

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 74, the measure just considered by the House.

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

There was no objection.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 5 p.m.

□ 1700

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT) at 5 p.m.

#### APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTER-PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h and clause 10 of rule I, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group, in addition to Mr. KOLBE of Arizona, Chairman, appointed on March 28, 2001:

Mr. BALLENGER, North Carolina, Vice Chairman;

Mr. DREIER, California;

Mr. STENHOLM, Texas;

Mr. BARTON, Texas;

Mr. FILNER, California;

Mr. LEWIS, Kentucky;

Mr. MANZULLO, Illinois;

Ms. GRANGER, Texas;

Mr. REYES, Texas;

Mr. THOMPSON, California.

There was no objection.

#### REAPPOINTMENT AS MEMBER TO NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON VITAL AND HEALTH STATISTICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to section 306(k) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 242k), the Chair announces the Speaker's reappointment of the following member on the part of the

House to the National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics for a term of 4 years:

Mr. Jeffrey S. Blair, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-58) on the resolution (H. Res. 134) providing for recommitment of 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, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 581, WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT ACT

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-59) on the resolution (H. Res. 135) providing 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, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 131 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 131

*Resolved*, That the requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider reports from the Committee on Rules

on the same day they are presented to the House is waived with respect to resolutions reported on the legislative day of May 8, 2001, providing for consideration or disposition of any 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.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), 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, H. Res. 131 waives clause 6(a) of rule XIII requiring a two-thirds vote to consider a rule on the same day it is reported from the Committee on Rules. The rule applies the waiver to a special rule reported on the legislative day of May 8, 2001, providing for consideration or disposition of a conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 83, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule. I am at a loss to explain why we are once again preparing to circumvent the rules of this body and cram a controversial budget conference down the throats of our colleagues. What aversion does the leadership have to regular order? Last week's paper caper in the midnight hour was a prime illustration of the adage "haste makes waste." In their haste to cover up the details of a flawed budget blueprint, the leadership wasted hour upon hour of time slated for the people's business.

Today's rule is more of the same. Martial law is an extremely heavy-handed process, even for this leadership. Under the rules of the House, a two-thirds vote is required to consider a rule on the same day the Committee on Rules reports it. But the martial law procedures before us allow a rule to be considered on the same day as it is reported rather with a majority, rather than a two-thirds vote.

This rule we are considering would waive the 1-day layover requirement. It would also kick off a chain reaction whereby this body considers several procedural votes in an elaborate game

to recommit last week's ill-fated budget conference report and bring up a revised version for consideration. Given what we have learned about the forthcoming conference bill on the budget, we should not be surprised. I suspect that the longer the measure is exposed to the light of day, the more likely it will shrivel up and die.

I would note for the record that no Democrats had input on the conference report. No Democrats were invited to participate in writing this agreement, nor were any Democrats given any information regarding the document that will be the budget guideline for this Nation. The word in the caucus room is that the Budget chairman refused to return the phone calls of our ranking member. This is a far cry from changing the tone in Washington that the current leadership prides itself on.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this rule.

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

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

I would just respond to say that the reason we are using the procedures that we are is to get us timely to the debate on the budget which we hope to have tomorrow. The rules covering the conference reports, preserving the prerogatives of both Chambers of the House, require that we recommit the conference report.

We have created a way to do that this evening, it seems appropriate to do, and then we will proceed tomorrow to debate on the budget. I think that the argument now that the minority has not had a chance to see the budget is a little bit strange considering we have just had 4 days, an ample time to review and ample time to consider that document.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER).

Mr. KELLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this budget. As someone who grew up in relatively humble circumstances, in a one-bedroom home in Orlando, Florida, I learned some important things about life at a young age.

First, I learned that single mothers and working families desperately need tax relief. This budget provides that tax relief to the tune of \$1.35 trillion.

Second, I learned that a first-class education is a child's passport out of poverty. This budget represents the largest investment in education in the history of the United States, including a \$1 billion increase in Pell grants and \$5 billion for reading in grades kindergarten through third grade.

I also learned that senior citizens depend on their Social Security checks and prescription drugs to live. This budget puts the Social Security sur-

pluses in a lockbox and spends up to \$300 billion for prescription drugs for seniors.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes on the budget. This is what we came here for.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS).

