



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 9, 2001

No. 63

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

Rabbi Ely Rosenzweig, Congregation Anshe Shalom, New Rochelle, New York, offered the following prayer:

O God, I pray that there shall come a day when each of us will know that it is not by virtue of might or power but by God's spirit that we truly lead; that we be as Moses' brother Aaron, each of us a peacemaker wherever trouble lurks and blood flows; that we love peace and pursue her in all that we do, all that we are.

I pray that we ever hear the still, small, silent voice of peace as she beckons us to ponder in her plaintive whisper: Have we not all one Father? Has not one God created us? Let us be then the noble builders of bridges and pathways to each other.

I pray that we shall know from all the beauty and grace that is America that our call to peace is for everyone everywhere. In the words of the poet, "Our country is the world and our countrymen all of mankind."

Almighty and merciful God, bless this hallowed House and all its Members and keep them well; shed thy light upon us all and show thy grace; lift thy countenance unto us and grant us that greatest and most cherished of gifts, the gift of peace, where none shall injure, none shall kill, and the land shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord.

How good and pleasant it is when we dwell, you and I, as brother and sister, in blissful, wondrous harmony.

Heenay mah tov u'mah naeem shevet achim gam yachad. God bless you and America, now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

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

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote

on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. McNULTY. 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. 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 335, nays 70, answered "present" 1, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 102]

YEAS—335

Akin	Burr	DeLauro	Gilman	Largent	Pickering
Andrews	Burton	DeMint	Gonzalez	Larson (CT)	Pitts
Army	Buyer	Deutsch	Goode	Latham	Platts
Baca	Callahan	Diaz-Balart	Goodlatte	LaTourette	Pombo
Bachus	Calvert	Doggett	Gordon	Leach	Portman
Baker	Camp	Dooley	Goss	Levin	Price (NC)
Baldacci	Cannon	Doolittle	Graham	Lewis (CA)	Pryce (OH)
Baldwin	Cantor	Doyle	Granger	Lewis (GA)	Putnam
Ballenger	Capito	Dreier	Graves	Lewis (KY)	Quinn
Barcia	Capps	Duncan	Green (TX)	Linder	Radanovich
Barr	Cardin	Dunn	Green (WI)	Lipinski	Rahall
Barrett	Carson (IN)	Edwards	Greenwood	Lofgren	Rangel
Bartlett	Carson (OK)	Ehlers	Grucci	Lowey	Regula
Bass	Castle	Ehrlich	Gutierrez	Lucas (KY)	Rehberg
Becerra	Chabot	Emerson	Hall (TX)	Lucas (OK)	Reyes
Bentsen	Chambliss	Engel	Hansen	Luther	Reynolds
Bereuter	Clayton	Eshoo	Hart	Maloney (NY)	Rodriguez
Berkley	Clement	Etheridge	Hastings (WA)	Manzullo	Roemer
Berman	Clyburn	Evans	Hayes	Markey	Rogers (KY)
Berry	Coble	Everett	Hayworth	Mascara	Rogers (MI)
Biggert	Collins	Fattah	Herger	Matheson	Rohrabacher
Bilirakis	Combest	Ferguson	Hill	Matsui	Ros-Lehtinen
Bishop	Condit	Flake	Hinojosa	McCarthy (MO)	Ross
Blagojevich	Cooksey	Fletcher	Hobson	McCarthy (NY)	Rothman
Blumenauer	Cox	Foley	Hoefel	McCrery	Roukema
Blunt	Coyne	Ford	Hoekstra	McHugh	Roybal-Allard
Boehler	Cramer	Fossella	Holden	McInnis	Royce
Boehner	Crenshaw	Frank	Holt	McIntyre	Rush
Bonilla	Cummings	Frelinghuysen	Honda	McKeon	Ryan (WI)
Bono	Cunningham	Frost	Horn	McKinney	Ryan (KS)
Boswell	Davis (CA)	Gallegly	Hostettler	Meehan	Sanchez
Boucher	Davis (FL)	Ganske	Houghton	Meek (FL)	Sanders
Boyd	Davis (IL)	Gekas	Hoyer	Meeks (NY)	Sandlin
Brady (TX)	Davis, Jo Ann	Gibbons	Hunter	Mica	Sawyer
Brown (SC)	Davis, Tom	Gilchrest	Hutchinson	Millender-	Saxton
Bryant	DeGette	Gillmor	Hyde	McDonald	Scarborough
			Hyde	Miller (FL)	Schiff
			Inslie	Miller, Gary	Schrock
			Isakson	Mink	Scott
			Israel	Mollohan	Sensenbrenner
			Issa	Moran (KS)	Serrano
			Istook	Morella	Sessions
			Jackson (IL)	Murtha	Shadegg
			Jefferson	Myrick	Shaw
			Jenkins	Nadler	Shays
			John	Neal	Sherman
			Johnson (CT)	Nethercutt	Sherwood
			Johnson (IL)	Ney	Shimkus
			Johnson, Sam	Northup	Shows
			Jones (NC)	Norwood	Simmons
			Kanjorski	Nussle	Simpson
			Kaptur	Ortiz	Skeen
			Keller	Osborne	Skelton
			Kelly	Ose	Slaughter
			Kerns	Otter	Smith (MI)
			Kildee	Owens	Smith (NJ)
			Kind (WI)	Oxley	Smith (TX)
			King (NY)	Pascarell	Smith (WA)
			Kingston	Pastor	Snyder
			Kirk	Paul	Solis
			Kleczka	Payne	Souder
			Knollenberg	Pelosi	Spence
			Kolbe	Pence	Stearns
			LaHood	Peterson (PA)	Sununu
			Lampson	Petri	Tanner
			Lantos		

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H2025

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

NAYS—70

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

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Tancredo

NOT VOTING—25

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

□ 1027

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

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. FOSSELLA led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would announce that all 1-minutes, with the exception of the introduction of the guest chaplain, will be postponed until the end of the legislative day today.

WELCOME TO RABBI ELY J. ROSENZVEIG AND HIS FAMILY

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

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

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

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

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

□ 1030

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

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

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

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

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

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 136

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 83) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as

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

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), my friend from the Committee on Rules, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

guished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1045

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1100

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This budget cuts community development block grants that would help

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1115

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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	Tauzin
Otter	Ryan (WI)	Taylor (NC)
Oxley	Ryun (KS)	Terry
Paul	Saxton	Thomas
Pence	Scarborough	Thornberry
Peterson (PA)	Schaffer	Thune
Petri	Schrock	Tiahrt
Pickering	Sensenbrenner	Tiberi
Pitts	Sessions	Toomey
Platts	Shadegg	Trafigant
Pombo	Shaw	Upton
Portman	Shays	Vitter
Pryce (OH)	Sherwood	Walden
Putnam	Shimkus	Walsh
Quinn	Simmons	Wamp
Radanovich	Simpson	Watkins
Ramstad	Skeen	Watts (OK)
Regula	Smith (MI)	Weldon (FL)
Rehberg	Smith (NJ)	Weller
Reynolds	Smith (TX)	Whitfield
Riley	Souder	Wicker
Rogers (KY)	Spence	Wilson
Rogers (MI)	Stearns	Wolf
Rohrabacher	Sununu	Young (AK)
Ros-Lehtinen	Sweeney	Young (FL)
Roukema	Tancredo	

NAYS—208

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

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
Boehrlert	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.

I think this commendation of the staff on both sides of the aisle is entirely appropriate and well in order. I thank the gentleman very much for doing so.

Mr. NUSSLE. I thank the gentleman.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NUSSLE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO REVISE REMARKS

Mr. FROST. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise my statement made on the consideration of the rule today to make it in compliance with the precedents of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 581, WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 135 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 135

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 581) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to use funds appropriated for wildland fire management in the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001, to reimburse the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service to facilitate the interagency cooperation required under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 in connection with wildland fire management. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amend-

ments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 135 is an open rule providing for consideration of the bill H.R. 581, the Wildland Fire Management Act. The rule waives section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 against consideration of the bill and provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Resources.

The rule further provides that the bill shall be open for amendment at any point and waives all points of order against the bill. Finally, the rule authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Madam Speaker, the Wildland Fire Management Act would authorize the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to use funds appropriated for wildland fire management in the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2001 to reimburse several Federal agencies for costs associated with the interagency cooperation required under the Endangered Species Act when managing wildland fires.

In response to devastating fire seasons in 1999 and 2000, Congress appropriated \$2.9 billion to reimburse funds borrowed by agencies for wildfire emergency suppression efforts, to rehabilitate and restore damaged lands and waters, to increase wildfire fighting readiness, and to provide State and local community assistance.

Subsequently, however, the U.S. Forest Service requested legislation to clarify that funds appropriated under the National Fire Plan can also be used for reviews of fire management plans required under the Endangered Species Act. Accordingly, H.R. 581 was introduced by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) in February of this year, and it was reported favorably by the Committee on Resources without amendment on March 28, 2001.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that enacting H.R. 581 would increase direct spending by \$3 million in 2001 and decrease direct spending by the same amount in 2002. Because the bill would affect direct spending, pay-as-you-go procedures would apply. Members should also be advised that the bill contains no governmental or private sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased that, consistent with the request of the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), the Committee on Rules has reported an open rule on this bill so that Members wishing to offer amendments may have every opportunity to do so.

As the fire season out West approaches, those of us who represent western States are particularly aware of the need for a coordinated Federal approach to wildfire suppression. The gentleman from Colorado's bill would certainly advance that important goal. Accordingly, I encourage my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 581.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, H.R. 581, the Wildland Fire Management Act, is a worthy legislative proposal which will facilitate Federal interagency cooperation in the control and abatement of wildland fires and fuel load reduction. The Committee on Rules has reported an open rule and Democratic members of the committee have no objections. We would like to point out, however, this noncontroversial bill could have been considered under suspension but is being brought to the floor today to serve as filler in order to give the House some business to conduct.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY), the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. HEFLEY. Madam Speaker, I stand in strong support of the rule and thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) for their work in crafting this rule.

H.R. 581 is a noncontroversial, I believe, and a nonpartisan bill that is strongly supported by the administration. It deserves our immediate consideration and support.

It is imperative, especially for those of us who represent districts in the West and Northwest, that the U.S. Forest Service be able to transfer national fire program funds as soon as possible to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service so that they can complete their consultation requirements under the Endangered Species Act. Once this work is complete, the Forest Service will have the opportunity to reduce dangerous high levels of fuel load.

I urge adoption of the rule.

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

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GREAT FALLS HISTORIC DISTRICT STUDY ACT OF 2001

Mr. HEFLEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 146) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating the Great Falls Historic District in Paterson, New Jersey, as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado for purposes of explaining the legislation.

□ 1415

Mr. HEFLEY. Madam Speaker, H.R. 146, as introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating the Great Falls Historic District in Paterson, New Jersey as a unit of the National Park Service. Designed by Alexander Hamilton and Pierre L'Enfant in 1791, the Great Falls District is one of the earliest industrial centers of America and was once considered the manufacturing center of the United States. At 77 feet, the Great Falls is the second highest waterfall on the East Coast, second only to Niagara Falls.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 146, I believe, is not controversial. It has strong support from State and local officials, the residents of Paterson and the surrounding communities, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 146.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, continuing on my reservation, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), the former mayor of Paterson, New Jersey, and a valued member of my other committee, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, first I would like to thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) for this legislation. This is very significant legislation in New Jersey and for the United States. The Great Falls Historic District possesses an historic significance that makes it an area to be preserved and treasured. I thank the gentleman for describing what this district is all about.

The Falls and the surrounding neighborhoods really represent the genesis of the American economic miracle, and increasing the presence of the National Park Service will give the area the attention and resources it rightfully needs.

These Falls represent our city, its people and all of its potential. This place can be a real destination that will create jobs, grow businesses and bring people from all over. We cannot put a velvet rope around the district. We must make it a living, breathing attraction that will celebrate our past.

In conclusion, I will steal the words of the National Park Service in the Design Guidelines created for the Great Falls Historic District in 1999. "The district bears eloquent testimony to the astounding feats of engineering and construction, to ingenious manufacturers, and to the courage, creativity and drudgery of untold lives spent within the mills. It is also about the human propensity to harness the forces of nature, to put water and gravity and stone to work. The district retains the sense of having been one large factory driven by one powerful engine, an image completely consistent with Hamilton's vision of a centralized national manufactory."

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MORELLA). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado? There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 146

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Great Falls Historic District Study Act of 2001".

SEC. 2. NATIONAL PARK SERVICE STUDY REGARDING GREAT FALLS HISTORIC DISTRICT, PATERSON, NEW JERSEY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) GREAT FALLS HISTORIC DISTRICT.—The term "Great Falls Historic District" means the Great Falls Historic District in the city of Paterson, New Jersey, established as an historic district by section 510 of the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-333; 110 Stat. 4158; 16 U.S.C. 461 note).

(2) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the National Park Service.

(b) STUDY.—As soon as practicable after funds are made available to carry out this section, the Secretary shall commence a study regarding the suitability and feasibility of further recognizing the historic and cultural significance of the lands and structures of the Great Falls Historic District through the designation of the Great Falls Historic District as a unit of the National Park System.

(c) STUDY PROCESS AND COMPLETION.—Section 8(c) of Public Law 91-383 (16 U.S.C. 1a-5(c)) shall apply to the study required by this section.

(d) SUBMISSION.—The Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report describing the results of the study.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANIMAL DISEASE RISK ASSESSMENT, PREVENTION, AND CONTROL ACT OF 2001

Mr. EVERETT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 700) to establish a Federal interagency task force for the purpose of coordinating actions to prevent the outbreak of bovine spongiform encephalopathy (commonly known as "mad cow disease") and foot-and-mouth disease in the United States, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 700

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Animal Disease Risk Assessment, Prevention, and Control Act of 2001".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) it is in the interest of the United States to maintain healthy livestock herds;

(2) managing the risks of foot and mouth disease, bovine spongiform encephalopathy, and related diseases in the United States may require billions of dollars for remedial activities by consumers, producers, and distributors of livestock, and animal, and blood products;

(3) the potential introduction of those diseases into the United States would cause devastating financial losses to—

(A) the agriculture industry and other economic sectors; and

(B) United States trade in the affected animals and animal products;

(4) foot and mouth disease is a severe and highly contagious viral infection affecting cattle, deer, goats, sheep, swine, and other animals;

(5) the most effective means of eradicating foot and mouth disease is by the slaughter of affected animals;

(6) while foot and mouth disease was eradicated in the United States in 1929, the virus could be reintroduced by—

(A) a single infected animal, an animal product, or a person carrying the virus;

(B) an act of terrorism; or

(C) other means;

(7) once introduced, foot and mouth disease can spread quickly through—

(A) exposure to aerosols from infected animals;

(B) direct contact with infected animals; and

(C) contact with contaminated feed, equipment, or humans harboring the virus or carrying the virus on their clothing;

(8) foot and mouth disease is endemic to more than 3/4 of the world and is considered

to be widespread in parts of Africa, Asia, Europe, and South America;

(9) foot and mouth disease occurs in over 7 different serotypes and 60 subtypes;

(10) as foot and mouth disease outbreaks have occurred, the United States has banned the importation of live ruminants and swine and many animal products from countries affected by foot and mouth disease;

(11) recently, the United States has implemented bans in response to outbreaks in Argentina, the European Union, and Taiwan;

(12) although United States exclusion programs have been successful at keeping foot and mouth disease out of the United States since 1929, recent outbreaks in Argentina, the European Union, and Taiwan are placing an unprecedented strain on our animal health system;

(13) bovine spongiform encephalopathy is a transmissible, neuro-degenerative disease found in cattle;

(14) in cattle with bovine spongiform encephalopathy, the active agent is found primarily in the brain and spinal cord and has not been found in commonly consumed beef products;

(15) bovine spongiform encephalopathy is thought to have an incubation period of several years but is ultimately fatal to cattle within weeks of onset of the active disease;

(16) bovine spongiform encephalopathy was first widely found in 1986 in cattle in the United Kingdom;

(17) bovine spongiform encephalopathy-carrying cattle have been found in cattle in Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, and Switzerland;

(18) cattle infected with bovine spongiform encephalopathy originating from the United Kingdom have been found and intercepted in Canada;

(19) since 1989, the Secretary of Agriculture has prohibited the importation of live grazing animals from countries where bovine spongiform encephalopathy has been found in cattle;

(20) other products derived from grazing animals, such as blood meal, bonemeal, fat, fetal bovine serum, glands, meat-and-bone meal, and offal, are prohibited from entry, except under special conditions or under permits issued by the Secretary of Agriculture for scientific or research purposes;

(21) on December 12, 1997, the Secretary of Agriculture extended those restrictions to include all countries in Europe because of concerns about widespread risk factors and inadequate surveillance for bovine spongiform encephalopathy;

(22) on December 7, 2000, the Secretary of Agriculture prohibited all imports of rendered animal protein products from Europe;

(23) Creutzfeldt-Jacob disease is a human spongiform encephalopathy;

(24) on March 20, 1996, the Spongiform Encephalopathy Advisory Committee of the United Kingdom announced the identification of 10 cases of a new variant of Creutzfeldt-Jacob disease;

(25) all 10 patients developed onsets of the disease in 1994 or 1995;

(26) scientific experts (including scientists at the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the World Health Organization) are studying the possible link (including potential routes of transmission) between bovine spongiform encephalopathy and variant Creutzfeldt-Jacob disease;

(27) from October 1996 to December 2000, 87 cases of variant Creutzfeldt-Jacob disease have been reported in the United Kingdom, 3 cases in France, and 1 case in Ireland; and

(28) to reduce the risk of human spongiform encephalopathies in the United States, the Commissioner of Food and Drugs has—

(A) banned individuals who lived in Great Britain for at least 180 days since 1980 from donating blood in the United States; and

(B) established regulations that prohibit the feeding of most animal-derived proteins to grazing animals.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to provide the people of the United States and Congress with information concerning—

(1) actions by Federal agencies to prevent foot and mouth disease, bovine spongiform encephalopathy, and related diseases;

(2) the sufficiency of legislative authority to prevent or control foot and mouth disease, bovine spongiform encephalopathy, and related diseases in the United States;

(3) the economic impacts associated with the potential introduction of foot and mouth disease, bovine spongiform encephalopathy, and related diseases into the United States; and

(4) the risks to public health from possible links between bovine spongiform encephalopathy and other spongiform encephalopathies to human illnesses.

SEC. 3. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

(a) PRELIMINARY REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the Committees and Subcommittees described in paragraph (2) a preliminary report concerning—

(A) coordinated interagency activities to assess, prevent, and control the spread of foot and mouth disease and bovine spongiform encephalopathy in the United States;

(B) sources of information from the Federal Government available to the public on foot and mouth disease and bovine spongiform encephalopathy; and

(C) any immediate needs for additional legislative authority, appropriations, or product bans to prevent the introduction of foot and mouth disease or bovine spongiform encephalopathy into the United States.

(2) SUBMISSION OF REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall submit the preliminary report to—

(A) the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives;

(B) the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate;

(C) the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(D) the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(b) FINAL REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the Committees and Subcommittees described in subsection (a)(2) a final report that—

(A) discusses the economic impacts associated with the potential introduction of foot and mouth disease, bovine spongiform encephalopathy, and related diseases into the United States;

(B) discusses the potential risks to public and animal health from foot and mouth disease, bovine spongiform encephalopathy, and related diseases; and

(C) provides recommendations to protect the health of animal herds and citizens of the United States from those risks including, if necessary, recommendations for additional legislation, appropriations, or product bans.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report shall contain—

(A) an assessment of the risks to the public presented by the potential presence of foot and mouth disease, bovine spongiform

encephalopathy, and related diseases in domestic and imported livestock, livestock and animal products, wildlife, and blood products;

(B) recommendations to reduce and manage the risks of foot and mouth disease, bovine spongiform encephalopathy, and related diseases;

(C) any plans of the Secretary to identify, prevent, and control foot and mouth disease, bovine spongiform encephalopathy, and related diseases in domestic and imported livestock, livestock products, wildlife, and blood products;

(D) a description of the incidence and prevalence of foot and mouth disease, bovine spongiform encephalopathy, variant Creutzfeldt-Jacob disease, and related diseases in other countries;

(E) a description and an analysis of the effectiveness of the measures taken to assess, prevent, and control the risks of foot and mouth disease, bovine spongiform encephalopathy, variant Creutzfeldt-Jacob disease, and related diseases in other countries;

(F) a description and an analysis of the effectiveness of the measures that the public, private, and nonprofit sectors have taken to assess, prevent, and control the risk of foot and mouth disease, bovine spongiform encephalopathy, and related diseases in the United States, including controls of ports of entry and other conveyances;

(G) a description of the measures taken to prevent and control the risk of bovine spongiform encephalopathy and variant Creutzfeldt-Jacob disease transmission through blood collection and transfusion;

(H) a description of any measures (including any planning or managerial initiatives such as interagency, intergovernmental, international, and public-private sector partnerships) that any Federal agency plans to initiate or continue to assess, prevent, and control the spread of foot and mouth disease, bovine spongiform encephalopathy, variant Creutzfeldt-Jacob disease, and related diseases in the United States and other countries;

(I) plans by Federal agencies (including the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention)—

(i) to monitor the incidence and prevalence of the transmission of foot and mouth disease, bovine spongiform encephalopathy, variant Creutzfeldt-Jacob disease, and related diseases in the United States; and

(ii) to assess the effectiveness of efforts to prevent and control the spread of foot and mouth disease, bovine spongiform encephalopathy, variant Creutzfeldt-Jacob disease, and related diseases in the United States;

(J) plans by Federal agencies (including the Agricultural Research Service, the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, and the National Institutes of Health) to carry out, in partnership with the private sector—

(i) research programs into the causes and mechanism of transmission of foot and mouth disease and bovine spongiform encephalopathy; and

(ii) diagnostic tools and preventive and therapeutic agents for foot and mouth disease, bovine spongiform encephalopathy, variant Creutzfeldt-Jacob disease, and related diseases;

(K) plans for providing appropriate compensation for affected animals in the event of the introduction of foot and mouth disease, bovine spongiform encephalopathy, or related diseases into the United States; and

(L) recommendations to Congress for legislation that will improve efforts to assess, prevent, or control the transmission of foot and mouth disease, bovine spongiform

encephalopathy, variant Creutzfeldt-Jacob disease, and related diseases in the United States and in other countries.

(C) CONSULTATION.—

(1) PRELIMINARY REPORT.—In preparing the preliminary report under subsection (a), the Secretary shall consult with—

- (A) the Secretary of the Treasury
- (B) the Secretary of Commerce;
- (C) the Secretary of State;
- (D) the Secretary of Health and Human Services;
- (E) the Secretary of Defense;
- (F) the United States Trade Representative;
- (G) the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency; and
- (H) representatives of other appropriate Federal agencies;

(2) FINAL REPORT.—In preparing the final report under subsection (b), the Secretary shall consult with—

- (A) the individuals listed in paragraph (1);
- (B) private and nonprofit sector experts in infectious disease, research, prevention, and control;
- (C) international, State, and local governmental animal health officials;
- (D) private, nonprofit, and public sector livestock experts;
- (E) representatives of blood collection and distribution entities; and
- (F) representatives of consumer and patient organizations and other interested members of the public.

Mr. STENHOLM. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill that deals with two, separate, animal health issues facing our nation. While Foot and Mouth Disease and BSE, commonly called "Mad Cow" disease, are not related, they are both concerns to agricultural producers and citizens of this Nation. We are thankful that our efforts have successfully prevented the introduction of either of these diseases into the United States and we all want to work to maintain our disease-free status.

I am hopeful that reports and the coordination encouraged by this bill will help to keep us free from both these diseases. The U.S. Department of Agriculture has done an excellent job thus far, but I hope that increased thought and coordination will help to make our efforts even better.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EVERETT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 700, the Senate bill just considered and passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MICA). Pursuant to House Resolution 135 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 581.

□ 1423

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 581) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to use funds appropriated for the wildland fire management in the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001, to reimburse the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service to facilitate the interagency cooperation required under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 in connection with wildland fire management, with Mrs. MORELLA in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Under the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) and the gentleman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY).

Mr. HEFLEY. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, I introduced H.R. 581 to assist the U.S. Forest Service in expediting the transfer of funds from the Service to other Federal agencies for critical and necessary interagency consultation activities in connection with wildland fire management.

H.R. 581 is simply a technical fix to clarify that funds appropriated in the 2001 Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act for wildland fire management may be transferred to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service to reimburse those agencies for the fuel load reduction consultation activities required by section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.

