

Culberson	Johnson, Sam	Pryce (OH)
Davis (KY)	Jordan	Putnam
Davis, David	King (IA)	Radanovich
Davis, Tom	King (NY)	Ramstad
Deal (GA)	Kingston	Regula
Dent	Kirk	Rehberg
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kline (MN)	Reichert
Diaz-Balart, M.	Knollenberg	Reynolds
Doolittle	Kuhl (NY)	Rogers (AL)
Drake	LaHood	Rogers (KY)
Dreier	Lamborn	Rogers (MI)
Duncan	Latham	Rohrabacher
Ehlers	LaTourette	Ros-Lehtinen
Emerson	Lewis (CA)	Roskam
English (PA)	Lewis (KY)	Royce
Everett	LoBiondo	Ryan (WI)
Fallin	Lucas	Sali
Feeney	Lungren, Daniel	Saxton
Ferguson	E.	Schmidt
Flake	Mack	Sensenbrenner
Forbes	Manzullo	Sessions
Fortenberry	Marchant	Shadegg
Fossella	McCarthy (CA)	Shimkus
Fox	McCaul (TX)	Shuster
Frelinghuysen	McCotter	Simpson
Galgley	McCrery	Smith (NE)
Garrett (NJ)	McHenry	Smith (NJ)
Gerlach	McHugh	Smith (TX)
Gilchrest	McKeon	Souder
Gillmor	Mica	Stearns
Gingrey	Miller (FL)	Terry
Gohmert	Miller (MI)	Thornberry
Goode	Miller, Gary	Tiaht
Goodlatte	Moran (KS)	Tiberi
Granger	Murphy, Tim	Turner
Graves	Musgrave	Upton
Hall (TX)	Myrick	Walberg
Hastert	Neugebauer	Walden (OR)
Hastings (WA)	Nunes	Walsh (NY)
Hayes	Paul	Wamp
Heller	Pearce	Weller
Hensarling	Pence	Westmoreland
Henger	Peterson (PA)	Whitfield
Hobson	Petri	Wicker
Hoekstra	Pickering	Wilson (NM)
Hulshof	Pitts	Wilson (SC)
Inglis (SC)	Platts	Wolf
Issa	Poe	Young (AK)
Jindal	Porter	Young (FL)
Johnson (IL)	Price (GA)	

NOT VOTING—23

Baird	Hunter	Rothman
Braley (IA)	Jones (OH)	Shays
Capito	Keller	Stark
Cubin	Linder	Sullivan
Davis, Jo Ann	Marshall	Tancredo
Emanuel	Matsui	Weldon (FL)
Engel	McMorris	
Franks (AZ)	Rodgers	
Harman	Melancon	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are reminded they have 2 minutes remaining to record their votes.

□ 1254

So the resolution was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 1585, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 1585, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, cross-references, and the table of contents, and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House in amending the bill, and that the Clerk be authorized to make additional technical corrections, which are at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?
 There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. CON. RES. 21, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 409 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 409

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 21) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2008 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2007 and 2009 through 2012. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read. The conference report shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON) is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 409.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, as the Clerk just described, House Resolution 409 provides for consideration of the conference report for S. Con. Res. 21, the fiscal year 2008 concurrent budget resolution.

The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and provides that the conference report shall be considered as read.

The rule also provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, I said it before and I will say it again: Budgets, more than anything else this government produces are moral documents. For this reason, I am proud to report that this Democratic budget is a victory for our working families and our communities. It is a budget that embodies the highest ideals of our government.

The fiscal path set by past Congresses was unsustainable, and it put

the economic future of our children and grandchildren at risk. But we are charting a new path, a path that is fiscally responsible and in line with the needs and the priorities of the American people.

Our budget reverses years of reckless Republican mismanagement, and restores fiscal responsibility to our government. The \$5.6 trillion in surpluses projected at the beginning of the Bush administration have disappeared, and have sadly been replaced by a national debt that was swelled to an estimated \$9 trillion.

