

Page 19, line 20, strike "cal" and insert "fiscal".

Page 43, move lines 4 through 13 two ems to the left.

Page 44, line 6, strike "\$153,000,000" and insert "\$153,000,000,000".

Page 46, line 10, "\$3,871,000" and insert "\$3,871,000,000".

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2002

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 100 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 concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 83.

□ 1032

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 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, with Mr. LATOURETTE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

The period of debate on the subject of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2002 that occurred on March 27, 2001, pursuant to the order of the House of March 22, 2001, shall be considered to have been debated on House Concurrent Resolution 83, and the time for debate prescribed in section 305 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall be considered to have expired.

A further period of general debate shall be confined to the concurrent resolution and shall not exceed 40 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) each will control 20 minutes.

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes for the purpose of opening the debate.

Mr. Chairman, good morning. We are in the midst of continuing the debate on the budget for fiscal year 2002, and let me review what our plan has in store. We wrote a budget that has six principles that we think are pretty important as we stand on this very important threshold of the 21st century.

In our budget, we have maximum debt elimination, a historic \$2.3 trillion of paying down the public debt by 2011 during this 10-year period.

Tax relief for every American taxpayer: \$1,600 on average income tax break for the average family of four.

Improved education for our children: \$44.5 billion commitment in fiscal year 2002 alone, an 11.5 percent increase for our kids. But we also recognize that it is not just the money, it is also reform of education.

A stronger national defense is our fourth principle: \$14 billion increase, not only in 2001, but a \$5.7 billion increase for pay, housing, and health care in 2002.

Health care reform that modernizes Medicare, provides for a prescription-drug benefit. It modernizes our Medicare benefit, because it is not just about the current Medicare and the current trust fund, it is about extending the life of the trust fund, extending the solvency through modernization. It is not a zero-sum game as some of my friends on the other side would have it.

Finally, saving Social Security. Third year in a row, the Republicans are setting aside all of the Social Security trust fund for exactly what we pay the FICA taxes for, for Social Security, for the retirement of our seniors. It is totally protected in this budget.

We have a good plan. These are the six principles that make up the plan.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, to talk about improved education for our children.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to stand before the House this morning in support of a budget blueprint that represents America's families and America's priorities.

Our colleagues on the Committee on the Budget have presented us with a common sense plan to improve education, strengthen the economy, and secure America's future. It reflects President Bush's efforts to close the achievement gap in education between disadvantaged students and their peers, and to work with States to push America's schools to be the best in the world.

Despite a decade of economic growth in the 1990s, the achievement gap between students, Anglo and minority, remains very wide. Washington has spent more than \$130 billion since 1965 in a well-intentioned effort to close this gap. We spent more than \$80 billion on that goal since 1990 alone; and, unfortunately, those efforts have not worked. Nearly 70 percent of inner city and rural fourth graders cannot read on a basic level, and low-income students lag behind their counterparts by an average of 20 percentile points on national assessment tests.

The hard lesson of the last 35 years is that money alone cannot be the vehicle for change in our public schools. There must also be accountability.

To ensure that Federal education dollars are being used effectively, we must ask States to assess student achievement in academics. One cannot correct a problem if one does not know that it exists; and for far too long, we have been spending Federal tax dollars in education without being able to track our students' progress and make certain that they are learning.

The budget before us today provides a framework for the most important change in Federal education policy since President Johnson. It paves the way for us to rededicate the Federal role in education to helping students who might otherwise fall through the cracks. It provides the resources needed to implement a system of accountability so parents will be able to know whether their children are learning.

This budget provides the resources necessary to accomplish these bold goals. It provides money to States to develop the test to track student performance each year, the centerpiece of the President's plan to leave no child behind. It targets resources to those who need it most by providing substantial funding for title I which provides aid to low-income students. Federal education funding for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the principle Federal law to aid disadvantaged students, is increased significantly.

Funding for reading programs is tripled, increasing to \$5 billion over 5 years. This program will help reduce the number of children placed in special-education classes simply because they have not learned to read, moving the Federal Government closer to its original promise of providing up to 40 percent of the average per-pupil expenditures in IDEA to the States.

This budget also provides \$2.6 billion for States to improve teacher quality through high-quality professional development, recruitment, and retention activities.

It addresses other educational priorities as well in higher education. An additional \$1 billion is included for Pell Grants, increasing the maximum award for all students to provide more need-based grant aid to low-income college students.

Mr. Chairman, until we have a real system of accountability in place, it is truly unfair to our children to enact massive increases in Federal education spending beyond the reasonable steps outlined in this budget resolution. Spending without accountability is the approach that Washington has followed in the past; and as a tragic consequence, many children have been trapped in chronically failing schools and denied the opportunity to realize the American dream.

This budget provides a framework that allows Republicans and Democrats to work together to close the achievement gap and to improve education quality and hope to our Nation's most disadvantaged students.

I commend the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) for his leadership in

crafting a budget that represents the hopes, dreams, and aspirations of all Americans, particularly those of the next generation of American students.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, our Republican colleagues have just laid out six principles by which to judge their resolution and our resolution. Let me take each one of those principles and apply it and compare the two resolutions.

First of all, maximum debt elimination. I heartily agree the more debt we can eliminate the better. Let's look at the bottom line on the two resolutions. Our budget resolution will provide \$3.7 trillion for debt reduction. Theirs will provide \$2.8 trillion for debt reduction. We provide \$915 billion more for debt reduction. It is not even close. Furthermore, to the extent that they spend \$1 out of this \$500 billion contingency fund that they create, that will be \$1 less for debt reduction.

Tax relief. Some of this surplus, a substantial share of it surely should be given back to the American people. We heartily agree with that principle. So what have we got? A third of the surplus that we set aside for tax relief, and we target it to those taxpayers who need it most, hard-working middle-income families.

Furthermore, this resolution makes in order, directs the Committee on Ways and Means by May 1 to provide \$60 billion in tax relief this year, fiscal year 2001, before September 30, in order to give this sagging economy a stimulus. That means we have got \$800 billion of tax reduction in this bill. By any yardstick, that is substantial tax reduction.

Education is at the top of the charts, a big concern amongst all people all over this country. Their budget increases education by 5.6 percent next year. Compare that to last year: 18 percent increase last year. Compare it to the last 5 years: 13 percent over the last 5 years. Compare it to our budget resolution: \$130 billion more for elementary and secondary education, higher education, Pell Grants across the spectrum, \$130 billion more than they provide for education. There is no comparison. There is no question. We win hands down on the issue of education.

National defense. I believe in a strong national defense. That is why we put in our budget realistic funding for defense. We have \$115 billion in our budget over and above inflation for national defense. Their budget, on the other hand, baselines national defense and tells us that, when Mr. Rumsfeld tells us what the number is, they will supply a new number. In the meantime, we are providing substantial increase and realistically budgeting national defense.

Medicare reform, Medicare reform, read their budget. I defy my colleagues to find one syllable in there that deals with Medicare reform. It does not take up the issue. The only thing that even

pretends to be Medicare reform in their resolution is a vague proposal to have some kind of prescription-drug coverage. But guess what. It is paid for out of the Medicare trust fund, the HI trust fund, which is already obligated for in-patient benefits. Now they double-obligate it.

They drain \$153 billion off the Medicare trust fund, I guess you can call that reform; but I will tell you, my colleagues, what it does, it shortens the solvent life. It makes the problem worse. I would not call it wholesome reform.

Finally, Social Security. They make it point number six. We make it point number one.

□ 1045

Now that we have the wherewithal, the resources to do something about the Social Security situation, that is, the liabilities that we have for benefits promised but not yet provided, we intend to do something. We take \$910 billion, one-third of the surplus over the next 10 years, and put it, 50 percent, in the Social Security Trust Fund, 50 percent in the Medicare Trust Fund. We extend the solvent life of Medicare to 2040 and Social Security to 2050.

There is no question that on all six of these principles we win hands down. Look at the scorecard, then decide how to vote. My colleagues should vote for our resolution. It is better even by the criteria they set down.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP), the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

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

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, the budget resolution currently before the House sets a level of funding for the national defense function of \$324.6 billion, or \$14.3 billion higher than the previous provided for in the current year. This was also the level proposed by the President in his February 27 economic plan.

However, it should be understood that this level of funding should be viewed only as a placeholder pending the completion of the administration's comprehensive strategy review that will define the proper course this Nation should take in securing our national security interests in the coming decade and beyond. At the completion of this review, scheduled for later this spring, Secretary Rumsfeld will forward conclusions to the President that I am confident will recommend an adjustment in the amount of funding proposed for the national defense functions.

In anticipation of this process, the budget resolution contains a specific provision, section 6, which establishes a strategic reserve fund and the mechanism to use this budget resource within

this fund to accommodate an increase in defense allocation resulting from the administration's strategy review.

I support President Bush's decision to first establish the strategic framework for the Department of Defense before putting forth a definitive defense spending plan. It marks a refreshing break from the previous administration's practice of allowing arbitrary budgetary considerations to set national security policy.

However, I am firmly convinced that regardless of what strategy adjustments the President proposes, there are severe and immediate and compelling needs facing the military that will require an infusion of additional budget resources this year and beyond. Therefore, while I would have preferred that the defense number in the budget resolution reflect this reality, I am satisfied that the resolution provides an adequate mechanism to revisit this question later in the year after the decision has been made for the proper funding level for defense.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) for working with me and other members of the Committee on Armed Services on this very difficult problem. With the colloquy that he and I had yesterday, I am satisfied that this clarifies our outstanding concerns, and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I heard people talking about a shell game, and I listened to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), and I thought of having seen this shell game actually played in the State of Illinois, southern Illinois. I want to use one example so my colleagues will understand it.

In the budget that is being proposed, the American people have paid, or will pay, \$526 billion more than is necessary over the next 10 years to cover Medicare. So that \$526 billion is represented by this little coffee bean, and we put it underneath the contingency fund. We also say we are going to use it for Medicare, and we are also going to use it for the drug benefit.

The Republican budget uses that same \$526 billion in two different places. They use 239 billion over here and 153 billion over there, and they still say, that we have a contingency fund over here. Now, that bean cannot be under all three of these shells. It simply is not possible. It can, however, be moved around, and that is why the game is like a county fair. You keep moving the bean or the money around, and the public guesses which one of the shells that bean is under.

The Republicans are figuring that the public is not smart enough to know that we are going to move it around and move it around and keep talking, and they will never know that they are spending it in three different places.

Now, the Democratic alternative, which is very simple, says we are going

to use that money for advancing the long-term strength of Medicare. It is to be used after 2010, when the baby boomers start coming on the rolls, rather than spending it on the contingency fund for things in the next 10 years, or using it for the drug benefit. We are going to keep it for the time when the baby boomers come on line. Additionally, out of the money that we save from not cutting so many taxes, we put an honest-to-God \$330 billion benefit for prescription drugs.

This is the foolishness of what they have done. The President says \$153 billion for prescription drugs. The bill they had on the floor last year was for \$159 billion, now estimated to be \$200 billion. So they are not even funding what they offered last year. And what we—the Democrats—are saying is that is not an adequate benefit. \$330 billion is what we are offering to the American people, and we are not going to play a shell game with them.

We are saving the Medicare surplus for Medicare as we know it, and we are adding to it a benefit.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST), the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) for working closely with us. This budget resolution contains an innovative feature that I want to address.

Mr. Chairman, the Congress and the Committee on Agriculture that I chair have been struggling for over 3 years to cope with major economic crises on the farm. The basic programs that we passed in 1996 have not been able to keep up with collapsing prices and skyrocketing costs, leaving family farmers hanging on by a thread. As it should have, Congress has stepped in with emergency economic assistance in each of the last 3 years, and many farmers are in business today because of that.

Mr. Chairman, it is time to stop ad hoc assistance and move to a more permanent solution that producers and their lenders can count on.

Mr. Chairman, in preparation for this, the Committee on Agriculture is completing a series of almost 1½ years of hearings to determine what our future course should be. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), recognizing the critical need that our farmers face, worked closely with us to address the problem. This resolution names agriculture along with defense as a budget item eligible for access to the \$517 billion reserve fund for fiscal years 2002 through 2011. In addition, it accesses fiscal year 2001 reserve funds for assistance in the current year.

Mr. Chairman, when the Committee on Agriculture reports legislation later this summer, budget allocations can be adjusted to reflect the Committee on

Agriculture's action. By granting access to the reserve fund, the House will have an opportunity to consider a policy reform that will meet the needs of our farmers within the constraints of our budget. This will not produce a debate over numbers, but instead a serious discussion of the farm policies needed in the current situation in the coming years.

Mr. Chairman, I have spoken to the President at length about the problems facing farmers. I was impressed by both his understanding of the problem and his willingness to help address them. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) and his budget team have brought to the floor a resolution that not only makes provision for the immediate crisis of this year's crop, but provides the means to put a more permanent policy in place based upon policy needs rather than driven by number fixation.

Mr. Chairman, every Member who is working to relieve the pain of American farmers should join me with enthusiasm in supporting this budget. It is just the prescription to deliver a cure for farmers' problems instead of another Band-Aid.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the last two speakers on the other side have made a very important point, and that is there is universal acknowledgment that in this upcoming fiscal year, there will be a spending increase for agriculture, and, more significantly, in defense. But we are not prepared today to confront those facts in terms of how much it is going to cost, and it is one reason why the contingency fund is not an appropriate way for us to be having this debate.

We ought to be honest with the American people on how much is the President going to propose for defense. Many of us are prepared to support a large percentage of that. How does that affect our ability to choose between the size of the tax cut and our ability to pay down the debt.

Mr. Chairman, one of the other things I want to highlight that you have heard a lot of discussion about in support of the Democratic alternative is why paying down the debt, taking one-third of the surplus and paying down the debt, or, as the Blue Dogs would propose, half of the surplus, will help Medicare and Social Security.

Mr. Chairman, as the baby boomers start to retire in 2012, this is going to put enormous strain on both Medicare and Social Security. There will be no easy choices. Raising the retirement age, nobody in this Chamber is going to advocate an increase in the payroll taxes. In fact, a lot of us would like to reduce the payroll tax.

Mr. Chairman, one of the few things available to us to soften the pain associated with these choices is to use more general revenue. We already put general revenue into Medicare. It is something that we have to consider

doing with Social Security as part of the solution to preserve Social Security and Medicare for the retirement of the baby boomers, not to mention the cost of a prescription drug plan, which we all have to acknowledge will not be inexpensive. How can we do that?

Mr. Chairman, by paying down the debt, we preserve our ability to use general revenue to be part of the solution to preserve the solvency of Social Security and Medicare. The State of Florida, and every State in this Nation, has a tremendous amount at stake if we do not do this right. We need to plan now.

Mr. Chairman, the only prudent thing to do is to use the lion's share of the projected surplus to pay down the debt and begin to prepare Medicare and Social Security for the retirement of the baby boomers.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS).

(Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to draw attention to what I believe is a serious deficiency in the budget resolution for fiscal year 2002.

Mr. Chairman, while I commend the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) for his hard work on the budget resolution, I would be remiss if I did not speak to the yearly military budget shortfalls of between \$50 billion and \$100 billion per year.

Mr. Chairman, if we do not address this reality now, we are facing a budgetary train wreck that is simply unavoidable. My concern is that this budget only allows for marginal improvements. Mr. Chairman, we must push beyond marginal improvements. This requires a dual-track approach. While we plan for the realities of the 21st century's many challenges, we must take care of the force that we are fielding today and ensure peace through strength. I do not believe that we adequately address this in the budget resolution; however, I intend to support this budget resolution and take it as a good-faith effort, but I do so with reservations.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to working with the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP) to address military funding shortfalls during the authorization process and with the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this budget resolution because it is not balanced. The consuming desire of our Republican colleagues for immediate political gratification has caused them to pursue exploding tax cuts for the most privileged people in our society without regard to our obligations both to our parents for Social Security and Medicare and to our children for educational opportunities.

Mr. Chairman, with the tax cuts for the privileged that are authorized by this resolution, we are setting a course, a path, to head back to the era of deficits, to head back to a period when we are no longer reducing the national debt and encouraging economic expansion and lower interest rates. That is a fiscal mistake.

□ 1100

A budget is more than number crunching. People can get crunched, too. Recently, the first particulars of this Bush budget and its impact on children in this country have leaked out. These are the troubling numbers and details that will be coming out this next month after votes are taken on the tax cuts. Under this Bush budget, the children of America, who rely on child care will be "bush-whacked." The entire Early Learning Opportunities Fund designed to improve the quality of child care in this country, will be totally eliminated. \$200 million will be removed from block grants to the states, for assisting the working poor in obtaining child care. This cut at a time when we already have 41,000 children in the State of Texas waiting to get access to child care; that under this waiting list will only grow. Although there are 900,000 reported cases of abuse and neglect of children across America, there will be an 18 percent cut in federal funding for state child protective services.

I am for all of the tax cuts that fiscal sanity will permit, but reality of this budget is that these tax cuts really cost. They cost and crunch our children in a very harsh way.

Last year, candidate Bush borrowed the slogan from the Children's Defense Fund, "leave no child behind," but the unrealistic tax breaks for those at the top make clear that this Republican budget has as its mantra "leave no millionaire behind."

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON), a new member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, as a new Member of Congress who has been here less than 3 months and a member of the Committee on the Budget, I have sought earnestly and honestly to find the true facts of the situation here; and I want to make two quick points.

First and foremost, it has come to my attention, I understand that the previous Congresses, when the Reagan tax cut was enacted, revenues doubled but spending tripled. I also want to make the point to the listening public that the Republican budget plan pays off as much publicly held debt as is legally possible to do so without incurring a penalty. That is a vitally important point, and I want to make sure the listeners understand that we cannot pay off any more debt than is contemplated by President Bush's budget without incurring penalties, and the Democratic budget plan would tax the

taxpayers with \$100 billion to \$150 billion in penalties over 10 years, according to the Office of Management and Budget. And a very good source, who has been objective, is Alan Greenspan who says we are paying off all Federal debt that can be paid off and the publicly held debt will be eliminated by the end of this decade. That is a vitally important point that I hope the public will remember.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, the choice before us today is not a choice between economic theories. It is a choice between moral positions. There is a major difference between the Democratic plan that I support put forth by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and the majority plan, and that major difference is this: Our plan pays off about \$1 trillion more of debt over the next 10 years than does the Republican plan.

This is a choice between instant gratification in 2001 or responsible treatment for our children for the next 10 years. The Republican budget does reflect one thing about American life. It reflects an unfortunate cultural tendency toward instant gratification; have a party now; spend all the money now and pass the bills off to the next generation.

A vote for the Spratt budget means that our children are \$1 trillion less in debt than they would be under the majority budget. Forsake instant gratification. Do what is responsible for the future. Reject the Republican budget and adopt the Spratt substitute instead.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCHROCK), a very able, new member of our committee and the president of the freshman class.

Mr. SCHROCK. Mr. Chairman, this good budget contains about \$400 million for military housing for our men and women in uniform, and that is a good thing. To give an example how bad military housing is, let me talk about Fort Story, which is an Army post in Virginia Beach, the Second Congressional District that I represent. There are 168 family units. Two have been condemned; 166 have been labeled code red, which means unacceptable. Most have been built before 1958. Several predate World War II.

As an example, the sergeant major of that command, the highest ranking enlisted man at that post, was living in a 1,700 square foot set of quarters that had been condemned. The floors had turned to sponge; termite infested and there was asbestos everywhere. It was going to cost \$70,000 to clean it up; and Congress would only allow \$20,000 to repair that, so it has to be condemned.

If we are going to make the mom and kids happy and keep dad in, what we have to do is make sure we provide the quality of life issues that are so important to the military people; and housing is one of them. I am delighted that this very good budget contains money for that.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT), for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, the authors of this budget resolution owe my constituents and owe every American an explanation. How can they justify siphoning money out of the Medicare trust fund when Medicare solvency is already in jeopardy? Which of their budget priorities is more important than Medicare?

In 1965, Republican Members of Congress overwhelmingly opposed establishing the Medicare program. In 1994, Newt Gingrich, then Speaker of the House and the Republican leader of this House, stated that he would like to see Medicare, quote, "wither on the vine," unquote.

Now the Republicans control the White House and control the Congress. They want to accelerate Medicare insolvency, and they want to privatize the Medicare program.

Medicare is not some throw-away program that one can experiment with, that one can starve, that one can walk away from, that one can ultimately abandon. To the Republicans, I say do America a favor. Put the best interests of Americans ahead of their top-heavy tax cuts and their indiscriminate disdain for public programs, especially those as overwhelmingly successful and popular as Medicare.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON), the subcommittee chairwoman in charge of Medicare.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I regret that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are playing such purposeful politics with this budget debate. The bottom line is that the HI trust fund, that is the hospital trust fund, that is part of the larger fund, can only be used for Medicare and it can be used for Medicare reform as well, because this body, Democrats and Republicans, voted for the lockbox bill. In fact, we voted 407 to 2. Everybody voted for it, and it said that the money in the HI trust fund could be used for Medicare and Medicare reform. So that is just that. Also, in this resolution we have explicitly provided the funding for a proposal that the President might propose for prescription drugs and/or Medicare reform or that we in Congress might write.

Where is the money going to come from? First of all, there is more money in this budget for prescription drugs

than there ever was in a Clinton budget, and he talked about it all the time. So we have pretty good money in this budget.

Remember that Clinton funded his entire first prescription drug bill from savings within Medicare.

Now, I did not believe that was possible then and I do not believe it now, but it does remind us that we can make some savings within the program to also rededicate those resources to prescription drugs.

Then there are 40 trust funds currently in surplus. Any one of those trust funds could be used to carry the money into Medicare reform or prescription drugs. In other words, there is money in the bill, there is authority in the bill for us to write the prescription drug bill that we think will serve seniors and their children and grandchildren in the future.

If we just pay for all of the drugs, we are talking a trillion dollars over 10 years. Medicare is going to double its costs in the same 10 years. So now we are at a trillion five. The defense budget, at its biggest, will never exceed \$300 billion.

We simply have to bring a prudent drug bill to the floor because the seniors do not need just prescription drugs. They need chronic-disease management. They need much better preventive health services than Medicare now offers.

Is it not pathetic that only last year we gave them coverage for pelvic exams and pap tests? So we have a lot of things we have to do to modernize Medicare, and we are obliged to bring back a disciplined, prudent prescription drug bill that meets the needs of seniors but also allows them the additional new services they need.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 45 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I would say that the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) brings out the walnut shells in me because when she starts talking about the fact that all of the money is going to Medicare and do not worry, it is in a lockbox, anybody who reads that lockbox bill and can read the English language can realize that one can call anything reform and the money comes out of it. That is all that bill says.

What it means is benefits are either going to be cut or provider payments are going to be cut, or something is going to be taken away if they are not going to cut down. The President says we are \$645 billion short, and we are still talking about modernizing, which means cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, when I talk with the folks back home in New Jersey and they discover that the tax cuts, three-quarters of them, will not even kick in

until more than 5 years from now, and they combine that with their realization that there is a lot of uncertainty about these projections, they wonder whether they are ever going to see this.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, we would be doing them a much greater favor in putting more money in their pockets if we pay down the debt. The Democratic version would pay down the debt a trillion dollars faster in the next 10 years. That would make us better able to deal with Social Security and Medicare when the baby boomers retire.

It would lower interest rates, which would help farmers and students and small businesswomen, home buyers; and by establishing fiscal discipline, it would improve consumer and investor confidence. That would be more money in the people's pockets.

Furthermore, the Democratic version goes considerably farther in investing in education and research, the necessary ingredients of a successful economy.

In both of those areas, they are necessary to lead to productivity growth. Again, more money in the pockets of the people of America.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, this is really a debate about our Nation's priorities. What do we want this country to be in the next 20 years? Do we want it to remain the strongest country on the face of the Earth or do we want it to slip back into third world status?

If this country is to remain strong, we need to invest in our people. That is the single most important investment this country can make in the future.

One in four children in my district in Rhode Island, in my first district, grows up in poverty; one in four. Yet, this Republican Congress would propose giving nearly half of the \$2 trillion surplus to the richest 1 percent of our country.

Let us look at it, right here, choosing how we spend \$280 billion. Are we going to invest it in our kids or are we going to invest it in a few millionaires who already have made it? I might add, to anyone who thinks that everyone who has made a million dollars earned it, let me just say something. I made a million dollars, and I did not earn it. I was given it by my parents and my grandparents. Know what? Wealth is now transferred from the rich to the rich.

Know what? People who are working for a living are not even earning enough to make it rich because this Republican Congress is gutting education; it is gutting job training; it is gutting those things that we know help people earn a living.

One of the things that this budget cuts is actual child care subsidies. Hello. I thought that this Congress was family friendly. What are they doing?

They are eliminating over 50,000 subsidies for child care. Now what does one think those parents are going to do without the child care? Oh, they will go back on welfare. No, we do not want welfare, the Republicans say.

Okay, well, give me a solution. I will say that this budget is all wrong for this country. The President of the United States says he wants to leave no child behind, but in this budget he will end up leaving millions of children behind.

Know what? Those kids out there do not even know it today. Those parents do not even know it. The people in this gallery may know it, but there are going to be millions of children who are never going to even know that the vote we make today is the vote that is going to seal their future. It is going to seal their future either in poverty or it is going to brighten up their future, like the Democratic plan would have it by investing in the programs that will make them strong people.

□ 1115

The thing that made this country so strong after World War II was the GI bill. It invested in a whole generation of Americans. Let us not miss the lesson of that importance of education; let us invest in the Democratic budget.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON).

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Democratic budget and in the alternative, the Blue Dog budget. It is quite familiar for me to stand here and address the subject of military budgets. For many years under both administrations, Democrats and Republicans, I would point out where we believe this body and America as a Nation were failing to set appropriate priorities in the defense budget. Far too often I have known that we were trying to do too much with too little. So I was glad to see both candidates for President advocate increases in the defense budget. It was good news. But that is not what is coming to pass.

I am disappointed with the President's defense budget for 2002 which the majority adopts in the budget resolution. The Bush budget provides about \$325 billion for national security activities, of which \$310.5 billion is for the Department of Defense. But then we have to take out the retiree health professions and then we have to adjust for inflation; and when that is done, we have an actual increase of only \$100 million, \$100 million. That will fix the gymnasium at West Point. So the \$100 million increase in the defense budget makes a mockery of the President's campaign pledge that help is on the way. He must have meant spiritual help.

In contrast, both the Democratic budget and the Blue Dog budget provide more money for defense. The Democratic alternative provides for \$2.7 billion more in fiscal year 2002, \$48

billion more in 10 years, \$7 billion in fiscal year 2001 for a supplemental. The Blue Dog provides for \$4.5 billion more in fiscal year 2002, \$19.3 billion over 5 years, \$7 billion in fiscal year 2001 for a supplemental.

So despite the campaign rhetoric, the Republican administration has utterly failed to live up to its commitments. I thus speak in favor of the Democratic budget and, in the alternative, the Blue Dog budget.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

I just want to say in benediction here that it did not have to be this way. We had no hearings at which the Secretary of Defense would even come up to the committee and tell us. There is not anybody on this floor who does not think there is going to be more money in the defense budget, but he would not even come up and talk to us about it. There was no talking with our side about this budget.

What we have here is a sham budget from the Republicans. They get full credit for it. God bless them.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think we saw from particularly the gentleman from Rhode Island probably the biggest contrast between the Republican and the Democrat substitutes. The gentleman from Rhode Island was very clear that the Democrats believe that government can solve people's problems, that government can take care of people, that government can solve all of the ills that our Nation has before it.

Republicans believe something just a little bit different, and that is we believe individuals and families make better decisions about their daily lives than the government can for them, and that if we could just keep the resources in their pocket to begin with, they could be empowered to make those decisions.

The most important debate of today, March 28, is not happening in the halls of Congress. Do we know where it is happening? It is happening around the kitchen tables of America as families struggle to balance their checkbooks, as they struggle to figure out how to send their kids to college, as they struggle between the decisions of, do I buy Nikes or do I buy Keds, whether we should buy name-brand cereal or should we buy generic. How do I pay my heating bill when I live in California? How do I pay my heating bill when I live in Iowa? How do I make the decisions that face me every single day about mortgages, about paying my visa bill, about my own debt; and when they hear on C-SPAN, which is probably droning in the background as they sit around their kitchen table, and they hear us talking about the debt held by the public and how we are doing such a great job, they say, what about me? What about my debt? How much money are you taking from me? It is almost

April 15. These people have paid their taxes, and they find out, we have more money than we need.

Mr. Chairman, we are balancing the budget. We have this done now for the fifth year in a row, number one; number two, the most debt reduced by any budget that has ever been provided, and there is still money left over. After paying for all of the Medicare reform with a prescription-drug benefit, there is still money left over. With all of Social Security set aside so that we can make sure that generations to come have got Social Security to retire, and there is still money left over. With an 11.5 percent increase in education, there is still money left over. Increases for military, for agriculture, a number of other opportunities and priorities within the budget, and there is still money left over.

I would say to my friends, it is not your money. It is not my money. It is their money, and they deserve it back, because they have paid enough, they have paid too much. We have met the priorities of this budget, and it is time to give them a refund. There is no 7-Eleven in the country that once you have paid for your gas and your Snickers bar and your Coca Cola or whatever it might be and you give the person a \$20 bill and the bill comes up to only about \$18, who would keep the change? In fact, in Iowa, they would even run out into the parking lot and chased you down to give you your change.

Mr. Chairman, let us give the American people back their change, and let us do it today.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, to govern is to choose—and today the House was called on to make some basic choices about the future of the economy and the future of our country.

We need to proceed carefully and responsibly. We should steer a course that responds effectively to the challenges of today without risking the opportunities of the future on the outcome of a riverboat gamble.

That is why we should take a different course than the one proposed by the Republican leadership. And that is why I supported the Blue Dog alternative and the Spratt Substitute—because those alternatives were more credible, less risky, and more responsible.

Mr. Chairman, Coloradans know well the dangers of relying on long-range forecasts. We live in an arid state—visit us in the summer and you will see that the sun shines almost every day. We like it that way, and so do our summer visitors. But it means we have to be careful and plan ahead.

We know it would be imprudent to drain the reservoirs and rely just on forecasts of surplus water in the years ahead.

But that is what the Republican budget does—not with water, but with fiscal policy, with the budget, and with the economy.

The Republican plan relies on a ten-year economic forecaster and runs the risk of shortening the solvency of Social Security and Medicare if that forecast doesn't pan out.

And, in the meantime, it would neglect other important needs in order to pay for the President's tax plan.

As a result, it would not do enough to reduce the publicly-held debt and would short-change education, seniors, research, and the environment.

By contrast, the Blue Dog substitute was far more prudent. To start with, it was a five-year plan, not one depending on a 10-year forecast. It would have allowed us to immediately reduce taxes by \$23 billion this year, and to make further substantial reductions in taxes over the next four years. It would have allowed us to pay off a full half of the publicly-held debt by 2006. And it would have allowed us to make the investments we need to make in education, health care, and our communities.

Unfortunately the refusal of the Republican leadership to proceed on that reasonable course meant that the Blue Dog substitute was rejected. That was a mistake—and it was compounded by the rejection of the Spratt substitute.

The Spratt substitute was also a ten-year plan. But it was much better than the Republican plan. It would have allowed us to pay off most of the publicly-held debt by 2008. It would have enabled us to provide tax relief to all taxpayers, including the millions of people who pay more in payroll taxes than in income taxes. It would have allowed us to provide a real and meaningful prescription-drug benefit for Medicare beneficiaries—without risking the solvency of Medicare as the Republican plan does. And it would allow us to do what needs to be done to promote science, protect our environment, and respond to the pressures of population growth and sprawl—needs that the Republican plan seriously shortchanges.

When the Spratt substitute was rejected, I was left with no responsible choice except to vote against the risky Republican budget plan.

That plan is very deficient—it is filled with problems. In area after area it seriously shortchanges our country's needs and offers the American people a series of empty promises—all that while betting our continued prosperity on a 10-year forecast that leaves no room for error.

Mr. Chairman, the list of deficiencies in the Republican plan is a long one—too long for me to spell out now. So, let me focus on just a few.

SHORTCHANGING THE ENVIRONMENT

The Republican budget plan backtracks on last year's landmark agreement to provide dedicated funding for conservation. It does not provide the funding called for in that agreement, and falls far short of a commitment to meeting the needs of our communities to protect open space and respond to the pressures of growth and sprawl.

In contrast, the Democratic substitute offered by Representative Spratt would have provided the full \$10.4 billion called for in last year's agreement. It also would have made sure we have the resources to improve the nation's water-supply infrastructure, revitalize brownfields in our cities, and make other needed investments in our public lands and environment.

These are areas of particular concern to all of us in Colorado, and I am particularly disappointed by these shortcomings in the Republican plan.

SHORTCHANGING SCIENCE

The Republican plan also pays too little attention to important funding needs of our science, space, and technology programs.

In particular, the numbers on NSF and NASA concern me. Neither of these premier science agencies receives a requested increase that even keeps pace with inflation. Even VA—HUD Appropriations Subcommittee Chairman Walsh has described the NSF request as falling far short of what is needed. Along with my Democratic colleagues on the Science Committee, I have committed my support to an increase in the NSF budget for FY 2002 of at least 15 percent to enable the Foundation to carry out adequately its vital role in support of science and engineering education and research.

Federal funding for research is a necessary precondition for continued economic success and security in our high-technology economy. I believe that science funding for all our agencies must be increased.

Also of particular concern to me is the funding levels of research accounts at the Department of Energy. The Republican resolution would cut appropriated energy programs for FY2002 by 15 percent, or \$500 million, below the level needed, according to CBO, to maintain constant purchasing power. It remains unclear how this 15 percent cut will translate into decreases in specific DOE programs, but rumors are that DOE's clean energy research and development programs will see cuts of between 20 to 50 percent from FY2001 levels.

Funding for these accounts is critical to help us reduce our dependence on foreign oil and diversify our energy production portfolio.

The Bush budget claims an increase in this account, but it would not materialize until FY2004, and then only under the far-from-certain scenario of oil extraction from the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR). I am glad that the Republican budget resolution does not assume receipts from oil leasing in ANWR—but neither does it make clear how clean energy accounts will be funded.

Dr. D. Allen Bromley, former President Bush's science advisor from 1989–1993, wrote in a March 9 New York Times op-ed that the Bush budget—which the Republican budget resolution mirrors almost exactly—"includes cuts, after accounting for inflation, to the three primary sources of ideas and personnel in the high-tech economy: NSF is cut by 2.6 percent, NASA by 3.6 percent, and the Department of Energy by an alarming 7.1 percent. The proposed cuts to scientific research are a self-defeating policy. Congress must increase the federal investment in science. No science, no surplus. It's that simple."

I believe we must heed Dr. Bromley's call. In FY2002, the Democratic substitute would provide \$300 million more than the Republican resolution for NSF, NASA, and Department of Science programs—and \$3 billion more than the Republican resolution over the ten-year period.

Here again, adoption of the Democratic substitute would have been a step in the right direction.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I regret that today the House decided to bet so much on such a risky proposition as the Republican

plan. I hope that our losses are less than I fear—but the odds are very much against us.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, budgets are about making choices. When a family sits down at the beginning of the year to write a budget, it must anticipate expenditures and honestly balance these against available resources. Families understand they have to allocate limited income among any number of competing priorities: paying the mortgage, car payments, dinners out, groceries, summer vacation expenses, saving for retirement or a child's future college expenses. The purpose of a budget is to confront these choices and make informed decisions.

The budget before the House today has little or nothing to do with making honest, informed choices. The document we are debating is about one thing, and one thing alone: enacting the President's tax program. It sacrifices everything else to that end.

At the heart of this budget is a gamble that future budget surpluses will be large enough to pay for the President's ten-year, two-trillion-dollar tax package. As the Congressional Budget Office has admitted, these surplus estimates are notoriously inaccurate. If the projected surpluses fail to materialize, the President's tax cut will eat into Social Security and Medicare. No one in his right mind would take out a home equity loan with a balloon payment and then count on winning the lottery to pay it off. Committing to such an oversized tax package on the basis of uncertain surplus projections is not budgeting. It's gambling with our nation's economy.

Budgetary considerations aside, the President's tax package is also the wrong medicine for the economic situation we face today. The President's plan is heavily backloaded, and provides almost no tax relief now when it's most needed.

The holes in this budget are big enough to drive Air Force One through. The defense budget anticipated by the budget resolution is tentative, pending the completion of the Administration's strategic review. The budget attempts to paper over these and other deficiencies. The same is true for Social Security and Medicare. Every one of us knows that significant resources will be needed to shore up these critical programs as the Baby Boom generation approaches retirement in a few years. We should step up to the plate to meet the financial challenges ahead, yet the budget before us actually makes the situation worse by diverting funds out of the Medicare Trust Fund, shortening the life of the Medicare Trust Fund by five years.

The Republican budget is long on rhetoric but actually shortchanges critical domestic initiatives. For example, the Republican prescription drug proposal provides insufficient funding for the President's so-called "immediate helping hand" proposal. The President's proposal is neither immediate, nor helpful to millions of seniors struggling with escalating drug costs. Even worse, the Republican budget pays for their prescription drug bill out of the Medicare Trust Fund, shortening Medicare's solvency. By contrast, the Democratic budget alternative's prescription drug proposal is more than twice as large and provides a meaningful benefit for seniors without endangering Medicare.

Similarly, the Majority's budget underfunds education. The Republican budget guts the school renovation program, diverts the money to other programs, and has the nerve to call this an education increase. It shortchanges funding for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. By contrast, the Democratic budget alternative boosts funding to reduce class size, provides for school modernization and teacher recruitment, and adequately funds special education and Head Start.

We can do better, which is why I will support the Democratic budget framework. Our budget provides \$730 billion for tax relief. Unlike the GOP plan, which lavishes a disproportionate share of the tax cuts on the richest one-percent of taxpayers, the Democratic plan provides tax relief to all working families. It extends the solvency of Social Security and Medicare. We pay down more of the nation's debt. Finally, the Democratic framework sets aside resources for critical investments in education, prescription drugs, veterans, defense, and protecting the environment.

No company in America could get away with a business plan like the one offered today by the Republican majority. None of the families we represent would mortgage their financial future on such a risky foundation. We shouldn't either. Reject the Republican budget and adopt the Democratic substitute.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am particularly disappointed that none of the proposed budgets offered today address the serious problems facing Social Security. Setting aside the surplus coming in to Social Security actually does nothing to avert Social Security's insolvency. I think there is a greater understanding in this body in the last few years about the serious problems that Social Security faces in the future. Because of that increased understanding, I am even more disappointed in the unwillingness of Members to address Social Security's unsolvency. Suggesting the budget provides for paying down all the available "public debt" is actually a negative for me. It means we won't be using the surplus for fixing Social Security.

Social Security today has an unfunded liability of \$9 trillion and we need to solve the problem now. That \$9 trillion unfunded liability translates in terms of future dollars to an astounding shortage of a \$120 trillion over the next 75 years. This means that there will be \$120 trillion additional funding needed over and above the revenues coming in from the Social Security tax, if we are to maintain promised benefits over the next 75 years. The shortfalls are real. We know the number of people that are working now and will be entitled to benefits. We know the number of future workers and future retirees and therefore, the funding needed to fund benefits.

So, again Mr. Chairman, it should concern us all that we are not addressing this serious problem within the context of this budget—or any of the substitutes offered today.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, the fiscal year 2002 budget resolution—Securing America's

Future, A Budget that Works for Every Family—is a budget that is realistic and reasonable. While I personally would like to see a slower increase in the overall growth of spending and supported the Republican Study Group's amendment to do so, this budget does attempt to hold spending increases to roughly the rate of inflation.

Republicans have already proven that we can balance the budget and pay off the federal debt. With this budget we are refusing to squander the \$5.6 trillion surplus projected over the next 10 years. The Republican budget has the right balance of priorities: cutting taxes, paying off debt, strengthening Social Security, modernizing Medicare, and bolstering our national defense.

The Republican plan will pay off \$2.3 trillion of the national debt, the maximum that can be repaid without penalty. The Republican plan will also provide needed tax relief for working families by cutting tax rates, eliminating the marriage tax penalty, doubling the child tax credit, and repealing the death tax.

Looking back a decade ago, it seems impossible that the government could ever dig itself out of its financial hole. For too long, uncontrollable spending and reckless "borrowing" reigned in Washington. Now, thanks to a fiscally-responsible Republican Congress, we have a budget that is realistic and reasonable, holding the overall growth of spending to roughly inflation, while increasing spending on important priorities that will ensure a more secure future for every American family.

This budget reins in government spending, limiting it to the about same rate of growth as the average family's budget. It reduces federal taxes. It pays down the debt. And it takes care of important priorities like Social Security, Medicare, and national defense.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, American farms face the deepest agricultural recession of the century. Current farm conditions are worse than those during the Great Depression, World War II, or the 80s farm crisis. The combination of low commodity prices, unfair markets abroad, repeated natural disasters, and skyrocketing input costs has put not just the farmer, but the entire fabric of rural America at risk. This is the recession that the Republican budget proposal ignores. Rather than providing real economic assistance in the budget baseline, the Republican budget relies on a red herring "reserve fund." This reserve fund supposes to cover not only agricultural interests, but defense, tax extenders, and all other appropriate legislation.

It is also worth pointing out that the reserve fund in today's budget resolution is far smaller than we have been led to believe. Once the Medicare portion of the reserve fund is taken off-budget, about \$500 billion dollars over \$10 years remain. In reality, this leaves little room for agriculture. For example, in FY 2005 and 2006, the contingency fund has only \$12 and \$15 billion, respectively, available. This is barely sufficient to cover the requests of agricultural needs, not to mention other appropriate legislation of which there is certain to be plenty. This year a broad coalition of commodity and farm groups wrote to Congress requesting \$9 billion for FY 2002, and \$12 billion for each year thereafter. My amendment would have increased farm assistance programs by \$9 billion in FY 2002 and by \$45 billion over the next ten years. On a straight party line vote of 21 to 16 Republicans on the

House Budget Committee, voted it down. This same amendment was also considered not in order by the Rules Committee.

The time is now for us to provide the needed funds by raising the agricultural baseline. If we are to be honest and of true assistance to our farmers, we must move away from the emergency assistance that we have provided in recent years. Emergency, ad-hoc funding is inherently unstable and unpredictable. Producers and lenders alike are understandably nervous about basing their financial decisions on money that may or may not materialize. This uncertainty threatens to chill the entire farm economy.

Mr. Chairman, farmers need help now. And they deserve better than to be promised so much, but with so little assistance. I urge my Republican colleagues to join with me in supporting our hardworking farmers by voting no to the Republican budget resolution. I will only support a budget resolution this year that supports farmers in the same way that they have supported this nation for so long. The Republican budget absolutely does not.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, today the House debates the Budget Resolution. This critical legislation lays out the framework for the federal budget and spells out our nation's economic priorities. I cast my vote for a budget that is fiscally responsible, provides tax relief for all Americans, and invests in the programs that improve our quality of life.

The prosperity that we have enjoyed over the last decade has produced today's record budget surpluses and projections for huge future surpluses. These projections present us with the opportunity to keep our fiscal house in order, while meeting the key important needs of the American people.

The budget I support will allow us, first of all, to pass substantial tax cuts. Since coming to Congress, I have voted repeatedly to cut taxes. At a minimum, we should lower overall tax rates, fix the marriage penalty, and reform the estate tax laws.

Secondly, I voted for a budget resolution that devotes a third of the surplus to debt reduction. Clearly, we must continue paying down the \$3.4 trillion national debt. Our progress in debt reduction has kept interest rates down and allowed families to pay less for their homes and cars.

Finally, the budget framework provides the funding necessary to address the most pressing needs of families on the Central Coast and across our nation. It invests in education, strengthens Social Security, Medicare and national defense, and provides the funding needed for an affordable prescription drug plan for all seniors.

Mr. Chairman, I pride myself on working in a bipartisan manner to address the concerns of my constituents. But I cannot, in good conscience, support the President's budget, as proposed today by the majority party.

The \$2 trillion tax cut proposed by the President is simply too big. It won't allow us to pay down the debt. I also fear that a tax cut of this magnitude could open the door to a new era of runaway deficits that would cripple our economy and saddle our children with the burden of crushing debt.

In addition, I opposed the majority party's budget proposal because it depletes the resources we need to keep Social Security and Medicare solvent and provides only a slight increase in education. Finally, the President's

budget will actually bring about deep cuts in several key areas, like veterans, agriculture, and environmental protection.

Mr. Chairman, today the House was faced with starkly differing proposals for setting the economic priorities of our nation. I truly believe that the votes I cast were in the best interests of our families and our future.

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the budget resolution before us today.

This budget resolution is unrealistic and irresponsible. It makes optimistic and incautious assumptions about future budget surpluses to justify a massive series of tax cuts that would result in the chronic underfunding of important federal action on health care, education, transportation, veterans' benefits, housing, justice, environmental protection, and scientific research over the next ten years. This budget resolution would not do enough to shore up Social Security and Medicare, and it will effectively rule out the enactment of a comprehensive Medicare prescription drug benefit.

If recent years are accurate indicators, and I believe that they are, the Republican majorities in the House and Senate will adopt a budget resolution that even they are unwilling to implement. There are a number of Republican Representatives and Senators who will not support appropriations bills later this year that make irresponsible cuts in programs that they support.

Consideration of the annual budget resolution, unfortunately, has become a grotesque caricature of what is supposed to be. In recent years, Congress has consistently passed budgets that everyone knew it couldn't abide by. The House has already passed a trillion-dollar tax cut, and we are scheduled to pass a \$400 billion tax cut tomorrow—after we have passed a budget resolution, granted, but certainly not after the House and Senate have agreed on the final tax cut and spending figures for Fiscal Year 2002. If Congress enacts massive permanent tax cuts and then passes appropriations bills that spend more than the amount authorized in this fantasy budget resolution, it seems all too likely that the federal budget will soon be running massive deficits again.

The budget resolution is in no way binding on the Republican majority. The all too common practice of disregarding the budget resolution in recent years has been formalized in the document before us today by the inclusion of a provision which allows the chairman of the House Budget Committee to adjust tax and spending levels unilaterally later in the year.

Congress has made many difficult decisions in order to produce the substantial surpluses we enjoy today. Our success has been made possible, however, only by remarkable economic conditions that we have done little to produce, and economic developments beyond our control could dramatically alter our fiscal reality in a very short period of time. Do we really want to throw this all away by celebrating prematurely and profligately? I don't think that we should.

I urge my colleagues to act conservatively and wisely. I urge them to pass a budget that funds discretionary programs at levels that reflect the appropriations levels we all know we will enact later this year. I urge them to use much of the on-budget surplus to pay down the national debt. And I urge them to pass a smaller, fairer, more fiscally responsible, and

more honest tax cut that provides tax relief to the households that need it the most. In short, I urge my colleagues to reject the budget resolution before us and support the Democratic alternative budget.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, last week the President told us that it was all right for American families to swallow drinking water with five times the arsenic allowed in Europe when he halted a safe drinking water regulation. Today we are being asked to swallow another dangerous proposal—his budget.

