our military retirees, but spend every penny of it on other things, how do we have a surplus?

Finally, for Federal employees, how do we take \$497.6 billion out of their paychecks, promise to set it aside for their retirement, spend it on other things, and then look them in the eye and say we have a surplus and therefore we have to cut taxes and, therefore, we cannot fund defense and therefore the fleet will keep shrinking? How can we say that when we cut the shipbuilding budget this year by almost \$4 billion that we are taking care of national defense?

□ 1300

Since the Republicans have taken over Congress, the fleet has shrunk from 392 ships to 313. And my colleagues are cutting the shipbuilding budget, but yet they keep saying this is good for defense.

I say to my colleagues, if they are looking for waste, the most wasteful thing we do is squander a billion dollars a day on interest on the billings we already owe. If my colleagues are serious about addressing that waste, then we should take every penny that we have and address it to national defense and paying down the national debt.

This budget does not do that, and therefore I am going to oppose it.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2¼ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) for yielding the time to me.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to say to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR), my good friend, that I agree that under the Clinton administration in the last 8 years, a lot of these things have in fact been devastated, like military spending and shipbuilding programs and so forth, but we are going to rebuild some of these things through a very smart budget.

The way we are going to do this is we are going to first put our priorities on top, Social Security, Medicare, education. Then we are going to take care of the normal functions of government, our obligations for roads and bridges, and for all of the departments, National Parks and Fish and Wildlife. Then what we are going to do is pay down the public debt.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the first debt that we have been able to pass, I believe, that actually does pay down the public debt to a zero level, which I think is extremely important. Then we get to that leftover amount.

Mr. Speaker, let me explain it to my colleagues this way: In Johnson High School, Savannah, Georgia, a couple months back, I was speaking to a group of seniors, and I asked them, how many of you have a job? Sitting in the front row, a blonde-haired Julie Lawhon said, I have a job. Julie, how much do you make? Seven dollars an hour. Seven dollars an hour? Then if you work for 2 hours, you made \$14, right? No, sir. Obviously, you have not had a job; I only get to take home about \$11.

Oh, where does the rest go, little 17-year-old, Julie? It goes to taxes. Okay, let us talk about that, the \$4 that you pay on your \$7 an hour in taxes for 2 hours of work, the \$4 an hour my friends in Washington take and we pay for education, we pay for roads, we pay for health care. You do not begrudge that, do you? You know those functions are needed. She said, yes.

Well, Julie, what if you found out I do not need \$4, that my friends and I can do all of this great stuff for \$3.75, what would you do with the extra quarter? Seventeen-year-old blonde-haired Julie Lawhon, Savannah, Georgia, says, give it back to me, it is my 25 cents.

That is all we are doing. God bless Julie Lawhon, the 17-year-old high school student. God bless the children of the next generation, because they get it.

Mr. Speaker, I am on bended knee, begging my colleagues across the aisle to get it as well. It is their money. It does not belong to one single person in here. It belongs to the taxpayers. Let us return the overcharge back to those who earned it.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I heard the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), my friend: Let us not give them 25 cents back and add 75 percent to their debt. That is what the gentleman from Mississippi said.

Mr. Speaker, our Republican friends have turned the annual budget resolution into a rite of spring.

Remember what the Washington Post said last year? The Republicans seek not to just cut taxes but to increase defense and selected other categories of spending while maintaining the appearance of fiscal discipline.

Does that sound familiar?

The year before that, The New York Times said the Republican Congressional leadership appears to prefer radical tax and spending cuts to reasoned accommodation on the budget.

The tone may be different, but the substance is not.

Three years ago, of course, the majority plumb the depths of budgetary gridlock. It could not even pass a budget resolution.

Mr. Speaker, to that poor soul who accidentally lost two pages in the budget resolution on the way to the House floor early last Friday, let me say, do not be too hard on yourself.

Mr. Speaker, that oversight is just a tiny blip on a fiscal radar screen, full, frankly, of Republican pretense.

The substance of this budget resolution is shameless. It is not a plan for our future. It is a stalking horse for Republican tax cuts that would mainly benefit the wealthy.

I am for a tax cut, a tax cut that is responsible and will fit defense and domestic discretionary spending and will help pay down the debt and save Social Security and Medicare.

Who would bear the brunt of the proposed spending cuts? The millions of Americans with no health insurance; the kids who go to school in crumbling buildings, zero-funded education in terms of any increases; the seniors who cannot afford prescription drugs not provided for.

My colleagues are either going to steal from Medicare, from Peter and pay Paul, but neither Peter nor Paul are going to be able to be funded.

Meanwhile, the President is pushing a missile defense system. It may be a good policy. He has no idea how to fund it, no idea how to pay for it.

He is pushing his plan to privatize Social Security, no idea and no plan in this budget how to pay for it; unless that is, of course, we continue to plan on raiding the Social Security surplus.

This budget resolution is not real any more than last year's, the year before, or the year before that. The chair of the Committee on Appropriations in the other body thinks that as well. He is a member of the party of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), not mine.

Mr. Speaker, we ought to reject this budget resolution. We ought to go back and do some real work for real Americans for a real future.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of our Committee on Appropriations thinks it is a real number.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2¼ minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE).

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, for doing a great job on this budget.

We will end up at the end of the day with a significant tax cut. We will have additional funds for education and many other of our priorities, agriculture; but I do want to point out something that Members of both sides need to be aware of, and that is the projected high costs for the prescription drug benefit.

If my colleagues look at the policies that looked relatively inexpensive just a year ago, we had a \$6,000 stop loss, and we can see the area in green above that for the costs above that.

In just 6 months since we debated that, we have seen a 30 percent increase in the baseline, which means a 500 percent increase in the stop loss area. What that means is that in just 6 months, if we look at the projected costs for the Republican plan last year, it would go from \$150 billion to \$320 billion.

If we look at the projected costs of the Daschle bill, it would go from \$300 billion to \$505 billion to \$600 billion, and that does not necessarily include a low-income senior benefit; because if we then look at that cost, these are the senior citizens existing on Social Security just above the poverty level, so they are not in Medicaid.

If we look at that and we go up to, say, 175 percent of poverty, you now have \$600 billion. If we go up to 135 percent, phase it out as in a bill that I have before Congress, we are looking at \$400 billion. Some of that is already picked up by Medicaid, maybe half of that. If we add that amount to the bill that we had last year, we come up with a 35 percent cost share, about \$500 billion. That is only up to the 2011.

In the year 2012, the baby boomers start to retire. We can afford a helping hand right now, but we need to structure prescription drugs in the context of Medicare reform.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 90 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting, all of the bipartisan things that were supposed to be in this budget. The bipartisan things in the House seem to be lost from this balanced budget, whether it is our commitment to education, whether it is our commitment to increasing funding for basic science research, whether it is our commitment not to spend the Medicare trust funds.

I want to go to comments of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON)

about little Julie Lawhon from Savannah. In fact, the way this budget is structured, she would not get any of that tax cut back, because she does not make enough money to qualify for the tax cut that they want to provide.

