

The legislation would move \$1 billion in funding to this fiscal year. Half of the funds would be allocated to the States pursuant to the statutory formula. The other half, however, would be considered contingent funding, and subject to the discretion of the Administration.

It is important that all of these funds reach those in need. The recently passed Energy Policy Act of 2005 authorized \$5 billion for this fiscal year. But even if all of the funds in this bill are sent to those in need, the total funding for the program will only total a little over \$3 billion. In other words, we are still going to be \$2 billion below the program authorization.

People in the Midwest and Northeast are in desperate need of these funds. According to the National Energy Assistance Directors' Association, since the winter of 2001–2002, yearly natural gas bills have soared from \$465 to \$1000, while annual heating oil bills have gone from \$465 to \$1000.

In my home state of Michigan, these national trends have translated to an average energy cost increase of nearly 37 percent. As a result, the state has anticipated a 6 percent increase in LIHEAP applications. Without additional funding, our state could experience as much as a \$60 million shortfall in LIHEAP money. This bill, while falling far short of providing the money necessary or authorized by EPACT, provide at least a few million dollars more to help my state address this projected shortfall.

Of course, much of the new funds will also go to warmer climates, where families will be facing unprecedented cooling bills this summer, so this is not just a regional bill.

It is unfortunate that funding for LIHEAP has remained constant over the years while heating costs have soared. Even with these new funds, many families will have a hard time paying their heating bills this winter.

Many of us would like to see LIHEAP funded at its authorized level of \$5 billion, but certainly this bill will be of immediate assistance and I urge its passage.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2320.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

**MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 4297, TAX RELIEF EXTENSION RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2005**

Mr. TANNER. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Tanner of Tennessee moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 4297 be instructed, to the maximum extent possible within the scope of conference, to insist on a conference report which will neither increase the Federal budget deficit nor increase the amount of the debt subject to the public debt limit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

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

Madam Speaker, this motion is very, very straightforward. It is a motion asking our conferees to basically apply what is known as PAYGO rules to the tax reconciliation bill that is coming over from the Senate.

Just today, this morning, in *The Washington Post*, we are reminded that President Bush said in March of 2001, "Future generations should not be forced to pay back money that we have borrowed. We owe this kind of responsibility to our children and grandchildren."

Madam Speaker, since that time this Congress and this administration have borrowed about \$1.5 trillion in hard money in new debts. I have been talking about this and writing about it for the last 3½ years. We are facing a debt ceiling again and we will be forced to raise the debt ceiling for the fourth time in the last 5 years since that statement was made by our President about borrowing money that loads the debt limits of all of us, including our children and grandchildren.

This new debt limit will raise how much money this country has borrowed in additional new debt \$3 trillion. I wish I was making some of this up. But you can go to the Treasury Department's Web site at [www.PublicDebtTreasury.gov](http://www.PublicDebtTreasury.gov) and see for yourselves. This is real. This is happening. It is happening now. And if the budget that has been proposed is adopted, we will go to \$11 trillion dollars.

Now, Madam Speaker, I have got some more things to say about this but last year, this is almost unbelievable but it is happening and I wish the American public would focus on it because if they do they will be I believe not only shocked but outraged at what the financial mismanagement of this country has done to the financial balance sheet. Last year the Federal deficit for 2005 was \$319 billion. If you break that down it means we here in public life in the name of every citizen in this country borrowed \$26 billion a month, \$886 million a day, \$36 million an hour, \$615,000 a minute, and \$10,200 a second.

□ 2300

Contrast that with what our President said back in March of 2001, as

quoted in the *Post* this morning, when he said, "Future generations shouldn't be forced to pay back money that we have borrowed. We owe this kind of responsibility to our children and grandchildren."

I could not agree with that statement more, but the facts absolutely belie what that sentiment that was expressed back in 2001 was meant to convey.

Now, if that was not bad enough, last year almost 90 percent of the money that we had to borrow to operate the government of this country came from overseas, came from foreigners who do not see the world as we see it.

We are doing in this government, on behalf of the people of the United States, something that none of us who were taught, like I was as a young man, three things to live by. One is live within your means, two is pay your debts, and three is invest in the future, whether it is your own retirement, your kid's college or whatever.