I am proud of the day in 1964 when I sided over the House when it passed Medicare legislation. It is probably the most important vote I cast in my life. It has brought protection and health to our country's seniors ever since. But today, just like in 1995, when my Republican colleagues took control of this chamber, Medicare is under attack again—and for the same reason—to pay for a tax cut, which will go primarily to the richest individuals in the country.

The budget before us would actually raid the Medicare Trust Fund, just weeks after we passed legislation to stop that. According to Budget Committee analysts, the budget will ultimately dip into the Trust Fund to pay for either tax cuts or undefined contingent funding.

The budget resolution marks a retreat from the President's promise to design a meaningful prescription drug benefit. The budget includes just \$153 billion over ten years for the new benefit, which is even less than the plan brought forward by my Republican colleagues last year. That proposal, which would give money to HMO's, was called unworkable and far too little.

The Democratic proposal would allocate more than double this amount and provide a meaningful drug benefit to all Medicare recipients who choose to participate, not just a small percentage who are poor. We could easily afford this benefit. But the President's budget puts tax cuts ahead of the needs of our seniors.

Even worse, this budget pays for its drug benefit by using the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund—money intended to pay for seniors' hospital care. In simple terms, this means we will pay for a drug benefit today by bankrupting Medicare sooner, and reduce future ability to pay for the doctor and hospital care seniors need, the old proverbial borrowing from Peter to pay Paul. That is wrong. We need to add a real prescription drug benefit to Medicare, but this is not the way to do it.

I could mention many other problems in this budget—how it shortchanges veterans and safe drinking water for starters—but let me just mention the energy budget. As Ranking Member on the Energy and Commerce Committee, I have heard a lot of rhetoric from the Administration on how we need to focus on our energy needs, but what does the President's budget do?

It actually cuts \$700 million from the Department of Energy's budget. While the President has refused to tell us where these cuts will come from, news sources indicate it will come from energy research into conservation and renewable energy. How can this make any sense whatsoever?

The bottom line is that the President's tax cut of over \$2 trillion is driving all of these decisions. This debate helps all of us, and the American people, understand that we must

choose our priorities carefully. Last year's campaign was marked by Republican obfuscation. But now they are making choices—the wrong choices.

Do we want to protect Social Security and Medicare or do we want a big tax cut now? The President has told us, for example, that reducing taxes on estates over \$2 million is more important than saving Social Security and Medicare. Will we agree? I, for one, will not.

The Republican budget is a blueprint for future borrowing at best, and draconian cuts at worst. It should be rejected. The Democratic Substitute, offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] is a much better alternative that will provide a fiscally responsible tax cut and will provide more adequate funding for education, Social Security, Medicare and prescription drugs, while continuing to pay down the debt.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, in poll after poll, the American people have stated that tax cuts should not come at the expense of Medicare.

Still, the Republican budget resolution we are considering in the House this week takes \$153 billion from the Medicare Trust Fund and diverts it to a new prescription drug benefit and unnamed Medicare "reforms."

CBO Director Dan Crippen has testified that adding a prescription drug benefit to the Medicare program could cost not \$153 billion—but more than \$1 trillion over the next decade.

Even Energy and Commerce Chairman BILLY TAUZIN has admitted that a prescription drug benefit for seniors will cost far more than \$153 billion. We all know the problem.

The Bush "super-sized" tax cut puts the solvency of the Medicare Trust Fund in jeopardy.

And Bush's oversized tax cut will squeeze out the budget resources we must have for a sorely-needed prescription drug benefit for our seniors.

The working families and senior citizens in my Los Angeles district can count. They realize that the Republican budget resolution just doesn't add up. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this legislation.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the Republican Budget because it severely cuts many of the programs, which benefits the needy in our country in order to pay for huge tax breaks for the wealthy.

I rise, as well, to urge support for the Democratic substitute which provides a fiscally responsible tax cut for middle income families, as well as, adequate funds for education, Social Security, Medicare, prescription drugs and it continues to pay down the national debt.

Mr. Chairman, 20 days ago, this House took the first step in dismantling all of our hard work and the progress that we have made in education, health care, housing and the many other needs of our constituents by passing the first piece of the Bush \$1.6 Trillion tax cut.

Today, my friends on the other side of the aisle intend to compound this shame by adopting what the Washington Post on Sunday called "a Lollipop Budget" because of the lollipops it provides to the few who need them the least, while leaving the government without the means to meet its obligations.

The budget the majority intends to pass today most surely will squander all of the funds necessary for critical investments in our nation.

Under this regressive budget plan for fiscal year 2002, there will be no money for, prescription drugs and ensuring the solvency of Social Security and Medicare.

Because of estimates that 12.2 million low and moderate income families with children—31.5 percent of all families with children—the majority of them headed by hard working adults, would not receive any tax reduction at all under this budget plan meaning that many Americans, especially Black and Hispanic will be left further behind.

Under this budget plan there will be inadequate spending for education, no New Markets initiative to provide the venture capital needed in our communities, 45 million Americans will continue to be without health insurance, and that HMO's will continue to make profits by denying care and the continued denial of prescription drug coverage for the over 25 million seniors who must choose between paying for food or medicine.

For my constituents who's tax system mirrors the Federal IRS Code, this budget will mean that the loss of \$28 million to our local treasury on top of the devastating cuts in programs upon which they rely for a helping hand up.

Under this budget plan Americans living in the territories and others living in the states will be denied access to health care because Medicaid will be cut so that those who are in the top 10% of incomes in this country can get more.

Unlike the Republican Budget, the Democrat Budget retires the public debt by 2008, provides tax relief to all taxpayers, provides a credible prescription drug benefit, extends the solvency of Medicare and Social Security and provides realistic funding for priority investments for veterans, healthcare, the environment, education and law enforcement.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford to pass the Republican budget because of the harm that it will do to average Americans.

We have the resources today to right the wrongs of the past. We must insist that President Bush and the leadership of this Congress not squander our nation's wealth, but to invest it instead in the people.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the resolution. Today, we are preparing to vote to approve a responsible budget that meets our priorities: saving Social Security for seniors today and tomorrow, repaying \$2.3 trillion in debt, improving education, providing a prescription drug benefit to our needy seniors, and providing tax relief to restart our flagging economy.

This budget also addresses a number of other key issues. The value of investment in foreign assistance is included, with special mention given to the urgent funding needs to support the Middle East Peace Process and the war on drugs in the Andean countries. The work of the U.S. Agency for International Development is commended. This is a direct result of the critical work being performed in areas including health care, democracy building and disaster relief.

The Great Lakes Naval Training Center is located in my district, and because of this vital role in training the fleet, naval training receives the attention it deserves in this resolution. Additional support is offered to the initiative to improve our national defense by reviewing the goals and needs of our Armed Forces to improve overall efficiency. This budget offers the

Department of Defense the flexibility it needs to complete this thorough review and grants the Congress the ability to provide additional funding if the review deems it necessary.

Special mention is made of our imperative need to clean up nuclear waste, an issue of great importance in the City of Zion. It is here that 1,000 tons of highly radioactive spent nuclear fuel is stored less than 120 yards from Lake Michigan.

Both the President and now Congress commit to doubling funding for the National Institutes of Health (NIH), the world's leading biomedical research institution. Because of the ground breaking research conducted at NIH, lives are saved and health care costs are reduced while jobs are created. This is particularly important for the health care companies based in my district, and this resolution addresses this critical need.

As a member of the Budget Committee, I have seen Chairman NUSSLE and Ranking Minority Member SPRATT set out to do the work of our Committee with a spirit of bipartisanship that shows itself in mutual respect, open dialog, and a willingness to hear all points of view. I am proud to support their efforts.

Mutual respect has been evident during all of this year's budget debate. Open dialog has been the order of the day in all bipartisan meetings, and was especially evident during the markup of this budget resolution, when Budget Committee staff members presented a detailed functional breakdown of the budget and answered questions from all members of the Budget Committee. I want to commend the staff, particularly Rich Meade, Jim Bates, Jim Cantwell, Jason McKittrick and Paul Restuccia, for their expertise and hard work over the last few weeks.

This budget is a first step toward implementing the priorities we all value. I urge my colleagues to support me in voting for it. To succeed in implementing the goals of this resolution, we need to continue to follow the principles of bipartisanship that Chairman NUSSLE has shown us in the Budget Committee. I urge my colleagues to support the Chairman in this, as well, and vote in favor of the resolution.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, during last year's campaign, President Bush made many promises to the American people. He promised to preserve Social Security and Medicare. He pledged to provide a prescription drug benefit for seniors. He said that he would increase our spending on national defense to improve readiness on national defense to improve readiness and the morale of our troops; and he declared that he would increase the federal commitment to education and maintain our efforts to protect the environment.

The FY 2002 budget before us today, based upon the President's own budget blueprint, sacrifices all of these promises and priorities in order to fulfill just one: a giant tax cut that offers its greatest benefits to the wealthiest Americans.

In my judgment, this budget is fiscally unsound because it relies upon rosy assumptions of economic growth and of subsequent government revenues to generate continued budget surpluses. And if these projected surpluses do not materialize, this Republican budget will cause the nation to return to the days of budget deficits and escalating national debt from which we only recently emerged. I would caution my colleagues to consider this point before casting their vote on the measure.

I am especially concerned about the shortsightedness of this budget with regard to our nation's defense. Although the President promised to increase defense spending to ensure that our military is prepared to meet challenges it will face in the 21st century, this budget allocation will not even keep pace with inflation. We already know that \$3.9 billion will be necessary to provide health care benefits to Medicare-eligible military retirees for 2002 in accordance with last year's National Defense Authorization Act, a fact that is not considered in this budget. The President and many of my colleagues also support a national missile defense program, the cost of which will be enormous, further draining resources from an already depleted defense budget.

This budget also does not assume any action in this current fiscal year to address the urgently-needed supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense. This is another faulty assumption and another area in which the Bush administration is retreating on the promise that "Help is on the Way" to address readiness concerns, the already-approved pay raise, and the need to improve quality of life for military personnel and their families. I believe that this issue is so important that I have already proposed a supplemental appropriations bill for my colleagues' consideration, containing legitimate emergency appropriations items that have been submitted by all of the services. To ignore these requests, as has been done in the Republican budget, is unwise.

My friends on the other side of the aisle will argue that Congress still may increase defense spending pending the outcome of a strategic review of defense requirements. I would point out to my colleagues that by the end of this week, it is likely that the House will have passed tax cuts totaling more than \$1.35 billion—almost 85 percent of the allocation provided for tax cuts in this budget resolution. Several components of the President's tax proposal remain to be considered, including the elimination of the estate tax, expanding the charitable deduction, and making permanent the research and experimentation tax credit. Once this tax package is approved, where will the money be found to fund any increase in defense? Very likely it would require deep cuts to Social Security and Medicare, and to education and the environment.

In contrast to this anti-defense Republican budget, the Democratic substitute delivers on defense, providing a \$7.1 billion defense supplemental for 2001 and providing \$48 billion more for defense over the next 10 years than the Republican budget. This level of funding will improve the quality of life for our troops and their families, enable the modernization and replacement of aging equipment, and provide the research and development needed to ensure that our military remains the strongest and most efficient armed force in the world.

I am also very concerned about the shortcomings in the Republican budget with regard to natural resources and the environment. Their plan cuts \$2.3 billion from last year's level, effectively an 11 percent cut considering inflation. Even after adjusting the budget to take into account for emergency funding made last year, the Republican budget plan does not return to last year's funding level until 2007.

As the Ranking Democratic Member of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, I have concerns about what the proposed budget im-

plications will be for our public lands and natural resource priorities. We already have unmet needs and backlogs. Any cuts to these important programs only worsen these problems.

The Democratic alternative is much more responsible with regard to our nation's commitment to protecting the environment. Our substitute budget provides \$3.6 billion more than the Republican plan for natural resources and environmental programs, adhering to last year's agreement regarding conservation programs, making needed investments in water infrastructure, and helping western states such as my state of Washington to better plan for and respond to the threat of wildfires.

Although Congress considers a budget resolution every year, there are times when annual decisions like this one have impacts that extend far beyond the next 12 months. In 1993, for example, Congress considered and approved one such budget that helped our nation to gain control over the escalating budget deficits we had experienced under the previous Bush and Reagan Administrations—deficits that were launched, interestingly, by the Reagan Administration's insistence on passing an enormous tax reduction bill. With the assistance of hindsight, I believe it is clear that this 1993 budget is, in no small part, responsible for the extremely positive financial circumstances we have enjoyed in the past several years.

In my judgment, the FY 2002 budget we are debating today will be much like that 1993 budget: a major landmark in our nation's fiscal history. What we pass today will outline how we will allocate the surpluses we project over the next ten years. We are determining whether we will devote necessary resources to preserving Social Security and Medicare, improving our national defense, protecting the environment, improving education, and providing sensible tax relief for working Americans; or, if we are going to abandon these needs to finance a politically popular tax cut. I urge my colleagues to oppose the Republican budget resolution and to support the Democratic alternative.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, simply stated, H. Con. Res. 83 should be defeated. The budget resolution reported by the House Budget Committee on a straight party-line vote, fails our veterans. It does not provide the discretionary funding needed for veterans' benefits and services, particularly health care. H. Con. Res. 83 falls far short of the \$2.1 billion increase in discretionary funding for veterans programs next year which Chairman CHRIS SMITH and I agreed was needed to, "Help us raise veterans benefits and services to a level at which we can confidently say as a Nation in freedom and at peace, at a time of plenty, we provide for our veterans."

It is bad enough that this budget fails to provide the funding needed for next fiscal year, which begins on October 1, 2001. But adding insult to injury, this budget plan actually calls for a nearly one billion dollar cut in funding for veterans benefits and services in the following budget year, fiscal year 2003. The \$24.3 billion in discretionary spending proposed by the Budget Committee will not adequately fund veterans programs for fiscal year 2002. The nearly one billion reduction in funding for 2003 is a blueprint for devastating cuts in benefits and services for veterans. These are the benefits and services our veterans have earned by their honorable service to the Nation.

Perhaps even worse, the Budget Committee plan directs the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to achieve "savings" in veterans benefits programs of more than \$7 billion. I look forward to the Budget Committee members who support this blueprint providing details on the specific veterans benefits they propose to reduce or eliminate. Clearly, Congress should not cut veterans benefits provided in current law to help finance a nearly \$2 trillion tax cut. A tax cut that mainly benefits those who are already the richest in our society. That is what this budget asks. I say no.

This nation honors its commitments. We have a national obligation to veterans. But it seems some want to ignore our nation's obligations to veterans. For them honoring this nation's obligations to veterans is not a priority.

Their priorities include instead a massive tax cut for the wealthiest in our society. Some veterans wait an entire year for a medical clinic appointment. That is shameful. That does not honor the sacrifice and service of our veterans. Some pay lip service to veterans, but veterans need real service.

If we do not honor veterans in both words and deeds, then we dishonor their service. I will not ignore America's veterans. They have already given of themselves for us.

As a nation, we owe veterans a tremendous debt. Our budget surplus allows that debt to be repaid if veterans are truly a priority. Veterans should be first in line. Today they are being pushed to the back as massive tax cuts for the wealthiest in society are the flavor of the month.

Our nation does not fully honor its obligations to veterans when we pause briefly on Memorial Day and Veterans Day. Our nation does not fully honor its obligations to veterans by building monuments. How well our nation honors its obligations to veterans is best measured in the benefits and services we provide those who have served and sacrificed for our Nation.

For these reasons and others, I urge the defeat of H. Con. Res. 83.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my opposition to the changes that were made to the emergency budget reserve account language in the FY02 Budget Resolution reported out of the House Budget Committee.

The reported budget reserve account language was meaningful. It created a \$5.6 billion budget reserve account that could only be used for major emergencies. The most important feature was that the Budget Committee held the keys to determining whether the spending proposed met the legal definition of an emergency.

The compromise that has been negotiated since then guts the budget reserve account. The Appropriations Committee unilaterally determines if the proposed spending meets the definition of an emergency. Furthermore, the Appropriations Committee can exhaust the \$5.6 billion budget reserve account with low level "emergencies" and rely on Congress to pass legislation to fund "major" emergencies above the discretionary caps when the time comes.

I urge my fellow colleagues to join me and Chairman NUSSE in sponsoring legislation that will be introduced today to make a real budget reserve account a permanent feature of our budgeting process.

In closing, I want to thank Chairman NUSSE for his efforts to reform our budget process. He has been at the forefront of this issue since he first came to Washington, D.C. As the process moves forward, I will be pleased to support his efforts every step of the way.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote against the ten-year budget offered by the Republican leadership today because its \$1.6 billion tax cut is too large and it fails to adequately fund important priorities such as agriculture, education, veterans, the COPS program, prescription drugs for seniors and national defense. I will also vote against the Democratic budget, because while it is a vast improvement on the Republican plan, it is also based on unreliable ten-year projections.

Instead, I will support the alternative budget offered by the Blue Dogs, because it is based on economic estimates covering only the next five years. This body knows from experience that trying to predict the economy over five years is difficult, and that over ten years it is impossible. The Blue Dog five-year budget makes sense. It provides for a reasonable tax cut while paying down the debt and devoting more resources to critical priorities that the Republican budget neglects.

I am particularly concerned about the excessive Republican tax cut amid signs that the economy is slowing, which could lead to big deficits in the future. While I support a significant tax cut and will vote again this year to repeal the estate tax and eliminate the marriage penalty tax, I believe a five-year budget will allow a better opportunity to assess the health of the economy and to tailor policies to keep it strong. I am also concerned that the Republican budget allows for the privatization of Social Security, which could jeopardize the long-term solvency of the program.

Mr. Chairman, we learned from the Reagan policies of the 1980s that large tax cuts do not lead to balanced budgets, let alone surpluses. We need a more fiscally responsible approach than the Republicans are currently offering to provide tax relief while keeping our important commitments to programs like Social Security and Medicare. I believe the Blue Dog budget meets these goals and I urge my colleagues to support it.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. The amendment specified in part A of House Report 107-30 and the amendment specified in the order of the House of earlier today are adopted and the concurrent resolution, as amended, is considered read.

The text of House Concurrent Resolution 83, as amended, is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 83

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002.

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001 is hereby revised and replaced and that this is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2002 and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2003 through 2011 are hereby set forth.

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2011:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,624,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: \$1,635,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: \$1,699,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$1,755,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$1,816,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$1,872,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$1,948,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$2,041,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$2,143,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$2,256,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$2,387,000,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be reduced are as follows:

Fiscal year 2001: \$5,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: \$67,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: \$83,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$108,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$133,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$167,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$187,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$201,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$217,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$232,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$240,900,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,556,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: \$1,613,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: \$1,660,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$1,723,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$1,799,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$1,851,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$1,918,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$1,998,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$2,077,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$2,161,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$2,252,800,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,508,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: \$1,579,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: \$1,634,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$1,698,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$1,777,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$1,825,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$1,889,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$1,973,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$2,053,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$2,139,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$2,230,200,000,000.

(4) SURPLUSES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the surpluses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2001: \$115,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: \$56,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: \$64,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$57,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$39,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$46,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$58,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$68,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$89,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$116,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$156,800,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2001: \$5,575,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: \$5,623,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: \$5,674,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$5,733,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$5,807,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$5,875,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$5,928,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$5,969,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$5,988,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$6,344,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$6,721,000,000,000.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and budget outlays for fiscal years 2001

through 2011 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, \$310,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$300,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, \$324,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$319,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$333,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$325,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$342,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$334,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$352,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$347,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$362,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$354,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$372,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$361,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$382,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$375,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$393,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$386,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$404,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$397,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$416,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$409,200,000,000.
(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, \$22,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, \$23,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$23,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$24,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$20,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$25,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$20,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$26,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$21,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$26,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$22,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$27,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$22,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$28,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$23,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$28,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$24,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$29,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$25,000,000,000.
(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, \$21,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, \$22,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$21,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$22,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$21,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$23,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$22,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$23,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$23,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$24,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$23,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$25,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$24,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$25,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$25,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$26,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$25,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$27,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$26,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$28,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$27,500,000,000.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, \$800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$2,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$2,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$2,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$2,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$900,000,000.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, \$28,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$26,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, \$26,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$26,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$26,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$27,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$27,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$27,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$27,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$27,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$28,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$27,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$28,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$28,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$29,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$28,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$30,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$29,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$31,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$30,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$32,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$31,500,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$23,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, \$19,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$17,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$18,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$17,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$18,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$17,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$18,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$16,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$17,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$16,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$14,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$15,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$14,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$15,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$14,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$15,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$14,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$14,700,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, \$2,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, \$7,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$4,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$8,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$3,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$12,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$8,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$12,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$9,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$12,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$8,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$13,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$9,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$13,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$9,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$14,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$9,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$18,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$12,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$13,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$9,800,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, \$62,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$51,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, \$61,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$55,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$58,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$58,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$59,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$60,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$59,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$62,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$60,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$63,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$60,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$64,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$66,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$68,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$62,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$69,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$63,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$71,200,000,000.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$10,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$10,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$10,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$10,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$10,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,600,000,000.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$76,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$69,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$82,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$76,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$82,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$81,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$83,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$82,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$87,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$84,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$90,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$87,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$92,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$90,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$95,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$93,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$98,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$95,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$100,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$98,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$104,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$101,400,000,000.

(11) Health (550):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$182,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$175,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$204,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$201,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$229,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$225,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$246,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$244,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$253,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$251,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$266,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$264,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$287,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$284,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$307,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$305,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$329,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$327,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$354,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$352,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$382,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$380,200,000,000.

(12) Medicare (570):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$217,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$217,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$229,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$229,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$243,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$243,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$260,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$260,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$291,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$291,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$309,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$309,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$336,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$336,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$362,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$362,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$391,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$390,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$423,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$423,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$459,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$459,400,000,000.

(13) Income Security (600):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$255,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$256,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$271,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$272,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$281,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$282,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$293,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$292,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$308,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$306,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$315,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$314,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$323,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$321,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$337,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$336,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$349,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$347,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$359,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$358,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$371,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$369,400,000,000.

(14) Social Security (650):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,400,000,000.

(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$45,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$52,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$51,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$53,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$52,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$55,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$54,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$59,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$58,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$58,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$58,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$58,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$57,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$62,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$61,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$63,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$63,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$64,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$64,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$67,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$66,700,000,000.

(16) Administration of Justice (750):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$34,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$34,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$34,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$35,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$35,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$36,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$36,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$37,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$37,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$38,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$38,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$39,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$38,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$40,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$40,200,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$16,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$16,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$16,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$16,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$17,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$16,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$17,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$17,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$17,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$17,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$18,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$17,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$18,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$18,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$19,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,900,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, \$273,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$273,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, \$257,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$257,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$253,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$253,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$248,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$248,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$242,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$242,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$239,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$239,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$236,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$236,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$233,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$233,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$229,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$229,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$224,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$224,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$219,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$219,100,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, —\$500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, \$5,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$5,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$4,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$6,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$4,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$6,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$5,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$6,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$6,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$6,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$6,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$6,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$6,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$7,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$6,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$7,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$6,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$7,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$7,000,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, —\$38,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$38,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, —\$42,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$42,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, —\$52,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$52,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, —\$53,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$53,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, —\$45,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$45,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, —\$46,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$46,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, —\$48,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$48,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, —\$49,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$49,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, —\$50,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$50,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, —\$51,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$51,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, —\$53,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$53,300,000,000.

SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

(a) SUBMISSIONS BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS FOR TAX RELIEF.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall—

(1) report to the House a reconciliation bill—

(A) not later than May 2, 2001;
(B) not later than May 23, 2001; and
(C) not later than June 20, 2001; and

(2) submit to the Committee on the Budget recommendations pursuant to section (c)(2)(F)(ii) not later than September 11, 2001,

that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the total level of revenues by not more than: \$5,783,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, \$64,427,000,000 for fiscal year 2002,

\$80,036,000,000 for fiscal year 2003, \$106,584,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, \$130,973,000,000 for fiscal year 2005, \$165,166,000,000 for fiscal year 2006, and \$1,625,951,000,000 for the period of fiscal year 2001 through 2011.

(b) SUBMISSIONS BY HOUSE COMMITTEES ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE AND WAYS AND MEANS FOR MEDICARE REFORM AND PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.—(1) Not later than July 24, 2001, the House Committees named in paragraph (2) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(2)(A) The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to increase outlays by not more than the following: \$2,500,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, \$11,200,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, \$12,900,000,000 for fiscal year 2003, \$14,800,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, \$12,500,000,000 for fiscal year 2005, \$12,800,000,000 for fiscal year 2006, and \$153,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal year 2001 through 2011.

(B) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to increase outlays by not more than the following: \$2,500,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, \$11,200,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, \$12,900,000,000 for fiscal year 2003, \$14,800,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, \$12,500,000,000 for fiscal year 2005, \$12,800,000,000 for fiscal year 2006, and \$153,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal year 2001 through 2011.

(c) OTHER SUBMISSIONS BY HOUSE COMMITTEES.—(1) Not later than September 11, 2001, the House Committees named in paragraph (2) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(2)(A) The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to increase outlays by not more than the following: \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2003, \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, \$7,000,000 for fiscal year 2005, \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 2006, and \$87,000,000 for the period of fiscal year 2001 through 2011.

(B) The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to increase outlays by not more than the following: \$0 for fiscal year 2001, \$180,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, \$466,000,000 for fiscal year 2003, \$561,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, \$681,000,000 for fiscal year 2005, \$836,000,000 for fiscal year 2006, and \$7,867,000,000 for the period of fiscal year 2001 through 2011.

(C) The House Committee on Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce revenues, as follows: \$0 for fiscal year 2001, \$139,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, \$101,000,000 for fiscal year 2003, \$92,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, \$96,000,000 for fiscal year 2005, \$101,000,000 for fiscal year 2006, and \$1,112,000,000 for the period of fiscal year 2001 through 2011.

(D) The House Committee on Government Reform shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays by not less than the following: \$0 for fiscal year 2001, \$0 for

fiscal year 2002, \$496,000,000 for fiscal year 2003, \$523,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, \$501,000,000 for fiscal year 2005, \$475,000,000 for fiscal year 2006, and \$3,871,000,000 for the period of fiscal year 2001 through 2011.

(E) The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to increase outlays by not more than the following: \$0 for fiscal year 2001, \$264,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, \$479,000,000 for fiscal year 2003, \$761,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, \$816,000,000 for fiscal year 2005, \$885,000,000 for fiscal year 2006, and \$7,087,000,000 for the period of fiscal year 2001 through 2011.

(F)(i) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to increase outlays by not more than the following: \$0 for fiscal year 2001, \$820,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, \$3,035,000,000 for fiscal year 2003, \$2,842,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, \$3,925,000,000 for fiscal year 2005, \$4,267,000,000 for fiscal year 2006, and \$39,515,000,000 for the period of fiscal year 2001 through 2011.

(ii) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the total level of revenues as specified in subsection (a).

(d) SPECIAL RULES.—In the House, if any bill reported pursuant to subsection (a) or subsection (c)(2)(F)(ii), amendment thereto or conference report thereon, has refundable tax provisions that increase outlays, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the amount of new budget authority provided by such provisions (and outlays flowing therefrom) allocated to the Committee on Ways and Means and adjust the revenue levels set forth in such subsection accordingly such that the increase in outlays and reduction in revenue resulting from such bill does not exceed the amounts specified in subsection (a) or subsection (c)(2)(F)(ii), as applicable.

SEC. 5. RESERVE FUND FOR EMERGENCIES.

(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR EMERGENCIES.—(1) In the House, in addition to the allocation provided under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this resolution shall include a separate allocation of \$5,627,000,000 in new budget authority and \$2,617,000,000 in outlays for emergencies for natural disasters for fiscal year 2002 to the Committee on Appropriations. Such allocation shall be deemed to be an allocation made under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for purposes of section 302(f)(1).

(2) In the House, after the reporting of a bill or joint resolution by the Committee on Appropriations, or the offering of an amendment thereto or the submission of a conference report thereon, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations shall suballocate the amounts of new budget authority and outlays allocated to it under paragraph (1) by the amount provided by that measure for an emergency for natural disasters as defined by this section and so designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985. Suballocations under this paragraph may be made only after the Committee on Appropriations has reported legislation (as adjusted for any amendments thereto or conference reports thereon) providing at least \$1,923,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2002 for accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying the conference report on this resolution. Such suballocations shall be deemed to be suballocations made under sec-

tion 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for purposes of section 302(f)(1).

(b) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section:

(1) The term "emergency" means a situation (other than a threat to national security) that—

(A) requires new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) to prevent the imminent loss of life or property or in response to the loss of life or property; and

(B) is unanticipated.

(2) The term "unanticipated" means that the underlying situation is—

(A) sudden, which means quickly coming into being or not building up over time;

(B) urgent, which means a pressing and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(C) unforeseen, which means not predicted or anticipated as an emerging need; and

(D) temporary, which means not of a permanent duration.

(c) DEVELOPMENT OF GUIDELINES.—As soon as practicable, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House shall, after consulting with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House, publish in the Congressional Record guidelines for application of the definition of emergency set forth in subsection (b).

(d) COMMITTEE EXPLANATION OF EMERGENCY LEGISLATION.—Whenever the Committee on Appropriations of the House (including a committee of conference) reports any bill or joint resolution that provides new budget authority for any emergency, the report accompanying that bill or joint resolution (or the joint explanatory statement of managers in the case of a conference report on any such bill or joint resolution) should explain the reasons such amount designated under section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 falls within the definition of emergency set forth in subsection (b) pursuant to the guidelines published under subsection (c).

(e) CBO REPORT ON THE BUDGET.—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall include in each report submitted under section 202(e)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 the average annual enacted levels of discretionary budget authority and the resulting outlays for emergencies for the 5 fiscal years preceding the fiscal year of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget.

(f) SECTION 314(b)(1) ADJUSTMENT.—Section 314(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall not apply in the House—

(1) for fiscal year 2001; or

(2) for fiscal year 2002 or any subsequent fiscal year, except for emergencies affecting national security.

SEC. 6. STRATEGIC RESERVE FUND.

(a) ADJUSTMENTS.—In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may, not later than July 25, 2001, increase allocations of new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) and adjust aggregates (and adjust any other appropriate levels) for fiscal year 2002 for a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for any fiscal year for a bill to reauthorize title I of the Federal Agriculture Improvement Act of 1996 and other appropriate legislation, reported by July 11, 2001, and legislation to provide for medicare reform and a prescription drug benefit; and, in the House, the chairman may also make adjustments for amendments to or conference reports on such bills. The chairman shall consider the recommendations of the President's National Defense Review, any comparable review by the President of national agricultural policy, and any statement of administrative policy or supplemental budget request relating to any matter referred to in the preceding sentence.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—(1) The adjustments for any bill referred to in subsection (a) shall be in an amount not to exceed the amount by which such bill breaches the applicable allocation or aggregate.

(2) The total adjustments made under subsection (a) for any fiscal year may not cause the surplus set forth in this resolution for any fiscal year, as adjusted, covered by this resolution to be less than the surplus of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund for that fiscal year, as determined consistent with procedures set forth in H.R. 2 (107th Congress), as passed the House.

SEC. 7. SUPPLEMENTAL RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE.

In the House, whenever a reconciliation bill is reported, or an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, under section 4, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may, for any of fiscal years 2001 through 2011, increase any allocations and aggregates of new budget authority (and outlays resulting therefrom) up to the amount provided by that measure to reform medicare and provide coverage for prescription drugs that is in excess of the instruction to the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Ways and Means under section 4(b) (and make all other appropriate adjustments). The total adjustments made under this section for any fiscal year may not exceed the amount by which the Congressional Budget Office's estimate of the President's prescription drug plan (or, if such a plan is not submitted in a timely manner, the Congressional Budget Office's estimate of a comparable plan submitted by the chairmen of the committees of jurisdiction at levels to be determined by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget) exceeds the levels set forth in section 4(b)(2) for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2011.

SEC. 8. RESERVE FUND FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001.

(a) ADJUSTMENTS.—In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase allocations of new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) and adjust aggregates (and adjust any other appropriate levels) for fiscal year 2001 for reported bills, or amendments thereto or conference reports thereon: (1) by the amount of new budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) provided by such measure to eliminate shortfalls for the Department of Defense, for assistance for producers of program crops and specialty crops, and for other critical needs; and (2) by the amount of reduction in revenue caused by such measure providing immediate tax relief.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—(1) The adjustments for any bill referred to in subsection (a) shall be in an amount not to exceed the amount by which such bill breaches the applicable allocation or aggregate.

(2) The total adjustments made under subsection (a) for fiscal year 2001 may not cause the surplus set forth in this resolution for that fiscal year, as adjusted, to be less than the surplus of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund for that fiscal year, as determined consistent with procedures set forth in H.R. 2 (107th Congress), as passed the House.

SEC. 9. RESERVE FUND FOR PROMOTION OF FULL FUNDING FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION.

In the House, whenever the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto is offered, or a conference report thereon is submitted that provides new budget authority for fiscal year 2002 in excess of \$6,368,000,000 for programs authorized under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may

increase the appropriate allocations of new budget authority and outlays by the amount of that excess, but not to exceed \$1,250,000,000 (and adjust any other appropriate levels).

SEC. 10. RESERVE FUND FOR ADDITIONAL TAX CUTS AND DEBT REDUCTION.

If the report provided pursuant to section 202(e)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the budget and economic outlook: update (for fiscal years 2002 through 2011), estimates an on-budget surplus for any of fiscal years 2001 through 2011 that exceeds the estimated on-budget surplus set forth in the Congressional Budget Office's January 2001 budget and economic outlook for such fiscal year, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House may, in an amount not to exceed the increase in such surplus for that fiscal year—

(1) reduce the recommended level of Federal revenues and make other appropriate adjustments (including the reconciliation instructions) for that fiscal year;

(2) reduce the appropriate level of the public debt, increase the amount of the surplus, and make other appropriate adjustments for that fiscal year; or

(3) any combination of paragraphs (1) and (2).

SEC. 11. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution—

(1) the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives; and

(2) such chairman, as applicable, may make any other necessary adjustments to such levels to carry out this resolution, and any adjustments permitted under sections 6, 7, and 8 may include changes in the appropriate reconciliation instructions.

SEC. 12. COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 13301 OF THE BUDGET ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1990.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocation under section 302(a) of such Act to the Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—In the House, for purposes of applying section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any discretionary amounts provided for the Social Security Administration.

SEC. 13. RESTRICTIONS ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

For purposes of title III of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, advance appropria-

tions shall be scored as new budget authority for the fiscal year in which the appropriations are enacted, except that advance appropriations up to the levels specified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this resolution for programs, projects, activities or accounts identified in such joint statement shall continue to be scored as new budget authority in the year in which they first become available for obligation.

SEC. 14. FEDERAL EMPLOYEE PAY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House of Representatives finds the following:

(1) Members of the uniformed services and civilian employees of the United States make significant contributions to the general welfare of the Nation.

(2) Increases in the pay of members of the uniformed services and of civilian employees of the United States have not kept pace with increases in the overall pay levels of workers in the private sector, so that there now exists—

(A) a 32 percent gap between compensation levels of Federal civilian employees and compensation levels of private sector workers; and

(B) an estimated 10 percent gap between compensation levels of members of the uniformed services and compensation levels of private sector workers.

(3) The President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2002 includes a 4.6 percent pay raise for military personnel.

(4) The Office of Management and Budget has requested that Federal agencies plan their fiscal year 2002 budgets with a 3.6 percent pay raise for civilian Federal employees.

(5) In almost every year during the past 2 decades, there have been equal adjustments in the compensation of members of the uniformed services and the compensation of civilian employees of the United States.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—It is the sense of the House of Representatives that rates of compensation for civilian employees of the United States should be adjusted at the same time, and in the same proportion, as are rates of compensation for members of the uniformed services.

SEC. 15. ASSET BUILDING FOR THE WORKING POOR.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress find the following:

(1) For the vast majority of United States households, the pathway to the economic mainstream and financial security is not through spending and consumption, but through savings, investing, and the accumulation of assets.

(2) One-third of all Americans have no assets available for investment and another 20 percent have only negligible assets. The situation is even more serious for minority households; for example, 60 percent of African-American households have no or negative financial assets.

(3) Nearly 50 percent of all children in America live in households that have no assets available for investment, including 40 percent of Caucasian children and 73 percent of African-American children.

(4) Up to 20 percent of all United States households do not deposit their savings in financial institutions and, thus, do not have access to the basic financial tools that make asset accumulation possible.

(5) Public policy can have either a positive or a negative impact on asset accumulation. Traditional public assistance programs based on income and consumption have rarely been successful in supporting the transition to economic self-sufficiency. Tax policy, through \$288,000,000,000 in annual tax incentives, has helped lay the foundation for the great middle class.

(6) Lacking an income tax liability, low-income working families cannot take advantage of asset development incentives available through the Federal tax code.

(7) Individual Development Accounts have proven to be successful in helping low-income working families save and accumulate assets. Individual Development Accounts have been used to purchase long-term, high-return assets, including homes, postsecondary education and training, and small business.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Federal tax code should support a significant expansion of Individual Development Accounts so that millions of low-income, working families can save, build assets, and move their lives forward; thus, making positive contributions to the economic and social well-being of the United States, as well as to its future.

SEC. 16. FEDERAL FIRE PREVENTION ASSISTANCE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Increased demands on firefighting and emergency medical personnel have made it difficult for local governments to adequately fund necessary fire safety precautions.

(2) The Government has an obligation to protect the health and safety of the firefighting personnel of the United States and to ensure that they have the financial resources to protect the public.

(3) The high rates in the United States of death, injury, and property damage caused by fires demonstrates a critical need for Federal investment in support of firefighting personnel.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Government should support the core operations of the Federal Emergency Management Agency by providing needed fire grant programs to assist our firefighters and rescue personnel as they respond to more than 17,000,000 emergency calls annually. To accomplish this task, Congress supports preservation of the Assistance to Firefighters grant program. Continued support of the Assistance to Firefighters grant program will enable local firefighters to adequately protect the lives of countless Americans put at risk by insufficient fire protection.

SEC. 17. SALES TAX DEDUCTION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) in 1986 the ability to deduct State sales taxes was eliminated from the Federal tax code;

(2) the States of Tennessee, Texas, Wyoming, Washington, Florida, Nevada, and South Dakota have no State income tax;

(3) the citizens of those seven States continue to be treated unfairly by paying significantly more in taxes to the Government than taxpayers with an identical profile in different State because they are prohibited from deducting their State sales taxes from their Federal income taxes in lieu of a State income tax;

(4) the design of the Federal tax code is preferential in its treatment of States with State income taxes over those without State income taxes;

(5) the current Federal tax code infringes upon States' rights to tax their citizens as they see fit in that the Federal tax code exerts unjust influence on States without State income taxes to impose one their citizens;

(6) the current surpluses that our Government holds provide an appropriate time and opportunity to allow taxpayers to deduct either their State sales taxes or their State income taxes from their Federal income tax returns; and

(7) over 50 Members of the House have cosponsored legislation to restore the sales tax deduction option to the Federal tax code.

(b) **SENSE OF HOUSE.**—It is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Committee on Ways and Means should consider legislation that makes State sales tax deductible against Federal income taxes.

SEC. 18. FUNDING FOR GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION AT CHILDREN'S TEACHING HOSPITALS.

It is the sense of Congress that:

(1) Function 550 of the President's budget should include an appropriate level of funding for graduate medical education conducted at independent children's teaching hospitals in order to ensure access to care by millions of children nationwide.

(2) An emphasis should be placed on the role played by community health centers in underserved rural and urban communities. An increase in funding for community health centers should not come at the expense of the Community Access Program. Both programs should be funded adequately, with the intention of doubling funding for increased capacity for community health centers, in addition to keeping the Community Access Program operational.

(3) The medicare program should emphasize such preventive medical services as those provided by vision rehabilitation professionals in saving Government funds and preserving the independence of a growing number of seniors in the coming years.

(4) Funding under function 550 should also reflect the importance of the Ryan White CARE Act to persons afflicted with HIV/AIDS. Funds allocated from the CARE Act serve as the safety net for thousands of low-income people living with HIV/AIDS who reside in metropolitan areas but are ineligible for entitlement programs. Moreover, the CARE Act provides critically needed grants directly to existing community-based clinics and public health providers to develop and deliver both early and ongoing comprehensive services to persons with HIV/AIDS.

SEC. 19. CONCURRENT RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY BENEFITS TO RETIRED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that the Secretary of Defense is the appropriate official for evaluating the existing standards for the provision of concurrent retirement and disability benefits to retired members of the Armed Forces and the need to change these standards.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Secretary of Defense should report to the congressional committees of jurisdiction on the provision of concurrent retirement and disability benefits to retired members of the Armed Forces;

(2) the report should address the number of individuals retired from the Armed Forces who would otherwise be eligible for disability compensation, the comparability of the policy to Office of Personnel Management guidelines for civilian Federal retirees, the applicability of this policy to prevailing private sector standards, the number of individuals potentially eligible for concurrent benefits who receive other forms of Federal assistance and the cost of that assistance, and alternative initiatives that would accomplish the same end as concurrent receipt of military retired pay and disability compensation;

(3) the Secretary of Defense should submit legislation that he considers appropriate; and

(4) upon receiving such report, the committees of jurisdiction, working with the Committees on the Budget of the House and Senate, should consider appropriate legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. No further amendment is in order except the amendments printed in part B of the report. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by the Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment.

After conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, there shall be a final period of general debate which shall not exceed 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

It is now in order to consider amendment number 1 printed in part B of House Report 107-30.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. KUCINICH

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. KUCINICH:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002.

The Congress declares that this is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2002 and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2003 through 2011 are hereby set forth.

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2011:

(1) **FEDERAL REVENUES.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,671,613,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: \$1,743,536,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$1,820,660,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$1,903,395,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$1,979,608,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$2,060,355,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$2,170,035,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$2,264,741,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$2,377,927,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$2,499,618,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2002: \$34,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: \$41,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$46,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$49,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$62,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$75,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$84,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$98,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$114,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$130,900,000,000.

(2) **NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,644,212,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: \$1,691,703,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$1,756,548,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$1,836,715,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: \$1,881,717,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$1,946,814,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$2,016,811,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$2,086,903,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$2,159,932,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$2,238,940,000,000.

(3) **BUDGET OUTLAYS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,605,871,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: \$1,662,777,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$1,734,976,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$1,812,019,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$1,852,444,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$1,915,721,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$1,991,123,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$2,062,464,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$2,136,979,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$2,215,937,000,000.

(4) **SURPLUSES.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the surpluses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2002: \$65,742,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: \$80,759,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$85,684,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$91,376,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$127,164,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$144,634,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$178,192,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$202,277,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$240,948,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$283,681,000,000.

(5) **PUBLIC DEBT.**—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2002: \$5,641,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: \$5,671,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$5,696,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$5,712,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$5,700,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$5,665,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$5,596,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$6,006,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$6,361,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$6,737,000,000,000.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and budget outlays for fiscal years 2002 through 2011 for each major functional category are:

(1) **National Defense (050):**

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$258,495,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$272,550,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$265,998,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$267,442,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$273,371,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$275,340,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$280,655,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$279,539,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$288,245,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$282,897,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$296,097,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$287,870,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$304,171,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$299,138,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$312,560,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$307,561,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$321,107,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$316,107,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$330,102,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$324,998,000,000.

(2) **International Affairs (150):**

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,389,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,327,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

- (A) New budget authority, \$22,909,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,831,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$23,357,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,369,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$24,037,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,589,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$24,614,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$20,031,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$25,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$20,598,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$25,557,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$21,118,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$25,995,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$21,720,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$26,498,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$22,287,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$27,087,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$22,800,000,000.
(3) General Science, Space, and Technology
(250):
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, \$21,583,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$20,725,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$22,055,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$21,361,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$22,379,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$21,945,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$22,839,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$22,429,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$23,323,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$20,847,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$23,812,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$23,280,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$24,303,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$23,743,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$24,816,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$24,339,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$25,335,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$24,749,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$25,879,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$25,274,000,000.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,360,000,000.
(B) Outlays, — \$19,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,328,000,000.
(B) Outlays, — \$72,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,309,000,000.
(B) Outlays, — \$120,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,254,000,000.
(B) Outlays, — \$91,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,336,000,000.
(B) Outlays, — \$3,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,411,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$71,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,882,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$440,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,998,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$579,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$2,021,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$703,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,990,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$691,000,000.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment
(300):
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, \$30,031,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$28,305,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$30,826,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$30,076,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$31,810,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$31,152,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$32,648,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$31,959,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$33,519,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$32,842,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$34,417,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$33,627,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$35,341,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$34,465,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$36,714,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$35,813,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$37,761,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$36,840,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$38,787,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$37,841,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, \$19,265,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$17,593,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$18,507,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$16,924,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$18,562,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$17,120,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$18,406,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$16,915,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$17,952,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$16,353,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,583,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$15,009,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$15,723,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$14,134,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$15,921,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$14,441,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,053,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$14,674,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,203,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$14,819,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, \$10,029,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$6,497,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$11,246,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$5,825,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$15,891,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$11,593,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,009,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$12,239,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$15,982,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$11,643,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,086,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$11,904,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,242,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$11,734,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,313,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$11,770,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,428,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$11,722,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,542,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$11,745,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, \$64,444,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$56,167,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$62,392,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$60,521,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$60,999,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$62,662,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$63,601,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$64,225,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$64,245,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$65,702,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$64,908,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$66,577,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$65,597,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$67,775,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$66,303,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$69,221,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$67,035,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$70,588,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$67,796,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$72,183,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development
(450):
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, \$11,892,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$11,730,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$12,067,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$11,731,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$12,350,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$11,967,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$12,664,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$11,913,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$12,933,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$11,936,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$13,198,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$12,181,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$13,476,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$12,444,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$13,759,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$12,696,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$14,048,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$12,962,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$14,340,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$13,233,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and
Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, \$110,389,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$94,926,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$117,559,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$110,183,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$125,822,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$119,806,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$135,923,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$129,772,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$139,035,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$134,017,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$148,706,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$143,631,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$151,981,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$148,841,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$155,367,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$152,778,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$158,833,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$156,541,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$162,392,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$160,127,000,000.
 (11) Health (550):
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$194,085,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$190,959,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$212,445,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$210,723,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$227,483,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$226,534,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$243,984,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$242,370,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$260,317,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$258,667,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$279,956,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$277,662,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$300,281,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$298,181,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$321,645,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$319,851,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$346,303,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$344,676,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$373,436,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$371,993,000,000.
 (12) Medicare (570):
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$284,179,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$282,221,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$299,228,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$298,278,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$315,675,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$315,495,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$339,054,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$338,782,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$352,860,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$352,265,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$378,665,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$378,812,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$403,469,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$403,292,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$430,768,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$430,412,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$460,355,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$460,520,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$492,688,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$492,601,000,000.
 (13) Income Security (600):
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$284,148,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$278,365,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$294,503,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$291,588,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$305,450,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$302,923,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$319,479,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$317,443,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$327,026,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$324,705,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$334,003,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$332,385,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$348,527,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$347,026,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$360,130,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$350,381,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$371,190,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$369,313,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$382,791,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$380,446,000,000.
 (14) Social Security (650):
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,004,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,004,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,733,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,733,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,496,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,496,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,308,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,308,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,207,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,207,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,168,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,168,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,241,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,241,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,483,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,483,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,878,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,878,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,388,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,388,000,000.
 (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$57,418,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$54,482,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$59,615,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$58,336,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,813,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$60,927,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$66,036,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$65,329,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,637,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$64,735,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,178,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$64,601,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$69,313,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$68,792,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$71,790,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$71,292,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$73,876,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$73,369,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$76,060,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$75,538,000,000.
 (16) Administration of Justice (750):
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,431,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,436,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,545,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,809,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,330,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$35,543,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,420,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,347,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,466,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,036,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,543,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,013,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,665,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,152,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,822,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,292,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,021,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,483,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,284,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,278,000,000.
 (17) General Government (800):
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,996,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,503,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,151,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,925,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,582,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,445,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,060,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,688,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,568,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,115,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,109,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,644,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,791,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,445,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,377,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,882,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,968,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,437,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,599,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,048,000,000.
 (18) Net Interest (900):
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$256,860,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$256,860,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$251,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$251,900,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$246,030,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$246,030,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$237,809,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$237,809,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$230,958,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$230,958,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$224,040,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$224,040,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$215,519,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$215,519,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$205,519,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$205,519,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$194,220,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$194,220,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$182,136,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$182,136,000,000.
 (19) Allowances (920):
 Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, —\$483,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$457,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$492,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$526,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$499,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$560,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$509,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$583,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$519,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$603,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$531,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$617,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$540,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$629,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$551,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$640,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$560,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$652,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$571,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$665,000,000.
 (20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$42,303,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$42,303,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$51,812,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$51,812,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$52,692,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$52,692,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$44,962,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$44,962,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$45,986,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$45,986,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$47,733,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$47,733,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$48,728,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$48,728,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$49,825,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$49,825,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$51,438,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$51,438,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$52,988,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$52,988,000,000.

SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report to the House a reconciliation bill not later than May 2, 2001, that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the total level of revenues by not more than: \$34,500,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, \$41,200,000,000 for fiscal year 2003, \$46,300,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, \$49,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2005, \$62,600,000,000 for fiscal year 2006, and \$737,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal year 2002 through 2011.

SEC. 5. RESERVE FUND FOR ELECTION REFORM.

In the House, whenever a bill is reported, or an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, to provide comprehensive election reform (that includes provisions to provide matching grants to States and localities to upgrade voting equipment with an 80/20 Federal/State-locality match), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may, for any of fiscal years 2002 through 2006, increase any allocations and aggregates of new budget authority (and outlays resulting therefrom) up to the amount provided by that measure for that

purpose (and make all other appropriate adjustments). The total adjustments made under this section for any fiscal year may not exceed \$500,000,000.

SEC. 6. RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFITS.

In the House, whenever a bill is reported, or an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, to provide comprehensive medicare prescription drug coverage for all beneficiaries with an 80/20 Federal/beneficiary match, and provisions to allow for reimportation and bulk purchase discounts, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may, for any of fiscal years 2002 through 2011, increase any allocations and aggregates of new budget authority (and outlays resulting therefrom) up to the amount provided by that measure for that purpose (and make all other appropriate adjustments). The total adjustments made under this section may not exceed \$500,000,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 100, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) and a Member opposed each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

A budget is a plan. It shows what we stand for. It measures that commitment in dollars. The Progressive Caucus budget stands for building enough schools, hiring enough teachers to create the 18-student classrooms ideal for learning, affordable prescription drugs for everyone, 100 percent government help to lower the price of prescription drugs, and an 80 percent direct assistance on Medicare, enough polling booths to accurately record the votes of every American, building affordable new housing, cutting wasteful spending in the Department of Defense.

The Progressive Caucus budget will give every American a \$300 dividend as a fair share of the budget surplus. We have set aside one-third of the budget surplus to give the American people their dividend.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to look at the Progressive Caucus budget, take a measure of our commitment. You will see that the caucus leads in advancing education, affordable prescription drugs, accurate elections, affordable housing, and government efficiency, and we provide more tax relief for average Americans.

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate a vitally important point that the American people need to remember as they listen to this debate. The Republican budget pays off as much of the publicly held debt as can be paid without incurring a significant financial penalty. This is a logical point that I as a new Member of Congress was not aware of until as a member of the Committee on the Budget we listened to the testimony of the experts. I sought very carefully to find

the truth of this matter and determined as logically and clearly as I could see that a bond can only be paid off within the time period specified in the life of the bond; and clearly, all of the Americans out there listening to me know that if you have a bond fund and you as a bond holder expect to be paid on a regular schedule, want to be paid off early, you are going to get a premium for being paid off early.

The Republican budget, as confirmed by the testimony given to the Committee on the Budget, pays off as much publicly held debt as can be paid without incurring a penalty. The chart that we prepared shows what we are paying off. This is the amount of the national debt after a 10-year period. Chairman Alan Greenspan, who is, everyone acknowledges, an objective, impartial observer, said in his testimony to the Committee on the Budget that we are paying off all of the Federal debt by the end of this decade. In fact, Chairman Greenspan points out that we need to think about what happens when we have eliminated all publicly held debt.

The Progressive budget, the amendment before the House offered by the Democrats, seeks to pay off \$747 billion more debt than can be paid off without incurring a penalty. If we adopt the amendment offered by the Democrats, the American taxpayers will incur a very significant financial penalty. The Office of Management and Budget estimates that the penalty that the American taxpayers will incur will exceed \$100 billion.

Why should we incur this additional penalty? Why should we saddle the American taxpayer, who is already overtaxed, with an additional penalty?

The Republican budget alternative I want to stress pays off every single penny of this debt that can be paid off, and I think it is also vitally important for the American public as they listen to this debate to think about the implications of paying off more publicly held debt. Once all of that debt is paid off, we reach a point, as Chairman Greenspan said in his testimony, where once all the debt is eliminated, what is the Treasury going to do with all of this additional money that is coming in that is above and beyond what is necessary to pay for government programs and since there is no more publicly held debt to pay off, what do we do with all of that extra cash?

Chairman Greenspan said in his testimony he believes for long-term fiscal stability that it is far better for the Nation that the tax surpluses, and they are tax surpluses because we are being overtaxed, that the tax surpluses be lowered by tax reductions rather than by spending increases.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I would remind the gentleman from Texas that our budget would give \$151 million to Texas for energy assistance.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DeFAZIO), one of the architects of this budget.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

The question here is are we going to have a people's budget, a budget that addresses the real needs and priorities of average Americans; or are we going to have a special-interest budget that cuts the programs important to most Americans in their daily lives, such as education, Medicare and others, and returns to the days of huge deficits? If we care about education, school construction, smaller class size, Pell grants to access higher education; if we care about Head Start, if we care about a real Medicare prescription-drug benefit, not a subsidy to the pharmaceutical industry, they are doing just fine, thank you very much. If we care about election reform, if we care about real tax cuts targeted to average Americans and not to those at the very top who have done so well already, then the Progressive budget is a much and far better alternative than the Republican budget.

□ 1130

It pays down more debt more quickly, despite this new concern about the Republicans about not paying down the debt too fast. No, that is a sham.

Then, if we are concerned about our veterans, we had better fund our veterans, particularly for the aging veterans population, World War II and Korea. If we care about our young men and women in the military, their quality of life, we will vote for this budget.

Yes, if Members care about the continuing waste at the Pentagon, I hear again and again, do not throw money at problems, do not throw money at problems. The Pentagon has huge problems. They cannot keep track of the money they spend. They are still paying \$400 for \$40 items. They have spent \$50 billion on Star Wars, and they cannot hit anything. They have three new jet fighter programs in the works, two of which are over budget, behind schedule; a new helicopter that does not work, cannot meet its mission, way over budget.

They have huge management problems at the Pentagon, and their answer is throw more money at them. If it were any other part of the Federal budget, if it is education or the concerns of average Americans, no, we cannot put more money there. Do not throw Federal money at it. But the Pentagon, yes, throw more money at it.

This budget essentially does all the things the American people need most, and reforms the Pentagon and pays down the debt. This is the best alternative before the Congress today.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY MILLER), a member of the Committee.

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, it is interesting, we talk about education. We in our budget have proposed an increase in education, yet

the proposal we have before us today is more mandates for local school districts. It says, when you are through hiring 100,000 teachers, we want you to hire another 100,000 counselors.

Well, maybe schools do not want counselors; maybe they need facilities, maybe they need money for special education. Maybe they do need money for counselors, but if they do not, we should not mandate them.

What we should do is tell education and the institutions associated with it that, here is the money; they know the needs of their children, they know the names of their children: Educate their children.

We have many Members coming before the House as if poor people only come in one color. There are black, white, brown, and red poor people. I know when I was a young man, I was raised by a single mother with my grandparents. We were poor. I remember coming home from school one day driving in a bus in seventh grade, and having the two boys before me, when we were driving on my street, they said, "Can you imagine anyone having to live on that street?" I never knew until that day I was poor.

When I decided to start a business, I had an old van that used more oil than gas. Every tool I had came in a cardboard box in the back. What did government do? Every time I tried to better myself, they took more of my money. All the Tax Code does today is build a wall between poor people and success and says, "We are going to hold you down," because every time somebody works harder, every time they make more money, we take more money from them as government.

We need to allow the working people of this Nation to keep their money, and people in Congress need to realize it is the money belonging to the people who earned it, it is not our money, because government does not earn any money.

Some say it is too much of a tax cut, that we want to eliminate the tax cut, we want to use it for new programs that the government thinks are better programs. Then one will say, we need to pay down more debt.

Our budget pays down every bit of the available debt that we have over a 10-year period. Members can go beyond that and say, we are going to pay our debt that is not due. First of all, we have to find somebody who wants to allow us to pay off debt that is not due. If we do find those people, I guarantee Members, we will pay a premium to pay off that debt.

We need reasonable government, reasonable structure, as the private sector has. We pay our debts as they come due. We are saying we are going to do that, but we want to go farther. We want to tell the American people that they earned their money. We want them to succeed. We want to give them more than lip service.

When we tell people they do not deserve a tax cut, we are giving them lip service when it comes to them being

successful in life. Let us allow people to succeed. Let us allow people to be entrepreneurs if they want to, to take advantage of the capitalistic system we have out there, a free-market system. If people want to work, want to work harder, let them keep more of their money.

Their budget does not do that, our budget does that.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to reassure my good friend, the gentleman from California, that California would get \$306 million in energy assistance under our bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS), who is someone who fights for the economic rights of her people.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my full support for the Progressive Caucus budget resolution, which provides responsible and just resources for all Americans.

Unlike the Republican-proposed budget, which would ravage any reliable social programs that serve our Nation's poor, hard-working Americans, the Progressive Caucus would offer a fair tax without sacrificing the welfare of any of our citizens.

On the other hand, the Republican budget alternative would absolutely devastate the people in my district. They get no benefit from this budget. The majority of the people in my district make \$31,000 a year. They get absolutely zero. The glass is empty. It is not even half full for them.

I am asking Members to consider alternatives that we are putting forward in the Progressive Caucus budget which would add and actually double grants, Pell grants, for needy students who would have a first chance, many the first in their family, to go forward and get a good education. Let us not leave any child behind. Let us not leave any minority or low-income student behind. Let us give them that education.

Let us also not rob those senior citizens that rely on MediCal and Social Security. There are thousands of senior citizens who need that support, many who have paid into the system. This is their money. They have worked many, many years here in our country to build this economy. Let us make sure that it goes back to their pockets, to those programs that they vitally need to survive.

I would also ask that we consider looking at what is happening right now in America. What we are talking about is an energy crisis in California, and we are talking about that happening all over the country. We really need to focus in on how we are going to provide some relief.

In California we know the experiment did not work. Let us not make that something that other States adopt

as well. Let us move forward. Let us provide relief where it is needed. It is our money; send it back home. Vote for the Progressive Caucus budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the chairman on putting together a mighty fine budget. Having chaired the Committee on Ways and Means in South Carolina, I recognize the difficulty of trying to match all the needs and all the requirements that are out there in this Nation with the limited resources we have.

But I applaud the gentleman and the other members of the Committee for standing firm that we would address the major issues that are facing this country, one being paying down the debt, and the other being returning some of the excess money back to those people that worked hard to make this great Nation strong, and giving some of that money back to them.

Our goal was to save Social Security, we have done that; to repay the debt, and we have a program to do that; improving education and returning tax overcharges back to our citizens, and those are being accomplished in this budget. I applaud the chairman and the other members of the committee for making that happen.

We all know that paying down the debt will mean better interest rates for all Americans. The Progressive Caucus budget calls for \$745 billion more debt reduction than the committee's budget during the years 2002 to 2011. To achieve this, however, the government will either pay a penalty premium to retire "unredeemable" debt, or will build up cash surpluses which would be invested in private equities, introducing government ownership of the private economy.

We are making the strongest strides possible without unwise penalties. In 2002, we will eliminate some \$213 billion in debt; in 5 years we will be up to \$1.2 trillion; and in 10 years, \$2.34 trillion.

In defense, we have made a decision that policy would drive the budget for defense, not dollars.

Another great concern of mine surrounds the Armed Forces budget. While the committee budget recognizes both immediate and long-term defense needs, the Progressive Caucus budget cuts deeply in defense. It provides \$753 billion less in budget authority and \$698 billion less in outlays during the years 2002 to 2011 than does the committee budget.

The quality of life for our Armed Forces personnel and their families is a priority in the House Republican budget, including increased pay, better housing, and \$3.9 billion for the first year of expanded health benefits for over-65 military retirees.

The progressive budget slashes funds for national defense. We cannot afford

to neglect our Armed Forces any longer. I applaud the chairman for supporting the committee budget.

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

Mr. Chairman, my friend from South Carolina should be delighted to know our budget includes an additional \$45.5 million for energy assistance for the people of his great State.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), a fighter for the people of Chicago.

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the need for public housing, low- and moderate-income housing, housing for the homeless, housing for veterans, housing for people with AIDS, all of these needs are well defined and well documented, yet the Bush budget cuts \$859 million from the public housing budget.

We all know about the problems of drugs in public housing, yet the Bush budget takes \$316 million from drug elimination grants. The Bush budget cuts \$422 million from the Community Development Block Grants program, \$200 million from home housing block grants, \$640 million from Section 8. It is unbelievable.

Mr. Chairman, these cuts can do nothing but leave pain, frustration, and blood. I hope that people will know how to bleed with compassion, because these cuts surely are not. When we cut, cut, cut, and cut, all that we get is blood, blood, blood, and blood. The blood of the American people will be on the heads of those who wielded the knife.

On the other hand, the Progressive Caucus has a budget which invests \$2 billion per year in affordable housing, gives increased funding for Section 8 by \$575 million to provide 100,000 more vouchers; \$500 million more to address the backlog of public housing; a 50 percent increase for the Child Care Block Grant program, and a \$200 million increase for homeless assistance grants.

This is the kind of budget, Mr. Chairman, that we need. This is the kind of progressive budget that I would be pleased to vote for. So I urge support for the Progressive Caucus' budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS).

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Committee on the Budget's budget. This is a budget that balances very clearly the need to provide tax relief for working Americans, the need to save and protect Social Security, the need to pay down our Nation's debt, and, yes, the need to meet unfunded liabilities of the Federal Government.

I would commend our chairman, who has led the way every single year that he has been on this Committee on the Budget, and now as chairman, in find-

ing the necessary resources to significantly increase funding not only for education programs, but most specifically the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, IDEA.

Every year that I have been in this Congress, as contrasted with the years prior to me being in Congress, funding for this critical program has increased. I am pleased to say that this year in this budget we have set aside \$1.25 billion to increase the part B IDEA funding program. It was never done before, and it is testimony to this chairman's commitment to IDEA as a program.

I will yield to the chairman for a couple of clarifications on this groundbreaking accomplishment. The fact is that the reserve fund allocation of \$1.250 billion is intended solely for the part B IDEA grants to States, not just IDEA-related funding generally.

Now, the report specifies that the IDEA reserve fund is for part B, but the resolution does not. I was wondering if the chairman would respond to that briefly.

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

Mr. BASS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct, number one.

Number two, we anticipate that the Committee on Appropriations will provide and other committees will provide the continued flexibility so that States and local school districts can meet the challenges of IDEA.

While the gentleman gave me some of the credit for that, and I appreciate that because it is a labor of love for me, there has been no one in this Congress who has held the banner any higher than the gentleman from New Hampshire.

I want to show Members what the gentleman has accomplished. This is the gentleman's work, I say to the gentleman from New Hampshire, since he has been here in Congress, these kinds of increases for special education. We are going to build on this average annual increase of 23 percent for special education.

While we celebrate that in this speech here today, we are not where we want to be yet. It is a labor of love for us. It is a labor of intellectual honesty, as well, of unfunded mandates. We are going to keep that fight going, but we have accomplished quite a bit in this budget. I appreciate the gentleman's leadership.

□ 1145

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I just want to emphasize, carrying on the point of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), that this is not necessarily instructions to the Committee on Appropriations to cap the fund at this amount. They are more than welcome to increase it above that. We certainly encourage them to increase the part B funding above that \$1.25 or 1 and a quarter billion dollars, if they choose to do so.

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

Mr. BASS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. NUSSLE. It is a commitment of that \$1.25 billion, yes, number one, but, more importantly, as the gentleman knows, the House should work, under the circumstances will, to increase that as much as possible to meet its commitment to special education.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), chairman of the Committee on the Budget, for his leadership on this important issue.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS), my good friend, he will be glad to know this budget does not leave the people of New Hampshire out in the cold. We have \$53 million for energy assistance.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER), who is a champion of veterans rights.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) for yielding the time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise as the ranking member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Subcommittee on Health, in support of the Progressive Caucus budget, and to say that the Republican budget on the floor does not meet the needs of our veterans.

The budget this year not only provides merely for an inflationary increase for our health care for our veterans, but in the 2nd and the 3rd years of this budget, it actually is a decrease for our veterans.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) can explain why our veterans in the years 2002 and 2003 of the budget resolution are cut from in the budget.

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

Mr. FILNER. We will get back to the gentleman.

When we have a veterans community that is waiting up to 2 years for health appointments, when we have 500,000 claims backlogged at this moment, claims for adjudication of benefits that are mounting at \$10,000 a week, this budget that the Progressive Caucus has meets those needs, whereas the budget resolution of the Republicans does not.

Our budget is supported by those who made up the independent budget, a coalition of veterans groups who said that the President's budget is short and the budget was short by up to \$2 billion.

This is what we need for our veterans. We need to make sure that their health care is provided for in a timely basis; that their claims are adjudicated in a timely fashion.

We have a GI bill today, Mr. Chairman, that pays merely \$500 a month to go to school. You cannot go to college with that kind of stipend. The Progressive Caucus budget actually begins to fund the Montgomery GI bill so we have a benefit that means something for our veterans.

It is a decade since the Persian Gulf War. We do not know what caused that illness, and we have no treatment for it. The budget of the majority has no funds for research into the Persian Gulf War illness. I can go on and on.

I say to the majority, my colleagues do not have a surplus unless we paid the bills. We have not paid our bills to our Nation's veterans. We have not lived up to our commitment. Vote for the Progressive Caucus budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to answer the question of the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

The Progressive Caucus say they spend more on veterans. Well, that is interesting. I appreciate that the Progressive Caucus may spend more, but evidently it is spent in the wrong places, because it is the Republican budget that has been applauded and endorsed by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the American Legion, the AMVETS, the Disabled Veterans of America, the Paralyzed Veterans of America, and the VFW.

So I guess the gentleman can make his claims, but the veterans are on the side of the budget that we have here as the base bill today.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NUSSLE. I asked the gentleman to yield. The gentleman did not yield.

Mr. FILNER. The gentleman did not answer my question.

Mr. NUSSLE. I certainly would be willing to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time is controlled by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE).

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds and say I am very happy to yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER), but I would appreciate the same courtesy allowed to me.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), my friend and member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of things wrong with this Progressive budget, but probably the most important thing that is wrong with it is the way it slashes defense spending.

I happen to believe that the number one responsibility of the Federal Government is to protect American lives, and the only way you keep America safe is you keep America strong. This budget moves in the wrong direction.

In the last 8 years, we watched our military get hollowed out, reduced by 40 percent; and, yet, deployment has increased almost 400 percent. We sent our troops gallivanting all over the world; and, today, the young men and women in uniform are worried about the direction that we are going to take.

I would say this budget as it is slashes defense spending. It does not recognize the world as it is today. The Cold War is over, yes, but we still face nuclear proliferation, non-State terror-

ists groups, world criminal elements with tentacles all over the world, and I think we have to recognize that.

We have to make America strong again, and that is what our budget does. It increases defense spending almost 5 percent. It adds \$5.6 billion to begin to increase the pay of our military, give them better housing, give them health care benefits. Already, you can see the morale is boosted among our troops.

Mr. Chairman, our budget spends \$2.6 billion on research and development. It is a down payment for what we need to spend in the future. The President believes, and I believe, that we ought to have a top-to-bottom review, so that our defense strategy will drive our defense spending and not the other way around.

It is a time of transition, a time of testing, and we do not want to go out and spend money on technology that might not work or be available.

And once this top-to-bottom review is finished, once our President and our military leaders know the direction we want to take and have a clear vision, I am confident he will come back to this Congress, ask for our help, and we will give him the necessary resources.

Let us not go backwards and continue to hollow our military; let us move forward and make America strong again.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), my very good friend, would be delighted to know there is \$91 million for energy assistance in our budget.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON). I would like the gentlewoman to know how much we appreciate her leadership on housing issues.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, as we speak, one part of the Progressive Caucus budget has already become well known in the country; that is, our American people's dividend which, as it appears, may well be introduced in the Senate. We proposed \$300 per family member. The Senate looks like it is going to promote \$300 per worker. I would just as soon declare victory if Senators did, because it would return us to the proud tradition of progressive taxation long associated with the Federal Tax Code.

This is allegedly a quick fix. It certainly is, because that is all this economy needs now. Witness the Consumer Confidence Index that came out yesterday, which was way up above expectations. If we need more, we can revisit the tax cut later.

One part of the Progressive budget that I would like to focus on is the forgotten stepchild of the Federal budget, that is, affordable housing. We have experienced the biggest housing boom of the century, and the worst housing bust for affordable housing since the Great Depression.

As the economy has spun up, housing costs have spun out of control. There is zero, amazingly zero, for affordable housing in the majority's budget. The Progressive Caucus budget would give \$2 billion. Amazingly, the majority actually cuts public housing repairs by \$1 billion. We would increase it \$500 million, because at the very least, we ought to save what pitiful housing stock we already have invested in.

There is more than enough tax cut to pay for help for affordable housing for working people. We would only make a start with our budget. Surely, a start is what working people are entitled to.

The Progressive Caucus budget focuses on the documented priorities of the American people: Affordable housing, prescription drugs, money for school construction and funds to reduce class size and electoral reform, finally.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM), a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to address this issue.

Mr. Chairman, one of the things I am reminded of as a freshman in this body is how diverse our land really is and how diverse the viewpoints are that come to Congress and stakeout their positions. The Progressive Caucus has laid out an interesting blueprint for the future of this country.

It has gutted defense allocations. It says to those young soldiers and sailors who are out there keeping the peace, defending the freedoms that we take for granted each and every day, it says to them that you are not our highest priority; that national defense is not our highest priority.

Mr. Chairman, I would submit that if that is progress, then I would rather stay put. I submit that that is regressive. We are going in the wrong direction.

Progress would be to look those soldiers and sailors in the eye and say we are behind you 100 percent. America supports the efforts and the dedication and the commitment that you display each and every day and the Congress will back up your sacrifice in a very meaningful and real way.

The Progressive Caucus budget does not address principle-based tax relief, the principle that it is wrong to tax people after they have died. It is wrong to treat people differently in the Tax Code because they choose to get married.

It does not address those bedrock foundation principles that government should not be involved in allocating how people run their lives based on the Tax Code. When it comes to education, it does not address the situation with individuals with disabilities, a very important issue that we have set aside, a tremendous trust fund in the Committee on the Budget presentation of the budget to address those needs.

It adds Federal mandates to those local school teachers, the local prin-

cipals and counselors from California to Florida, from Maine to Texas who are trying day in and day out to treat the young people with respect, who inculcate in them the lessons of life instead of freeing them up to do what they do best. It adds another Federal mandate.

Mr. Chairman, I would submit that the Federal Department of DOE has never graduated a single student. They have never had the first parent-teacher conference, and for that reason, Mr. Chairman, I would urge this body to reject the regressive caucus position on the budget.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM), I am sure, would be pleased to know that our budget provides \$51 million for child care.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), who is a strong defender of the rights of workers.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, the majority party here, the Republicans, are seeking to sell their budget principally by advancing a huge tax reduction, and they claim to justify that huge tax reduction by saying that it is the people's money and they want to give that money back to the people.

First of all, that assertion is simply false. The biggest bulk of the tax cut goes to a tiny fraction of the American people, the wealthiest people in the country get the most reduction. If you are a millionaire, you will receive a reduction of about \$50,000 when their budget and their tax cut is fully implemented.

The rest of the people in the country get very little and most of them get nothing.

If we were really interested in putting the people's money back in the pockets, in the hands of people so they could go to a 7-Eleven and make the purchase that was talked about a few moments ago, we would adopt the Progressive budget; that puts more money into the hands of more people sooner than the Republican tax cut does.

Yes, it is the people's money, but it is also the people's Social Security. The Republican budget cuts Social Security. It is also the people's Medicare. The Republican budget cuts Medicare. Their budget takes fully \$1 trillion out of Social Security and Medicare in a bogus attempt to fund a prescription drug program, by which they subsidize the insurance companies and would provide very little in the way of prescription drugs to the people who really need them.

If we are interested in doing something for health care, adopt the Progressive budget. If we are interested in putting money in the hands of the people who can use it and would spend it, adopt the Progressive budget. If you are interested in doing something about education improving the quality of education for all the people of this country, adopt the Progressive budget, therein lies the solution to much of our

economic problems not in the Republican budget.

□ 1200

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Show me where it shows Medicare or a Social Security cut in here. Show me a Medicare cut in here. Come over here and show me. It is not in our budget. My colleagues know it is not. Let us not use war of words like that. Show me the cut. We have a difference of opinion on how to get there, but do not tell me.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman to come over here and show me the cut.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NUSSLE. Come here and show me the cut.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? If the gentleman will yield and give me an opportunity, I would be happy to show it to him.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE).

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strongly support the committee budget. It is a good budget. It meets our priorities. I am interested to hear my friends from the Progressive Caucus. They represent the liberal wing of their party, and I will be speaking for the conservative wing when we have the Republican Study Committee budget coming up.

But I heard the tax cut attacked in this committee budget, that it was giving the money away to the wealthiest taxpayers. It does no such thing except it does give the money back to the people who paid the taxes. Thank heavens we do not live in a socialist republic yet, although perhaps if my friends in the Progressive Caucus have their way, we may get that. But thankfully, we still believe in equality under the law, and we do not believe it is just to take from one to give to another. So this is simply giving the money back to the people who pay the tax.

On the question of taxes, Mr. Chairman, I note that our budget here lets taxpayers keep substantially more of their own earnings, \$1.6 billion over 10 years versus the less than \$700 million under the Progressive budget.

Every American who pays income taxes receives tax relief under the House Republican budget. Only a select few get tax relief under the Progressive Caucus plan.

The other thing I would like to focus on in my remaining time is the question of defense. While the committee budget recognizes both the immediate and long-term defense needs, the Progressive budget cuts defense deeply. It provides \$753 billion less in budget authority than does ours.

Now, we all know the quality of life for armed forces personnel.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a misstatement of fact?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I do not have the time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman will not yield for a misstatement of fact?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, the quality of life for armed forces personnel and their families is a priority in the House Republican budget. We need to do something for our men and women in the Armed Forces, and this does it.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would ask the courtesy of all Members on both sides of the aisle to only speak to the Chair when under recognition. Members apparently have great passions and great interests on all sides of this issue, but the Chair would ask that Members respect the rules of the House.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume 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. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Budget Proposal submitted by the Congressional Progressive Caucus.

This budget delivers what the Republican budget promises—substantial and equal tax relief for all Americans.

Over ten years, this budget would provide the American People's Dividend—\$300 annually to every man, woman, and child, as long as the budget surplus exists.

Many people may think that \$300 is not a lot of money. But for a working family of four with two children, the Progressive Caucus budget represents an extra \$1,200 that could be applied toward basic needs like school shoes, winter coats, and groceries.

On the other hand, the Republicans have proposed giving 42 percent of the tax benefits to the wealthiest 1 percent of the population—essentially, a new luxury automobile. The bottom 95 percent would receive less than half of the benefit.

The Progressive Caucus has focused upon spreading relief around equally, to help people to deal with the skyrocketing costs of housing, medicine, college education and other elements that we consider part of the American dream. The American people are fair people. The Progressive Caucus budget is a fair budget.

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

Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) would be pleased to learn that, in his State, which had a 40 percent increase in utility rates yesterday, there is a \$306 million amount for energy assistance under this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I think most people in this country know what is going on today. At a time when the wealthiest 1 percent of the population own more wealth than the bottom 95 percent, at a time when CEOs of major corporations now earn 500 times more than their workers, at a time when the wealthiest people in large corporations flood the United States Congress with all kinds of money, Mr. Chairman, this is pay-back time. That is what is going on.

The gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE), the previous speaker, made a funny remark. He said the Progressive Caucus is only providing tax relief to, I believe he said, the select few. Do my colleagues know who the select few is? It is the middle class and the working class of this country, the vast majority.

Yes, we plead guilty. We are not providing 43 percent of the tax breaks to the richest 1 percent. We are apologetic about that, but we think the middle class, the working class, the people who are working 50 and 60 hours a week, who are making \$30,000, \$40,000 a year, need the help and not the millionaires and the billionaires.

The issue that I want to focus on and urge people to vote for the Progressive Caucus budget on is prescription drugs. The Progressive Caucus says it is absurd that, at a time when the pharmaceutical industry is enjoying record-breaking profits, that the American people have to pay by far the highest prices in the industrialized world for prescription drugs.

We say that every American senior citizen is entitled to prescription drugs because they are a citizen in this country and because they are on Medicare, and no senior should pay more than 20 percent out-of-pocket for their prescription drugs.

We do this in a number of ways, but one of them is by doing away with the loopholes in last year's reimportation bill. We say that, if people in Europe can pay 30 or 40 or 50 percent for the same exact prescription drug that our people are paying for, then prescription drug distributors and pharmacists should be able to bring that drug into this country and sell it to the American people for the same price.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair advises the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) that he has 45 seconds remaining. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time to close the debate.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), a champion of women and children's issues.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, how Congress chooses to spend our Federal funds says a great deal about who we are as leaders, who we are as people, and who we are as a Nation.

Mr. Chairman, the President may say that he supports improving education, but the Republican budget fails to reflect on that priority. It fails to reflect what he said during the campaign, that he wants to leave no child behind.

In order to truly support children, we must invest in education at every level. The progressive budget does just that by increasing funding to hire new teachers, by improving teacher compensation, by supporting school renovation, and by helping schools to invest in technology.

Rather than cutting millions of dollars from Head Start, as the Republican budget does, the Progressive Caucus budget fully funds Head Start. It adds \$11.5 billion to the Head Start program. This way, we will leave no child behind.

Like my Progressive Caucus colleagues, I also believe that one of our national priorities in order to invest in our children must be to greatly increase the role of renewable energy sources, energy efficiency, and conservation measures. In that way, we will be able to meet our future energy needs. In that way, we can invest in our environment and at the same time invest in our children and in our Nation's future.

Lastly, the Republican budget increases military spending while making deep cuts in children's programs. This sends a message loud and clear to our children about what we value in this Nation. It tells them that we value weapons more than we value them. I believe that our Nation's strength is in our children. Our children are our national security, and we must support them.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS), a person who in this House really works very hard for school construction.

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) for bringing a budget to the floor which represents reality. It is very close to the reality experienced by the American people.

In the area of education, it is proposing to expend about \$110 billion over the next 5 years. That is closer to what is really needed. Among those needs that will be addressed is the need for school construction, modernization, and renovation.

I want to bring my colleagues' attention to the fact that President Bush has taken a step backwards with respect to school construction and renovations. We appropriated \$1.2 billion last year. Now the President refuses to expend that funding on school repairs and renovations, and he has nothing in the ongoing budget to continue any school repairs and renovations.

We made a major breakthrough, and now this President who proposes to leave no child behind is going to leave

no child behind with arsenic in the water, with more carbon dioxide in the air, and unsafe schools that do not encourage learning, unsafe buildings.

So we would like to stress the fact that we have made a breakthrough. This budget continues that.

Mr. Chairman, I will submit a letter that was sent to President Bush on February 6, 2001, by 141 Members of the House asking him to appropriate the money that was put in the budget last year.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. HILLIARD).

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about the dangers to our great Nation, not from outside enemies, but from those within. These enemies are ignorance, poverty, crime, diseases, the destruction of our countryside, and most importantly, corporate greed.

I believe that the most powerful Nation in the world, this country, can cope militarily with the weaponry it has.

Rather than lining the pockets of the rich with a huge, unfair tax cut, and pumping our Nation's resources into the pockets of military contractors, we need to repair and build new schools and fund a complete medical system for everyone.

Mr. Chairman, the Progressive budget protects all the American people, and the majority budget is a danger to the health and welfare of the American people.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 45 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, our budget gives money to the troops for housing, for wage increases. Our budget takes money away from weapons systems which do not work. There has been 7.6 trillion in accounting entries in the Pentagon; and of that, 2.3 trillion were not supported by enough evidence to determine their validity.

The Department of Defense stores nearly 30 billion worth of spare parts it does not need, according to the GAO. The GAO also reports that the Navy recently wrote off as lost over \$3 billion worth of intransit inventory, and the Air Force is missing over 2.3 billion in stock.

Today's defense budget is 80 percent of the amount allocated during the height of the Cold War and is 15 percent higher than in real terms than when Mr. Rumsfeld left the Pentagon in the 1970s.

We need to pay attention to housing, to education, to opportunities for all Americans and adopt this progressive budget.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) to close the debate on behalf of the Progressive Caucus.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, everything in the majority's budget revolves around a \$2.6

trillion tax cut of which 43 percent will go to the people in the top 1 percent, people who average over \$912,000 a year.

In order to do that, they are going to cut education, Head Start. They are going to jeopardize Medicare, Social Security. They are going to pay down the debt more slowly than the Progressive alternative.

We have offered a responsible alternative based in reality. We are not going to spend the money before it comes in. One-third for debt reduction, one-third for the priorities of the American people, and one-third for targeted tax cuts. Yes, targeted tax cuts toward middle-income families who are struggling to make ends meet, not the people at \$920,000 a year. I have not noticed that they are having such a hard time.

It is time that the Federal Government began to pay attention to the needs of average Americans in this country, not just the special interests and the wealthy.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, since no one has shown me the Medicare or Social Security cuts in my budget, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this budget, and I really question the competence of those who wrote it. This budget pays massive prepayment penalties on the U.S. debt to wealthy bondholders. If one wants to extract hard-working taxpayers' money and give it to rich people, then vote for the Progressive budget because we would pay those penalties to wealthy Americans.

I would say for all of those who have looked at the charts of either side showing steep cuts in the Medicare fiscal viability as the baby boom generation retires, adding money to Medicare without Medicare reform is like arguing about whether we can afford dessert in the cafeteria of the Titanic.

Our budget lays the groundwork for bipartisan reform on Medicare, ensuring that Medicare will survive into the future as the baby boomers retire. This budget includes a prescription-drug benefit. This budget operates under the key principle that Medicare should offer health care coverage as good as the one offered Congressmen.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Progressive Caucus Budget.

This budget reflects the real priorities of the American people, not big business, wealthy campaign donors, or big oil companies. Working families want us to improve education, health care, and the economy.

We respond by spending \$110 billion on education—for more teachers, school renovation, and school counselors. We double Head Start and triple funding for new schools.

The Progressive Caucus Budget offers the only substantial Medicare prescription drug program—one that includes an 80/20 federal/beneficiary cost sharing. Our plan would help millions of Americans struggling to pay the high costs of prescription drugs.

Our budget is also designed to stimulate the economy. We provide for a \$900 billion tax

cut, by providing \$300 annually to every man, woman, and child in America. Our plan would actually provide more tax relief to more people than the Administration plan. In fact, 80% of the American people would get more money from the Progressive Caucus tax cut plan.

Our tax cuts are enough to boost consumer confidence and keep the economy growing, but not so large and so unfair as to force harsh budget cuts or create new deficits. It is time to leave the Reagan/Bush deficit legacy behind once and for all.

We also stimulate the economy with funds for new housing construction and badly needed energy assistance. We increase LIHEAP by 400 percent and weatherization programs by 650 percent. We cut nuclear power research and instead direct those funds to clean alternative energy research on wind and solar power development. Lowering energy costs, stimulating the economy, and creating a cleaner environment for our children and grandchildren.

This plan may sound radical to some in Congress and especially those conservatives in the Administration, but to the American people it's not radical, it's common sense. Why not spend the surplus on education, health care, and the economy? Why not? Because President Bush wants to give wealthy individuals \$46,000 dollars each instead. What a shame!

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, the great Republican hero Ronald Reagan once said, "Trust, but verify." That is wonderful advice coming from the icon of the Republican revolution. So, I decided to verify Bush's new budget.

Of course, a major portion of Bush's proposal will include a \$1.6 trillion dollar tax cut. Now we all know that the American people need and deserve a tax break. But it turns out that 50% of the tax relief is going to the richest 5% of the population. The very wealthy can expect to get back \$46,000, while low income families will get zero.

Meanwhile, President Bush and the richest Cabinet in the history of this country are pushing for Estate Tax Relief. This will provide a tax kickback of over \$100 million to President Bush and his cabinet.

Bush's first budget cuts Head Start, Child Care, and Public Housing repairs.

At least now we have verified who is paying for the kickbacks to Bush's rich friends. The nation's children and the poor.

It was once said that the true measure of a society is in how it treats its least fortunate. That is why we must support the Progressive Caucus Budget. In my home state of Georgia, the budget increase for Head Start would serve over 20,000 children. The brave Americans who served our country would see big increases in Veterans Medical care and construction programs. Low-income families would benefit from increases in Section 8 vouchers and the Public Housing Capital Fund.

We will pay for the Progressive Caucus budget by eliminating wasteful programs and corporate welfare, such as the tax deductibility of Tobacco advertising. We cut back on Star Wars, so that we can pay our military personnel what they deserve rather than increasing profits of defense contractors.

The Progressive Caucus budget takes care of our nation's children, seniors, veterans, military personnel, and middle and low income families.

Upon verification, the Bush plan will fill the coffers of big business at the expense of the

hard working men and women of this country who created the prosperity that led to our budget surplus. Mr. Chairman, I challenge my colleagues to do what they know is right for their constituents, and support the Progressive budget.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Progressive Caucus's alternative budget resolution and in strong opposition to the Republican budget. It is clear which budget truly benefits the American people.

Let me give you just a few examples of why we should support the Progressive Caucus budget.

First, the Progressive Caucus budget places a priority on affordable housing, which is not only important in the Bay Area, including my congressional district, but also in many other parts of this country. Families are finding the American dream of homeownership harder and harder to attain and the Progressive Caucus budget takes low- and moderate-income Americans one step closer to realizing that dream. We include \$2 billion for affordable housing construction. The Republican budget does not include one penny for this purpose. And in order to ensure that low-income families don't have to live in squalor in public housing, our budget includes a \$500 million increase for public housing repairs while the Republican budget actually cuts this program by \$1 billion! That is outrageous.

Second, my home state of California is facing an energy crisis. Just yesterday, the California Public Utilities Commission voted in favor of a rate increase for consumers, raising the rates by as much as 46 percent. I order to try to help Californians and others around the country who need help paying their increased energy bills, the Progressive Caucus budget would provide a \$6.7 billion increase for LIHEAP, a low-income energy assistance program. This 400 percent increase will make it easier for many more Californians to pay their energy bills during this crisis. The Republican budget freezes LIHEAP funds next year and does not provide any funding at all in the LIHEAP emergency account. Clearly what is happening in California is an emergency and will spread throughout the Western states and the nation. We must have these funds to help the people in our state.

Finally, on a subject that is dear to me and many others in Congress—election reform—the Progressive Caucus provides \$2.5 billion to ensure that what happened in Florida last year does not happen again. This funding for election reform would assist states and localities in upgrading election procedures and voting technologies. Far too many people in our country were disenfranchised by what happened in the 2000 election and we must do everything in our power to ensure that we never have another Florida. I think it is disgraceful that the Republican budget does not provide any funding for these essential reforms.

The Progressive Caucus budget also includes large increases in education, health care, veterans' programs and true tax cuts that benefit all Americans and not just primarily the very rich, all while preserving Social Security and Medicare. I urge my colleagues to vote for a budget that cuts taxes, provides for debt relief, and allows for needed spending programs. I urge my colleagues to vote for the Progressive Caucus budget.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Progressive Caucus Alternative Budget. Already this Congress, our colleagues on the other side, have shown that they simply do not share the priorities of America's hard working families. They wish to gamble our savings and the surplus we have worked so hard to create, on a risky tax cut that benefits the wealthiest 1 percent of America. To pay for their tax cut, our colleagues have targeted for budget cuts important domestic programs such as child care, low income housing, and much needed environmental protections.

The Progressive Caucus Budget provides for programs that are important to all of America's families: new school construction, one hundred thousand new teachers, one hundred thousand new school counselors, a Medicare prescription drug program, and affordable housing so that every family may achieve the American dream of owning their own home. It addresses our energy concerns and the debt we owe to our veterans. It provides for our priorities of strengthening and extending Social Security and Medicare. It also provides \$2.5 billion for upgrading election procedures and voting technology.

In doing so, the Progressive Caucus Budget addresses one of the most important issues to come out of the past election, assuring the American people that their elections are fair, free, and that everyone has the opportunity and ability to cast their vote. None of the other budgets we will consider today set aside any funding to address this issue, so critical to the integrity of our democracy. Antiquated voting technology in primarily minority communities casts a pall over our elections this past November. We must do everything in our power, to prove to ourselves and the world, that America is the cradle and the bastion of democracy. It is our duty as Members to foster and sustain America's faith in the very essence of democracy, the act of casting a vote. It is one of my highest priorities, to insure the integrity of the democratic process and I applaud the Progressive Caucus for making it their priority as well.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 79, noes 343, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 66]

AYES—79

Ackerman
Baca
Blumenauer
Bonior
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Clay
Clayton
Conyers
Coyne
Cummings
Davis (IL)

DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
Engel
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank
Gephardt
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hilliard
Hinchev
Honda
Jackson (IL)

Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kilpatrick
Kucinich
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Loftgren
Lowey
Maloney (NY)
Markey
McCollum
McDermott

McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meeks (NY)
Millender-
McDonald
Miller, George
Moakley
Nadler
Napolitano
Oberstar
Olver

Owens
Pallone
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sanders
Schakowsky
Serrano
Slaughter

Solis
Stark
Tierney
Velazquez
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—343

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Billakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardin
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeLauro
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan

Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Ford
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kind (WI)

King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klecza
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Largent
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
Meehan
Menendez
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pascarell
Pastor
Paul
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds

Riley	Shows	Thornberry
Rivers	Simmons	Thune
Rodriguez	Simpson	Thurman
Roemer	Skeen	Tiahrt
Rogers (KY)	Skelton	Tiberi
Rogers (MI)	Smith (MI)	Toomey
Rohrabacher	Smith (NJ)	Towns
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (TX)	Traficant
Ross	Smith (WA)	Turner
Roukema	Snyder	Udall (CO)
Royce	Souder	Udall (NM)
Ryan (WI)	Spence	Upton
Ryun (KS)	Spratt	Visclosky
Sabo	Stearns	Vitter
Sanchez	Stenholm	Walden
Sandlin	Strickland	Walsh
Sawyer	Stump	Wamp
Saxton	Stupak	Watkins
Scarborough	Sununu	Watts (OK)
Schaffer	Sweeney	Weldon (FL)
Schiff	Tancredo	Weldon (PA)
Schrock	Tanner	Weller
Scott	Tauscher	Whitfield
Sensenbrenner	Tauzin	Wicker
Sessions	Taylor (MS)	Wilson
Shadegg	Taylor (NC)	Wolf
Shays	Terry	Young (AK)
Sherman	Thomas	Young (FL)
Sherwood	Thompson (CA)	
Shimkus	Thompson (MS)	

NOT VOTING—10

Baldwin	Lampson	Shaw
Becerra	Meek (FL)	Sisisky
Boucher	Mink	
DeLay	Rothman	

□ 1236

Messrs. GOODLATTE, DIAZ-BALART, NORWOOD, RAMSTAD, GARY MILLER of California, LIPINSKI and SAWYER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 66 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 107–30.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 IN THE NATURE OF A
SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. STENHOLM

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. STENHOLM:

Strike all after resolving clause and insert the following:

**SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE
BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002.**

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001 is hereby revised and replaced and that this is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2002 and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2003 through 2006 are hereby set forth.

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2011:

(1) **FEDERAL REVENUES.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,606,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: \$1,680,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: \$1,754,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: \$1,832,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: \$1,916,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: \$1,996,700,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be reduced are as follows:

Fiscal year 2001: \$23,230,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$22,440,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: \$27,631,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: \$31,109,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: \$33,332,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: \$43,338,000,000.

(2) **NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,535,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,588,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: \$1,641,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: \$1,700,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: \$1,759,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: \$1,798,000,000,000.

(3) **BUDGET OUTLAYS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,481,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,550,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: \$1,617,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: \$1,674,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: \$1,738,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: \$1,784,000,000,000.

(4) **SURPLUSES.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the surpluses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2001: \$90,850,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$84,650,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: \$100,950,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: \$113,750,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: \$121,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: \$150,750,000,000.

(5) **PUBLIC DEBT.**—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2001: \$5,637,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002: \$5,585,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003: \$5,542,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: \$5,401,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: \$5,385,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: \$5,288,300,000,000.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and budget outlays for fiscal years 2003 through 2011 for each major functional category are:

(1) **National Defense (050):**

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$317,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$301,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$329,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$323,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$334,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$329,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$345,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$338,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$357,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$335,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$367,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$359,300,000,000.