This Democratic budget, in contrast to that reckless spending, reaches balance by 2012 and strictly adheres to the pay-as-you-go principle. And at the same time, it rebalances our priorities to help our communities and those most in need.

Our budget increases funding for jobs and education, essential to my home State of Ohio, which has lost over 200,000 manufacturing jobs since 2001.

Our budget rejects the President's cuts to vital health care programs such as SCHIP, Medicare and Medicaid. In fact, our budget provides for a significant increase in SCHIP funding that, in contrast to the President's proposal, will help cover the 242,000 children in Ohio who remain uninsured. And our budget increases funding for our veterans and our veterans health care programs. These brave men and women who have served our Nation so heroically, deserve only the best services and treatment when they return home.

□ 1300

Our budget increases funding for the Community Development Block Grant and the Social Services Block Grant, and it saves the Community Services Block Grant, which the President completely zeroed out.

I'm especially proud to have fought for these increases because almost 100,000 people in my congressional district alone have experienced the benefits of the CDBG funding.

This budget provides a new direction for our Nation, and let me be clear, Mr. Speaker, no matter what may be said by those on the other side of the aisle, this budget does not call for a single cent in tax increases. Let me repeat, no matter what may be said by those on the other side of the aisle, this budget does not call for a single cent in tax increases.

We have also ensured that no additional taxpayers will be ensnared by the Alternative Minimum Tax in 2007 and have provided a reserve fund for a permanent fix.

For three of the last 5-years, the Federal Government has had to operate without a budget resolution because the past Congresses failed to pass one, which is why it is critical that we adopt the resolution before us today. It is a budget that reaches balance in 5 years and restores fiscal responsibility through PAYGO rules. We do all this while keeping our priorities in line

with the needs and priorities of the people we have been elected to serve.

As a moral document that reflects the priority of our Nation, I believe we have crafted a strong budget, and I'm proud to support it.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON) for yielding me the time, the gentlewoman from Ohio, my friend on the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this rule and to the outrageous tax increase conference report that the Democrat majority is bringing to the House floor today.

Mr. Speaker, once again, we will reiterate, the Democrat Party says it's not a tax increase, but if it's not a tax increase, then it's several hundred billion dollars more worth of spending. It's one or the other, because what we see here today is exactly that. They are going to give us the largest single tax increase in the history of this country, and even though they say it's not a tax increase, then it's going to be an outrageous spending spree because they intend to spend more money or have more taxation, and that's why we're opposed to this bill.

I wish I could report to my colleagues that the majority Democrats had seen the downside of their tax-and-spend ways since the House last considered the budget in March, but on the positive side this budget does contain a 1 year Alternative Minimum Tax patch which prevents over 20 million middle class Americans from being slammed by this tax.

And this tax in this budget also represents the largest tax increase in history, not the first anyway, but I'm sorry to report that it's about as good as it gets from here because the massive and irresponsible tax increase included in the House budget would still be the second largest in American history, weighing in at least \$217 billion over the next 5 years.

It also contains a trigger that could nearly double it by including increases in taxes in marginal rates, capital gains and dividend taxes, among other tax relief that was provided previously by the Republican majority.

As further evidence that the Democrats continue to ignore their campaign trail promises to demonstrate fiscal discipline, the additional spending envisioned by this plan will trigger an automatic tax hike that will affect every single taxpaying American.

This means that as Democrats continue to implement their true tax-and-spend agenda, important middle class tax relief provisions passed by the Republican majorities of the past, such as the marriage penalty and the child tax credit, will shrink or disappear, raising the Democrats' tax increase right back to the original House-passed level of \$400 billion, or restoring it to its historic infamy, which it would truly be,

as the largest tax increase in American history.

And if this insatiable appetite for taxing were not enough, Democrats leave themselves enough room in this budget to raise taxes even further to pay for more than \$190 million of additional, unfunded spending promises.