This government, under this leadership, is doing none of those. We are not living within our means, we are not paying our debts, and we are certainly not investing in the future.

The more that we borrow, the more we degrade the tax base in this country. We are now paying at 4 percent, since that statement was made in 2001, we are now paying more than \$55 billion a year in additional interest checks, almost 80 percent of which is not even staying in this country. This is not only outrageous, it is the most irresponsible financial conduct of the fiscal affairs of this country that any political leadership in the history of this country has engaged in such a short period of time. That is without question.

So what is actually happening here is a weakening of our collective ability, as expressed through the Federal Government, to do two things, to keep this country strong, safe and, most importantly, secure. Strong safe and secure, what do you mean when you say that?

First of all, there is no country in the history of recorded civilization that without the ability to invest in infrastructure and human capital remained safe, strong and secure. Infrastructure, that is what the government must do to give private enterprise the ability to congregate around clean water, sewer systems, highways, bridges, roads, all of the things that go into the infrastructure of a Nation. We are not being able to keep up with not only new infrastructure that is needed but to repair the infrastructure we have got. If you do not think that is important, go to any country on the planet earth that has no infrastructure and see how many people are doing very well. Nobody is because there is no infrastructure for private capital to invest and to create jobs, to create the economy we all want.

Human capital, what do I mean by investing in human capital to keep our country strong, safe and secure? I

mean education and health care. There is no country in recorded civilized history that has had an unhealthy, uneducated population that was safe, strong and secure. It is not possible. It will never happen, and the more we degrade the tax base, the more we are less able to make sure that the future is invested in, as I said earlier.

One of the things that is not hard to figure, it is common sense, and that is, we had in March of 2001, when the President said we owe it to our children and grandchildren to pay our debts, basically, we had \$55 billion out of the tax base. Without raising a dime in taxes, we had \$55 billion to do these investments that we do not have today because we have engaged in such frivolity when it comes to spending habits, when it comes to all of the things that go into sound financial practices, we are doing none of them.

So I am at a loss to see how anyone could say when you are going to do this tax reconciliation bill, you simply do it in a way by cutting wherever else one needs to be of a lower priority to make sure that we do not dig this hole deeper.

The chairman of the Federal Reserve today said, "I am quite concerned about the intermediate-to-long-term Federal budget outlook. By holding down the growth of national saving and real capital accumulation, the prospective increase in the budget deficit will place at risk future living standards of our country." These are not my words. These are the words of the new chairman of the Fed.

There is no question every reputable economist knows that the more we engage in deficit spending the more the tax base is degraded, the less able the country is to meet the challenges to keep us strong, safe and secure.

We voted earlier today about the Dubai ports deal, and that was a matter of national security. We are going to turn around tonight, if we do not adopt this motion to instruct and the conferees do not adhere to it, we are going to turn around and continue to mortgage this country to anybody on the planet earth that will let us have money on the cheap. I believe it is a national security issue, as I have said many times on this floor. At some point our creditors, particularly the Chinese and perhaps the OPEC countries, the Caribbean banking center, at some point they are going to get tired of taking our paper, and I believe this Dubai thing is one of the first signs of it. They are going to stop buying our debt, and they are going to want to buy equity, and they will have the ability to do it because of the profligacy of this Congress and this administration in refusing, absolutely refusing, deliberately refusing to balance the books.

Let me say one other thing. The GAO reports that 16 of 23 Federal agencies cannot produce an audit. You know why? Because there is no check here. You have got a compliant Congress, a friendly administration, money's leav-

ing Washington through a fire hose, and Congress is not even asking the administration what are you doing with the money. If they did ask, they could not tell you.

There are four agencies of the Federal Government where the IG, Inspector General, says on the front page of the audit, we disclaim any knowledge as to whether or not what we are telling you is true. We cannot balance the books. We cannot even tell how much money is being spent for anything.

Do you think Congress is investigating any of that? No, not one hearing with an Inspector General drug up here and say what did you do with the money.

The Blue Dogs have a 12-point plan because the budget process around here is so broken. I will not go into all 12 of them. Some of them are less important than the others, but there are two that are particularly important. One is accountability. Accountability, what did you do with the money? If you cannot tell us, you are not going to get it next year.