Madam Chairman, the fiscal 2001 Interior Appropriations Act appropriated \$2.9 billion towards the National Fire Plan in response to the devastating 1999 and 2000 fire seasons. The \$2.9 billion which was appropriated, which included \$1.6 billion designated as emergency contingent funding, is administered by the Department of Interior and the Forest Service. Included in the plan are funds specifically directed for reducing fuel load. However, before fuel loads can be reduced, the Forest Service must meet existing laws, including the Endangered Species Act.

Among the goals of the National Fire Plan are: to build firefighting readiness, to be better prepared to fight wildland fires; to reduce hazardous fuels, to invest in projects to reduce the fire risk; to restore fire-impacted sites, to restore landscapes damaged by fire; to protect communities, to concentrate efforts in the wildland-urban interface; and to assure accountability and track accomplishments of the plan.

Decades of excluding fire from our forests and past management practices

have drastically changed the ecological condition of western forests and rangelands and dramatically affected fire behavior. A century ago when low-intensity, high-frequency fires were commonplace, many forests were less dense and had larger, more fire-resistant trees. Over the last century, the number of trees has increased dramatically and composition of our forests has changed from primarily fire-resistant tree species to more species that are nonresistant to fire.

Madam Chairman, the fire ecologists point out the paradox in which we now find ourselves in terms of fire suppression: The more effective we become at fire suppression, the more fuels accumulate and ultimately create conditions for the occurrence of more intense fires, such as those we in the West have experienced the last 2 years.

To illustrate my point, here is a statistic to think about: In the early 1930s, the annual acreage burned by wildfires in the lower 48 States was about 40 million acres a year. By the late 1950s, we were effectively controlling fires at less than 5 million acres per year. Through the 1970s and much of the 1980s, the annual acreage burned by wildfires in the lower 48 States stayed at about the same levels, but in 1988 and again in the late 1990s we had severe seasons, burning close to 10 million acres each year.

Experts predict that future fire seasons will be similar to last year's devastation.

Reversing the effects of a century of aggressive fire suppression and past management practices will take time and money targeted to high-priority areas to protect people, communities, readily-accessible municipal watersheds, and habitat for threatened and endangered species. The most at-risk areas are those wildland-urban interface zones represented by areas with increased residential development in fire-prone areas adjacent to Federal land.

With continuing drought in the western and southern United States, we are facing the threat of another possibly horrendous and catastrophic wildfire season. It is important that H.R. 581 proceed expeditiously to launch the multiagency fire prevention initiative needed to ward off another devastating wildfire season.

The funds made available in this bill to the Fish and Wildlife Services and the National Marine Fisheries Services will enable the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management to proceed with their fire management program, as intended by the 2001 Appropriations Act. The bill will not affect other aspects of the National Fire Plan.

Lastly, Madam Chairman, H.R. 581, I do not believe, is controversial. It is nonpartisan and it is supported by the administration. It is also reported by unanimous consent from the Committee on Resources. So I would urge an aye vote on H.R. 581.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, H.R. 581 was introduced, as we heard, by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) from the Committee on Resources and our esteemed chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks, Recreation, and Public Lands.

The legislation authorizes the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to use funds appropriated for wildland fire management in the fiscal year 2001 Interior Appropriations Act to reimburse the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service for the costs of carrying out the responsibilities under the Endangered Species Act in connection with wildland fire management activities.

□ 1430

The legislation is necessary because without such reimbursement authority, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service would be required to carry out their endangered species responsibilities related to wildland fire management activities using their existing resources. The effect of this would be potentially to delay important fire management projects.

Although no hearings were held on this measure, the Committee on Resources favorably recommended the bill to the House by voice vote. The technical change made by the legislation will help facilitate completion of environmental compliance for wildland fire projects in a timely manner. I think that is something we can and should support seeing happen.

Making sure that wildland fire management activities are done in an environmentally sound manner is a key element of the national wildland fire plan. It is a policy that will yield long-term benefits for both humans and nature.

Madam Chairman, H.R. 581 is a non-controversial measure supported by all interested parties. I appreciate the leadership of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) on this matter, as well as that shown by the bill cosponsors, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL). I support the bill as well, and favor its adoption by the House today.

Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL).

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

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 581. This bill allows us to use wildland fire funds to deal with endangered species issues, and it does so in a very responsible way.

This is a win-win for everyone. It is a responsible piece of environmental legislation. The National Fire Plan will

move forward on an expedited basis, thereby protecting our communities and their watersheds. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will have the essential tools and resources to resolve issues related to overall ecosystem health.

I want to applaud the gentleman from Colorado (Chairman HEFLEY) and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN), for their hard work and leadership on this issue. I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Madam Chairman, the Wildland Fire Management Act, H.R. 581, provides the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture legal authority to use wildland fire management funds for reimbursement of costs associated with Endangered Species Act compliance.

The strategy of the National Fire Plan is to identify ecosystem health issues in a manner that protects our communities. I support the National Fire Plan and believe it is a significant step in addressing a complex problem.

To support the implementation of the National Fire Plan, the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture attempted to transfer funds to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service in support of administering the Endangered Species Act.

On December 26, 2000, however, the USDA Office of the General Council (OGC) rendered a formal opinion eliminating the use of the Economy Act as the vehicle for transferring to other agencies funds that were originally appropriated in FY 2001 to the Forest Service for ESA consultation in implementing the National Fire Plan. Thus, the wildland fire management agencies were forced to identify other alternatives to meet ESA requirements.

Moreover, on January 10, 2001, the deputy chiefs of the USDA Forest Service wrote to their field units about the importance of implementing the National Fire Plan. In the letter, they recommended the Plan be a top priority because consultation for activities such as fuels management is critical to achieving success on the ground and to the establishment of a long-term program. The letter outlined several options to keep the agency moving forward. However, there is still concern that a lack of funding for ESA consultations will slow down the approval of all wildland fire projects.

The intent of H.R. 581 is to allow the federal agencies to do their job, implement the National Fire Plan, and keep the agencies moving forward. This bill is consistent with the National Fire Plan's goal of assigning the highest priority for hazardous fuels reduction to communities at risk, readily accessible municipal watersheds, threatened and endangered species habitat, and other important local features, where conditions favor uncharacteristically intense fires.

In conclusion, the National Fire Plan is a step in the right direction. The fires of 2000 underscored the importance of pursuing an aggressive program that addresses the fuels problem by encouraging collaboration between local communities, state governments, and Tribal, and federal agencies. In fact, the Report to the President In Response to the Wildfires of 2000, issued by the Departments of Agriculture and the Interior, stated that funding would be available to support Endangered Species Act consultation work by the

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service. H.R. 581 ensures that a mechanism is in place to do just that. I therefore strongly urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

(Mr. UDALL of Colorado asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands for yielding me time.

Madam Chairman, I rise in support of this important legislation introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY). I commend the gentleman for his leadership in this regard. I also note with pride that he and I last year introduced a piece of legislation specifically targeted at the State of Colorado to deal with the red zone situation that we face there, the urban wildland interface, and my pride is because much of what is in the National Fire Plan includes some the ideas and sections of our legislation from last year.

The legislation provides that the United States Forest Service can use National Fire Plan monies to undertake Endangered Species Act studies. In the end, this will ensure that projects comply with the Endangered Species Act so we can reduce fuel loads, return our forests to a healthier condition and minimize the potential for catastrophic fire this year and in years to come.

So, in short, I urge the House to promptly pass this legislation to forestall problems and to keep the fire plan both on track and on a sound legal and environmental footing.

Madam Chairman, I thank again the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands.

Madam Chairman, an original cosponsor, I rise in support of this bill and I congratulate my colleague from Colorado, Mr. HEFLEY, for his leadership in introducing it.

This is an important bill, Mr. Speaker, but it is not complicated or controversial. It was passed by the Resources Committee by a unanimous voice vote and could well have been considered under suspension rather than being brought up under a rule.

As has already been explained, the bill deals with funds provided to the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management to implement the new national fire plan established and funded in last year's Interior appropriations bill.

The bill makes clear that fire plan funds can be transferred to the Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service.

The purpose of that is to enable those agencies to make sure the requirements of the Endangered Species Act are met in connection with fuel-reduction and other projects that are part of the fire plan.

This is completely consistent with the intent of the legislation establishing the fire plan. But the Agriculture Department's lawyers think the current wording of the legislation does not permit the transfer of funds from the Forest Service to the other agencies for that purpose.

So, the bill does not establish a new policy—it merely makes clear what was intended when the fire plan was enacted last year.

We definitely need to press forward with the important work of reducing the risk of catastrophic wildfires in the areas where our communities border on forest lands.

But it is just as important that this be done in a way that fully complies with the requirements of the Endangered Species Act and all the other environmental laws—and this bill will help make sure that occurs.

This is very significant for everyone in Colorado and in other western States.

Across Colorado—and across the west—rapid population growth means that more and more communities are pressing against and into our forest lands.

That means our state has a large “urban interface”—what in Colorado we refer to as the “red zone.” That is the area where forest fires present the greatest dangers to people’s lives and homes.

The fire plan focuses on that “urban interface,” and that is where it will be implemented through projects to reduce the danger by reducing the buildup of brush and other fuels that has resulted from policies that suppressed the normal role of fire in the ecosystem.

Of course, this danger of forest fires in the “red zone” is not new. But last year we got a wake-up call about it—and so did the rest of the county. That was what led to enactment of the fire-plan legislation.

It also was what had earlier led me to introduce a bill to address the problem in Colorado.

That bill was cosponsored by my colleague, Mr. HEFLEY, and by Representatives DEGETTE and TANCREDO as well.

Our bill had many similarities to the legislation that set up the national fire plan. But it would have applied only to Colorado—and it had some other significant differences, too.

For one thing, our bill emphasized public involvement by providing for setting up a committee—representing a broad spectrum of interests—to establish priorities for use of funds.

And our bill specifically provided that fuel-reduction projects would have to meet some essential guidelines.

Like the fire-plan legislation, our bill required compliance with the Endangered Species Act and other environmental laws.

It also specified that projects could not be performed in Congressionally-designated wilderness areas and that roadless areas would have to be protected.

And, notably, our bill included a specific limit on the size of trees that could be removed as part of a fuel-reduction project.

That idea—a cutting limit based on tree size—drew many comments from people holding differing views about the use of mechanical thinning to reduce fire risks.

Some people do not support removal of trees as big as our bill would have allowed, or perhaps of trees of any size. Others see any specific limit as both arbitrary and too restrictive.

I respect the sincerity of both those points of view. However, I think our bill struck an appropriate balance and represented a legitimate starting point for legislative action.

The bill recognized that where the risk of catastrophic wildfires comes from overly-dense vegetation, it is because of the build-up of small-sized materials.

It also reflected the fact that cutting larger trees often can lead to more severe fires, for a variety of reasons, and can also have other adverse effects.

The limit in our bill also reflected the fact that cutting larger trees is controversial—especially when the larger trees may have commercial value.

It is simple fact that some will see the inclusion of larger trees as evidence that a project ostensibly aimed at reducing the risk of fire is really intended to be a commercial undertaking, by the Forest Service and by industry.

This could lead to challenges that would unnecessarily complicate necessary projects that were otherwise not controversial.

In short, both on the scientific merits and for reasons of public acceptability, I thought—and I still think—that there should be limits on the scope of these projects, of the kind that would have been set by our bill.

That is why last year, after enactment of the legislation setting up the national fire plan, I initiated a letter—ultimately also signed by 25 other Members of the House—to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior urging that the fire plan be implemented under appropriate safeguards and conditions.

I later received a response from the Deputy Chief of the Forest Service for State and Private Forestry, stating that the Agriculture Department shares the concerns expressed in our letter and outlining how those concerns will be addressed in the implementation of the national fire plan.

At the end of my remarks, I will attach both of these letters for inclusion in the RECORD.

In conclusion, Madam Chairman, in Colorado’s “red zone” and other areas covered by the national fire plan, there are very real risks to people, property and the environment—some of them resulting from past fire-management policies.

It is important that we respond to those risks—and that is why I support the national fire plan.

But it is also important that the need to respond to those risks is not misused as a convenient rationale for projects that do not meet proper standards.

That’s why the fire-plan projects should reflect public involvement. That’s why the projects need to be based on sound science. And that’s why the projects need to be completely consistent with applicable environmental laws.

Enacting this bill will be an important step in that direction—because, as I said, the purpose of this bill is to make sure the projects comply with the Endangered Species Act.

So, I urge the House to promptly pass this legislation, to forestall problems and to keep the fire plan both on track and on a sound legal and environmental footing.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, DC, October 20, 2000.

HON. DAN GLICKMAN,

Secretary of Agriculture, Jamie L. Whitten Building, Washington, DC.

HON. BRUCE BABBITT,

Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY GLICKMAN AND SECRETARY BABBITT: As you know, the fiscal 2001 Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act provides important funding for work to restore federal lands damaged by large-scale forest fires and to lessen the risk of such

fires in the future by reducing accumulations of fuels.

We support these objectives. However, in the past there have been efforts to use the “fuel reduction” label to justify environmentally-unsound timber sales and it is very important that pursuit of restoration and fuel reduction does not weaken sound land management or the protection of the environment. So, we urge you to make sure that these activities will be subject to appropriate safeguards and conditions.

Recent events have shown the importance of a scientifically sound fuels reduction program targeted to protect communities in the wildland/urban interface. However, the relevant language in the Interior appropriations bill does not spell out adequate environmental safeguards to protect wilderness, roadless areas, old growth forests, endangered species habitat, or riparian areas. Wilderness areas should be off-limits to fuels reduction by mechanical means, and appropriate conditions should be imposed to assure that mechanical fuel-reduction projects will not adversely affect old growth forests, roadless areas, endangered species habitat, or riparian areas.

In addition, we believe direction is needed to ensure that fuels reduction projects focus on the fine and surface fuels that create the greatest fire risks. We urge that the agencies be directed to develop ecologically-sound treatment criteria with an emphasis on underbrush and small-diameter trees.

The Interior bill also includes language providing the Administration with an option to develop expedited NEPA procedures within the next 60 days. We are strongly opposed to any weakening of the current NEPA procedures and public involvement in decision-making for fuels reduction projects. We respectfully urge the Administration to not exercise this authority to expedite NEPA procedures.

We also believe the funding increase for fuels reduction should be carefully targeted to protect communities at risk from wildfire. The need for fuel reduction is greatest in those areas where homes exist within or about forested areas—the wildland/urban interface or “red zones,” and in particular in the areas closest to homes and communities. In many cases that means within 200 feet of homes or communities. We urge the Administration to prioritize emergency fuels reduction funds to support projects to reduce risks in these narrowly defined areas to the maximum extent practicable. In addition, we urge the Administration to support the Firewise program and other cooperative efforts for community protection in the wildland/urban interface.

There is a significant increase in funding for preparedness activities. We urge the Administration to make the completion of fire management plans the top priority for these funds. Currently only 5 percent of the National Forests have completed fire management plans which were mandated by the Fire Management Policy of 1995.

The Forest Service and BLM undoubtedly will be pressured to expedite fuel-reduction efforts by taking old projects, including timber sales, off the shelf regardless of whether they are environmentally sound fuels reduction projects. We urge that before funds under this program be allocated for any “old project,” the projects first be reevaluated to make sure that they are consistent with the focus on fuels reduction rather than other objectives.

We have noted with some concern that the report to the President in response to this year’s fires seems to identify “recovering some of the economic value of forest stands” as one reason for including removal of burned trees in restoration and fuel-reduction efforts. We think that salvage logging

based in part on economic considerations should remain separate from fuels reduction.

We are also concerned that funds intended to address hazardous fuels issues in western forests will be diverted to eastern forests which do not have the same ecological needs. For example, conditions in the relatively moist Southern Appalachian forests naturally limit the spread of fire. Fuel reduction bears little relevance to the decline of native forest types, which is a major threat confronting the Southern Appalachians. We urge that emergency fuels reduction funds be used in the Forest Regions that are subject to the greatest risks—principally those in western States.

On a related point, the Interior bill authorizes the Forest Service to enter into an additional 25 “end-result” stewardship contracts. The “goods-for-services” authority allows the Forest Service to trade National Forest trees for contracted services and, if not subject to appropriate restrictions, could encourage large-scale logging in conjunction with restoration projects. We urge that in the fuels-reduction program the Forest Service be directed to place priority on use of appropriated funds rather than issuance of additional stewardship contracts under the fuels-reduction program and that all agencies be required to ensure that the protections discussed above are followed in any “goods-for-services” contracts to assure that these projects remain exclusively focused on fuels reduction purposes.

Finally, we appreciate that the Administration opposed and was able to remove from the Interior bill language to set excessive targets for timber sales. However, the statement of managers in the conference report still urges the Forest Service to prepare for sale 3.6 billion board feet of timber. This would represent a significant increase in timber sales above the current level of 2.1 billion board feet, and this timber targets language is backed up by a significant increase in funding for logging. The bill contains a \$40 million increase in logging subsidies, including \$5 million earmarked specifically for the Tongass National Forest. We are very concerned that this \$40 million in additional logging subsidies could result in unsound timber sales on the National Forests. We urge that instead this unrequested increase in funding be used to mitigate environmental degradation by spending it on forest restoration through road decommissioning and obliteration.

If the fuels-reduction program is to bring real benefit, it must be implemented in a way that avoids the controversies, appeals, and litigation associated with significant increases in logging that degrade water quality and fish and wildlife habitat. We look forward to working with the Administration to avoid such results.

Sincerely,

Mark Udall, James Leach, George Miller, Cynthia McKinney, Lloyd Doggett, John Lewis, Frank Pallone, Jr., Barbara Lee, Fortney (Pete) Stark, Grace F. Napolitano, Edolphus Towns, Sam Gejdenson, Sander Levin, Bob Filner, Rush Holt, Earl Blumenauer, Bill Pascrell, Jr., Nancy Pelosi, Anna G. Eshoo, Maurice Hinchey, Sherrod Brown, Henry A. Waxman, Diana DeGette, Howard L. Berman, Ellen O. Tauscher, Michael R. McNulty.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE,

Washington, DC, February 6, 2001.

Hon. MARK UDALL,
House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office
Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN UDALL: thank you for your October 20, 2000, letter from you and

your colleagues, to former Secretary of Agriculture Dan Glickman regarding the Fiscal Year 2001 Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act.

The Department of Agriculture (USDA) shares your concerns about the implementation of the fuels reduction program. As directed in the Interior Appropriations Act, funds provided to reduce hazardous fuels will be focused in and around communities at risk. In these areas, protecting life and property from catastrophic wildfire will be the primary objective of the treatments. In complying with existing environmental laws, we will work closely with the treatments. In complying with existing environmental laws, we will work closely with the local communities to design and implement these treatments. I assure you that environmentally appropriate safeguards will be maintained throughout the planning and implementation efforts to restore lands damaged by recent wildland fires and to mitigate future wildland fire risks through fuel reduction projects.

The USDA Forest Service has developed the Cohesive Strategy, Protecting People and Sustaining Resources in Fire-Adapted Ecosystems—A Cohesive Strategy. A suite of Federal laws and regulations guide management of fire-related activities on those lands. They include the Organic Act, Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, Endangered Species Act, and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), among others, that will ensure clean air, clean water, and biodiversity in fire-adapted ecosystems. Long-term sustainability is a consistent theme embodied within these laws. The Forest Service's efforts to reduce hazardous fuels compliment long-term sustainability and will fully comply with these laws and regulations. All Forest Service activities will be in full compliance with procedures established by the Council on Environmental Quality for implementation of NEPA.

The National Fire Plan is in response to Managing the Impact of Wildfires on Communities and the Environment, A Report to the President in Response to the Wildfires of 2000, which was submitted on September 8, 2000. The Plan discusses the Forest Service's strategy to remove excessive fuel through vegetative treatments and prescribed fire in order to protect communities at risk, help prevent insect and disease damage, and generally improve overall ecosystem health and sustainability. It also discusses how the Forest Service's locally-led, integrated teams should coordinate environmental reviews and consultations, facilitate and encourage public participation, and monitor and evaluate project implementation.

The 1995 Federal Wildland Fire Policy and Program Review reinforces the Forest Service's efforts to utilize the best available science that incorporates the role of fire in land, resource and fire management planning. Recently, the Agency requested a review of the 1995 Policy. The review found the basic policy sound. The review group made 11 recommendations, which were accepted by the Agency, on ecosystem sustainability, restoration, science, communication, and evaluation. As the Forest Service continues to implement this Policy, planning efforts will ensure that full environmental safeguards, as required by laws and policies, are more than adequate to address all concerns raised in your letter.

Thank you again for your thoughtful letter and expressing your concerns. Identical letters will be sent to your colleagues. I appreciate your continued support for our forest health and restoration program. Please do

not hesitate to contact me at (202) 205-1657, if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. RAINS,
Deputy Chief,
State and Private Forestry.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HEFLEY. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Chairman, I do have an amendment at the desk. At the conclusion of debate, I will just offer that amendment.

Madam Chairman, this is basically a buy-American amendment. I realize much of this money is to be transferred, but some of it will end up trickling down to make a purchase or an expendable consumption.

I want to commend this chairman and the ranking gentlewoman handling this bill and thank them for accommodating my amendment.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Wildland Fire Management Act, which would make a small technical correction that would free up resources for fighting wildfires.

When you drive from the northern end of my district in Florida to the southern end, you pass through an area that still bears the scars of wildfires from only a few years ago. Those fires devastated families, businesses, and farms. And, while we can rebuild our facilities and buy new belongings, there's a toll exacted on the people whose lives are disrupted that can never be quantified or reimbursed.

Right now there are wildfires raging nearby in Florida, and there is a serious drought across the state. The concern my constituents feel is palpable. And, it is precisely because we in Florida's Fourth District understand the destruction that wildfires can cause that I support the swift passage of this legislation, which merely makes a technical correction necessary to keep the fire management tools for which Congress has already appropriated funding from drying up.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 581.

Mr. HEFLEY. Madam Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of H.R. 581 is as follows:

H.R. 581

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. USE OF WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT FUNDS TO FACILITATE COMPLIANCE WITH ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT CONSULTATION REQUIREMENTS.

The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may use funds appropriated for wildland fire management in the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001 (Public Law 106-291; 114 Stat. 922), to reimburse the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and

the National Marine Fisheries Service for the costs of carrying out their responsibilities under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) to consult and conference, as required by section 7 of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1536), in connection with wildland fire management activities.

The CHAIRMAN. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

Are there any amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

Add at the end of the following new section:
SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS; REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE.

(a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized to be purchased using funds provided under section 1, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving the funds should, in expending the funds, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(b) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF FUNDS.—In expending funds provided under section 1, the head of each Federal agency receiving such funds shall provide to each recipient of the funds a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

(c) NOTICE OF REPORT.—Any entity which receives funds under section 1 shall report any expenditures on foreign-made items to the Congress within 180 days of the expenditure.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Chairman, I would like to commend the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking gentlewoman on our side for their work on the bill. It is a good bill. Some of this money may trickle down to be used for the purchasing of some equipment and certainly some services.

Just briefly, I would like to say our last month's trade deficit was \$33 billion. Our trade deficit projected for this year will exceed \$300 billion. China is now taking \$100 billion a year out of our economy. Madam Chairman, even our trade deficit bears a label "made in China."

This is a very simple amendment that says any use of these funds, we recommend where possible, services and goods, if purchased, give the American worker and the American companies a tumble.

Mr. HEFLEY. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HEFLEY. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, I am supportive of this amendment. I would like to commend the gentleman from Ohio for keeping our feet to the fire when it comes to this buy-American theme that the gentleman has been the leader in Congress on. I think in the appro-

priations bill where the money is appropriated, the gentleman has gotten the amendment in last year there, so we have it there. We have it in the authorization side. I think both are good, and I support the amendment.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment as well.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Chairman, I move the question on the amendment, and yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments?

If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MICA) having assumed the chair, Mrs. MORELLA, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 581) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to use funds appropriated for wildland fire management in the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001, to reimburse the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service to facilitate the interagency cooperation required under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 in connection with wildland fire management, pursuant to House Resolution 135, she reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 581 and H. Con. Res. 83.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain one-minute speeches.

CUBAN MUNICIPIOS

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, fleeing the repressive communist regime that took the political and military power in Cuba on January 1, 1959, Cuban nationals started to arrive in the U.S. for freedom and democracy. The Cuban diaspora had to face the hardships of their new lives.

But despite their difficulties, the exiled Cuban-Americans succeeded in preserving their cultural heritage. They never failed to dedicate time to promote liberty for the land they had left behind. They initiated ways to help their homeland regain its freedom.

In the early 1960s, the Cuban exile community regrouped by "Municipios," or cities from which they originated. The Municipios formed the Municipios de Cuba en el Exilio, the Cuban Municipalities in Exile, that became the largest Cuban organization outside of the island.