Second of all, what would happen is this budget would spend so much of the Medicare Trust Fund that by the time little Julie was able to get Medicare benefits that she is paying out of that \$4, the benefits would be cut so low and probably the payroll taxes raised so high because we raided it through this budget, that she would not get much for that.

So I am afraid little Julie from Savannah, Georgia would end up paying a lot more under this budget than less.

Mr. Speaker, the problem with this budget is contrary to what Congress voted on this year and last year. This budget spends about \$300 billion of obligated Medicare trust funds to help pay for the tax cut and to help provide some sort of prescription drug component and some form of Medicare reform, whatever that may be.

In fact, in the budget there is no specific reconciliation instruction telling the committees to report a prescription drug component to the full House or the full Senate. So we do not know if there is going to be a prescription drug program or not.

I would urge the Members to vote down this budget, let us write a real bipartisan budget as opposed to one that abandons our bipartisan commitments.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BROWN), a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today we declare victory for every taxpayer in America. Finally, a tax refund is on the way. The government has overcharged the American people, and it is time to return their money.

This budget will provide long-term tax relief of \$1.35 trillion over the next 11 years. This includes an immediate, much-needed hundred billion dollars this year.

When Americans have more money in their pockets, the Nation's economy will benefit.

This agreement on the budget resolution between the House and the Senate will also repay a historic \$2.4 trillion on the debt by 2011, which is the maximum that can be repaid without penalty. This, too, will benefit our economy by lowering interest rates.

Do not be misled by political rhetoric. Let us look at the facts and support this budget resolution. This budget is good for America and a victory for the taxpayers of this great Nation.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, we are all entitled to our own opinion but not to our own set of facts. The fact is, contrary to what the gentleman

from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) said earlier, it was not President Clinton that cut the shipbuilding program, it was actually President Bush that first did that. I want to clear that up for the RECORD. The facts will bear that out.

Mr. Speaker, when the Congressional Budget Office estimated last year that economic growth would increase by two-tenths of a percent on average over the next 10 years, we were faced with a historic choice. When they told us that the surplus estimates would increase by 75 percent up to \$5.6 trillion, we had to decide, are we going to use this unprecedented opportunity to sustain the American legacy of leaving a better quality of life to our children than we inherited from our parents, or are we going to take care of ourselves first?

The problem with this budget resolution is that it does the latter and not the former. It breaks that American legacy, because we had a historic opportunity to pay off the debt that we incurred during the 1980s. When \$3 trillion matures by the end of this decade, that should be our first priority, get rid of that debt. The second priority should be to take care of the baby boomers' retirement.

I am a baby boomer. I was born in 1945. I do not want my kids having to pay for my retirement, but this budget resolution is going to force them to, and that is unfair, to leave them with trillions of dollars of debt and the responsibility to pay for our Social Security and Medicare costs. That is wrong. That is what this budget does. That is why it should be defeated.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, for yielding the time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) for having done an outstanding job, in my opinion, of bringing this budget resolution through the process. That job is not always easy.

I would like the Members to know that the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations probably has a better relationship and better communication between each other this year than we have had in a long, long time.

□ 1315

I want to say, in the few remaining seconds, that this is a good budget. There are those who think that it does not spend enough money. But there are always Members in Congress who think budgets do not spend enough money. There are also those who think it spends too much. Somewhere in between is where we ought to be; and that is where we are today, somewhere in between.

I would remind my colleagues that this budget provides for \$60 billion

more than we had last year at this same point in the process. So for those who think it is not enough money, understand, there is \$60 billion more than we started with last year.

So I commend this budget resolution to the Members. I also want the Members to know that there are 61 working days basically left before the end of the fiscal year. We have 52 specific appropriations events that must take place in that 61-day period. None of them can take place at the same time. Fifty-two separate events that all have to have their own block of time.

So we need to pass this resolution today. The 302(b) process is next. Then we will start bringing appropriations bills to the floor. Again, I compliment the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE). He has done a really great job, and I encourage the Members to support this budget resolution.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the choice before us today is whether we choose the future or the present. In the present, the smart political thing to do is go home and tell everyone you cut their taxes. People like to hear that. It makes for good political patter.

But the future demands that we do something very different. It demands that we relieve our children of the \$5 trillion debt that we have placed upon them. A family would never make the choice the majority is about to make. When a family has some excess income and a huge debt, they would pay off that debt, not pass it on to their children. So should we. The appropriate vote for the future is to vote no on the budget resolution before us because unlike the Democratic plan, it does not pay down the debt.

Mr. NUSSLE. 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 thank the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) for this time, and it is a fine job he has done this year.

The Members on the Democratic aisle talked about telling the truth. Let us tell the truth. Last year, Republicans proposed a \$373 billion tax cut for the American people, and they did not support it. In fact, the President vetoed it, and they upheld his veto.

Then they held the budget up till December. Why? Because they wanted to spend more money, and we did. Shamelessly, we did. And that spending increase alone will cost us \$572 billion over 10 years. They had no problem spending \$572 billion of the people's money, but they could not give those same people the \$373 billion tax cut.

On average, since 1990, the Federal revenues have grown 9.1 percent each and every year on average. How many of you at home got a 9.1 percent increase in pay every year since 1990? Nobody I know of.

My colleagues on that side of the aisle talk about cutting education. The fact is, read the budget. We are spending 11.5 percent more this year on education than we did last year. How many of you at home got an 11.5 percent increase in pay this year? Nobody I know.

Every time we set aside funds, the problem is my colleagues do not want to give them back to the people. They want to spend those dollars. We are paying down 100 percent of the debt that we can pay down over 10 years. We can pay no more than is due.

We are saying we are going to set aside 100 percent of the Social Security money. We are going to set an additional \$300 billion aside to reform Medicare and prescription drugs; yet my colleagues say we are not dealing with the problem.

The problem is they want to feed the cow. We tell the cow owner that he deserves more of the revenue from the milk coming from that cow.

The problem is we are never going to agree. The facts are very clear. They are in the record as far as the tax cut last year. They are in the record as far as the tax cut this year.

We can afford it. The American people earned these dollars. They deserve to spend their dollars. We talk about it is for the children. Why do we not let the American family keep more of their hard-earned money so they can provide for their children. They know the needs of their children. We do not.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, we have, as I understand it, 2 minutes remaining on our side; and we will close with that, I would just inform the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY MILLER) who just spoke that it is as a matter of record we overspent the President's request last year. While there were some things the President got that were over and above what we were willing to give him before the negotiations began, we were already beyond the President's request for spending, and we added \$4 billion among other things to his request for national defense.

We added a huge sum to transportation precipitated by the Speaker's request that we take care of Chicago's mass transit.

So there was a mutual effort to add to spending last year. We ought to really come clean and say we all were part of that process last year, the President, the Congress on both sides of the aisle.