This budget also promises and provides for a massive new spending spree by increasing nondefense appropriations by \$22 billion over 2007 levels. This is in addition to the \$26 billion that they have already proposed to spend outside the normal appropriations process through the omnibus and supplemental legislation that they have forced through the House.

This conference report abandons the emergency set-aside fund included in last year's budget and opens the way for unlimited future spending by dropping any limitation on what can be considered emergency spending. But it has new funds for peanut farmers and spinach growers, so I guess that's a good thing.

But in a surprising bit of consistency, the Democrats do hold true to their pay-for rules and allow the 23 shell reserve funds to spend an additional \$190 billion, as soon as appropriate because these will be tax increases that they intend to identify and then pay for.

This irresponsible budget continues to ignore the brewing entitlement crisis and puts off any major reform for at least another 5 years. This is despite the fact that around 77 million baby boomers will be retiring in the near future and will begin collecting Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid. Funding this new spending represents the greatest economic challenge of our era, and it is a challenge that the Democrat budget has chosen to completely ignore while going on their own spending spree everywhere else.

And what's worse, this budget completely shirks its oversight responsibility to root out waste, fraud and abuse in Federal spending by providing only \$750 million of reconciliation spending out of an \$8.5 trillion Federal budget. This is the legislative equivalent of checking under the seat cushions to pay the Federal Government's rent, and I believe, for one, that the American people deserve better.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, despite these massive tax increases, the Democrats fail to provide a surplus large enough to halt the raid on Social Security, directly contradicting their previous campaign trail promises to do precisely that. This is something that the Republican budget provided a surplus large enough to do starting in the next 5 years, and it did so by controlling, among other things, spending, not raising taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the voters watching this debate on C-SPAN can understand what these tax increases will mean for our economy and for our ability to compete globally. I think that they can see through this charade,

and I know that they deserve better than this massive tax increase and spending spree that is on their dime and against the future of our children.

I urge my colleagues to reject this rule and the underlying tax increase.

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

Ms. SUTTON. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman's permission to speak on this bill because I am pleased, as having joined with her as a member of the Budget Committee, to embrace a new direction in terms of the Democratic management of the budget.

I have been in this Chamber for the last 11 years and watched Republican performance fall short of what Republican promises were made. We have watched people who are preaching austerity fall short time after time after time, record deficits, coupled with tax benefits concentrated for those who need it the least and truly Draconian budget cuts.

We have watched, in a particular that I have specialized in in terms of the environment, the natural resource funding, the Function 300, has been cut 16 percent, and anybody who's been in our national parks has a chance to see the consequences. There have been lost conservation opportunities and Superfund cleanup has languished.

I am pleased that we have a budget framework that focuses on tax relief for those who need it the most, and there will be extended obviously those areas where there is broad bipartisan consensus dealing with the lowest income tax brackets, protection of family, marriage benefit, but the Democrats will be focusing on the tax tsunami that is bearing down on the American public, and that's the Alternative Minimum Tax which once was supposed to be limited to the wealthiest of Americans and now has morphed into a tax on middle America.

It's not the hedge fund managers that are going to be paying it, but every middle class two-income family with children is going to be threatened with this if we don't act, and that's what we have focused on.

Last but not least, we have rejected further Draconian budget cuts. They were offered up here on the floor, rejected, because people didn't want to further erode environmental protections, erode educational benefits, erode benefits for our veterans.

Instead, you have a budget that is on a path towards balance, tax relief for those who need it most, and being able to focus on critically neglected programs in the past.

Anybody who wants to look at the difference can look at what we have supported with what the Republicans have failed to deliver over the last 6 years when they controlled everything.

I appreciate the rule that's brought forward, look forward to its passage

and the passage of this ultimate legislation.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), the ranking member.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I'd like to get into this tax issue. I think we just heard this, there's no tax increase in this budget. You're going to hear that claim over and over and over.