(2) **International Affairs (150):**

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$20,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$20,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,400,000,000.

(3) **General Science, Space, and Technology (250):**

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,230,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,590,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,680,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,810,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,110,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$23,540,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,670,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$24,250,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,350,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$24,770,000,000.

(4) **Energy (270):**

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$160,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

(5) **Natural Resources and Environment (300):**

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$28,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$26,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,650,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$26,350,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,820,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$26,920,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$27,930,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$27,330,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$27,830,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$27,630,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$27,930,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$27,730,000,000.

(6) **Agriculture (350):**

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$31,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$29,290,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$29,530,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$27,560,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$29,380,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$27,780,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$28,560,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$27,090,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$27,750,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$26,230,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$27,140,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$25,510,000,000.

(7) **Commerce and Housing Credit (370):**

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,920,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$10,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,800,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$62,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$51,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$60,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$55,490,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$58,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$58,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$59,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$60,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$59,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$61,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$60,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$63,600,000,000.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$10,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$10,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$10,300,000,000.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$76,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$69,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$84,950,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$76,630,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$85,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$83,330,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$87,770,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$85,030,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$91,810,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$88,080,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$95,090,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$91,800,000,000.

(11) Health (550):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$182,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$175,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$192,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$189,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$215,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$211,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$231,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$229,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$248,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$246,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$265,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$263,300,000,000.

(12) Medicare (570):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$217,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$217,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$231,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$231,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$257,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$257,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$282,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$282,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$309,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$309,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$382,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$327,800,000,000.

(13) Income Security (600):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$256,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$257,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$271,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$271,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$281,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$281,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$292,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$291,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$307,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$305,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$314,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$313,100,000,000.

(14) Social Security (650):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,800,000,000.

(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$46,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$53,850,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$53,250,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$54,460,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$54,060,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$56,540,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$56,220,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$60,680,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$60,240,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$60,260,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$59,820,000,000.

(16) Administration of Justice (750):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,160,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,010,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,160,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,850,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,050,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,310,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,690,000,000.

(17) General Government (800):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,100,000,000.

(18) Net Interest (900):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$205,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$205,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$184,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$182,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$172,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$171,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$155,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$154,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$134,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$133,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$112,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$112,400,000,000.

(19) Allowances (920):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,150,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,600,000,000.

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$46,170,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$46,170,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$47,890,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$47,890,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$59,020,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$59,020,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$66,220,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$66,220,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$57,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$57,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$62,590,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$62,590,000,000.

SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

(a) SUBMISSIONS BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS FOR TAX RELIEF.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall submit to the Committee on the Budget recommendations pursuant to section (c)(2)(D)(ii) not later than July 24, 2001, that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the total level of revenues by not more than: \$23,230,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, \$22,440,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, \$27,631,000,000 for fiscal year 2003, \$31,109,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, \$33,332,000,000 for fiscal year 2005, and \$43,338,000,000 for fiscal year 2006.

(b) SUBMISSIONS BY HOUSE COMMITTEES ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE AND WAYS AND MEANS FOR MEDICARE REFORM AND PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.—(1) Not later than July 24, 2001, the House Committees named in paragraph (2) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget.

(2)(A) The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to increase outlays, as follows: \$0 for fiscal year 2001, \$2,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, \$14,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2003, \$22,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, \$26,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2005, and \$31,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2006.

(c) OTHER SUBMISSIONS BY HOUSE COMMITTEES.—(1) Not later than September 11, 2001, the House Committees named in paragraph (2) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget.

(2)(A) The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to increase outlays, as follows: \$7,500,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, \$10,265,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, \$10,675,000,000 for fiscal year 2003, \$10,619,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, \$10,022,000,000 for fiscal year 2005, and \$9,848,000,000 for fiscal year 2006.

(B) The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to increase outlays, as follows: \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2003, \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, \$7,000,000 for fiscal year 2005, and \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 2006.

(C) The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to increase outlays, as follows: \$0 for fiscal year 2001, \$180,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, \$1,166,000,000 for fiscal year 2003, \$1,361,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, \$1,481,000,000 for fiscal year 2005, and \$1,636,000,000 for fiscal year 2006.

(D) The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to increase outlays, as follows: \$0 for fiscal year 2001, \$1,872,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, \$1,951,000,000 for fiscal year 2003, \$2,057,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, \$2,165,000,000 for fiscal year 2005, and \$2,379,000,000 for fiscal year 2006.

(d) ____.—After receiving the recommendations reported pursuant to subsections (a), (b) and (c), the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(e) SPECIAL RULES.—In the House, if any bill reported pursuant to subsection (a) or subsection (c)(2)(D)(ii), amendment thereto or conference report thereon, has refundable tax provisions that increase outlays, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the amount of new budget authority provided by such provisions (and out-

lays flowing therefrom) allocated to the Committee on Ways and Means and adjust the revenue levels set forth in such subsection accordingly such that the increase in outlays and reduction in revenue resulting from such bill does not exceed the amounts specified in subsection (a) or subsection (c)(2)(D)(ii), as applicable.

(f) In carrying out reconciliation instructions under this section respecting any changes in laws within its jurisdiction to increase outlays or reduce revenues, the applicable House committees shall only recommend changes that will be fully phased-in by the close of fiscal year 2006.

SEC. 5. RESERVE FOR DEBT REDUCTION AND STRENGTHENING SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any reported bill or joint resolution, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that would cause a surplus for any of fiscal years 2001 through 2006 to be less than the sum of the level set forth in subsection (b) and the level of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund set forth in section 6, except as provided for in subsection (c).

(b) DEBT REDUCTION RESERVE.—

(1) The sums referred to in subsection (a) are as follows:

(A) Fiscal year 2002: \$48,650,000,000.

(B) Fiscal year 2003: \$61,950,000,000.

(C) Fiscal year 2004: \$72,750,000,000.

(D) Fiscal year 2005: \$81,500,000,000.

(E) Fiscal year 2006: \$106,750,000,000.

(2) The funds in the debt reduction reserve shall be used exclusively for buying back publicly held debt, except as provided for in subsection (c).

(c) EXCEPTION FOR LEGISLATION STRENGTHENING SOCIAL SECURITY OR MEDICARE SOLVENCY.—

(1) Subsections (a) shall not apply to social security reform legislation or medicare reform legislation.

(2) For purposes of this subsection, social security reform legislation refers to legislation that the chief actuary of the Social Security Administration certifies extends the solvency of the Federal Old Age and Survivors Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust fund, taken together, for 75 years.

(3) For purposes of this subsection, Medicare reform legislation refers to legislation that the chief actuary of the Health Care Financing Administration certifies extends the solvency of the Federal beyond 2050.

SEC. 6. ENFORCEMENT OF MEDICARE LEVELS.

(a) It shall not be in order in the House or Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that would cause a decrease in surpluses or an increase in deficits of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund in any year relative to the levels set forth in subsection (b). This paragraph shall not apply to amounts to be expended from the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund for purposes relating to programs within part A of Medicare as provided in law on the date of enactment of this paragraph.

(b) The amounts referred to in subsection (a) are as follows:

(1) Fiscal year 2002: \$36,000,000,000.

(2) Fiscal year 2003: \$39,000,000,000.

(3) Fiscal year 2004: \$41,000,000,000.

(4) Fiscal year 2005: \$40,000,000,000.

(5) Fiscal year 2006: \$44,000,000,000.

SEC. 7. USE OF CBO ESTIMATES IN ENFORCEMENT OF RESOLUTION.

For purposes of enforcing the budgetary aggregates and allocations under this resolution, the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget shall, in advising the presiding officer on the cost of any piece of leg-

islation, rely exclusively on estimates prepared by the Congressional Budget Office or the Joint Tax Committee, in a form certified by that agency to be consistent with its own economic and technical estimates, unless in each case he first receives the approval of the Committee on the Budget by recorded vote to use a different estimate.

SEC. 8. TAX CUTS AND NEW SPENDING CONTINGENT ON DEBT REDUCTION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, it shall not be in order to consider a reconciliation bill pursuant to section 4 of this resolution or any legislation reducing revenues for the period of fiscal years 2002 to 2006 or increasing outlays for mandatory spending programs unless there is a certification by Director of the Congressional Budget Office that the House has approved legislation which—

(1) ensures that a sufficient portion of the on-budget surplus is reserved for debt retirement to put the government on a path to reduce the publicly held debt below \$1,700,000,000,000 by the end of fiscal year 2006 under current economic and technical projections; and

(2) legislation has been enacted which establishes points of order or other protections to ensure that funds reserved for debt retirement may not be used for any other purpose, except for adjustments to reflect economic and technical changes in budget projections.

SEC. 9. ADJUSTMENT FOR REVISION OF BUDGET SURPLUSES.

(a) ALLOCATION OF INCREASED SURPLUS PROJECTIONS.—If the Congressional Budget Office report referred to in subsection (b) projects an increase in the surplus for fiscal year 2000, fiscal year 2001, and the period of fiscal years 2002 through 2006 over the corresponding levels set forth in its economic and budget forecast for 2001 submitted pursuant to section 202(e)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House shall make the adjustments as provided in subsection (c).

(b) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE UPDATED BUDGET FORECAST FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002.—The report referred to in subsection (a) is the Congressional Budget Office updated budget forecast for fiscal year 2002.

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—If the Committee on Ways and Means reports any reconciliation legislation or other legislation reducing revenues exceeding the revenue aggregates in section 2(1)(B), reduce the revenue aggregates in section 2(1)(A) and increase the amounts the revenues can be reduced by in section 2(1)(B) by an amount not to exceed one-quarter of the increased surplus. If the Committees on Agriculture, Appropriations, Commerce, National Security, or Ways and Means report legislation increasing spending above the allocation for that committee, increase the allocation for that committee and the aggregates set forth in sections 2(2) and 2(3) by an amount not to exceed one-quarter of the increased surplus.

(d) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments made pursuant to subsection (c) for any measure shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

SEC. 10. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to section 10, 11, or 12 for any measure shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) **EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.**—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) **BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.**—For purposes of this resolution—

(1) the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives or the Senate, as applicable; and

(2) such chairman, as applicable, may make any other necessary adjustments to such levels to carry out this resolution.

SEC. 11. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING RETIREMENT TRUST FUNDS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

(1) the Congress has made commitments to balance the Federal budget without including the surpluses of trust funds dedicated to particular purposes, such as the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, the Disability Insurance Trust Fund, and the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund;

(2) the assets of the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund are used to finance the military retirement and survivor benefit programs of the Department of Defense;

(3) the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund is facing a long-term unfunded actuarial liability which will require all of the fund's current surplus to pay the retirement and survivor benefits promised to current and future members of the Armed Forces; and

(4) the assets in the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund are included in the calculation of the Federal budget surplus and account for approximately \$100,000,000,000 of the estimated Federal budget surplus during the next 10 years.

(b) **SENSE OF THE HOUSE.**—It is the sense of the House of Representatives that any portion of the Federal budget surplus attributable to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund should be used exclusively for the financing of the military retirement and survivor benefit programs of the Department of Defense, and not for the financing of tax policy changes, new Federal spending, or any other purpose.

SEC. 12. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING SURPLUS PROJECTIONS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

(1) disagreements on objective budget surplus figures, in the annual budget and appropriations process, have led to repetitive and time-consuming budget votes, decreasing the time available for consideration and oversight of federal programs, undermining legislation to provide responsible tax relief, and delaying enactment of legislation necessary to fund the Government;

(2) Congress and the Administration want to work together to do everything possible to maintain a strong and growing economy;

(3) an agreement on baseline estimates will prevent us from undermining the fiscal discipline that has contributed to our economic strength and allow Congress and the Administration to address their collective priorities in a responsible, bipartisan manner;

(3) a bipartisan majority of the Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate have voted to protect the social security and medicare trust funds;

(4) empirical evidence and the Congressional Budget Office agree that changes in

economic conditions make projections based on ten-year forecasts highly uncertain;

(5) the caps on discretionary spending are set to expire at the end of fiscal year 2002 and no formal rules will be in place to contain the growth in discretionary spending;

(6) baseline estimates typically overstate the size of available surpluses by not assuming costs of extending or changing policies that affect revenues, such as expiring tax provisions and the cost of indexing the alternative minimum tax (AMT) to protect middle-class families from the AMT; and

(7) current baseline estimates do not recognize underlying demographic pressures that will incur future obligations that may threaten projected surpluses outside the ten-year budget window.

(b) **SENSE OF THE HOUSE.**—It is the sense of the House that future budget resolutions, as well as all tax and spending legislation, should maintain our commitment to fiscal responsibility by using agreed-upon surplus, tax, and spending figures derived from the following principles:

(1) The size of the available surplus should exclude social security and medicare trust funds.

(2) The uncertainty of long-term economic forecasts should be recognized.

(3) Realistic assumptions for the growth in discretionary spending should be accounted for.

(4) The projected surplus should be adjusted to recognize that scoring conventions do not incorporate the costs of policies that Congress historically reauthorizes.

(5) There should be a recognition that the Federal Government will incur sizable, future obligations due to demographic pressures set to occur upon the retirement of our baby-boom generation.

SEC. 13. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING BUDGET ENFORCEMENT.

It is the sense of Congress that legislation should be enacted legislation enforcing this resolution by—

(1) establishing a plan to retire half of the publicly held debt by the end of fiscal year 2006;

(2) setting discretionary spending limits for budget authority and outlays at the levels set forth in this resolution for each of the next five years;

(3) extending the pay as you go rules set forth in Section 252 of the BBEDCA for the next ten years; and

(4) establishing modified line item veto authority requiring Congressional votes on rescissions submitted by the President and reducing the discretionary spending limits to reflect savings from any rescissions enacted into law.

SEC. 14. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS ON THE UNCERTAINTY OF BUDGET FORECASTS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

(1) the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) has not produced ten year forecasts frequently enough to produce meaningful averages of its ten-year projection errors;

(2) 71 percent of the projected surplus outside of Social Security and Medicare occurs in the second half of the ten-year projection, the period more subject to error;

(3) based on its own record, CBO concludes 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.

(4) if this uncertainty continues to grow in years six through ten at the same rate it has proven to grow in years one through five, CBO's expected surplus in 2011, excluding Social Security and Medicare, would be expressed as \$524 billion, plus or minus \$800 billion; and

(5) recognizing these uncertainties, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board has

warned that "we need to resist those policies that could readily resurrect the deficits of the past and the fiscal imbalances that followed in their wake", while the Comptroller General testified that "no one should design tax or spending policies pegged to the precise numbers in any 10-year forecast";

(b) **SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) this resolution recognizes the uncertainty of 10-year budget projections; and

(2) a reserve fund, consisting of non-Social Security, non-Medicare surpluses should be created to ensure that the Social Security and Medicare trust funds are protected in the event surplus projections do not materialize; and (3) surplus funds materializing from this reserve in calendar years six through ten should be dedicated to new revenue reducing initiatives.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 100, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, a few weeks ago I read a quote from a gentleman across the aisle who wondered why some of us got so exercised about having a budget put in place first. He said everyone knows the budget does not really mean anything because Congress will do whatever we want later on anyway.

The Blue Dogs rise today to insist that the budget should mean something. It should provide the blueprint which carries enough integrity, realism and authority to force us to pound out our priorities and keep us in line through the subsequent appropriation and reconciliation steps. That is why the Blue Dogs put together a plan we can live with for the next 5 years. It prioritizes removing the taxpayers' debt off our children's shoulders. It maximizes the tax cuts we can afford while remaining fiscally conservative. It reflects the fact that taxpayers do want some of their dollars invested in things like Social Security, Medicare, veterans, education, prescription drugs, and agriculture.

Today, we offer an honest, balanced plan that we can live with, both practically and politically. Even more importantly, it is a budget our constituents can live with. We ask support for the Blue Dog budget alternative.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, all parents want their children to succeed. In today's America, success often requires a college education. It is a way out of poverty for many. Yet, for many families, particularly middle-class families, a college education is out of their reach. With rising tuition costs, rising room and board, the dream of a college education is simply that for too many people, a dream; a dream deferred for too many children of middle-class parents.

However, if we pass the budget resolution offered by the gentleman from

Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), we can help make the dream of college education a reality for more of America's children.

This budget provides significant educational help for families. Not only does it accommodate a significant increase in Pell grant programs, not only does it allow a 10-fold increase in annual contributions families can make to their educational IRAs, but, and this is why I rise, it provides for a full tax exemption for prepaid tuition savings plans.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Alabama State Board of Education, I was there when in 1989 we established our prepaid college tuition plan. Today, virtually all States have a prepaid tuition plan, or college savings plan. Those plans are working. Millions of middle-class American families are paying into those plans. They offer the only affordable option for many families to send their children to college. Yet our current tax law punishes those families for doing what is right.

It punishes them for planning ahead and saving for their children's college education. The IRS taxes them when the student enrolls in college and begins to draw on that investment. Surely, all of us can agree that no tax makes less sense than one that hurts middle-class students trying to earn a college degree. No tax makes less sense than this tax on families that save for their children's college education.

I commend the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) and the budget resolution that he has offered for it goes a long way. It makes these plans tax exempt. It makes college more affordable. That helps more American children succeed.

So I rise in strong support and offer one more reason to support the resolution offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE).

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE), the co-chair of the Blue Dog Budget Task Force.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to the last statement made by the gentleman and basically point out and commend them to read the Blue Dog budget, because it does more for education than the majority's proposal.

I want to talk for just a couple of minutes about 10-year budgets versus 5-year budgets. Just yesterday we filed a bill that would restore truth and integrity in budgeting called the Transparent Budgeting Act of 2001. The first 10-year projection was made by CBO back in 1992 when they predicted a deficit for next year, 2002, of \$407 billion. In January of this year, the CBO projected a fiscal year surplus of \$313 billion. There was only a swing of \$700 billion, three-quarters of a trillion dollars, in those projections.

I think that illustrates what we are trying to say here, and that is we need to be realistic. We need to be responsible and fiscally conservative in our projections upon which these budgets are based, on which these tax cuts come.

We have placed, Mr. Chairman, a \$5.7 trillion mortgage on the future of our children and grandchildren, and now we are talking about tax cuts. All of us on both sides of the aisle are for tax cuts, but responsible tax cuts that we can afford. I suggest that if we do what we are talking about on this side, and that is look at 5-year projections as opposed to these 10-year projections, we are going to be a much steadier ground when it comes to enacting new tax cuts.

I would ask the people on both sides of the aisle to take a hard look at the Blue Dog budget. I think it is fiscally responsible. It is conservative and it recognizes the income that we are going to have in terms of revenues in the next few years, not 10 years but the next 5 years. I think if we do that we will have a much sounder basis for enacting tax cuts in the rest of our budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), a friend and colleague from the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I just say God bless our President, George W. Bush. Finally, we have a President who wants to limit government bureaucracy so the people can have more. Compared with the Blue Dog budget, the Republican budget sets in place common sense priorities that are good for America and simple to understand.

First, the Republican plan gives the people some of their money back because the tax surplus is really theirs; not ours.

□ 1245

Second, the Republican proposal pays down the public debt by \$2 trillion, and it protects defense.

Third, our plan protects Social Security and Medicare by locking away every penny of the trust fund surplus.

Fourth, it stops Federal spending at 4 percent. That means to us in America that the era of tax increases and runaway government spending has ended. It means that Washington bureaucrats better run for cover, because this President, for the first time in 8 years, is going to put people first, not a bloated Federal Government.

Furthermore, the people of America should know this: President Bush is going to be granting every American a pardon from high taxes because he will sign, not veto, elimination of the marriage penalty and the death tax.

The Republican budget is responsible, fair, and above all, good for our economy. It is not a Blue Dog budget; it is an American budget that we need to vote for, the Republican budget. Vote for a strong America. Vote for freedom. Vote for the Republican budget.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON).

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the fiscally re-

sponsible Blue Dog budget. From what I am hearing so far, I think we need to encourage everyone in this body to read this budget and pay attention to what it actually does, because it cuts through the rhetoric and it takes a fiscally responsible approach to what we ought to be doing here today.

We agree we want to cut taxes, and we agree we want to have debt reduction. This budget commits four times the amount of tax relief in the first year, compared to the Republican budget. But beyond that, this budget represents the voice of fiscal responsibility. The Blue Dogs believe in paying down debt. In fact, this budget, over the first 5 years, pays down \$400 million of additional debt compared to the Republican plan.

This is the real deal. This makes a down payment on our future. We need to take a look at our children and not place the burden of that debt that we ran up over the last 20 years on them.

My concern is that we are all talking about a surplus here when, in fact, the proper term is a projected surplus; and if the projected surplus does not actually occur and if we come in underneath that, our tax cuts and our spending are going to move forward and debt reduction is going to fall off the table. It is going to be the odd man out. This budget says, let us be aggressive; let us pay down our debt first.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage everyone to support the Blue Dog budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP).

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Chairman, it is my desire to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Iowa on an important science investment called the Spallation Neutron Source, which represents a \$1.4 billion investment. It is under construction in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, in my district; but the benefits will be generational. It is a physical science investment, but we are going to have life science and physical science benefits come out of this most important science initiative. It crosses over from the previous administration to this administration. We are in our second year of funding. This current year is \$278 million. The President is asking for a large number for the coming year. It is very important generationally I think that we accede science and basic research investment for future generations for benefits that we really do not even fully realize at this time.

Mr. Chairman, the science community supports this initiative. It is a consortium of five different laboratories all across our country. It has been the subject of many technical reviews over the last couple of years. The science community really scrubbed this project clean before they fully supported it, and they do fully support it.

So my question is, Mr. Chairman, as we are considering the budget resolution, there is a 5.7 percent increase in

Function 250, General Science, Space and Technology, where the SNS will be funded. Is it the committee chairman's expectation to see the SNS continue on track and on budget with this increase in Function 250?

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

Mr. WAMP. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I share the gentleman's belief that the President will continue his commitment for full funding, and there is room within this budget function to accommodate that request.

Mr. WAMP. I thank the chairman.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD).

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) for yielding me this time, and I want to thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) and the leadership team for allowing us to have this debate on the Blue Dog budget.

We have had many discussions with leaders here in Washington, including the President and the Vice President; and often the comment comes up, Mr. Chairman, that if we leave the money in Washington, they will just spend it. I think many of us in this country understand why some of us are leery of that and some of us have that feeling.

So what we have suggested, Mr. Chairman, to the President and to others is that we will work with our colleagues to put reasonable spending caps in place. This budget, Mr. Chairman, provides for an average of 3.5 percent spending growth, discretionary spending growth, 3.5 percent. That is very, very reasonable.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would encourage my colleagues strongly, all of the Members of this body, to look at this budget and the way it treats spending restraints.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, defense does need to be rebuilt. In the wake of the outgoing administration, the CBO estimates that we are spending \$30 billion just on equipment, that is on replacing the tanks, trucks, planes, ships. The army tells us we are \$3.5 billion short on what they call critical ammunition supplies. The CBO estimates that we have underfunded training by about \$5 billion; this is all per year. We are not giving our pilots enough time to train. We have a people-pay gap of about 10 percent. That means a difference between people wearing the uniform and people in the private sector.

If we add all of those costs up, just people, equipment, training, ammunition, we come up with a shortfall with respect to the baseline that we have

been spending over the last several years of about \$310 billion. Now \$320 billion was the last Clinton estimate; we come up with a shortfall of about \$50 billion. I agree with that. I think it is at least \$50 billion short.

Now, against that background we have a new administration coming in. They got into the saddle late because of the late election. When we would call up Assistant Secretaries and Secretaries, they were just then getting into their positions in the Pentagon, and the President told us he wants to do a review before he comes up with his budget on defense. Now, that leaves us in a difficult position. But their decision has been to get the review first and then come with the numbers, and the Committee on the Budget has made an allowance for that by accessing the strategic reserve under which this administration can come in with a new request in a couple of months and increase the top line for national security.

Everybody realizes we are going to have to increase it. I want to salute the conservative Democrats for having more dollars for defense; I want to salute the Republican Study Committee who put in an additional \$25 billion per year, which is a big step toward closing this gap. But the Committee on the Budget chairman and other Members of the House have been working with the administration. Our chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP), has been working, and they said help is on the way. We can expect that they are going to come in and increase the top line on defense.

In the end, Mr. Chairman, we have to rely on people. I will rely on DICK CHENEY, George Bush, and Don Rumsfeld to bring that help in a couple of months. I, therefore, strongly support the Committee on the Budget's product.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN).

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I say to the last speaker, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), my friend, that if he wants to fund defense plus-ups, as I do, he has a better chance of doing that if we enact the Blue Dog budget.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Blue Dog budget and urge bipartisan support for the most fiscally responsible plan we will consider in this House.

Many of us are veterans of the hard budget votes of the early and mid-1990s, votes like the 1993 Clinton budget, Penny-Kasich, a constitutional amendment for a balanced budget, a constitutional amendment for limiting tax increases, and the 1997 Balanced Budget Act. These hard votes helped produce the first budget surpluses in a generation and restored economic vitality to our Nation. Let us not squander our good fortunes.

The Blue Dog budget is a responsible and balanced plan. It pays down the national debt, the best tax cut for all Americans.

It protects Social Security and Medicare by enacting a strong lock box, and providing a cushion to ensure that missed estimates of the strength of the economy, projected surpluses, or the cost of tax cuts do not result in renewed deficit spending or borrowing from the Social Security and Medicare surpluses.

The Blue Dog budget maps out a higher level of defense spending. It funds improvements in education and respects the sacrifice of our veterans, and it funds plus-ups in agriculture, a key component of California's economy.

Unlike the GOP budget, the Blue Dog budget proposes a responsible approach to cutting taxes. It shapes what tax cuts we can afford, not the other way around.

I enthusiastically support the Blue Dog budget. It is responsible, fair, balanced, and honest. It is a framework for policy choices which will sustain our nation's economic prosperity.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), a member of the committee.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I do appreciate what the Blue Dogs are attempting to do. But I would remind Members that they are working off a 5-year plan. Frankly, in many respects I think we should be working off a 5-year plan. I think that is the right thing to do. Unfortunately, we are working off a 10-year plan; and it makes it very difficult for us to really do a comparison.

I do want to talk about a couple of things because I think they need to be addressed, because one of the things we have heard last night and we have heard in some of the debate so far today and I suspect we will hear again and that is that we are being reckless somehow that we cannot afford this large tax cut, that the budget numbers do not work.

When we had the Director of the Office of Management and Budget in front of the Committee on the Budget, he made a point that actually what we are using for projections in terms of revenue to the Federal Government over the next 10 years are very conservative. As a matter of fact, he told us that if revenue growth to the Federal Government simply averages what it has averaged for the last 40 years, we will not have a \$5.5 trillion surplus over the next 10 years, we will have a \$7.5 trillion budget. In fact, this is in response to clarify what he told us, I asked him this question: 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 our budget projections; is that correct? And the answer from

Mr. Daniels was, yes, sir, that is correct.

So the numbers we are working off of here today are incredibly conservative, and they also assume that we will probably have sometime in the next 10 years an economic slowdown, at least one.

But I want to come back to another point that we have heard a lot about today and probably will hear more about and that is that somehow this budget is being unfair to farmers.

□ 1300

I really think that is unfair to us, because I want to show the Members, for their benefit, when we passed the farm bill that we are currently operating under, we were saying that by the year 2002, the amount that would be spent on the baseline for the commodity programs would be somewhere between \$5 billion and \$7.5 billion.

Actually, we are going to spend a whole lot more than that. What we see here in this blue line is a declining baseline for the commodity programs. The green represents the marketing loan benefits which have been created because of a weak farm economy. The red bar shows how much is available or has been available in terms of emergency payments.

I represent farm country, and I do not care whether Members come from farm country or not, this Congress Republicans or Democrats from either side are simply not going to stand idly by and allow us to lose a generation of young farmers. That is not going to happen.

Here is what we have agreed to do with agriculture this year. First of all, we have given them, I think, a very generous baseline of \$19.1 billion. In addition to that, there will be available marketing loan payments as well.

But let me just show the Members what we do when we add this final bar. We have also told the agriculture community that we will make available up to \$8 billion in emergency payments this year. When we add it all together, to say that we are being less than fair to agriculture is less than generous.

In fact, agriculture is the only area where we are literally giving them three bites at the apple. We are giving them a generous baseline. We are saying if they have a bill by July 11, we will increase that. Finally, we are making available up to \$8 billion in emergency payments. I think that is fair, I think it is reasonable, and I think it is responsible.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds.

I would respond to the gentleman by saying the Blue Dog budget guarantees the numbers. The budget that is before us in the House today is very speculative, and depending on contingency funds that may or may not be there. These charts are irrelevant if the money is not there.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, the Blue Dog Democrats want the biggest tax cut we can afford, and we want it as soon as we can get it. American families need immediate tax cuts to put money into their pockets. They deserve tax cuts that fit within a responsible budget and that are paired with aggressive repayment of the national debt.

When shaping our tax cuts, we should be generous with the real surpluses that we have today, just as we should be cautious with the uncertain surplus projections that we only hope will occur 5 and 10 years from now.

The Blue Dog budget offers immediate tax relief. For every dollar in tax cuts in the Republican plan, the Blue Dog budget gives us \$4. That is four times the tax relief in our plan than in the Republican plan.

The Blue Dog budget fits significant tax relief into a budget that will not send us back into deficit spending or raid Social Security or Medicare. Our budget pays down the \$5.7 trillion national debt faster than any budget on the floor today.

We do more to be sure our children will not be left with a massive Federal debt. We do more to ensure that we do not continue to waste \$1 billion a day in just interest payments on our debt. We do more to prepare for the looming crisis in Social Security and Medicare that arises with the retirement of the baby-boom generation when the short-term surpluses in Social Security and Medicare of today turn into the long-term deficits of tomorrow.

We urge Members to seriously consider the Blue Dog plan. It will return us to a course of fiscal responsibility, restore credibility in our financial markets, and do the right thing for the American people and for our children.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON).

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation to the Blue Dogs for offering this substitute. It really enhances the debate. All of the substitutes have done that.

I do believe there are a number of fatal flaws in the Blue Dog substitute. One of the flaws that catches our attention like a mosquito biting our neck in the Ozark Hills is that the Blue Dog budget reduces the amount of money going to the taxpayers and increases the amount of money going to the government. That is the bottom line that is the difference that stands out more than anything else in the distinctions between the budgets.

The Blue Dog budget grows government at 5.4 percent. The budget coming out of the committee grows it at a 4 percent rate. The 5.4 percent growth of government is a greater increase than those on Social Security receive; it is more than workers receive on average across the country. It grows govern-

ment too much. So the choice is, we do not have to grow government that much, we can give more of it back to the taxpayer.

One of the gentlemen from my district told me that he does not need the government doing more for him, he needs the government taking less out of his paycheck. That is what the plan is in the budget that is presented.

The budget presented by the committee eliminates \$2.3 trillion in public debt by 2011, the right amount; \$64 billion in tax relief next year, and much of that will be accelerated with provisions for it to be accelerated; a 4.6 increase in defense spending; over a 7 percent increase in our Nation's veterans; an 11 percent increase in education; and it fully funds the Violence Against Women Act.

I think those are the right priorities for America. I believe they are the right priorities for my district, certainly because we increase spending only 4 percent across the board. There are areas that are not growing as much. The Department of Justice is one of those.

We have to make a balance. We have to present the right decision and the right priorities. I think the Committee on the Budget's proposal hits that right balance and sets the right priorities. I ask Members to support the committee's plan.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds.

I would correct the record, Mr. Chairman. I know the gentleman did not intend to misspeak, but the Blue Dog budget provides for a 5.4 percent increase in the first year, an average of 3.7 percent over the 5 years.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY).

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas for yielding time to me, and thank him also for his leadership in this matter and all of the hard work that he has put into the budgets over the years.

Mr. Chairman, there is no greater need in America that is unfulfilled than prescription drugs for our seniors. The Blue Dog budget provides \$92 billion over 5 years for real, defined, voluntary prescription drug benefits for Medicare. The Republican budget, however, over 10 years provides \$153 billion for an undefined prescription drug plan that is no more than pie in the sky, and they will take that money out of the Medicare Trust Fund to do it. This is not keeping the Medicare Trust Fund in a lockbox, as everyone loves to talk about. It is robbing Peter to pay Paul.

The Blue Dog budget also provides for more money for our hospitals, who continue to struggle. We get letters and calls every day about the difficult time our hospitals are having, particularly in rural areas.

So we have dealt honestly and fairly with these issues. We deal with health

care for our seniors in an appropriate way in this budget. I am very proud to support the Blue Dog budget, and encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do so.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. FLETCHER), a member of the Committee.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, as we look at the budget that we have passed out of the Committee on the Budget, I think it is a very balanced budget. It is not a perfect budget. I do not think there is a perfect budget that comes out of this body. There is always room for improvement or tweaking here and there.

One of the first things that I think is most important out of this budget is we find that it does give a tax refund. It understands that principle that it is not the government's money, it is the people's money.

I asked some of the Blue Dogs, where were they 2 years ago when we wanted to pass a tax bill, that we would have given tax money back to citizens? Where were they when we tried to override that veto? We would have been able to give that money. It would have been in the economy now, and possibly would have really ameliorated some of the decline we have seen in the economy thus far if they would have acted then.

I say that the tax relief they are talking about, they are about 2 years late. We have a tax relief plan that takes only 25 percent of the surplus and refunds that to the taxpayers. We also provide substantially for education, not just throwing money at education, but reforming the way education is done so we can leave no child behind, and make sure that we give every child in this country an opportunity to learn and take away that barrier from economic prosperity.

It modernizes Medicare and sets aside money. We can throw more money at prescription drugs or whatever, but we certainly budget a good amount for prescription drugs. Not only that, but we have some flexibility to modernize Medicare to meet the modern needs of health care, which include disease prevention and chronic disease management, which is not part of the Medicare system now. It needs updating. Medicare spending will double over the next 10 years. If we do not reform the system, we are not really going to be able to provide the health care we need.

Our budget addresses the uninsured, and provides several programs to make sure we can cover the uninsured.

This increases the funding for community health centers to make sure those folks who fall through the cracks can get the help they need. It allows families people who are disabled or have disabled members to buy into Medicaid. It allows increased funding for NIH and research.

I encourage Members to vote for the committee's budget.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds to respond by

saying the Blue Dogs were in exactly the same place 2 years ago that we are today; that is, we should fix Social Security and Medicare first, pay down the debt, and we should not obligate 100 percent of the projected surpluses on a yet-projected surplus into a tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, let me thank my good friend, the gentleman from Texas, for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, farmers in southern Indiana are not getting much for their corn and soybeans. It is not going to get any better any time soon. Southern Indiana farmers are the same as the farmers and ranchers across this Nation. They are experiencing tough times. Their only certainty is more uncertainty about the future.

Over the last 3 years, Congress has had to give farmers nearly \$25 billion in ad hoc emergency assistance. Without these emergency payments, they would not be in business today. American farmers produce the world's finest food. Stop and think about where we would be if we did not have family farmers working hard to give us a safe, secure, and abundant food supply.

It is time for Congress to be honest. Our farmers and ranchers should not have to depend on a wink and a nod, and then hope their income support payments appear in a supplemental bill. Instead, they should know what to expect now, this month, as they prepare for planting.

Various farm organizations have testified before the Committee on Agriculture. They have told us Congress needs to increase the agricultural baseline by as much as \$12 billion a year in the next farm bill. The majority's budget does not guarantee needed funding for agriculture. Instead, if agriculture is increased at all, it will have to compete with defense and other priorities for a limited amount of time in a so-called contingency fund.

Congress cannot do anything about uncertain weather conditions, but the Blue Dog budget does take some of the uncertainty out of farming. The Blue Dog budget follows the lead of farm groups and increases the mandatory spending baseline for agriculture by a total of \$57.1 billion over 5 years. That is \$57.1 billion more than the majority's budget. The Blue Dogs are responsible about budgeting, and they are realistic about the needs of America's farmers and ranchers.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER).

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, everybody within the sound of our voices here knows that we cannot have it all. We cannot have it both ways.

The Blue Dog budget basically says what we ought to do as a Nation is pay our debts, meet our needs in defense and other areas that have been talked

about this morning, and then give the money back to the people.

The Republican outlook is to give the money back over a 5- or 6-year phased-in tax cut based on 10-year numbers, the uncertainty of which is known to all of us in a very, very vivid and real way.

Our budget is a movie; the Republican budget is a preview of coming attractions. We have a real budget. If Members want to talk about tax cuts, we do four times this year the amount of tax cuts that the Republican budget does. If we want to talk about meeting our needs in defense, this year we provide \$7 billion in emergency supplemental to fully fund a pay raise, to fully fund housing allowances, to immediately address the crisis we all know we have about spare parts and maintenance.

We provide \$45 billion more over the CBO baseline in the next 5 years for defense, \$26 billion more than the Republican plan does; we fund the Murtha pay increase proposal; in short, all of the things that some of the folks over there talked about with regard to defense we actually do. We do not say, "Wait around a while and we will get to them when we can, but, first of all, we have to shove this money out of here, because if we do not, we are liable to spend it."

If Members look at our budget, it is truly a budget that we recommend to people.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I want to encourage all of my defense-oriented colleagues, Republican and Democrat, to support this budget. The Blue Dog budget would provide an additional \$48 billion over the President's request for the Department of Defense.

Just 1 year ago right now General Hugh Shelton appeared before the Committee on Armed Services and said that there was a \$100 billion shortfall in defense spending.

□ 1315

It has been echoed by the gentleman from California, (Mr. HUNTER), my colleague, they need the money. We really do not need a study to tell us that our planes are old; that there are over 900 30-year-old Huey helicopters in the Army's fleet today; that the fleet has shrunk by 74 ships since my Republican colleagues have taken over control of the House and the Senate.

We also do something we have never done as a Nation, and that is we have heard much about protecting Medicare and Social Security trust funds, we have not heard one word about protecting the military retiree trust funds.

Right now our Nation owes our military retiree trust fund \$163 billion. The

Blue Dog budget for the first time ever will protect those funds in a lockbox, much like Medicare and Social Security, so that those people who did so much for us will have their retirement check there for them when it comes due, rather than being a burden on future generations.

We have been pulling money out of the Department of Defense budget, but they have been spending it elsewhere. They have not been putting it aside for retirement pay. We protect those funds.

Lastly, as far as veterans' benefits, it is very sad to say, but statistically accurate that 1,300 World War II veterans are dying every day. We all know that about 90 percent of the health care costs for all of us will occur in the last 6 weeks of our lives.

Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry to say that those last sixes are coming for many of our World War II veterans. We would provide the funds to take care of our veterans with dignity in the last weeks of their lives, \$2.1 billion more than my Republican colleagues and spend \$10 billion more on the Montgomery GI bill benefit over the next 5 years than the Republican proposal.

I urge those of my colleagues who care about veterans, who care about defense, to support the Blue Dog budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, am I correct that the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) is ready to close?

Mr. NUSSLE. Yes.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Chairman, if I were a constituent sitting back home in West Texas watching this budget debate, I would be mighty confused by all the assertions and counterassertions which have already been made.

Each of the budgets offered obviously has merits and political benefits, but the bottom line is how those strengths compare to the weaknesses? What was left out?

It has been interesting to hear our budget criticized on defense when we provide more funds for defense.

It has been interesting to hear speaker after speaker say our budget was weak on education when we provide more for education.

It has been interesting to see how our budget is weak on agriculture, when we budget for agricultural matters, not depend on a contingency fund.

The weakness of the Republican budget which I find the most troubling is that the promises do not match honest numbers.

First, the oft-repeated myth that we are precariously close to retiring too much debt is laughable. Trust me, Congress will find a way to swerve if we find ourselves on the brink of that precipice.

Secondly, as the ranking member on the Committee on Agriculture, I find it

frightening that we are asked to bet the ranch on a contingency fund which has been promised not only to us, but to defense, prescription drugs, business groups wanting additional tax cuts, and I would point out the majority has already spent, spent the \$500 billion contingency fund on additional tax cuts with the rhetoric and the votes that they are forcing on this House.

The contingency fund is gone. That already overstretched contingency fund will not even be around if the projected surpluses fail to materialize its promise.

As a real-life farmer, I know that agriculture always entails some degree of risk, but given the economic depression we have been through lately, I find no security and an oversubscribed, undefined contingency fund.

Likewise, seniors are being asked to literally bet their farm when it comes to Social Security and Medicare. The alleged protection for those two programs disappears with just the slightest change in economic growth because the tax cuts already will have consumed any cushion those programs might need.

The promise of Medicare reform will be achieved only through deficit spending. Additional cuts on already stressed hospitals and nursing homes are significantly reduced by program solvency under the scenario created by the majority budget. It will be impossible to match my friend's rhetoric on Social Security modernization. Since their budget fails to set aside any on-budget surpluses to finance the transition reform to Social Security, and that is one of my most disappointing aspects of the Republican budget.

In contrast, the Blue Dog budget does not make promises it cannot keep or rely on numbers that are unrealistic or downright deceptive. We know that even 5-year projections much less 10-year projections are no reason to bet the farm.

We know that Americans have a variety of priorities which all must be balanced. We know that they want tax cuts, but not at the expense of their children and grandchildren.

We know that our veterans deserve fulfillment of the promises made to them. Seniors need health care and retirement security. Children need a good education.

I hope Members and constituents alike will look beyond the gloss of how a budget is advertised and consider what and who gets left behind.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Blue Dog budget.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond very briefly to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. Chairman, let me say to my friend from Texas, there is no one in this House that has put together more budgets than the gentleman from

Texas. I respect the quality of his work and I respect his concerns about the priorities we have laid out.

His budget is my second favorite. However, I support the committee mark and the Committee on the Budget, and I appreciate the tenor and the quality of the debate today with regard to the Blue Dog budget.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU), the vice chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

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

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to distill the facts, to clarify, to try to cut through some of this fog, as the Members from the minority have suggested, and I just want to review where we really are in this budget debate and talk about this alternative and where it falls short.

The Republican budget proposal pays down as much debt as we can over the next 10 years. I am not arguing that it pays down too much. I do not think we should spend too much time to talk about whether we should pay down \$2.4 trillion or \$2.5 trillion.

The fact is, we have paid down \$600 billion in debt. We will keep paying down debt, and this sets aside funds to do it throughout the 10 years of this budget proposal.

Of course, we have tax relief. As the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. FLETCHER) pointed out, we give 25 percent to 28 percent of the surplus back to the taxpayers. I will talk more about that in just a moment.

We strengthen funding for education and for national defense. Of course, we set aside funds for Social Security and Medicare. The suggestion was that creating reserve accounts for Medicare or reserve accounts for Social Security was somehow part of a conspiracy or it was risky.

I think that is ridiculous. We have never created a reserve account like this in the history of our government. I think it makes common sense. Any one that does a budget at home understands that simple fact.

Is the difference between these two budgets about agriculture? I do not think so. We could take a guess at a funding level for agriculture, but I do not think that is good policy.

We allow the budget chair to come back and make amendments and address agricultural issues as they come out of committee.

Is this about defense spending? I do not think so. We make sure that once we have a review from Secretary Rumsfeld we can deal with those needs in an immediate way and treat the men and women in our Armed Services with the equipment and the resources they need.

What is the difference and the distinction really about? It is about taxes. Clearly and simple, it is about taxes. We put roughly 28 percent of the surpluses back in the pockets of working

men and women across the country. We cut taxes for everyone that pay income taxes.

Twenty-eight percent of the surpluses, does this alternative give 28 percent of the surplus back? No. Does it give back 25 percent? No. Does it give back 15 percent of the surplus? No. How about 10 percent? It does not even do that. It gives back less than 10 percent of the surplus to the men and women who are being overcharged today.

Why? What is the excuse? I could not tell you exactly what the excuse is. But the minority and, in particular, those that crafted this budget today have found every reason under the sun to oppose budget resolutions that contain tax relief in them.

First, they said you cannot cut taxes. We have not balanced the budget; that was just 4 years ago when I was first elected to Congress. We balanced the budget, and we did it while cutting taxes.

Then they said we cannot support the tax cut in your budget resolution, because we have not set aside every penny of Social Security. Three years ago, we did just that. Then they suggested you have to set aside Medicare. We did that. Now, they are saying we have to pay down every penny of the debt. What is the excuse now?

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject this excuse for a budget alternative and support the Republican platform.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the budget resolution reported by the committee and to support the Blue Dog budget alternative.

The Republican budget is completely inadequate. It is inadequate in its treatment of priorities that this House has time and time again said are important. It is inadequate in its treatment of our senior citizens. It is inadequate in its treatment of agriculture. It is inadequate in its treatment of defense. It is inadequate in its treatment of education. And it is inadequate in its treatment of the national debt.

The Republican budget is an exercise in fuzzy math. They have based their numbers on 10-year projections. These types of projections have proven time and time again to be completely inaccurate. In fact, just yesterday, we learned that the Administration now plans to spread their tax cut over 11 years instead of 10 because of the uncertainty of the numbers. The Comptroller General has testified that "no one should design tax or spending policies pegged to the precise numbers in any 10-year forecast." We simply should not gamble our parents' and our children's futures on such uncertainty. The Blue Dog budget does not. The Blue Dog budget is a five year budget and is far more reliable than the 10-year Republican budget.

The Social Security and Medicare surpluses are already committed to paying benefits we have promised our seniors. But the Republicans would raid those surpluses and shorten the solvency of both, thereby eventually requiring either severe benefit cuts or tax increases.

Not only do they not provide any additional resources for Social Security reform beyond

the funds already committed to Social Security, they would privatize Social Security and invest a portion of the trust fund in the stock market—something we should all question after the performance of the stock market in the last couple of weeks. In contrast, the Blue Dog budget allocates an additional \$350 billion from the on-budget surplus that would be available to finance reforms to make the Social Security system financially sound for future generations without affecting current and near retirees.

The Republican budget makes a mockery of the need to provide prescription drug coverage for our seniors. They actually propose to pay for prescription drugs out of the Hospital Insurance trust fund and take money away from hospitals and/or make the Medicare HI trust fund go broke sooner. In contrast, the Blue Dog budget saves 100% of the Medicare HI trust fund to provide benefits promised under current law. We set aside half of the surplus outside Social Security and Medicare for debt reduction, which will have the effect of protecting the Medicare trust fund from being raided even if the surplus projections deteriorate.

The Republican budget would harm the hard-working farmers in my district. They would force important agriculture programs to compete with defense, prescription drugs, and other priorities for limited funds in the strategic reserve that could be wiped out if the tax cut exceeds \$1.62 trillion or surplus projections deteriorate—either or both of which seem likely under current conditions. In contrast, the Blue Dog budget would provide \$9 billion in assistance payments to farmers this fiscal year and increases the agriculture baseline by \$12 billion for each subsequent year. These funds would be available to improve farm income, conservation, export, rural development, and research programs as recommended by the farm and commodity organizations.