Let me direct our attention to this budget. I have said from the start that my concern with this budget is, first of all, it is a watershed budget. It will affect what we do, not just in 2002, it will frame what we can do for the next 10 years, because we are making fundamental watershed decisions in this budget.

In dealing with a budget of that gravity, that importance, the numbers ought to be real. I am not worried about a couple of missing pages. I am worried about plugs and placeholders and numbers that I do not think are real. Let me tell my colleagues which ones.

First of all, defense spending, the largest account in the budget other than Social Security, the largest appropriation bill that we handle on the floor every year. \$325 billion is a number inserted for defense spending in the year 2002. But we all know that is not the number. That is the Clinton-coined budget number. That is a placeholder.

We also all know that Mr. Rumsfeld has been working for months now behind closed doors, 18 different committees, making a comprehensive review of our national security requirements. We have seen leaks in recent weeks in all kinds of publications and some directly from him by way of television, indicating that his request will be substantial, I mean 2 to \$400 billion a year over the period that we are talking about. \$25 billion a year at least in the way of an increase in defense spending over and above what this budget provides. That is why the defense number is patently unreal.

In fact, we have given the chairman of this committee unprecedented unilateral authority, once he gets the numbers from Mr. Rumsfeld, without consulting with anybody else, to come over and adjust the allocation to defense by up to \$400 billion.

I cannot recall any kind of authority like that that we have given any single individual before, but that shows us we explicitly recognize in this budget that the defense number is not a real number. It will be jacked up considerably before this fiscal year is over.

Emergency spending. To his credit, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) tried to deal with this spending. He tried to put it in the budget because, historically, we know from experience every year we have emergencies. Hurricanes, tornados, you name it, we have them. And we pay for it out of this budget through FEMA.

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) provided \$5.6 billion after a tussle with the appropriators that was taken out. But if we add it back, that is \$60 billion that is not in the budget but ought to be provided in the budget.

Discretionary spending. This budget purports to have a tight limit, a tight tether on discretionary spending. In the outyears, 2003 to 2011, the purported rate of increase is 2.6 percent. That is not even inflation. Over a 10-year period of time, for nondefense dis-

cretionary, this provides less than inflation, \$50 billion less than inflation.

Now, that is a tough challenge to the appropriators at a time when we have a massive surplus. It used to be we could say we have got this deficit, and you could deter people from pushing their spending request; but now we have this surplus, it is a lot tougher to beat back the people who want to add this and add the other.

Does one think that we are going to hold discretionary spending to 2.6 percent at the same time we are taking the budget and favoring things like transportation? We have allowed transportation a special niche in the budget, giving them substantially more than inflation. We have allowed NIH and other favored activities like that a much bigger than inflationary increase. When we allow those favored programs their extra share of the budget, it means we have got to cut everything else.

That is the reason, Mr. Speaker, when we look at this budget, we should realize that all the numbers down to function 920 called allowances are not real. If we look at function 920, we will see a number called \$67 billion. That is \$67 billion in unspecified cuts.

The conference labored hard to come to a final conclusion, but they effectively threw in the towel. What they effectively adopted as the spending level for every function was just an inflationary rate of increase.

My colleagues know and I know that is not the way the appropriations process works. But if they cannot resolve at the function level where the cuts are going to hit, how in the world will we resolve it and bring in total spending at a 2.6 percent rate of increase for 10 years? I do not believe it will happen. I do not believe this is a real number. Function 920 is the ultimate tip-off.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the tax cuts are real. As soon as the compromise at \$1.35 trillion for tax reduction over 10 years, as soon as it was announced, Senator LOTT said there are other ways to do tax cuts. This is round one.

Secretary O'Neill was on the Hill. He testified that this is more of a floor than a ceiling, that there are other ways to skin this cat and provide additional tax relief. Look at what is on the cutting room floor. Once we trim this \$1.6 trillion request to \$1.3 trillion tax cut bill, it will have to be increased.

Look at the charts and realize that the bottom line here will soon be gone. It puts the bottom line in jeopardy. Two numbers I would say to my colleagues. \$342 billion invasion of Medicare, \$255 billion invasion of Social Security is the arithmetic. That is where this budget leads us.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, this is an opportunity to vote for either excuses or opportunities. That is what we are faced with

here today. First the excuses: “we cannot,” “we should not,” “it will not work.” Those are the excuses.

The excuses have been going on for years why we cannot return the tax surplus to the American people. First is do not have a tax cut until we balance the budget. We balanced the budget. Then it was do not cut taxes until we have saved Social Security. We have saved all of Social Security. Then it was do not cut taxes until the Medicare trust fund is set aside. We set aside the Medicare trust fund.

There was still money left over, but they said do not do it until you significantly increase spending. We increased spending for important priorities. They say do not cut taxes because it is the wrong time. Then it was the wrong way. Then it was the wrong process. Then they said it was too big.

Today there has even been Members who have come to the floor and have suggested that the tax cut will not work because it is too small.

Now, look, we have all heard the story about the three bears and the excuses. The excuses stop today with a budget that provides for opportunities: the fifth balanced budget in a row, maximum debt relief of \$2.4 trillion, saves Social Security, provides for a Medicare surplus for modernization, budgets for Americans priorities at 4 percent for education, 11.5 percent increase. Agriculture is increased. Defense is increased. Veterans priorities are maintained. The National Institutes of Health, the largest increase in history. There is still money left over.

It is at that time that we have to recognize who does this money belong to. It is the American people. The budget that they negotiate around their kitchen table is more important than the Federal budget. So let us stop making excuses about the Federal budget. Let us recognize where those tax dollars come from. Let us take the opportunity to provide tax relief for the American people. Vote for a budget of opportunities. Vote for the conference report.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, when we first debated this budget resolution in the House, I opposed it because I thought it would risk the opportunities of the future on the outcome of a riverboat gamble.

The original resolution was based entirely on a long-range forecast about the economy—a forecast that predicts good economic weather and budget surpluses for a full decade ahead. How prudent is that? If you want to know, ask any rancher in Colorado, or anyone who watches for fires in our forests, or anybody who has watched the stock market lately. They will tell you how risky it can be to bet too much on forecasting the weather or the economy for one year, let alone for a decade.

The original resolution ran the risk of shortening the solvency of Social Security and Medicare, while neglecting other important needs in order to pay for the President's tax plan. And it would not have done enough to reduce the publicly held debt and would have shortchanged education, seniors, research, and the environment.

I had hoped that after the Senate considered the resolution and there had been a conference between the two bodies, it would improve.

Unfortunately, that hasn't happened—in fact, in some important ways the conference report is not even as good as the original resolution passed by the House.

It's still a gamble, all right. But while the original resolution was like a high-stakes poker game on a riverboat, this conference report makes me think of a rigged roulette wheel in a mining town gambling hall—complete with the false front.

On the gambling hall, the false front gave the illusion of a full-sized building, concealing the incomplete structure that lay behind.