Undertaking numerous actions to advance the cause of democracy, freedom and human rights in Cuba, the Municipios also participate actively in projects aimed at improving mutual understanding in South Florida and beyond.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate all of the Municipio members for helping to advance the cause of freedom and democracy in my native Cuba.

GARY YOUMANS, NATIONAL FINANCIAL SERVICES ADVOCATE OF THE YEAR

(Mr. ISSA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Gary Youmans, a constituent of mine from Fallbrook, California. Mr. Youmans has been named National Financial Services Advocate of the Year by the U.S. Small Business Administration.

This prestigious award recognizes Mr. Youmans for his continued service to small businesses and his effort to encourage the flow of investment capital to small ventures.

I would like to take a moment to describe some of the many contributions that Mr. Youmans has made to advance the interests of small businesses.

In 1991, Mr. Youmans started with Community National Bank and, in 8 years, established an SBA loan department ranked in the top 25 banks nationwide in overall lending. For over 20 years, he has been involved with SCORE, a volunteer business consulting counseling program. He is also a founding director and original board member of the National Association of Government Guaranteed Lenders, an organization created to represent the interests of the small businesses lending community, who utilize SBA and

other government guaranteed programs.

In San Diego, Mr. Youmans organized a consortium of 11 lenders of the Greater San Diego Chamber of Commerce to financially support the "Small Business Today" page that appears monthly on the San Diego Union Tribune. In addition to all of his business-related service, he also finds time to volunteer at a local church and the Boy Scouts of America.

□ 1445

WOMEN'S HEALTH OFFICE ACT OF 2001

(Mrs. MORELLA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, this week all around the country Americans are preparing for a time-honored tradition. This tradition is as apple pie as America; it is what we have come to know as Mother's Day.

Mother's Day is not just a day when we honor mothers, we also honor our wives who are mothers, as well as our sisters, our aunts. It is indeed a day that honors women.

Mr. Speaker, I too would like to honor women through our Mother's Day tradition. I would like to raise awareness and promote the health of American women, an important issue.

As my colleagues may know, for years the National Institutes of Health, our Nation's premier medical research institute, ignored, maybe inadvertently, the health concerns of women; and in 1989 we had a report issued by the General Accounting Office that reflected that. A year later, in 1990, we established the Office of Research on Women's Health. Since that time, we have made great strides in women's health research, but we still must be vigilant and must address the issues that are not receiving the public attention and research priority that they deserve.

That is why today I have introduced legislation that can serve as the catalyst to advance women's health. It is called the Women's Health Office Act of 2001. It will provide for permanent authorization of offices of women's health in five Federal agencies: Health and Human Services, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Agency for Health Care Research and Quality, Health Resources and Services Administration, and the Food and Drug Administration.

The bill has 28 original cosponsors from both sides of the aisle. I hope that all will join in sponsoring this important legislation.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MICA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the fol-

lowing Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HINCHEY, addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ENVIRONMENTAL EXTREMISM THREATENS U.S. ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MORELLA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, yesterday, I read one news item and heard another, both of which caused me great concern. One was the headline in the Knoxville News-Sentinel which said, "Tennessee Economic Outlook Grim."

Now, Tennessee has become one of the most popular places to move to in the whole country. Also, our economy is very diversified and not overly dependent on two or three big-ticket items and, thus, not as subject to the boom-and-bust cycle seen in some other places. So if Tennessee's economic outlook is grim, it causes me great concern about the economy in the Nation as a whole.

The second item was a report on a national news cast that said Dell Computer and some other leading companies were withdrawing job offers previously made to people about to graduate from college. The report said that Dell was announcing additional layoffs which will soon total about 6,000, or 10 percent of their workforce, in addition to the withdrawn job offers.

Over the years, I have had many parents and grandparents bring their children or grandchildren who have graduated from college to me for help in getting jobs. For the most part, they are good-looking young people and have made very good grades, but who are unable to find jobs. Many young people are going to graduate schools today because they cannot find good jobs with just a bachelor's degree, as in the past. Also, many young people are

majoring in subjects in which there are almost no jobs. Colleges and universities cannot discourage people from majoring in some subject where the job prospects are poor because they would make the professors of those subjects very angry. But it is really sad when someone spends years in college and cannot find a job.

Also, some universities are encouraging students to incur huge student loans which they cannot then repay. I remember last year reading in the Washington Times about the glut of Ph.D.s. The story told of one man who had gotten a doctorate in English and had sent out almost 400 resumes and got only one job offer for a job he really did not want.

There are far too many lawyers. We always read about what the top graduates from the top schools are getting. The reality is that many law school graduates cannot find jobs or end up making less than they would if they managed a McDonald's or drove a truck.

I was visited recently by members of the Tennessee Hospital Association. Their main problem is a severe shortage of nurses. Nursing is a great profession to go into at this time. But I strongly encourage all young people to check out the job prospects before they spend a small fortune and years of their lives getting a degree or even degrees that are almost meaningless.

The main thing, though, that is going to cause our economy real trouble if we do not wake up is the energy crisis. We have wealthy environmental extremists all over this country that protest anytime anyone wants to drill for any oil, dig for any coal, produce any natural gas or cut any trees. Bill Bryson, in his book "A Walk in the Hoods" about hiking the Appalachian Trail, mentions that New England was once only 40 percent in forest land, while today it is almost 70 percent covered by forests. My own State of Tennessee is half in forests now, 50 percent, compared to only 36 percent in 1950.

The amount of forest land has gone way up in the last 50 years; yet the children in our schools have been so brainwashed in recent years by extreme left-wing environmentalists. I am sure almost none of them would answer correctly if asked if the forest land had gone up over the last half century. The Sierra Club and some other environmental groups have gone so far to the left in recent years they are making socialists look conservative.

Some wonder why gas is going toward \$3 a gallon, as many are predicting, and why utility bills are going way up. Well, it is primarily because rich, yuppie environmentalists are slowly but surely shutting this country down economically. They may not be hurt when gas and utility bills go way up, but millions of lower-income and middle-income people are. Jobs are destroyed and prices go up when we stop or delay for years the production of

any energy or even many other forms of production in this country.

We have closed half of our oil refineries since 1980. We now have to import most of our oil. We are now cutting only one-seventh of the new growth in our national forests each year. Environmentalists pushed for it and won and passed a law in the mid-1980s saying we would only cut 80 percent of the new growth. But they always demand more, and they continually have to exaggerate the problems or their contributions will dry up.

East Tennessee had 157 small coal companies in the late 1970s. Now there are none due to environmental extremism. Former President Clinton locked up 213 trillion cubic feet of natural gas just before he left office. Now the mayor of the small town of Englewood, Tennessee, tells me he has senior citizens in his town who are having to choose between eating or paying their utility bills. One Illinois water district said its water bills would have to go up \$72 a month to achieve the unrealistic Clinton standards on arsenic levels; yet even at the present safe levels, people would have to drink water full-time for their entire lives to run even a minute, minuscule risk of cancer from the 50-parts-per-billion standard now in effect. All of the coal, oil, lumber, and natural gas companies we have shut down or greatly restricted used to hire many college graduates and other workers.

When we drive up energy costs, we harm almost all companies and individuals. College graduates cannot find jobs at the very time prices for everything are going way up.

Madam Speaker, if we do not soon stop this extremism and bring some balance and moderation back into our environmental policies, many more college graduates will be unable to find jobs and millions of lower- and middle-income people will suffer greatly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE GEORGE MCGOVERN-ROBERT DOLE INTERNATIONAL FOOD FOR EDUCATION AND CHILD NUTRITION ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, last Thursday was a remarkable day. That morning, the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON) and I joined a broad, bipartisan coalition of Members from the House and the Senate in introducing landmark legislation to end hunger among the world's children in our lifetimes.

In a time when rancor and bitterness often characterize business in the Congress, we have come together around a vision for the future, a future where every child receives at least one nutritious meal a day and that meal is served in a school setting.

I want to commend my colleagues who join the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON) and me in introducing H.R. 1700: the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JOHNSON), the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT), the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BARRETT), and the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN).

Our bill is called the George McGovern-Robert Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Act of 2001. It is named after two great men who, in their time together in the Senate, spear-headed bipartisan legislation to create our own school lunch, school breakfast and WIC programs here in the United States. Now they have called upon this Congress and this administration to duplicate those actions worldwide.

Our bill will provide long-term, reliable funding to purchase U.S. commodities in order to provide millions of hungry children around the world with a school breakfast or a school lunch or both.

Madam Speaker, over 300 million of the world's children are hungry. About 130 million of these children do not go to school, and about 60 percent of those are girls.

Isolated programs around the world have demonstrated that more families send their children to school, including the girls, when a meal is provided. In fact, in many cases, enrollment doubles within 1 or 2 years. The children become more alert and capable of learning with a meal in their bellies; and test scores improve, attendance increases, more children graduate, and dropout rates decline.

For just 10 cents a day for each meal, we can feed a hungry child and help that child learn. With what we pay for a Big Mac, fries, and a soft drink, we could afford to feed two classrooms of kids in Ghana or Nepal. Hands down, education is the best way to improve people's lives. Education reduces disease rates, increases economic activity, reduces the birth rate, and strengthens communities; and the best way to get a child into school is to have a nutritious meal waiting for them.

These children will grow up to be the teachers, the more productive farmers, the bankers, the small business owners, and the leaders of their countries. They

will also grow up to be the new consumers of American goods and services. In the meantime, our farmers, food processors, transportation industry, ports and maritime shipping benefit from the purchases and shipment of this food aid.

This program will succeed because its scale is large, its vision is long-term, and its approach is multilateral. It will succeed because this will not just be America going it alone. We call on every country that can step up to the plate to do just that. It will succeed because we will not take money away from existing food and development programs. We need those programs to address our other long-term development priorities.

So much is already in place to move ahead with this initiative. We already have successful partnerships with U.S. private and voluntary organizations to carry out the programs on the ground. We already have relationships with international food and education agencies such as the World Food Program and UNICEF to help us coordinate with other countries; and we already have a successful history with our farmers in providing food aid.

Quite frankly, we have the resources to eliminate hunger among the world's children and get them into school. We do not need to raise taxes; we do not need to cut any domestic programs. We just need to get to work. The only thing that could stand in our way is the lack of political will.

□ 1500

By introducing H.R. 1700, we have shown the world that in this Congress of the United States that the political will could be mustered.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to join the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON) and me in support of this bill. We can help end hunger in our lifetime.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following for the RECORD:

THE MCGOVERN-EMERSON BILL BUILDS UPON AND ENHANCES THE GLOBAL FOOD FOR EDUCATION INITIATIVE PILOT PROGRAM

On December 28, 2000, President Clinton formally announced the launching of a \$300 million pilot program authorizing 630,000 metric tons in commodity purchases to provide hungry children in developing countries at least one nutritious meal each day in a school setting. Inspired by a proposal put forward by Ambassador George McGovern and Senator Bob Dole, the Global Food for Education Initiative pilot program, administered through the U.S. Department of Agriculture, will reach approximately 9 million children through 49 projects in 38 countries.

Representatives Jim McGovern (D-MA) and Jo Ann Emerson (R-MO) are introducing legislation—the George McGovern-Robert Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Act of 2001—that builds upon and enhances the program initiated by the pilot program.

Makes the Global Food for Education Initiative a permanently-established program with funding consistent with the proposal put forward by Ambassador McGovern and Senator Dole: \$300 million beginning in fiscal year 2002 and increasing to \$750 million fiscal year 2004.

Adds a Global WIC program, as originally envisioned by Ambassador McGovern and Senator Dole, beginning with \$50 million in fiscal year 2002 and increasing to \$250 million by fiscal year 2004.

Ensures that any commodity that would enhance the effectiveness of school feeding programs may be designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as eligible for purchase (e.g. lentils, beans, etc.)

Provides for transportation of commodities to storage and distribution sites.

Provides for purchase of commodities in non-surplus years.

Allows the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) at the U.S. Department of Agriculture to provide technical assistance and advice to recipient countries and to other USDA departments on how to establish and carry out effective school feeding programs.

Allows for financial assistance to be made available to agencies and organizations for itemized administrative costs and to undertake activities that enhance the effectiveness of these programs (e.g., training of cooks, establishing and equipping school kitchens, holding community workshops to inform families that a school feeding program has begun and the benefits of such a program, etc.).

Allows for the monetization of commodities to ensure the effectiveness, longevity and self-sustainability of these programs (e.g. purchase of local foods to round out nutritional balance of meals, helping communities establish a pre-school or school feeding program, expanding facilities as successful programs attract and maintain more children as students, etc.)

Provides for interagency coordination and reimbursement to relevant federal agencies, such as the U.S. Agency for International Development, for activities related to implementing the program (e.g. technical assistance, monitoring in the field, evaluation, auditing, etc.). This is especially important in countries where USAID has mission staff but USDA does not.

Calls upon the President to ensure multi-lateral involvement in this global effort, as well as engaging private sector and foundation support, and to report annually to Congress on progress in these efforts.

SUPPORT FOR THE GEORGE MCGOVERN-ROBERT DOLE INTERNATIONAL FOOD FOR EDUCATION AND CHILD NUTRITION ACT OF 2001

Academy for Educational Development
ACDIVOCA
Adventive Development & Relief Agency International
American Farm Bureau Federation
American Soybean Association
American School Food Service Association
Archer Daniels Midland/ADM Milling Co.
Bartlett Milling Company
Bread for the World
Breedlove Dehydrated Foods
Bunge Lauhoff/Milling Division
Cargill Foods/Flour Milling
Catholic Relief Services
Cereal Food Processors, Inc.
Coalition for Food Aid
ConAgra Grain Processing Company
Counterpart International
Didion Milling, Inc.
Friends of the World Food Program
International Partnership for Human Development
International Orthodox Christian Charities
Land O' Lakes, Inc.
Mercy USA
National Association of Wheat Growers
National Corn Growers Association
National Farmers Union
National Pork Producers Council
North American Millers' Association

Opportunities Industrialization Centers International.
Project Concern International
Save the Children
USA Rice Federation
U.S. Rice Producers Association
World Food Program
World Share

ASFSA SUPPORTS GLOBAL MEALS FOR EDUCATION INITIATIVE

ALEXANDRIA, VA (May 3, 2001)—The American School Food Service Association (ASFSA) is excited and proud to lend its support to the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Act of 2001 that is being introduced today. It is our hope that Congress will quickly approve this legislation so that this program can continue helping needy children throughout the world.

"The global meals initiative is bringing the success and know-how of this country's school breakfast and lunch programs to poor school children around the world," said ASFSA President Marilyn Hurt, SFNS. "Further, providing school meals in poor countries gives children extra incentive to attend school and get the education they need."

An estimated 300 million children worldwide, most of them female, either do not attend school or do not receive a meal at school. Of that total, approximately 170 million children do attend school but are not fed at school. The United Nations' World Food Programme (WFP), which has been addressing these problems for years, uses food to entice children to school, which in turn helps improve literacy, break the cycle of poverty, and reduce pregnancies among school-age girls. Last year, WFP fed more than 12 million school children in 54 countries.

Former U.S. Senators George McGovern and Robert Dole have played a leading role in advocating for an international school lunch program to spread the benefits enjoyed by American children worldwide. Last December, the White House authorized \$300 million to help fund school feeding projects in poor nations. Of that amount, \$140 million will go to WFP to expand existing efforts and develop new school meal programs in 23 countries.

"By itself, feeding poor and hungry children would seem like a moral imperative to many," Hurt said. "But when you learn of the strong linkage between nutrition, learning and the positive impact of school attendance on early pregnancy and child mortality rates, it becomes even more clear that this initiative is worthwhile in countless ways."

ASFSA is a national, non-profit professional organization representing more than 58,000 members who provide high-quality, low-cost meals to students across the country. Founded in 1946, ASFSA is the only association devoted exclusively to protecting and enhancing children's health and well-being through school meals and sound nutrition education.

USA RICE SUPPORTS INTERNATIONAL FOOD FOR EDUCATION BILL

FUNDING FOR NEEDY OVERSEAS CHILDREN ALSO A CRITICAL FOOD AID PROGRAM FOR U.S. RICE

Why Is the George McGovern-Robert Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Act of 2001 important to the rice industry when there are other food aid programs?

The International Food for Education bill is designed to target commodities and resources directly to the beneficiaries, needy children. At the same time, this unique program provides a new outlet for U.S. rice movement, a commodity particularly suited

for school feeding. Rice is ready to eat with minimal preparation, and is easy to transport and store. It provides a complete protein when combined with pulses such as peas.

Getting U.S. rice to needy children should not be dependent on the unpredictability of surplus designation. The International Food for Education bill secures permanent funding under Section 416(b) authority, as well as the inclusion of non-surplus commodities. This allows the rice industry to work closely with USDA and private voluntary organizations to find consistent, ongoing uses for rice in feeding and monetization projects, which helps to stabilize market conditions in the United States.

Overall, food aid funding has declined significantly over the last 10 years. The International Food for Education bill will assist the U.S. rice industry in maintaining rice food aid tonnage supply to meet overseas demand, and will generate important economic activity in local communities here in the United States.

Why are food aid programs like International Food for Education so important to the U.S. rice industry?

The movement of food aid tonnage is important to the rice industry because we produce more rice than can be consumed on the domestic market. 40-60 percent of the U.S. rice crop is exported, and up to 20 percent of this is in the form of food aid. Food Aid means export opportunity for the U.S. rice market as it faces increased production costs, extremely low prices, competition from low-price foreign competitors, and export demand restricted by trade barriers and unilateral sanctions.

Last year the movement of rice food aid (9 million hundredweight) accounted for 1,200 jobs, and created an influx of millions of dollars to local economies in terms of labor hours, utilization of equipment and services, and investment in the rice industry infrastructure.

Food aid serves as a long-term market development tool for the U.S. rice industry as well as a humanitarian effort. USA Rice continually seeks new outlets for U.S. rice. Food aid movement allows U.S. rice to enter developing countries that cannot currently afford to buy high-quality U.S. product. Introducing U.S. rice to consumers and traders in recipient countries allows commercial trade to develop when economic conditions improve.

LAND O'LAKES, INC.,

Arden Hills, MN, May 3, 2001.

Hon. JAMES P. MCGOVERN,
House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. JO ANN EMERSON,
House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES MCGOVERN AND EMERSON: Land O'Lakes commends you for taking the lead in introducing, "The George McGovern-Robert Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Act of 2000". This legislation will codify as an enduring program the feeding of many hungry school children in developing countries. At the same time this activity assists U.S. farmers through the removal of excess stocks. Utilizing U.S. commodities in this program allows our farmers to operate in a market environment that is more balanced rather than the current situation that is characterized by burdensome levels of carry-over stocks.

International child feeding programs provide increased nutrition resulting in increased attendance at school. As a result, more children participate in the educational system and prepare themselves to be skilled participants in today's global economy. Furthermore, feeding children at school also

provides them the nourishment to improve their cognitive ability so that they also will retain the knowledge imparted during the time that they spend in the classroom. The long-term results will be: (a) to enable educated people to rise out of poverty, (b) to increase the education and earning capacity for girls providing the means to reduce the incidence of exploitation of women; and, (c) to improve the quality of life for millions of people in developing countries around the world.

The specific elements of this legislation that Land O'Lakes is particularly supportive of include: 1. Making the recently announced Global Food for Education Initiative pilot program a permanently funded program. 2. Encouraging private sector involvement in the delivery of programs under this authority. 3. Directing the Commodity Credit Corporation to devote \$600 million in Fiscal Year 2002 and \$750 million in succeeding fiscal years to establish preschool and school feeding programs and \$100 million in fiscal Year 2002 and \$250 million in succeeding fiscal years for maternal and infant health and feeding programs.

Land O'Lakes is currently participating in school feeding programs through the 416(b) allocations in Indonesia. Working in partnership with the Tetra Pak Company, we provide 450,000 children in 3,000 primary schools with a long-shelf life milk drink and fortified biscuit three times a week.

Already we have achieved remarkable results. The Ministry of Education is reporting marked increases in school attendance rates, especially by girls. There is also evidence of significant improvement in the health and stamina of children receiving the nutritious products they consume at school. For too many of the recipient children, those servings are their predominant source of vitamins and protein.

Land O'Lakes was also gratified that it was selected to implement similar programs in Bangladesh and Vietnam as part of the Global School for Education Initiative pilot program announced in December 2000. Land O'Lakes will work with Tetra Pak to provide over 1.5 million school children with the same combination of a milk beverage and snack three days per week. These programs require considerable collaboration with the local processing industry, the Ministry of Education, and strong local NGO's to monitor the distribution of product and consumption by students.

Our private sector team's approach to deliver low cost, industry-enhancing, sustainable school feeding programs combines Tetra Pak's 40 year international school feeding expertise with Land O'Lakes 20-year history of international economic development programs. We believe that this unique approach will create immediate nutritional benefits for innumerable children. Moreover, this program increases capacity in developing countries by assisting the local dairy and food industry to become more sustainable through commercial partnerships.

It is important to note that this program performs a long-term market development function for US commodities. Students are being introduced to dairy products during their formative years, which is the most effective time to develop tastes and preferences and create millions of future consumers. Furthermore, important linkages are established among private sector firms that may form the foundation for future commerce and investment that will benefit US cooperatives and agribusinesses as the move toward increased globalization presses forward.

The George McGovern-Robert Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Act of 2001 will provide valuable nutri-

tional and educational assistance to countless children around the world while supporting American agriculture. Land O'Lakes supports the enactment of legislation to create a permanent global school feeding program and is ready to assist in this endeavor.

I offer our support in moving the bill towards enactment, and I look forward to working with you in this regard. Members of the Land O'Lakes International Division staff, including myself, are available to meet with you to discuss the necessary steps for moving this bill forward. In addition, Land O'Lakes will gladly testify in support of the legislation in hearings held by any of the committees with jurisdiction over this matter.

Thank you for your leadership in making the international school feeding program a permanent means of improving the lives of needy children around the world. Please let me know when and how we can help to secure passage of this legislation.

Sincerely,

THOMAS A. VERDOORN,
*Vice President, International
and Dairy Proteins.*

REMARKS OF KENNETH HACKETT, EXECUTIVE
DIRECTOR, CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES

It is a pleasure to be here today with these distinguished guests and with the Senators and Members of Congress. You have taken the bold, first steps to turn concept into legislation in a hope that millions of young lives can be improved. Today, I am speaking on behalf of 13 private voluntary organizations (PVOs) that are members of the Coalition for Food Aid. As US charitable organizations and cooperatives, we draw our support from tens of millions of Americans.

We are very pleased that the issues of child nutrition and education are the focus of this tremendous level of bipartisan support in Congress.

Starting over half a century ago, in a true public-private partnership, the US has provided over 60 million metric tons of food aid through PVOs to meet disaster and human development needs. PVOs have implemented pre-school, primary-school and mother-child health programs in poor communities throughout the world. PVO participation has been critical to changing lives, assuring program accountability, and demonstrating the effectiveness of American food aid. We will build on that experience in managing and implementing this wonderful program.

But, achieving educational and nutritional goals among the world's poorest communities takes more than just handing out food. Both bills recognize this by providing funds directly, and through commodity sales, to support not only the distribution of food but also the necessary educational and health activities. These activities include providing books, teacher training, micronutrient supplements, and take home food rations—particularly to encourage girls attendance in school.

We see two critical issues that need watchful attention as these bills progress through the legislative process: 1. PVOs must continue to have direct partnerships, as we do in the other food programs, with our Government in the implementation of this legislation. This should include substantial involvement in the decision-making processes relative to implementation. 2. The Food for Education and Child Nutrition program should be an addition to other, well-established and successful food aid programs, including PL 480 Title II and Food for Progress.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the Food for Education and Child Nutrition bills.

[From the Washington Post, May 1, 2001]

(By George McGovern and Robert Dole)

ONE LUNCH AT A TIME

In the summer of 1968, CBS television broadcast a powerful hour-long documentary titled "Hunger: USA." The cameras peered into the dismal pockets of hunger and misery populated by poor American families. Hollow cheeks and rickety legs plagued children and adults alike.

The most moving scene was filmed in a school where all students—even those who were too poor to pay for a meal—were required to go to the cafeteria at lunchtime. One 9- or 10-year-old boy was asked how he felt standing at the rear of the room watching his better-off classmates eat. Lowering his head, the boy confessed softly, "I'm ashamed."

Thirty years later, a child going hungry in an American school is practically unheard of. That's because of the overwhelming success of bipartisan legislation we sponsored in the 1970s, while we were both U.S. senators, which ensures a nutritious meal at school for all children, including America's poorest. While hunger has not yet been eradicated in the United States, the lives of a whole generation of American schoolchildren have been improved thanks to that program.