Every businessperson in this country knows what I am talking about. When they go to their comptroller and say here is a \$10,000 expenditure, what is it; if the comptroller said, I cannot tell you, he would not be there and that company would not be in business. That is what is happening here. Why would you not put up with that in your private business, and yet the people of this country not only tolerate it but, in some cases, encourage the behavior of this irresponsible government as it relates to keeping up with the money we are already taking away from the taxpayers involuntarily in the form of taxation and not even asking what happened to it? Replete, replete with instances of total incompetency.

FEMA, Hurricane Katrina, \$10 million to rehab a military barracks and house six people. This is insane, and that is what is going on here.

So all we are asking in this motion is whatever you do on the tax bill, for goodness sake, do not continue to borrow money to cut taxes. That is a sure ticket to financial ruin, and not only that, it is not a tax cut. It is a tax increase because next year we will begin to pay interest on that, and that will add to the \$55 billion. I tell you, it is a road to financial ruin what we are on.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT), my dear friend.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank very much my distinguished friend from Tennessee. It is a pleasure and, quite frankly, an honor to be on the floor with you tonight to talk about this extraordinary problem and crisis that this country is faced with.

Without question, you are absolutely right. We cannot have national security if we do not have financial security, and we do not have financial security today. Now, let me just tell you

and I hope the American people are paying attention to us tonight because we are here to state some important truths and facts about the financial health of this country, and our financial health is not well.

This President, this administration and this Republican-controlled Congress is heading us straight down the path of financial ruin and financial disaster.

Let me just give you one very salient point. Under this President, this Republican-controlled Congress, we have borrowed more money from foreign governments and from foreign interests than all of the preceding 42 Presidents in the history of the United States. Hear me again. If that does not wake you up and let you know that we are headed for disaster, this President, this Republican-controlled Congress has borrowed more money from foreign governments and foreign financial institutions than all of the preceding past 42 Presidents.

That means that since 1789, the very beginning of this country, to the year 2000, 211 years, through the Revolutionary War, through the foundation of the country, through the Spanish-American War, through the Civil War, through the Mexican War, through World War I, through a depression, through World War II, the Vietnam War, through the Korean War, through all of the upheavals, the economic downturns of this great country, through all of that, yet this President in the last 5 years has borrowed more money from foreign governments than all of our previous Presidents in this history. That is phenomenal. That lets you know that we are in serious, serious trouble.

As I have said time and time again, no greater founding father was there than Alexander Hamilton who founded the financial system of our country, and it was Alexander Hamilton who said, Woe be it unto this country if we fall under the heel of our finances being controlled by foreign interests. Alexander Hamilton himself was a foreigner, as were many of the Founding Fathers of this country. They understood that, and here we are today beholden on our financial security.

Here are the facts. In the last 211 years, from 1789 to 2000, under 42 Presidents, this country borrowed \$1.01 trillion. In the last 5 years, under this Republican President and this Republican-led Congress, we have borrowed \$1.05 trillion. That is not healthy. That is not the way you have got to go to have a solid country, and now we are here saying we are going to raise the debt ceiling so that we can borrow more. We are dealing with a budget that is ratcheted with devastating cuts time after time.

As the gentleman from Tennessee pointed out, just look at how this Nation is aching and hurting from the mismanagement of Katrina. Families still devastated, an entire important coastline of this country devastated.

□ 2315

And we cannot even deal with that. And some of the very programs, community block grants, being cut. Aid to our veterans, talk about national security, being cut by \$2.1 billion. Help to our farmers, to help them with the drought, to help them with the devastation of Katrina, cut, all for the purpose of making unwise tax cuts to the top 10 percent of the wealthy in this country permanent at a time of such great uncertainty.

And then to borrow the rest of the money for the tax cuts from, guess where, from China, from Japan, from India and from OPEC. Now, let me tell you how serious this is, ladies and gentlemen. The U.S. is becoming too increasingly dependent on foreign lenders for our debt. We are handing over this country on a platter to foreign countries. The Dubai Ports deal was just the beginning, just the tip of the iceberg.

And I just want to say how proud I am to say I am a United States Congressman. Because finally this Congress stood up to this administration, both Democrats and Republicans, and said no, no more, and turned down that Dubai Ports deal. Can you imagine? How unwise, to turn our port security over. Even the thought of it.