Here, the label of “budget” conceals what is not in the conference report. It conceals that the conference report doesn't include a way to pay for a realistic Medicare prescription drug benefit. It conceals that the conference report doesn't include enough for education. It conceals that the conference report doesn't include enough to adequately protect the environment. It conceals that the conference report doesn't include enough for scientific research. It conceals that the conference report would not do enough to reduce our debt.

And, like the false front on the gambling hall, the “balanced budget” label on this conference report conceals the real game here.

That game is to get the President's tax plan over to the Senate under rules that will shorten the time for debate and that will make it harder to make adjustments so it would be less of a gamble with our fiscal future.

Once that has been done, I expect that this unrealistic budget has served its purpose—and I am tempted to hope it will then be disregarded. I would like to think that its false front will be replaced by a sounder structure that will accommodate doing what should be done to bolster Social Security and Medicare and to make needed investments in education, health, and other vital needs.

But banking on that would be another gamble—and I am afraid that the odds are not very good. What is much more likely—almost a sure thing, in fact—is that the imbalance will be made worse when the Administration completes its defense-policy review and seeks increases in defense spending that are not accounted for in this budget.

What will be the result when that happens—as I expect it will? What will result when Congress acts to relieve middle-class families from the problem of the Alternative Minimum Tax—as it definitely should? And what will result when Congress extends other tax provisions, like the credits for research and development—as it should?

The answer is that the approach of this budget will lead us to further weaken Medicare and fall further short of meeting the test of fiscal responsibility.

I do not want to play that game. And so I cannot support this conference report.

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on the fiscal year 2002 budget resolution.

The compromise that was crafted in conference and in consultation with the White House—and finished, apparently, just hours ago—suffers from the same failings as the budget resolution passed by the House in March.

The conference report on the budget resolution calls for an irresponsible \$1.25 trillion tax

cut over the next ten years, and a number of Republican Representatives and Senators have already expressed an interest in enacting additional tax cuts. How can the members of the House Majority in good conscience pass a budget that they have no intention of following? We shouldn't be surprised—we've seen the same actions in previous years.

The unrealistic tax cuts are only one of the problems with this budget. Unrealistic spending levels are another. The discretionary spending levels specified in the conference report are, I believe, inadequate to address the many domestic challenges facing this nation over the next ten years. Moreover, if previous years are an indication, many members of the House Majority want higher appropriations levels as well. This budget plan does not include the additional discretionary spending that would be needed for President Bush's proposed ballistic missile defense system, nor does it include the increased defense spending that the President will probably request once Secretary Rumsfeld completes his review of our current defense policies. It doesn't do enough for education, nor does it provide enough money to enact a decent Medicare prescription drug benefit or address the problem of Americans without any health insurance.

What is even more troubling is the fact that under this budget plan, Congress would most likely be forced to dip into the Medicare surpluses in order to pay for the tax cuts and new spending that we can already anticipate. Throwing fiscal caution to the wind is not my idea of conservative government.

And finally, and the most troubling of all, I am concerned that this budget plan leaves no room for error or unanticipated bad news. If some of the projected surpluses fail to materialize over the next ten years, the federal government could easily start running deficits again—or dipping into the Social Security Trust Fund.

I'd like to see the House's so-called conservatives show a little more interest in responsible fiscal policy. I will oppose this conference report, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this budget which shamefully does not fund education, health care, and housing programs that this country so desperately needs. The meager 3.6 percent increase in this budget's education funds is simply not enough to modernize our crumbling schools and institute programs to retain teachers and improve student aptitude nationwide. There is simply not enough money in the budget to fund the education rhetoric coming from the Administration.

The basis of this budget is a massive tax cut that does not come for free. It has a price. In my district in Alameda County, California we are having an affordable housing crisis at all income levels but particularly affecting low and moderate income people. To pay for this tax cut we will cut 1.7 billion in real dollars from the federal housing budget, including cuts to the drug elimination program, the community development block grant, and empowerment zone funding.

We are also having a health care crisis in this country. Many of us have been pushing for a Medicare prescription drug plan for our seniors who cannot afford costly drugs. Because of this tax cut our seniors will continue

to pay the highest cost for drugs among developed nations. This is the cost of the Bush tax cut.

This budget eliminates the COPS program which practically any law enforcement official will tell you made our streets safer and crime go down during the past several years. Another cost of the Republican tax cut.

A vote for this budget and the Bush Administration's mega tax cut is a vote against most Americans and their rights to decent shelter, healthcare and safety. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this budget.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, as Democrats and Republicans it is our job to work together on a budget that reflects the issues that the voters sent us all to Congress to address. The nation's priorities are clear. Americans want a balanced federal budget that meets our health, education, retirement and infrastructure needs while paying down our national debt and providing for a reasonable tax cut.

Unfortunately, the Republican budget abandons the fiscal responsibility that has resulted in the budget surpluses we are presently enjoying. The sum of the Republican tax cuts reach almost \$2 trillion and are completely based on a projection for surpluses that may or may not materialize over the next ten years. I support responsible tax cuts that are targeted to working families and ensure our seniors will continue to have retirement security.

In fact, the Republicans controlling Congress spend more on tax cuts for the wealthiest one percent of Americans than they spend on every other need in this budget. Worst of all, the Republican budget uses Medicare and Social Security as a slush fund that will be raided if the projected surpluses are not realized.

Today's budget resolution shortchanges education and provides even less money than the President asked for in his budget plan. It threatens Medicare by raiding the trust fund, jeopardizing the benefits to which seniors are now entitled and does not guarantee that any portion will go toward a prescription drug benefit. In addition, it cuts back on energy programs that we should be strengthening to help our constituents deal with the energy crisis and cope with sky-high prices.

This budget resolution should balance all of our priorities—from the need for tax cuts to investments in public schools, our national defense to prescription drugs. Most of all, America's budget should do nothing to break faith with the millions of seniors who rely on Social Security and Medicare.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Budget Resolution Conference Report presented to us today. That opposition is based on the substance of the budget as well as the tactics used by the Republican majority to force this bill to the floor of the House of Representatives with no input from those of us on the Democratic side of the aisle.

I guess it doesn't matter that Democrats have not had real input into the budget process because the overall document is a sham anyway. It does not reflect the total cost of the tax cuts that Republicans plan to pursue this year. Nor does it reflect the total defense spending increases that will become law before this year is over. And, this budget resolution still fails to account for additional cuts that will have to occur in many domestic programs in order to make room for the bloated tax cut

and defense spending increases. Finally, it fails to protect Medicare and Social Security and falls far short of guaranteeing the funds necessary to add a prescription drug benefit to Medicare.

On the tax cut front, the House has already passed tax cut legislation totaling more than \$1.54 trillion. That is more than this budget resolution would even allow. Yet, the House-passed bills and this budget resolution still fail to address many tax issues that we know will be included before the year is over. Such tax changes include: a business tax package that will ultimately be part of any proposal to increase the minimum wage, tax extenders like the Research and Development Tax Credit, adjustments to the Alternative Minimum Tax, and various tax incentives for health care and education.