Now we have the opportunity to reach an even higher goal: to implement a similar plan for the 300 million poor children in the world who either receive no meal at school or do not even attend class.

Once again we have jointly made a proposal, this time to establish a global school feeding program. It is currently being discussed among Washington policymakers and will soon be introduced in Congress. Building on a pilot program initiated this year, the bill commits an annual amount of American agricultural surpluses to provide nutritious meals to already enrolled students and to attract poorer children to school.

Studies show that when food is provided at schools in the developing world, attendance often doubles within a year, and within two years, academic performance can improve by as much as 40 percent. Students remain in school longer, and more of them graduate. Long-term studies indicate that increased literacy rates among girls and women mean they have fewer children. Of the estimated 130 million children who currently do not attend school, 60 percent are girls.

We are not talking about ordinary charity. Feeding children at school yields tangible results in their lives as well as long-term benefits for society as a whole. And in contrast to questionable mega-projects for development school feeding focuses on the individual child. Reducing children's hunger and improving their educational opportunities creates the human infrastructure needed by nations if they are to prosper and become self-reliant.

This global challenge can once again be met in the spirit of bipartisanship. By committing annual funds for a global school lunch program, we will not only dramatically improve the lives and futures of millions of poor children. We will also be helping out American farmers by increasing purchases of surplus food commodities.

To use these surpluses, especially in periods when prices are down, strengthens our farmers' markets and takes some of the burden off storage capacities or selling surpluses off at rock-bottom prices. Overseas shipments of U.S. agricultural products also generate business for American processors, packers, shippers, railroads, stevedores and ocean carriers.

Start-up costs to cover the first two years of a global program would be about \$3 billion. As the leader of the effort, the U.S. government should commit half of that amount,

the bulk of it in purchased surplus commodities.

As the program grows and more students enroll in participating schools, costs will increase, but it is hoped and expected that other countries will join in to help. Discussions with other governments have already begun. Rich nations that do not have farm surpluses could contribute cash, shipping, personnel, utensils and other educational inputs. Government costs could be further reduced or supplemented with contributions from private foundations, corporations, labor unions and individuals.

In order for the program to be sustainable, the benefiting governments should be expected to take over financing within five to 10 years. In the meantime, the initiative would be under the instructional and monitoring eyes of the World Food Program, which has nearly 40 years of school feeding experience. Working with other charities and aid groups, WFP can ensure that the other necessary aspects such as teacher training, sanitation and health inputs are coordinated.

In an era of cynicism and weariness about third World problems, using food surpluses to feed and help educate poor children may seem like a surprisingly simple way to make an impact. But a hot meal to a poor student today is key to helping him or her become a literate, self-reliant adult tomorrow. This could become the first generation in human history that is finally free from the scourge of hunger.

THE GEORGE MCGOVERN-ROBERT DOLE INTERNATIONAL FOOD FOR EDUCATION AND CHILD NUTRITION ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MORELLA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. EMERSON. Madam Speaker, I want to join with the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my good friend, to talk about the global food for our education bill, and also to thank the gentleman for doing such a tremendous job in leading the charge forward on this particular legislation that I think is so very, very important for all of the children in the world who have no means to get a nutritional meal, and also because of the importance that it will mean for our farmers in America who are now suffering from the fourth year of low commodity prices, whose revenues will probably decrease in the neighborhood of about \$4 billion this year.

This legislation, quite frankly, is a win-win for the American farmer, and it is a win-win for children all over the world who desperately need food assistance and who need an education.

Madam Speaker, I am particularly excited and motivated by the vision of former Senator and now Ambassador George McGovern and former Senator Bob Dole who really led the charge early in this fight against hunger, back many years ago when they were both serving in the Senate.

It is also a very important issue for members of my family, because my late husband Bill was so very instrumental in bringing the issue of hunger,

both domestically and internationally, into the Congress and worked so closely with his friend, the late Mickey Leland, as well as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

I know that we all share a common desire to try to help as many people as we can all over the world, and I am particularly hopeful that we will be successful in passing this legislation as a stand-alone, but if not, hopefully it will be part of the next farm bill as it is written.

I cannot think of anything that is more important for us to do as a country. I think Senator McGovern probably said it best when he said we had a moral responsibility as a country with our rich and valuable natural resources and our abundant and very safe food supply to help people who cannot help themselves.

And I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), that the gentleman has done a magnificent job in getting our colleagues to be very excited about this, to be enthusiastic, and I am so very pleased also that the United States Senate is participating as well with their bill.

Madam Speaker, let me say that from an agricultural standpoint, there are many, many benefits for the United States economy for international food assistance. We have done this for many, many years as a country. I am very hopeful that this will be a policy that we perpetuate, that we are able to get the rest of the world involved in, but, most importantly, this kind of foreign assistance.

U.S. food aid helps alleviate poverty. It promotes economic growth to the recipient countries, and this is very, very important, because as incomes in developing countries rise, then we know that consumption patterns change, and we also know that food and other imports of U.S. goods and services increase.

In fact, back in 1996, 9 of the top 10 agricultural importers of U.S. products were food aid recipients. While we are shipping food aid abroad, it is important for people to understand that most of the money stays in the United States.

The domestic beneficiaries of U.S. food aid exports include our agricultural producers and suppliers, our processors, our millers, edible oil refiners, packaging, manufacturing, rail and motor transportation lines; I could go on and on and on. Most every State in the country does benefit from food aid exports, in spite of the fact that most people would not knowingly think that they were agricultural States.

I think that we must do everything possible to help the world's hungry children. When my late husband Bill came back from a trip in the Sudan, when he came back from various trips to Ethiopia and other countries, it was a very, very sad experience. He would hold dying children in his arms, children who were 12 years old and 13 years

old, who were about the size of a 3-year-old or 4-year-old, who did not weigh anything, who had no opportunity to go to school.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say in closing, then, that I hope that more people will help all of us help children all over the world, as well as the American farmer.

CINCO DE MAYO CELEBRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TOOMEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, I had the pleasure of joining my constituents in Goliad, Texas to celebrate Cinco de Mayo. Cinco de Mayo is celebrated with music, with dancing, with great food and, yes, and Mr. Speaker, with great speeches.

Texas A&M associate professor, Armando Alonzo, said so eloquently, and I quote, "The important thing about this celebration is that it comes from the citizens of the community, not from scholars, not from politicians, or those of us who are at universities with special training."

Although the holiday has spread throughout the world, its true spirit is in communities like Goliad, Texas, where people honor the value of their Mexican history and culture and the contributions that Mexican Americans have made across the spectrum of American life.

Mr. Speaker, I stand before my colleagues as a proud first generation Texan, born of Mexican immigrant parents who came to the United States as children in 1910.

Mr. Speaker, Goliad is the true heart of Cinco de Mayo, because it is the birthplace of General Ignacio Zaragoza, the young Mexican general who defeated the French at the battle of Puebla on May 5, 1862. This triumph was not only a military victory, but a moral victory over tyranny and oppression.

General Zaragoza is rightly called the "George Washington of Mexico." His dedication to the cause of freedom and democracy is an inspiration and challenge to us all.

General Zaragoza was born in Goliad, Texas on March 24, 1829. He was the son of a soldier, but was educated as a priest. He was a small businessman for a short time, but his passionate support of Mexico's struggle for democracy led him to follow his father into military service.

During the years of the War of the Reform in 1857 to 1860, he joined with the legendary Benito Juarez and fought in numerous battles, including the Battle of Calpulalpan, which ended the War of Reform.

His military brilliance in those 4 years was recognized, and he quickly moved up the ranks to general. When Mexican President Juarez was forced to declare a moratorium on Mexico's European debt in order to salvage the

bankrupt economy, Spain, England, and France sent their fleets and forced the surrender of Veracruz.

Because General Zaragoza was serving as head of the War Ministry, President Juarez initially sent one of his other generals to Veracruz, Mexico. When the general saw the awesome forces of the great European powers arrayed in front of Veracruz, he immediately resigned.

President Juarez then turned to General Zaragoza to lead the Army of the East. Although the Spanish and the English withdrew after negotiations with President Juarez, the French army, recognized as the finest army in the world at that time, began its march towards Mexico City. Napoleon III had dreams of an empire in the Americas, with Mexico as its center, in alliance with the Confederate States of America. However, standing in the way of French conquest was General Zaragoza.

The young Mexican general was determined to make his stand at Pueblo, 100 miles east of the capital. He did not know it could not be done. His ill-equipped and outnumbered Army was composed of farmers, Indians, militia and many young residents of Puebla. Many had obsolete firearms or they used rocks, sticks and machetes.

The French forces attacked on May 5, 1862. The battle lasted throughout the day. Despite repeated assaults by the French calvary and infantry, General Zaragoza's army held. They were fighting for their homes and their families and they would not be denied a victory.

The French were forced to retreat in defeat. After that battle, General Zaragoza proved he was a man of compassion as well as valor. He ordered his medical staff to treat the French wounded. He received a hero's welcome in Mexico City, but while visiting his own sick troops, he contracted typhoid fever and died soon after, on September 8, 1862. He was only 33 years old. He was given a state funeral; and on September 11, 1862, President Benito Juarez declared May 5, Cinco de Mayo, a national holiday.

This weekend's celebrations in Goliad were even more special as the birthplace of General Zaragoza was reopened to the public and rededicated after several months of renovation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to especially thank Lupita Barrera and the Texas Department of Parks and Wildlife for the wonderful job they did restoring this great man's home.

Mr. Speaker, I am extending an invitation to the two Presidents of Mexico and the United States to come to Goliad, Texas this next year.

The people of Goliad are proud and determined to keep the legacy of General Zaragoza alive. The little town and surrounding communities have taken the time not only to celebrate, but also to teach their children the true lesson of Cinco de Mayo; namely, the freedom we now enjoy has a price, and each successive generation must be vigilant and willing to continue the fight if freedom is to endure.

Goliad is over a thousand miles away from Puebla, Mexico. Yet the citizens of Goliad have adopted Puebla and Hidalgo, Nuevo Leon, Mexico, the birthplace of General Zaragoza's wife, Rafaela Padilla, as sister cities. Cooperation, trade and interaction among the three cities is vigorous. People along the border realize that what affects their neighbors affects them as well.

The Rio Grande River—a Heritage River, has become a bridge between two peoples and two rich cultures. We all prosper through open communication, undying friendship and growing trade. This, too, is a lesson of Cinco de Mayo. General Zaragoza helped preserve our Union by defeating the French troops. Today, trade with Mexico is helping to drive our booming economy and strengthening the North American continent. In this interdependent world, we truly need each other.

As you can see, I—Congressman HINOJOSA am very proud to represent and speak in the Halls of Congress for Goliad and Goliad County. I am starting early—I am extending a very cordial invitation to Mexican President Vicente Fox and President George W. Bush to jointly visit Goliad, Texas during May of 2002 to celebrate Cinco de Mayo. I want to extend the invitation to all of you, my colleagues in Congress, as well.

Mr. Speaker, include for the Record an exemplary speech given at Saturday's Goliad Cinco de Mayo celebration by Professor Armando C. Alonzo, an Associate Professor of History at Texas A&M University into the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

EXCERPTS FROM TALK GIVEN BY PROF. ARMANDO C. ALONZO AT THE CINCO DE MAYO CELEBRATION

Good morning. I'm very happy to be here today with all of you for today's celebration and I want to thank the Society of General Ignacio Zaragoza for inviting me to be part of this important event along with the city and county officials as well as Congressman Ruben Hinojosa. I'm always happy to be in Goliad because I also have some roots in this area because my father was born and raised in Yorktown, not very far from here. I want to make two points today without going too much into the historical facts of General Zaragoza's victory over the French in 1862 because others have already talked about that.

One of the important things about this celebration is that it comes from the citizens of the community not from scholars, politicians, or those of us who are at universities with special training. It's important that events like this be planned and organized by the people in the community because history is made by the people of these communities. Trade and the economy are certainly important but this celebration reminds us of the value that history and culture have for Mexico and its citizens and for Texas and its citizens. The people in this community have taken the time and effort to celebrate our history and culture and that is very important because of the impact that this kind of events have for our children and for the entire community. Even though we are about a thousand miles from Puebla where the battle took place, this celebration still has connections and its far-reaching impact is evident by the fact that there are people here from the sister city of Hidalgo, Nuevo Leon, Mexico, from other parts of the country, and we even have a direct descendant of a soldier who fought at the Battle of Puebla—the lady who lives in South Texas, whose grandfather fought at the battle.

Memory helps to keep our history alive. This celebration is a memory of an impor-

tant historical event—the battle that took place on the Cinco de Mayo. It's important for parents to connect the memory of that event to our culture and history and pass it on to our children.

This celebration, which goes back at least 55 years, keeps the memory alive of our history and our culture for the entire community. Professor Americo Paredes, who died two years ago, said the Mexican experience in Texas is part of the story of "Greater Mexico." In his works 50 years ago Professor Paredes explained how cultural influences, such as language, music, the corridos, that are familiar to us, theater, and other factors made Texas a part of "Greater Mexico." Today we see this "Greater Mexico" through the flow of trade and people. I look at the Rio Grande not as a political boundary but as a bridge between two peoples and two cultures. The Rio Grande is a bridge that connects us together rather than divides us. For us in Texas especially, "Greater Mexico" is part of our daily lives. In fact our roots can be traced to Coahuila from which the Spanish colonization of the provincia de Los Tejas proceeded. As a matter of fact, the settlers initially called this land, Texas, Las Nuevas Filipinas (in honor of King Philip of Spain). Nuevo Leon and Nuevo Santander also helped colonize Texas by sending settlers. So as we can see, the history of Texas is connected to Mexico in different ways.

In Zaragoza we have a Tejano who is a hero of Mexico. Ignacio de Zaragoza was born in this little village, in this poblito in Texas but his work, his values and his love were for his country, his patria, instead of for Santiago Vidaurri, the strongman of Nuevo Leon. Through his mother, who was part of the Seguins of San Antonio, he was a multi-generation citizen of Texas. Ignacio de Zaragoza was a Texan of Hispanic origin, a son of Texas who moved with his father to the lower Valley and then to Nuevo Leon. The legacy of General Zaragoza is the value and worth that his life gives to our history and culture. That is what this community is celebrating today.

Thank you very much. I hope you have a good day.

EXPRESSING SORROW AT THE UNTIMELY PASSING OF STEVE GREEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this time to talk about a great loss to San Diego, a great loss to journalism and a great loss to our Nation, and that is the untimely passing of Steve Green of Copley Press.

Steve had a long career in journalism. He worked as a reporter for the old Washington Star. He used to get the scoop on his better-financed opposition and adversaries in the Washington Post. He later went on to the Washington Post and worked for them during the Watergate period and was the kind of guy who really knew how to get a scoop, how to follow a story until he got everything out of that story.

He later went to work for Copley Press and was ultimately the bureau chief in the Washington Bureau of Copley Press, and it was there that I and the other members of the San Diego delegation and lot of other folks

in politics in Washington, D.C. got to know Steve.

The reason I am talking about Steve today is because I think that Steve Green represented the very best of one of the most important aspects of this democracy, and that is journalism.

Steve was a guy who was in the middle, in the heart of a lot of the very fundamental, earthshaking events in the last 34 years in Washington, D.C., and he was in the middle of the Watergate scandal. He covered a lot of national stories that had a great deal of importance to this country and to this town.

After he left the position of bureau chief for Copley, he went on to become the editor who covered the Pentagon and the United States military, a very, very important issue, especially for those of us from San Diego.

Throughout this stint of covering very important issues, issues which often revealed the sordid side of politics, like the bribery scandals and, to some degree, the Watergate scandal, Steve Green was a real person, was a real human being.

He was a guy who had a great sense of humor, a great sense of evenness, a great sense of decency. And those people, people with good hearts, are very important to this democracy, especially in a position in the center of journalism in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, I got to know Steve when he was covering the San Diego congressional delegation, and you noticed in Steve's stories, Steve was a guy who got all the details. You could not pull the wool over his eyes. He knew what was going on, and he always kind of knew the story behind the story.

He also wrote those stories in a way that was very even, very fair-handed, without an agenda, and I think with a little sense of humor also, and with a sense of civility.

□ 1515

With this entire city searching for civility and, of course, the President asking for it and using that as a trademark for this new administration, it is guys like Steve Green in Copley Press who really manifest that civility, because they do it in writing evenhanded stories and portraying to the great public out there what is really happening in Washington, D.C.

While sometimes there are sordid sides and bad sides for the story and stories that reveal some of the darker parts of human nature, he also liked to write a story that would reveal the better sides of human nature and justice and triumph in the end and the good things about America.

To be able to cover this period in which a lot of journalists turn to cynicism when looking at Washington, D.C. and this great Capitol, this people's House, to remember Steve Green sitting here in the Speaker's lobby with his pencil and his paper out taking an interview after a vote on the floor or

after something happened, and doing it in his evenhanded manner, his optimistic manner, always looking for the good aspect of the story was something that was very important to myself and to the other Members of the congressional delegation.

So Steve passed away, Mr. Speaker. He leaves a great legacy for Copley Press and for anybody who wants to be a journalist and cover the great national theater of action which is in Washington, D.C. with the Congress and the President and all of the aspects of a new administration like the one that is in place right now.

In fact, Alison, his daughter, sent me a few notes on Steve's life the other night, and I could tell from her conversation that she is kind of a chip off the old block. But he leaves Ginny. His widow is a wonderful lady. We all wish all the best to Steve's family.

EDUCATION BUDGET AND VALUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TOOMEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about education, the budget, and something those of us in North Carolina call North Carolina values.

Mr. Speaker, we have often heard that the projected budget surplus, assuming it materializes like predicted, is the people's money. Of course it is. It is the people's money. We agree on that. It should be spent on the people's priorities. The budget must reflect the values of the American people. It must affirm their long-term dreams and help them meet their daily needs.

This Congress should invest in a better future for the American people. We must build the human infrastructure. We need for an economy that creates the opportunity for prosperity for all Americans who are willing to work for it.

We must invest in long-term research in science and technology and engineering that will yield a long-term benefit but may not be seen as benefiting a short-term political gain. But it certainly will produce a strong economy down the road.

We must invest in education and lifelong learning so that Americans will have the most skilled work force in the world and continue to exert global economic leadership. We must repair the torn farm safety net so that farm families will have the opportunity, not only to survive, but to thrive.

Unfortunately, this House today passed along party lines a budget full of missed opportunities and misplaced priorities. Do not get me wrong. I strongly support responsible tax relief for working families in America. But this budget will run our economy in the ditch, and it will turn us to the days of large budget deficits, economic stagnation, high unemployment, and, yes, inflation.

I come from North Carolina, and we say North Carolina values call for balancing your budget every year and responsible policies. But this budget sends us on a river boat gamble with America's future.

Mr. Speaker, the other day I visited Anderson Creek Elementary School in my home county in North Carolina, and I saw the good work they are doing every day to prepare for a bright future in this country for those children. We are blessed with some of the most wonderful teachers and staff and dedicated parents and, yes, bright, hard-working students at Anderson Creek.

They are going like gang busters on a program we call Key to the Future. It is a reading award we give out each year. Here are some of the totals, and I would like to share with my colleagues what good work is being done on the ground out there where teachers work every day.

At Anderson Creek, of the 683 students enrolled this year, 500 one of those students have read more than 100 books on their own with their parents in the evening. In the kindergarten class alone, they read 24,883 books. In the first grade, they have read 37,514 books. In the second grade, the students have read 40,130 books.

As a former county commissioner, State legislator and two-term elected State superintendent, it does my heart good to see local communities throwing themselves into the education effort. It holds so much promise for a bright future for these children and for all the rest of us.

Mr. Speaker, the folks in Anderson Creek demonstrated the kind of priorities that Congress ought to be adopting. We should forgo the short-term appeal of an easy path and choose, instead, the right path. It takes vision and hard work, but in the end, the payoff is well worth the effort.

We missed an opportunity today to put money in the budget for school construction. I will talk about that at another time. But those are the kind of values that the people of North Carolina sent me to Congress to represent, and those are the values this Congress should embrace when making important decisions on the budget, taxes, and appropriations.

Today's vote was, unfortunately, a big step in the wrong direction. But, hopefully, Congress will get its priorities straight and enact policies that honor what I call North Carolina values and reflect the kind of priorities that the American people truly want and expect us to deal with.

CLEVELAND PASSES ISSUE 14; A BOND TO FIX CRUMBLING SCHOOLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, May 8, the voters of the City

of Cleveland did a great thing. They voted overwhelmingly to pass issue 14, a bond issue needed to fix our crumbling school buildings.

This was our T-shirt. It said "Safe schools for Cleveland's children. The cause is right. The time is now." The voters of the City of Cleveland said that the cause was right, and they realized that the time was now.

It is a day of celebration for the children, for the teachers, for the schools, for the administrators, for the maintenance workers, for the custodians, for labor, for the neighborhoods, for property owners, for businesses, and for our country.

The bond issue was a bond issue for \$338 million. We are very excited about it. Particularly because it made us eligible for a \$500 million match from the State of Ohio to fix the crumbling school buildings of the City of Cleveland.

The voters looked past mismanagement, failure on the part of prior school boards to the needs of the children of the City of Cleveland and the need for safe schools.

I want to congratulate a number of people who participated in this great bond issue yesterday: Mayor Michael R. White, who is the mayor of the City of Cleveland, the first mayor to take over the responsibility for oversight over the Cleveland public school system.

I want to celebrate our new, CEO, Barbara Byrd Bennett. For the past 2½ years, she has brought hope, energy, and optimism to the City of Cleveland at Cleveland schools.

I want to congratulate the school board chair, Reverend Hilton Smith; his vice chair is Miggie Hopkins; and other members of the school board; the president of the Cleveland Teachers Union, Richard DeColibus; his vice chair is Merle Johnson and Michael Churney; the athletic chair, Leonard Jackson; campaign chair, Arnold Pinkney, who has forever, it seems, run campaigns in the City of Cleveland and been quite successful; to his senior advisor on the campaign, Steve Rusniak; and the media manager, Alan Seiffullah.

My co-chairs for the campaign, and I should say that I had the privilege to cochair the campaign for the bond issue. My co-chairs were the Reverend ET Caviness of Greater Abyssinia Baptist Church and John Ryan, the head of the AFL-CIO.

I want to congratulate other organizations that supported Cleveland in this great effort, the Black Elected Democrats of Cleveland, Ohio; the 11th Congressional District Caucus for the New Millennium; the NAACP; Urban League; Growth Association; Bishop Pilla, the head of the Catholic Diocese; the Baptist Ministers Conference; the Southern Christian Leadership Conference; the New Future Outlook League; and an organization called BUILD, Black United In Labor and Democracy.

Finally, I want to congratulate all of the elected officials and organizations who I did not mention in this statement who were willing to sign on to this important issue.

I have to say that, as we debate the budget here in Congress and as we talk about the importance of education and a lack of Federal funding for school construction, I am so happy and even more proud that I come from the City of Cleveland, Ohio where we stepped up to the plate yesterday and voted to fund school improvement in our area.

I want to thank God. I want to thank Cleveland for hearing and responding to the needs of Cleveland's children. The time is right. The time is now.

NEW ADMINISTRATION'S ENERGY POLICY IS TO DRILL, NOT CONSERVATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the news magazines of this country often give us warning what is going to happen. If one wants to know what is going to happen in the United States, always look at California. No matter what is happening, if California has got something going on, it is going to be everywhere in the United States in the next 3 years.

Now, if one picks up this week's Newsweek magazine, there is an article by Allan Sloan called "Profiting From the Darkness." It really lays out the rape and pillage of the California electrical consumers over the course of the last few years, last few months actually.

Now, who saves us from this kind of assault on the consumers? Well, the government does. But in January, we put into this country a new dynasty or brought back an old dynasty. George, II of the oil dynasty took the White House; and he brought with him some of his counts and his dukes and so forth. The Duke of Wyoming became the Vice President. He has worked for an oil company, as did the President. The Secretary of Commerce, he came from an oil company. Go right down the line and one can see that the oil dynasty is fully in charge in this country.

Now, the question that has to be raised here is how are we going to deal with the energy problems in this country. Now, there are only three things one can do. Well, there are three major things one can do. One is increase the supply, the second is conserve, and the third is develop alternative energy sources.

Now, the Vice President of the United States met with all the legislators from California, Washington, and Oregon, and Idaho and Montana and told us this is not a Federal problem. It is not a Federal problem. This is a State problem. Whatever happens to

California, that is their problem. Whatever happens to Washington, it is their problem.

When the issue of conservation was raised, he said conservation may be a sign of personal virtue, but it is not a sufficient basis for sound comprehensive energy policy.