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the House-Senate conference report on the budget for fiscal year 2002. Last week, after excluding Democrats from any meaningful participation in the conference, the House leadership tried to ram this resolution down our throats. Fortunately, they failed because they could not even make the entire bill available for Members' consideration. Under closer inspection it is easy to see why they believe the bill could not bear the light of day.

The information we have been able to review to date indicates that in fiscal year 2002 the conferees approved significantly lower funding for veterans programs than the funding levels passed earlier by either the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs or in the House budget resolution. Under the leadership of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the House managed to almost double the President's meager request for discretionary spending for the Nation's veterans, but that effort now appears to have been for naught.

Unfortunately, the Republican leadership has not kept its promises to America's veterans. After applauding themselves on the funding increases for veterans programs, my Republican colleagues realized that realistically their numbers just did not add up. They will tell you that they will fix the harm they have done to these programs with emergency spending. But if that is the case, why do they not just do it in this resolution? Ultimately they were not able to reconcile their promises to veterans with the giant tax cut they have promised to America's wealthiest taxpayers.

The joint resolution will eliminate the gains made for veterans programs in the House and Senate resolutions for fiscal year 2002. The House added \$730 million to the President's budget for veterans programs while the Senate passed two separate resolutions that would have added about \$1.7 billion to the Bush request of about a \$1 billion increase for veterans programs. So we are now back to Bush, and that is bad news for the Nation's veterans.

Veterans groups agree that the Bush budget is inadequate. In a press release this February, the American Legion said, "The Bush administration's fiscal year 2002 budget for the Department of Veterans Affairs is not good enough. Frankly this is a budget that is insufficient to fulfill the campaign promises George W. Bush made."

In a letter to the Senate from four major veterans service organizations, AMVETS, Paralyzed Veterans of America, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Disabled American Veterans, the increase recommended by the Bush administration was described as an "amount that would not even cover the costs of mandated salary increases and the effects of inflation."

I will vote against this inadequate funding resolution for veterans. The American people need to understand the effect of this overblown tax cut. Our veterans will pay the price.

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

I understand that even as we speak, the Senate is rewriting this conference report which we are supposed to vote on today and that there is another breakdown going on.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, as someone who loves baseball, I want to say thank you to the President for bringing tee ball to the White House. Seeing those youngsters enjoy themselves on the White House lawn was really terrific. But let me just say that the President should put his money where his photo op is.

The budget that the President and the Republican leadership are pushing through this House cuts important programs that affect our children's education, health and well-being, all for the sake of a tax cut that provides 43 percent of its benefits to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans.

Who gets cut? Pediatric graduate medical education, training for future pediatricians to care for our kids, gets cut by \$35 million. No new funding for Head Start, a program that helps to prepare youngsters for school. No new funding for reading and mathematics education programs that serve our children, and not a dime more in this budget for that program for the next 10 years.

There are 7 million children between the ages of 8 and 13 who go home alone every single day. Yet the President cuts the 21st Century Learning Center program that provides after-school educational opportunities for our kids. The President slashes \$1.4 million from the universal newborn hearing screening program, an 18 percent cut.

Photo ops are one thing, but you have to put your money where your values are. That is what budgets are about. They are about values.

□ 1715

It is not about programs. There are some fundamental American values at stake in this debate, values that say everyone should have a chance to succeed, every child should have the best education and a secure retirement.

Those values, every child should have the best education, the best health care, and every single senior should have a decent and secure retirement, those values, for all of the President's rhetoric, are not in the President's budget. This is reflective of the priorities and the values of this administration. They are not focused on American families or American children.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking member on the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the budget that the Republicans brought to the House late last Thursday has more than just two pages missing. It is a budget full of plugs and placeholders, and what is really missing are real numbers.

Take defense, the largest account in the discretionary budget. This budget allocates \$325 billion to defense, basically what Clinton and Cohen would have spent. But \$325 billion is not a real number. It is a placeholder, pending Mr. Rumsfeld's review of what is needed to transform our military. Reports indicate when the time is right, after the tax cuts are enacted, Mr. Rumsfeld will request at least \$25 billion a year more than this budget provides.