I applaud my Senate colleagues for fighting to lower the amount of dollars dedicated to tax cuts in this budget resolution conference report from the \$1.6 trillion requested by the President to approximately \$1.215 trillion (and the \$100 billion stimulus package for fiscal years 2001 and 2002). However, that appreciation is strongly dampened by the reality that even \$1.25 trillion is too high and the tax cut number in this budget resolution is going to grow still larger. We will surpass these dollar limitations for tax cuts; in fact, we already have. And we will pay the price in more ways than one when we are forced to reduce expenditures in vital domestic programs that mean much more to a wider array of Americans than the tax cuts ever will.

We can and should be increasing our investment in education. President Bush has made education one of his highest rhetorical priorities, but rhetoric alone won't fund education improvements. This budget fails to follow through with the resources necessary to make great strides on education.

My colleagues in the Senate were able to dramatically increase funding for education by \$294 billion in their version of the budget resolution. This conference report strips those increases from the package. The total funding level for education in this budget conference report is even less than the amount the President requested and the House approved this past March! That's moving backward on education—not forward.

This budget puts at risk the Medicare and Social Security Trust Funds to finance other expensive components of this package.

In 2011, the baby boom generation will start to become eligible for Medicare benefits. That begins a major demographic shift with far fewer workers supporting far greater numbers of seniors on Medicare. Today the ratio is approximately 3.4 workers per Medicare beneficiary. According to the Medicare actuary, that number is predicted to drop to about 2.1 workers per beneficiary by 2029. All of this cries out for protecting every cent that we have in the Medicare Trust Fund and making changes to law to ensure that more funds go into the Trust Fund in the future. But, the budget before us does the opposite. It raids the Medicare Trust Fund to fund an inadequate prescription drug benefit and makes the Medicare Trust Fund vulnerable for raiding for other purposes as well.

Make no mistake about it. The dollars diverted from the Medicare Trust Fund in the budget before us today will never be returned to the Trust Fund. They are being spent else-

where. That means that there are fewer resources dedicated to Medicare's future. We are robbing Peter to pay Paul. No ifs, ands, or buts about it.

It is past time for us to add a prescription drug benefit to Medicare. None of us would join a health insurance plan that didn't include prescription drug coverage, but Medicare does not cover these necessary medical costs. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that Medicare beneficiaries will spend \$1.5 trillion on prescription drugs over the next ten years.

Instead of using a portion of the surplus to assure meaningful coverage, this budget resolution presents a Hobson's choice between covering prescription drugs or assuring available funds for future hospital, home health and nursing home services that are already covered. It diverts needed dollars from the Medicare surplus into an account that is labeled by the Majority for use on prescription drug coverage and so-called "modernization."

I opposed the earlier House-passed budget for the same reasons that I am opposing this budget resolution conference report before us today. This version still fails to appropriately prioritize the needs of our nation. It could put us back in the economic ditch that the Reagan tax package created in the 1980s, and from which we only recently emerged.

During this time of unprecedented surplus, we should be shoring up the federal programs on which people rely, we should be increasing our investment in education, we should be improving the quality and availability of child care in our nation, we should be covering prescription drugs through Medicare, and doing much, much more. Instead, this budget squanders projected resources on tax cuts that disproportionately benefit the most well-off and puts at risk our ability to finance important government priorities now and in the future. I urge my colleagues to vote no on the budget resolution conference report before us.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose the budget resolution conference report.

It is not a fiscally responsible plan. It does not spend our surplus wisely nor make any additional reductions in the public debt. Instead, it sets out a course that may well result in huge deficits by the end of the 10–11 year period.

When I was first elected to Congress in 1992, the annual federal budget deficit was close to \$300 billion. But I joined many of my colleagues in making the hard-fought and difficult deficit cutting votes of the 1990s. I voted for the 1993 budget, Penny-Kasich, constitutional amendments to balance the budget and to limit tax increases. And I voted for the 1997 Balanced Budget Act, which finally produced the first federal surpluses in a generation.

The budget before us could well restore that \$300 billion annual deficit by 2011, undoing everything I fought for.

It could return us to raiding the Social Security and Medicare trust funds—despite this chamber's repeated promise not to do so.

And the budget retreats from making needed investments in our citizens. For example, it eliminates 98 percent of the increase proposed in the Senate's budget for special education—a program of critical importance to educators in my district and elsewhere.

The budget before us has accounting margins so precarious that any small bump in the economy will result in a deficit. It spends, for

example, all but \$1 billion of the FY01 \$96 billion surplus. That surplus, however, was estimated in January—before the downturn in the economy and the freefall of the stock market.

Mr. Speaker, a fiscally responsible budget should meet our nation's investment needs while using the surplus to reduce the public debt and enact responsible and affordable tax cuts. The framework I support—fashioned by the Blue Dogs—would allocate the surplus 50%—25%—25% across these three budget categories.

Most important, the Blue Dog framework earmarks half of the surplus to reducing the debt—the policy most preferred by my constituents and most Americans.

The budget before us has none of these characteristics. It is imbalanced in its priorities, and predicated on budget surplus numbers that are ephemeral at best and illusory at worst.

My constituents deserve better.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Con. Res. 83, the conference report to the Fiscal Year 2001 Budget Resolution. The document before us is sham which purports to set spending and tax policy for the next fiscal year, as well as important parameters for the next ten years when, in fact, this is a highly flawed budget that is destined to fail when actual legislation is adopted to put it in place. Mr. Speaker, here we are again for part II of a budget debacle that defies all reason. Even if the conference report before us includes the two pages missing from last week's submission, it is still incomplete. This conference report abandons any commitment to improving education. This conference does not provide for the Administration's national missile defense proposal or the other increases in the defense budget that will be recommended as a result of the administration's review of defense policy and requirements. Further, this conference report claims a tax cut of \$1.35, yet it leaves out such proposals as \$300 billion to fix the AMT, extension of the R&D credit, and enact the Portman-Cardin pension/IRA bill that the House passed. Finally, this conference report does not set aside the requisite level of funds needed to pay for the President's Social Security privatization plan, approximately \$1.0 trillion. Without that transition funding, the \$1.0 trillion would have to be taken out of the Social Security trust fund, benefit cuts or new debt generated.

Mr. Speaker, I predict that this so-called compromise of tax cuts totaling \$1.35 trillion over eleven years and spending held to 4% in FY 2002 will be breached before the end of the year. This budget also turns its back on our commitment to paying off the national debt. If we were to stay the course, the nation could retire all of the debt held by the public for the first time since 1835, and add three trillion dollars to net national savings. This budget clearly indicates that the Republican Majority has no qualms about turning its back on budget process and policies that has served this nation so well and is readily willing to risk returning us to the budgetary turmoil of the 1980s and early 1990's to make room for the President's tax cut.