Now, his answer to our problems in this country is to drill, drill in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, drill under the Great Lakes, even go down to the President's brother's State, Florida, and drill in the shelf off the coast of Florida. The Governor of Florida told his brother to go on back home and stay out of his local waters. But that is the solution being offered, drill wherever you can, and maybe we can fix it.

Now, the fact is that the American Council on Energy Efficiency Economy estimates that gradually raising the fuel efficiency on automobiles and small trucks to 35 miles per gallon would save a million and a half barrels a day in 2010 and four and a half million barrels a day by 2020.

□ 1530

That is seven times what could be attained if we drill in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. There is no reason to be drilling. We ought to be raising the conservation standards in this country.

The energy czar the President appointed also says that we ought to have 1,300 new generating plants in the next 20 years. This comes from an arm of the Energy Department that has always pushed coal and gas and oil. But at the same time they are using that study to say we have got to build 1,300 new plants, they conveniently overlook another Energy Department study, called "Scenarios For a Clean Energy Future," which is put out by the Energy Department's national laboratories. This study concludes that efficiency measures alone could obviate the need for building 610 of those 1,300 plants. Conservation alone would cut it in half. In fact, constructing buildings that were more efficient would eliminate the need for 100 plants. Air-conditioning, clothes dryers, water heater changes could save another 180 plants.

But our government is designed to help the oil industry, make it possible for them to drill everywhere. And this spring and summer, as they are now talking about \$3-a-gallon gasoline, when our constituents are riding around in a car and they stop and pay three bucks for a gallon of gasoline, who is the person they should thank? The President of the United States. He wants us to use that. We do not hear anything out of this administration about conservation or about alternative energy sources.

Now, here is a simple little fact: every day in California, seven times the energy that is used in California falls out of the sky in the form of solar energy. Seven times. There is no energy crisis in California, and we ought to be talking about a lot of other things besides drilling for oil.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TOOMEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. CLAYTON. addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

THE EDUCATION BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to protest the Republican budget on which we voted because it slashes critical investments in education that are essential to Rhode Island's schools. This budget falls \$21 billion short of even the President's proposal for education investment. President Bush and too many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have made this tax cut for the rich a top priority and paid for it with Draconian budget cuts in critical social services.

I am disheartened to see the President abandoning his campaign promise and abandoning our children. Under this partisan budget that we were forced to vote on today, Rhode Island will lose critical funding for class size reduction, school construction and violence prevention programs. In 1999 and 2000, Rhode Island received more than \$11 million under the 100,000 New Teachers program. With these funds, Rhode Island was able to hire 145 new teachers. President Bush wants to terminate this valuable program and resign Rhode Island's children to overcrowded classrooms. More teachers and smaller class sizes are critical to helping all students, and they have a particularly dramatic impact on those from low-income families. In fact, smaller class sizes are key to substantially closing the achievement gap between high-performing and low-performing students. To leave no child behind, we must reduce the size of classes by helping schools recruit and hire more teachers.

Rhode Island is also in serious need of money for school construction. Many schools throughout the State are deteriorating dramatically. Too many children are learning in trailers and in classrooms that do not meet even the minimum health and safety standards. In sum, Rhode Island schools are in need of \$1.6 billion in repairs. Yet the Republican budget abandons Rhode Island's children by providing zero funding for school construction. Instead of creating modern and safe schools that are conducive to learning, the Bush budget eliminates the school renovation program and retroactively redi-

rects the \$1.2 billion already appropriated for this year to other programs. As many as 1,000 schools in disrepair will not be renovated because of this budget.

Mr. Speaker, reforms without resources will not produce results. Public demand to invest in education has never been stronger. Parents and taxpayers want to reduce class size, repair schools, ensure students have the highest-quality teachers and target Federal assistance to schools that are most in need.

This opportunity must not be squandered on ill conceived plans or sacrificed because of inadequate funding and a lack of political courage. Let us make children and public education our top priority and provide resources needed to make a difference for every child in America.

To truly leave no child behind, the White House and Congress must match rhetoric with resources needed to turn words into deeds and hope into reality.

PUBLIC SERVICE RECOGNITION WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today we are in the midst of Public Service Recognition Week, and I rise to salute the public servants whose hard work and determination have markedly improved the way government does business.

Each May, the Public Employees Roundtable launches activities in cities across our Nation which highlight excellence in public service at the Federal, State, and local government levels. The organization hosts agency exhibits and demonstrations that educate the public about the array of programs and services that public employees provide to the American people.

Activities in my own hometown were kicked off yesterday by the Chicago Federal Executive Board. The board held its 44th Annual Excellence in Federal Career Awards program at the grand ballroom at Navy Pier in Chicago. Thirty-one agencies submitted a total of 487 nominations for the Board's consideration. Among the 11 first place Outstanding Employee or Team winners were: Lynn Hoffstadter, a manager with the Department of Veterans Affairs, who was recognized as an outstanding supervisor for leading Hines Veterans Administration Hospital to the highest level of accreditation that hospitals can receive. Michael Johnson, an employee with the U.S. Customs Service, was recognized as an outstanding community service employee for his work with the homeless and the troubled in his church. And the Chicago Lead Enforcement Initiative at the Environmental Protection Agency was awarded the Outstanding Law Enforcement Team Award for forming an aggressive alliance between Federal,

State, and local agencies to protect families from the debilitating effects of lead contamination.

Mr. Speaker, while I have only enough time to recognize a few of the winners, I believe that each award recipient and each person nominated deserves our appreciation. This past Monday the Public Employees Roundtable held a ceremony here on Capitol Hill and presented its "Breakfast of Champions" award to representatives of exceptional programs at each level of government. The 2001 award winner at the Federal level was the Ricky Ray Program at the Department of Health and Human Services in Rockville, Maryland.

Other programs receiving special recognition this year were the Ohio Appalachian Center for Higher Education in Portsmouth, Ohio; Hennepin County Adult Correctional Facility Productive Day Program in Plymouth, Minnesota; and the Long Beach, California, Department of Parks, Recreation and Marine's Public Art in Private Spaces program.

Beginning this past Monday, and continuing through Sunday, May 13, over two dozen Federal agencies and employee organizations will have exhibits set up in large tents on the National Mall at Third and Independence Avenues. The public is invited to come out to learn more about the functions of these agencies and the services that each one provides. There will also be a job fair and a science fair. Some of our military bands and other groups will provide entertainment during this family-oriented event.

So, Mr. Speaker, Public Service Recognition Week offers all Americans, especially young people, the opportunity to learn and get excited about a career in public service. It also provides the opportunity to thank those who serve us daily for their efforts. I believe that public service should be valued and respected by all Americans, and the activities occurring this week across the Nation prove why. I thank all our public service employees, Mr. Speaker.

SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives, I am pleased to join with the President in helping to celebrate Small Business Week. We have several members of our Committee on Small Business here on the floor today, and I would recognize and yield to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of our Committee on Small Business for yielding to me.

I come to the floor today as a member of the Committee on Small Business to recognize the significant role of small businesses in the spirit of National Small Business Week. In my home State of West Virginia, where small business is big business, 90 percent of the businesses employ less than 20 people. Those smaller-sized firms employ nearly 60 percent of West Virginia's private sector employees. They are at the forefront of job creation, adding a net total of 4,700 employees between the years of 1995 and 1996 in West Virginia alone.

These numbers prove that small business is the backbone of our economy. But small businesses often serve other roles: as a second family to the employees or as pillars to their community. Often small businesses invest time and resources in other causes and organizations, or they become involved in local schools, churches, and sports teams.

In Charleston, West Virginia, my home, Bill Signorelli, the owner of Security America, sponsors a Little League team, along with volunteering much of his free time to the Charleston area chamber of commerce. Bill has built his business from the ground up, and now his business works to encourage the same work ethic that he used as a young person in many children through their baseball team.

In Lewis County, West Virginia, a man by the name of Frank Brewster owns and runs Sun Lumber Company, a company that employs about 10 employees. Aside from running his own business, Frank spends many hours of his valuable time as the head of the employer support of the Guard and Reserve for West Virginia. Frank's tireless commitment helps strengthen our country by easing the way for other small businesses to serve in the National Guard and in the Reserves.

That kind of spirit and local involvement is not unique to these particular small businesses; rather, it is very common among small businesses across the country. That spirit is why I stand here today, and that is why I wish to join in the celebration of National Small Business Week.

So today, and for the rest of the week, we recognize, celebrate, and commend the vital and significant contributions of small businesses, not only to our families, to their employees, but also to our local communities and our country.

Mr. MANZULLO. I have a question for the gentlewoman. She was kind enough to participate in a full small business hearing that we held this past week concerning the purchase of berets for our soldiers.

Mrs. CAPITO. Yes.

Mr. MANZULLO. About \$29 million in purchases, of which only about \$4 million was domestic and the rest was procured overseas. We have succeeded to a large part in stopping the overseas procurement, but the gentlewoman had mentioned to me something to the ef-

fect that just this past week she lost several hundred jobs involved in the clothing industry; is that correct?

Mrs. CAPITO. Yes. Over the last several months we have lost an enormous employer in Roane County, in Spencer, West Virginia, which actually had a factory for clothing and textiles sewing. So we would have liked to have had that business in Spencer, West Virginia. It was a small business, and it has kind of gutted the community now that they have left. So if the military is going to rebid that, we sure want to be in on that.

□ 1545

Mr. MANZULLO. There is about \$40 billion a year worth of all types of procurement coming from the Department of Defense; a good percentage of that is clothing. I know that your heart was hurting over the fact that 3- or 400 people lost their jobs.

Mrs. CAPITO. Yes.

Mr. MANZULLO. And being it is a small town in a rural county, it is very difficult to find work elsewhere.

Mrs. CAPITO. That is right. I appreciate your bringing that to my colleague's attention. When you lose that many jobs, it not only guts the community in terms of the economics, but also the local involvement, the church, the Little League teams, school fundraisers, all of these things start to fall apart when you lose a large employer like that.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman's participation in our special order this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. Speaker, each year for the past 38 years the President has issued a proclamation calling for the celebration of National Small Business Week. National Small Business Week, which is sponsored by the SBA, is being held this week. We honor the estimated 25.5 million small businesses in America that employ more than half the country's private workforce and create three out of four new jobs, and generate a majority of American innovations.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform and Oversight, I would like to lay out the principles that I believe should inform this body's agenda for our Nation's small businesses.

First, we need tax relief for small business owners. The House has taken a step in the right direction in passing a fiscally responsible budget that leaves room for tax relief. Contrary to what our opponents charge, cutting rates in the highest income tax brackets does not yield benefits just for the wealthy. Most small businesses pay taxes as individuals. Sixty-three percent of tax filers who will benefit from the top rate cut are small business owners who will likely reinvest their money in their businesses.

The Department of Treasury reports that a top tax rate reduction could increase small business receipts by 9 percent. The tax reform and relief allowed by today's budget will help encourage risk-taking and investment in small businesses.

Secondly, we need health care reform that protects employees and small businesses. In many cases, associations and industry organizations can provide health care to their member organizations at lower cost than those charged by traditional providers. We should actively promote legislation that will free small businesses to choose health benefit packages that will attract and retain the best people.

Right now, government employees, our own staffs, have far more choice in health plans than the small businesses in our districts. Colleagues, this ought not to be. Let us let small business employers offer the same health care choices to their workers that our staffers on Capitol Hill are given. In reforming health care, we must not extend legal liability to employers for health care decisions made by HMOs or other similar providers. Holding small businesses responsible for mistakes made by health care providers will drive many of them out of business and millions of employees out of insurance.

Thirdly, I believe we must create high-tech infrastructure that aids entrepreneurs. If we do not create an economic environment that allows for high-tech innovation, our small businesses will stagnate, unable to keep up with competitors in the high-tech marketplace.

Increasingly, new small business owners are starting their own businesses in cyberspace. Unless the high-tech infrastructure is in place to make this possible, there will be a dangerous divide between the "haves" and "have-nots" which could significantly undermine business growth and development in small and medium-size towns, like many which I represent in east central Indiana. Without access to the information superhighway, both education and local economies will suffer.

Fourth, we need regulatory reform which is informed by sound scientific information and careful and unbiased research. Much of the debate in the small business area is driven by Federal regulatory agencies and the new policies they create for health, safety and the environment. While the government has made great strides in recent years to improve compliance assistance and review for impact on small businesses, much more remains to be done. Let us work together to remove the regulatory impediments to innovation and problem solving.

Congress must ensure that the engine of our economy, our Nation's small family-owned businesses, are not undermined by flawed and burdensome regulations.

Finally, we must explore new opportunities for trade to open up new markets and opportunities for small businesses. Small manufacturers and entrepreneurs are increasingly successful because they are able to win new customers in overseas markets. Congress should help the President win access to new markets through fast track trading authority. Also, we must work to expand free trade zones around the world. The President's recently announced initiative to advance a Free Trade Area of the Americas is a visionary first step. By fighting for fair free trade in our own hemisphere, we will help end unfair trade practices that undermine America's natural competitive advantage. These new markets will help grow our economy and ensure that our allies in the Western Hemisphere continue to grow politically and economically.

Our Nation's small businesses are the strongest in the world. With tax relief for small business owners, health care reform that provides choice for employees, high-tech infrastructure that aids entrepreneurs, and regulatory reform to eliminate burdensome regulations, combined with expanded international trade, I believe that our small businesses will continue to be the backbone of our economy in the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO) for the opportunity to speak during this special order and for his leadership of the Committee on Small Business, and permitting me to join with you in celebrating the small businesses of Indiana and the small businesses of America.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for participating in our special order today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GRUCCI).

Mr. GRUCCI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MANZULLO), the chairman of the Committee on Small Business, for yielding to me to honor America's small businesses, and I thank him for his guiding and stable hand in directing the committee which is doing so much good work for our small businesses throughout this great country in helping to create the economic stability or the cornerstone of our economic revival.

As you may know, Mr. Speaker, over 22 million viable small businesses are thriving across the United States. Small businesses with fewer than 500 employees make up the vast majority, 99.7 percent of all employer firms. Let me repeat that number. It is 99.7 percent of our small businesses make up our employer firms.

Small businesses generate approximately 50 percent of all U.S. jobs and sales. One of small businesses' biggest contributions to the economy is that they hire a greater population of individuals who might otherwise be unemployed than larger businesses. Very small firms with fewer than 10 employ-

ees hire part-time workers at a rate twice that of large firms of 1,000 or more employees. These small firms employ a higher proportion of workers under 25 and age 65 and older.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to focus my remarks this afternoon on the benefit of streamlining the paperwork across the board to improve the efficiency of America's small businesses as well as their experiences with the Federal Government.

During my career both in the private sector, and as a small family businessman, and in the public sector where I served as supervisor of the largest town in Suffolk County on Long Island, I have always been a proponent of streamlining the costly bureaucracy that hinders the success of small businesses and stifles the entrepreneurial spirit.

In my small family business, I experienced firsthand how encyclopedia-sized applications discourage owners from competing for government projects. I had to hire additional attorneys, accountants and consultants just to fill out the basic paperwork. These requirements place unnecessary burdens on the backbone of our Nation's economy.

As a local town supervisor, I streamlined and enhanced the planning review process on so many small businesses so that they could obtain permits at a faster pace. I created a streamlined, one-stop shopping system where small business owners and potential entrepreneurs could find all of the information and permits they needed to quickly expand their business or, in fact, start up a new one. For example, my policies afforded a high-technology company the opportunity to begin construction on a 40,000 square foot facility that created new jobs in less than 30 days. Without my streamlining plan, this process could have taken months, if not years, and those jobs would have been lost.

By streamlining the process, small businesses open faster, expand at a greater rate, create additional jobs and improve the quality of life for all Americans. In addition, I implemented budgets that cut the property tax burden on homeowners and businesses by \$72 million. The result was the creation and retention of more than 20,000 good-paying jobs in less than 5 years.

Once again, I ask my colleagues to join in honoring small business owners across the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership of the committee.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, this is National Small Business Week, and it is a time to reflect on exactly who these small business people are, why they are involved in small businesses operating for themselves as opposed to working for somebody else. There is a lady back home by the name of Rebecca Hillburst in Rockford, Illinois, and she has been honored this week in the field of government procurement as the Regional Subcontractor of the Year.

Mr. Speaker, few people know that small businesses provide over \$63 billion worth of goods and services to the Federal Government. Rebecca is the first in our region to receive this award. Rebecca's father started the Commercial Printing Company in Rockford in 1948. She assumed the helm of the company in 1989. The business performs customized and commercial printing jobs. Rebecca Hillburst and her four employees, George, Lars and Eleanor Hillburst, as well as Darcie Powelson, are symbolic of the small entrepreneur enterprise that makes America great. I applaud their hard work and dedication.

When I was 4 years old in 1948, my father bought a grocery store on the southeast side of Rockford, Illinois. At that time, right after World War II, times were very difficult. The immigrants coming from eastern Europe would often stop right in front of my father's grocery store, which was also a bus stop, and they would walk in with a piece of paper which would say, "See Frank at Frank's Port Market when in Rockford." Likewise, hundreds of families came out of Arkansas, came to Rockford because of a huge crop failure in Arkansas at that time.

Dad, over the period of years that he had that grocery store, grubstaked literally hundreds of families who otherwise could possibly have starved. He would extend them credit based upon the fact that he knew he would get repaid and he was doing the right thing.

He was also a master carpenter. I recall on occasions when dad would take the Blue Star potato chip boxes which were about an inch thick, he would go to garages and places where these people lived and use those potato chip boxes to insulate their homes so the cold air would not come right through the board walls. Those were times when in the summer, people lived in tents, and many times people lived in basements, not being able to build the house on top of the basement that they themselves had constructed.

□ 1600

Dad chose to go into small business because of his desire to work for himself. He could have earned a lot more money working for other people, but he envisions today what we know as the entrepreneurial spirit. That spirit gave rise to a sense of social consciousness that has been passed down to me. Oftentimes on Saturday night, Dad and other people in the community would get a large painter's tarpaulin and hang it from a billboard and get the 16-millimeter projector from Morris Kennedy School and show Hopalong Cassidy movies and all types of movies that those people in this country that are in their 50's will remember at that time.

The small businesses worked very closely with the schools and the churches and brought together what we call this sense of community, people working together to make a community a better place to live. When I ran

for Congress, I would talk about my father and his commitment to the people. Time after time people would come up to me and say, Mr. MANZULLO, we knew your father. Were it not for him, our family would have had a very difficult time making our way even to live in this country. He found us places to live. He found us jobs. We would go into the grocery store with a cut hand, and he would be there to break open a package of Band-Aids just to help us.

But Dad is not unique. He envisioned along with my mother the spirit of entrepreneurship and, that is, you work as hard as you possibly can to get ahead in life. But he also recognized something else. Dad was not much about government. Oh, he voted all the time and believed that government was necessary; but he also believed that government was getting involved in too many areas where it should have stayed out of, the regulations that hit Dad's grocery and then eventually the restaurant business that he went into in 1953. My brother Frankie carries on that tradition today with Manzullo's Famous Italian Foods. I told my brother I think that name is a little bit facetious, but he believes that his menu is famous; and he believes that the fact that people eat that Italian food, that they will be famous also. But Frankie also with his 13 tables and a small Italian restaurant carries on the tradition of entrepreneurship. He believes very strongly that people are supposed to work hard, it is an ethic that is ingrained into our system of America today, and that small businesspeople should be rewarded, not asking for anything except to keep the fruits of their labor.

What do we have today? We have a government that has gotten so big, so large, exercised jurisdiction where it has no business being, that small businesses are crushed under the burden of regulations.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman for his leadership. And advocating for small businesses, the gentleman understands very well the critical role that small business plays in our economy, that small business plays in our entire society. I am sure he is well aware of the fact that small businesses have in recent years created 80 percent of the new jobs in America. It is very hard to overstate the importance of small business, and so it is fitting that we recognize small businesses this week. I just want to recognize and commend him on his leadership, the hearings that he has held and the attention that he has focused on finding ways that the government can relieve the burden that government imposes on those people creating these jobs and really contributing so much to our economy.

I wanted to speak in particular about why today is a big day for small business owners across America and not just small business owners but every

single person who is employed by a small business, the people who provide supplies and services to small businesses, the communities that derive tax revenue from small businesses and suffice it to say our entire economy and that is the budget resolution that we passed today. One of the highlights of the budget resolution is the tax relief that is contemplated, it is allowed for by this budget resolution. It is modest tax relief. If you look at it in any historical standards, it is quite modest. If you look at it compared to the size of our economy it is quite modest; but it is important because it is significant, it is across the board, it will provide tax relief for all tax-paying Americans, and it is the most significant tax relief in a generation.

Why is it so important? There are a number of reasons, but let me focus on one in particular. The tax relief that we voted to allow today with our budget resolution, if enacted, which I believe it will be and I am sure the President will sign it into law, it is going to lead to economic growth and prosperity. It is going to increase the economic output of our country, and that means productivity of our workers is going to rise, that means workers' wages will go up, that means standards of living will improve and that means a better quality of life for all Americans. That is why this is a big day, not just for small businesses really but for everybody, but especially for small business. Part of what is going to help small businesses in particular is lowering of the marginal rates of taxes.

As the gentleman knows, many small businesses, probably most small businesses in America, are taxed using the personal income tax rates, especially those that choose a subsection S designation, which is to say most, they are subject to personal tax rates. When we lower the tax rate that that small business is going to pay, we increase the incentive to work, to save, to invest and to grow that business.

Now, the fact is the majority of people in America are going to get up and go to work every day whether or not we lower taxes. That is a fact. But growth occurs on the margin; and many small business owners have flexibility, they have a choice, they have a decision to make. Should they put in extra time, extra work, more effort, more risk, more of their capital at risk, expanding their business, growing their business, should they do that? Or should they spend that marginal savings, time, energy doing other things, spending it with their families, spending it at leisure, spending it doing something else? If you think about it, when we increase the rewards that that small business owner is going to be able to take home by lowering the amount of money we confiscate from him in the form of taxes, when we increase the rewards for working and saving and investing, people choose to do more working, saving and investing.

Every single time in our Nation's history that we have had significant

across-the-board tax relief, we have seen a corresponding increase in economic activity and economic productivity, in growth and prosperity. That is what is going to happen when we finish through this process and we enact the tax relief that is contemplated by this budget. I am convinced if we continue on this path and we follow through with this budget resolution and we provide this tax relief, and frankly I hope that this will be a floor, not a ceiling, in terms of tax relief, there are many important elements that we could include, that we could add to the tax relief that was proposed by the President, I hope we will because we should, if we do that, we are going to increase the rewards and we are going to increase the incentives and we will see a corresponding increase in the output of economic activity, and that is higher wages, higher standards of living, greater economic growth.

That is what this is all about. It is going to give people the opportunity to develop and accumulate capital which gets invested in this economy and really leads to all good things and continued growth in the tremendous engine of growth for our economy which small business has been.

I am delighted today to recognize the contribution small businesses make to our economy, to our prosperity, and to recognize also that the budget resolution we passed today is going to help everybody who is an owner, an employee, a provider of services or products for small businesses. That is a big step forward for all of them.

Mr. MANZULLO. I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania a question if he has the opportunity to stick around for a few minutes.

Mr. TOOMEY. Certainly.

Mr. MANZULLO. So often we hear people saying, well, look at all the things that government can do for businesses. I would like to ask the gentleman what in his mind he envisions when he hears that question asked.

Mr. TOOMEY. One of the best things that I think government could do for business is get out of the way. We share several things in common, one of which is our historical involvement in the restaurant industry. My brothers and I have been in the restaurant industry, I no longer am, but for many years we were in this business, having started a restaurant business from scratch. The regulations are extremely onerous; but even more onerous from my point of view was the tax burden and the Tax Code, both obviously visited upon business owners by the Federal Government.

To give my colleague an example, or to put it in perspective, I think of the restaurant business in many ways; it is a simple business. You go out, you buy food, you cook it, and you sell it. It is not terribly complicated. But every year at the end of the year when it comes tax time, I have to hire an accountant and pay a great deal in fees

for the accountant to go out and calculate what our tax obligation is. What he sends back to me, or what he used to when I was an owner of these restaurants, would be a stack of documents at least an inch high with instructions to fill out a check for a particular amount, sign the form, send it in and hope for the best.

That is what small business owners do every day. There is no reason for that. There is no justification for a Tax Code that is too complicated to understand. There is no justification for a Tax Code that rewards and punishes people with their own money based on whether they behave in a fashion that is approved of by politicians. This is not the way we ought to be doing things. Part of what we need to do is move on and provide meaningful simplification of our Tax Code and more fairness in our Tax Code.