Take next the rest of all appropriated spending. This budget holds discretionary spending to an increase of 3.8 percent next year and in years thereafter to 2.6 percent below inflation. This is tight, really tight, a lot stricter than any limit to which spending has been held in recent years. If spending is capped at these levels, and a few favored programs such as NIH and transportation get outsized disproportionate increases, then many others will have to be cut. Rather than indicate these unpopular and, some would say, unlikely cuts now, the Republican budget simply increases discretionary spending by the rate of inflation in every function across the board, except defense, which gets more. Then they bury in the last catchall function of the budget \$6 billion of unspecified cuts in 2002 and a total of \$67 billion in unspecified cuts over the next 10 years.

Now, if we want to see what happens, what results from indiscriminate budgeting, look at education. Remember how the President said in his State of the Union that education would get the largest increase in his budget? That turned out to be a modest increase of \$21.4 billion above inflation over the next 10 years. When the budget was open to amendment on the Senate floor, Senators voted three times to debit tax cuts and credit education to the tune of 294 billion additional dollars for education. It was a great victory, but short-lived.

Once Republicans got the budget in the closed conference, they not only deleted all the adds made in the Senate but also cut the President's request of \$21.3 billion. This budget now treats education like every other function; inflation only for 10 years, nothing more.

Consider finally the initiative to add prescription drug coverage to Medicare. The President asked for \$153 billion over 10 years to pay for drug benefits. In Congress, key Republicans in both Houses called this amount inadequate. Senate Democrats moved to raise the provision for drugs and prevailed. In their conference then, the Republican leadership did not pare down this increase. In conference this was not pared back. The next worst thing was done to it. Instead of setting aside some of the surplus, general fund surplus, to pay for this added benefit, they allow the \$300 billion for drug benefits to be drawn from the Medicare Trust Fund.

In the long run, this trust fund, the Medicare Trust Fund, faces a serious shortfall, as we all know. If the cost of prescription drugs is drawn from the trust fund, it will only hasten the day of insolvency.

It is tax cuts that drive this budget, and tax reduction is the most understated number of all. The budget calls for tax cuts of \$1.35 billion, \$300 billion less than the President first requested, but Republicans from Senator LOTT to Secretary O'Neill have said this is just round one for tax reduction, and I credit them for their honesty because more tax is surely coming. This is not the final number for tax reduction.

When all of these numbers are added up, all of these plugs, all of these placeholders, and add up the likely action that will be layered on top of it, the bottom line in this budget goes negative as early as next year.

Within the next 10 years, we will be \$342 billion into the Medicare Trust Fund, \$255 billion into the Social Security Trust Fund. Maybe that is why the conference was kept secret and the budget was not shown to us until midnight last Thursday.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to say again that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) played no role whatever in this budget and was unable to even get his phone calls returned, and I regret that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, this budget ought to come out with a warning for senior citizens: Do not look for a decent prescription drug benefit here. President Bush, one may remember, when he was a candidate,

promised a prescription drug benefit under Medicare. Instead, this budget has a measly proposal available only to seniors that make under \$11,500 a year. This is not going to help people like the Reinauers in my district. He is 75 and she is 71, but they make too much money to get help under the Republican plan.

Mr. Reinauer wrote to me last February saying, "We are going broke paying for prescription drugs." He is paying \$324 a month. Mrs. Reinauer has a drug bill that will knock your eyes out, and she pays the full price.

This is a budget that does more for a million millionaires than it does for 39 million Medicare beneficiaries that are waiting for a real prescription drug benefit. That is priorities.

This is not what President Bush promised when he was a candidate and it is not what senior citizens deserve to see in this budget.

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

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. Last week, the House was kept in session until 3:00 a.m. waiting to vote on a budget that our side had not even seen and had no part in creating. That is bipartisanship, according to the Republican model. Then we could not consider the bill until this week because of two missing pages. Since then, those two pages have apparently been found, but there are three more important elements missing: Those are honesty, common sense and fairness.

The resolution we are considering tonight is missing honesty. It does not include resources necessary to offer seniors a universal voluntary prescription drug benefit under Medicare. In fact, the budget resolution shortens the solvency of the Medicare program. George Bush and his allies in the majority party promised to include prescription drug benefits under Medicare over and over in ad after ad, yet this budget falls woefully and embarrassingly short. This budget is missing common sense. The budget proposes large increases in defense spending but the budget they put forward does not pay for them.