The Republican Majority knows that their appetite for tax cuts will be too hard to control, just as their appetite for spending. Tax cuts are the overriding priority of the Republican budget. Over eleven years, their cut will cost

anywhere between \$2.2 trillion and \$2.5 trillion, including debt service and the inevitable cost of fixing the alternative minimum tax (AMT). Thus, this tax plan consumes nearly all of the \$2.7 trillion surplus outside of Social Security and Medicare. The "tax-cuts-at-all-costs" strategy, employed by the drafters of this resolution, ignores logic and history to make room for this plan.

Rather than take a long look at obligations on the horizon, the national debt, Social Security and Medicare solvency and the need to invest in education and research, the Republicans seek to push this resolution through the Congress before anyone has a chance to read it. The Republicans are bound and determined to push this budget through on a party line vote without telling the American people how they intend to live within the confines of their budget resolution or how they will pay back Medicare for the amount they seek to spend from the trust fund or how they will fund the recommendations from Secretary Rumsfeld's Defense review or how they will fund the national missile defense or even how they will fund the President's Social Security privatization scheme. And, now we find that the Republicans have dropped even the President's education initiative in the name of tax cuts. Hollow as it may be, the Republican Majority is desperate to claim victory here and drive the death nail into the coffin of the Budget Act. This budget is not about funding priorities. It's not about tax cuts or tax policy. It's certainly not about fiscal responsibility and it is most certainly not a product of bipartisanship. It's about politics.

This budget is not so much the product of deliberation but rather arbitrariness. The Republican Majority arbitrarily set each of the non-defense discretionary levels to the CBO baseline, thus failing to make any decisions about how to allocate these resources. Then, they dropped any assumption for natural disasters or emergencies. And, finally, they assume unspecified cuts in discretionary spending of \$6 billion per year. Mr. Speaker, this budget's failure to list a meaningful dollar level for each budget function means that the Congress and the public can have no clear idea about what the budget really means for America. Aside from failing to articulate our current obligations, this budget also turns a blind eye to the looming costs of the President's agenda, such as missile defense, privatization of Social Security, prescription drugs for seniors and tax cuts.

Mr. Speaker, not only does H. Con. Res. 83 fail to reflect any contemplation, it is seriously flawed. This conference report turns its back on all the fiscal policies that led to the greatest period of sustained economic expansion but sets us on the path back to "spend today, borrow tomorrow." H. Con. Res. 83 eliminates the budget surplus in the non-Social Security, non-Medicare operations of the federal government, and spends at least \$300 billion of already-obligated Medicare Trust Fund monies on other benefits. It's like spending the house payment on roof repairs and not acknowledging that you still owe on the mortgage. Thus, the conference report puts the Medicare and Social Security Trust Fund surpluses in jeopardy. The Republicans claim they want to fund a prescription drug program for senior citizens but they plan to raid Medicare to do it. They don't even require that such a plan be reported to the House. Any economic adver-

sity or policy miscalculation could leave the government again spending out of the trust fund surpluses, instead of adding those surpluses to the nation's pool of savings for business investment to make the economy grow. At the very worst, H. Con. Res. 83 sets us on a course of returning to deficit spending.

With the CBO reporting that its average projection error for a budget is about 0.5 percent of the GDP, or roughly \$52 billion this year and rising to around \$85 billion in 2011, the funding level for this conference agreement falls below that minimal level of security until the last two years of the ten-year budget window. Lest we forget that more than 87 percent of the projected non-Social Security, non-Medicare surplus under the conference agreement would occur in the last five years of the ten-year budget cycle. History has taught us that it is far better for our national interest to pay down debt and make our economy grow than consume surplus funds on new spending or tax cuts. If fully implemented, the Republicans use none of the on-budget surplus to pay down debt and spend a portion of the Social Security surplus for their tax cut. If history is any judge, and the Republican Majority fails to make huge discretionary spending cuts, it will spend even more of the Social Security surplus.

Mr. Speaker, this budget finances its large tax cut by assuming that non-defense appropriations will be held to unrealistically low levels over the next ten years. This budget ignores the fact that it is very unlikely that this Congress will execute the cuts prescribed under the budget. The Republican Majority claim that the funding level for all appropriated programs will be increased by about 4.0 percent. When advance appropriations made last year on a one-time-only emergency funding basis are discounted, the total overall increase is around 3.8 percent, which is just about the amount necessary to maintain purchasing power at the 2001 level. With most of the 3.8 percent increase devoted to defense, international affairs, that leaves an increase of only about 1.8 percent over the CBO baseline in 2002 for domestic discretionary programs. Among non-defense discretionary programs, most will see cuts of, on average, 1.2 percent, including the SBA, NASA, flood control, drug enforcement, alien incarceration programs and the COPS in school program. This budget does not merely limit the growth of domestic spending, as the Republican Majority asserts, it cuts domestic programs. Are the Republicans really advocating that we cut the FBI, INS or DEA?

The conference report claims to increase our bipartisan commitment to double funding at the National Institutes of Health (NIH) but it turns its back on the bipartisan commitment to double funding for the National Science Foundation. Further, the budget cuts so many health programs it will pit the NIH against such things as Community Health Centers and child and maternal health programs. But worse, Mr. Speaker, the Republican budget fails to adequately invest in education, one of the President's own priorities. This partisan budget ignores the strong bipartisan support for education funding, retreating from this commitment. This measure not only strips the \$294 billion in increased education funding provided for by the Senate, but also provides \$21 billion less education support than provided for under the President's budget. It eliminates all of the

Senate provision to increase the federal share for special education costs absorbed by local school districts, as mandated under IDEA and it fails to adequately advance the goal of improving our schools.

If the cuts provided for under H. Con. Res. 83 are made, they will hurt key domestic investments which enjoy broad support among the American people. If the cuts are not made and the large tax cut is enacted, Congress risks raiding the Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds and possibly pushing us back into deficits. I believe the Republicans know that these cuts will never occur, but they provide cover for their huge tax cut which will ultimately eat through the on-budget surplus and into the Social Security surplus at the expense of solvency and long-term economic growth.

As I have said before, logic tells us that basing a tax cut plan on ten-year revenue projections, when the CBO has only been in the business of doing such long-term projections, is playing with fire. In fact, CBO itself acknowledges that current projections may substantially overstate projected surpluses and has concluded that "the estimated surpluses could be off in one direction or the other, on average, by about \$52 billion in 2001, \$120 billion in 2002, and \$412 billion in 2006." Second, history has taught us that it is far easier to enact additional tax cuts in future years if economic projections hold up or improve, while it is far more difficult to enact tax increases or budget cuts in the future if the projections go unrealized. And, Mr. Speaker, we all know that the President will come back to Congress, after we pass this budget, and ask for billions of dollars of new spending for defense.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting this "spend today, borrow tomorrow" measure that was bound together by the Republican Majority in such a haphazard fashion, so as to leave no room for adequately funding the nation's priorities or protecting against unforeseen economic downturns. As I have said before, I support a substantial tax cut but not at the expense of hard-fought fiscal ground and long-standing domestic priorities, such as strengthening Social Security and Medicare, providing a universal prescription drug benefit, and adequately funding education and defense. Mr. Speaker, that is why I cannot support H. Con. Res. 83 and would urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting this sham budget.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the budget conference committee report. Amazingly, this proposal keeps getting worse, not better. The item before us, in order to accommodate the tax cut, does not include provisions earlier passed by the Senate for education. The \$294 billion supported by the bipartisan majority in the Senate, and that would be supported by a majority of the members in this body, is nowhere to be seen. It even does not have \$21.5 billion for education proposed by President Bush and approved by the House in March. It also provides less money than the President requested for the Ryan White AIDS Treatment Grants, Maternal and Child Care Health Block Grants, the Centers for Disease Control, and the Food and Drug Administration. This budget proposal has \$700 million less for veteran's programs in FY 2002 than the House-passed resolution and \$2.7 billion less than the Senate-passed resolution. Furthermore, at a time of energy crisis, this document does nothing to

restore the significant reductions in energy conservation proposed by the Administration. It is in short, a resolution that stands our bipartisan budget priorities on their head.

