

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

Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hart
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kerns
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kolbe
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)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pence

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

NAYS—205

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
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)

Frank
Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoefel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslie
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Kucinich
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
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
PHELPS
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel

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

NOT VOTING—6

Baldwin
Becerra

Gordon
Lampson

Rothman
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,

15-percent rate bracket, and earned income credit and to allow the non-refundable personal credits against regular and minimum tax liability, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTER-PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group:

Mr. KOLBE of Arizona, Chairman.
There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain 1-minute requests.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

THE NET CORPS ACT

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

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to come to the House floor to speak about legislation I introduced last week, the National Education Technology Corps Act of 2001, or better known as NET Corps.

As a former science teacher, principal and school board member, I am extraordinarily pleased that Congress is becoming more engaged in the plight of our schools. Much of the discussion centers on how the Federal Government can be more creative and how we can meet the needs of our schools. I agree that we do need to be more creative, and I am confident that the Net Corps Act is as intelligent and innovative as the backers, the high-tech industry, educators, and nonprofits.

Representatives from each of these sectors recently attended a press conference in San Jose where they voiced their support for this bill and efforts to improve our education system. I crafted this bill in the spirit of the Peace Corps and Americorps, programs that are based on the premise that American citizens of all backgrounds have something constructive to offer underfunded and underserved communities.

It is a shame that in America we must classify our schools as underfunded. As a member of the Committee on the Budget, I argue that it is a sad statement about our national values when our schools cannot offer our children the tools that will prepare them for the information economy.

I often talk about accountability. No, not just teacher accountability, but also about holding our political institutions accountable for inadequately serving our schools. I am discouraged by the Republican budgetary earmarks for education. The vote today only reinforces how necessary it is for advocates of schools to be creative.

NET Corps is creative and it is smart. The NET Corps program, an expansion of the Corporation for National Service, will recruit high-tech savvy volunteers from academic institutions and high-tech companies. I am particularly excited by the inclusion of the high-tech companies in the NET Corps.

The reality is that many high-tech companies already have organized programs and efforts to help our schools. Companies like 3Com and Silicon Graphics, Intel and Hewlett-Packard come immediately to mind. NET Corps rewards these companies for their efforts by providing them a 20 percent tax credit on the time their employees have spent in schools working directly with teachers and school administrators. But NET Corps is not about rewarding companies who are already active; it is about enticing engaged companies to lend their employees to help our children. High-tech companies are receptive to this legislation because they understand that the future of America's IT economy rests on their ability to attract qualified workers.

I am pleased to be joined in my effort by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN). The gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), as a former president of the California State University at Long Beach, understands the great challenges our schools and children face, and he recognizes that NET Corps better prepares teachers to address these challenges. I am proud to have him as a cosponsor, and I look forward to working with him to pass this important legislation.

Finally, let me say that since introducing this legislation, I have been contacted by countless high-tech employees, teachers, and parents who support this legislation. They are part of what I call the NET Corps movement.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in this movement. Our children's futures depend upon it.

BLACK BERETS FOR U.S. ARMY SHOULD BE MADE IN AMERICA

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to once

again bring attention to the issue of the decision by the Army Chief of Staff to issue black berets as standard issue head gear to all Army personnel. Until this decision was made, the black beret had been the outward symbol of the Army Rangers, one of the most elite fighting forces within the United States armed services. While much has been said regarding the decision, I believe that even more needs to be said, particularly regarding the decision to bypass the Barry amendment and purchase the bulk of the berets totaling nearly \$35 million from Communist China.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when the small businesses of our Nation are struggling for new business, it is a travesty that our own government has chosen to bypass the Buy American Rule in order to meet an arbitrary deadline. While the 225th birthday of the United States Army should be marked with great celebration, I do not believe that the men and women who so faithfully serve in the Army would want the day marked by having to wear a beret that says "Made in China."

I recently received a letter written by a small businessman from Sanford, North Carolina, and I will submit this letter for inclusion in the RECORD.

Mr. Brooks Pomeranz is president of Cascade Fibers Company, a small mill that in a matter of a few short months could convert its cutting and sewing operation into a mill that could have produced at least a part of the beret order for the United States Army. He writes, and I quote him: "With the decline of U.S. textiles and U.S. textile mills closing every month, it is unconscionable that our government is contracting foreign companies to manufacture these berets. With just a portion of this business being contracted to my company would enable us to keep 80 families from losing a vital income for their children. Our quality is outstanding and our service is superior. Eighty families, 80 moms, 80 dads and countless children whose livelihood would continue if this bill were given even a portion of the order for new berets. Instead, those berets will be made by men and women in China who work under the worst possible working conditions for merely pennies per day. The same men and women who are told that they are not allowed to worship as they please and who are told that they cannot have more than one child. And, at the center of all of this is the undeniable fact that United States tax dollars would go to a communistic government to be used for the purpose of weapons from our enemies to threaten and intimidate not only the people of the United States, but also our allies. This should concern all Americans."

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO) and the Committee on Small Business on the House side for holding next week's hearings on this issue, and I want to call on the House Committee