And that is what disturbs me so much when we talk about security. When you talk about national security and financial security, that is the number one issue on the minds of America today. Two things: Can this government keep us safe as a country? Can they keep us alive? Can they keep our lives safe, and then can they keep our money safe? Well, you can't keep our money safe; you certainly can't keep our lives safe. And that is the particular situation we are in today.

Let me just tell you how serious this issue is. Foreign lenders hold a total of \$2.174 trillion of our public debt. And quite honestly, in the last 10 years, they hold 90 percent of it. In other words, every dime that we are using for our government right now we are borrowing it from China and India. Japan, for example, now owns \$682.8 billion of our debt. China owns \$250 billion of our debt. England, the United Kingdom, owns \$223 billion. The Caribbean Banking Center owns \$115.3 billion. Taiwan, \$71.3 billion. OPEC countries, OPEC, already in the Middle East we are so dependent on oil that they are holding us hostage on that now, but some of these same companies are holding our debt.

America, wake up. We have got to begin to step forward and take responsibility for our financial house. I am here to tell you there is nothing more important than keeping our money straight. Lord knows, if the American people across this country, if they ran their little families, if they ran their businesses the way we are running this government, it would be bankrupt.

So I am delighted to be here tonight to join with my distinguished colleague, Mr. TANNER, to talk about this

issue. Because I believe that it is the number one issue facing the survival of this country. And let me just say this. If you look through the history books, JOHN, the history books are cluttered with the wreckage of so many great civilizations. And on the wretched bones of those great civilizations are written those pathetic words: Too late. They moved too late to save themselves.

Let us not move too late in this country. The American people are expecting us not to move too late, and we must not. And one of the first steps is to follow your lead and get some sanity. Let us instruct the conference committee to not increase the debt and let us not raise the debt ceiling limit.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to instruct. May I inquire as to how much time is left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DRAKE). The gentleman from Tennessee has 6½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin has 30 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate a lot of what the two gentlemen have said, the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Tennessee. A lot of it I agree with. And the Blue Dogs traditionally here in Congress have been joining with a lot of us fiscal conservatives on this side of the aisle to work for some of these budget reforms, and I hope in the future, in this session, that we could see a merger on budget process reforms to improve the quality of our budgets that we have here.

Tonight, we are talking about this motion to instruct. This motion to instruct I think is misguided in a few ways. Number one, I think it is hitting the wrong target. If the problem is with the budget that we pass and the results of those budgets, then the target ought to be the budget resolution. The budget resolution has already passed.

I think it is very noteworthy to point out the fact that last year's budget resolution, and we are negotiating this year's now, but last year's budget resolution, for the first time since modern budgeting, actually reduced domestic spending. It reduced nonsecurity discretionary spending. So we actually passed one of the most frugal budgets ever passed since we created the 1974 Budget Act here in Congress.

So we are on a path of being very frugal with the taxpayers' dollars. But what this motion to instruct is about is the tax bill. More importantly, this discusses cutting taxes. And the claim in this motion to instruct or the inference in this motion to instruct is that we shouldn't be cutting taxes; that we should take pressure off of cutting taxes. It is very important to point out that this tax bill really doesn't cut

taxes, it simply stops taxes from being increased. It stops tax cuts from going away.

What we did in 2003, and it is important to remember, we came in to a recession in this country. We had the Enron scandal, the dot com bubble burst, the recession hit, 9/11. We got hit really hard as an American economy. The American people got hit hard. What is so wonderful about the story that has occurred since 2003 is the resiliency of the American people, the American entrepreneurs, the families, the farmers, the businesses, and of the American economy.

But there is one thing that happened in 2003 to get that going, to get our economy back on track, to get our budgets going in the right direction, and that was the tax cuts. Now, this chart shows where we were as an economy prior to the tax cuts that occurred in 2003.

Now, if you take a look at the left side of this chart, the average economic growth rate in America, the 10 quarters before, going back to 2001, the 10 quarters before the tax cuts was 1.3 percent. This is where the recession was. We had very anemic growth. We were losing hundreds of thousands of jobs in America every month during this recession.