When I talk to the people who are still in small businesses back in Lehigh and Northampton Counties and Montgomery County in Pennsylvania, the folks across the Upper Perkiomen Valley and the Lehigh Valley who are creating all those jobs, what they tell me is, Give us some room. Just step back, lower our tax burden, lower the regulatory burden and we will be fine. These folks are not looking for a gift; they are not looking to be given anything except the opportunity to go out and run their own businesses as they see fit. I think they deserve that.

Mr. MANZULLO. I concur with the gentleman. The best thing that government can do for all businesses is to stay out of the way. Obviously, there are necessary things that the government has to do with regard to safety. We are not questioning those things. But take the area, when my mother died about a year ago and although our brother's business is not affected because of the very modest amounts, I would like to ask the gentleman what in his opinion this death tax does when the owner of the business dies and he wants to pass it on to his children. What has been the gentleman's experience on that?

Mr. TOOMEY. I know of a number of cases and circumstances in which the effect is devastating. An important point to remember is that the death tax which the gentleman is referring to, which is the tax whereby at the occasion of a person's death the government comes in and confiscates up to 55 percent of everything that person has left over, let us step back and remember that whatever a person has left over is left over after multiple layers of taxation were already paid.

Mr. MANZULLO. During the lifetime.

Mr. TOOMEY. During the course of a working person's lifetime, the person pays tax on their income. If there is a little money left over from that and you save it or invest it, you pay taxes on dividend or interest. If you have a capital gain because an asset appreciates in value, you pay a tax on that.

If you still manage to have something left over after all those taxes are paid at the end of your life when you die, the government comes in and takes more than half of that. I think to most Americans that is absolutely unreasonable and unfair to have that many layers of tax on the same income, the same savings. But nevertheless that is what we do.

What are the ramifications of that? They are extremely negative. One example that is all too common is that small businesses, farms, they might grow to the point where there are assets that are substantial, they may be several million dollars, but very frequently they are not cash, they are not in the form of securities. They are not liquid assets that are available to pay bills. They are investment in plants, in equipment, in factories, in land, in very tangible real property but property that is not liquid.

When suddenly the government comes in and says we are going to assess the value of this entire operation, and we want more than half of it now, that forces the heirs to that person's family business or farm to make some very, very difficult and sometimes devastating decisions. Often they have to sell the entire thing to generate the revenue to pay the tax bill. Sometimes they have to sell portions of it. Sometimes, Mr. Speaker, a family is forced to take on a huge amount of debt to pay the tax bill, continue to try to operate the business now with this huge debt that has saddled them and sometimes they have to lay off workers, sometimes they have to cut back on their workforce in order to afford the service on the debt.

The point is the Tax Code should not be driving that kind of decision. It should be the economics of the operation that determine whether you sell the operation, take on debt, not a Tax Code that says it is time for the government to take half of their value. That is the kind of devastating impact it can have. It can force farmers to sell their farm, it can force small businesses out of business altogether, and it can force small businesses to have to take on a mountain of debt which their business may not be well equipped to handle.

□ 1615

It can have all of these unintended consequences, all in the name of trying to confiscate a person's savings at the occasion of their death.

So it is important to remember that this is not just a tax that penalizes those people who chose to be frugal and to save and invest and accumulate an asset over their life, but also they are employees; the contribution that business makes to the community; the revenue that is derived from people who provide goods and services to that business; the ramifications spread out from there, and they do much harm.

Mr. MANZULLO. One of the things that I have seen taking place is farm-

ers that really want to pass the farm on to their kids but they know the death tax would be so excessive that they sell out because the capital gains tax is cheaper than the death tax and the capital gains tax can be timed over a period of time.

Some folks in our country are concerned, and in many cases rightly so, over the loss of green space. A person wants to sell his or her farm, that is obviously their right of private property. But to sell it, essentially prematurely, that is not the way it should be.

Mr. TOOMEY. If the gentleman will yield, in my district in the Lehigh Valley and the Upper Perkiomen Valley of Pennsylvania, we have beautiful rolling countryside, farmland and a rural area, within a short distance of the center cities that make up the heart of my district.

Many people are quite justifiably concerned about the sprawl that is going on; the development that is extending ever further outward; the congestion that arises as a result of that; the diminution of the quality of the countryside as these developments have gone on.

What we have is we have a Tax Code that encourages that. In some ways, the Tax Code forces that kind of development because just as the gentleman points out, it is an economically rational decision in many cases, not a decision a farmer wants to make but an economically rational decision, given the Tax Code, to sell that farm, even though he would much prefer to pass it on to his children.

To sell that farm, who is the likely buyer of a farm? It is going to be a developer.

Mr. MANZULLO. I was in a position years ago, as an attorney in Ogle County, Illinois, when a family had to sell half the 640 in order to keep the 320, just to pay the death taxes. That is not nice. That was before there was the unlimited marital deduction.

To see the widow and the kids devastated by the sale of that farm, and money just to pay taxes and they had worked on that farm their entire lives. What we see is the farmers who have to have a tremendous amount of capital assets, and restaurant owners, grocery store people, people with construction companies literally can run into the millions of dollars worth of equipment in many cases to make a very modest living. They are absolutely totally devastated.

Take the difference between a professional person such as an attorney. He does not need but literally a few thousand dollars' worth of equipment to get started. At the end of that person's career, the cases are picked up by other people within his office and not taxed. The firm is not taxed.

Yet, for a farmer or the grocery store owner or the restaurant owner, that cannot be done because their wealth, their income, is based upon the use of assets that cost a tremendous amount of money.

So we see that 80 percent of small employers have to spend costly resources to protect their families from the death tax. There is a tremendous amount of money in attorneys' fees, accountants' fees, life insurance premiums all going towards that eventual date when the person dies that there be enough resources out there to pass that farm on to the kids. What happens when that money is used for expenses like that, it does not get plowed back into the business.

Mr. TOOMEY. If the gentleman will yield once again, that is a very important point. There is an enormous amount of money, by many responsible estimates, as much or more than what is collected from the death tax every year, is spent to avoid it.

Now think of how counterproductive that is; to force people to spend that kind of money all to circumvent this onerous tax. The gentleman is exactly right. This money is going to pay attorneys and accountants to set up trusts and all kinds of funds and to pay massive amounts of insurance premiums, which is such a counterproductive use of this capital.

This is money that could be invested in our economy to grow the economy, to grow those small businesses, to create more of those jobs that we know these businesses are so inclined to do if given the opportunity. But instead, we force them to allocate resources in a way that makes no economic sense; no sense for their business; no sense for our economy. It is all driven by this terrible flaw in the Tax Code, which is why it is so important that we repeal the death tax in its entirety rather than just create some increase in the exemption.

If we just increase the exemption, we have not gotten rid of the problem. We have diminished it somewhat, but the only way to resolve this problem is to repeal an unfair tax.

Mr. MANZULLO. If we just increase the exemption, then the next Congress can come back and lower it way back again. Back in 1992, before I was elected to Congress, there was a bill that was introduced that would lower the then-exemption from \$400,000 to under \$200,000, which would make it even more obstructive.

We have introduced a bill called the Small Employer Tax Relief Act of 2001, H.R. 1037, that is a bipartisan bill. I signed onto it, helped draw it, along with the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ), who is the ranking minority member on the Committee on Small Business. I believe that this is a breakthrough, a bill that really will help small businesses.

First of all, small businesspeople that are not incorporated should be allowed to write off 100 percent of the cost of health and accident insurance for the self-employed. My brother is facing \$600 and \$700 a month for health and accident insurance, and there are small businesspeople that actually go out of business, decide to work for

somebody else, simply because they can get the health insurance benefits. So it is time that this Congress really stepped up to the plate and said, look, for too long we have gone with playing games. Now I think it is only 60 percent is deductible.

Mr. TOOMEY. Again, I think this is a very important point, because again we have a Tax Code that causes such an inappropriate distortion in our economy. We have a Tax Code that says if a corporation goes out and buys insurance, health insurance for an employee, the corporation can deduct that as a legitimate expense. It is deducted from their tax liability. That is fine.

When an individual or a small business, unincorporated small business, goes out and tries to purchase that identical policy, that person cannot deduct it.

Now, what is the possible justification for that?

Mr. MANZULLO. There is no rationale for it.

Mr. TOOMEY. It is not rational. It is not in the interest of anybody to do this, but yet we perpetuate this, even in light of the fact that we have millions of Americans who are uninsured.

Clearly, many of those would be better able to afford the insurance if they could deduct it; just as corporations already do.

I think what the chairman is suggesting is merely that individuals get the same kind of treatment that corporations already get.

Mr. MANZULLO. Yes.

Mr. TOOMEY. Why would we not extend that tax treatment to individuals?

Mr. MANZULLO. It is just something that the small businesses have been trying and trying for the longest period of time to get, and it has had a very difficult time getting through. Hopefully, it will get through this year.

On this bipartisan bill, as to which I believe the gentleman is a cosponsor, it would get rid of it by repealing the FUTA, a 2 percent surtax. It would increase expensing up to \$50,000. In fact, we are in the process now of looking at whether or not the small business owner or the casual investor should be allowed to set his or her own depreciation schedule.

I just put a rubber roof on a building, a 130-year-old building, not worth that much but the roof cost \$25,000. The law says one has to take 39 years to depreciate it. It has a 10-year warranty on parts and a 5-year warranty on labor. It absolutely does not make sense to have arbitrary rules like that.

If we allowed the small business owner to set his or her own depreciation schedule, then, for example, I could choose the number of years I want to do it, say 4 or 5 years, but if I expense it then I could no longer add it to the basis for the property when I sell it. Well, that is all right.

To have to go through that tremendous expense and really get very little tax break to help with it, simply does not make sense.

So there are a lot of things that we can do. This small business bill also allows small businesses with annual gross receipts of \$5 million or less to automatically use a cash method of accounting as opposed to the accrual system.

The gentleman would recall a hearing that was held in the Committee on Small Business where people were involved in the installation of drywall. It was a very small company and the Federal Government said even though they did not have a storehouse where they took the drywall, and even though they called the wholesaler and the wholesaler delivers the drywall directly to the place where it is to be installed, that we are going to consider this to be inventory and, therefore, we are going to tax them on the accrual method, which means that they are taxed based upon what they bill as opposed to what they receive.

This is a company of about 12 people, got hit with a \$200,000 tax bill. Now, it does not make sense because essentially the Federal Government collects no more money on the accrual system than it does on the cash system.

Mr. TOOMEY. It is really a question of timing, is it not, in terms of the Federal revenue on the taxes?

Mr. MANZULLO. It is.

Mr. TOOMEY. It is a question of timing, which is not terribly important to the Federal Government but it is incredibly important to the small business operator who in the example the gentleman just presented is forced to pay a huge tax bill on income that he has not collected yet. Is that correct?

Mr. MANZULLO. And may never collect.

Mr. TOOMEY. Right.

Mr. MANZULLO. In fact, the IRS had entered into some type of an agreement with a dentist in downstate Illinois that said he would have to be on the accrual method. We got wind of this and worked with a couple of organizations. I actually sat down with Commissioner Rossotti of the IRS. His background is in systems as opposed to being a tax attorney. He was really surprised that one of his 106,000 employees had forced this dentist to do that, and he put an end to it.

So we see all of these tremendous numbers of abuses and we are really working on, I believe, some monumental, in fact bipartisan, legislation to help out the small businesspeople.

I appreciate the gentleman from Pennsylvania joining us today for special orders.

SIX-MONTH PERIODIC REPORT ON NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO IRAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 107-68)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. HART) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and,

together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12170 of November 14, 1979.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 9, 2001.

WHAT ARE OUR REAL NATIONAL PRIORITIES?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Madam Speaker, it is good to be here today, though I am saddened by the fact that a budget has passed out of this House and I was unable to be on this budget resolution. That budget did not speak to the needs of my community. In fact, it did not speak to many communities, that of the environmental community as well as the education community.

It is amazing that the President said, when he was Candidate Bush, that he promised a new era of environmental protection, and that we should leave no child behind. Yet the impact of this budget today was simply that: We are leaving children behind, and the environment has not been given anything to enhance or direct some of the toxic wastes, the brownfields and all of those other environmental hazards that impact my district.

□ 1630

I can recall that last year in the budget when we talked about 100,000 new teachers. When I was a teacher, I really did gleam at the whole notion that we would for once pay attention to the importance of quality teachers, to bring those 100,000 new teachers into classrooms, whereby no child would be left behind in having a quality teacher.

When we talked about reducing class sizes, where class sizes would be no more than 20 students per class, again I was excited about the budget last year that brought forth those types of innovative provisions and initiatives that certainly did speak to leaving no child behind.

Today's budget resolution did not have either of those in there. In fact, the President has been very inconsistent with the application of his promise. If the President were true to his promise, he would not cut critical and necessary environmental and education programs.

It is so important for Watts in my community and other Members' urban

communities to have gotten from this body a budget that would speak to the issues that are so important to them, and yet we rushed quickly to get out the \$1.6 trillion tax cut, which invariably the Senate did reduce a bit to a \$1.35 trillion tax cut overall.

I am for a tax cut, have always been for one, but we must have targeted tax cuts that will enable us to have those 100,000 new teachers, that will enable us to have those reduced class sizes, so that in my districts of Compton and Watts and the Los Angeles Unified School District, students really will get quality education that they sorely need.

It is important that the American people understand that the children that we speak about are poor children. Those 53 million children that we have to educate in this country are poor, they are disabled; they are, for the most part, limited English speaking. They are in need of a budget that speaks to them, a budget that does not leave them behind.

So the Republican proposal provided less than half the average funds Congress granted the Department of Education for the past 5 years, in speaking to education, the Department of Education that Congress granted over the past 5 years, speaking to education, speaking to the environment, speaking to those needs of the children, the majority of the children who make up the 53 million children who are in dire need of those qualified teachers.

This proposal that the majority put out fraudulently inflates their increase by taking credit for funding previously provided initiatives during the past administration for the 2002 appropriations. In reality, Madam Speaker, that is not the way you do business in terms of a budget.

Let us look at some of the things that happened in this budget proposal. It actually guts out school renovation, whereby States have to then divert \$1.2 billion in their 2001 budget to fund other critical education programs, because they need more than \$100 billion to bring classrooms up to adequate condition.

I certainly would like for Members who voted on this budget to come to my district and to look at the classrooms in my district, where the ceilings are falling, where the seats have splinters, where the students cannot move around in the seats because they will really be in danger of getting some type of sore, some kind of mark, or just simply cannot sit still in a seat because the seat is not adequate for them.

I would like for you to come to my district, where we do not have computers for every student, that once a semester they get a different teacher, and this teacher has an emergency credential.

I want those who really voted on this budget to come to my district to look at the school environment and recognize that this budget did not speak to

those students. This budget also caps the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act, IDEA, funding at \$1.25 billion. Disabled students, students we are trying to bring into the mainstream, should be in the mainstream of education, having now to deal with caps and funding that is below par in meeting their needs, the needs of these students who have special needs, but still are very sharp, very much wanting to be in the mainstream of education, and needing the funding to provide them the type of resources that are critically needed.

Madam Speaker, it also cuts educational technology funding by \$55 million, less than the 2001 freeze level of \$872 million. What a travesty. We have an H1-B bill that passed out of this House sending for folks from other countries over here to do high-tech jobs because we do not have trained personnel for these jobs, and yet we are not even in the process of trying to train the future leaders in high-tech when we cut educational technology by \$55 million.

I have just mentioned to you that these schools do not have computers for every child or even a computer for every two or three children in a classroom; and if you look at the projections of the workforce in the next 5, 10, or 15 years, they will be the absolute children we are talking about today who are the poor children who will not have a chance to move into the world of work and high-tech jobs. They will simply be unable to meet the criteria for these jobs because of our not putting the money in a budget today that speaks to education for our children who will be the workforce of tomorrow.

So, I am simply concerned about this. It is a critical issue that really touches me deeply, because I was sent here by people who want to make their life better by education. They want to have a better quality of life by ensuring that their children have a qualified teacher and that the class sizes are conducive to learning. That means students who are in classes which have no more than 20 students.

So I say to you, those of you who voted on this bill, obviously you do not need the money for educational technology. Perhaps you do not need the money in your district for the individuals with disabilities. But I certainly do, and many of the Members here who represent urban and rural districts need this. So when we talk about "leave no child behind," I am afraid this budget in terms of education has left many children behind, many of whom represent the 53 million children who I speak of today.

When we talk about the environment, we again recognize that Candidate Bush promised a new era of environmental protection. I have grandchildren who talk about the water, because they have heard by others and have seen on television that we have a problem with arsenic in our drinking water. Yet this budget rescinded an

order that limits arsenic in drinking water, rescinded that, that limits the arsenic in drinking water. It is asking for more studies.

How many more studies will we have to present to discern the notion that we must limit arsenic in our drinking water, that we must have that Clean Water Act, and cannot erode that by any means; and yet it is being looked at as a possibility of being eroded by this budget, this President's budget that passed out of this House today.

There has been a renouncement of the Kyoto Agreement on global warming and reversed a campaign promise to regulate carbon dioxide emission from power plants. Again, there was a promise that the Candidate Bush did, but now we see has totally dissipated. But the emissions in the air are not dissipating at all. We still have this problem of carbon dioxide and other toxics in the air.

This is why the clean air and clean water bills cannot and should not be eliminated or diminished in their effectiveness, because of the critical need for the environment to again be conducive to children who play outside, who have no other recourse but to play outside, and they are playing in these areas where you have toxics, where you have carbon dioxide emissions in the air.

If that was not enough, we looked in this budget to see delayed new hard rock mining regulations that would require companies to protect water quality, pay for cleanup, and restore public lands ruined by mining activities.

These are provisions that were inside of this budget. A delay on this, rescinding on that, pushing back, suspending on others, clearly issues that do not and will not help this environment at all. We will not have a budget that speaks to clean air, clean water, clean up of toxic waste, clean up of brownfields.

Another provision in this budget that was proposed was a proposal to drill for oil and gas in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. We have heard a lot about ANWR. We have heard a lot about the need for that. And that is not a need. We should not disturb wildlife. We should try to find alternative means by which to deal with our environment, and it should not be that drilling for oil and gas at all in a place that will disturb the inhabitants.

The proposal was to suspend several of the past administration's environmental rules, including one that would protect the remaining roadless areas in the National Forest. What are we trying to do? What are we simply trying to do when we tend to erode those things that past administrations have done to speak to the needs of a cleaner, safer environment? Why are we trying to destroy those provisions, those initiatives, that will help the communities, the urban and rural communities, to reach levels where the air is cleaner, the water is safer, and, indeed, that there is no drilling in places that

will create a climate that is not conducive to one who wants to go into National Forests and wants to not have roads and other areas that will, again, impede their solace of being there.

We have looked at EPA in the budget that is supposed to help us with the clean water, clean air, brownfield cleanups, and yet there has been a cut in the funding of EPA by \$500 million, less than the 2001 freeze level.

Those of us who come out of local government, and once as a mayor of a city I recognized if you do not clean up the environment, you will not be able to induce or to even bring in businesses to provide the jobs for those who are the least of those who will get a tax cut or the results of a tax cut. You will simply not have those persons who will be able to make the charge of investing in this economy, investing in this country, if they do not have the jobs that accord them the salaries that will be conducive to the quality of life that we would want all Americans to have.

□ 1645

Yet we see these cuts in EPA of \$500 million.

The budget also provides \$850 million for the Clean Water State-Revolving Fund program, but it is less than two-thirds of last year's level. If, again, Madam Speaker, we are talking about clean water, we cannot make this budget and its resources less than two-thirds of last year's level. We have to bring this up to the level where those in this country will realize that we are trying to clean the water, we are trying to clean the air, we are trying to clean those brown fields, we are trying to stop the emissions in the air. We simply cannot state that charge if, in fact, the budget reflects something that is totally different, and which this budget did.

The budget also cut the EPA's science and technology program by \$54 million, again, from the 2001 freeze level. This cut includes \$4.5 million for safe drinking water research and a \$6.3 million cut in research on key air pollutants. I simply cannot understand a person who said with the most oratorical stance that one could make that there will be a new era of environmental protection; and yet this budget does not reflect any of that, a person who spoke about this comprehensive education package that will leave no child behind; and yet we see that many children will be left behind.

I simply say as an educator, I cannot go back to my district and say, well done, we have done what you need, we have met those needs that you have. I cannot go back to my grandchildren and those children who think that the water is tainted, that there should be something done with the water and say, well, we do not know whether we can do that; we do not know whether we can fix that now. I cannot tell my asthmatic children and grandchildren who have asthma that you really cannot go outside because the emission in

the air is so thick that you will not be able to breath. I simply cannot go home and say that "well done" on a great budget resolution. I cannot go home and say that this budget speaks to the needs of my community.

I simply will have to say that we do not have the right people making the right decisions for you; and, therefore, we need to look at the possibility of changing that in the near future. Because, Madam Speaker, if we are talking about the environmental and educational welfare of our children, then our Nation is at stake, our children, the environment really are at stake here. Because we have to speak to the children. We have to speak to the environment. We have to speak to the critical needs that will help us to address these needs, the critical needs of these areas that will not be advantaged by this tax cut. In fact, they do not even meet the levels of the tax cuts.

So if we are to live up to our promises, if we are to be the types of leaders that will be obligated to be responsible for those who are less fortunate, for those who are looking to us to provide those things that have not been provided for on the local and State level, then we must address why this budget resolution did not present itself in the fashion that would create the type of climate that would be conducive to the needs of those of whom I speak.

This is why I could not support the budget. I wanted to. I really wanted to help the President and help our country to have a budget that we could all rally behind and would appreciate. But that budget left behind our Nation's poorest and the most underserved children. And because of that, we simply cannot go out and rally that this budget was one for the urban or the rural communities. In fact, we cannot even say this budget presented itself for children so that we could bring them forward and not leave them behind.

It is a pretty sad day when we cut from educational technology and children are desperately trying to get on the Internet and trying to see just what that computer is all about. It is a sad day when the disabled student cannot get some of the resources that he or she needs because of this budget that did not speak to them. It is a very sad day when children cannot have adequate schools because of the renovation, the funding that has been cut from this budget.

I am pleased that we have one who has come to the floor who is a great leader, who is one of our budget persons, and who can speak to and articulate why the majority of this Democratic House did not vote on this budget. I present to my colleagues now this outstanding leader, the gentlewoman from the State of North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I appreciate her leadership in coming to

the floor and speaking about the seriousness of this budget and how it affects children, how it affects the environment. I heard the gentlewoman say what a marvelous thing he is doing for the country, to point out the seriousness of a budget document. The budget document is very important. It says, where are we going to put our resources. It says, indeed, where we place value. It says if we are talking from a political campaign or from a deep-seated commitment of American resources.

Now, the document should indeed be about where our priorities and our needs are; and the gentlewoman was correct, I think I heard her talk about recruiting teachers. I know the gentlewoman has taken a leadership role on that before she came to Congress on the whole issue, and she knows the critical shortage of teachers we have across America. She also knows that the future of our country is based on having good schools. So we have to have those who are able to lead the others. So it is so critical, and the number one priority in America happens to be education. Yet it was the most egregious omission in the budget.

Now, I come from agriculture; and I am very pleased that I saw there was some lifting up of the agriculture over what we had originally, so I want to applaud that. But I cannot accept that this budget was an important document; and you know that at the end of the day, that document will not be the guide that we just passed for several reasons. One, we cannot ignore the priorities of education and prescription drugs and the needs of America without the appropriators hearing from all of us and hearing from America who is saying, regardless of what we did with the budget, we have desperate needs. Regardless of what we have heard in terms of opportunities for us to get by with so little, we need more resources. So we know at the end of the day they are going to ignore those caps, and they are going to exceed those caps.

Also, we know that the budget is an important document because it should tell us where we are going to get our resources. We know that when we balance our budget at home, we cannot speculate that the job I do not have, I can just plug in a number. Well, the Federal Government, how we fund our resources is usually from taxes; and those are the actions we now have an obligation or that are legal on the books. So that is one.

The other one for resources happens to be trust funds, trust funds committed for the future. What are those trust funds? The trust fund for Social Security, the trust fund for Medicare. Or another way we can add resources, we can say well, if I need more money, I will just reduce spending over here in order to put money over there. So that is another way. So our budget should clearly indicate to the American people, how do we plan to pay for this and where do we get those monies? What tax reductions will do? So if we reduce

the taxes, do we get more from the trust fund? Or do we cut programs? The money has to come from somewhere. So if we have an important document that should be telling the American people, this is a guide, well, the guide should clearly say, if I look at your budget, I know your resources and I know your revenue; and I know where these resources are from and how we gather the revenue, and that I am not either going into the Medicare Trust Fund, I am not going into the Social Security Trust Fund.