The last speaker just mentioned that they are preserving some tax relief for some people, marriage penalty, for child tax credit, the 10 percent bracket. What they mean, they're saying, they're acknowledging, I'll give them credit on the face of it, they are going to preserve some tax relief and prevent those tax increases from coming.

What that means is they are going to let all these other tax cuts expire. More importantly, the fact is they are banking on the fact, they are requiring all those other tax cuts to expire and all those taxes to increase.

Numbers don't lie, Mr. Speaker, and what a budget is is basically a page full of numbers, and the numbers don't lie.

This chart shows you how it works. The lower line, the green line, is the line that our budget used, which assumes and requires the extension of all the tax cuts, the per child tax credit, the income tax rates, the abolishment of the death tax, cap gains, dividends, all tax cuts. The dotted red line is what the Democrats are using in their budget, and that line says they're going to raise all those taxes, marginal rates, across the board, except we hope not to raise the child tax credit tax or the marriage penalty tax or the 10 percent bracket. And we're putting a trigger in the law, and I call this the trigger tax, and that's the red line, the solid red line. And that is in the year 2010, if the Treasury Department says the surplus will be big enough in 2012 that we the government can afford tax cuts for some people, these three tax cuts, then they will have their tax cuts.

But here's the vicious cycle that we're going into and the vicious cycle is this. Their budget starts with a new \$24 billion spending spree just next year in domestic spending. Then they have a \$217 billion tax increase in their budget. Then they have 23 promises, 23 wish lists, 23 reserve funds that amount to a call to spend another \$190 billion.

□ 1315

They are going to have to raise taxes to pay for all of that. That's going to have the fact that there is no entitlement reforms. What their budget says is, tax more, spend more; tax more, spend more. Then come 2010, when those surpluses don't materialize, because we have done all this spending, they won't even get those three tax cuts that they want to extend, and this budget will go from having the second largest tax increase in American history to having the largest tax increase in American history.

Let's look at what the true intention of this budget was when it passed the House just a month ago. The budget that passed the House a month ago had a \$392.5 billion tax increase in it. All the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts that got us out of recession, that created 7.6 million new jobs, that gave us 3 years of double digit revenue growth, they wanted to get rid of it.

Then in conference with the other body, with the Senate, they agreed to the Senate to say, okay, we won't raise every one of these taxes, we would like to preserve three of those tax cuts, but raise all the rest. So they have a \$217 billion tax increase in this budget.

But that's not even enough, because their trigger tax will say, if they don't spend as much money now as they are saying now they want to spend, then maybe the taxpayer will get some of those tax benefits. But if they don't, then we are back to a \$400 billion tax increase.

The point is this, this is a vicious cycle of tax taxing and spending. The biggest problem with this budget is not what it includes, it's what it doesn't include. It doesn't include any spending control at all. There is no control on spending anywhere in the government, at all, anywhere, no control, no reform of our entitlement programs, even though witness after witness after witness, Democrats and Republicans, the left and right came to Congress and told us, you guys in Congress better get a handle on entitlements. You better get a handle on the fact that next year the baby boomers start retiring, and we are not ready for them. They say for 5 years let's do nothing, but let's just spend more money.

The worst thing we could do is put this budget on a trajectory of more spending and more taxes. What they will do, they will compromise the economic growth we have had over the last 3 years. They will compromise the recipe for success that have given us 3 years of double-digit revenue growth, 7.6 million new jobs.

To tie it all up, they came into the majority 5 months ago declaring new fiscal rules, more fiscal security, PAYGO, pay-as-you-go principle. So what are they doing in this budget? They are getting rid of PAYGO. In this budget, they are turning their PAYGO rules upside down.

This budget actually revises and turns upside down their entire PAYGO principle. The idea that they came in the majority just 5 months ago saying well, we will pay as we go, well, they are violating with this budget, into itself.

The last final point, which I think is really a shame, because 2 weeks ago we had a vote here in the House, 364 Members of Congress, Democrats and Republicans said, let's stop the raid of the Social Security trust fund once and for all. Let's stop that. That's what we said. We agreed that this budget should not raid Social Security. Both parties are responsible for this.