The Republican budget provides less than half of the defense funding the Blue Dog budget would provide. The Republicans have chosen to play a dangerous game with our national defense by providing minimal funding for defense programs in this budget and waiting to make the tough decisions. When they get ready to decide defense spending priorities, those priorities will have to compete with agriculture, prescription drugs, and other priorities for limited funds in the "strategic reserve." Never mind that this reserve could be wiped out if the tax cut exceeds \$1.62 trillion or surplus projections deteriorate—both of which are strong possibilities.

The Republican budget does nothing to meet the President's stated goal of leaving no child behind. It barely increases education funding above inflation! It would not continue to progress we have made on smaller class sizes. It would not provide adequate funding to restore dilapidated schools and build new schools. It would not address many of the education priorities that we have identified in recent years. In contrast, the Blue Dog budget would allow for an increase in the maximum Pell Grant award and provide funding to help schools meet the increased accountability of education reform, comply with IDEA, and meet other local needs.

Furthermore, the Blue Dog budget provides funding specifically for the Hunger Relief Act, a program to increase nutritional assistance to

low-income working families with children. Studies have shown that children who come to school hungry don't learn at their full capacity. By providing nutritional assistance, we help children to learn.

Finally, the Republican budget shows that they are not serious about debt reduction. They would leave too much debt for our children to pay off. They do not allocate one dime of the on-budget surplus outside of Social Security and Medicare to debt reduction in the first five years. That means that all of their debt reduction would occur in years 6–10—the time when the surplus projections are most unreliable. In contrast, the Blue Dog budget devotes half of the on-budget surplus outside of Social Security and Medicare—\$370 billion over the next five years—to reducing the publicly held debt. We would reduce the publicly held debt by more than half over the next five years—from a projected \$3.148 trillion at the end of FY 2001 to \$1.57 trillion at the end of FY 2006.

Mr. Chairman, the priorities reflected in the Republican budget simply are not the priorities of the American people. I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting the Blue Dog budget and rejecting the Republican budget.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Blue Dog budget which balances fiscal responsibility with the need to adequately fund programs addressing our national priorities and needs. The Blue Dog budget is a responsible plan that balances the budget, retires public debt, and provides modest tax cuts without tapping into the Social Security trust fund. Unlike the Republican plan, it does not foolishly drive our budget back into the red with massive and unnecessary tax cuts for the wealthy.

Mr. Chairman, I am particularly pleased the Blue Dog budget provides needed funding to expand the Montgomery G.I. Bill in accordance with H.R. 320, the Montgomery G.I. Bill Improvements Act which I, along with my colleague LANE EVANS, introduced earlier this year. It also provides funds to pay for a substantial military pay raise and improve the veterans' and military retirees' health care system.

The Armed Forces face serious recruiting problems. In order to meet our defense needs, the Armed Forces must have the tools it needs to draw men and women into uniform. The Montgomery G.I. Bill has proven to be the military's most valuable recruiting tool. Unfortunately, the combination of a substantially devalued G.I. Bill and expanded federal financial assistance to college-bound students without military service has crippled the G.I. Bill's effectiveness.

Recent recruiting gimmicks such as psychedelic humvees, Spike Lee advertisements, drag racers, or desperate cash giveaways are not the answer to these problems. Nor is conscription. Congress would best help our Armed Forces by improving the G.I. Bill. Providing access to higher education in exchange for national service is the right thing to do. A strong G.I. Bill helps veterans and their families, aids our national defense, and strengthens the economy.

The Montgomery GI Bill Expansion Act (H.R. 320) will ensure that our All-Volunteer Armed Forces has the ability to attract recruits, and, at the same time, provide veterans with the skills they need to better our economy and their lives. The Blue Dog budget wisely

provides funding to expand the G.I. Bill in line with H.R. 320 and will restore the MGB's value both as a meaningful readjustment benefit and an effective recruiting incentive.

Mr. Chairman, the Blue Dog budget is good for America's veterans and soldiers and is a solid blueprint for our nation's future. Unlike the Republican budget that would foolishly squander the surplus, the responsible Blue Dog budget pays down the national debt and provides sensible tax relief. It will put the nation on a course to cut the publicly held debt in half by 2006 with a strong, immediate commitment to debt reduction rather than return us to deficit spending.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to do the right thing for veterans, soldiers and our nation's future. Vote for the Blue Dog budget.

Mr. PHELPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Republican Budget Resolution for fiscal year 2002 and in favor of the Substitute offered by Mr. STENHOLM on behalf of the Blue Dog Coalition.

I support the Blue Dog Budget because it is based on real, not projected, surpluses and presents a balanced, honest view to meeting our many budget concerns. The Blue Dog Budget builds on the fiscal progress we have made in the past few years, but provides needed tax relief and priority funding for education, health, and agriculture.

I will not support the Republican Resolution simply because it is not credible. The majority's plan is built on thin air. It promises everything: large tax cuts, debt pay down, protection of Social Security and Medicare, and continued spending. But, the catch is it is based on surpluses that do not and may not ever exist. It relies on 10 year budget projections that even the new Secretary of the Treasury says are unreliable. If the economy slows, as it is already doing, this budget will force us to borrow from Social Security, cut spending and stop paying down national debt.

In contrast the Blue Dog Budget Resolution operates on a more conservative five year cycle and preserves the balanced budget while paying down the debt, providing for meaningful tax relief, and honestly meeting our spending priorities.

The Blue Dog Budget does not squander the progress we have made paying down the debt. In fact, it provides \$375 billion more debt reduction than the Republican plan.

The Blue Dog Budget provides immediate and fair tax relief. In fact, it allows for \$23 billion in immediate tax relief for 2001, four times the amount of the majority's budget.

The Blue Dog Budget does not drastically cut critical spending or use gimmicks and emergency funding to balance the budget. In fact, the Blue Dog budget establishes realistic discretionary spending caps which will restrain spending but also provide room to fund new initiatives without relying on unspecified or unrealistic spending. It also does not rely on an overly-committed contingency fund to address necessary agriculture and defense needs.

In short, the Blue Dog Budget is honest where the majority proposal is not. The Blue Dog Budget is credible, where the Republican plan is not. Most importantly, the Blue Dog budget is responsible and the other plan is not.

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, as Ranking Member of the House Conservation Subcommittee, I cannot remain silent in the face of the inadequacy of the funding for agriculture in the budget presented by the majority.

Conservation programs are already facing a shortfall in funding, while the precious lands which are our original heritage, are ravaged by erosion, fire, pestilence, and many other dangers.

The Conservation Reserve Program needs to grow, and the Wetlands Reserve Program is deeply underfunded by the sum of \$569 million. The Environmental Quality Incentives Program needs to be nearly doubled in acreage, and the essential Farmland Protection Program needs to more than double.

These programs allow our farmers to participate in restoring our great nation's resources to a healthy state while keeping the farmers solvent. Conservation is a win/win matter, and the majority budget fails to meet the needs of the American people and our lands. I strongly support the agriculture provisions of the Blue Dogs budget and call upon all members who want to preserve and restore the health of our landmass to support them.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 204, noes 221, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 67]

AYES—204

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
DeFazio
DeLaunt
DeLauro

Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Duncan
Edwards
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank
Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)

Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Klecza
LaFalce
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender
McDonald
Miller, George
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal

Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo

Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Scarborough
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shimkus
Shows
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm

Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Turner
Udall (CO)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Wamp
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—221

Aderholt
Akin
Army
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilirakis
Blunt
Boehrlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Coble
Collins
Combest
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeGette
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Doolittle
Dreier
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
English
Evans
Everett
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gillman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham

Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hansen
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy (MN)
Kerns
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Paul

Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reynolds
Riley
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schaffer
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Sherwood
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Strickland
Stump
Sunnunu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Townes
Traffant
Udall (NM)
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Waters
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—7

Baldwin Mink Sisisky
 Becerra Rothman
 Lampson Shaw

□ 1347

Messrs. CALLAHAN, LEWIS of California, OTTER, TOOMEY, COOKSEY, BRYANT and MORAN of Kansas changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. BARRETT of Wisconsin, BROWN of Ohio, CONYERS, BLAGOJEVICH, CUMMINGS, DUNCAN, MOLLOHAN, WAMP and Ms. WOOLSEY and Ms. MCKINNEY changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall Nos. 65, 66 and 67 I was absent due to a family medical emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall No. 65 and “no” on rollcall Nos. 66 and 67.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 107–30.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. FLAKE:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002.

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001 is hereby revised and replaced and that this is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2002 and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2003 through 2011 are hereby set forth.

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2011:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,537,500,000,000
 Fiscal year 2002: \$1,601,500,000,000
 Fiscal year 2003: \$1,658,100,000,000
 Fiscal year 2004: \$1,726,300,000,000
 Fiscal year 2005: \$1,802,800,000,000
 Fiscal year 2006: \$1,851,600,000,000
 Fiscal year 2007: \$1,908,700,000,000
 Fiscal year 2008: \$1,988,800,000,000
 Fiscal year 2009: \$2,066,200,000,000
 Fiscal year 2010: \$2,147,300,000,000
 Fiscal year 2011: \$2,225,900,000,000

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be reduced are as follows:

Fiscal year 2001: \$93,000,000,000
 Fiscal year 2002: \$102,000,000,000
 Fiscal year 2003: \$124,000,000,000
 Fiscal year 2004: \$138,000,000,000
 Fiscal year 2005: \$147,000,000,000
 Fiscal year 2006: \$188,000,000,000
 Fiscal year 2007: \$227,000,000,000
 Fiscal year 2008: \$254,000,000,000

Fiscal year 2009: \$294,000,000,000

Fiscal year 2010: \$342,000,000,000

Fiscal year 2011: \$393,000,000,000

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,554,200,000,000
 Fiscal year 2002: \$1,597,400,000,000
 Fiscal year 2003: \$1,642,500,000,000
 Fiscal year 2004: \$1,701,700,000,000
 Fiscal year 2005: \$1,777,600,000,000
 Fiscal year 2006: \$1,823,000,000,000
 Fiscal year 2007: \$1,884,200,000,000
 Fiscal year 2008: \$1,963,200,000,000
 Fiscal year 2009: \$2,038,800,000,000
 Fiscal year 2010: \$2,120,600,000,000
 Fiscal year 2011: \$2,208,500,000,000

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,502,700,000,000
 Fiscal year 2002: \$1,564,400,000,000
 Fiscal year 2003: \$1,612,100,000,000
 Fiscal year 2004: \$1,672,800,000,000
 Fiscal year 2005: \$1,750,000,000,000
 Fiscal year 2006: \$1,791,200,000,000
 Fiscal year 2007: \$1,851,300,000,000
 Fiscal year 2008: \$1,934,300,000,000
 Fiscal year 2009: \$2,010,500,000,000
 Fiscal year 2010: \$2,094,800,000,000
 Fiscal year 2011: \$2,176,500,000,000

(4) SURPLUSES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the surpluses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2001: \$34,800,000,000
 Fiscal year 2002: \$37,100,000,000
 Fiscal year 2003: \$46,000,000,000
 Fiscal year 2004: \$53,500,000,000
 Fiscal year 2005: \$52,800,000,000
 Fiscal year 2006: \$59,900,000,000
 Fiscal year 2007: \$57,400,000,000
 Fiscal year 2008: \$54,500,000,000
 Fiscal year 2009: \$55,700,000,000
 Fiscal year 2010: \$52,500,000,000
 Fiscal year 2011: \$49,400,000,000

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2001: \$5,656,000,000,000
 Fiscal year 2002: \$5,641,900,000,000
 Fiscal year 2003: \$5,692,400,000,000
 Fiscal year 2004: \$5,736,600,000,000
 Fiscal year 2005: \$5,793,300,000,000
 Fiscal year 2006: \$5,889,600,000,000
 Fiscal year 2007: \$6,395,300,000,000
 Fiscal year 2008: \$6,985,500,000,000
 Fiscal year 2009: \$7,629,900,000,000
 Fiscal year 2010: \$8,687,200,000,000
 Fiscal year 2011: \$9,543,400,000,000

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and budget outlays for fiscal years 2003 through 2011 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$310,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$300,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$349,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$344,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$362,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$354,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$369,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$360,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$379,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$374,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$390,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$381,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$401,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$389,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$412,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$404,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$423,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$416,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$435,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$428,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$435,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$428,400,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$20,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$20,600,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$20,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$20,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$23,000,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2001:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, —\$100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$1,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, —\$2,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$3,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, —\$800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$2,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, —\$800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$2,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, —\$800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$2,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, —\$700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$2,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, —\$1,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, —\$1,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, —\$1,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, —\$100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$1,400,000,000.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment
(300):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, \$28,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$26,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, \$23,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$23,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$23,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$24,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$24,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$24,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$24,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$24,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$24,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$24,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$25,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$25,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$26,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$25,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$26,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$26,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$27,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$26,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$28,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$27,200,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, \$26,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$23,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, \$19,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$17,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$18,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$17,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$18,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$17,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$18,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$16,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$17,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$16,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$14,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$15,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$14,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$15,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$14,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$15,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$14,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$14,700,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, \$2,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, \$6,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$4,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$7,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$11,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$7,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$11,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$7,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$11,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$6,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$12,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$8,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$12,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$8,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$13,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$8,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$15,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$10,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$12,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$3,800,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, \$62,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$51,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, \$61,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$55,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$58,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$56,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$58,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$58,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$59,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$59,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$59,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$61,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$60,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$62,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$60,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$64,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$61,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$65,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$61,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$67,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$62,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$68,800,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development
(450):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, \$11,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$11,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, \$9,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$10,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$9,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$9,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$9,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$9,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$9,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$9,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$10,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$9,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$10,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$9,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$10,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$9,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$10,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$9,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$11,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$10,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$11,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$10,400,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and
Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, \$76,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$69,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, \$77,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$72,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$77,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$77,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$79,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$78,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$82,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$79,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, \$84,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$82,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$86,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$83,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$88,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$85,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$90,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$87,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$92,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$90,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$94,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$91,400,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, \$180,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$173,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, \$189,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$187,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$208,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$205,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$223,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$222,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$240,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$238,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, \$276,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$274,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, \$297,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$295,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$318,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$316,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$343,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$341,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$370,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$368,800,000,000.
 (12) Medicare (570):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$217,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$214,400,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$229,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$225,700,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$243,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$240,300,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$260,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$256,900,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$283,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$279,800,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$297,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$293,100,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$322,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$319,200,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$347,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$343,300,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$374,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$370,100,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$404,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$400,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$435,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$431,700,000,000.
 (13) Income Security (600):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$256,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$257,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$265,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$265,700,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$275,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$275,600,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$286,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$285,100,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$300,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$298,900,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$307,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$306,100,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$314,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$312,600,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$328,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$326,900,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$339,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$337,500,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$349,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$348,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$360,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$358,400,000,000.
 (14) Social Security (650)
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,800,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,700,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,500,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,300,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$14,200,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,200,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,200,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,500,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,900,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,400,000,000.
 (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$45,900,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$52,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$51,600,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$53,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$52,800,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$55,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$54,900,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$59,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$58,900,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$58,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$58,300,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$58,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$57,700,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$62,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$61,600,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$63,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$63,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$64,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$64,400,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$67,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$66,700,000,000.
 (16) Administration of Justice (750):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$28,600,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,300,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,300,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,900,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,400,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,200,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$35,100,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$35,900,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,700,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,000,000,000.
 (17) General Government (800):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,900,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,800,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,200,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,100,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,100,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,400,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,300,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,700,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,400,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,800,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,800,000,000.
 (18) Net Interest (900):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$278,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$278,600,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$260,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$260,600,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$260,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$260,100,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$255,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$255,500,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$249,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$249,400,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$243,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$243,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$237,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$237,500,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$236,600,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$236,600,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$233,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$233,300,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$230,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$230,400,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$229,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$229,100,000,000.
 (19) Allowances (920):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, —\$500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, —\$300,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$100,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$600,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,200,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,200,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,300,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,200,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,500,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, —\$38,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$38,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, —\$42,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$42,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, —\$52,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$52,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, —\$53,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$53,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, —\$45,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$45,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, —\$46,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$46,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, —\$48,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$48,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, —\$49,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$49,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, —\$50,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$50,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, —\$51,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$51,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, —\$53,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$53,300,000,000.

SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

(a) SUBMISSIONS BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS FOR TAX RELIEF.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall—

(1) report to the House a reconciliation bill—
(A) not later than May 2, 2001;
(B) not later than May 23, 2001; and
(C) not later than June 20, 2001; and
(2) submit to the Committee on the Budget recommendations pursuant to section (c)(2)(F)(ii) not later than September 11, 2001; that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the total level of revenues by not more than
\$93,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2001,
\$102,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2002,
\$124,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2003,
\$138,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2004,
\$147,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2005,
\$188,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2006, and
\$2,302,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal year 2001 through 2011.

(b) SUBMISSIONS BY HOUSE COMMITTEES ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE AND WAYS AND MEANS FOR MEDICARE REFORM AND PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.—(1) Not later than July 24, 2001, the House Committees named in paragraph (2) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(2)(A) The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to increase outlays, as follows: \$0 for the period of fiscal year 2001 through 2011.

(B) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its

jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to increase outlays, as follows: \$0 for the period of fiscal year 2001 through 2011.

(c) OTHER SUBMISSIONS BY HOUSE COMMITTEES.—(1) Not later than September 11, 2001, the House Committees named in paragraph (2) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(2)(A) The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to increase outlays, as follows: \$0 for fiscal year 2001, \$0 for fiscal year 2002, \$0 for fiscal year 2003, \$0 for fiscal year 2004, \$0 for fiscal year 2005, \$0 for fiscal year 2006, and \$0 for the period of fiscal year 2001 through 2011.

(B) The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to increase outlays, as follows: \$0 for fiscal year 2001, \$0 for fiscal year 2002, \$0 for fiscal year 2003, \$0 for fiscal year 2004, \$0 for fiscal year 2005, \$0 for fiscal year 2006, and \$0 for the period of fiscal year 2001 through 2011.

(C) The House Committee on Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce revenues, as follows: \$0 for fiscal year 2001, \$139,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, \$101,000,000 for fiscal year 2003, \$92,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, \$96,000,000 for fiscal year 2005, \$101,000,000 for fiscal year 2006, and \$1,112,000,000 for the period of fiscal year 2001 through 2011.

(D) The House Committee on Government Reform shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce outlays, as follows: \$0 for fiscal year 2001, \$0 for fiscal year 2002, \$0 for fiscal year 2003, \$0 for fiscal year 2004, \$0 for fiscal year 2005, \$0 for fiscal year 2006, and \$0 for the period of fiscal year 2001 through 2011.

(E) The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to increase outlays, as follows: \$0 for fiscal year 2001, \$264,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, \$479,000,000 for fiscal year 2003, \$761,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, \$816,000,000 for fiscal year 2005, \$885,000,000 for fiscal year 2006, and \$7,087,000,000 for the period of fiscal year 2001 through 2011.

(F)(i) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to increase outlays, as follows: \$0 for fiscal year 2001, \$0 for fiscal year 2002, \$0 for fiscal year 2003, \$0 for fiscal year 2004, \$0 for fiscal year 2005, \$0 for fiscal year 2006, and \$0 for the period of fiscal year 2001 through 2011.

(ii) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the total level of revenues as specified in subsection (a).

(d) SPECIAL RULES.—In the House, if any bill reported pursuant to subsection (a) or subsection (c)(2)(F)(ii), amendment thereto or conference report thereon, has refundable tax provisions that increase outlays, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the amount of new budget authority provided by such provisions (and outlays following therefrom) allocated to the Committee on Ways and Means and adjust the revenue levels set forth in such subsection accordingly such that the increase in outlays and reduction in revenue resulting from such bill does not exceed the amounts specified in subsection (a) or subsection (c)(2)(F)(ii), as applicable.

SEC. 5. RESERVE FUND FOR EMERGENCIES.

(a) ADJUSTMENTS FOR EMERGENCIES.—In the House, after the reporting of a bill or joint resolution by the Committee on Appropriations, the offering of an amendment thereto, or the submission of a conference report thereon, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall increase the allocation of new budget authority and outlays under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for fiscal year 2002 by the amount provided by that measure for an emergency that the chairman so determines and certifies. Adjustments to such allocation made under this subsection may be made only for amounts for emergencies in excess of \$1,923,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2002 and the total of any such adjustments for such fiscal year shall not exceed \$5,600,000,000 in new budget authority.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section:

(1) The term 'emergency' means a situation (other than a threat to national security) that—

(A) requires new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) to prevent the imminent loss of life or property or in response to the loss of life or property; and

(B) is unanticipated.

(2) The term 'unanticipated' means that the underlying situation is—

(A) sudden, which means quickly coming into being or not building up over time;

(B) urgent, which means a pressing and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(C) unforeseen, which means not predicted or anticipated as an emerging need; and

(D) temporary, which means not of a permanent duration.

(c) DEVELOPMENT OF GUIDELINES.—As soon as practicable, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House shall, after consulting with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House, publish in the Congressional Record guidelines for application of the definition of emergency set forth in subsection (b).

(d) COMMITTEE EXPLANATION OF EMERGENCY LEGISLATION.—Whenever the Committee on Appropriations of the House (including a committee of conference) reports any bill or joint resolution that provides new budget authority for any emergency, the report accompanying that bill or joint resolution (or the joint explanatory statement of managers in the case of a conference report on any such bill or joint resolution) shall explain the reasons such amount designated under section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1974 falls within the definition of emergency set forth in subsection (b) pursuant to the guidelines published under subsection (c).

(e) CBO REPORT ON THE BUDGET.—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall include in each report submitted under section 202(e)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 the average annual enacted levels of discretionary budget authority and the resulting outlays for emergencies for the 5 fiscal years preceding the fiscal year of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget.

(f) SECTION 314(b)(1) ADJUSTMENT.—Section 314(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall not apply in the House—

(1) for fiscal year 2001; or

(2) for fiscal year 2002 or any subsequent fiscal year, except for emergencies affecting national security.

SEC. 6. RESERVE FUND FOR RETIREMENT SECURITY.

Whenever the Committee on Ways and Means of the House reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto is offered (in the House), or a conference report

thereon is submitted that enhances retirement security through structural programmatic reform and the creation of personal retirement accounts, provided that such accounts are funded from the taxes currently collected for the purpose of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Program, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may—

(1) increase the appropriate allocations and aggregates of new budget authority and outlays by the amount of new budget authority provided by such measure (and outlays flowing therefrom) for that purpose;

(2) reduce the revenue aggregates by the amount of the revenue loss resulting from that measure for that purpose; and

(3) make all other appropriate and conforming adjustments.

SEC. 7. RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE REFORM AND COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 4(b).

Whenever the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce report a bill in compliance with Section 4(b) of this Concurrent Resolution that achieves long-term Medicare reform and provides for an expanded prescription drug benefit, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget may—

(1) increase the appropriate allocations and aggregates of new budget authority and outlays by the amount of new budget authority provided by such measure (and outlays flowing therefrom) for that purpose provided that:

a. for the period of fiscal year 2001 through 2011 the increase in new budget authority is \$0; and

b. the increase for any one fiscal year does not exceed the amount of surplus credited in that fiscal year to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund;

(2) make all other appropriate conforming adjustments.

SEC. 8. CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES RESULTING FROM REALISTIC SCORING OF MEASURES AFFECTING REVENUES.

(a) Whenever the House considers a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion or conference report, including measures filed in compliance with Section 4 of this Concurrent Resolution, that propose to change federal revenues the impact of such measure on federal revenues shall be calculated by the Joint Committee on Taxation in a manner that takes into account:

(1) the impact of the proposed revenue changes on:

- i. Gross Domestic Product, including the growth rate for the Gross Domestic Product;
- ii. total Domestic Employment;
- iii. Gross Private Domestic Investment;
- iv. General Price Index;
- v. Interest Rates;
- vi. Other economic variables; and

(2) the impact on Federal Revenue of the changes in economic variables analyzed under subpart (1) of this paragraph.

(b) The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make any necessary changes to allocations and aggregates in order to conform this Concurrent Resolution with the determinations made by the Joint Committee on Taxation pursuant to paragraph (a) of this Section.

SEC. 9. PROMOTION OF ECONOMIC GROWTH AND COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 4(a) OF THIS CONCURRENT RESOLUTION.

When reporting to the House reconciliation measures in compliance with Section 4(a) of this Concurrent Resolution, the Ways and Means Committee shall not report legislation, which:

(1) proposes to provide a graduated or phased-in reduction over time in—

- (a) Individual income tax rates;
- (b) Corporate tax rates; or

(c) The rate of taxes collected on the proceeds from investments, including taxes collected on capital gains; or

(2) conditions any changes in tax law upon the achievement of some level of:

- (a) Federal Revenue,
- (b) Federal Surplus, or
- (c) Level of Public Debt.

SEC. 10. RESERVE FUND FOR ADDITIONAL TAX CUTS AND DEBT REDUCTION.

If the report provided pursuant to section 202(e)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the budget and economic outlook: update (for fiscal years 2002 through 2011), estimates an on-budget surplus for any of fiscal years 2001 through 2011 that exceeds the estimated on-budget surplus set forth in the Congressional Budget Office's January 2001 budget and economic outlook for such fiscal year, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House may, in an amount not to exceed the increase in such surplus for that fiscal year—

(1) reduce the recommended level of Federal revenues and make other appropriate adjustments (including the reconciliation instructions) for that fiscal year;

(2) reduce the appropriate level of the public debt, increase the amount of the surplus, and make other appropriate adjustments for that fiscal year; or

(3) any combination of paragraphs (1) and (2).

SEC. 11. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution—

(1) the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives; and

(2) such chairman, as applicable, may make any other necessary adjustments to such levels to carry out this resolution.

SEC. 12. COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 1301 OF THE BUDGET ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1990.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 1301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocation under section 302(a) of such Act to the Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—In the House, for purposes of applying section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any discretionary amounts provided for the Social Security Administration.

SEC. 13. RESTRICTIONS ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

For purposes of title III of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, advance appropri-

tions shall be scored as new budget authority for the fiscal year in which the appropriations are enacted, except that advance appropriations in excess of the levels specified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this resolution for programs, projects, activities or accounts identified in such joint statement shall continue to be scored as new budget authority in the year in which they first become available for obligation.

SEC. 14. ACTION PURSUANT TO SECTION 302(b)(1) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT.

(a) COMPLIANCE.—When complying with Section 302(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Committee on Appropriations of each House shall consult with the Committee on Appropriations of the other House to ensure that the allocation of budget outlays and new budget authority among each Committee's subcommittees are identical.

(b) REPORT.—The Committee on Appropriations of each House shall report to its House when it determines that the report made by the Committee pursuant to Section 301(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the report made by the Committee on Appropriations of the other House pursuant to the same provision contain identical allocations of budget outlays and new budget authority among each Committee's subcommittees.

(c) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report providing new discretionary budget authority for Fiscal Year 2002 allocated to the Committee on Appropriations unless and until the Committee on Appropriations of that House has made the report required under paragraph (b) of this Section.

SEC. 15. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING THE ENFORCEMENT OF CLAUSE 2(a)(1) OF RULE XXI OF THE RULES OF THE HOUSE

(a) Congress finds that:

(1) Each year, the House Appropriations Committee provides funding to hundreds of programs whose authorization has expired or were never authorized by an Act of Congress.

(2) For Fiscal Year 2002, there were over 200 programs funded in 112 laws totaling over \$112 billion whose authorization had expired.

(3) According to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), the largest amount for a single program is for veterans medical care, which was last authorized in 1998 and totals over \$20.3 billion. Funding for the economic support and development assistance programs was last authorized in 1987 by the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985 and totals just over \$7.8 billion in 2001 and much of the appropriation provided for the Department of Justice in 2001, which totals over \$16.8 billion, is unauthorized.

(4) Rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives prohibits the funding of an appropriation, which has not been authorized by law.

(5) The House Rules Committee typically waives Rule XXI when considering general appropriation bills.

(6) The respective authorizing committees have not made reauthorization of unauthorized programs a priority.

(7) The lack of congressional oversight over the years, as far back in 1979, has led to the deterioration of the power of the respective authorizing Committees and thus the loss of congressional oversight and fiscal responsibility, which is a blow to the voters of America and their role in the process.

(8) The lack of congressional oversight over the years has led to the shift of power away from the Legislative Branch toward

the Executive Branch and unelected federal bureaucrats.

(b) It is the sense of the Congress that:

(1) The House of Representatives and the Senate give priority to the authorization of expired programs, with an emphasis on federal programs which have been expired for more than five years.

(2) Congress should pass, and the President should sign into law, legislation to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to require Congress to fund programs that are currently unauthorized at 90 percent of prior fiscal year levels.

(3) Congress should pass, and the President should sign into law, legislation to require the Congressional Budget Office to prepare budget baselines based on the figures where unauthorized programs are frozen and funded at 90 percent of current levels.

SEC. 16. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING DEPARTMENT AND AGENCY AUDITS AND WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Each branch of government and every department and agency has a fiduciary responsibility to ensure that tax dollars are spent in the most efficient and effective manner possible and to eliminate mismanagement, waste, fraud, and abuse.

(2) A minimal measure of whether a department or agency is upholding its fiduciary responsibility is its ability to pass an audit.

(3) The most recent audits for Fiscal Year 1999 revealed that nine major agencies—the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, Education, Housing and Urban Development, Justice, and Treasury and the Agency for International Development, Environmental Protection Agency, and Office of Personnel Management—could not provide clean financial statements.

(4) Mismanagement, waste, fraud, and abuse cost American taxpayers billions of dollars.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that no agency or department which has failed its most recent audit should receive an increase in their budget over the previous year, unless the availability of the increased funds is contingent upon the completion of a clean audit.

SEC. 17. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE USE OF FEDERAL SURPLUS FUNDS TO INVEST IN PRIVATE SECURITIES.

It is the Sense of Congress that Congress should pass, and the President should sign into law, legislation codifying a general prohibition on the use of Federal surplus by the Secretary of the Treasury to make investments in securities (within the meaning of the securities laws of the United States) other than government securities.

SEC. 18. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON FULLY FUNDING SPECIAL EDUCATION.

(a) Congress finds that—

(1) all children deserve a quality education, including children with disabilities;

(2) the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act provides that the Federal, State and local governments are to share in the expense of educating children with disabilities and commits the Federal Government to pay up to 40 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure for children with disabilities;

(3) the high cost of educating children with disabilities and the Federal Government's failure to fully meet its obligation under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act stretches limited State and local education funds, creating difficulty in providing a quality education to all students, including children with disabilities;

(4) the current level of Federal funding to States and localities under the Individuals

with Disabilities Education Act is contrary to the goal of ensuring that children with disabilities receive a quality education;

(5) the Federal Government has failed to fully fund the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and appropriate 40 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure per child with a disability as required under the Act to assist States and localities to educate children with disabilities;

(6) the levels in function 500 (Education) for fiscal year 2002 assume sufficient discretionary budget authority to accommodate fiscal year 2002 appropriations for IDEA at least \$10.6 billion above such funding levels 2000, thus, fully funding the Federal Government's commitment to special education;

(7) the levels in function 500 (Education) to accommodate the fiscal year 2001 appropriation for fully funding IDEA may be reached by eliminating inefficient, ineffective and unauthorized education programs.

(b) It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Congress and the President should increase function 500 (Education) fiscal year 2002 funding for programs under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act by at least \$10.6 billion above fiscal year 2001 appropriated levels, thus fully funding the Federal Government's commitment;

(2) Congress and the President can accomplish the goal by eliminating inefficient, ineffective and unauthorized education programs.

SEC. 19. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON FISCAL YEAR 2001 SUPPLEMENTAL SPENDING.

It is the sense of Congress that—

to the extent that any additional funding is required in Fiscal Year 2001 for the Department of Defense, for assistance for producers of program crops and specialty crops, and for other critical needs, such funding should be offset through rescissions in other Federal programs.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 100, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE.)

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an alternative budget on behalf of the Republican Study Committee. This is a budget based on the principles of limited government, economic freedom and individual responsibility. My colleagues will address various parts of the amendment. Let me just offer a few highlights.

Mr. Chairman, on tax relief, our amendment embodies the Toomey bill which provides approximately \$2.2 trillion in tax relief over 10 years. It offers \$93 billion in immediate tax relief in 2001, and it stipulates that any summer bump-up in surplus estimates would go to tax relief and debt reduction. We also would beef up funding of defense to \$350 billion in 2002, which is \$25 billion over the Committee on the Budget. We also would provide for debt reduction. This dedicates the Social Security and Medicare surplus to public debt reduction, ensuring that the maximum level of debt reduction is achieved within 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, our amendment reins in spending. Over the past 3 years, we have had an average of 6 percent spending growth in discretionary spending.

That is simply too high. If we are a party of limited government, we have to rein in spending. We would actually hold spending below the inflation rate. Ours would hold spending over 10 years at 2.9 percent.

Mr. Chairman, about 35 years ago Ronald Reagan stood and said it was a time for choosing. I believe it was the greatest speech ever delivered. He said, Now is the time we choose whether we believe in our own capacity for self-government, or whether we "confess that a little intellectual elite in a far-distant capital can plan our lives for us better than we can plan them ourselves."

Mr. Chairman, I never thought I would be in that far-distant capital, but I am here; and I do not pretend that I have any great knowledge. I have only been here a few short months, and I have not had any epiphany about how to spend people's money better than they can spend it themselves.

This budget, better than any budget being offered on the floor, honors those principles, limited government, economic freedom and individual responsibility.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LUTHER).

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Chairman, we all know that the revenue forecast on which this budget resolution is based is simply not reliable. We simply should not risk the future of our country based on this kind of an unreliable forecast. Just 1 month ago in this Chamber, the President said that we need a contingency fund, a rainy day backup plan that will take effect if our economic forecasts do not turn out to be quite as sunny as we hope. But that rainy-day fund referred to by the President somehow got lost on the way through this Congress. The budget resolution before us leaves simply no way to adjust if our economy does not continue to perform as we hope.

Mr. Chairman, let us all hope that we have sunshine in the future and not rain for this country. But to jeopardize and to risk our country's future and the future of our children and their children based on these revenue forecasts, without any way out, is simply no way to go. I urge opposition to this underlying budget resolution.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) for yielding me this time, and I want to congratulate the Republican Study Committee, the staff of the Republican Study Committee, and the gentleman from Arizona for his leadership in putting together an extremely responsible, progrowth, protaxpayer budget that is something that we all ought to be able to support.

Let me step back and remind my colleagues. It was a little over a year ago,

at the time he was candidate George Bush, that our now President proposed a tax relief plan of about \$1.6 trillion, out of what was then expected to be about a \$3 trillion surplus. Since then two big things have changed: The surpluses are obviously going to be much larger than that. The consensus estimate is now at least \$5.5 trillion in surpluses. The other thing that has changed is the economy has clearly weakened.

We need to do more, we can do more, and the budget that we are talking about right now, the Republican Study Committee budget, accommodates a broader, faster, more helpful tax relief package. That is what we need to do.

This budget is very responsible. In fact, it is a modest tax relief package. It is only 7 cents of every dollar that is scheduled to come to Washington. It is less than 40 percent of the combined surpluses. It is much smaller than the tax cuts of the 1980s. It is smaller even than the tax cuts that President John F. Kennedy put through in the early 1960s.

What we do is we take President Bush's plan and phase it in faster under the Republican Study Committee's budget. We cut marginal income tax rates retroactively to January 1 of this year. We take other elements, and we introduce them into this tax relief package, like allowing families to put more money into IRAs; like repealing the 1993 tax increase on Social Security; like phasing out the alternative minimum tax and fully eliminating the marriage penalty. Those are things we need to do, and this budget would allow us to do that.

Let me address the issue of the certainty of the surplus. This has come up many times, and we just heard the previous speaker mention this. Nobody knows for sure exactly how large a surplus can be, but the fact is these are extremely conservative estimates that have been used. The fact is that for the last 3 years every revision has been an upward revision. The fact is we are not helpless victims as to whether or not there is going to be a surplus. We know how to make sure we have the funds available. We are not helpless victims waiting to see whether there is a surplus, as though it were a storm rolling up the eastern seaboard.

We know how to make sure this happens: Reduce excessive taxes so the economy can prosper, like it has done every time we have lowered taxes, and control spending. If we do that, there is more than enough money. And we can do that. This budget calls for that. It also provides the freedom and fairness that we as representatives of the working people of America ought to do.

I want to congratulate all my colleagues on the Republican Study Committee that put this budget together, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this alternative budget resolution.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York and South Carolina (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Democratic alternative and in opposition to H. Con. Res. 83.

The Democratic budget provides a prudent framework for meeting the needs of the country and responds to the priorities set by the American people. It is risky at best to base a budget and massive tax cuts on a projected surplus and expected revenues. The Republican's budget amounts to double-dipping by appropriating the same funds in different places. The Democratic alternative responds to these issues that Americans have noted as most important.

On education, the Democratic alternative provides \$151 billion over the 10-year period; the Republican plan only \$21.4 billion. The Democratic alternative seeks to provide a much-needed Medicare press drug benefit with realistic numbers and adequate levels of funding. We do not try to trick the American people. We provide the full \$330 billion necessary to carry this program.

While Americans have signaled Congress that they want and deserve a tax cut, they have also asked for a reasonable and responsible and realistic and timely tax cut. The Democratic alternative provides that.

The Republicans plan a massive and rapid \$2 trillion tax cut, while wholly ignoring process and priorities and procedures. It is clear, Mr. Chairman, that the Republican tax cut is contrary to the American people.

The Democratic alternative proposes a \$730 billion tax cut, while still funding farm aid at \$46 billion; the Republican budget provides nothing for America's farmers; the alternative provides \$7 billion for Veteran Health care; the Republicans cut funds to our nations veteran by \$5.7 billion. The Republican plan proposes a massive and rapid \$2 trillion plus tax cuts while wholly ignoring process, priorities, and procedures.

Mr. Chairman, it has become clear that the Republican budget is contrary to both the needs and the priorities of the American people. The Republican budget seeks to mortgage the Trust Fund; the needs of children and the gains of this period of prosperity for a rushed and ill-conceived tax cut.

I urge my colleague to support the democratic alternative and vote for a fair, prudent and realistic budget.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) has 15 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 18 minutes remaining.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the State of Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, if my colleagues are concerned about the job losses in America, if they, like me, are con-

cerned about the thousands of layoffs that are occurring, if they are concerned about the high energy prices which are taking money right out of our economy, then they ought to vote for this budget, because this budget, in addition to protecting Medicare and Social Security, in addition to bringing back responsible spending, is the real progrowth, pro-job-creation tax bill budget resolution.

This budget cuts taxes not next year, not in the year 2006, but it cuts taxes this year, and it does it in a way that is going to be good for our economy. It is the most progrowth tax bill we have on the floor today. It is the best answer toward getting jobs back on line in this economy. It is the best answer that we can send to our constituents.

Help is on the way: More money is going back into the taxpayers' paychecks this year. We are serious about getting this economy back on its feet. I urge a "yes" vote on the Republican Study Committee budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA).

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I will make a very quick point. For the past few days, we have been talking about education and budget and monies. The Democratic plan is a much better plan. We provide much more monies to support education.

Just a while ago it was said that before we give more money, we should have accountability, and that that is why the Republican plan is providing less money than the Democratic Party. But I have to tell my colleagues one thing about accountability. Public Law 94-142, which is a special ed bill, has mandated our local school districts to provide special education. Now, we said that we would support it by 40 percent of the cost of special education, yet over the years we have not supported special education to the local public schools at 40 percent.

□ 1400

It is somewhere between 13 and 15 percent. If we were to support public education to 40 percent, say over the next 10 years, what that does, and we do not speak about this, we do not speak about its impact at the local level, it will release the local general fund monies that have been allocated for special ed; support that. We could free that money up, have the local school districts provide the education, further the education at the local level.

We believe in local control. We believe in local direction of curriculum instruction, and yet we are not providing and not doing the very thing that we want everybody else to do, and that is to fulfill our promises.

Accountability is a two-way street. We mandate. We should support it with our funds that we said we would, and that way the local districts will not be burdened with the mandates that we

give them and therefore they can use more of the local monies for the local educational projects that they have for their own kids.

We have to go all the way to support special ed at its full 40 percent. Accountability, again, is a two-way street.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the Republican Study Committee budget actually prioritizes IDEA funding. I thank the gentleman for the opening here.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to support the Republican Study Committee budget. This budget is good for the American people, and this budget helps to rebuild the military.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very unsafe world. I want to make reference to three news articles and read the titles. In February of this past year, 2000, "China Warns U.S. of Missile Strike." The second article I want to make reference to, "Russia Sends Cruise Missiles to China for New War Ships." Mr. Chairman, just today, "Admiral Warns of Perilous Buildup of Chinese Missiles."

Mr. Chairman, this budget helps to rebuild the military.

Let me further state that China has proposed a 17.7 percent increase in defense spending for this coming year. That is the largest increase in 20 years. In addition, when all the expenditures are added up, it is generally believed that China's defense spending is three or four times the official figure. China figures defense spending as a percentage of their total government expenditure is 8.29 percent in the year 2000.

Let me talk a little bit about the American military and why this budget bill is so needed. Today, the U.S. spends less than 3 percent of its GDP on national security. We are near the lowest level of defense spending as a percentage of GDP since before the Korean War. We do not have the luxury of time, Mr. Chairman, to rebuild our Nation's military.

Let me say, in closing, this is a great bill for many reasons, but one very important reason is to help rebuild the military of this country. It is time to rebuild our military for the good of the American people.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, the Republican Party has thrown a big good-bye party for the surplus. First they brought out a pinata for all their wealthy friends and they let each one of them take a whack at it and out comes a huge tax cut with the wealthiest 1 percent getting an overwhelming 45 percent of the tax cut.

The Republicans claim it only cost \$1.6 trillion but we really know it is

going to cost an extra trillion more. Good-bye surplus.

Next, Mr. Chairman, the Republicans divert hundreds of billions of dollars from the Medicare and Social Security trust fund dollars from the lockbox and put it over into a sandbox for their friends to play with. That diversion will be a disaster for seniors. Seniors will get sandbagged by this budget because the Republican diversion will shave 9 years off the Social Security trust fund and 5 years off the life of the Medicare Trust Fund. Good-bye, surplus.

Plus, they are doing regulatory changes at the same time. EPA used to stand for the Environmental Protection Agency. Now EPA stands for "Eat Plenty of Arsenic." They cannot get enough of helping their friends.

This is an absolute orgy that is going on, helping the wealthiest in America and the most powerful industries.

Mr. Chairman, it is immoral to pass these huge tax cuts that explode in 2008 and 2009 and 2010, based upon dot com company projections of revenues.

The American public knows that the NASDAQ collapsed. These same revenue estimates made by CBO are just as bogus, but in order to make sure that there is no money there for senior citizens, long-term care, building schools in this country a decade from now, they are committed to having these huge tax cuts that will bankrupt this country.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would remind the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) that our tax cut is not \$1.6 trillion. It is \$2.2 trillion, if that makes him feel any better.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE).

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, above the Speaker's rostrum is the national motto, "In God We Trust," but I have always been taught that we need to do our part in order to have God do his.

One of the things that we need to do is to cut the spending and cut the taxes. I am delighted to know that the Republican Study Committee budget provides for the largest tax cut, because it is critical. Look at what is happening in this country.

U.S. News and World Report 2 weeks ago has on its cover the title, "Drowning in Debt." It was not talking about the U.S. Government. It was talking about families in this country, an unprecedented amount of debt.

It baffles me to hear some of my Democrat colleagues get up and espouse how we better not give too big a tax cut.

This is the people's own money. They are entitled to it. This gives us the greatest amount of tax relief, and we should all pull behind this and work hard to enact this substitute budget.

This is a crisis. Every time I read about school shootings, it is not the phony solution of gun control that is the problem. The fact of the matter is, we have grown this government too big. We have too much regulation, and moms and dads have been forced out of the homes and away from being with the kids.

Vote for this substitute.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to address the budget that President Bush and his Republican colleagues have put together. It is a disgrace. Not only will it return the country to the era of big deficits and high interest rates, President Bush does not keep the promises he made to our country's students.

Throughout his campaign then-Governor Bush promised American students he would increase funding to the Pell Grant program, and he said he would provide a maximum grant of \$5,100. This would enable more students to obtain a college education. However, in the Bush budget the Republicans have laid out for us, the maximum Pell Grant will only be \$3,900, an increase of only \$150. Nearly \$1,100 separate this budget from President Bush's campaign promise.

In addition, Bush breaks his promise to provide funding so that students can have the facilities and equipment they need. Instead of slashing by two-thirds programs to purchase computers and Internet access for poor and underserved areas, we need to increase the funding for our schools.

The Bush budget provides funding for charter schools to purchase buildings and materials at a time when our public schools are crumbling. Many schools do not have heating, air conditioning or plumbing that works properly.

The Republicans claim the Department of Education's budget is increasing 11 percent. However, after accounting for the redirecting of funds already appropriated, President Bush's budget only increases funding by 5.7 percent. In just one example, Republicans eliminate the school renovation program but redirect \$1.2 billion from last year's budget. I ask for a no vote on this budget. It does not keep the promise. He is indeed leaving children behind.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER).

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

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) for yielding and commend him for offering the Republican Study Committee budget alternative.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this substitute budget because it is the best for our Armed Forces. While President Bush and Secretary Rumsfeld have every right to conduct a

review, and I support the review, it is still the constitutional responsibility, the constitutional obligation of the Congress, to provide for our Armed Forces to meet our threats.

The Republican Study Committee budget invests \$350 billion, \$25 billion more than the committee's budget, to eliminate some serious readiness woes, such as, one, a combat readiness rate of 41 percent for Air Force aircraft stationed in the continental United States; an acute shortage of ammunition for our Army and Marine Corps, Navy and Coast Guard aircraft, as well as ships and cutters that are grounded for lack of funding.

Remember, it was President Ronald Reagan who said, quote, "I believe it is immoral to ask the sons and daughters of America to protect this land with second-rate equipment and bargain-basement weapons," end quote.

It was immoral then. It is immoral today. It is immoral to continue to ask our men and women in uniform to do more and more with less, both in operations and maintenance and with their own compensation and benefits. This budget goes farther than any other budget alternative to do just that.

For example, it seeks to close the pay gap for our men and women in uniform, almost 11 percent at this time. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the annual amount required to cover the shortfall of modernization alone is \$30 billion a year. According to CBO, the additional amount required to maintain OPTEMPO, operating tempos and current levels of readiness, is \$5 billion short. Also, the amount to accelerate missile defense and enhance science- and technology-based programs is woefully inadequate.

The Republican Study Committee budget goes a long way in meeting these obvious requirements and necessary requirements for our national defense.