In some instances, like paying our soldiers a decent wage, I fully support defense increases. But when it comes to \$100 billion missile defense systems, that is not common sense, it is uncommon foolishness.

Finally, the resolution is missing fairness. I have written the Tax Deduction Fairness Act of 2001 which would allow taxpayers in States like ours the option to deduct either their State income taxes or their State sales taxes. This would restore fairness to the Tax Code for residents in my State and in

the States of Tennessee, Texas, Nevada, Wyoming, Florida and South Dakota. Such proposals as this were not included in this budget. This budget demands that our States subsidize the rest of the tax cuts for the rest of the country. This body deserves better. We deserve true bipartisanship, true discussion, true common sense, and the seniors and children of this country deserve true health care reform.

This budget does not provide it. We deserve better.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, at the onset, I would like to emphatically state my opposition to this rule, because this process is shameful and insulting.

Mr. Speaker, this process is shameful and insulting because it denies an opportunity to act responsible by informing the American people that the numbers in this budget do not add up unless the Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds are reduced drastically.

I regret that the budget process has come to this stage. We started off with such promise in the House Committee on the Budget of having a fair and open debate on priorities in the budget. The Democrats expected to lose many of the votes in discussions because we are in the minority, but we were at least given an opportunity for an open and fair debate.

President Bush has insisted that he wanted to set a new tone of respect and bipartisanship. What really happened to this fair and open bipartisanship with regard to negotiations on the budget?

On last Wednesday, I read an article in the Washington Times that the White House and the so-called congressional budget negotiators agreed on an 11-year \$1.35 trillion tax cut plan. The question in my mind is, who are these negotiators?

The Democrats on the Committee on the Budget were completely shut out of the process. There was no input allowed by the House Democratic leadership or the House Democrats on these budget cuts or tax adjustments. This kind of behavior is unworthy of the honorable Members of Congress and it is very dangerous politics that affects the core of democracy and fair play in our Nation.

This is regrettable because we are balancing the budget on the backs of our seniors. These numbers will not add up unless we reduce the Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds. Yet the President is promising Americans that they can have their cake and eat it, too. He is promising a national missile defense system, far-reaching education reform, prescription drug pro-

gram, and the list goes on to include inevitably a large additional tax cut that would mostly benefit big business and the wealthy.

I want the American citizens to know that they are being overpromised and deceived in this budget process. As a result, we cannot live up to providing improved education, prescription drugs for seniors, securing Social Security and Medicare, while paying down the debt and giving away a \$1.35 trillion tax cut which will probably result in a \$2 trillion tax cut.

The attitude projected in this process is that we are not listening and that we will not consider recommended adjustments or changes. This is in spite of the Senate Democrats' effort to allow for increased educational funding in this conference report. All of the \$294 billion for educational funds were dropped. Certainly this is not a bipartisan process. To pass this budget means we are breaking our commitment to our seniors, and I urge the defeat of the rule.

To pass this budget means—breaking our commitments to our senior citizens by failing to protect the Social Security and Medicare trust funds; denying our youth and children the best educational opportunities possible; and depriving the poor and needy food and services for their welfare.

As we attempt to balance the priorities of our nation, we should have at least agreed with the Senate by passing a conference report that reflects the needs of our people—like reducing the tax package; paying down more of the national debt; committing new resources for Medicare prescription drugs for all seniors, to provide quality education programs, to meet agricultural needs, and health care needs. There is room for tax relief for everyone, but this tax relief should be considered within the context of ALL of our national needs.

I am insulted by the idea of invoking the Martial Rule. This reflects a disrespectful tactic by the House Majority of this budget process which avoids Democratic input into this budget, and implies that their views are irrelevant or insignificant. There is no doubt that this conference report will raid both the Medicare and the social security trust funds. As trustees of this nation's wealth, we must make hard choices about how to allocate the resources of the American people. The wrong choices will affect the lives of millions of Americans for years to come.