The part that is most objectionable to those of us in Oregon is the silence on where future budget cuts are going to fall. There will be a requirement for additional budget cuts of at least \$6 billion next year and more than ten times that amount over the next ten years, without a hint of where those reductions will come from. Last week the budget process fell apart after keeping the Members of this House waiting until the early hours of the morning for a vote. In part, this breakdown was less due to the two pages that were lost, and more due to the fact that this bill has not proceeded as a serious piece of bipartisan legislation. Despite the hopeful rhetoric about changing the tone in Washington from the Bush Administration, nobody had seen the resolution last week, and now what has been revealed to us leaves gaping holes in essential priorities.

What we do know is the Administration is about to unveil massive increases for defense. When coupled with the known requirement for annual emergency spending that is not accounted for in this document, the cost rises by hundreds of billions of extra dollars. Additionally, we must acknowledge the need to correct the problem of the Alternative Minimum Tax that was originally implemented to ensure the super wealthy at least paid some income tax. Instead the AMT is affecting lower income Americans with large families in ways never intended and the impact will be much worse under President Bush's proposed income tax rate reductions. Everyone in Congress knows it has to be fixed and this budget resolution ignores our duty to correct this inequity in the tax code.

Congress and the American people deserve an honest budget resolution that tells us where we want to go and how we are realistically going to get there. This proposal does neither.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this Republican budget. Unfortunately, this budget is nothing but missed opportunities and misplaced priorities.

Mr. Speaker, our nation needs a national economic strategy for economic opportunities for all Americans. We can charge boldly into the 21st Century with prosperity for all if we have the vision to see our opportunities and the courage to seize those opportunities. But this budget will squander our prosperity and set America back on a failed course.

We must invest in science and technology and innovation, but this budget cuts Research and Development. We must invest in better schools and training so we can have the greatest workforce in the world, but this budget neglects education. Some people say education is too expensive; I say it's a whole lot cheaper than ignorance. We must strengthen Social Security and reform Medicare to include a benefit for prescriptions, but this budget will raid those trust funds. We must rewrite the Farm Bill so North Carolina's farm families have an opportunity to make a living, but this budget puts agriculture under the knife. We must modernize our defenses and make America's military second to none, but this budget blows the resources we need to accomplish that mission.

Don't get me wrong: I support responsible tax relief for our working families. But this

budget will run our economy into the ditch and return us to the days of huge deficits, economic stagnation, high unemployment and out-of-control inflation. Our North Carolina values call for balanced budgets and responsible policy, but this budget sends us a on riverboat gamble with America's future. I urge its defeat.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises in strong support of the Budget Conference Report.

This Member is especially pleased with the funds proposed for agriculture. Not only does the budget agreement include \$26.3 billion for agriculture related programs in FY2001, but it also includes funds for emergency spending of \$5.5 billion in FY2001 and \$7.35 billion in FY2002. Furthermore, an additional \$66.15 billion will be held in reserve for reauthorization of farm support programs between FY2003 and FY2011. This sends a strong signal that there will be money available for farmers this year to meet emergencies and in the coming years as we develop the new farm bill. Farmers and their bankers certainly need assurance that there will be money there and these numbers demonstrate that commitment.

This Member strongly regrets that the funds originally in the conference report for the creation of a new natural disaster contingency fund within the budget were eliminated during last minute conference negotiations. Not only were there disagreements about the emergency fund between authorizers and appropriators, but there was a crucial and possibly erroneous ruling by the parliamentarian in the other body that the emergency fund would trigger a requirement for a 60-vote majority. That ruling caused the other body to oppose the creation of the funds in the conference report. While the amount of money in the emergency fund (\$5 billion) might end up being an underestimate, depending on the number and severity of natural disasters, it would have been a good start in responsibly addressing the certainty of a need for disaster assistance funding in this big and diverse nation. This Member has been a long-time supporter of the establishment of such a fund and is hopeful that it will be created as soon as possible.

The compromise includes \$1.35 trillion in tax cuts over the next 11 years including \$100 billion in an immediate tax cut "stimulus" for the current fiscal year, and it holds overall spending to a four percent increase. While the overall tax cut is less than President Bush proposed, it is still the largest tax reduction in the last 20 years. Furthermore, the budget conference report provides an historic \$2.3 trillion in public debt reduction by 2011 (the maximum that can be repaid without penalties).

Mr. Speaker, this is a good budget agreement that provides a strong framework for the future of our country. Accordingly this Member is pleased to support this common sense plan that funds our nation's top priorities, provides for the continuation of the retirement of our national debt, and which also gives tax relief to every taxpayer. At a time of actual and projected budget surpluses the American taxpayers deserve "a refund" to keep that money from being collected for dramatic increases in spending. Therefore, the tax relief offered by this agreement will help strengthen our economy, create jobs, and leaves more money in the pockets of those who earned it.

In closing Mr. Speaker, this Member urges his colleagues to support this important measure.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the \$1.35 trillion budget resolution. While I am in favor of tax relief for the American people, I do not believe relief should be accomplished through tax cuts benefiting big business and the wealthiest of Americans.

I believe that the Congress can and should pass legislation giving tax relief to the American people. That is why I have consistently voted to eliminate the death-inheritance tax and the marriage tax penalty.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress can and should give tax relief to the American people. However, any tax cut should not threaten our Social Security and Medicare programs. While we still have a surplus we should provide a prescription drug coverage paid by Medicare, an initiative the majority of Americans support. Even so, we should not support a budget and ensuring tax cut that spends expected revenue 11 years down the road. We need to have a mechanism in place to adjust the plan if revenue projections prove to be wrong.

Today I intend to vote against the Republican budget. A more realistic five-year spending bill should be put in place to fund critical programs important to the American people like Social Security, Medicare/Medicaid, national defense and other important programs. Then we should bring a tax relief package before the Congress that is realistic and that has a mechanism that directly ties tax cuts to controlled spending and the amount of revenue that will come to the federal treasury each year.