So what did Congress do to respond to this? Congress did cut taxes and cut taxes across the board. We cut taxes on families, cut taxes on businesses, cut taxes on savings for seniors, cut taxes on capital formation which creates jobs, like capital gains and dividends and business expensing. But what happened after those tax cuts? Since the enactment of these tax cuts, the unemployment rate fell from 6.3 percent in June of 2003, the high, to 4.8 percent. Since the enactment of these tax cuts, we have gained nearly 5 million net new jobs in America. What this shows you is the average growth rate of our economy for the 10 quarters since the tax cuts has been 3.9 percent.

So take a look at what happened in America. We had the recession, the dot com bubble, the 9/11 terrorist attack, and we went into a recession and our economy was sputtering. We were growing at an average of 1.3 percent and losing hundreds of thousands of jobs. When we cut taxes on the American people, on the American economy, we had a huge rebound right away. Right away the economy kicked into gear, produced jobs and has grown at an average rate of 3.9 percent, faster than the national average for the history of our economy. Five million new jobs were created.

Now, one of the other things that occurred was during that time, because of the dot com bubble, because of the Enron scandal, the stock market really fell. And who really got hit by that were seniors and savers. There are so many seniors that I have talked with in my district, in the first Congressional District of Wisconsin, who literally saw their savings portfolio, in

that period of 2001 to 2003, cut in half; wiped away by 60 percent.

One of the things we were so worried about was the fact that senior citizens and their pension plans and their 401(k)'s and their IRAs had so much less value in their savings that they had much less to live on. So we went immediately to act, and what we did was we reduced tax rates on capital, tax rates on the things that stocks matter, which is capital gains and dividends.

What happened after that? Since the enactment of these 2003 tax cuts, the Dow Jones Industrial Average increased by 27 percent and now is back to where it was before the crash of the market. So we were able to build back that growth in savings for most of the seniors who rely on that, for the pension funds, for the 401(k)'s, so people could get their retirement savings back.

Those are some of the fundamental tax cuts that are in this tax bill. See, if we do nothing, taxes go up. If this motion to instruct would see its way through, taxes would go up. The effect of this motion to instruct is to say, do not prevent these tax increases. And if you do want to prevent these tax increases, you will have to raise taxes somewhere else to prevent these other tax increases. I think that is bad economic policy.

Now, where we need to improve is on spending. We need to bring the deficit down, and that is where the three of us are going to agree. That is where the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Tennessee and I will clearly agree. Our deficit is too high. Our debt is far too high and we have to get it going in the other direction.

But, what has happened since 5 million net new jobs were created since 2003? What happened since the economy grew at such a faster rate? What actually happened was revenues increased. So when we cut tax rates, you would have thought that revenues would have gone down. In fact, the budget estimators here in Congress and in the administration said, we know that if you cut taxes, we think revenues will go down. Even though that may happen, it is important to get us out of the recession.

So back then we used this estimating measuring stick and our estimates predicted that revenues would go down if we cut taxes. We still cut taxes because we wanted to get people back to work. But what happened was the opposite occurred. Revenues went up. Revenues from capital gains taxes went up, even though the rate was lower. Revenues from marginal income tax rates went up, even though the rate was lower. Revenues from corporations surged by 47 percent last year alone, even at lower tax rates.

What happened was, just last year alone our tax revenues went up 15 percent. The year before they went up. So as a consequence of that, the budget deficit went down by 23 percent in 2004

and went down by 25 percent in 2005 from their projections. So the budget deficit projections actually went down because revenues went up, because people went back to work. They went from collecting unemployment to having a job and paying taxes.

That is good economic policy. It is good budget policy. And to reverse that by raising taxes would be bad economic policy but also bad budget policy. Where we need to focus is on the spending side of the ledger.

If you want to put it into perspective, the size of these tax cuts, and I want to rephrase that again, the tax cuts are simply preventing tax increases, the size of these tax cuts are \$70 billion out of a 5-year budget that will spend \$14 trillion. Next year's tax cuts, or to put it another way, to prevent tax increases from occurring next year amounts to \$11 billion out of a budget that will spend \$2.7 trillion.

Let me just read a list of some of the tax policies that would go away if this were to see its way through.