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, Republican budgets are a blueprint for disaster. To pay for President Bush's irresponsible and fuzzy math tax cut for the rich, the Republican budget ignores the needs and priorities of the American people who have sent us to Washington to fight for their interests. This Republican budget ignores people like 73-year-old Olga Kipnis from my district. With the help of the Federal Government, Olga now lives in an apartment in a safe and quiet neighborhood but soon she may lose that apartment and be forced to move out of the neighborhood.

Does the budget address our national affordable housing crisis? Hardly. This Republican budget resolution would guarantee millionaires a down payment for a summer home and seniors like Olga their eviction notice. And because of that tax cut, our national priorities will not be met.

\$800 billion is needed for a quality prescription drug benefit for seniors

under Medicare. The Republican budget dedicates only a paltry amount for a meaningless benefit. The Democratic alternative budget will provide \$151 billion for education needs like teacher recruitment and school construction. The Republican budget does not commit any money to school construction. The American public believes the Federal Government has a role to play to meet our Nation's education, public housing and health care needs and to ensure the health of Medicare and Social Security. The Republican budget fails that role miserably.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK).

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make a couple of points about this budget that I think are very important. One of them is that this budget provides immediate retroactive income tax relief for all taxpayers to the tune of \$93 billion. That is immediate tax relief. It also phases out the alternative minimum tax, which affects a lot of people in our country.

The third point that I wanted to make was it does repeal the capital gains tax, starts that repeal of capital gains. I think that is very important. These are all things that are going to do a tremendous amount to spur our economy, which we need right now.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK).

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, we have an opportunity in America today to invest in America. Sadly, the budget before us and the underlying budget does not do that.

The Democratic budget will do that. It will provide a tax cut with one-third of the budget surplus. It will also require one-third be spent for Social Security and Medicare. Why then are we now debating a budget that will put us back into deficit that took us 18 years to get out of under the former Republican administration? This budget gives no taxes, no relief, for over one-third of the families in this country with children. Over one-third of the families with children get nothing under this budget proposal.

On the other hand, the Democratic proposal gets at least \$130 million more into education. We have heard a lot today, America, but the facts are clear, the Republican budget will take us back into deficit. The Republican budget will take us back into deficit. The Democratic budget, on the other hand, will invest in America, your children and our families. Vote for the Democratic budget.

□ 1415

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COX).

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. Particularly, I thank him for bringing this budget to the floor, because in this budget we will have room to do two

things: first, meet the President's objectives and more on controlling the growth in spending. This budget allows for growth in spending, but it does not grow spending as fast as some of the other proposals we have seen on the floor. Second, it provides for across-the-board rate relief. Third, it provides, as nobody else is proposing to do here immediately, today, for a diminution, a reduction, in the rate of tax applied to savings and investment, the penalty tax on creating jobs, the penalty tax on new investment that we call capital gains.

Throughout my service in Congress for 13 years, we have pretended that every time we raise the capital gains rate, we gain revenue for the Treasury, and every time we reduce the rate, we lose it. That is how we score revenue. But each time we have done this since 1978, we find that when we raise the rate of tax on capital gains, we lose money for the Treasury, and when we reduce the rate of tax on capital gains, we gain money.

Cap gains revenues increased 385 percent in the 5 years after we reduced the rate from 28 to 20 percent in the Economic Recovery Tax Act. In 1986 when the Congress was chasing after scored revenue and jacked the rate of tax up again because that would be more responsible, that would avoid deficits, cap gains revenues fell by a third in the first year; and they stayed in the tank for 10 years, essentially, from 1986 to 1996. Then, in the mid-1990s, in this Congress, President Clinton vetoed a cut in the capital gains tax rates because he wanted to be responsible, because keeping that rate high would somehow help. Nonetheless, in 1997, we enacted a rate cut from 28 percent to 20 percent; and today, as we stand here, cap gains revenues to the Treasury are up over a third.

Mr. Chairman, this budget will permit us to cut the cap gains rate and make money for the Treasury, as well as help the American people. I thank the gentleman for bringing it to the floor.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN).

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I have to say, I am really amazed when I listen to my Republican colleagues. They acknowledge that the economy is getting weaker, they acknowledge we are having layoffs, but then they tell us we are going to have greater surpluses. It really does not make sense.

They move on and say what we really need is a bloated tax cut for all Americans. It is not for all Americans, it is for the rich Americans, because the richest 1 percent get 43 percent of the tax benefit. Where is the fairness in that?

Let us talk about education. The Democratic alternative gives us \$150 billion more for education. That means for teachers, smaller classrooms, more computers, more books, and school renovation. The Republican budget does not compare.

Let us move on and talk about debt reduction. I have not heard them talk about debt reduction. The Democratic budget gives us \$915 billion more in debt reduction, which means lower interest rates for all Americans.

Finally, let us talk about law enforcement. The Democratic budget gives us \$19 billion more for local law enforcement, more cops on the street; and that is a good thing. At the end of the day, the choice is very clear. The best budget for all Americans is the Democratic budget. I urge adoption of the Democratic alternative.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind the gentleman from Maryland that this budget actually gives tax relief to anybody who pays income taxes.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the alternative budget offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and supported by the members of the Republican Study Committee.

Over the past 5 years, Congress has been, let us admit it, on a spending spree with the people's money. Last year's budget included an 8.7 increase in nondefense discretionary spending, and it took Congress just 5 months to consume \$20 billion of the \$26 billion surplus for last year.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the budget presented by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, is an excellent start. However, Congress has demonstrated that if there is money to be spent in Washington, indeed it will be spent.

The Republican Study Commission reintroduces fiscal discipline to Washington, D.C. It recognizes that the surplus was created through the efforts of hard-working families of America by returning \$2.2 trillion of the surplus to them. It does this by speeding marginal tax relief to working families, small businesses, and family farms, and by making tax cuts fully retroactive up and down the scale. At the same time, the RSC budget provides for our most important initiatives: IDEA funding, Medicare, Social Security, defense, and debt reduction.

Our friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle would have us believe that a tax cut and a fair and responsible budget is impossible. This premise is simply false. This budget has proven that we can help families with a tax cut and have a responsible and fair budget. The proof is in the numbers. Defense spending would increase to \$350 billion, \$25 billion more than the proposed budget. The RSC budget would require 100 percent of Social Security and Medicare surpluses, as well as other priorities be funded. It is a responsible budget, and it helps working families.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this alternative plan, which is actually worse than the Bush budget and tax cut plan, and I do so for several reasons. First of all, the Bush plan fails to make important investments in education, health care, law enforcement, and the digital divide. As a matter of fact, the Bush budget plan puts tax cuts first and leaves large gaps and services for millions of people who need them. In reality, the Bush plan leaves 53 percent of black and Hispanic families behind, despite claims that the tax cut would go to all taxpayers.

According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 53 percent of black and Hispanic families with children will receive no tax reduction from the Bush plan, even though 75 percent of these families include someone who is working. The 6 million black and Hispanic families that will receive the benefit from the proposal include 6.1 million black children and 6.5 million Hispanic children, or 55 percent of all black children and 56 percent of Hispanic children. Among non-Hispanic blacks, 3 million families with children, 52.8 percent of all such families, would not benefit from the Bush tax plan. The figures are the same essentially for Hispanic children.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say, cut us in or cut it out. This is not the plan; this is not the program; this is not for America.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN).

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment.

One of the things that I find a little difficult, and perhaps some of my colleagues do as well, is to try to figure out how many zeroes go behind a trillion. We are starting to talk about quantities of money that are sometimes hard to put into perspective. My comments this afternoon try to do that, try to talk about what does it really mean in terms of a \$2.2 trillion plan.

When we take a look at the chart to my immediate left, what we see is that in spite of the comments of the Democrats, that the Kennedy plan of years ago was larger in terms of tax cuts than what is being proposed either by the President or by the plan that is before us today. We are looking at \$2.2 trillion, and the Kennedy plan and the Reagan plans both were bigger. In fact, the Reagan tax cut was about 3 times bigger than what we are considering here today.

This, when we consider that the economy is already struggling and we have a tax surplus, when we put those facts together, what we are doing is proposing a very reasonable and a very temperate budget. It is still a balanced budget, we are still paying down the deficit, we are still keeping the Social

Security and Medicare money where they belong; but what we are doing is we are providing that stimulus to the economy to protect jobs and to move the economy forward. This plan then, when we take a look at it in context, when we take a look at all of those zeroes behind a trillion, we can understand what it means. It is less than the Kennedy or the Reagan plan.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, this budget is about making choices, and this Republican budget makes all the wrong choices for this country.

Like monkey see, monkey do. We need to look at my home State of Florida to see the devastating effect that this budget will have on our country. When Jeb Bush took over as Governor of Florida, he inherited a surplus and a booming economy from a Democratic administration. Today, as he continues to push for more tax cuts for the wealthy Floridians, the surplus is gone. There is a \$1 billion hole in Medicaid, and we cannot even afford books for our students.

Also unfortunate for the citizens of Florida is that this budget does nothing to improve the voting system that kept thousands of our votes from counting.

It is a choice. We can continue the prosperity we have worked so hard for; or we can go back to the huge debts, high interest rates, and skyrocketing unemployment that followed the Ronald Reagan tax cut. Remember, the deficit, the deficit, the deficit.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, national defense is in trouble. We need to spend an additional \$30 billion a year on equipment; we need to spend an additional \$6 billion to \$10 billion on people to raise their pay up to a level commensurate with the private sector; we need to spend an additional \$3 billion or \$4 billion per year on ammunition, and an additional \$5 million or so for training so that our pilots can get the requisite number of hours per month. We have a lot of holes in defense.

This budget is one of the few budgets that recognizes the problem and, in fact, raises the defense spending to \$350 billion, which is a \$25 billion increase from the baseline that we have established over the last several years. It is excellent in that sense.

I want to remind my colleagues that the administration, George Bush, DICK CHENEY, Don Rumsfeld, have promised that when they have finished their review, they are going to come in with a different defense number. I hope it is upward and I think it will be; and the reason I think it will be is because of the great analysis that has been done by the Republican Study Committee and the leaders who have put these numbers together, including the defense budget. Help is on the way, and

my colleagues have helped to be leaders in that area.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ).

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Chairman, let me, first of all, start by stating the fact that right now in Texas we are having a really serious problem with our budget, and our former Governor, now President, left us in shambles. We have a situation where we were supposed to have a major surplus and the fact is that we do not. We have teachers that do not have access to insurance because of the fact that we do not have sufficient resources. We have youngsters that are not being covered for medication because of the fact that we do not have enough money to make the match. We have families that are uninsured and kids that are uninsured because of the fact that we do not have sufficient resources to be able to get those Federal monies for the CHIPS program.

Now, the President is trying to do the same thing on the Federal level. Without proposing the exact budget that we need in terms of making priorities that we need to consider such as education, which is critical, as we move into the global economy; our national defense where we know full well that we need 40,000 additional troops out there; the testimony from Gingrich that we talked about where we need the \$60 billion to \$80 billion right now as a supplemental.

We are not talking about those items. What we are talking about is a tax cut that is irresponsible, not considering the fact that we have a situation before us that we are having a problem with our economy.

□ 1430

Even back home in Texas, they are not even willing to tell us now what the economy is going to look like, just like here, where any economist with any right sense would not be able to tell us what it is going to look like 5 or 6 years from now.

So it makes sense for us to look at the Democratic alternative that considers taking care of Social Security, considers taking care of our senior citizens and Medicare, and considers assuring that we continue to expend our resources where they should be.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, let me just reflect on what the overall effect on this budget does. It increases spending, but it does it responsibly, not massively, as the Democratic alternative would.

It takes all the Social Security and surpluses and puts that aside. It retires all the available debt.

Now, after we have increased spending, put all of the Social Security and Medicare money aside, paid off all of the debt, how could we not provide tax relief with the money left over?

I have heard my colleagues suggest that the tax package is unfair. Our tax package is the relief for everyone who pays income taxes. Now, does that go back to people in proportion to the taxes they pay? No, a more than proportionate share goes to the lowest-income workers. People making \$35,000 a year, a family of four, would pay no taxes at all. There is no question this disproportionately benefits the people at the lower end of the income spectrum.

Finally, the biggest and best reason we should be supporting the Republican Study Committee budget is the effect it will have on the economy, the ability it has to unleash economic growth and prosperity. That is what this is all about.

The empirical evidence is overwhelming: Every time in American history everywhere around the world when societies lower the burden that government imposes on an economy, when societies lower the tax burden, the taxation and litigation and regulation, those kinds of burdens, the result is economic growth and prosperity. That means more jobs, higher wages, greater productivity, rising standards of living.

That is what we are here for. That is what our obligation is as representatives in Congress, to provide that opportunity for the hard-working men and women across America to enjoy their dreams, enjoy the fruits of their labor. That is what our budget does better than any other budget.

I urge my colleagues to support the Republican Study Committee budget.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address again some of the misperceptions that I think surround the basic resolution today.

I am particularly disturbed by assertions contained in letters of support from various agricultural groups. Ostensibly their support hinges on agriculture being guaranteed priority status out of the \$517 billion reserve fund.

I have examined and continue to examine the legislative language that establishes this reserve, and nowhere do I find a priority given to agriculture. The resolution provides for a strategic reserve fund for agriculture, defense, and other appropriate legislation. While the legislation does include the reference to agriculture, it is treated the same way as all other legislation that spends money from the reserve.

Indeed, the reference to "other appropriate legislation" includes any other spending increases that the chairman of the Committee on the Budget wishes to accommodate, because he alone is given the ability to increase allocations in order to meet increased spending. The chairman may increase the allocation. He is not required to do so.

In addition, the money guaranteed to agriculture in fiscal year 2001 is pro-

vided under essentially the same terms. These are not priorities. This is merely the ability to compete for funding. This is no different from what occurs every year when we consider increased spending.

It is rumored that many groups have been pointed towards this strategic reserve fund as the answer to their funding request. While \$517 billion over 10 years appears to be an ample amount, in reality there is little room in some years to accommodate additional spending for agriculture.

In fiscal year 2005 and 2006, for example, the general contingency fund has only \$12 billion and \$15 billion available. These amounts are barely sufficient to cover the agricultural request, not to mention the additional defense and other appropriate spending that the chairman of the Committee on the Budget wishes to squeeze out of this account.

In addition, increased defense expenditures, additional funding for prescription drug coverage, or additional tax provisions severely limit funding. Unfortunately, the only budget that would have addressed this, the Blue Dog budget, it lost. This budget does even less for agriculture.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my colleagues on the Republican Study Committee and the staff for putting together this budget. We believe it is a great budget.

First and foremost, as has been outlined, when President Bush outlined his economic plan during the campaign, times were different. The surplus was a lot smaller, and the economy was a lot more robust. We were doing a lot better.

Times are certainly different now. The times call for a larger tax cut, and also, as President Bush has said, we need to move more money out of Washington.

I would say to my colleagues across the Capitol in the Senate who are considering campaign finance reform and looking for ways to get more money out of politics, the best way to do that is to get more money out of Washington, because the reason there is so much money in politics is because there is so much money in Washington. The Tax Code is too complex and too tough to deal with.

I would simply ask that this budget be favorably considered, our alternative budget.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman I would emphasize once again what I have said throughout: What we do today in deciding on this budget resolution may be little noted in all of the country, but it

will be long remembered, because the consequences of this budget resolution will flow on for years to come.

I have three basic problems with the resolution that the majority has brought to the floor, and the conservative alternative which is being presented now only worsens those problems.

In the first place, in making so much room for tax cuts, their budget leaves very little room for anything else. Over the last 18 years, we have deferred and denied many needs and priorities of this country. Education is one.

Now that we finally have a surplus, surely some part of it ought to be dedicated to those things that not only we want to do, but the American people clearly want us to do. Look at any poll, any opinion chart. Everybody ranks education as number one.

Between us and them, the difference on education is like night and day. We provide \$130 billion more than the base Republican budget resolution. I have not done the calculus on this resolution, but I am sure we provide substantially more than that for education.

There is one other thing that makes me back off from the proposal they are making here today. That is that for years now we have been able to look into the future and see that Social Security and Medicare faced a shortfall. It is just over the horizon of this budget. The baby boomers begin to retire in the year 2008.

We will not actually see the effects sometime after the time frame of the budget we have right here, but we know it is coming, and 77 million baby-boomers are marching to their retirement right now. They are not going anywhere else. They expect their benefits. We are not in a position to fully provide for them, at least in the third and fourth decades of this century.

We have not been able in the past to do anything about it. We did not have the sort of surpluses that are now projected. But now that we have those surpluses, now that we have the opportunity, we have the obligation.

I would fault this resolution and the base Republican resolution because both of them slough off that obligation, leave it to our children to pay for the baby boomers' retirement. I think that is not only a budgetary problem, I think it is a moral problem. That is why I opposed this resolution and the base Republican resolution as well.

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the Republican Study Committee budget alternative. The leadership budget puts in place the framework for enacting the President's budget and tax cut plan. It is a good budget, not just for the taxpaying American, but for the parents and children of America's taxpayers. This budget will eliminate \$2.3 trillion of the national debt by 2001, freeing our descendants from the crushing weight of debt. It gives tax relief to every taxpayer, and immediate tax cuts for the lowest bracket. It increases the educational IRA contribution limit from \$500 to \$5000, enabling families to save, not just for college, but for primary and sec-

ondary schools as well. Perhaps most importantly, this budget will eliminate the death tax. No longer will the grieving children of farmers and small businessmen have to sell their inheritance to pay off the taxman.

The leadership budget is a good bill. But in the last few weeks we have begun to see signs that our prosperity may be in jeopardy. The strain of paying for a huge surplus is beginning to drag on our economy. That is why I am voting for the Republican Study Committee alternative budget. It does everything the leadership budget does, but adds larger and more immediate tax relief. Additional tax cuts are needed now to help our economy. Just as an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, larger tax relief now will generate economic growth that will save us untold amounts later. The RSC alternative will give us \$600 million more in tax relief over the next 10 years, from \$1.6 trillion in the leadership budget to \$2.2 million.

By making more of these tax cuts retroactive, it will help taxpayers now. Thousands of people in Idaho and around the nation are delaying home ownership, college educations and starting their own businesses because they don't know when they will see the money they sent to Washington. We need people working, not worrying. Sending the surplus home will release a flood of inward investment that will improve the life of every American.

Passing the RSC budget alternative will have a tremendous impact on the financial markets and consumer confidence. It will declare to America and the world that the 107th Congress is serious about maintaining the economy. It will encourage investors and businessmen to bet on American prosperity. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for the RSC budget and empowering the American economy. Send the surplus home, and vote for the Republican Study Committee alternative.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 81, noes 341, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 68]

AYES—81

Akin	Deal	Istook
Bachus	DeLay	Johnson, Sam
Barr	DeMint	Jones (NC)
Bartlett	Doolittle	Keller
Barton	Dreier	Kingston
Blunt	Dunn	Largent
Boehner	Everett	Lewis (KY)
Brady (TX)	Flake	Lucas (OK)
Bryant	Gibbons	Manzullo
Burton	Goode	Miller, Gary
Camp	Goodlatte	Myrick
Cannon	Graham	Nethercutt
Cantor	Hall (TX)	Norwood
Chabot	Hansen	Otter
Chambliss	Hayworth	Pence
Cox	Hefley	Petri
Crane	Herger	Pitts
Cubin	Hoekstra	Pombo
Culberson	Hostettler	Portman
Davis, Jo Ann	Hunter	Reynolds

Riley	Schrock	Sununu
Rohrabacher	Sensenbrenner	Tancred
Royce	Sessions	Terry
Ryan (WI)	Shadegg	Tiahrt
Ryun (KS)	Shimkus	Tiberi
Scarborough	Spence	Toomey
Schaffer	Stearns	Vitter

NOES—341

Abercrombie	Fattah	Lewis (CA)
Ackerman	Ferguson	Lewis (GA)
Aderholt	Filner	Linder
Allen	Fletcher	Lipinski
Andrews	Foley	LoBiondo
Armey	Ford	Lofgren
Baca	Fossella	Lowe
Baird	Frank	Lucas (KY)
Baker	Frelinghuysen	Luther
Baldacci	Frost	Maloney (CT)
Ballenger	Galleghy	Maloney (NY)
Barcia	Ganske	Markey
Barrett	Gekas	Mascara
Bass	Gephardt	Matheson
Bentsen	Gilchrest	Matsui
Bereuter	Gillmor	McCarthy (MO)
Berkley	Gilman	McCarthy (NY)
Berman	Gonzalez	McCollum
Berry	Goss	McCrery
Biggart	Granger	McDermott
Bilirakis	Graves	McGovern
Bishop	Green (TX)	McHugh
Blagojevich	Green (WI)	McInnis
Blumenauer	Greenwood	McIntyre
Boehlert	Grucci	McKeon
Bonilla	Gutierrez	McNulty
Bonior	Gutknecht	Meehan
Bono	Hall (OH)	Meeks (NY)
Borski	Harman	Menendez
Boswell	Hart	Mica
Boucher	Hastings (FL)	Millender-
Boyd	Hastings (WA)	McDonald
Brady (PA)	Hayes	Miller (FL)
Brown (FL)	Hill	Miller, George
Brown (OH)	Hilleary	Moakley
Brown (SC)	Hilliard	Mollohan
Burr	Hinchey	Moore
Buyer	Hinojosa	Moran (KS)
Callahan	Hobson	Moran (VA)
Calvert	Hoeffel	Morella
Capito	Holden	Murtha
Capps	Holt	Nadler
Capuano	Honda	Napolitano
Cardin	Hoolley	Neal
Carson (IN)	Horn	Ney
Carson (OK)	Houghton	Northup
Castle	Hoyer	Nussle
Clay	Hulshof	Oberstar
Clayton	Hutchinson	Obey
Clement	Hyde	Olver
Clyburn	Inslee	Ortiz
Coble	Isakson	Osborne
Collins	Israel	Ose
Combust	Issa	Owens
Condit	Jackson (IL)	Oxley
Conyers	Jackson-Lee	Pallone
Cooksey	(TX)	Pascarell
Costello	Jefferson	Pastor
Coyne	Jenkins	Paul
Cramer	John	Payne
Crenshaw	Johnson (CT)	Pelosi
Crowley	Johnson (IL)	Peterson (MN)
Cummings	Johnson, E. B.	Peterson (PA)
Cunningham	Jones (OH)	Phelps
Davis (CA)	Kanjorski	Pickering
Davis (FL)	Kaptur	Platts
Davis (IL)	Kelly	Pomeroy
Davis, Tom	Kennedy (MN)	Price (NC)
DeFazio	Kennedy (RI)	Pryce (OH)
DeGette	Kerns	Putnam
Delahunt	Kildee	Quinn
DeLauro	Kilpatrick	Radanovich
Deutsch	Kind (WI)	Rahall
Diaz-Balart	King (NY)	Ramstad
Dicks	Kirk	Rangel
Dingell	Kleczka	Regula
Doggett	Knollenberg	Rehberg
Dooley	Kolbe	Reyes
Doyle	Kucinich	Rivers
Duncan	LaFalce	Rodriguez
Edwards	LaHood	Roemer
Ehlers	Langevin	Rogers (KY)
Ehrlich	Lantos	Rogers (MI)
Emerson	Larsen (WA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Engel	Larson (CT)	Ross
English	Latham	Roukema
Eshoo	LaTourette	Roybal-Allard
Etheridge	Leach	Rush
Evans	Lee	Sabo
Farr	Levin	Sanchez

Sanders	Stark	Visclosky
Sandlin	Stenholm	Walden
Sawyer	Strickland	Walsh
Saxton	Stump	Wamp
Schakowsky	Stupak	Waters
Schiff	Sweeney	Watkins
Scott	Tanner	Watt (NC)
Serrano	Tauscher	Watts (OK)
Shaw	Tauzin	Waxman
Shays	Taylor (MS)	Weiner
Sherman	Taylor (NC)	Weldon (FL)
Sherwood	Thomas	Weldon (PA)
Shows	Thompson (CA)	Weller
Simmons	Thompson (MS)	Wexler
Simpson	Thornberry	Whitfield
Skeen	Thune	Wicker
Skelton	Thurman	Wilson
Slaughter	Tierney	Wolf
Smith (MI)	Towns	Woolsey
Smith (NJ)	Traficant	Wu
Smith (TX)	Turner	Wynn
Smith (WA)	Udall (CO)	Young (AK)
Snyder	Udall (NM)	Young (FL)
Solis	Upton	
Spratt	Velazquez	

NOT VOTING—10

Baldwin	McKinney	Sisisky
Becerra	Meek (FL)	Souder
Gordon	Mink	
Lampson	Rothman	

□ 1500

Messrs. LEWIS of California, SHAYS, CUNNINGHAM, DUNCAN, BUYER and HASTINGS of Florida changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. BACHUS, CULBERSON and EVERETT changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 107-30.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. SPRATT

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Part B amendment No. 4 in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. SPRATT:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002.

The Congress declares that this is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2002 and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2003 through 2011 are hereby set forth.

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2011:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,676,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: \$1,727,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$1,800,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$1,885,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$1,972,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$2,065,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$2,166,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$2,279,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$2,402,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$2,536,000,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2002: —\$27,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: —\$54,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: —\$63,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: —\$64,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: —\$67,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: —\$70,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: —\$76,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: —\$80,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: —\$86,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: —\$91,900,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,638,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: \$1,692,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$1,757,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$1,837,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$1,904,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$1,974,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$2,056,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$2,138,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$2,228,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$2,314,100,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2002: \$1,590,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: \$1,658,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$1,727,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$1,809,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$1,872,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$1,941,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$2,022,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$2,105,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$2,197,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$2,283,200,000,000.

(4) SURPLUSES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the surpluses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2002: \$85,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: \$69,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$73,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$75,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$100,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$124,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$143,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$173,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$206,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$252,600,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2002: \$2,969,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: \$2,732,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$2,477,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$2,197,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$1,873,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$1,504,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$1,095,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$639,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$528,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$418,000,000,000.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and budget outlays for fiscal years 2002 through 2011 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050): This function includes funding for the Department of Defense, the nuclear-weapons-related activities of the Department of Energy, and miscellaneous national security activities in various other agencies such as the Coast Guard and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The policy of this resolution is that there shall be budget authority of \$327,200,000,000 and outlays of \$320,500,000,000 in fiscal year 2002, and budget authority of \$3,732,100,000,000 and outlays of \$3,640,200,000,000 over fiscal years 2002 through 2011. This is greater than the level of the Committee-passed resolution by \$2.6 billion of budget authority and \$1.2 billion of outlays in fiscal year 2002, and \$48.1 billion of budget authority and \$28.9 billion of outlays over fiscal years 2002 through 2011, better to

address priorities such as but not limited to: maintaining a high level of military readiness; improving the quality of life for military personnel and their families, specifically including pay and housing, ensuring health care for active-duty members, their families, and all military retirees and their families; transforming our military to meet post-Cold-War threats; and modernizing conventional forces required to execute the national military strategy.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$327,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$320,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$334,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$325,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$345,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$334,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$356,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$349,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$368,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$358,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$379,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$366,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$390,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$380,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$400,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$391,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$409,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$402,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$420,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$412,500,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150): This function includes virtually all United States international activities, such as: operating United States embassies and consulates throughout the world, military assistance to allies, aid to underdeveloped nations, economic assistance to fledgling democracies, promotion of United States exports abroad, United States payments to international organizations, and United States contributions to international peacekeeping efforts. The policy of this resolution is that there shall be budget authority of \$23,900,000,000 and outlays of \$19,600,000,000 in fiscal year 2002, and budget authority of \$264,200,000,000 and outlays of \$219,800,000,000 over fiscal years 2002 through 2011, which is \$0.7 billion of discretionary budget authority and \$0.7 billion of discretionary outlays greater than the CBO current services baseline in 2002, and \$7.6 billion of discretionary budget authority and \$6.7 billion of discretionary outlays greater than the CBO current services baseline over fiscal years 2002 through 2011, to address priorities such as but not limited to: providing greater security for foreign-service personnel and embassies, improving health care in poor countries, with particular emphasis on combating HIV/AIDS, providing a supplemental appropriation to advance the national security interests of Israel, supporting drug-interdiction efforts, and promoting the economic, environmental, political, and national security interests of the United States.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$20,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$20,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$27,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$28,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$23,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$28,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$24,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$29,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$25,000,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250): This function includes funding for the National Science Foundation, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (except air transportation programs), and general science research programs of the Department of Energy. The policy of this resolution is that there shall be budget authority of \$22,500,000,000 and outlays of \$21,200,000,000 in fiscal year 2002, and budget authority of \$250,000,000,000 and outlays of \$243,100,000,000 over fiscal years 2002 through 2011, which is \$0.3 billion of budget authority and \$0.2 billion of outlays greater than the Committee-passed resolution in 2002, and \$3.1 billion of budget authority and \$2.8 billion of outlays greater than the Committee-passed resolution over fiscal years 2002 through 2011, and will allow for substantial expansion of programs in this function to reflect the important role that scientific research plays in fostering the future prosperity and security of the Nation. These amounts will be used to address priorities including but not limited to: expanding research, and math and science educational activities, undertaken by the National Science Foundation, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Office of Science of the Department of Energy.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$23,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$24,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$24,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$25,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$25,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$27,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$26,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$28,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$27,200,000,000.

(4) Energy (270): This function includes funding for the nondefense programs of the Department of Energy as well as for the Tennessee Valley Authority, rural electrification loans, and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The programs supported by this function are intended to increase the supply of energy, encourage energy conservation, facilitate an emergency supply of energy, and safeguard energy production. The policy

of this resolution is that there shall be budget authority of \$1,400,000,000 and outlays of \$0 in fiscal year 2002, and budget authority of \$17,000,000,000 and outlays of \$2,900,000,000 over fiscal years 2002 through 2011, which is \$0.6 billion of budget authority and \$0.2 billion of outlays greater than the Committee-passed resolution in 2002, and \$2.4 billion of budget authority and \$2.1 billion of outlays greater than the Committee-passed resolution over fiscal years 2002 through 2011, to maintain funding for appropriated energy programs after full adjustment for inflation, to address priorities such as but not limited to: funding energy research, stabilizing energy supplies, addressing rising energy costs, increasing energy production, conserving energy, using energy more efficiently, protecting the environment, reducing pollution through development of clean-coal technologies, and assisting low-income families who are hard-pressed by high home heating and cooling costs by protecting programs such as the Weatherization Assistance Program.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$900,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300): This function includes programs in a variety of Federal agencies concerned with the development and management of the Nation's land, water, and mineral resources, and recreation and wildlife areas; and environmental protection and enhancement. The policy of this resolution is that there shall be budget authority of \$30,300,000,000 and outlays of \$28,400,000,000 in fiscal year 2002, and budget authority of \$348,400,000,000 and outlays of \$338,300,000,000 over fiscal years 2002 through 2011, which is \$3.6 billion of budget authority and \$2.0 billion of outlays greater than the Committee-passed resolution in 2002, and \$59.0 billion of budget authority and \$53.0 billion of outlays greater than the Committee-passed resolution over fiscal years 2002 through 2011, better to address priorities such as but not limited to: full funding levels for the Land Conservation, Preservation, and Infrastructure Improvement Program, established last year as part of the Interior Appropriations Act. In establishing this program, Congress recognized land conservation and related activities as critical national priorities and provided a mechanism to guarantee significantly increased funding. Congress resolved to provide \$1.76 billion for fiscal year 2002 and \$12 billion from 2001–2006 for conservation, preservation, and recreation programs, and to set this funding aside in a new dedicated conservation budget category. The

President's budget request would breach last year's agreement, and rewrite the funding levels of the conservation budget category, reducing the fiscal year 2002 level to \$1.5 billion and reducing the six-year funding total by \$2.7 billion. It is the policy of this resolution to maintain and fully fund the new budget category for conservation; to increase grants to states and local governments for improvements in our nation's safe drinking water and wastewater treatment infrastructure; to continue funding needed to reduce the threat of wildfires on Federal lands and to fight fires when they occur; to provide high-priority funding for Pacific Northwest salmon recovery; to fund grants for States and Tribes for administration of environmental programs, within the Department of Commerce; to continue current funding levels for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; to fund continued procurement of an advanced weather satellite system being developed jointly with the Department of Defense; to continue current funding levels for the Army Corps of Engineers and to increase funding to deal with the deferred maintenance backlog in the National Park system; to provide funds to protect wetlands and endangered species and their habitats on public and private lands.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$30,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$28,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$31,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$30,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$31,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$32,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$33,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$34,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$35,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$36,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$38,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$37,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$38,600,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350): This function includes programs administered by the Department of Agriculture, including such activities as agricultural research and the stabilization of farm incomes through loans, subsidies, and other payments to farmers. The policy of this resolution is that there shall be budget authority of \$27,300,000,000 and outlays of \$25,600,000,000 in fiscal year 2002, and budget authority of \$219,300,000,000 and outlays of \$204,000,000,000 over fiscal years 2002 through 2011, which is \$8.2 billion of budget authority and \$8.1 billion of outlays greater than the Committee-passed resolution in 2002, and \$46.9 billion of budget authority and \$46.6 billion of outlays greater than the Committee-passed resolution over fiscal years 2002 through 2011, better to address priorities such as but not limited to: maintaining the inflation-adjusted funding for appropriated agriculture programs over ten years, including food safety protection, conservation, and vital agriculture research, which is cut in the Committee-passed resolution; increasing mandatory programs for agriculture by \$8 billion in fiscal year 2002, \$6 billion in fiscal year 2003, and \$4 billion per year thereafter,

reflecting spending levels consistent with recent needs; providing farmers with a more stable, dependable source of supplementary income assistance, rather than continued unpredictable ad-hoc assistance, minimizing the need for continued emergency assistance, and making spending assumptions more realistic, in preparation for the upcoming reauthorization of the farm program.

Fiscal year 2002:

- (A) New budget authority, \$27,300,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$25,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

- (A) New budget authority, \$24,500,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$23,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

- (A) New budget authority, \$22,600,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$21,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

- (A) New budget authority, \$22,400,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$20,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

- (A) New budget authority, \$22,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$20,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

- (A) New budget authority, \$20,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$19,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

- (A) New budget authority, \$19,700,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$18,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

- (A) New budget authority, \$19,900,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$18,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

- (A) New budget authority, \$20,100,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$18,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

- (A) New budget authority, \$20,200,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$18,800,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370): This function includes deposit insurance and financial regulatory agencies; the mortgage credit programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD); the Department of Commerce's Census Bureau, its business promotion programs, and its technology development programs; rural housing loans; the Small Business Administration's business loans; the Postal Service; and other regulatory agencies such as the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). The policy of this resolution is that there shall be budget authority of \$7,400,000,000 and outlays of \$4,400,000,000 in fiscal year 2002, and budget authority of \$127,900,000,000 and outlays of \$84,300,000,000 over fiscal years 2002 through 2011, to address priorities such as but not limited to: an increase in the limit on the maximum loan that may be guaranteed, thereby making home ownership in high-cost housing areas more affordable, and consequent increased premium collections for the Federal Housing Administration's Mutual Mortgage Insurance (MMI) Fund, which will finance other important housing activities; increased premium collections from allowing FHA to insure hybrid adjustable-rate mortgages; continuation of the Advanced Technology Program in the Department of Commerce, and increased funding by 18 percent, or \$9 million, for the collection and calculation of basic economic statistics, to improve key measures used by government and business policy makers.

Fiscal year 2002:

- (A) New budget authority, \$7,400,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$4,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

- (A) New budget authority, \$8,500,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$3,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

- (A) New budget authority, \$12,800,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$8,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

- (A) New budget authority, \$12,700,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$9,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

- (A) New budget authority, \$12,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$8,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

- (A) New budget authority, \$13,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$9,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

- (A) New budget authority, \$13,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$9,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

- (A) New budget authority, \$14,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$9,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

- (A) New budget authority, \$18,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$12,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

- (A) New budget authority, \$13,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$9,800,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400): This function is comprised mostly of the programs administered by the Department of Transportation, including programs for highways, mass transit, aviation, and maritime activities. The function also includes several small transportation-related agencies, and the civilian aviation research program of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). The policy of this resolution is that there shall be budget authority of \$63,700,000,000 and outlays of \$55,600,000,000 in fiscal year 2002, and budget authority of \$641,200,000,000 and outlays of \$647,300,000,000 over fiscal years 2002 through 2011, which is \$2.7 billion of budget authority greater than the Committee-passed resolution in 2002, and \$33.2 billion of budget authority and \$7.7 billion of outlays greater than the Committee-passed resolution (which imposes a cut in nominal dollars) over fiscal years 2002 through 2011, better to address priorities such as but not limited to full funding of the authorized levels provided for highways and transit under the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21), full funding of the levels authorized for the Federal Aviation Administration under the Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century (AIR-21), the funding needed to keep the Federal commitment to Amtrak, and the funding needed to meet the ongoing requirements of the Coast Guard, at a level higher than requested by the President, to improve personnel training, eliminate spare parts shortages, operate drug interdiction more effectively, and ensure maritime safety.

Fiscal year 2002:

- (A) New budget authority, \$63,700,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$55,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

- (A) New budget authority, \$61,600,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$59,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

- (A) New budget authority, \$62,200,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$61,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

- (A) New budget authority, \$62,800,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$63,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

- (A) New budget authority, \$63,400,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$64,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

- (A) New budget authority, \$64,100,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$65,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

- (A) New budget authority, \$64,800,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$66,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

- (A) New budget authority, \$65,500,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$68,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

- (A) New budget authority, \$66,200,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$69,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

- (A) New budget authority, \$66,900,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$71,200,000,000.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450): This function includes programs that support the development of physical and financial infrastructure intended to promote viable community economies. It covers cer-

tain activities of the Department of Commerce and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. This function also includes spending to help communities and families recover from natural disasters, and spending for the rural development activities of the Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and other agencies. The policy of this resolution is that there shall be budget authority of \$10,500,000,000 and outlays of \$11,400,000,000 in fiscal year 2002, and budget authority of \$116,300,000,000 and outlays of \$110,800,000,000 over fiscal years 2002 through 2011, which is \$0.4 billion of budget authority greater than the Committee-passed resolution in 2002, and \$2.7 billion of budget authority and \$1.8 billion of outlays greater than the Committee-passed resolution over fiscal years 2002 through 2011, better to address priorities such as but not limited to full inflation-adjusted funding of appropriations, including: the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program, which is frozen in the Committee-passed resolution, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), Empowerment Zones, the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund (CDFI), and the Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program.

Fiscal year 2002:

- (A) New budget authority, \$10,500,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$11,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

- (A) New budget authority, \$10,600,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$11,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

- (A) New budget authority, \$10,800,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$10,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

- (A) New budget authority, \$11,100,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$10,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

- (A) New budget authority, \$11,500,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$10,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

- (A) New budget authority, \$11,700,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$10,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

- (A) New budget authority, \$12,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$11,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

- (A) New budget authority, \$12,400,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$11,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

- (A) New budget authority, \$12,600,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$11,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

- (A) New budget authority, \$13,100,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$11,900,000,000.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500): This function primarily includes Federal spending within the Departments of Education, Labor, and Health and Human Services for programs that directly provide or assist states and localities in providing services to young people and adults. The activities that it covers include providing developmental services to low-income children, helping disadvantaged and other elementary and secondary school students, offering grants and loans to post-secondary students, and funding job-training and employment services for people of all ages. The policy of this resolution is that there shall be budget authority of \$87,700,000,000 and outlays of \$79,200,000,000 in fiscal year 2002, and budget authority of \$1,050,300,000,000 and outlays of \$995,800,000,000 over fiscal years 2002 through 2011. This is greater than the level of the Committee-passed resolution by \$5.6 billion of budget authority and \$3.0 billion of outlays in fiscal year 2002, and \$132.8 billion of budget authority and \$104 billion of outlays over fiscal years 2002 through 2011, better to address priorities such as but not limited to: reducing class sizes by recruiting and adequately compensating qualified teachers;

improving teacher quality through professional development programs, especially for math and science teachers; facilitating school renovation by providing grants and subsidizing interest-free loans to local school districts; ensuring the effectiveness of all of our schools through increased funding of the title I program; enhancing the performance of our schools through investments in technology, school counselors, and after-school programs; expanding the Federal commitment to special education under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act by no less than \$1.5 billion per year, expanding access to higher education by sufficiently funding higher education programs, including an increase in the maximum Pell Grant award; sustaining the strength of the Nation's vocational rehabilitation programs, ensuring that each year more of those children eligible for Head Start are enrolled in the program and are well prepared for elementary education, sustaining the competitiveness of our economy through sufficient funding for workforce investment programs, and strengthening the safety net provided to our nation's most vulnerable people through, for example, increased funding levels for child welfare programs and the Social Services Block Grant (title XX).

Fiscal year 2002:

- (A) New budget authority, \$87,700,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$79,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

- (A) New budget authority, \$89,200,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$86,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

- (A) New budget authority, \$92,700,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$89,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

- (A) New budget authority, \$96,800,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$93,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

- (A) New budget authority, \$99,500,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$96,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

- (A) New budget authority, \$102,500,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$99,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

- (A) New budget authority, \$109,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$102,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

- (A) New budget authority, \$116,600,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$108,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

- (A) New budget authority, \$124,300,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$116,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

- (A) New budget authority, \$132,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$123,800,000,000.

(11) Health (550): This function includes Federal spending for health care services, disease prevention, consumer and occupational safety, health-related research, and similar activities. The largest component of spending is the Federal/State Medicaid program, which pays for health services for some low-income women, children, and elderly people, as well as people with disabilities. The policy of this resolution is that there shall be budget authority of \$194,300,000,000 and outlays of \$190,200,000,000 in fiscal year 2002, and budget authority of \$2,898,600,000,000 and outlays of \$2,873,100,000,000 over fiscal years 2002 through 2011. This is greater than the level of the Committee-passed resolution by \$1.7 billion of discretionary budget authority and \$400 million of discretionary outlays in fiscal year 2002, and \$4.0 billion of discretionary budget authority and \$2.6 billion of discretionary outlays over fiscal years 2002 through 2011, better to address priorities such as but not limited to: doubling funding for the National Institutes of Health relative to the 1998 level by 2003, maintaining inflation-adjusted funding for other discretionary health programs, expanding access to health

insurance for working families by allowing states to cover families under the Medicaid or State Children's Health Insurance Program, and allowing a buy-in to Medicaid for families with special-needs children if family income is under 300 percent of poverty, increasing funding for community health centers, providing low-income Medicare beneficiaries protection against premiums and cost-sharing requirements of a Medicare prescription drug benefit, and restoring Medicaid benefits to certain legal immigrants.

Fiscal year 2002:

- (A) New budget authority, \$194,300,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$190,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

- (A) New budget authority, \$217,700,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$213,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

- (A) New budget authority, \$235,600,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$233,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

- (A) New budget authority, \$255,400,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$253,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

- (A) New budget authority, \$276,600,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$274,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

- (A) New budget authority, \$296,600,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$293,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

- (A) New budget authority, \$319,200,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$316,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

- (A) New budget authority, \$341,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$338,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

- (A) New budget authority, \$366,800,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$365,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

- (A) New budget authority, \$395,400,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$393,200,000,000.

(12) Medicare (570): This function is comprised of spending for Medicare, the Federal health insurance program for elderly and eligible disabled people. Medicare consists of two parts, each tied to a trust fund. Hospital Insurance (HI, also known as Part A) reimburses providers for inpatient care that beneficiaries receive in hospitals, as well as care at skilled nursing facilities, home health care related to a hospital stay, and hospice services. Supplementary Medical Insurance (Part B) pays for physicians' services, outpatient services at hospitals, home health care, and other services. The policy of this resolution is that there shall be budget authority of \$229,200,000,000 and outlays of \$229,100,000,000 in fiscal year 2002, and budget authority of \$3,487,100,000,000 and outlays of \$3,486,800,000,000 over fiscal years 2002 through 2011. This is greater than the level of the Committee-passed resolution by \$100 million of budget authority in fiscal year 2002, and \$179.5 billion of budget authority and \$179.2 billion of outlays over fiscal years 2002 through 2011, better to address priorities such as but not limited to: extending the solvency of the Medicare HI (Part A) Trust Fund, by transferring surplus funds from outside the program to the HI Trust Fund, creating a voluntary prescription drug benefit within the Medicare program for all Medicare beneficiaries, and providing \$330 billion to fund it, and taking the Medicare HI (Part A) Trust Fund off-budget to ensure that it is used solely for current-law Medicare benefits.

Fiscal year 2002:

- (A) New budget authority, \$229,200,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$229,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

- (A) New budget authority, \$257,500,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$257,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

- (A) New budget authority, \$281,100,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$281,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

- (A) New budget authority, \$307,300,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$307,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

- (A) New budget authority, \$324,200,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$324,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

- (A) New budget authority, \$353,900,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$354,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

- (A) New budget authority, \$382,700,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$382,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

- (A) New budget authority, \$414,600,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$414,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

- (A) New budget authority, \$449,200,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$449,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

- (A) New budget authority, \$487,400,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$487,400,000,000.

(13) Income Security (600): This function covers Federal income-security programs that provide cash or in-kind benefits to individuals. Some of those benefits (such as food stamps, Supplemental Security Income, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, housing, and the earned income tax credit) are means-tested, whereas others (such as unemployment compensation and Civil Service Retirement and Disability payments) do not depend on a person's income or assets. The policy of this resolution is that there shall be budget authority of \$273,800,000,000 and outlays of \$272,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2002, and budget authority of \$3,230,300,000,000 and outlays of \$3,217,300,000,000 over fiscal years 2002 through 2011. This is greater than the level of the Committee-passed resolution by \$2.3 billion of budget authority (but \$100 million less of outlays) in fiscal year 2002, and \$17.6 billion of budget authority and \$15.7 billion of outlays over fiscal years 2002 through 2011, better to address priorities such as but not limited to: enhancing America's nutritional safety net through improvements that facilitate access to the Food Stamp program, providing increased funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance program (LIHEAP) and emergency funds in response to escalating energy prices; ensuring that Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and children (WIC) funds supplying nutritional benefits and counseling for pregnant women, infants and children increase with inflation; giving states more resources to support families moving from welfare to work through child care and critical TANF assistance programs; addressing the Nation's affordable housing crisis by maintaining public housing Capital Fund and Drug Elimination programs at inflation-adjusted levels; renewing all expiring section 8 contracts, maintaining adequate section 8 reserves, and adding 84,000 new section 8 housing assistance vouchers and maintaining them for ten years, increasing housing resources for the low-income elderly in preparation for the aging of the baby boom generation, maintaining Congress' commitment to the flexible HOME Investment Partnership Program, ensuring that grants to state and local governments for affordable rental housing and home ownership activities at least keep pace with inflation, as opposed to the Committee-passed resolution which diminishes HOME program grants through new set-asides, and restoring SSI and food stamp benefits to certain legal immigrants.