Why is that important? Well, in the tax budget we just passed, it says that we will have a \$1.25 trillion tax reduction over the next 10 years. Now, that is just the beginning of the process. That is not the end. And we are paying down less of our debt. If we pay less of our debt, that means, guess what? Interest will go up. And as the interest goes up, so will that tax bill go up. We will find as we do that, the American people will say, well, I thought you said that the tax reduction was only about 1.3. How come at the end of the day, it is almost 1.6 or \$2 trillion? Well, you have to add interest; and guess what, there are some other tax adjustments that we need to do, and a number for interest will be knocking on the door.

So again, I want to commend the gentlewoman for taking the time to explain to the American people and to our colleagues that the gentlewoman takes seriously the budget process, and I know I do. I am on the Committee on the Budget. I am offended not only by process, but also by substance. We have 435 of us, and the process allows that in a conference stage, the conferees, taken from both sides, should meet together. Now, we understand that the Democrats are in the minority and they will lose many of those battles supposedly, but we do not expect to be shut out completely.

So I am offended by process, but I am equally offended by substance, which is not there, the kinds of things that we will not be able to do. The kids will not be able to get educated, the environment will not be able to keep clean, and the commitment to the American people we cannot sustain if, indeed, we go with this budget resolution as it is. It means that we have to indeed get the money from somewhere. So it has to come from the trust funds, Social Security and Medicare. When we do that, we have violated the trust and our commitment to the American people. There is not enough money for prescription drugs, and the gentlewoman knows that as well.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for coming to the floor, because I tried to just take portions of this to speak on and next week we will speak on some of the others; and hopefully, this will send a signal to those conferees that we really are concerned about the impact this budget will have on our communities.

But when we look at the cuts in educational technology, the gentlewoman was one of the lead persons on the H1B bill, that really suggests to me and hopefully to some others of us that we are not trying to get the future ready for these high-tech jobs that surely should be the workforce from this country and not having to bring folks from across the waters to try to fill those types of high-tech jobs. So when we cut from educational technology, we are simply saying, that workforce that will mirror more of a minority, we do not worry about them anyway. We will just continue to bring people over. So the gentlewoman's take on that is really very valid.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Again, Madam Speaker, I just want to thank the gentlewoman for taking the time and taking the leadership and for raising the consciousness and the understanding of the importance or the lack thereof, as we propose, of the budget process. Perhaps the American people will understand what happened today is of some significance, and they should wake up and be engaged in this process.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Well, again, we thank the gentlewoman so much and thank her for the work that she has done on the budget, irrespective of how it came out today.

We have again with us one of the great leaders of another State that has been front and center on education and on the environment, and I am sure she can pull from that budget any number of things that she feels was really egregious for the constituents whom she serves. Let me please recognize now the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY).

□ 1700

Ms. MCKINNEY. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, I would like to applaud the fact that the gentlewoman had the initiative, the gentlewoman took the initiative to come down here to talk to the American people, to talk to our constituents about the issues that are very important to us and issues that are important to them, promises made and promises broken.

At the same time, we hear from the White House statements like, I am keeping the promises I campaigned on.

Let us just go and replay that campaign, because as far as I can remember, if I remember correctly, the current occupant of the White House lost the vote of the American people by 500,000.

Then on top of that, I had an election reform town hall meeting, and at the town hall meeting, we had the private company ChoicePoint come and testify about how the voter list was affected, so that those people who would go and present themselves in Florida and try to vote were denied the right to vote, because they started off the process with a list that was wrong.

What ChoicePoint testified at our hearing was that the State of Florida requested an inaccurate list. They requested a list of ineligible voters that was larger than the number of actual ineligible voters in Florida.

Where did they get those additional names of ineligible voters? They got those additional names from the State of Texas. Remind me. Who was running the State of Texas? Who is now running the State of Florida?

So we have the Bush brothers getting together and deciding who is going to vote in Florida and who is not going to vote in Florida, and then we have Kathy Harris coming up here on Capitol Hill to the Congress, the most powerful legislative body on the planet of Earth, coming and saying that election reform is the most important agenda for me as Secretary of State.

If the State of Florida was important to the Bush brothers in the year 2000, just imagine after having lost the popular vote by 500,000-plus, how important is the State of Florida going to be in the year 2004?

Now we are asked to come here to talk about the environment and the budget, and I see that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HART), who is sitting in the chair, is watching the timer, because this is the kind of information that folks do not want to come out.

Forty-five percent of George W. Bush's tax cut is going to go to the wealthiest 1 percent of taxpayers. If you make a million dollars, you are going to get a lot back. But if you happen to be a regular, average American, you will not get very much back; but we want to make sure that regular, average Americans get the most that they can get back.

Is it not interesting, I just happened to compile a list, we got up to 80 important issues for the first 100 of the Bush days. I would like to remind the people that this is the wealthiest Cabinet in the history of the United States. So, of course, they are going to go all over the country talking about we have to support the President's tax proposal.

How much are they going to get back? Our Secretary of Energy, Spencer Abraham, campaigned on a platform to abolish the Department of Energy; is that not interesting? Can you imagine? No wonder the White House is now going into apoplexy as they try and recover their position on the environment.

Americans, by a remarkable 7-1 margin, think that Bush is less concerned about protecting the environment than protecting the interests of the energy industry. Of course, we see that oil is thicker than blood, because now George W. is even going against his brother Jeb down in Florida, so that they can auction off offshore oil and gas leases in the Gulf of Mexico.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) gave the administration an "incomplete" with respect to dealing with the environment in their first 100

days. Now, we also would have to give the administration an incomplete, because even as we try and take care of business on behalf of our constituents, and, of course, we have to interact with the White House, I guess they are just yelling down the hall to empty offices, because 90 percent of the positions have not even been filled.

Madam Speaker, I have written letters to the White House on the Yucca Mountain project, the apparent appointment of Walter Kansteiner, which is an abomination, to be the assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs. That appointment is an abomination.

I have written to the White House on the Kyoto Protocol, on behalf of the people of Vieques, on behalf of people who have hemophilia, about the issue of the Free Trade Area of the Americas, about the education rate or the E-rate program, about the National Science Foundation, about the need for the Center for Disease Control and Prevention in my district, which is responsible for doing the most incredible things around the world on behalf of our health security.

I have written about contract bundling and the negative impact that it has on minorities and women who want to do business with the Federal Government. I have written about the 2000 Census. I have also written about the 1946 murders of four black sharecroppers in Walton, Georgia, who were lynched.

What have I gotten in response? I got a letter that says, I have shared your letter with the President's advisers and the appropriate agencies who have been formulating policy recommendations in this area.

Hello.

You were elected how many months ago? You had your plan of operation how many months ago? You certainly had your plan of operation in effect in November of the year 2000, because you took the election. But what comes after the election is governing, and that unfortunately is not what is being done.

The American people are being shortchanged. The American people are being shortchanged by what is happening in this Congress, with this Republican majority, that since it was elected in 1994 has failed to produce a budget on time.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) for her leadership. I want to thank her for allowing us to have this opportunity to come here tonight and to let the American people know what is really happening with their government, our government.

We must have change. We must be able to deliver on behalf of our constituents.

Madam Speaker, I include the following for the RECORD:

1. Bush campaigned on a pledge to provide a \$1.6 trillion tax cut to America's wealthiest families.

2. Bush named the wealthiest cabinet in the history of the United States.

3. Bush's Cabinet stumped for the President's tax cut proposal.

4. Bush's number one priority in his first 100 days has been promoting a tax plan that will cost \$2.6 trillion over the next ten years. 45% of his cut will benefit the wealthiest one-percent of taxpayers, people with an average income of \$915,000.

5. The Bush tax plan against women and lower income earners gives no tax relief at all to those families too poor to pay income taxes (12 million families with 24 million children), no tax deductions for 53% of Black and Hispanic families; and no tax cuts made for single persons earning between \$6,001 to \$27,050 nor for married persons earning \$12,001 to \$45,200.

6. The administration's proposal also fails to make adjustments that would make tax rates truly progressive. Completely untouched is the regressive payroll tax that places the heaviest burden on low to middle income workers, predominately female, while leaving in place a substantial break for high income earners who make no payroll tax contributions above the \$80,400 level (most of whom are men, of course).

7. Bush's tax cut would wipe out the rest of any funds available, leaving nothing for future contingencies, including shoring up Social Security.

8. The richest cabinet in history will get a kickback of over \$100 million through Bush's efforts to push the Estate Tax legislation through Congress.

9. The Republican party is so devoid of talent that Bush named a record number of George Herbert Walker retreats to his Administration. There's no question about one assignment that's going to get a big, fat "Incomplete"—installing the 487 top officials who will run the executive branch the next four years. 90% of assigned positions are unfilled.

10. Our new Secretary of Energy, Spencer Abraham, recently campaigned on eliminating the Department of Energy, the very program he now runs, while also leading efforts to prevent increased fuel efficiency in vehicles.

11. Our Secretary of the Interior, Gale Norton, has led efforts to rollback endangered species protection and allowed mining company polluters to escape clean up requirements and liability.

12. Bush appointed Gale Norton as Secretary of Interior because she believes that corporations have a constitutional right to pollute.

13. Gale Norton's first concrete attempt at a regulatory rollback was a proposal to gut updated environmental mining regulations that went into effect at the end of the Clinton administration. Independent reports estimate that taxpayers could be on the hook for about \$1 billion in environmental cleanup cost from today's mines.

14. President Bush's choice for the No. 3 spot at the Department of Energy is Robert G. Card, who until recently was CEO and president of a cleanup contractor that has been fined or penalized more than \$725,000 for numerous worker safety, procurement and other violations since 1996.

15. The New Attorney General has a history of blocking enforcement of environmental laws; and throughout his career, Ashcroft has worked tirelessly to restrict a woman's right to choose.

16. The new head of the EPA, Christine Whitman, who doubts that global warming is a serious problem, defended global warming and got kicked by Bush. In a memo from Whitman to Bush, the EPA Administrator stressed the need for Bush to "appear" to be engaged in addressing global warming, as if the environment responds to appearances.

17. Tommy Thompson, the new Secretary of the Department Of Health and Human Services was one of the country's most anti-choice governors and now heads up the department that wields the greatest influence over policies affecting women's reproductive health.

18. Bush named Don Eberly, a right wing activist who was an official with the National Fatherhood Institute, to head up a White House office for faith-based programs. Some women's rights advocates are concerned that Eberly will utilize the office to help funnel even more federal monies to misogynist groups who promote so-called fatherhood initiatives.

19. John Negroponte, Bush's appointee for UN Ambassador has a track record of disrespecting human rights. During his tour as ambassador to Honduras, Negroponte earned his reputation for being soft on human rights abuses. Under the helm of General Gustavo Alvarez Martinez, Honduras's military government was both a close ally of the Reagan administration and was disappearing dozens of political opponents in classic death squad fashion. Negroponte turned a blind eye to human rights abuses and even helped to cover up extrajudicial killings.

20. Bush's appointee for Undersecretary of State for Arms Control and International Security, John Bolton, does not belong in the arms control job because, as the director of the Carnegie Non-Proliferation Project, Joseph Cirincione, says: "Bolton is philosophically opposed to most of the international treaties that comprise the nonproliferation regime."

21. The nomination of Cuban-born Otto J. Reich as the State Department's top Latin American official is drawing Democratic criticism based on his role in the 1980s Central American wars. The Democrats' concerns over Reich focus on his leadership of the State Department's one-time Office of Public Diplomacy for Latin America and the Caribbean. The office—which Reich led from its inception in June 1983 until January 1986 was accused of running an illegal, covert domestic propaganda effort against Nicaragua's leftist Sandinista government and in favor of the Contra rebels.

22. Bush named Linda Fisher, an executive with Monsanto Co., a leading developer of the world's most dangerous chemicals and biotech foods, for the second-ranking job at the Environmental Protection Agency, the White House said yesterday.

23. Energy interests gave \$2.9 million to Bush for his political campaign, and then kicked in an additional \$2.2 million for his inauguration fund.

24. Bush plans to allow drilling in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge and to sell out our public lands to private interests.

25. He did a big favor for major electricity wholesalers by keeping the federal government largely out of the California energy crisis, which has produced major profits for energy companies including Dynegy Inc., Enron Corp. and Reliant Energy Inc., all of which are based in Bush's home state of Texas.

26. Bush showed his loyalty to the coal mining and electricity industries when he reversed a campaign pledge to reduce carbon dioxide emissions, which may have saved an estimated 30,000 lives a year of those who die due to respiratory illness.

27. Bush endangered the world's future and damaged our credibility in the International community when he announced the United States' withdrawal from the Kyoto Protocol, an international treaty aimed at combating global warming. Seems that he's more interested in changing the global climate than the political climate.

28. Dick Cheney formulated crucial energy policy decisions behind closed doors.

29. Cheney's task force focused heavily on incentives for production; easing regulatory barriers for energy development; and opening more public lands to drilling including national monuments and the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska.

30. Americans, by a remarkable 7-to-1 margin, think that Bush is less concerned about protecting the environment than about protecting the interests of the energy industry.

31. Despite objections from his brother, Florida Governor Jeb Bush, he plans on auctioning offshore oil and gas leases in the Gulf of Mexico. Seems that natural gas is thicker than blood.

32. The Bush administration announced that it will block a rule from Clinton's administration requiring more energy efficient air conditioners.

33. Republican representative Sherwood Boehlert said that the Bush first 100 days deserve the grade of "incomplete in dealing with the environment."

34. Bush's budget proposes slashing more than \$200 million from federal renewable energy and efficiency research programs, even as his administration declares the United States needs to find ways to cope with an "energy crisis."

35. The snows of Mount Kilimanjaro melt away as global temperatures and ocean levels rise, Bush plans nothing to address it.

36. The Environmental Protection Agency announced it would withdraw the pending decrease in allowable arsenic for drinking water, prepared during the final days of the Clinton administration.

37. Bush asked Congress to remove from the Endangered Species Act a provision that allows environmental groups and others to sue the Interior Department to get rare plants and animals listed as endangered.

38. The Bush Administration plans to suspend rules that require federal contractors to comply with environmental, civil rights and labor laws.

39. In Quebec, Bush announced his intention to promote a trade plan for the Americas based on the failed NAFTA model. This will lead to further erosion of labor rights, human rights, and environmental protections throughout the hemisphere.

40. And Bush is looking to kill the roadless policy rule that will protect millions of acres of public land from taxpayer subsidized logging.

41. A Bush White House aide confirms that Bush is taking a look at recommending easing clean air regulations without Congressional actions, thus saving utilities and coal-mining companies billions of dollars of violations of clean air regulations and at the same time mooted legal action against polluting companies.

42. Bush was the top recipient of contributions from tobacco companies. Through carefully orchestrated budget cuts, Bush has managed to kill the lawsuit that the Justice Department has against big tobacco for deliberately deceiving the American people on public health issues. This move could potentially save big tobacco billions.

43. Speaking of Bankrupt public policy. Legislation championed for years by the financial industry that would make it harder for consumers to wipe away their debts was passed by an overwhelming margin in both chambers of Congress. Though a similar measure had been approved last year, President Clinton vetoed it. Bush, however, has signaled he will sign the bill, a move that could generate an estimated tens of millions of dollars in additional revenue for major credit card companies.

44. Where did Bush's enthusiasm come from? Charles Cawley, President of MBNA America personally raised at least \$100,000 for the Bush campaign, qualifying him for

admission into the Pioneers, the campaign's roster of top supporters. Last January, Cawley broke out his checkbook again, writing a \$100,000 check to the Bush-Cheney Inaugural Fund.

45. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce contributed more than \$514,000 to candidates and parties, 94% of that money went to Republicans, and the National Association of Manufacturers spent \$12.8 million lobbying Members of Congress from 1997 to 1999.

46. In a private meeting in late February, Bush and Republican congressional leaders decided to kill the ergonomics rule put forth by the Clinton Administration, which would protect workers from workplace related injuries.

47. Following his pledge to leave no [rich] child behind, President's Bush's budget reduces resources for the Child Care and Development Block Grant projects by \$200 million. That means that many low-income children will no longer be eligible for childcare, making it more difficult for their parents to work.

48. Bush plans to eliminate all funding for the Early Learning Opportunities program, which would have supported parent education and family support services.

49. Bush's budget will shortchange vital education programs; including efforts to reduce class sizes, improve teacher training, repair crumbling schools, promote after-school programs, and increase the number of Pell Grants available to low income freshmen.

50. Bush plans to cut in half grants that help states investigate and prevent child abuse and neglect.

51. President Bush has proposed a regime of annual testing for all students between grades three and eight. Schools that demonstrated an improvement in performance would be granted increased federal funding. Students at schools designated as low-performing would, after three years, be able to use their share of federal funds to attend other public or private schools. The school would then be privatized with the assistance of the federal government.

52. Bush's budget does not even provide funds to keep up with inflation for the WIC program, which provides vital nutrition assistance to low-income women, infants, and children.

53. On the anniversary of Roe v. Wade, President Bush ordered the reinstatement of the global "gag" rule on international family planning programs, programs that strive to prevent unintended pregnancies, reduce abortion, and avert hundreds of thousands of infant and maternal deaths worldwide each year.

54. Bush is prepared to unilaterally abrogate the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty.

55. Bush strongly advocates the National Missile Defense System or "Star Wars". This program has cost taxpayers over \$40 billion to date, and yet it has failed repeatedly in carefully orchestrated tests. The program is destabilizing and China has already indicated that it would initiate an arms race if the U.S. pursues the program.

56. The Bush administration has put its European allies on notice that it intends to move quickly to develop a missile defense and plans to abandon or fundamentally alter the treaty that has been the keystone of arms control for nearly 30 years.

57. Bush said he would suspend negotiations with North Korea, this strict stance on Korea has soured once-improving relations with North Korea.

58. The U.S. bombs 10 miles outside of Baghdad—a major metropolitan area—saying that the area was "unpopulated."

59. Plans by U.S. President George W. Bush to sell weapons including eight diesel-powered submarines to Taiwan have received an

embarrassing setback at the hands of European governments. Neither the Germans nor the Dutch, who have sown up the market in diesel submarines, are willing to allow the sale of the subs to Taiwan.

60. Under Bush, there has been a growing Anti-US feeling in the EU and around the world.

61. Bush's decision to proceed with arms sales to Taiwan—China has said that offensive weapons such as subs will only lead to greater tensions in Asia.

62. Bush's commitment to the Balkans. While trying to build peace he is reducing U.S. commitment to peacebuilding. Same with the Middle East where tensions are growing and he is seeking to be less involved.

63. Bush has continued use of drug certification and the nomination of another hard liner to lead the War on Drugs.

64. President Bush worked with the CIA and a Private Military Company to cover up their responsibility in the deaths of two American missionaries killed by a Peruvian fighter as part of U.S. drug war strategy.

65. For women who depend upon government to advance economic equity in an economically unjust society, there would be little or no money for improved child care/early childhood education programs, effective Equal Employment Opportunity Commission enforcement against discrimination and harassment.

66. There will be little or no money for expansion of Violence Against Women programs, few options for expansion of health care coverage to the 43 million uncovered, no funds for a new prescription drug benefit for seniors.

67. A multi-trillion dollar tax cut may also jeopardize the future financial solvency of Social Security and Medicare—the majority of beneficiaries being women—and there will be few resources remaining for critically needed social investments.

68. Bush proposes to privatize Social Security, a move that jeopardizes the financial future of millions of Americans.

69. President Bush announced an expanded faith-based initiative and a vigorous, but misguided campaign to turn over social service programs to religious organizations. Faith-based initiatives, a more pernicious version of the old "charitable choice," would permit direct federal funding of programs run by religious organizations, free to proselytize and discriminate, that would have little public accountability.

70. Bush's faith based initiative faces major setback: people of faith have little faith in it!

71. President Bush's budget will propose deep cuts in a variety of health programs for people without health insurance. Services providing "health care access for the uninsured," would be reduced 86 percent, to \$20 million, from \$140 million in the current fiscal year.

72. Mr. Bush's budget request would also cut federal spending for the training of doctors, dentists, nurses, pharmacists and other health professionals.

73. Bush put a stop to giving unions preference on contracts for federal building projects.

74. Senator Pete Domenici disagrees vehemently with Bush's decision to hold all federal spending to no more than a 4% increase.

75. Kathy Harris, symbol of a purposely-failed election, travels to Washington to testify before Congress on the need to have elections that the people can believe in.

76. George W. Bush needs to win the Florida electoral college vote more in 2004 than in 2000. Therefore, don't look too soon for any election reform from this President.

77. According to David Broder, "The Bush White House so far has not made changing

the election system a priority. The President's proposed budget, along with the budget resolutions of the House and Senate, set aside no fund for federal aid for improving election equipment or administration.

78. Republican Jim Ramstad said that Bush White House interference in Minnesota politics could end up hurting the party. A phone call by Dick Cheney to dissuade a potential candidate from running has all the markings of Bush and Cheney trying to be a "kingmaker" thwarting the will of the people.

79. World reaction was tepid, critical or simply silent to President Bush's announcement that the United States would build a shield against ballistic missile attacks.

80. President Bush throws a bash featuring 535 Members of Congress to celebrate his first 100 days and schedules it on a Monday when few Members of Congress are in town: fewer than 200 Members of Congress bothered to show up.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY) for her extraordinary leadership, for bringing the really poignant issues to the American people. The American people need to hear what passed out of this House or, more importantly, what did not pass out of this House in terms of a budget for them.

If we are indeed to have a value system that speaks to those who are less fortunate, then a budget should reflect that.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to have the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) here, who is an outstanding Member, an outstanding woman who had served with me in the State legislature of California, who was also a mayor of a city at the time that I, too, was one in another city in California.

The gentlewoman has been extremely strong in her leadership on the issues of education, the environment, on our children who are limited English-speaking.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) to discuss this budget.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) for the opportunity to speak on our President's budget and the environment; that topic is very near and dear to many of us from the West Coast.

President Bush certainly has not received any honeymoon from the Nation's environmentalists: global warming, oil drilling in Alaska, arsenic levels in drinking water, all of the issues that have garnered headlines as environmentalists and others have argued with the President's position.

President Bush also stated last week in a Los Angeles Times article that he is committed to clean air and clean water. We hear him. We honor him. I have the perfect opportunity for him to demonstrate that commitment and achieve an early, bipartisan environmental safety victory.

There is a 10½ million ton mountain of radioactive uranium scrap in a city called Moab in the State of Utah. That

particular site is leaking 57,000 gallons a day of poison into the Colorado River, which is one of the main sources of tap water for over 20 million Americans, some 18 out of California, and then others from Nevada, Utah, Colorado, Arizona. And it is the main source of tap water for all of these individuals.

Even though Moab is several hundred miles upstream from where we are, from the point of where southern California draws its water, and no unsafe level of radioactivity or toxic substances to date have been detected in our area, it is a matter that requires our immediate attention.

Let me tell my colleagues a little bit about this. This is a very dangerous situation that scientists and environmental groups and many public officials from those areas have referred to as a radioactive time bomb.

Picture a truncated mountain or an ancient ruin that is covering 130 acres and in circumference rising 11 stories high. This is the ominous legacy of a nearby uranium ore mill, which for 28 years processed uranium ore for our national defense during the Cold War.

These mill tailings, or scrap, were dumped into an unlined pond that eventually grew into this huge mountain. Because of the mountain's concave top, rainwater funnels through the tailings, out the bottom, as a brew 650 feet away that includes arsenic, lead and ammonia. That is just to name a few of those contaminants.

Pressed to clean up this toxic site, the Atlas Corporation that ran it filed bankruptcy in 1998. Now, who can predict when this mountain's poisons will endanger our health and that of our children, of our grandchildren and their grandchildren? As a grandmother of 14, there is a question I sure do not wish to contemplate. We must act now. We cannot wait.

Last year, Congress passed and former President Clinton signed a bipartisan legislation for the Department of Energy to take control of this site of Moab, to clean it up, take it over from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

This would not have been possible without the support of Members of Congress on both sides, the generosity of the Ute Indian Tribe who had agreed to sign a memorandum of understanding with the Department of Energy to allow them to acquire the Department's naval oil shale reserve.

This Federal land, rich in gas reserve, was taken away from the Ute Tribe by the Federal Government in 1915. In return, the pledge made by the Ute Tribe dedicates a portion of the gas royalties towards the cleanup and removal, not capping, removal of the uranium tailings pile.

Our legislative goal this year will be to get this \$10 million for cleanup in the Department of Energy's nondefense environmental programs.

I remind my colleagues, this is not a line item in the budget. It was not included in our President's budget. It is

such an important issue, and yet it was not even considered for entry into our budget for this coming year.

The cleanup is not just a priority to the residents of the 34th Congressional District, my district; it is an issue for agencies like the Metropolitan Water District and others who import the drinking water from Colorado for over 17 million urban Southland residents. Efforts to clean up these uranium wastes are being championed by all of them throughout the western States of Utah, Nevada, Arizona, California and other States.

