

higher taxes. America's economy is coming back, but the Democrats want to raise our taxes. Employment is growing, but the Democrats want to raise our taxes. Manufacturing production is increasing, but the Democrats want to raise our taxes. Productivity is high, but you guessed it, the Democrats want to raise our taxes. Interest rates are low, but Democrats want to raise taxes. Homeownership is at an all-time high, but you've got it, the Democrats want to raise taxes.

To each and every ailment that our economy suffers, the Democrats have one solution, they want to raise our taxes. To each and every new success that the economy achieves, the Democrats have one response, they want to raise our taxes.

Never in our history have tax increases promoted economic growth. Never in our history have tax increases created jobs for the American people. In fact, the Democrats' tax increases would stall the economic recovery and cost Americans jobs.

This really is more than a philosophical difference in economic policy. There really are real-world consequences to the Democrats' policies of wanting to tax us again and again. It is telling to me that not one of the Democrats' proposals that they have put forward reflects their own presidential nominee's budget-busting spending. They know it is a political loser. And, even more, it is even more irresponsible than some of the crazy proposals that we have heard already.

Imagine right now for a moment that the likely presidential nominee of the Democratic Party today is sitting 1 year from now in the Oval Office. Instead of just talking about raising our taxes, my friends, they will actually be doing it. They will be raising our taxes. That is why the debate on this budget matters.

Our budget cuts taxes, makes the right investments in our troops, the right investments in the war on terror, in homeland security and in job creation. While the Democrats want to take us backward with higher taxes and runaway government, the Republican plan provides the services we need at a price we can afford.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds just to respond that my friend, the last speaker, wants to cut taxes and have veterans' health care pay for it. My friend, the last speaker, wants to cut taxes and have money come out of the Social Security trust fund.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY). The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. KIND. I thank my friend for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, just to wrap up this debate, I would love to have a national referendum asking the American people what economy they would more

likely adopt today, the economy of the 1990s or the current economy that this majority party and the administration have given them because, to set the record straight, it was in the first Bush administration in 1990 when, in fact, some tax increases were had on the wealthiest Americans. And then the budget that passed in 1993 by just one vote had a slight increase on the wealthiest 1 percent in this Nation. With all the doom and gloom and procrastination and the prediction of recession and great depression, it led to 28 million new jobs being created in the 1990s, 4 consecutive years of deficit reduction followed by 4 consecutive years of budget surpluses, where the Social Security and Medicare trust fund was not even being touched.

That is what is so disturbing about the vision that they offer in their budget today. It is a status quo budget based on a failed economic policy that is not working for working families in this country, and especially is not going to be working for the future of our Nation, our children and grandchildren with historically large budget deficits that are due to explode in future years.

That is the only reason they are offering a 5-year budget resolution, to mask the true size of these budget deficits that occur in the second 5 years with the permanent extension of their tax cuts; and they have no plan to turn that around.

Our party brings balance to the budget within 8 years. We believe balanced budgets are a good economic dynamic that does help job creation, and at the end of the day, that is the big difference between our plan and their plan.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds just to point out to the gentleman, we are not cutting veterans, we are increasing it nearly \$2 billion. Only in Washington when you spend \$2 billion more do people still keep calling it a "cut."

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS) having assumed the chair, Mr. SWEENEY, Chairman pro tempore 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. 393) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2005 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2004 and 2006 through 2009, had come to no resolution thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

House Concurrent Resolution 328, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 3059, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 3873, by the yeas and nays;

House Concurrent Resolution 189, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

□ 1730

RECOGNIZING AND HONORING UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES AND SUPPORTING NATIONAL MILITARY APPRECIATION MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 328, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 328, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 424, nays 0, answered "present" 1, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 80]
YEAS—424

| | | |
|----------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Abercrombie | Brown-Waite, | DeFazio |
| Ackerman | Ginny | DeGette |
| Aderholt | Burgess | Delahunt |
| Akin | Burns | DeLauro |
| Alexander | Burr | DeLay |
| Allen | Burton (IN) | DeMint |
| Andrews | Buyer | Deutsch |
| Baca | Calvert | Diaz-Balart, L. |
| Bachus | Camp | Diaz-Balart, M. |
| Baird | Cannon | Dicks |
| Baker | Cantor | Doggett |
| Baldwin | Capito | Doolittle |
| Ballance | Capps | Doyle |
| Ballenger | Capuano | Dreier |
| Barrett (SC) | Cardin | Duncan |
| Bartlett (MD) | Cardoza | Dunn |
| Barton (TX) | Carson (IN) | Edwards |
| Bass | Carson (OK) | Ehlers |
| Beauprez | Carter | Emanuel |
| Becerra | Case | Emerson |
| Bell | Castle | Engel |
| Bereuter | Chabot | English |
| Berkley | Chandler | Eshoo |
| Berman | Chocola | Etheridge |
| Berry | Clay | Evans |
| Biggert | Clyburn | Everett |
| Billirakis | Coble | Farr |
| Bishop (GA) | Cole | Fattah |
| Bishop (NY) | Collins | Ferguson |
| Bishop (UT) | Conyers | Ferguson |
| Blackburn | Cooper | Filner |
| Blumenauer | Costello | Flake |
| Blunt | Cox | Foley |
| Boehlert | Cramer | Forbes |
| Boehner | Crane | Ford |
| Bonilla | Crenshaw | Fossella |
| Bonner | Crowley | Frank (MA) |
| Bono | Cubin | Franks (AZ) |
| Boozman | Culberson | Frelinghuysen |
| Boswell | Cummings | Frost |
| Boucher | Cunningham | Gallegly |
| Boyd | Davis (AL) | Garrett (NJ) |
| Bradley (NH) | Davis (CA) | Gephardt |
| Brady (PA) | Davis (FL) | Gerlach |
| Brady (TX) | Davis (IL) | Gibbons |
| Brown (OH) | Davis (TN) | Gilchrest |
| Brown (SC) | Davis, Jo Ann | Gillmor |
| Brown, Corrine | Davis, Tom | Gingrey |
| | Deal (GA) | Gonzalez |