Fiscal year 2002:

- (A) New budget authority, \$273,800,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$272,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

- (A) New budget authority, \$284,400,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$282,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

- (A) New budget authority, \$295,600,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$293,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$309,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$308,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$317,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$316,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$323,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$323,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$338,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$338,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$350,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$349,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$361,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$360,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$373,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$372,300,000,000.

(14) Social Security (650): This function is comprised of spending for the Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance programs, commonly known as Social Security. Social Security consists of two parts, each tied to a trust fund. The Old-Age and Survivors Insurance (OASI) program provides monthly benefits to eligible retired workers and their families and survivors. The Disability Insurance (DI) program provides monthly benefits to eligible disabled workers and their families. The policy of this resolution is that there shall be budget authority of \$11,000,000,000 and outlays of \$11,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2002, and budget authority of \$150,900,000,000 and outlays of \$150,900,000,000 over fiscal years 2002 through 2011. This is greater than the level of the Committee-passed resolution by \$100 billion of discretionary budget authority in fiscal year 2002, and \$3.1 billion of discretionary budget authority and \$2.7 billion of discretionary outlays over fiscal years 2002 through 2011, better to address priorities such as but not limited to: protecting the Social Security Trust Fund from any diversion of its surplus, to extend the solvency of this essential program for today's retirees and for future generations, and maintaining the inflation-adjusted level of appropriations for social security administrative costs, with \$3 billion more in funding than provided in the Committee-approved Republican Budget Resolution, thereby protecting the level of service for all elderly, disabled, and survivor beneficiaries.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$11,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$11,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$12,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$13,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$14,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$15,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$20,400,000,000.

(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700): This function covers programs that offer

benefits to military veterans. Those programs, most of which are run by the Department of Veterans Affairs, provide health care, disability compensation, pensions, life insurance, education and training, and guaranteed loans. The policy of this resolution is that there shall be budget authority of \$52,400,000,000 and outlays of \$51,700,000,000 in fiscal year 2002, and budget authority of \$606,400,000,000 and outlays of \$602,000,000,000 over fiscal years 2002 through 2011. This is greater than the level of the Committee-passed resolution by \$100 million of budget authority and \$100 million of outlays in fiscal year 2002, and \$12.4 billion of budget authority and \$11.9 billion of outlays over fiscal years 2002 through 2011, better to address priorities such as but not limited to: increasing funding for appropriated veterans programs by \$100 million for 2002 over the levels in the Committee-approved Republican resolution, to meet the needs of the VHA, and to increase Department of Veterans Affairs personnel and technology for claims processing and administration, reaffirming our commitment to veterans by adequately funding the Department of Veterans Affairs; avoiding shifts from one program to another to meet current crises; ensuring that veterans are able to receive, in a timely manner, the benefits Congress intended for them; and increasing mandatory programs for veterans by raising the education benefit in the Montgomery GI bill from \$650 to \$1100, and enhancing certain burial benefits as provided in H.R. 801.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$52,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$51,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$53,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$53,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$56,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$55,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$60,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$59,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$59,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$59,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$59,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$58,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$63,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$63,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$65,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$64,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$67,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$66,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$69,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$68,600,000,000.

(16) Administration of Justice (750): This function covers programs that provide judicial services, law enforcement, and prison operation. The Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Customs Service, the Drug Enforcement Administration, and the Federal court system are all supported under this function. The policy of this resolution is that there shall be budget authority of \$32,400,000,000 and outlays of \$31,400,000,000 in fiscal year 2002, and budget authority of \$378,400,000,000 and outlays of \$374,700,000,000 over fiscal years 2002 through 2011. This is greater than the level of the Committee-passed resolution (which cuts funding for the Justice Department in nominal dollars) by \$1.5 billion of budget authority and \$1.1 billion of outlays in fiscal year 2002, and \$19.1 billion of budget authority and \$18 billion of outlays over fiscal years 2002 through 2011, better to address priorities such as but not limited to maintaining inflation-adjusted levels of appro-

priations for every program, specifically including: the Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) program, which provides funds to local communities to hire additional community police officers; all of the Department of Justice's law enforcement and legal divisions, the Treasury Department's United States Customs Service; the Treasury Department's Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms (ATF); and State and local law enforcement assistance.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$31,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$32,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$35,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$36,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$37,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$38,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$38,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$39,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$40,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$40,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$41,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$42,700,000,000.

(17) General Government (800): This function covers the central management and policy responsibilities of both the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government. Among the agencies it funds are the General Services Administration and the Internal Revenue Service. The policy of this resolution is that there shall be budget authority of \$17,200,000,000 and outlays of \$16,800,000,000 in fiscal year 2002, and budget authority of \$177,100,000,000 and outlays of \$174,600,000,000 over fiscal years 2002 through 2011. This is greater than the level of the Committee-passed resolution by \$500 million of budget authority and \$500 million of outlays in fiscal year 2002, and \$600 million of budget authority and \$1.2 billion of outlays over fiscal years 2002 through 2011, better to address priorities such as but not limited to maintaining inflation-adjusted levels of appropriations, above the level of the Committee-approved Republican Budget Resolution, and enactment of election reform legislation guaranteeing State and local election jurisdictions sufficient funds to replace outdated and outmoded voting technologies.

Fiscal year 2002:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

- (A) New budget authority, \$18,400,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$18,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

- (A) New budget authority, \$18,700,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$18,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

- (A) New budget authority, \$19,400,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$18,900,000,000.

(18) Net Interest (900): This function includes the debt-servicing obligation of the Federal Government for the sum of all of its past budget deficits. The policy of this resolution is that there shall be budget authority of \$259,600,000,000 and outlays of \$259,600,000,000 in fiscal year 2002, and budget authority of \$2,311,000,000,000 and outlays of \$2,311,000,000,000 over fiscal years 2002 through 2011, which is \$71.6 billion of budget authority and \$71.6 billion of outlays less than the Committee-passed resolution over fiscal years 2002 through 2011, to address priorities such as but not limited to: the most rapid retirement of debt possible, faster than under the President's budget, and faster still than under the Committee-approved Republican Budget Resolution, and the consequent maximum reduction in the Federal Government's net interest costs, to strengthen the budget and the economy for the demographic challenges ahead.

Fiscal year 2002:

- (A) New budget authority, \$259,600,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$259,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

- (A) New budget authority, \$254,500,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$254,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

- (A) New budget authority, \$249,300,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$249,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

- (A) New budget authority, \$241,800,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$241,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

- (A) New budget authority, \$236,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$236,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

- (A) New budget authority, \$230,500,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$230,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

- (A) New budget authority, \$223,400,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$223,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

- (A) New budget authority, \$215,100,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$215,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

- (A) New budget authority, \$205,500,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$205,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

- (A) New budget authority, \$195,300,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$195,300,000,000.

(19) Allowances (920): This function may include amounts to reflect proposals that would affect multiple budget functions. The policy of this resolution is that there shall be budget authority of \$5,000,000,000 and outlays of \$1,800,000,000 in fiscal year 2002, and budget authority of \$50,000,000,000 and outlays of \$45,500,000,000 over fiscal years 2002 through 2011, to address priorities such as but not limited to a reserve fund for unforeseen contingencies such as floods, earthquakes, and other natural disasters.

Fiscal year 2002:

- (A) New budget authority, \$5,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$1,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

- (A) New budget authority, \$5,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$4,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

- (A) New budget authority, \$5,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$4,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

- (A) New budget authority, \$5,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$4,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

- (A) New budget authority, \$5,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$5,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

- (A) New budget authority, \$5,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$5,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

- (A) New budget authority, \$5,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$5,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

- (A) New budget authority, \$5,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$5,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

- (A) New budget authority, \$5,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$5,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

- (A) New budget authority, \$5,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$5,000,000,000.

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950): This function comprises major offsetting receipt items that would distort the funding levels of other functional categories if they were distributed to them. The policy of this resolution is that there shall be budget authority of -\$38,700,000,000 and outlays of -\$38,700,000,000 in fiscal year 2002, and budget authority of -\$514,900,000,000 and outlays of -\$514,900,000,000 over fiscal years 2002 through 2011, to address priorities such as but not limited to adjusting rates of compensation for civilian employees of the United States at the same time, and in the same proportion, as are rates of compensation for members of the uniformed services. The budget resolution does not include the provision contained in the President's budget that assumes the opening of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) for oil drilling. The budget resolution does not extend a provision included in the February Blueprint and the Committee-approved Republican Budget Resolution that increases agency contributions for employees covered by the civil service retirement system.

Fiscal year 2002:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$38,700,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$38,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2003:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$49,100,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$49,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$57,600,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$57,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$55,300,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$55,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$48,600,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$48,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$46,900,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$46,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$51,400,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$51,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$52,600,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$52,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$54,400,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$54,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$60,300,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$60,300,000,000.

SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

(a) SUBMISSION BY HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS FOR TAX RELIEF IN FISCAL YEAR 2001.—Not later than May 1, 2001, the House Committee on Ways and Means shall report to the House a reconciliation bill that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce revenues by not more than \$60 billion during fiscal year 2001.

(b) SUBMISSIONS BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS FOR ENHANCED STATUTORY PROTECTIONS AND SOLVENCY EXTENSION FOR MEDICARE AND SOCIAL SECURITY.—

(1) TAKING MEDICARE OFF-BUDGET AND REAFFIRMING THE OFF-BUDGET STATUS OF SOCIAL SECURITY.—Not later than June 8, 2001, the

House Committee on Ways and Means shall report to the House Committee on the Budget a reconciliation bill that changes laws within its jurisdiction to designate the Medicare HI surplus as having the same off-budget status as the Social Security surplus, and that reaffirms the off-budget status of the Social Security surplus. Pursuant to this and without exception:

(A) 100 percent of the Social Security surplus in each fiscal year from 2002 through 2011 shall be saved by purchasing from the Treasury special non-marketable bonds, which can be redeemed only to pay for Social Security benefits stipulated in current law;

(B) 100 percent of the Medicare HI surplus in each fiscal year from 2002 through 2011 shall be saved by purchasing from the Treasury special non-marketable bonds for the Medicare HI trust fund, which can be redeemed only to pay for Medicare HI benefits stipulated in current law; and

(C) the Treasury shall use the proceeds of sales of special non-marketable bonds to the Social Security and Medicare HI trust funds exclusively for redeeming publicly held debt.

(2) EXTENDING SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE SOLVENCY.—Not later than June 8, 2001, the House Committee on Ways and Means shall submit legislation to the House Committee on the Budget providing for the annual remittance from the General Fund of the Treasury to the Hospital Insurance (Medicare Part A) Trust Fund and to the Old Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund of an amount equal to one-third of the projected on-budget, that is non-Social Security, non-Medicare HI, surplus, currently projected to be \$910 billion from fiscal year 2002 through fiscal year 2011. Such remittances shall be equally divided between the two trust funds, with the objective of extending their solvency to at least 2040 and 2050, respectively. Such remittances shall be derived exclusively from the on-budget, that is non-Social Security, non-Medicare HI, surplus over that ten-year period.

(c) SUBMISSIONS BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS FOR RESPONSIBLE TAX RELIEF.—

(1) SUBMISSION.—Not later than June 8, 2001, the House Committee on Ways and Means shall submit legislation to the House Committee on the Budget reducing revenues in amounts which, when combined with the debt service costs of tax adjustments made in fiscal year 2001, does not exceed \$34 billion in fiscal year 2002, \$300 billion for fiscal years 2002 through 2006, and \$737 billion for fiscal years 2002 through 2011.

(2) POLICY ASSUMPTIONS.—Within the framework of this budget resolution, which provides for the extension of the solvency of the Social Security and Medicare trust funds, the policy of this resolution is that there shall be net tax relief, which when combined with the debt service costs of tax adjustments made in fiscal year 2001, does not exceed \$34 billion in fiscal year 2002, \$300 billion in fiscal years 2002 through 2006, or \$737 billion in fiscal years 2002 through 2011. Such tax relief shall include but not be limited to provisions that—

(A) create a new income tax bracket, taxing income at a rate below the current 15 percent rate;

(B) mitigate the marriage penalty including that created through the earned income credit;

(C) increase the earned income credit for working families with children;

(D) eliminate estate taxes on all but the very largest estates; and

(E) grant other tax relief, such as modification of the individual alternative minimum tax and enhancement of tax incentives for retirement savings.

(3) FLEXIBILITY FOR THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—If the reconciliation submission by the Committee on Ways and Means alters the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in ways that are scored by the Joint Committee on Taxation as outlay changes, as through legislation affecting refundable tax credits, the submission shall be considered to meet the revenue requirements of the reconciliation directive if the net cost of the revenue and outlay changes does not exceed the revenue amount set forth for that committee in paragraph 1 of this subsection. Upon the submission of such legislation, the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget shall adjust the budget aggregates in this resolution and allocations made under this resolution accordingly.

(d) SUBMISSIONS BY HOUSE COMMITTEES ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE AND WAYS AND MEANS FOR MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.—

(1) Not later than June 8, 2001, the House Committees named in paragraph (2) shall report the following changes in laws within their jurisdiction to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(2)(A) The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall increase outlays by not more than the following: \$94,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, \$97,865,000,000 for the period fiscal year 2002 through 2006, and \$330,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal year 2002 through 2011.

(B) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall increase outlays by not more than the following: \$94,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, \$97,865,000,000 for the period fiscal year 2002 through 2006, and \$330,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal year 2002 through 2011.

(e) OTHER SUBMISSIONS BY HOUSE COMMITTEES.—

(1) SUBMISSIONS.—Not later than June 8, 2001, the House Committees named in paragraph (2) shall report the following changes in laws within their jurisdiction to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(2)(A) SUBMISSION BY HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE FOR ASSISTANCE TO FARMERS, RESTORING FOOD STAMPS FOR LEGAL IMMIGRANTS, AND ENHANCING THE NUTRITIONAL SAFETY NET.—The House Committee on Agriculture shall increase outlays by not more than the following: \$8,381,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, \$29,158,000,000 for the period fiscal year 2002 through 2006, and \$54,019,000,000 for the period of fiscal year 2002 through 2011.

(B) SUBMISSION BY HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND WORKFORCE FOR STUDENT LOAN FORGIVENESS FOR MATH AND SCIENCE TEACHERS.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall increase outlays by not more than the following: \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, \$32,000,000 for the period fiscal year 2002 through 2006, and \$82,000,000 for the period of fiscal year 2002 through 2011.

(C) SUBMISSION BY HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE FOR THE FAMILY OPPORTUNITY ACT AND FOR PROVIDING ACCESS TO HEALTH INSURANCE FOR LOW-INCOME FAMILIES.—The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall increase outlays by not more than the following: \$97,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, \$13,475,000,000 for the period fiscal year 2002 through 2006, and \$50,021,000,000 for the period of fiscal year 2002 through 2011.

(D) SUBMISSION BY HOUSE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS AFFAIRS FOR EXPANSION OF MONTGOMERY GI BILL EDUCATION BENEFITS, BURIAL BENEFITS, AND OTHER BENEFITS.—The House

Committee on Veterans Affairs shall increase outlays by not more than the following: \$264,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, \$3,205,000,000 for the period fiscal year 2002 through 2006, and \$7,087,000,000 for the period of fiscal year 2002 through 2011.

(E) SUBMISSION BY HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS FOR EXTENDING TANF SUPPLEMENTAL GRANTS, INCREASING TITLE XX (SOCIAL SERVICES BLOCK GRANT), PROMOTING SAFE AND STABLE FAMILIES, PROVIDING INDEPENDENT LIVING VOUCHERS FOR FOSTER CHILDREN, INCREASING THE CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT FUND, AND RESTORING EQUITY IN SSI AND MEDICAID BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN LEGAL IMMIGRANTS.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall increase outlays by not more than the following: \$714,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, \$9,411,000,000 for the period fiscal year 2002 through 2006, and \$31,091,000,000 for the period of fiscal year 2002 through 2011.

SEC. 5. TREATMENT OF OASDI ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

In the House, in addition to amounts in this resolution, allocations to the Committee on Appropriations shall include the following amounts, which are assumed to be used for the Administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration, and, for purposes of section 302(f)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, those allocations shall be considered to be allocations made under section 302(a) of that Act: \$3,597,000,000 in new budget authority and \$3,542,000,000 in outlays.

SEC. 6. RESERVE FUND FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION.

In the House, whenever the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides new budget authority for any fiscal year from 2002 through 2011 of at least the level appropriated in the previous fiscal year adjusted for inflation for programs authorized under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), part B grants to States, the Committee on the Budget shall increase the appropriate allocations of new budget authority and outlays for that fiscal year by \$1,500,000,000 (and adjust any other appropriate levels), an amount to be used solely for programs authorized under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), part B grants to States. However, no such adjustment shall exceed the amount by which the bill exceeds the applicable allocation.

SEC. 7. FUNDS ALREADY APPROPRIATED FOR ARRANGEMENTS TO THE UNITED NATIONS.

For purposes of enforcing the allocations in this resolution, any outlays scored from authorizing legislation releasing previously appropriated funding for the United Nations is assumed not to be new outlays.

SEC. 8. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE STABILIZATION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL PAYMENTS TO STATES, COUNTIES, AND BOROUGHES.

It is the sense of Congress that Federal revenue-sharing payments to States, counties, and boroughs pursuant to the Act of May 23, 1908 (35 Stat. 260; 16 U.S.C. 500), the Act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 963; 16 U.S.C. 500), the Act of August 28, 1937 (chapter 876; 50 Stat. 875; 43 U.S.C. 1181f), the Act of May 24, 1939 (chapter 144; 53 Stat. 753; 43 U.S.C. 1181f-1 et seq.), and sections 13982 and 13983 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-66; 16 U.S.C. 500 note; 43 U.S.C. 1181f note) should be stabilized and maintained for the long-term benefit of schools, roads, public services, and communities, and that providing such permanent, stable funding is a priority of the 106th Congress.

SEC. 9. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE IMPORTANCE OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the levels in this concurrent budget resolution for function 250 (General Science, Space, and Technology) for fiscal year 2002 are \$300,000,000 above the level in the House Republican budget resolution and over ten years (fiscal years 2002 to 2011), the levels in this concurrent resolution are \$3,100,000,000 above the levels in the House Republican budget resolution;

(2) the National Science Foundation is the largest supporter of basic research in the Federal Government;

(3) the National Science Foundation is the second largest supporter of university-based research;

(4) research conducted by the grantees of the National Science Foundation has led to innovations that have dramatically improved the quality of life of all Americans;

(5) because basic research funded by the National Science Foundation is high-risk, cutting edge, fundamental, and may not produce tangible benefits for over a decade, the Federal Government is uniquely suited to support such research; and

(6) the National Science Foundation's focus on peer-reviewed, merit-based grants represents a model for research agencies across the Federal Government.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the function 250 levels assume an increase for National Science Foundation that is sufficient for it to continue its critical role in funding basic research, cultivating America's intellectual infrastructure, and leading to innovations that assure the Nation's economic future.

SEC. 10. FEDERAL EMPLOYEE PAY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House of Representatives finds the following:

(1) Members of the uniformed services and civilian employees of the United States make significant contributions to the general welfare of the Nation.

(2) Increases in the pay of members of the uniformed services and of civilian employees of the United States have not kept pace with increases in the overall pay levels of workers in the private sector, so that there now exists—

(A) a 32 percent gap between compensation levels of Federal civilian employees and compensation levels of private sector workers; and

(B) an estimated 10 percent gap between compensation levels of members of the uniformed services and compensation levels of private sector workers.

(3) The President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2002 includes a 4.6 percent pay raise for military personnel.

(4) The Office of Management and Budget has requested that Federal agencies plan their fiscal year 2002 budgets with a 3.6 percent pay raise for civilian Federal employees.

(5) In almost every year during the past 2 decades, there have been equal adjustments in the compensation of members of the uniformed services and the compensation of civilian employees of the United States.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—It is the sense of the House of Representatives that rates of compensation for civilian employees of the United States should be adjusted at the same time, and in the same proportion, as are rates of compensation for members of the uniformed services.

SEC. 11. ASSET BUILDING FOR THE WORKING POOR.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress find the following:

(1) For the vast majority of United States households, the pathway to the economic

mainstream and financial security is not through spending and consumption, but through savings, investing, and the accumulation of assets.

(2) One-third of all Americans have no assets available for investment and another 20 percent have only negligible assets. The situation is even more serious for minority households; for example, 60 percent of African-American households have no or negative financial assets.

(3) Nearly 50 percent of all children in America live in households that have no assets available for investment, including 40 percent of Caucasian children and 73 percent of African-American children.

(4) Up to 20 percent of all United States households do not deposit their savings in financial institutions and, thus, do not have access to the basic financial tools that make asset accumulation possible.

(5) Public policy can have either a positive or a negative impact on asset accumulation. Traditional public assistance programs based on income and consumption have rarely been successful in supporting the transition to economic self-sufficiency. Tax policy, through \$288,000,000,000 in annual tax incentives, has helped lay the foundation for the great middle class.

(6) Lacking an income tax liability, low-income working families cannot take advantage of asset development incentives available through the Federal tax code.

(7) Individual Development Accounts have proven to be successful in helping low-income working families save and accumulate assets. Individual Development Accounts have been used to purchase long-term, high-return assets, including homes, postsecondary education and training, and small business.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the Federal tax code should support a significant expansion of Individual Development Accounts so that millions of low-income, working families can save, build assets, and move their lives forward; thus, making positive contributions to the economic and social well-being of the United States, as well as to its future.

SEC. 12. FEDERAL FIRE PREVENTION ASSISTANCE.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(1) Increased demands on firefighting and emergency medical personnel have made it difficult for local governments to adequately fund necessary fire safety precautions.

(2) The Government has an obligation to protect the health and safety of the firefighting personnel of the United States and to ensure that they have the financial resources to protect the public.

(3) The high rates in the United States of death, injury, and property damage caused by fires demonstrates a critical need for Federal investment in support of firefighting personnel.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the Government should support the core operations of the Federal Emergency Management Agency by providing needed fire grant programs to assist our firefighters and rescue personnel as they respond to more than 17,000,000 emergency calls annually. To accomplish this task, Congress supports preservation of the Assistance to Firefighters grant program. Continued support of the Assistance to Firefighters grant program will enable local firefighters to adequately protect the lives of countless Americans put at risk by insufficient fire protection.

SEC. 13. FUNDING FOR GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION AT CHILDREN'S TEACHING HOSPITALS

It is the sense of Congress that:

(1) Function 550 of the President's budget should include an appropriate level of funding for graduate medical education conducted at independent children's teaching hospitals in order to ensure access to care by millions of children nationwide.

(2) An emphasis should be placed on the role played by community health centers in underserved rural and urban communities. An increase in funding for community health centers should not come at the expense of the Community Access Program. Both programs should be funded adequately, with the intention of doubling funding for increased capacity for community health centers, in addition to keeping the Community Access Program operational.

(3) The Medicare program should emphasize such preventive medical services as those provided by vision rehabilitation professionals in saving Government funds and preserving the independence of a growing number of seniors in the coming years.

(4) Funding under function 550 should also reflect the importance of the Ryan White CARE Act to persons afflicted with HIV/AIDS. Funds allocated from the CARE Act serve as the safety net for thousands of low-income people living with HIV/AIDS who reside in metropolitan areas but are ineligible for entitlement programs. Moreover, the CARE Act provides critically needed grants directly to existing community-based clinics and public health providers to develop and deliver both early and ongoing comprehensive services to persons with HIV/AIDS.

SEC. 14. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS ON PRESERVING HEALTH CARE SERVICES AND PROFESSIONAL HEALTH CARE TRAINING.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The Congress finds that—

(1) it recognizes the need to maintain the national network devoted to providing health care services and supports its continuation;

(2) without adequate resources devoted to research and development of new technologies, modern medicine cannot meet the challenges of the new century; and

(3) without adequate resources devoted to the recruitment and training of skilled caregivers in all settings, the latest technologies may never benefit the American people.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of the Congress that to preserve funding for vital health care services, address shortages in health care professions, such as nursing, as well as health care research, the Congress should support fully funding these programs, specifically including health care professions training, and other health-related programs, at a level sufficient to support continuation of current services.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 100, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and a Member opposed each will control 25 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget is full of empty promises. President Bush says he is the education President, but he eliminates the commitment to modernizing our aging schools.

President Bush says he wants to protect Medicare, but his budget does not provide the resources to shore it up.

President Bush says he wants to protect the environment; but at the same time he is allowing arsenic into our

water supply and preparing to drill for oil in the pristine Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. He shortchanges environmental protection by \$60 billion.

President Bush says he wants to fix our broken election system to avoid another fiasco like we had in Florida, but he does not provide a dime in his budget to solve the problem.

Why all the unfulfilled promises? Because one cannot provide a \$2 trillion tax cut targeted to those making a million dollars a year, and one cannot provide tax-free inheritances for the sons and daughters of billionaires without giving something up. What President Bush gives up are priorities like educating our kids, health care for our veterans, saving Social Security and Medicare for our seniors, and keeping our air and water safe and clean.

We Democrats think that is a bad deal, a poor trade-off; so we are offering America a more balanced, more responsible choice for a brighter future.

We are for a tax cut, yes, but one that gives as much of a break to the middle-manager or teacher or fire fighter as it does for the oil magnate.

With the money we save by giving a fair tax cut for all, instead of an enormous tax cut for the millionaires, we can pay down our national debt; we can provide a prescription-drug benefit for our seniors, something we all know will be there when we retire; we can make sure every child, whether from an inner city or wealthy suburb or rural community, can get an education in a modern school with up-to-date textbooks and access to the Internet; and, yes, we can provide a \$60 billion stimulus package right now, immediate tax relief; and we can improve the standard of living for the soldiers who protect our freedom.

The choice is clear. Let us not give up all of these possibilities just so a multimillionaire can get a \$30,000 tax cut.

We have been down that budget-busting, deficit-spending road before. It took us a decade and a half to get out of it. We had high inflation, high unemployment, high interest rates. We do not need to go back to that with the economy as it is today.

Let us win a brighter future for all of America's families. That is what the Democratic budget does. It does it responsibly. It gives tax relief. It pays down the debt at a quicker rate. Ultimately, it secures America's economic future and those of its families. Vote for the Democratic substitute.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU) will control the 25 minutes in opposition to the Spratt amendment.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Hampshire for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to go back to some of the basic principles that undergird this basic budget. I think when people begin to understand that, they will begin to realize it is fair, it is responsible, it is reasonable, and in many respects it is overdue.

First of all, maximum debt elimination. I think every American realizes that one of the greatest gifts we can give to our kids is to pass this Nation on to our kids debt free. We pay off the maximum amount of debt possible over the next 10 years.

Tax relief for every taxpayer. For the average family of four in my district, ultimately this results in about \$1,600 worth of tax relief. That is money that they will get to spend on their priorities, not Washington's.

Improve education for our children. That is one of President Bush's top priorities to make certain that our kids are getting the education they will need to compete in the world marketplace.

A stronger national defense. I think most of us realize we have short-changed the kids who serve us in uniform around the world.

Health care reform that modernizes Medicare. We all know, if we are honest with ourselves, that something has to happen in the next several years to reform and modernize our Medicare system.

Finally, a better Social Security for seniors today and for tomorrow.

These are all big goals, these are all important principles, and they are included in this budget blueprint.

One of the things we have heard a lot about in the last couple days is, well, this is all built on pie-in-the-sky projections. Well, the truth of the matter is that is not the case at all. In fact, here is a quote from the Congressional Budget Office when they testified before the House Committee on the Budget. Let me read it:

"A recession of average size would probably not alter the 10-year outlook significantly. The reason is that the CBO's baseline 10-year assumptions allow for the likelihood of a recession of average severity will occur over the next decade."

We are assuming the economy will slow down at least once. In fact, it is even better than that. We are assuming relatively slow economic growth in this budget projection. In fact, I asked the director of the Office of Management and Budget a very serious question.

Here is my question: 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 right? The answer is: "Yes, sir, that is correct."

What that means, Mr. Chairman, is, if the economy simply grows, if revenue to the Federal Government grows at what it has grown on average for the last 40 years, we will not have a \$5.5 trillion surplus, we will have a \$7.5 tril-

lion surplus. I think we are being extremely conservative in our projections.

Finally, let me just talk briefly because we have heard a lot about protecting our farmers. I said this earlier and I will say it again, no one in this Congress, no one in this Chamber is going to take for granted our farmers. No one wants to bet the farm and end up losing a generation of younger farmers. We are going to be there. We have been there in the last several years.

But when we passed this last farm bill, we all agreed that we were going to see a reduction in the baseline for agriculture. But this is what we have actually been spending.

If we include what we are agreeing to in this budget resolution in terms of emergency spending, it would be hard for anyone honestly to argue that we are not going to keep our commitment to agriculture.

We understand that things are tough on the farm, but the answer is not necessarily in more and bigger checks from the Federal Government. The answer is better access to markets both internationally and domestically.

I think this budget is fair. It is responsible. It is reasonable. It has been built on a solid foundation and important principles. I think the American people will agree with it.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA).

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to ask my fellow colleagues in Congress to support the Democratic amendment being offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

This bill provides our Nation with the needed funding for education. Unlike the Republican proposal, the Democratic amendment provides an additional \$130 billion over 10 years for class size reduction, for school renovation, for title I aid for the disadvantaged students, Pell grants, and for Head Start.

President Bush calls himself the education President, but falls short on adequately addressing the Hispanic education crisis facing our Nation. Just 70 percent of Hispanic students complete high school, and only 10.6 percent have a bachelor's degree.

With the Republican-proposed budget, the Hispanic community will have no hope of improving upon their current situation and raise the level of education attainment.

Mr. Chairman, President Bush has stated that his budget proposal will leave no child behind. Well, today, the Republican proposal makes sure that children are not left behind. Millions of students are forgotten altogether.

My fellow Republican colleagues have said that today's Republican proposal will take the money from Washington and return it to the people. The truth is that today's Republican bill

will take America's education budget and return 43 percent of it to the wealthiest 1 percent.

The truth is that everyone in Congress wants to give America a tax cut, including me; but the real question is if we are willing to do it irresponsibly.

Finally, the Spratt Democratic plan returns \$910 billion to America and provides for education, for health care, for agriculture, for Medicare and election reform. This budget plan is responsible and good for America.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), a member of the committee.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to address some of the concerns that have been raised by the other side of the aisle about the budget we are voting on today. This budget does protect Social Security and Medicare actually in ways that we have never done before as a Congress. It truly takes the trust funds and protects them for the future for generations to come.

It also for the first time in our Nation's history really does do something about the debt. We pay off more national debt under this budget than Congress has ever done before. In fact, we pay down all of the available national debt.

We also, despite what we have heard from the other side and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) just talked about education, we increase funding significantly for education. We are going to improve our public schools under this budget with, again, an increase in education spending that is significantly higher than Congress had traditionally done. In fact, overall, if one looks at the spending for education and other items on the domestic discretionary side, we increase spending by 4.5 percent, well above inflation.

After we do all that, protect Social Security and Medicare, increase funding for education, pay down the national debt, strengthen our national defense significantly, there is still money left on the table.

I heard a story today about a woman in Iowa who spoke up at a town meeting and said, You know, I make cookies for my kids; and when the cookies are left on the table, something happens to them. They get eaten. We do not want to leave more cookies on the table to get eaten by a bigger and bigger Federal Government. We do not want a bigger, a more intrusive Federal Government. We want to be able to give the taxpayers some money back of the \$5.6 trillion surplus we are now building up here in Washington projected over the next 10 years.

The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), the speaker before me on the Republican side, talked about how this projection is actually conservative. The vote today is whether we are going to let those taxpayers keep a little of that hard-earned money. We are

saying, we are proposing that they ought to be able to keep a little less than 28 percent of that surplus, remember, every dime of which was created by the hard-working taxpayers of this country. That is what we are saying.

We are saying, at the end of the day, after we have taken care of all of these other priorities, we ought to let the people who are paying the bill, who are pulling the wagon, who created all this surplus keep a little of that hard-earned money for their own lives and their own decisions. We have got to do it now to help this economy.

□ 1515

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make the point again that this is a big debate between Republicans and Democrats. It is a debate that is raging around the country, and it comes down to how big Washington is going to be, how big is our spending going to be on more and more government, or are we going to let people keep more of their money.

With job losses around the country, including in my own district, with the potential of a recession looming, we have got to not only let people keep a little more of their hard-earned money, but we have to as a Congress stimulate economic growth and get this economy back on its feet to ensure we have jobs.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the budget proposal before us today and reject the Democrat alternative.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, we Democrats also care about the people that are pulling the wagon; but unlike the Republicans, we are concerned that we are going to put too much of a debt load on the people that are pulling the wagon. What this comes down to is a great deal of risk; a gambit, a "river boat gamble," as the term was used back in 1981. This is what the Congressional Budget Office says are the likelihood of whether or not we will see a \$5.6 trillion surplus. It is all over the map in the outyears, and that is when the bulk of the projected surplus comes into play.

This budget before us, the Republican budget, is drafted around the maximum size of a tax cut you can get, and the problem with that is that it leaves no room for error.

Mr. Chairman, Democrats believe that we can have a tax cut, but we should be risk-averse in doing so; that we should first pay our obligations, and the first obligation is to paying down the national debt. We pay down more national debt in the Spratt substitute than the Republican budget does. My colleagues are going to say, we are paying down all of the debt that can be redeemed, that matures within the time period. Nobody in this House knows ex-

actly how much debt can be paid down, but rather than limit ourselves at what we can do through our budget resolution, the Democrats say, let us dedicate more to paying down debt.

Mr. Chairman, we do it for a couple of reasons. We do it because it is our obligation to pay it, and also because these numbers, like the Congressional Budget Office, may be wrong. We may actually be in a deficit, not in a surplus, in 10 years. If we do not have a safety valve through paying down the debt, we will end up issuing more debt. That does not lighten the load of the people that are pulling the wagon, it increases the load. At the same time, we say, let us take Medicare and Social Security off budget. Let us lighten the load there as well. Our Republican colleagues go the other direction. In their plan they would shorten the life span of Medicare and Social Security.

Mr. Chairman, how would you make up for the shortening of that life span? Well, there are only really three ways. You can cut benefits, you can raise payroll taxes or add even more debt. To me that heavies the load for the people that are pulling the wagon.

The Democrats care as much as the Republicans. Some of us would argue the Democrats care even more about the people pulling the wagon, the Dicky Flats of the world. What we are saying here today is we are not going to take a river boat gamble on something that may or may not occur 10 years down the road that would put the burden back on the American working families that are out there.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for the Spratt substitute, defeat the Republican budget, and we will be a lot better off for it.

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

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

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Chairman, we are considering a Democrat alternative right now, and I think it is important to review the budget that is on the floor and to make some fair contrasts, because there are a lot of claims that are being made.

Mr. Chairman, we just heard one about retiring even more debt than is in the Republican budget proposal. We are going to retire \$2.3 trillion in debt over the next 10 years. That is more debt than has ever been retired in the history of our country. We have paid down about \$625 billion in public debt.

I think what we are hearing is in many ways an esoteric argument whether we can pay down \$2.3 trillion or \$2.5 trillion or \$2.7 trillion over the next 10 years, and that fog is being sent out in order to create an argument against cutting taxes. I understand that there are some of my colleagues in this Chamber that have no interest in lowering the tax burden on the average American.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) made clear the tax proposal in this budget gives back 28 percent of the surplus to the American taxpayer, and there are a lot of my colleagues in this Chamber on the minority side who think that is too much money to give back to the American people. They do not want to cut income tax rates in order to encourage economic growth; they do not want to repeal the death tax or eliminate the marriage tax penalty. There are probably 150 or 180 Members of this Congress that did not vote to repeal the marriage tax penalty when it came before us last year. That is unfortunate. Ultimately those colleagues are looking for an argument to be able to continue to stand to oppose tax relief and keep that money in Washington in order to increase the size and scope of the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, do we set aside every penny of the Social Security surplus? Of course we do, and so does the Democrat alternative. My colleagues recognize that is the right thing to do. We also set up a reserve for Social Security and a reserve for Medicare. It has never been done in the history of our country, but it makes sense, and it is the right thing to do.

Mr. Chairman, at the end of the day we come down to a whole series of excuses why we should not cut taxes until we balance the budget.

Mr. Chairman, 4 years ago the same Democrats that are opposing this budget resolution said we cannot cut taxes until we balance the budget. Three years ago they said we cannot cut taxes until we set aside the Social Security surplus. We did both of these things. We set aside the entire Medicare surplus; and now what we see is we cannot cut taxes because we cannot predict the future, and there is some uncertainty as to what the level of economic growth will be next year or the year after that.

Mr. Chairman, of course on that reasoning we will never cut taxes, and I think for some of my colleagues on the minority side, that is the ultimate goal. Leave the money here in Washington. I think that is unfair. I think we should support what is a balanced budget proposal to pay down debt, cut taxes and fund the right priorities.

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

Mr. Chairman, in response to what the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU) just said, I do not know what resolution my colleague is talking about, because the resolution now before us sets aside fully one-third of the surplus from the years 2002 through 2011 for tax reduction, and targets that tax reduction at those taxpayers that need it the most. That is a tax cut of more than \$750 billion.

Mr. Chairman, in addition we say because we know there will be a substantial surplus this year, let us take two-thirds of that surplus that we can foresee coming on the end of this year, \$60

billion, and give it to taxpayers now both because they deserve it, because we know that it is available, and because we believe that it will be a stimulus to this sagging economy.

Mr. Chairman, that is what is in our resolution, and what the gentleman from New Hampshire said is 180 degrees out from what is before the House at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), who is the ranking member of the Committee on Small Business.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in strong opposition to the Republican budget and in support of the Democratic substitute. The Republican budget resolution is terribly flawed. It fails to protect Social Security and Medicare and makes cuts in vital areas, such as housing, transportation and the environment, to provide a tax break to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans.

In addition to the cuts targeted at those who can ill afford to lose any more, we are asking the hard-working men and women who run our Nation's small businesses to bear an unfair burden of this budget.

Although the Republicans continue to claim that they are providing tax relief for small businesses, the truth is that what is contained in the Republican budget resolution is not a tax break for small businesses, but a tax increase by imposing new fees for SBA loans and technical assistance.

Ask any business owner, and he or she will say that these fees are nothing more than a tax. To add insult to injury, small-business owners, who have seen their businesses destroyed in a flood, earthquake, hurricane or some other disaster, will be expected to pay almost \$10,000 more for disaster assistance, effectively prohibiting many business owners from rebuilding their life's dream.

Is this what the President means when he talks about compassionate conservatism; kicking someone when they are down?

The Democratic substitute is fair and realistic. It continues to protect and fund this Nation's priorities while providing sensible tax relief to all Americans. Therefore, I will urge my colleagues to support the Democratic substitute and vote down the Republican budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), a member of the committee.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the committee's resolution is preferable to the substitute, and I want to focus on just

one issue, and that is national defense. The committee budget recognizes that the President has ordered a strategic review, and that strategy should come first, and that strategy should drive decisions on resources.

We know there are some places we need to spend more money. The budget recognizes that we are going to spend more than \$5 billion on people for pay raises, more housing and military health care. We know we are going to have to spend more on research and development, and we make a down payment on that. But there is a lot we do not know. So we have this contingency fund so that, after the strategic review is completed, we can draw more resources to fund the strategy that the President and the Secretary of Defense recommend.

Now, the substitute takes a different approach. They believe they know how much more resources we need for defense. They believe we need \$2.6 billion more in 2002 and about \$48 billion more over the next 10 years. But that is putting cart before the horse. For too long we have had a mismatch between the strategy, the programs to implement that strategy, and the funding of those programs. It is time to get it all together and to get it all aligned. This administration is trying to do that with a strategic review to see where we are in the world, what our missions should be, and what kind of force structures we need to accomplish those missions.

This administration also acknowledges that the world is changing around us, and we better do some hard thinking about what we need to spend money on so that we can be prepared for those threats coming in the future. I believe that the strategic review, followed by the contingency fund to implement that review, is a better approach to making sure that this Nation is safely defended in the years to come.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK).

(Mrs. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in strong opposition to the Republican budget plan and in strong support of the Democratic substitute offered by my good friend, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

We need a budget. We need to be able to take the money which the American public has given us and to use it fairly and wisely. We need to save certainly on taxes, but we also need enough money left to do the other things that are important to the American public.

Now, everyone who comes before this Congress and says what they think the American public wants, they do not always know what the American public wants. But that is sort of a word that everyone uses, the American public says so-and-so. Not so, because we need

to improve education, we need to provide real prescription drug relief, we need to ensure the solvency of Social Security and Medicare, and we need to pay down the national debt. There is no question about it, we cannot do it with the Republican budget.

Now, there have been many other efforts made, but the Spratt effort shows how that that can be done. We need a good balance of tax relief, debt relief and a third for new programs. The housing part of this budget is criminal. What they have said is that they are putting more money into housing. That is not correct.

When we look at it, we see we will not be able to get the affordable housing which the Republican budget has come up with, because what they have done is, they have done what they call the funny money shuffle and mixed the FHA funds in terms of regular housing funds. They have also reduced monies for public housing. Tragic.

We should look at this much more closely and not pass this particular approach to the budget resolution. And the Congress should understand that when they go back home to their districts, they are not going to be able to answer some of these crucial problems, particularly regarding affordable housing, one of our major problems.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), a member of the committee.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Republican budget. It is sensible, it is responsible, and it is fair.

□ 1530

I think my colleagues have done a great job of pointing out the underlying foundation of this budget. Number one, it pays down the national debt. That is good for everybody, for our children, our grandchildren. It gives tax relief to working Americans. It allows them to keep more of what they earn, and that is important.

When we look at Social Security and Medicare, it preserves those programs for our senior citizens and their kids and their grandkids as well, and it improves education by putting more money and giving more local control and flexibility.

Finally, as a new Member who comes from a district that is largely military oriented, I am proud to say that this budget begins to make America strong again. It begins to rebuild our forces which have been hollowed out for the last 8 years. It is a good budget. It is a sound budget, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, a little less than a month ago, the House overwhelmingly passed a bankruptcy reform measure that while not perfect sent an unmistakable message to every household in

America: Do not spend money that you do not have because if you do you will be held responsible for your choices. We are not going to give you a pass on personal responsibility just because you could not say no to all the enticing credit card offers you received in the mail.

Thus, today, I have to stand here and shake my head in amazement. Here we are, scarcely a month later, debating a Republican budget resolution that is an abdication of fiscal responsibility. The tax cuts outlined in this GOP budget document would cost more than \$2 trillion over the next decade; and as a result, they would squander projected surpluses. Note the emphasis on projected. They are not in hand. As a matter of fact, 70 percent of the American public showing their wisdom do not think they will ever be in hand.

Maybe our friends on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Chairman, ought to trust the common sense and intuition and wisdom of their constituents. Instead, they insist on pushing ahead with this budget blueprint for the fortunate few. The top 1 percent get 45 percent of this tax cut.

This bill, the Democratic bill, cuts three-quarters of a trillion dollars in taxes and the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU) gets up and says we are against tax cuts. Baloney. What we are for is responsibly helping working Americans, but not adding, as we did in the 1980s under President Reagan and a Republican Senate, \$4 trillion to the debt of whom? Of the American public. That is whose debt we added to. It is their money that is being put at risk. But at what cost?

Their plan would do nothing to stimulate our economy now. It threatens to invade the Social Security and Medicare trust funds and it would cut vital services, such as after-school lunch programs that improve learning and help make schools safer.

The diversified Democratic plan, on the other hand, would provide a responsible tax cut for all Americans. It would extend the solvency of Social Security and Medicare. It will allow us to invest in crucial national priorities. I am for investing in our defense and have supported every defense bill that has been signed by the Presidents, Republican and Democratic.

I urge my colleagues to do the right thing today. Vote for fiscal responsibility. Vote for a diversified budget plan that meets our Nation's needs. Vote for this Democratic alternative.

I was here in 1981 when we passed Gramm-Latta I and Gramm-Latta II. I voted against them. I was here when we passed Conable-Hance, the tax cut bill. And I was here when bright young people like the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU) got up here with their charts and said it will all work.

I was here when that bill was sent from this House, from this Senate, to the White House. And I was here in August of 1981 when President Reagan

signed the bill and, like the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU) said, guess what, we are going to balance the budget by October 1, 1983.

In that time frame, we added almost a billion extra dollars to America's debt; \$3 trillion was yet to come of additional debt that we added on the heads of Americans.

Let us be responsible. Vote for the Democratic alternative. It is good for America. It is good for our country and it is good policy.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, 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. Chairman, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 83 and against the pending substitute. I would like to begin my remarks by thanking the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), for crafting a responsive and responsible budget in general and for being especially sensitive to the needs and the concerns of our veterans around this country.

The decision of the Committee on the Budget to increase the veterans' affairs budget by 12 percent, that is \$5.6 billion over last year, including \$1 billion more than even the Bush administration suggested, is a breakthrough and a very, very important plus-up for all of our veterans.

I have said all along that the Bush budget was a work in progress and that we would do more, and today our budget chairman has done so. This 12 percent increase in funding will be a serious and a very tangible expression of solidarity and support for veterans and is especially justified in light of the sacrifices that our veterans have made.

Let me just say to my friends and colleagues, that record increases in spending for medical care will compensate, one, for inflation, as well as for significant increases in spending on mental health care, long-term care, additional staff for reducing waiting times, higher pharmacy costs, spinal cord injury care, homeless veterans, transitional housing, and the list goes on and on.

Yesterday this House passed two very important pieces of legislation that I was the sponsor of—H.R. 801 passed 417 to 0 and then H.R. 811 passed overwhelmingly as well. Both of those bills are fully accommodated by this budget.

As a matter of fact, the second bill, H.R. 811, would provide \$550 million for emergency repair of our hospitals. We saw what happened with the recent earthquake, the seismic damage that was done to the American League Hospital. There are many hospitals that have, unfortunately through neglect

they are in grave need of upgrading and repair. This legislation would do that.

Tomorrow I will be introducing the new GI Bill of Rights, the Education GI Bill of Rights.

Mr. Chairman, I ask Members to vote in favor of H. Con. Res. 83.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 83—and against the pending substitute.

I want to begin my remarks by thanking Chairman NUSSLE for crafting a responsible budget in general—and for being especially sensitive to the needs and concerns of veterans in particular. The decision of the Budget Committee to increase funding by 12 percent for the Department of Veterans Affairs—up \$5.6 billion over last year—including \$1 billion more than the Bush administration's budget proposal—is a breakthrough increase for veterans.

I have said all along that the Bush budget was a work in progress—and that we would do more. This 12-percent increase in funding in the underlying resolution is a serious and tangible expression of solidarity and support for veterans and is especially justified in light of the personal sacrifices made by the men and women who have protected our Nation, in peace and war, and whose lives have forever been changed by their experiences. This victory is a victory for all veterans, especially those who continue to suffer from the disabling effects of war wounds or from lingering mental illnesses connected to their service. They answered the call and now we must do the same.