□ 2330

AMT relief for personal tax credits; State and local sales tax deduction. That is a huge issue in States like Tennessee and Texas and others. Research and development tax credit, a big job producer. Above-the-line deduction for higher education expenses; work opportunity tax credit; the welfare-to-work tax credit; savings accounts; enhanced 179 expensing for small businesses that allows small businesses to write off investments in their plant and equipment so they can create new jobs. Brownfield expensing to clean up environmental catastrophe areas; capital gains and dividends, the very tax cuts that have actually increased economic growth, produced jobs and increased tax revenues to the Federal Government.

So, at the end of the day, I think we are going to have a difference of philosophy when we talk about this. We may agree on the need to reduce spending. I hope we have agreement. But what we do not agree on this side of the aisle is the wrong thing to do to the American taxpayer today is to raise their taxes.

The problem here is not that Washington taxes too much; the problem here is that Washington spends too much. That is what we should focus on. The pressure should be on spending, not on raising taxes. I am sorry, but the effect of this motion to instruct would be to do just that.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

We do agree on some things, but part of what we heard is Lewis Carroll: What is up is down and what is down is up. This is Alice in Wonderland.

When he says the budget deficits are going in the right direction because they are less than the projection, they are the largest budget deficits in the history of the United States.

Let me read something. He talks about spending. The Republicans have had total control of the Federal Government here for the last 5 years. This is from the CATO Institute. President Bush has presided over the largest overall increase in inflation-adjusted Federal spending since the late 1960s. Even after excluding spending on defense and homeland security, President Bush is still the biggest spending President in over 30 years. His 2006 budget does not cut enough spending to change his place in history, either. Total government spending grew by 33 percent during Bush's first term. The Federal budget as the share of economy grew from 18.5 percent of GDP on Clinton's last day in office to 20.3 percent by the end of President Bush's first term. The Republican Congress has enthusiastically assisted the budget bloat. Inflation-adjusted spending on the combined budgets of the 101 largest programs they vowed to eliminate in 1995 has grown by 27 percent, and yet somehow they say spending is a problem.

They have total control. The Democrats have not spent any money in this House in over 10 years. We cannot. We do not have enough votes.

This motion says nothing about raising taxes. It says offset whatever tax revenue reduction you are going to make by spending cuts. That is what has not happened. In fact, it has gotten worse.

When President Bush came to town in 2001, in July of that year this country embarked on President Bush's economic plan for the country. Based on a series of assumptions over the next 10 years that would yield a \$5 trillion surplus. Well, 2 months later, we had 9/11. Instead of readjusting the economic game plan because every assumption that was made in July of 2001 was suddenly not valid months later in September of 2001, instead of adjusting, what has happened, a compliant Congress and a friendly administration have simply borrowed the difference. We are doing something that people have tried to do since the dawn of civilization and that is borrow themselves rich. It is impossible.

When you cut taxes with borrowed money, you are actually raising taxes. We have raised taxes \$55 billion a year every year from now on under this economic game plan because it is interest that we have to pay, and we have to pay it off the top. It is not unlike a credit card. You run your credit card up, you can live pretty good for a little while. But when you have to pay that monthly interest and your monthly payment is only covering the interest, suddenly you cannot invest in anything using that credit card because the service charges are eating you alive. That is exactly what is happening with this government.

All this motion to instruct says, whatever you do with the tax reconciliation bill, do not add to the Federal deficit and do not pile more money on

the debt of our citizens. It is that simple. If they cannot figure it out, maybe they should not be running the place.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Speaker, first, I want to respond to something my distinguished colleague from the other side said. Now you talk about smoke and mirrors. For him to say on our side that we are talking about raising taxes is so disingenuous. Nobody is talking about raising taxes. We are talking about fiscal responsibility and pay-as-you-go responsibilities.

We are saying that we do not want to cut vital services to the American people and then go borrow more money that we have to pay interest on. That, in effect, when you put it altogether, if anybody is talking about raising taxes, it is the Republicans. Somebody has to pay for this. You know who is going to pay for it, our grandchildren and our children based on their proposals.

No, sir, you are not going to be able to depend on Democrats this night that we are talking about raising taxes. Democrats are talking about keeping our taxes low and bringing fiscal responsibility back to this House.