My fellow colleagues, I urge you to vote "no" on the Martial Law Rule. I vote "no" out of principle since neither the Democratic Members of the Budget Committee nor the Democratic Leadership were given a level playing field in this process.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the gap between rhetoric and reality has never been wider than in this budget, and I am going to concentrate today especially on the education budget because that gap is truly massive in that area.

We are being asked to support a budget that provides no increase over inflation for education funding, and even falls short of what the President asks for in his budget plan. Despite all the talk from the White House, despite all the talk from our Republican friends, education is not a priority in this budget.

We have serious education needs. We need to reduce class size. We need to construct more schools, get our kids out of trailers. We need to recruit and train teachers. We need to boost Title I aid for disadvantaged school districts. We need to close the achievement gap between majority and minority children. We need to increase Pell grants for college opportunity. We need to meet the Federal Government's obligation to IDEA special education funding. We need to expand Head Start. The list of needs is long. This budget comes up short on every count.

With this budget, President Bush and the Republicans break their promise to increase the maximum Pell grant to \$5,100. During the campaign, Candidate Bush promised to raise the maximum Pell grant award to \$5,100 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 about \$150, which is far less than Pell grant increases in recent years, and this budget does even less than what the President requested.

□ 1730

Then let us talk about Gear Up. Gear Up, that program already underfunded, that program to get colleges and private businesses engaged in mentoring high school students, closing that achievement gap, preparing them for college. This Gear Up program, praised by Secretary of Education Paige when he was in Houston as head of the system there, President Bush wants to cut Gear Up by 20 percent, meaning 200,000 fewer kids being helped; and now this Republican budget provides even less funding.

Bipartisan majorities in the Senate adopted amendments to add \$294 billion over 10 years for education over the House-passed budget, but the final version of this budget eliminates those increases. In fact, education receives less in this budget than the woeful House-passed budget by almost \$1 billion next year and \$21.4 billion over 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to just throw money at education and hope for improvements; but without new resources, 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 need more than talk. Reject this budget.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota, Mr. POMEROY.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are debating this motion before us to try and fix the budget filing foul-up of the majority from the other night. You know, it is one thing for the majority to be unfair; it is another thing for the majority to be inept. But for the majority to be both on the same piece of legislative business, it is a bit much.

By delaying until after midnight the attempted consideration of the budget, they utterly deprived almost half of this body of the chance of even seeing the numbers they are proposing, literally, until the hour of the vote. But, as we know, that fouled copying machine that withheld two critical pages stopped them dead in their tracks.

You know, it kind of shakes your confidence. My goodness, if they cannot collate, you do not know whether they can calculate. And now that we have actually had a chance to survey the numbers, we can see indeed there are some very serious problems in calculation, substance problems that go far beyond the embarrassing procedural foul-up they brought upon themselves.

Let us talk specifically about one area, education. This is an area where our new President has called for more Federal leadership in improving the quality of our schools. In fact, he committed \$900 million over the next year, \$21.4 billion over the 10 years of the budget.

We passed the President's recommendation when the budget was considered in the House over to the Senate, where they said that is a good start, but we need to do more. With a bipartisan vote, they voted to add \$294 billion in additional resources into the budget package.

What happened? Well, when we finally got to the numbers of their package, numbers they hoped we would not get to look at and debate fully before this vote we are about to take, all of that money for our schools, all of that money for better education for our children, was stripped out; even President Bush's recommended funding, gone.

Ultimately, all that was left was an inflationary adjustment that amounts to \$12.90 per kid per year. We are not going to improve schools on that pittance. We need to adhere to the President's recommended levels and beyond. More money for schools. Reject this budget.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 8½ minutes.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I guess I rise today in opposition to the rule, but the truth is this rule means nothing, this budget means nothing, because there are no numbers here that anyone can tell you an answer to.

Most people in my district over the weekend were asking me what we are going to do this week, what is going to happen with the budget, how much money is going into education, how much money is going into health care? The truth is, not a single Member of this House or Senate can answer those questions based on this budget. They do not know. They have no idea how much money is going into education.

I can tell you one thing, the Medicare system, no matter what number they use, this budget will bring the Medicare budget to insolvency much more quickly than before. Community health centers will be cut. I do not know how much, but they will be. Housing will be cut in virtually every single program; from \$700 million cut for public housing capital improvement, to a \$25 million cut in rural housing programs.