□ 1715

The gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER), the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) are all moving in a broad bipartisan coalition to press for the removal of this radioactive uranium waste and the cleanup of this site that affects millions of Americans.

My colleagues and I will work diligently to educate our new Secretary of Energy and Members in the House and Senate about this looming catastrophe. In these exciting days of this new Congress, and with our new administration, we all look forward to joining with our president, with Secretary Abraham, and with colleagues on both sides to serve the best interest of our western States to ensure that clean water from the Colorado is available for future generations and will protect not only the environment but the precious sites that exist in that area.

I do not know how much time the gentlewoman has left; but if I have another few minutes, I have another issue of environment that I would like to mention.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. That would be fine.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. There is another issue that deals with environmental issues, and that is the tertiary treatment of water now being effectuated in some areas, including in California water that is treated before it is released into the ocean. EPA is now mandating that treatment plants be set up, costing taxpayers billions of dollars, in order to do a fourth treatment before that water is released into the ocean, or at least a third of it is treated. This water, which is used for irrigation in green spaces, in government areas for commercial and industrial use, is to be given a fourth treatment.

Now, imagine that we have an agency, EPA, that is saying that we will now have to consider doing a fourth treatment to water that is already given the highest treatment before release for any other use. I think that we need to be very careful. Although we want to protect the health concerns of our citizens, and we are certainly concerned about the after-effects of anything that we release for consumption, although we do not drink tertiary-treated water, it is used for commercial and industrial and irrigation pur-

poses, we are also aware that the costs that are going to be borne to do a treatment for which there has not been any validity given to it, that fourth treatment.

We must find ways of being able to work with the environmental community to give that fourth treatment, whether it is through settling ponds, so that it can filter through nature's way, or be able to utilize it in melding through the rivers and aquifers, so that we do not saddle the taxpayers with additional burdens of paying for additional costs to set up agencies to do a fourth treatment on water. That is a very important issue for anybody who is concerned about their aquifer refurbishment so that we have enough water in times of drought.

That is very important and a very safe way of being able to deal with water shortages and other issues that are now facing us in many areas of our country.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend and colleague, one of the great women out of the State of California, for coming today to lend the support of why we did not vote on this budget and why this budget is not good for American people who have been left short of the American Dream.

I now have another outstanding leader of this House who has demonstrated over and over again her leadership on a myriad of issues, but critically on the environment and education. I am pleased to yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) to speak about the impact of this budget on her constituents and on some of our American people.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding to me and for her leadership in gathering us today to talk about the budget that just passed the House of Representatives. And I am sorry to say it passed without my vote, because I would have liked to have voted for a budget that would have done what is right for the American people. That was not this budget.

We are at a remarkable point in our history right now. For the first time in memory, really, we have a surplus of money in the budget. We have an opportunity as Americans now, as a family might do, to say, okay, now we have some extra money available, why do we not look around and see if it is not time to fix the roof, to send our kids to a really good university, to provide ourselves with the health care that we need, to clean up our community, to make things better, to pay down our debts. How about that? We could pay off our debts, if as a family we had extra money.

But instead of doing that, we are about to squander the money that we have by giving most of it to the wealthiest of Americans, at the expense of what? Well, as a mother and as a grandmother, I am very concerned about education. As a Congresswoman,

I have been going around my district, and not just to poor communities but to my suburban communities, and what do I find? I find schools that are overcrowded, where kids are bundled up in a couple of classes in one room, where ceiling paint is falling down, where there is not enough computers to teach the new technologies. We cannot even plug in computers in some schools because the wiring is faulty.

We have the money now to do school construction, to provide after-school programs, and early childhood education. Things that would benefit all of our children are within our reach right now because we have a surplus of dollars. What instead are we doing? We look at the education budget that came out of this House today, and it does not even include what the President of the United States asked for in increasing the budget. It barely increases education funding by the rate of inflation, one of the poorest increases in education funding that we have ever seen, or at least in recent years. And yet this President says he is an education President. We are doing so little for what needs so much right now. And knowing what we could do, it just makes me want to weep.

I live in Chicago; I represent a district in Chicago where there is a crisis in affordable housing. We are short about 155,000 affordable housing units in the Chicago area. This budget that came out of this House today cuts \$2 billion from housing and urban development, money that could go to provide housing. Not more housing. As a consequence, we could get less housing. We are meeting less of the need than we should have.

If we look at the programs that have formed the basis of our security net in this country, Social Security and Medicare, programs that have worked to lift seniors out of poverty, have provided health care for our elders, people with disabilities, widows and orphans, things that all Americans can be proud of, all Americans rely on, this threatens the integrity of the Social Security Trust Fund. It threatens Medicare. It raids the Medicare Trust Fund to pay for an inadequate prescription drug benefit.

So senior citizens who thought, my goodness, both candidates for President, including George Bush, campaigned he wanted a prescription drug benefit under Medicare. But do not look in this budget that just came out of the House. I am afraid to say it is not there. There is a measly program that will go to seniors, some of whom earn \$11,500 or less. But we know even middle-income seniors are going broke because they cannot buy their prescription drugs. Where is the prescription drug benefit under Medicare? It is not there.

This is the first budget in a long time that does not give more funding for the Ryan White Care Act for the AIDS pandemic that continues to rage in the United States, even as AIDS cases, particularly among women, particularly

among women of color, continues to accelerate. There is no money for that.

Child abuse prevention is cut. Child care is cut. Graduate medical education training for doctors to work in children's hospitals is cut. Veterans benefits are inadequate. Medicaid is being cut. We are supposed to be trying to pay down our debt, which would help us bolster the Social Security Trust Fund.

All of this is being crowded out by a tax cut almost half of which is going to go to the wealthiest Americans. Does it make any sense that we help the million millionaires at the expense of 39 million senior citizens and persons with disabilities who want a prescription drug benefit or want to know that their Medicare is safe? And it is all based on projections of a surplus for the next 10 years that is using a flawed crystal ball.

What makes us think that our projections are going to work when they never have in the past? We have always been way off; yet we are going to commit this money. No family would do that. We are going to commit this money now and hope that it will be there. This budget is fuzzy math, big time; and it jeopardizes all of the programs that have helped Americans to improve their quality of life.

I thank the gentlewoman for letting me say that.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman so much. I really do thank her, and I appreciate her leadership on the issues.

Mr. Speaker, as we close, we want to remind all of us that the number one priority for this country must be our children, the future of tomorrow. And if education is going to be anything, it should be to not leave any child behind. Hopefully, the conferees will look at that; and we will have a budget coming out of the Senate side, I should say, that will help us in bridging the ones who are underrepresented along with those who are represented in terms of the American Dream.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BROWN of South Carolina). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1825

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DREIER) at 6 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1646, FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 2002 AND 2003

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-62) on the resolution (H. Res. 138) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1646) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal years 2002 and 2003, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. INSLEE (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for May 8 on account of flight delays.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. HINCHEY, for 5 minutes, today.
 Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. HINOJOSA, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. LANGEVIN, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. MCGOVERN, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. ETHERIDGE, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mrs. JONES of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.
 The following Members (at the request of Mr. PENCE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.
 Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, May 16.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until Thursday, May 10, 2001, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1796. A letter from the Acting Administrator, FSA, Department of Agriculture,

transmitting the Department's final rule—Wool and Mohair Market Loss Assistance Program and Apple Market Loss Assistance Program (RIN: 0560-AG35) received April 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1797. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Brucellosis in Cattle; State and Area Classifications; Oklahoma [Docket No. 01-016-1] received April 25, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1798. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Plant Protection Act; Revisions to Authority Citations [Docket No. 00-063-2] received April 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1799. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products; Central Air Conditioners and Heat Pumps Energy Conservation Standards [Docket No. EE-RM-98-440] (RIN: 1904-AA77) received April 24, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1800. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision to Requirements for Licensed Anti-Human Globulin and Blood Grouping Reagents; Confirmation of Effective Date [Docket No. 00N-1586] received April 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1801. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Illinois [IL197-1a; FRL-6970-6] received April 23, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1802. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Plans For Designated Facilities and Pollutants: Rhode Island; Plan for Controlling Emissions From Existing Hospital/Medical/Infectious Waste Incinerators [Docket No. RI040-7167a; FRL-6971-1] received April 23, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1803. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New York; Motor Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program [Region II Docket No. 45-216; FRL-6924-3] received April 23, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1804. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Butte County Air Quality Management District [CA 153-0195a; FRL-6958-1] received April 26, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1805. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Revisions to the Arizona State Implementation Plan, Pinal-Gila Counties Air Quality Control District and Pinal County

Air Quality Control District [AZ 099-0032a; FRL-6967-8] received April 26, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1806. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.606(b), Table of Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations (New Iberia, Louisiana) [MM Docket No. 01-2; RM-10036] received April 24, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1807. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Kankakee and Park Forest, Illinois) [MM Docket No. 99-330; RM-9677] received April 24, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1808. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), FM Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Monticello, Arkansas and Bastrop, Louisiana) [MM Docket No. 99-141; RM-9339] received April 24, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1809. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.622(b), Table of Allotments, Digital Television Broadcast Stations (Jacksonville, North Carolina) [MM Docket No. 01-3; RM-10010] received April 24, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1810. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-48, "Prevention of Unauthorized Switching of Customer Natural Gas Accounts Temporary Act of 2001" received May 9, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1811. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-46, "Dedication and Designation of Tremont Street, S.E., Act of 2001" received May 9, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1812. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-49, "Arena Fee Rate Adjustment and Elimination Temporary Act of 2001" received May 9, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1813. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-47, "Approval of the Extension of the Term of Comcast Cablevision of the District, LLC's Franchise Temporary Act of 2001" received May 9, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1814. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-54, "Moratorium on the Construction of Certain Telecommunications Towers Temporary Act of 2001" received May 9, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1815. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-45, "Closing of Public Alleys in Square 697, S.O. 98-270, Act of 2001" received May 9, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1816. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-50, "Master Facility Plan Requirement Temporary Amendment Act of 2001" received May 9, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1817. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-52, "Brownfield Revitalization Temporary Amendment Act of 2001" received May 9, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1818. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee For Purchase From People Who Are Blind Or Severely Disabled, transmitting the Committee's final rule—Additions to and Deletions from the Procurement List—received April 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1819. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Justice, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1820. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Justice, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1821. A letter from the Executive Resources and Special Programs Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1822. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1823. A letter from the Executive Services Staff, Social Security Administration, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1824. A letter from the Congressional Liaison, U.S. Trade and Development Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1825. A letter from the the Chief Administrative Officer, transmitting the quarterly report of receipts and expenditures of appropriations and other funds for the period January 1, 2001, through March 31, 2001 as compiled by the Chief Administrative Officer, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 104a; (H. Doc. No. 107-67); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

1826. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Law and Order on Indian Reservations (RIN: 1076-AE15) received April 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1827. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Yellowfin Sole by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 010112013-1013-01; I.D. 042601A] received May 1, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1828. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Pelagic Longline Fishery; Sea Turtle Protection; Shark Drift Gillnet Fishery [Docket No. 010319072-1072-01; I.D. 110600A] (RIN: 0648-

A076) received April 26, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1829. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Model 750 Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-NM-63-AD; Amendment 39-12169; AD 2001-07-04] received May 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1830. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 767 Series Airplanes Powered by General Electric or Pratt & Whitney Engines [Docket No. 2000-NM-157-AD; Amendment 39-12170; AD 2001-07-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1831. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Saab Model SAAB 2000 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-NM-178-AD; Amendment 39-12171; AD 2001-07-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1832. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-600, -700, -800, and -700C Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-48-AD; Amendment 39-12186; AD 2001-08-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 03, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1833. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD-11 Series Airplanes Equipped With Pratt & Whitney Model PW4400 Series Engines [Docket No. 2001-NM-43-AD; Amendment 39-12173; AD 2001-07-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1834. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Bassett, NE; Correction [Airspace Docket No. 00-ACE-39] received May 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1835. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Molokai, HI [Airspace Docket No. 00-AWP-12] received May 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1836. A letter from the Attorney, NHTSA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Incentive Grants for Use of Seat Belts—Allocations Based on State Seat Belt Use Rates [Docket No. NHTSA-98-4494] (RIN: 2127-AH38) received April 26, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1837. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, Customs Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Licenses for Certain Worst Wool Fabrics Subject to Tariff-Rate Quota [T.D. 01-35] (RIN: 1515-AC83) received April 26, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1838. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, Customs Service, Department of the

Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Rules of Origin for Textile and Apparel Products [T.D. 01-36] (RIN: 1515-AC80) received April 26, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1839. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Definitions Relating to Corporate Reorganizations [Rev. Rul. 2001-24] received May 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1840. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Definitions Relating to Corporate Reorganizations [Rev. Rul. 2001-25] received May 4, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1841. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Administrative, Procedural, and Miscellaneous [Rev. Rul. 2001-29] received April 24, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1842. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Last-in, First-out, Inventories [Rev. Rul. 2001-23] received April 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1843. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Administrative, Procedural, and Miscellaneous [Rev. Rul. 2001-32] received April 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1844. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Low-Income Housing Credit—received April 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DIAZ-BALART: Committee on Rules, House Resolution 138. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1646) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal years 2002 and 2003, and for other purposes (Rept. 107-62). Referred to the House Calendar.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

[Omitted from the Record of May 8, 2001]

H.R. 1088. Referral to the Committee on Government Reform extended for a period ending not later than May 9, 2001.

[Submitted May 9, 2001]

H.R. 1088. Referral to the Committee on Government Reform extended for a period ending not later than May 10, 2001.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. WELLER (for himself, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. Boucher, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GORDON, Mr. VITTEB, Mr. COX, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. OSE, and Mrs. KELLY):

H.R. 1769. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for information technology training expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. CAMP, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. WELDON of Florida, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina):

H.R. 1770. A bill to prohibit the purchasing, issuing, or wearing of berets as standard Army headgear (other than for certain specialized units) until the Secretary of the Army certifies to Congress that the Army ammunition shortfall has been eliminated; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. FILNER, Ms. LEE, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. DEFazio):

H.R. 1771. A bill to provide for funding for the top priority action items in the inter-agency public health action plan that has been developed in response to the problem of antimicrobial resistance, to the extent that the activities involved are within the jurisdiction of the Department of Health and Human Services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CANNON:

H.R. 1772. A bill to provide for an exchange of certain property between the United States and Ephraim City, Utah; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ENGLISH (for himself and Mrs. THURMAN):

H.R. 1773. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for the purchase of a principal residence by a first-time homebuyer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLETCHER (for himself, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. ARMEY, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. FROST, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. EHLERS, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GOSS, Mr. GREENWOOD, Ms. HART, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HILLEARY, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. NORTUP, Mr. OSE, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PETRI, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. REHBERG, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WELDON of Florida, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 1774. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to improve access and choice for entrepreneurs with small businesses with respect to medical care for their employees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GALLEGLY:

H.R. 1775. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to create an offense of solicitation or recruitment of persons in criminal street gang activity; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 1776. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of establishing the Buffalo Bayou National Heritage Area in west Houston, Texas; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 1777. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make higher education more affordable by providing a tax deduction for higher education expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (for herself and Ms. CARSON of Indiana):

H.R. 1778. A bill to provide for the collection of data on traffic stops; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. Boucher, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. STARK, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KING, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. FRANK, Mr. COX, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. EVANS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. TANCREDO, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 1779. A bill to support the aspirations of the Tibetan people to safeguard their distinct identity; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1780. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for contributions to a volunteer firefighter savings account; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. HOLT, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GORDON, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ISSA, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. WAMP, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. LEE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. BACA, and Mrs. TAUSCHER):

H.R. 1781. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to develop a plan for a magnetic fusion burning plasma experiment for the purpose of accelerating the scientific understanding and development of fusion as a long term energy source, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. MANZULLO:

H.R. 1782. A bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to provide for the position of Assistant United States Trade Representative for Small Business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANZULLO:

H.R. 1783. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a safe harbor for determining that certain individuals are not

employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MORELLA (for herself, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. HONDA, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. THURMAN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. LEE, Mr. WYNN, Mr. FROST, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. HORN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. SOLIS, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BENTSEN, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio):

H.R. 1784. A bill to establish an Office on Women's Health within the Department of Health and Human Services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 1785. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent the avoidance of gain recognition through swap funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OBEY (for himself, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. MCHUGH):

H.R. 1786. A bill to impose tariff-rate quotas on certain casein and milk protein concentrates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 1787. A bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act require that certain technical medical employees of the Indian Health Service be compensated for time during which they are required to be on-call; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 1788. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the treatment of cooperative housing corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHAW (for himself, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. MICA, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. PUTNAM, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. KELLER, Mr. GOSS, Mr. BILLIRAKIS, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mr. WELDON of Florida):

H.R. 1789. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt from income tax State-created organizations providing property and casualty insurance for property for which such coverage is otherwise unavailable; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan (for himself, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. UPTON, Mr. CAMP, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. BONIOR):

H.R. 1790. A bill to reauthorize the tree loss assistance program to compensate orchardists and tree farmers who plant trees for commercial purposes but lose the trees as a result of a natural disaster; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 1791. A bill to provide a grant under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 to assist in the development of a Millennium Cultural Cooperative Park in Youngstown, Ohio; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma:

H.R. 1792. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to ensure that air carriers meet

their obligations under the Airline Customer Service Agreement, and provide improved passenger service in order to meet public convenience and necessity; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H. Res. 139. A resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding commitment to the Voting Rights Act of 1965; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 17: Mr. BALDACCI.
 H.R. 21: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.
 H.R. 25: Mr. HOUGHTON.
 H.R. 80: Mr. BOUCHER.
 H.R. 82: Mr. BOUCHER.
 H.R. 123: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.
 H.R. 192: Mr. SAXTON.
 H.R. 224: Mrs. BONO.
 H.R. 228: Mr. AKIN, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
 H.R. 239: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH and Mr. BORSKI.
 H.R. 298: Mr. KERNS and Mr. BONIOR.
 H.R. 389: Mr. BONIOR.
 H.R. 397: Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. AKIN, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. CONDIT.
 H.R. 425: Mr. MATHESON.
 H.R. 436: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan and Mr. BAIRD.
 H.R. 440: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. GORDON.
 H.R. 442: Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. MCKINNEY.
 H.R. 458: Mr. HAYWORTH.
 H.R. 490: Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. EHRlich, and Mr. WU.
 H.R. 500: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
 H.R. 534: Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
 H.R. 586: Mr. SHAW and Mr. CRANE.
 H.R. 606: Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. BALDACCI.
 H.R. 622: Mr. WATKINS, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. SAWYER, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H.R. 678: Mr. DEUTSCH.
 H.R. 690: Mr. OLVER and Ms. DEGETTE.
 H.R. 696: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
 H.R. 717: Mr. REHBERG, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, and Mr. KIRK.
 H.R. 737: Mrs. BIGGERT.
 H.R. 746: Mr. EVANS and Mr. COLLINS.
 H.R. 781: Mr. OLVER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. SOLIS, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.R. 783: Ms. HART.
 H.R. 786: Mr. SAWYER and Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 805: Mr. COOKSEY.
 H.R. 808: Mr. BRYANT, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. HILL, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. HOLT, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
 H.R. 822: Mr. RAMSTAD.
 H.R. 832: Mr. SHIMKUS.
 H.R. 840: Ms. RIVERS, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, and Mr. OLVER.
 H.R. 854: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. HORN, Mr. DREIER, Ms. LEE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. STRICKLAND, and Mr. STUPAK.
 H.R. 902: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. SANDLIN, and Mr. LOBIONDO.
 H.R. 917: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 932: Mr. MATHESON.
 H.R. 936: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
 H.R. 954: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
 H.R. 964: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 968: Mr. SOUDER.
 H.R. 975: Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. FORD, and Mr. JENKINS.
 H.R. 978: Mr. JONES of North Carolina and Mrs. MEEK of Florida.
 H.R. 992: Mr. SHAYS.
 H.R. 994: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.R. 1005: Mr. BARCIA.
 H.R. 1008: Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. PICKERING, and Mr. WELLER.
 H.R. 1037: Mr. BLUNT.
 H.R. 1073: Mr. MASCARA, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TOOMEY, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. TIERNEY.
 H.R. 1086: Mr. BAIRD.
 H.R. 1110: Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mr. VITTE.
 H.R. 1127: Mr. KINGSTON and Mr. HORN.
 H.R. 1129: Mr. HINCHEY.
 H.R. 1130: Mr. HINCHEY.
 H.R. 1140: Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. OSE, Mr. ISSA, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mr. RADANOVICH.
 H.R. 1151: Mr. BOUCHER.
 H.R. 1162: Mr. DEUTSCH.
 H.R. 1185: Ms. BALDWIN and Ms. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 1189: Mr. SANDERS.
 H.R. 1192: Mr. STRICKLAND.
 H.R. 1195: Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. REYES, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Ms. HART.
 H.R. 1199: Ms. KILPATRICK.
 H.R. 1201: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. FRANK, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
 H.R. 1212: Mr. TANCREDO.
 H.R. 1232: Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.
 M.R. 1242: Mr. OSBORNE.
 H.R. 1262: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. GONZALEZ.
 H.R. 1266: Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. NEY, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 1276: Mr. KUCINICH and Ms. DELAURO.
 H.R. 1291: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mrs. THURMAN, and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1292: Mr. REYES and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.
 H.R. 1305: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. MATSUI, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. PAUL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SHAW, Mr. STUMP, Mr. FORD, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. REHBERG.
 H.R. 1306: Mr. KUCINICH.
 H.R. 1307: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, and Ms. KILPATRICK.
 H.R. 1323: Ms. LEE, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
 H.R. 1334: Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. QUINN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. KING, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. GRUCCI, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. OWENS, Mr. WEINER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. ACKERMAN.
 H.R. 1342: Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. HEFLEY.
 H.R. 1354: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. HEFLEY.
 H.R. 1377: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SOUDER, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, and Ms. SOLIS.
 H.R. 1382: Ms. MCKINNEY.
 H.R. 1388: Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CLYBURN, and Mr. ROEMER.

H.R. 1406: Ms. MCKINNEY.
 H.R. 1436: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. FORD, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. DOOLEY of California, and Mr. HINCHEY.
 H.R. 1454: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SOUDER, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
 H.R. 1459: Mr. WATKINS and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
 H.R. 1464: Mr. REHBERG.
 H.R. 1482: Ms. SANCHEZ.
 H.R. 1487: Mr. RAMSTAD and Mr. GILMAN.
 H.R. 1494: Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 1540: Mr. FILNER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. CLYBURN.
 H.R. 1541: Mr. BONIOR.
 H.R. 1556: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mr. BALDACCI.
 H.R. 1561: Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 1562: Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 1563: Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 1581: Mr. WATKINS and Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.R. 1585: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. HONDA.
 H.R. 1586: Mr. BONIOR.
 H.R. 1592: Mr. STUMP.
 H.R. 1597: Mr. FRANK.
 H.R. 1599: Mr. SHIMKUS.
 H.R. 1609: Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. BALDACCI.
 H.R. 1613: Mr. KIRK and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 1615: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 1624: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. TANNER and Mr. NETHERCUTT.
 H.R. 1626: Mr. FROST.
 H.R. 1644: Mr. GOODE, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. AKIN, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. TERRY.
 H.R. 1677: Mr. OTTER, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. NETHERCUTT, and Mr. GRAHAM.
 H.R. 1713: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 1727: Mr. STARK, Mr. SHAW, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. CRANE.
 H.R. 1765: Mr. GANSKE.
 H.J. Res. 36: Mr. CULBERSON and Mr. GOODLATTE.
 H. Con. Res. 12: Mr. BONIOR.
 H. Con. Res. 63: Mrs. THURMAN and Ms. SANCHEZ.
 H. Con. Res. 104: Mr. FRANK and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H. Con. Res. 106: Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. SCHAFER, Ms. HART, Mr. KLECZKA, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and Mr. HAYWORTH.
 H. Con. Res. 120: Mr. SESSIONS.
 H. Res. 86: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. SABO, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. RIVERS, Ms. WATERS, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
 H. Res. 106: Mrs. JONES of Ohio.
 H. Res. 120: Mr. GIBBONS.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1646

OFFERED BY: MR. TRAFICANT

AMENDMENT No. 2: Page 122, after line 23, add the following:

SEC. 747. SENSE OF CONGRESS; REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE.

(a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided under this Act (including any amendment made by this Act), it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(b) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance under this Act (including any amendment made by this Act), the head of each Federal agency shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

(c) NOTICE OF REPORT.—Any entity which receives funds under this Act shall report any expenditures on foreign-made items to the Congress within 180 days of the expenditure.