I am also troubled that this budget does nothing to ensure the solvency of Social Security, instead relying on a commission loaded down with individuals who have publicly supported the privatization of Social Security. I am adamantly opposed to investing any money intended for a secure retirement through our current Social Security system in a stock market that is increasingly more volatile.

Mr. Speaker, today we should reject this misguided budget.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 136, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 207, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 104]

YEAS—221

Aderholt	Calvert	Diaz-Balart
Akin	Camp	Doolittle
Armey	Cannon	Dreier
Bachus	Cantor	Duncan
Baker	Capito	Dunn
Ballenger	Castle	Ehlers
Barr	Chabot	Ehrlich
Bartlett	Chambliss	Emerson
Barton	Coble	English
Bereuter	Collins	Everett
Biggert	Combest	Ferguson
Bilirakis	Condit	Flake
Blunt	Cooksey	Fletcher
Boehlert	Cox	Foley
Boehner	Cramer	Fossella
Bonilla	Crane	Frelinghuysen
Bono	Crenshaw	Galleghy
Brady (TX)	Culberson	Ganske
Brown (SC)	Cunningham	Gekas
Bryant	Davis, Jo Ann	Gibbons
Burr	Davis, Tom	Gilchrist
Burton	Deal	Gillmor
Buyer	DeLay	Gilman
Callahan	DeMint	Goode

Goodlatte	Lewis (CA)
Goss	Lewis (KY)
Graham	Linder
Granger	LoBiondo
Graves	Lucas (KY)
Green (WI)	Lucas (OK)
Greenwood	Manullo
Grucci	McCrery
Gutknecht	McHugh
Hayes	McInnis
Hall (TX)	McKeon
Hansen	Mica
Hart	Miller, Gary
Hastert	Moran (KS)
Hastings (WA)	Morella
Hayworth	Myrick
Herger	Nethercutt
Hilleary	Ney
Hobson	Northup
Hoekstra	Norwood
Horn	Nussle
Hostettler	Osborne
Houghton	Ose
Hulshof	Otter
Hunter	Oxley
Hutchinson	Pence
Hyde	Peterson (PA)
Isakson	Petri
Issa	Pickering
Istook	Pitts
Jenkins	Platts
John	Pombo
Johnson (CT)	Portman
Johnson (IL)	Pryce (OH)
Johnson, Sam	Putnam
Jones (NC)	Quinn
Keller	Radanovich
Kelly	Ramstad
Kennedy (MN)	Regula
Kerns	Rehberg
King (NY)	Reynolds
Kingston	Riley
Kirk	Rogers (KY)
Knollenberg	Rogers (MI)
Kolbe	Rohrabacher
LaHood	Ros-Lehtinen
Largent	Roukema
Latham	Royce
LaTourrette	Ryan (WI)
Leach	Ryun (KS)

NAYS—207

Abercrombie	DeLauro
Ackerman	Deutsch
Allen	Dicks
Andrews	Dingell
Baca	Doggett
Baird	Dooley
Baldacci	Doyle
Baldwin	Edwards
Barcia	Engel
Barrett	Eshoo
Bass	Etheridge
Becerra	Evans
Bentsen	Farr
Berkley	Fattah
Berman	Filner
Berry	Ford
Bishop	Frank
Blagojevich	Frost
Blumenauer	Gephardt
Bonior	Gonzalez
Borski	Gordon
Boswell	Green (TX)
Boucher	Gutierrez
Boyd	Hall (OH)
Brady (PA)	Harman
Brown (FL)	Hastings (FL)
Brown (OH)	Hefley
Capps	Hill
Capuano	Hilliard
Cardin	Hinchey
Carson (IN)	Hinojosa
Carson (OK)	Hoeffel
Clay	Holden
Clayton	Holt
Clement	Honda
Clyburn	Hooley
Conyers	Hoyer
Costello	Insee
Coyne	Israel
Crowley	Jackson (IL)
Cummings	Jackson-Lee
Davis (CA)	(TX)
Davis (FL)	Jefferson
Davis (IL)	Johnson, E. B.
DeFazio	Jones (OH)
DeGette	Kanjorski
Delahunt	Kaptur

Saxton	Napolitano
Scarborough	Neal
Schaffer	Oberstar
Schrock	Obey
Sensenbrenner	Olver
Sessions	Ortiz
Shadegg	Owens
Shaw	Pallone
Shays	Pascrell
Sherwood	Pastor
Shimkus	Paul
Simmons	Payne
Simpson	Pelosi
Skeen	Peterson (MN)
Smith (MI)	Phelps
Smith (NJ)	Pomeroy
Smith (TX)	Price (NC)
Souder	Rahall
Spence	Rangel
Stearns	Reyes
Sununu	Rodriguez
Sweeney	Roemer
Tancredo	Ross
Tauzin	
Taylor (NC)	
Terry	
Thomas	
Thornberry	
Thune	
Tiahrt	
Tiberi	
Toomey	
Trafficant	
Upton	
Vitter	
Walden	
Walsh	
Wamp	
Watkins	
Watts (OK)	
Weldon (FL)	
Weldon (PA)	
Weller	
Whitfield	
Wicker	
Wilson	
Wolf	
Young (AK)	
Young (FL)	

Rothman	Stupak
Roybal-Allard	Tanner
Rush	Tauscher
Sabo	Taylor (MS)
Sanchez	Thompson (CA)
Sanders	Thompson (MS)
Sandlin	Thurman
Sawyer	Tierney
Schakowsky	Towns
Schiff	Turner
Scott	Udall (CO)
Serrano	Udall (NM)
Sherman	Velazquez
Shows	Visclosky
Skelton	Waters
Slaughter	Watt (NC)
Smith (WA)	Waxman
Snyder	Weiner
Solis	Wexler
Spratt	Woolsey
Stark	Wu
Steholm	Wynn
Strickland	

NOT VOTING—4

Cubin
Miller (FL) Rivers
Stump

□ 1402

Mr. SHERMAN changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. TOOMEY changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. STUMP. Madam Speaker, it was unfortunately not possible for me to be in Washington, D.C. today.

Had I been present and voting, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 103, the rule providing for the consideration of the Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2002 Conference Report and “yea” on rollcall No. 104, approving the Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2002 Conference Report.

COMMENDING STAFF OF COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

(Mr. NUSSLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. NUSSLE. Madam Speaker, I rise to thank the Members who supported the conference report first of all, but most especially I would like to thank the staff of the Committee on the Budget, both majority and minority, Rich Meade and Jim Bates from the majority side, Tom Kahn from the minority side, and others who worked so hard to get us to this point. It is a huge task, a huge undertaking to put all of this together in the time that is allotted. Both sides deserve a lot of credit for the work that they do.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NUSSLE. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPRATT. I simply want to underscore what my counterpart, the chairman of the committee, is saying. We do the talking; our staffs do the arduous analytical work and all the document preparation, working long, long hours to meet this peak-period requirement. They do an enormous job and do an excellent job as well on both sides.