Training for pediatricians will be cut. We think we know a number on that, but we are not sure. The National Institutes of Health will be cut. We are not sure how much, but we think it will be cut. Ryan White AIDS grants will definitely be cut. Drug elimination grants will be cut. The COPS program will be cut. We are not sure how much, but it will be cut. Retraining programs for all those people who are now unemployed, every day we turn on the TV and read the paper, we read about more Americans getting unemployed, but this budget has no money to deal with that. We are not sure how much the Department of Defense is going to go up. We have no idea.

That is why at the end of this budget, you will see what is a huge slush fund. There is no other way to put it. It is the first time in my adult life I have ever seen a negative slush fund, however. It is negative \$67 billion, because the numbers do not add up, and what that says is when we get around to it, we will cut something; we do not know what, we will cut something to make this work.

I defy anyone at home to tell me what a negative slush fund is, except a budget that does not work. That is why I rise today to oppose this budget, to oppose this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time back to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York has 6 minutes remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island, Mr. LANGEVIN.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this rule and to a budget conference agreement

that jeopardizes fiscal discipline and critical social programs to make room for an enormous tax cut skewed toward the wealthy and based on surplus projections that may never materialize.

Despite a modest reduction in the tax cut originally proposed by the administration, it is still far too large. To pay for it, the agreement usurps funds that should go to other critical priorities, like reducing our debt, creating a stable defense, improving education, providing affordable health care, strengthening Social Security and Medicare, and, yes, a real prescription drug benefit for our seniors, particularly in light of the fact that just today, as reported, spending on prescription drugs has increased by almost 19 percent.

Furthermore, this fundamentally flawed agreement would cut Federal programs that are vital to our Nation's small businesses: worker, health, environmental protection, energy efficiency and housing needs. This budget also shortchanges our vast transportation and infrastructure needs, decreases funding for critical law enforcement programs, and cuts budget authority for the benefits our veterans have earned.

We would all like to reward hard-working Americans by returning some of their tax dollars, but we would also need to ensure that our most pressing needs are met. These are real concerns that warrant a real budget based on real numbers, not partisan rhetoric that falsely touts cooperation and accord. Bipartisan negotiations involve a lot more than just inviting a couple of folks over to the White House for lunch.

I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting this ill-conceived Republican proposal and supporting instead a sensible, well-balanced budget resolution that speaks to the needs of every American family.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that maybe the Senate copier was on to something when it split these two pages out. This conference report makes me want to gag when I think about what happened. The obfuscation and deception that has been the hallmark of this budget process is truly worthy of the conference report.

The majority insisted on voting on a budget resolution before seeing the President's budget. That was the first thing. Then the majority shut out the Democrats from any consideration on this conference report and then tried to sneak a vote past the American people before they even had a chance to see their cynical handiwork.

I do not blame the Republican leadership for trying to hide the details of this budget from the people. Nobody would be proud of this budget that pays

for tax cuts with the futures of our children. Look at all the child-hostile measures in this budget. It cuts Head Start; it makes child care harder and more less affordable for working families. It cuts Individuals With Disabilities Education Act Part C, which helps prepare disabled infants and toddlers for school. It cuts the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program, which keeps kids safe and productive after school. It cuts the Mental Health Services block grant, which is what everyone tells me is what works in our States when providing that crucial community support for our most vulnerable children. It cuts all of these things, and yet we say that we have a President that wants to put his emphasis on education.

It certainly is not relevant in this budget. We need to see the dollars, or else that will be a hollow promise of his being an education President.

Deception seems to be the name of the game because the majority's irresponsibility for what is going on with this tax cut plan is what is making this such a vulnerable budget to begin with, because it will make it unable for us to meet our obligations long-term for this Nation while being able to cut the taxes for the most wealthy in this country. That is why I think that we should make sure these two pages are included, and we ought to know what the full impact of this budget is.

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

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my colleague for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that we have to resort to these types of extraordinary rules. We could have bipartisan agreement on a budget. It would not have been difficult for the majority to reach out to the Democrats and come out with a budget that we all could support, that would provide for tax relief as well as protecting Social Security and Medicare and the priority programs, and, most importantly, reducing our national debt.