You talk about responsibility. When Democrats were in control, when President Clinton was there, he left a several trillion dollar surplus. In just 5 years, this President and this Republican-led Congress has squandered that surplus. So when you talk about who is more responsible for the taxpayers' money, it is Democrats, not Republicans. And the American people are not going to be fooled by this smoke and mirrors of consistently trying to paint the Democrats as being for raising taxes and they for not. The Republicans are for raising taxes and raising the debt ceiling.

Madam Speaker, I want to show this chart. It is not as big as your chart, but the Republicans have increased the debt limit by \$3 trillion. I have been here 4 years, and this is the fourth time that the Republicans have asked to raise the debt ceiling so they can borrow more money.

In June, 2002, they asked to raise the debt ceiling by \$452 billion. In May, 2003, they asked to raise the debt ceiling by \$984 billion. In November of 2004, they raised the debt ceiling by \$800 billion, all of which we are borrowing against, against the best national security interests of this country, against the best financial security interests of this country.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I hope the gentleman appreciates the fact that I yielded him a minute to beat me up some more.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Speaker, let me assure the gentleman it was not beating him up. He is a great gentleman, but it is some of the policies that have been emanating from the gentleman's leadership.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Reclaiming my time, a couple of points.

Number one, as a percentage of this economy, this is not the largest deficit we have had in history, which is the statistic that matters. But you know what? This deficit is too big because it is a deficit, period.

Number two, if you do not pass this tax bill, taxes automatically go up. That means they are increased. Here is what this tax bill does: It prevents these tax cuts from going away. Said another way, it keeps taxes where they are so they do not automatically increase because the law requires that taxes go up next year, the year after, and the year after that.

So the concern we have is that because we lowered taxes, got economic growth going again, created new jobs, it actually increased revenues to the Federal Government and lowered our deficit projections. The concern we have is let us focus on spending, not taking more money out of the pocketbooks of our constituents. Let us not take a bigger bite of the paychecks of the workers of America by taking more of their tax dollars. Let us prevent these tax increases from hitting the American people and let us focus on the real problem, spending.

So if you try to defeat this tax bill, you are basically saying we want taxes to increase. Or if you want to offset it, you are saying to prevent tax increases we need to increase taxes. That does not make a lot of sense.

So the point is we have probably a fundamental disagreement. We believe that we should not raise taxes on people. We believe that the more money a person has in their paycheck, the more money a person has in their pocketbook and wallet and their business, the more successful they are going to be, the more freedom they have, the more prosperous they will be and the better our economy will be. And its impact on our budget deficits is a beneficial one, usually, because it means there are more revenues coming to the government.

Nevertheless, we should not look at it as an opportunity to spend. We should look at this good economic news we have right now, the fact that the economy is growing, people are going back to work and paying taxes, we should look at this as a moment to make sure we do not spend as much money so we can reduce the deficit and pay down our debt. That is what it is all about at the end of the day.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the dialogue and the debate. I urge a no vote on this motion to instruct.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DRAKE). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER).

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

Mr. TANNER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### LIBERATION OF IRAQ

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

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, 3 years ago this month, the fight for liberation of Iraq began in the hot desert lands of the Middle East. On March 19, 2003, American soldiers embarked on the war against tyranny, treachery and terrorism. Since then, thousands of brave, passionate Americans have fought for freedom for the Iraqi people.

As the song says, all have given some, and some have given all in this battle for liberty and justice. The Americans went to Iraq as freedom fighters and have established a democracy in that place that has never known true freedom.

Those young Americans are all volunteers, and more Americans are joining the military each day to continue this battle.

When I was in Iraq, I visited with those Americans, and they told me they are winning this war on terror, and I agree with them. This is the finest military ever assembled in history, and we owe them our support and our resolve. I paraphrase what President Kennedy said, We will support any friend, oppose any foe, pay any price to secure the defense of liberty.

Some things are just worth fighting for, and freedom is one of those things. God bless these Americans, and that's just the way it is.

#### CONGRATULATING THE PLANO, TEXAS, BOYS BASKETBALL TEAM

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include therein extraneous material.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Plano Senior High School boys basketball team.

Under the leadership of Coach Inman, they made history on March 11 as the first Plano school team to capture a State basketball championship. The Wildcats, you know, come-from-behind