Mr. Chairman, record increases in spending for medical care will compensate for inflation, as well as allow for significant increases in spending on mental health care, long-term care, additional staff to reduce waiting times, higher pharmacy costs, spinal cord injury care, homeless veterans transitional housing and emergency care. Additional funds will also be provided for research and construction, state nursing home and cemetery grants, the Veterans Benefits Administration and National Cemetery Administration.

For the first time in my memory, the Budget Resolution includes additional funds to cover mandatory increases which will be needed to fund H.R. 801, the Veterans Opportunities Act of 2001, and a bill I will introduce later this week to increase benefits available to veterans using the Montgomery GI bill. By providing funds in this year's budget to immediately implement H.R. 801, the Congress will be able to provide overdue increases to cover the rising costs of many urgently needed veterans' services, such as adaptive automobile and housing grants for severely disabled veterans.

H.R. 801, which passed the House yesterday by an overwhelming vote of 417–0 will also expand the Servicemembers Group Life Insurance program to include spouses and children, and make the increase in the maximum benefit from \$200,000 to \$250,000 retroactive to October 1, 2000, in order to provide a higher benefit to those men and women who have recently lost their lives in tragic military accidents.

The bill also increases funds for specially adopted housing grants as well as other important projects.

Under our proposal to update the Montgomery GI bill, the monthly benefit will be increased to a level that allows a qualified recipient to cover their monthly costs of attending a State college as a commuter. It would increase the monthly benefit available to a full-time student over a 3-year period beginning October 1, 2001 from \$650 to \$1,100 per month.

Last night, the House also approved the Veterans Hospitals Emergency Repair Act, H.R. 811, a bill that I introduced to provide immediate emergency funding to repair and rebuild dilapidated VA medical care facilities. The increase in funds for veterans contained in this resolution is based in part on the need for funds authorized in H.R. 811. This legislation authorizes \$550 million over the next 2 years for the Department of Veterans Affairs to immediately address urgent construction needs, specifically in facilities identified as having patient safety hazards, requiring seismic protection, or to improve privacy or accommodations for disabled veterans.

In closing, let me again thank the Committee and advise all of my colleagues that the level for veterans authorized in this resolution is both fair and defensible. Although there are certainly advocates who are calling for even higher levels of funding, I tell my colleagues that this is a good budget and one we should take pride in.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Democratic substitute and commend our ranking member, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), for his leadership, and in opposition to the Republicans' irresponsible budget resolution.

Our national budget, Mr. Chairman, I believe, should be a statement of our national values. The Republican budget resolution makes very clear the priorities of the Republican leadership and President Bush. They value tax cuts for the wealthy above all else, above initiatives that working families rely on to care for their children.

Mr. Chairman, anyone who has studied economics or reads the business section of the paper or makes investments, or all of the above, is familiar with the term opportunity cost of money. When we use money for one purpose, we lose the opportunity to use that money for another purpose. The opportunity cost is the benefit that would have accrued to the investor.

When the House chooses to use trillions of dollars for a tax cut, it gives us a tremendous opportunity cost to American families. We lose the benefit of improving child care and education for our children. We lose the opportunity for real prescription drug benefits for our seniors. We lose the benefit of reducing interest rates on our credit cards, mortgage and car payments. We lose the benefit of fully paying down the debt, strengthening Social Security and Medicare and giving a tax cut to American working families that will stimulate the economy and be responsible.

Mr. Chairman, the opportunity cost of the Republican tax budget is an opportunity lost for America's children

and their futures. President Bush has said many times that this administration will leave no child behind. Yet his budget and the budget resolution, which is based on the funding levels proposed in President Bush's budget outline, both do exactly that in order to pay for the irresponsible tax cut.

Example after example demonstrate the President's budget does leave many children behind. The Bush budget cuts the Child Care and Development Block Grant by \$200 million. It cuts grants to prevent and investigate child abuse by \$15.7 million. It eliminates the Early Learning Fund, which was created last year to improve the quality of child care and pre-education education.

This budget not only fails to live up to the President's rhetoric, it fails to represent the values of our country. I urge our colleagues to support the Democratic alternative, give a vote to the children of our country and to their future.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the very distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), a new member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, Eliran Rosenberg, Natali Landsgoren, and Shelhevat Pass, just 10 months old, three Israelis killed in recent terror attacks by bombs and a sniper, a sniper, where warning was given against these Israelis.

This afternoon we have learned that Israel has taken action today against Force 17, Yassir Arafat's own personal security detail, that plants cars bombs in Israel. This budget fully funds the President's International Affairs Function 150 request of \$23.8 billion and it sends a message to the Middle East and to the Arab League that we will stand by our allies, and especially Israel in her hour of need.

This is a responsible budget and fully funds America's role in the world.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Chairman, I respect the position of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and his knowledge of this position, but let me say we have something in our budget that the other side does not have. We have put in the 150 line for foreign aid and assistance \$450 million to fund the supplemental for Israel because of the dire straits in which Israel now finds itself.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) would yield?

Mr. SPRATT. I do not have the time to yield.

It is in our budget. If the gentleman votes for it, the money will be coming.

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

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Chairman, we have been seeing this chart now for the last 2 days, and it is a very interesting chart and I need to run through it quickly.

As we can see here, first of all I want to start out by saying that the budget we have before us is better than the budget the President submitted to us. I give him credit for that. It is a step in the right direction and I appreciate the effort, but there is more to do.

Maximum debt elimination, better budget than the President's. The Democratic alternative does more.

Tax relief for every taxpayer, the only difference is we only want to cut taxes by \$800 billion. That is all we want to cut taxes by. I guess I can be criticized for that, and I will take that criticism because the question is, what do we want to do with the difference?

The difference is going to some debt elimination; do more for improving education; do more for the Defense Department, \$47 billion more; do more for Medicare; do more for Social Security.

On this particular list, we do not even see things like LIHEAP, things like housing, things like election reform, things like research, things like retraining, and we can go on and on and on. They are not here. Our budget does it. The other side does not. That is why our budget is better.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate my friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), for the spectacular job he has done in crafting this with members of his committee.

Mr. Chairman, over the last 6 years, Republican majorities in both the House and the Senate have made history with budgets that stopped reckless Washington spending; paid down the debt; protected Social Security and funded our Nation's top priorities. For the first time in the now over 2 decades that I have been privileged to serve here in the United States Congress, we have a budget that has come from the President, that has not been designated "dead on arrival."

Republicans changed the culture of Washington so much that President Clinton was forced to acknowledge that the era of big government is over. Today, with President Bush at the helm, we continue to make history. The Republican budget pays down \$2.3 trillion of national debt. This Republican budget provides real tax relief for every American taxpayer. This Republican budget makes our children's education a top priority. This Republican budget protects Social Security from spending raids. This Republican budget restores strength to America's military.

To sum it up, Mr. Chairman, this Republican budget is a fair and balanced American budget that fully funds our shared priorities while providing tax relief to working Americans and paying down our national debt. We should

all provide strong bipartisan support for this very balanced measure.

□ 1545

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER).

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Democratic budget alternative. The Democratic budget provides a more realistic level of funding for our Nation's immediate defense needs. If we do not increase the amount of money we spend on our military now, Navy pilots will not have enough fuel to conduct flight tests, the Army will not have enough ammunition for training, and all branches of the military will face a shortage of spare parts. These shortages will have a real and lasting effect on the readiness of our Nation's military.

President Bush promised to improve the quality of life for our men and women in the military, but the Republican budget resolution fails to fund those priorities.

However, the Democratic budget alternative provides for a fiscal year 2001 supplemental appropriations bill totaling \$7.8 billion to immediately address these needs.

I urge my colleagues to do the right thing for national security and vote for the Democratic budget alternative.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, once again, class warfare, rich versus poor, politics of division, politics of fear. This madness must stop in America. Tell me who hires American workers. Is it the man on welfare, or is it the men and women who take a risk. Some of them go bankrupt, but some become successful and some gain great wealth. Thank God for that.

Wealth, profit, success are not dirty words in a free enterprise society; and by God, that is what we are, and we should be proud of it.

The dream of America is that we can be all we can be. We should be promoting and incentivizing the opportunity to gain wealth, not to demean those who have gained such wealth. After all, if the wealthy lose money, they move overseas and take your people and my people's jobs along with them. I want to incentivize the opportunity in America to gain wealth for all people, thus keeping those jobs here in America.

Mr. Chairman, our capitalist phenomenon not only creates jobs and stabilizes families, it does one more important thing. It stabilizes democracy not only in America, but around the world; and in doing so, it highlights the pitfalls, the injustice, and the failure of communism, I say to my colleagues.

I support the budget of President Bush. I commend the great work of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE). I want to close by saying, the President is right on. If we target some people in, you thus target people out. That is not

the dream of America. This rhetoric of division can some day turn into the fuel of socialism, I say to my colleagues. What strengthens America is there is just one America, not two, not three. One people, under God, indivisible. That is the dream of America. Wealth, profit, and success are not dirty words.

The Democratic substitute is not all that bad; but it does still play to divide, and I shall oppose it and I will support the work of the gentleman from Iowa. I believe we have a fine budget. Parts of it can be refined. I applaud his efforts.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in strong support of the Democratic substitute which provides substantially more funding for transportation over the next 10 years than does the budget resolution provided by the Republican majority.

Given the congestion in the Nation's transportation system, we must do better; and this Democratic substitute does better. The intent of the majority resolution is to honor the funding guarantees for highway, transit, and aviation as provided in TEA 21 and AIR 21; but the committee developed their resolution based on the administration's budget resolution, and they got it wrong.

The budget resolution brought to the floor by the majority does not include enough transportation funding under Function 400 to honor the firewalls of TEA 21 and AIR 21 and provide necessary funding for the Coast Guard.

This is not an issue of partisan politics, counting things differently. The administration admits they got it wrong. Ten days ago they admitted they got it wrong. OMB wrote to the Committee on the Budget to explain the understated transportation amounts necessary to fund the President's proposed budget.

Last night, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), our Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure chairman, in a discussion on the floor with the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, got assurances that the chairman would work to restore funding to honor TEA 21 and AIR 21 in conference, and I commend our chairman for that effort. But the point is that what we are voting on does not provide enough funding for the transportation programs that it claims to fund. They have had 10 days to fix it. They even had a rule that included a self-executing amendment to the resolution; and we could have had it fixed there, but they did not do it.

In contrast, the Democratic substitute fully funds TEA 21 and AIR 21

guarantees for highway, transit, and aviation investments. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) does not say with a wink, I will take care of it later. He says, it is in here; add it up. The \$33 billion additional is there to deal with these issues. Let us deal with the Democratic substitute.

Still worse than the disservice to transportation is the majority's treatment of education in this budget resolution. The Republican budget increases appropriated funding for the Department of Education by only \$2.4 billion, or 5.7 percent, over the 2001 enacted levels. This is less than half the average increase Congress has granted education appropriations for the last five years.

The Democratic budget, however, provides \$4.8 billion more in appropriated funding for education and related services than the Republican budget. Over the ten-year period from 2002 to 2011, the Democratic budget provides \$129 billion more for education than the Republican plan. These funds allow Democrats to boost funding for critical priorities including class size reduction, school renovation, special education, and Pell grants and other higher education programs.

This past Sunday, I met with teachers and administrators of Duluth area schools, as well as state legislators, all of whom underscored the need for significantly greater investment in education. They shared with me their views on the need for greater education partnership with and expanded investment from the federal government.

For example, Frank Wanner, a teacher from the Duluth School District, said that in 1978 he had \$1700 for classroom materials; today, the allocations buy only a box of Kleenex. Similarly, Russ Berntson of Proctor, Minnesota, said that 3,000 layoffs are expected in my home state of Minnesota in the next year due to underfunding and declining enrollment.

This kind of disrespect for public education must stop. Clearly, the Democratic substitute offers a substantially greater investment in education and the future of our country than does the committee or the administration budget resolution.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes and 15 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), my friend and colleague.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer my specific thanks to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) and the rest of the Committee on the Budget on both sides for including an amendment by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), my good friend, that would maintain the nearly 20-year-old tradition of pay parity between military and civilian Federal employees.

As many of my colleagues already know, the pay rates for both civilian and military personnel have fallen significantly below those of their private sector counterparts. Very recently, the Bureau of Labor Statistics released a report that confirmed that even now, more than 10 years after the enactment of the Federal Employees Pay Comparability Act, FEPCA, civilian and military employees are paid 32 percent and 10 percent respectively less than their private sector counterparts.

The Committee on the Budget has taken the first important step for protecting the 20-year tradition of pay parity between military and civilian Federal employees. I would like to thank my very good friend and neighbor, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), for leading the cause of the committee and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) for accepting this. Without this and the help of the chairman of the Committee on the Budget we would not have had this included in the fiscal year 2002 budget.

A few words about the bigger picture, Mr. Chairman. The budget we have proposed is good for America's future. It shows a strong commitment to the fiscal responsibility that has long been lacking here in Washington. We are committed to paying down the national debt by providing \$2.3 trillion for this purpose. That is the most that we can pay. The substitute pays down more of the debt that we can pay because of the long-term, non-callability of some of the government bonds, which leads me to suspect this money would lay around Washington and could be spent on other programs.

It also recognizes that the American people deserve to keep more of their hard-earned money by providing tax relief for every family that pays taxes. That, Mr. Chairman, is only fair. It does not do so at the expense of important programs such as Medicare. In fact, it incorporates the vital protections we passed overwhelmingly in H.R. 2 by keeping the Medicare part A surplus off limits for any purpose other than for Medicare itself or paying down the debt until necessary reforms are made. It recognizes the vital role the Federal Government plays in health care by providing a \$2.8 billion increase for NIH.

Finally, it reflects the obligation we have to the future of our youngest citizens by increasing education spending by \$47.5 billion over the next 10 years, including an 11.5 percent increase for fiscal year 2002, the largest percentage increase for any department.

Mr. Chairman, this budget is a clear reflection of our priorities. It protects our senior citizens; it teaches the young; it improves the Nation's health care economically, physically and mentally. I urge my colleagues to give it their support.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

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

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Spratt amendment for the children of this country.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the Republican Budget Resolution. Unfortunately, this budget is a missed opportunity and it represents misplaced priorities.

Sadly, Mr. Chairman, this budget is very much a missed opportunity. The White House and the Republican Leadership have utterly

failed to deliver on the President's promise of a bipartisan process that puts accomplishment for the American people above gamesmanship by Washington politicians.

More importantly, this budget fails to provide for America's priorities. We must pay down the national debt to remove that burden from our children and grandchildren and cut interest rates for items like cars and homes. This Republican tax package will return us to the days of big deficits, high interest rates, high unemployment and a struggling economy.

I support balanced tax relief as part of a comprehensive economic plan that will restore America's prosperity so that all of our hard working families can have security in their family finances. In my state of North Carolina, last month, we registered an unemployment rate higher than the national average for the first time in nearly two decades. We must pass a strong economic plan, not a wasteful tax giveaway.

The Republican budget mortgages the future based on a guess. If the projected surpluses fail to materialize, Social Security and Medicare will be on the chopping block. The American people know that the budget projections are not real. They are an estimate. It is irresponsible to make decisions that will directly impact people's lives based on a ten-year number we know is no more reliable than a ten-year hurricane forecast.

As the only former state schools chief serving in Congress, I was very pleased by the President's promise to increase education investment. But this budget is a big disappointment because the increase is due largely to the education appropriations we passed last year. It rolls back the clock on school renovation by making those funds compete with other needs. This budget does nothing to help states build schools to relieve overcrowding and get our students out of trailers. Other areas that could be subject to cuts include child care, Head Start and job training that are vitally important to allow people to make the most of their God-given abilities.

Mr. Chairman, a great deal of attention has been paid lately to the trouble on Wall Street and signs the economic boom may well be over. One sector that hasn't been booming for some time is agriculture, and farmers in my district have been hurting in the face of production cuts, commodity price losses and natural disasters. I was appalled when the Budget Committee passed its budget that would gut important farm programs. If approved, these cuts would eliminate funds to identify solutions to the state's hog waste problems and force dozens of our Farm Service Agency offices to close their doors. These agriculture cuts are wrong, and I will fight to restore them despite the Budget Committee's action.

Mr. Chairman, this budget is a missed opportunity, but it doesn't have to be that way. I urge my colleagues to vote down this budget and come together to pass a responsible budget that honors America's values and respects the people's priorities.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I have served in this House for more than 18 years; and for most of these years, the deficit has been our dominant concern. It has actually been a fixation. It has taken us almost 20 years and \$4 trillion in debt to escape the fiscal mistakes we made

in the 1980s and turn this big budget around, out of deficits and into surpluses.

Today I have one priority, one overriding objective, and it is simply this: to make sure that we do not backslide into the hole we just dug ourselves out of. That is my overriding objective and that is why I have a problem with the Republican resolution, because it leaves so little room for error.

I hope that these blue-sky projections that total some \$5.6 trillion in surpluses over the next 10 years will materialize. It will be a great bounty for all of us. But if they do not and if we pass this resolution, we can find ourselves right back in the red again in the blink of an economist's eye. This chart says it all. That is how thin the ice is on which this budget skates for the next 10 years.

We, at least, avoid or lessen that problem, that risk, by setting aside one-third of the surplus, or \$910 billion, if these projections pan out. To the extent that these projections do not pan out, that share of the surplus serves as a buffer to protect Social Security, Medicare and their trust funds from being raided again. So we have downside protection; they do not.

The next problem I have with the Republican resolution is that it gives so much room, so much room to tax reduction that it leaves almost no room for anything else. If we want to see the consequences of that, if we have not been listening to this debate up until now, just go through the major accounts of the budget. We are both committed, at least rhetorically, to providing Medicare prescription drugs, but we provide a real Medicare benefit with \$330 billion in real money. They provide a meager \$153 billion and take that, siphon that out of the Medicare trust fund.

We provide for education. We believe in education. We provide \$130 billion more than they do, because we have a balanced budget.

We provide for the environment, parks, conservation. We had a bill out here last year where we increased the amount of money we are spending there significantly. We fully fund it; they do not.

Finally, this resolution does nothing to save or make solvent Social Security and Medicare for the long run. For years and years now, we have known that we face a shortfall in both of these programs looming in the future, just over the horizon of this budget. But we have not had until now the resources to do anything about that problem. The \$2.7 trillion surplus in the general fund which we hope we now have over the next 10 years gives us that opportunity, and we dare not do anything else with it if we are going to be true to the commitments that have been made to the beneficiaries of the Social Security and Medicare program, and that includes almost all Americans.

The question is, will we uphold this great compact on which the country

has stood, the intergenerational compact for 65 years, or will we slough the problem off to our children.

To keep the promises that we made, we set aside \$910 billion, one-third of the surplus, and transfer it in equal shares, half to the Medicare trust fund, half to the Social Security trust fund, making Social Security solvent until 2050, and making Medicare solvent to 2030.

□ 1600

By contrast, the Republican resolution siphons money out of the Medicare trust fund, shortens the solvent life of that program, and does nothing at all for Social Security.

If Members want to save Social Security, if they want to provide a real prescription drug benefit, if they want to do something for education and scientific research, for successful programs like COPS, if Members want to provide \$740 billion in tax relief over 10 years and \$60 billion over the next several months, if Members want to pay down the debt by \$900 billion more, their choice is clear: Vote for the Democratic budget resolution.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I would just say to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), I am going to oppose his budget, but I want to thank the gentleman for the way he has conducted the debate today and for the honorable partnership that we have formed in the Committee on the Budget to bring this vehicle to the floor today.

We have some shared goals, even though we do not always share the ideas on how to achieve those goals. I want to applaud the gentleman publicly.

I also want to applaud the staff on both sides who have worked so hard to bring both the gentleman's substitute and our base bill to the floor.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SPRATT. I very much appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we have had a different working relationship, more methodical, to the problem this year than in years past, and I appreciate that. I do, however, look forward to the day when the well of the House becomes a free market of ideas again, and we can hope to meet on common ground and negotiate our differences and come up with a final result that has something for the gentleman and something for us both in it.

I am sorry to see us diverge on this occasion rather than converge, but I hope some day soon, and perhaps this year before this process is all over, we will sit down and try to find common ground.

Mr. NUSSLE. We will work together to enforce the budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Let me also, Mr. Chairman, if I might, thank my staff, who

have worked arduously. I am not sure about the Fair Labor Standards Act, our compliance with it, with the hours they have worked. But we could not have pulled this together or brought this to the floor or made this presentation had it not been for the diligent work of our staff.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the very distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority whip.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I, too, want to add my congratulations to the chairman of the Committee on the Budget and to the ranking member for a job well done. This is the chairman's first budget, and we are very proud of the work that he has done in bringing this budget to the floor. He has done an outstanding job in bringing a lot of people together and listening to a lot of people, and now we have a budget I think that is good for America.

Mr. Chairman, the Members need to be real careful, because the Democrat substitute budget is a beguiling mirage. It is sold as fiscal discipline, but a close inspection shows that it sustains big government and offers taxpayers little more than a patched waste of paltry relief.

The Democrat budget gives the impression that it offers significant debt reduction, but it really comes down to a false choice. Even Chairman Greenspan has reservations about paying off too much of the debt too quickly. Democrats do not take his concerns into account.

Because Democrats refuse to return the tax surplus to the people who earned it, their budget leads to two unacceptable outcomes: first, excessive bonus payments to foreign investors who now hold U.S. debt and who will not sell them back before they mature; and second, the Federal government buying up stocks and bonds once our public debt is gone.

Under the Democrat plan, the Federal government could actually eventually control up to 5 percent of the entire stock market in just 10 year's time after the Treasury has to invest the surplus dollars in an investment product other than Treasury securities. For the first time, the Federal government would own stock in the stock market.

The Democrat plan offers less than \$700 billion for tax relief. After we account for their \$300 billion alternative minimum tax proposal, there is not even enough room to drop the bottom tax bracket from 15 percent to 10 percent, or there is not enough room to double the per child tax credit.

That is not all that the taxpayers give up for the Democrat plan. The Democrats keep the death tax. The Democrats keep the marriage penalty. Their plan shortchanges taxpayers.

But Congress can choose real relief. That is why every Republican and open-minded Democrat Member of this House ought to support the President's

budget, because it strengthens American families, it expands economic freedom, and it strikes a very fair and reasonable balance between national need and fiscal restraint.

For every hard-working family, every struggling small businessman, and for every young woman who is ready to launch her own business start-up, the President's budget carries a note of hope and optimism.

In fact, for anyone who hopes to realize his or her American dream, this budget, our budget, brings that dream one step closer to reality. That is because our budget respects the taxpayer. The reasoning behind it begins with the supposition that tax dollars actually belong to the people who earned them.

The President wants to let America keep more of what it earns, and we ought to help him do it. So for those women and men who desire nothing but the opportunity to challenge their talents and chase their dreams, the President's budget will spur job creation, enhance economic freedom, and provide the resources to restore limited constitutional government.

Vote down and reject the Democrat substitute, and support freedom by supporting the President's budget.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the budget resolution put forward by the Republican leadership and in support of the Democratic Substitute introduced by the Ranking Member of the House Budget Committee, Mr. SPRATT. Within the framework of a balanced budget, the Democratic budget provides for a better future for all Americans.

The Republican-supported budget resolution fails our seniors, fails our children, fails our veterans, fails our cities and communities, fails our farmers and fails our small businesses. In good conscience, I cannot support it.

I cannot support a budget that shortens the solvency of Medicare by at least five years and the solvency of Social Security by nine years, bankrupting these programs by 2024 and 2029 respectively. We should be working to extend the solvency of these programs. The Democratic budget puts \$910 billion over ten years into the Medicare and Social Security Trust Funds with resources coming from outside these two programs. This extends solvency to at least 2040 for Medicare and at least 2050 for Social Security.

I will not support any budget that gambles with the lives and well-being of our seniors. And I certainly will not support any budget that actually decreases the solvency of these programs, which have kept millions of elderly Americans out of poverty and provided for the majority of their health care needs.

The Democratic budget provides \$1.7 billion for LIHEAP, the Low-Income Home Energy Program, which so many Massachusetts and New England families and seniors depend when faced with skyrocketing energy costs and energy emergencies. The Republican budget freezes LIHEAP and eliminates the emergency funds, in effect cutting LIHEAP funding by \$300 million from FY 2001 levels.

The Republican budget breaks faith with our police and firefighters, men and women who put their lives on the line every day for our safety. The enormous cuts to overall funding

for justice programs in the Republican budget threaten the Community Oriented Policing Service, the COPS program, which, since 1994, has placed over 100,000 new police officers on the street and provided new resources for state and local law enforcement. The COPS program has been the cornerstone of community crime prevention efforts, has helped reduce violent crime since 1994, and has brought the nation's crime rate to a 25-year low.

Just as troubling, the Republican budget fails to provide the \$300 million approved by Congress last year to support the FIRE Act, funds for grants that help develop and provide new resources and technology to save the lives of victims and firefighters alike. Last year, hundreds of firefighters from across the nation fought for and won this new funding. The Worcester Firefighters Association, and especially Fire Chief Frank Raffa and his colleagues, spent weeks personally talking to over 250 Members of Congress about the tragic fire in Worcester that took the lives of six firefighters and that helped awaken the conscience of a nation to the special needs of these dedicated public servants. I refuse to turn my back on the men and women who serve our local communities and I will not support a Republican budget proposal that treats them so callously.

I'm very concerned that the Republican budget backtracks on last year's landmark agreement to set aside dedicated funding for land conservation, preservation and recreation programs. In contrast, the Democratic budget keeps the promise to preserve and protect our environment and helps our communities clean up contaminated lands and ensure that our families have clean water to drink and clean air to breathe. The Democratic budget provides the resources to tackle the nation's water infrastructure needs, an issue of great concern to many communities in the 3rd Congressional District of Massachusetts. It funds new grants for states to help them set up and carry out clean-up programs for brownfields. Helping Massachusetts with this problem will spur economic development in urban areas and remove one of the great causes of urban sprawl.

Even in an area where President Bush and the Republican majority increase funding, such as education, they fail our families, students and communities.

The Republican education budget increases funds by 5.9 percent over last year's level. However, this represents less than half of the average yearly increase that Congress has provided in the last five years. The Republican budget fails to keep pace with the nation's education needs.

Once again, the Republican budget fails to help schools address emergencies and repairs, eliminating the new \$1.2 billion urgent school repair program. It fails to include the bipartisan Johnson-Rangel initiative to provide interest-free bonds from school construction. Our country is facing a nation-wide crisis in school facilities and this budget fails to address that crisis in any effective way.

The Republican budget diverts desperately needed Title I education program monies for low-income and poor children to private and religious school voucher programs.

The Republican education budget also fails to invest additional resources in critical education programs like the TRIO program, which

funds successful programs in Worcester and Bristol Counties, and GEAR-UP. It freezes funding for Head Start, eliminates the new Early Learning Opportunities Fund, and appears to freeze funding for safe schools, after-school programs and education technology initiatives. Furthermore, the Republican budget fails to provide sufficient, let alone full, funding for Pell Grants and for the federal share of special education (IDEA) programs.

The Democratic budget, in contrast, provides for \$129 billion more than the Republican budget over ten years in funding for education and related services. Democrats boost funding for critical priorities, including class size reduction, school renovation, teacher recruitment, training, and development, title I aid to the disadvantaged, Pell Grants and other higher education programs, special education (IDEA), after-school programs, school counselors, instructional technology and Head Start.

Finally, the Democratic budget provides for all these programs and more, within the framework of a balanced budget, and still provides \$910 billion in tax relief to America's hard-working families.

The Democratic budget cuts taxes and funds priorities like Social Security and Medicare solvency, education, community infrastructure and public services, the environment, and still has room to provide a Medicare prescription drug benefit and continues to pay down the debt. This is not a budget built on smoke and mirrors. The numbers add up, and the proposals are based on real monies and not projected funds that might fail to materialize.

The Democratic budget will better the lives of all of Massachusetts' communities and residents. The Republican budget will not.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, today, Congress debated and voted on the President's FY 2002 Budget plan. The President's plan is both harmful to our economy and unnecessarily cuts important government programs, and I voted against it.

Today, in response, I supported three alternative budgets that better address our future needs while providing working Americans with tax relief. Each alternative plan allows for an honest estimate of future spending needs and provides tax relief that will go directly to families who most need assistance.

The Republican plan triple counts Social Security and fails to protect Medicare in order to fit the President's tax cut. Such a proposal doesn't address some of the real inequities in the tax code like the Alternative Minimum Tax, which increasingly impacts middle-income families.

I know Oregonians deserve better than the shame budget approved today, and I was pleased to support alternative plans that realistically address America's needs.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 243, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 69]

AYES—183

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

NOES—243

Aderholt	Chabot	Fossella
Akin	Chambliss	Frelinghuysen
Armey	Coble	Galleghy
Bachus	Collins	Ganske
Baker	Combest	Gekas
Ballenger	Cooksey	Gibbons
Barr	Costello	Gilchrest
Bartlett	Cox	Gillmor
Barton	Crane	Gilman
Bass	Crenshaw	Goode
Bereuter	Cubin	Goodlatte
Berry	Culberson	Goss
Biggart	Cunningham	Graham
Bilirakis	Davis, Jo Ann	Granger
Blunt	Davis, Tom	Graves
Boehlert	Deal	Green (WI)
Boehner	DeLay	Greenwood
Bonilla	DeMint	Grucci
Bono	Diaz-Balart	Gutknecht
Brady (TX)	Doolittle	Hall (TX)
Brown (SC)	Dreier	Hansen
Bryant	Duncan	Harman
Burr	Dunn	Hart
Burton	Ehlers	Hastings (WA)
Buyer	Ehrlich	Hayes
Callahan	Emerson	Hayworth
Calvert	English	Hefley
Camp	Everett	Herger
Cannon	Ferguson	Hill
Cantor	Flake	Hilleary
Capito	Fletcher	Hobson
Castle	Foley	Hoekstra

Horn	Morella	Shadegg
Hostettler	Myrick	Shaw
Houghton	Nethercutt	Shays
Hulshof	Ney	Sherwood
Hunter	Northup	Shimkus
Hutchinson	Norwood	Shows
Hyde	Nussle	Simmons
Isakson	Osborne	Simpson
Issa	Ose	Skeen
Istook	Otter	Smith (MI)
Jenkins	Oxley	Smith (NJ)
John	Paul	Smith (TX)
Johnson (CT)	Pence	Souder
Johnson (IL)	Peterson (PA)	Spence
Johnson, Sam	Petri	Stearns
Jones (NC)	Phelps	Stump
Kaptur	Pickering	Sununu
Keller	Pitts	Sweeney
Kelly	Platts	Tancred
Kennedy (MN)	Pombo	Tanner
Kerns	Portman	Tauzin
King (NY)	Pryce (OH)	Taylor (MS)
Kingston	Putnam	Taylor (NC)
Kirk	Quinn	Terry
Knollenberg	Radanovich	Thomas
Kolbe	Rahall	Thornberry
LaHood	Ramstad	Thune
Largent	Regula	Tiahrt
Latham	Rehberg	Tiberi
LaTourette	Reynolds	Toomey
Leach	Riley	Towns
Lewis (CA)	Rivers	Trafficant
Lewis (KY)	Roemer	Upton
Linder	Rogers (KY)	Visclosky
Lipinski	Rogers (MI)	Vitter
LoBiondo	Rohrabacher	Walden
Lucas (KY)	Ros-Lehtinen	Walsh
Lucas (OK)	Ross	Wamp
Manzulio	Roukema	Watkins
Matheson	Royce	Watts (OK)
McCrery	Ryan (WI)	Weldon (FL)
McHugh	Ryun (KS)	Weldon (PA)
McInnis	Saxton	Weller
McKeon	Scarborough	Whitfield
Mica	Schaffer	Wicker
Miller (FL)	Schiff	Wilson
Miller, Gary	Schrock	Wolf
Moore	Sensenbrenner	Young (AK)
Moran (KS)	Sessions	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Baldwin	Gordon	Rothman
Becerra	Lampson	Sisisky

□ 1629

Messrs. BRADY of Texas, PHELPS, DOOLITTLE, BOEHLERT, SHOWS, BUYER, HALL of Texas and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. HOLDEN, DICKS, RUSH, MOLLOHAN and JACKSON of Illinois changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1630

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order for a period of final debate on the concurrent resolution.

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) each will control 5 minutes.

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, today we present a budget that we have been working on for more than just a few days. We have been working on this budget for almost 20 years, a 20-year attempt to slow the rate of growth of government, provide tax relief for Americans, pay off the debt held by the public, and recognize once and for all that the important decisions happen around kitchen tables, not around committee tables.

Mr. Chairman, the most important debate today will not occur on this floor. The most important debate of today is going to happen tonight sometime after the kids are tucked into bed and mom and dad are sitting around the kitchen table, and they are trying to figure out how to pay for college, and they are trying to decide whether to buy Nike shoes or Keds, or they are trying to decide how to pay that Visa bill that just went over their limit one more time, or they are trying to figure out how to pay the mortgage, how to pay the heating bill, how to pay for the extra energy costs.

Mr. Chairman, we sometimes think that the trillion dollars and trillion dollars of debate that we have here is the most important. But sometimes it is the \$10, the \$20, the \$100 that is debated around our kitchen tables that is the most important. That is why we have presented the budget that meets the goals that we have worked so long to achieve.

We had a priority of paying down the maximum amount of publicly held debt. We accomplish that, and there is still money left over.

We set aside in a bipartisan way, I would say to my friends on both sides, all of the Social Security trust fund, a big victory for the American people and for seniors today and seniors tomorrow; and there is still money left over.

We set aside all of the trust fund for Medicare. We provide for a prescription-drug benefit. We want to modernize Medicare in this budget, and there is still money left over.

We provide for the important priorities of defense, agriculture, education, environment, so many issues that we have come here to debate in the halls of Congress; and there is still money left over.

The question is, Who does that money belong to? It belongs to the people who debate around their kitchen table tonight. Let us give them that refund that the President asked. Let us provide for them in this budget. Let us pass the budget.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have stated the reasons that I oppose this resolution before, but I will state them in a nutshell again.

First of all, in its single-minded zeal for tax reduction, this resolution cuts so close to the bone that it leaves no margin of error. If these projections do not pan out, we are in deficit again.

Secondly, it makes so much room for tax cuts that it leaves little room for other priorities. If my colleagues want to see those other priorities, look at them, tick them off: Medicare, prescription drugs, education, conservation, down the list. It does an insufficient amount.

Finally, it does nothing at all for Social Security and Medicare, nothing at all. In fact, it actually deducts funds from the Medicare program by siphon-

ing off money from the Medicare Hospital Insurance trust fund to pay for a meager and inadequate prescription-drug insurance.

For all of that, if the bottom line is debt reduction, it achieves less debt reduction to the tune of \$915 billion than the resolution that we have just presented which covers priorities across the board.

We can do better.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the minority leader.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask Members to consider voting against this budget resolution and to support the Democratic budget because I think it is a better budget.

When one does a budget, one makes choices. One makes choices between size of tax cuts, how much is going to go to pay down the debt, how much goes to Medicare, prescription medicine, how much goes for education, how much goes to support the environment.

I suggest to Members that we are making a mistake with this budget. Let us think of it as two products. First, we have the Republican budget product. It is a \$2 trillion-plus tax cut, most of which goes to the wealthiest Americans. If we buy this budget, this is what is contained in this plan, this program.

On the other hand, if my colleagues vote for a Democratic budget, they get much more. It is a better product. We get lower interest rates. Yes, we get a tax cut focused on middle-income Americans, but we also get debt-free by the year 2008.

We get a prescription-drug benefit for all senior citizens. It extends Social Security to 2050, Medicare to 2040. It extends both about 12 years. More quality teachers and more cops on the beat.

So the question is which box do we want for the American people. I suggest that this is a decision that will be with us for a long time.

I was here in 1981. We had a new President who came saying that he wanted a budget that included a large tax cut. We came to this floor in 1981 and debated that budget. The President said that it would not cause large deficits, that it would create jobs, that it would bring down interest rates and inflation.

After we lost our alternative to that tax bill, many of us sat on the floor and wondered what we would do, how we would vote.

I was getting calls from home, people saying give the new President a chance; and I did. I voted for the Reagan tax cut. Then the deficits began, as we worried they would. First it was \$100 billion a year, then \$200 billion, then \$300 billion, then almost \$400 billion. We went from \$1 trillion in back debt to this country to almost \$6 trillion in debt.

It took the budget summit of 1990 and the Budget Act of 1993 and 1997 to begin to get that deficit under control.

Now, instead of having deficits as far as the eye can see, we have surpluses for the first time in 20 years. Why? I ask my friends in this Congress, why would we want to go back and repeat that mistake again?

When I went home these last weeks, constituents came up and said where is the Medicare prescription drug program that I thought was going to be coming after the election? Where is the furthering of the solvency of Medicare and Social Security? Where are the smaller classrooms with better teachers and more classroom sizes? These are the issues that people are deciding in this budget debate.

I plead with Members, turn down this budget and let us do a budget that does not send this country back into bankruptcy, back into high deficits, back into high interest rates, back into high inflation. We still have time to avoid it.

I urge Members to vote against this misguided wrong-headed budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the very distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I listened very intently to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the distinguished minority leader; and, Mr. Chairman, his argument just does not wash. In fact, it promises a "Tide" of new spending for America.

Mr. Chairman, this budget is right for America. It establishes a new direction. For too many years, we have seen liberals raise our taxes and send spending into orbit.

But now we have a new President and one who wants to tell us all to come back to Earth. Our new President wants to send us in a new direction; and we should say, We are with you, Mr. President.

Mr. Chairman, I am amazed by the complaints I have heard about this budget. I hear your spending plan does not go far enough. We cannot lower taxes that much. What do these complaints mean? They mean more taxes, and they mean more spending.

Now, have we heard this before? Yes. Think about what we are hearing. That is called tax and spend, and that is the track we are trying to leave. It is the same tired vision for America. It is a vision that we reject.

We are here today trying to establish a new direction, one that we can call fiscal responsibility. Yes, we have achieved a lot already. We have had the first balanced budget in 30 years. Today again, for the fifth year in a row, we will not only balance a budget, but run a surplus in our budget. Mr. Chairman, that has not happened for 70 years.

Fiscal responsibility used to be about as common in this town as Haley's comet, but we put the tax and spend century behind us. We are here today to replace it with a century of surplus.

We have to understand that this budget, Mr. Chairman, is not about numbers. It is not about pie charts. It is not about CBO or OMB or calculators or green eye shades. This budget is about people. This budget is about setting the right example. This budget is a vision for a better America, a responsible vision.

This budget is a road map for America. It is not the end of the road, Mr. Chairman; it is the beginning of the road. It points the way that reflects all the right priorities.

□ 1645

Mr. Chairman, this budget is, in fact, fiscally responsible. It will pay down all of the available public debt, and that is in addition to the half trillion dollars of public debt we have already paid down. And it makes generous provisions for the spending on the right priorities: education, public health, national defense. And after we have done all of that, yes, indeed, we will give tax relief to everybody in America who pays taxes. There is marriage penalty tax relief. There is across-the-board tax reductions in the rates. There is death tax relief. We will do as much as we can to give money back to the people who earned it.

As for spending, some of my colleagues still complain that our spending plan does not go far enough. Mr. Chairman, this budget spends an additional trillion dollars over the next 10 years. If you put a trillion dollars together end to end, it would reach to the planet Mars; and that is not enough? This budget spends \$23 trillion total over the next 10 years. If you put \$23 trillion together end to end, it would take you to Jupiter and back; and that is not far enough? I think my colleagues who are saying that are still out there someplace.

Mr. Chairman, I was in Congress when we passed the first \$1 trillion Federal budget. It took two centuries for Congress to spend a trillion dollars in a single year, and here we are 14 years later, we are near the \$2 trillion mark; and that is not far enough? And now we will add an extra trillion dollars over the next 10 years; and that is still not enough?

So the choice is very clear. The choice is between two visions: a vision of bigger and bigger government spending, a choice between larger and larger taxes, or a choice of smaller government that trusts the people to make up their own minds.

My colleagues, especially those of my colleagues on this side of the aisle, let us trust the American people as our President has led us to do. Let us say we are with you, Mr. President. We are with you, Mr. and Mrs. America. We are "yes" on this budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the very distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Chairman, first of all, with all due respect to the mi-

nority leader, yes, we have all been sold soap before; and sometimes bigger boxes of soap do not necessarily get the job done, especially when bigger boxes of soap mean more government. I remember one time when my wife was breaking me in on just how to wash the laundry. If you put too much soap in that machine, bubbles came out, and it gushed all over. We had soap all over. Everywhere was soap and bubbles.

Mr. Chairman, that happens with government, too. If we put too big of dollars in government, what happens is spending goes up. We will never see a balanced budget again. We will never see a surplus. That is what this is all about. This is all about trying to lay out what our plans are for our children and grandchildren and our lives in the next 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of work done on this bill, and there are a lot of points of view, and I appreciate what everyone did because it laid down the parameters of debate on what people really wanted to do and what their vision for the Nation is. Those are the choices that we will have to make, and the vote in a few minutes will give us the chance to make those choices.

Mr. Chairman, the choice here is a choice between government that grows too big, too much, too fast, too big a burden on the American taxpayers, or a budget that holds the growth of government down to slow growth of government and takes a little bit of that extra money, not all of it, not half of it, but just a part of it, and says, we need to take some of that money, and we need to pay it back, we need to give it back to the people that made it in the first place.

Mr. Chairman, that is what this choice is all about. So there is tax relief for the American people. So people who get married are not paying an extra \$1,400 because they are married rather than being single. Or if you have a small farm or family business and you want to pass it on to the next generation, you can do that without the Federal Government coming in and confiscating 55 or 60 percent of it.

Probably everybody who pays taxes deserves a little tax relief. When we cut across the board the marginal tax rates, that means thousands and thousands of Americans in this country who pay taxes now will not even have to pay taxes. But it also means the man and wife that go to work to support their children that earn the \$60,000 or \$70,000 a year, or \$40,000 or \$50,000, are going to have more money in their own pocket so they can make decisions about their kids and families and what kind of education they are going to have; or maybe just pay the bills or the tuition to a sports camp, something special for their family. Those are the choices that we are trying to take away from government bureaucrats with too much spending and give it back to the American people who know what their priorities are, that have the right and deserve to spend more of their money the way that they see fit.

Mr. Chairman, this budget is also about children and about children in a very special way. It is about education. When you talk about education, sometimes it just kind of goes over some people's heads. But where real education takes place, and I spent 16 years in a classroom, education takes place in a classroom with good teachers and parents who care. We put more dollars not into some bureaucracy, not for some bureaucrat in Washington, D.C., to lay down more paper and more busywork, but we put dollars in the classroom so teachers can do a better job and parents can get more satisfaction sending their children to school and knowing something good is going to happen.

Mr. Chairman, we have talked about this budget a great deal. There has been a lot of debate on this floor today, but this budget, crafted by the President, worked on by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), and I thank him for his great work, really goes to the heart of what we want to do for the future of this country and for the moms and dads and children and our grandchildren.

We can make this a better place to live. We can make, through this budget, better choices for people to make because they can make their own choices and have better education for their kids.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to support us today and pass this budget resolution because it is time we do it. Let us go to it.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS) having assumed the chair, Mr. LATOURETTE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration 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 and, pursuant to House Resolution 100, he reported the concurrent resolution, as amended by the adoption of that resolution and by the previous order of the House, back to the House.

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

The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution, as amended.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 205, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No 70]

YEAS—222

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

NAYS—205

Abercrombie	Boyd	Davis (FL)
Ackerman	Brady (PA)	Davis (IL)
Allen	Brown (FL)	DeFazio
Andrews	Brown (OH)	DeGette
Baca	Capps	Delahunt
Baird	Capuano	DeLauro
Baldacci	Cardin	Deutsch
Barcia	Carson (IN)	Dicks
Barrett	Carson (OK)	Dingell
Bentsen	Clay	Doggett
Berkley	Clayton	Dooley
Berman	Clement	Doyle
Berry	Clyburn	Edwards
Bishop	Conyers	Engel
Blagojevich	Costello	Eshoo
Blumenauer	Coyne	Etheridge
Bonior	Cramer	Evans
Borski	Crowley	Farr
Boswell	Cummings	Fattah
Boucher	Davis (CA)	Filner

Ford	Lucas (KY)	Reyes
Frank	Luther	Rivers
Frost	Maloney (CT)	Rodriguez
Gephardt	Maloney (NY)	Roemer
Gonzalez	Markey	Ross
Green (TX)	Mascara	Roybal-Allard
Gutierrez	Matheson	Rush
Hall (OH)	Matsui	Sabo
Harman	McCarthy (MO)	Sanchez
Hastings (FL)	McCarthy (NY)	Sanders
Hefley	McCollum	Sandlin
Hill	McDermott	Sawyer
Hilliard	McGovern	Schakowsky
Hinchee	McIntyre	Schiff
Hinojosa	McKinney	Scott
Hoeffel	McNulty	Serrano
Holden	Meehan	Sherman
Holt	Meek (FL)	Shows
Honda	Meeks (NY)	Skelton
Hooley	Menendez	Slaughter
Hoyer	Millender	Smith (WA)
Inslee	McDonald	Snyder
Israel	Miller, George	Solis
Jackson (IL)	Mink	Spratt
Jackson-Lee	Moakley	Stark
(TX)	Mollohan	Stenholm
Jefferson	Moore	Strickland
John	Moran (VA)	Stupak
Johnson, E. B.	Murtha	Tanner
Jones (OH)	Nadler	Tauscher
Kanjorski	Napolitano	Taylor (MS)
Kaptur	Neal	Thompson (CA)
Kennedy (RI)	Oberstar	Thompson (MS)
Kildee	Obey	Thurman
Kilpatrick	Olver	Tierney
Kind (WI)	Ortiz	Towns
Klecza	Owens	Turner
Kucinich	Pallone	Udall (CO)
LaFalce	Pascrell	Udall (NM)
Langevin	Pastor	Velazquez
Lantos	Paul	Visclosky
Larsen (WA)	Payne	Waters
Larson (CT)	Pelosi	Watt (NC)
Lee	Peterson (MN)	Waxman
Levin	Phelps	Weiner
Lewis (GA)	Pomeroy	Wexler
Lipinski	Price (NC)	Woolsey
Lofgren	Rahall	Wu
Lowey	Rangel	Wynn

NOT VOTING—6

Baldwin	Gordon	Rothman
Becerra	Lampson	Sisisky

□ 1715

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PUTNAM. 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. 83, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2002.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida? There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6, MARRIAGE PENALTY AND FAMILY TAX RELIEF ACT OF 2001

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-31) on the resolution (H. Res. 104) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the marriage penalty by providing for adjustments to the standard deduction,