Mr. Speaker, the reason why I will not support this budget is that I believe it provides for tax cuts that will be too large, allowing us to protect Social Security and Medicare, not only this year, but in future years, and would allow us to continue to make the type of investments in education and the environment and other priorities that are important for the people I represent.

But, most tragically, Mr. Speaker, I think this budget will do exactly what the National Review indicates it will do, and that says "Do not fear a deficit." "Do not fear a deficit."

I think that there are many who understand that this budget, if implemented, will lead to deficit spending again and an effort to downsize govern-

ment. We do not want to see deficits again, yet I believe this budget will lead in that direction.

So, Mr. Speaker, I regret that we have not used the time until now to work together to bring Democrats and Republicans together on a budget that will allow for reasonable tax relief and allow us to pay down our national debt, rather than adding potential red ink to it.

I urge my colleagues to reject this budget and to work together for the American people.

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

Mr. Speaker, I realize it might be a little late to do this, but in the interest of accuracy and trying to refocus what we are actually about here, what we are debating is the rule that waives the requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to the same day consideration of certain resolutions reported by the Committee on Rules.

We are not debating the budget here, and the vote we are going to take is not on the budget. In fact, if you wish to get to the budget debate, I urge you to support the rule. The majority is trying to bring the budget to the floor so that the debate we have already heard, some good introductory discussions in this past half-hour, can come to full-blown debate under the conference rules on the floor of the House. So I am going to ask everybody please to support this rule so we can in fact get on with the budget debate tomorrow.

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

□ 1745

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

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

Those who would say that the majority has not been particularly apt or particularly fair in this process are entitled to their opinion, but I think those that come to Washington to look for perfection ought not to be the ones who cast the first stones. I am reminded that I am human and I readily

admit I make errors, and I have machines in my office that jam occasionally, they are called copy machines, and if members have copy machines that do not jam, I would like to know what the brand is, because most every brand I have tried jammed, and that, in fact, is what happened. We had a jammed copy machine, and in our interest to try and get the debate started, we were not prudent enough to catch the fact that there were still two pieces of paper caught in the copy machine. We did catch it; but we just did not catch it immediately, so we misfiled.

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

I also believe this problem is a much more minor problem; this only involves perhaps giving the opportunity of Members 4 more days to review what might, in fact, be our budget document for budget debate.

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

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

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

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

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). The question is on the resolution.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this resolution are postponed.

RECESS

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

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

□ 1801

AFTER RECESS

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

HONORING NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION FOR 50 YEARS OF SERVICE

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

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

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

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 214, nays 200, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 100]

YEAS—214

Aderholt	Goss	Petri
Akin	Graham	Pickering
Armey	Granger	Pitts
Bachus	Graves	Platts
Baker	Green (WI)	Pombo
Ballenger	Greenwood	Portman
Barr	Grucci	Pryce (OH)
Bartlett	Gutknecht	Putnam
Barton	Hansen	Quinn
Bass	Hart	Radanovich
Bereuter	Hastings (WA)	Ramstad
Biggert	Hayes	Regula
Bilirakis	Hayworth	Rehberg
Blunt	Hefley	Reynolds
Boehler	Herger	Riley
Boehner	Hilleary	Rogers (KY)
Bonilla	Hobson	Rogers (MI)
Bono	Hoekstra	Rohrabacher
Brady (TX)	Horn	Ros-Lehtinen
Brown (SC)	Hostettler	Roukema
Bryant	Houghton	Royce
Burr	Hulshof	Ryan (WI)
Burton	Hunter	Ryun (KS)
Buyer	Hutchinson	Saxton
Callahan	Hyde	Scarborough
Calvert	Isakson	Schaffer
Camp	Issa	Schrock
Cannon	Istook	Sensenbrenner
Cantor	Jenkins	Sessions
Capito	Johnson (CT)	Shadegg
Castle	Johnson (IL)	Shaw
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Shays
Chambliss	Jones (NC)	Sherwood
Coble	Keller	Shimkus
Collins	Kelly	Simmons
Combust	Kennedy (MN)	Simpson
Cooksey	Kerns	Skeen
Cox	King (NY)	Smith (MI)
Crane	Kingston	Smith (NJ)
Crenshaw	Kirk	Smith (TX)
Culberson	Knollenberg	Souder
Cunningham	Kolbe	Spence
Davis, Jo Ann	Largent	Stearns
Davis, Tom	Latham	Sununu
Deal	LaTourette	Tancredo
DeLay	Leach	Tauzin
DeMint	Lewis (CA)	Terry
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (KY)	Thomas
Doolittle	Linder	Thornberry
Dreier	LoBiondo	Thune
Duncan	Lucas (OK)	Tiahrt
Dunn	Manzullo	Tiberi
Ehlers	McCrery	Toomey
Ehrlich	McHugh	Traficant
Emerson	McInnis	Upton
English	McKeon	Vitter
Everett	Mica	Walden
Ferguson	Miller (FL)	Walsh
Flake	Miller, Gary	Wamp
Fletcher	Moran (KS)	Watkins
Foley	Morella	Watts (OK)
Fossella	Myrick	Weldon (FL)
Frelinghuysen	Nethercutt	Weldon (PA)
Gallegly	Ney	Weller
Ganske	Northup	Whitfield
Gekas	Norwood	Wicker
Gibbons	Nussle	Wilson
Gilchrest	Osborne	Wolf
Gillmor	Ose	Young (AK)
Gilman	Otter	Young (FL)
Goode	Oxley	
Goodlatte	Pence	

NAYS—200

Abercrombie	Bentsen	Boswell
Andrews	Berkley	Boucher
Baca	Berman	Boyd
Baird	Berry	Brady (PA)
Baldacci	Bishop	Brown (FL)
Baldwin	Blagojevich	Brown (OH)
Barcia	Blumenauer	Capps
Barrett	Bonior	Capuano
Becerra	Borski	Cardin

Carson (IN)	John	Payne
Carson (OK)	Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi
Clay	Kanjorski	Peterson (MN)
Clayton	Kaptur	Phelps
Clement	Kennedy (RI)	Pomeroy
Clyburn	Kildee	Price (NC)
Condit	Kilpatrick	Rahall
Conyers	Kind (WI)	Rangel
Coyne	Kleczka	Reyes
Cramer	Kucinich	Rodriguez
Crowley	LaFalce	Roemer
Cummings	Langevin	Ross
Davis (CA)	Lantos	Rothman
Davis (FL)	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard
Davis (IL)	Larson (CT)	Rush
DeFazio	Lee	Sabo
DeGette	Levin	Sanchez
Delahunt	Lewis (GA)	Sanders
DeLauro	Lipinski	Sandlin
Deutsch	Lofgren	Sawyer
Dicks	Lowe	Schakowsky
Dingell	Lucas (KY)	Schiff
Doggett	Luther	Scott
Dooley	Maloney (CT)	Serrano
Doyle	Maloney (NY)	Sherman
Edwards	Markey	Shaw
Engel	Mascara	Shelton
Eshoo	Matheson	Slaughter
Etheridge	Matsui	Smith (WA)
Evans	McCarthy (MO)	Snyder
Farr	McCarthy (NY)	Spratt
Fattah	McCullum	Stark
Folsom	McGovern	Stenholm
Filner	McIntyre	Strickland
Ford	McKinney	Stupak
Frank	McNulty	Tanner
Frost	Meehan	Tauscher
Gephardt	Meek (FL)	Taylor (MS)
Gonzalez	Meeks (NY)	Thompson (CA)
Gordon	Menendez	Thompson (MS)
Green (TX)	Millender-	Thurman
Hall (OH)	McDonald	Tierney
Hall (TX)	Mink	Towns
Harman	Moakley	Turner
Hastings (FL)	Mollohan	Udall (CO)
Hill	Moore	Udall (NM)
Hilliard	Moran (VA)	Velázquez
Hinches	Murtha	Visclosky
Hinojosa	Nadler	Waters
Hoefel	Napolitano	Watt (NC)
Holden	Neal	Waxman
Holt	Oberstar	Weiner
Honda	Obey	Wexler
Hooley	Olver	Woolsey
Hoyer	Ortiz	Wu
Israel	Owens	Wynn
Jackson (IL)	Pallone	
Jackson-Lee	Pascrell	
(TX)	Pastor	
Jefferson		

NOT VOTING—17

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

□ 1824

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

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

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

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

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