I am not saying it's the Democrats' fault, it's the Republicans' also. But what does this budget do? It raises the Social Security trust fund. Every year that this budget has a proposal, they are raiding the Social Security trust fund every year, even though 2 weeks ago 364 out of 435 of us said let's stop doing that. They turned around and said, and they are brining us a budget that continues to raid the Social Security trust fund. That's wrong. Both parties have been responsible for it. Both parties should fix it.

This budget should be defeated.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of the gentleman from Texas if he has any remaining speakers. I am the last speaker on this side.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, I do have an additional speaker.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be on the House floor today to raise a significant concern I have with the budget proposal that will be before the House of Representatives this week before its final passage.

At the moment, as we speak here on the House floor, Republican and Democrat members of the House Agriculture Committee are gathered in the House Agriculture Committee room to talk about a plan for a new 2002 farm bill. As we gather together, it's a wonderful thing that those of us who care about the farmers and ranchers of the country, who care about the environmental and conservation needs, who care about the food and nutrition needs of Americans, have decided we want to craft a farm bill together. We want to work side-by-side to reach the right priorities within the farm bill.

The problem is the budget priorities established under this budget are inadequate to provide a safety net for the farmers of America. There is a ruse going on here. The budget provides for a \$20 billion reserve fund that the farm bill can access in the process of developing a new farm bill, but only if we cut spending someplace else, or we raise taxes.

So we are sitting in the Agriculture Committee trying to determine how do we meet the needs of the agriculture producers and the consumers of America, how do we meet the land and environmental and conservation needs of the people of our cities and our countryside, and we are going to try to determine that in a vacuum that suggests there is actually \$20 billion in the budget that's not there.

It is simply a gimmick to allow us to try to write a farm bill to appeal to all the variety of interests that care about the outcome of this farm bill debate. But the money is not available.

For too long we have had the gimmicks in the budgetary process. To me,

this is one of the biggest I have seen in my time in Congress in which we pretend there is a fund to draft farm bill legislation.

The farmers of America, certainly the farmers of Kansas, struggle today. We are in perhaps the beginning of an end of a 6-year drought. Commodity prices are higher. The last farm bill, 2002 farm bill, spent \$18 billion less than was expected. But do we get the advantage of that in agriculture spending? The answer is no. It's taken away from us because commodity prices at the moment are higher than they were. But we know, in agriculture, we know the laws of supply and demand and economic rules that govern our economy, that the result of higher commodity prices is lower commodity prices.

So as we draft a farm bill, we are going to pretend there's money there to meet the safety net needs of farmers when it's not there. Commodity prices will be lower. That's a natural result of higher commodity prices.

Conservation environmental needs will be greater. Food stamps and nutrition programs will need to be funded. Yet, this budget fails to meet those needs. Even the administration's proposal had a better offer for American agriculture than the Democrat-passed budget on the House floor today.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, there is talk about higher commodity prices for our farmers, but very few people talk about the purpose of the farm bill, which is to provide a safety net when the cost of production to produce the crop is higher than the commodity price that the farmer receives. Yes, commodity prices are higher this year than they were last year or the year before, but let me remind people of this body what has happened to the input costs that a farmer, in fact, all Americans, face.

Agriculture is an energy dependent business, with the increasing cost of fuel, fertilizer and natural gas, the price, the cost of producing agricultural commodities in this country has skyrocketed since the 2002 farm bill. Yet the budget that we are presented with today will allow us to do less for farmers, not more.

I rise just to raise serious objection to the budget, and to make my colleagues aware, as we work together in a bipartisan fashion in the Agriculture Committee, to craft a farm bill, the parameters that have been laid out by the budget make that process almost impossible to accomplish.

I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me the time. Again, I rise to oppose this budget and its failure to meet the agricultural, environmental and food safety needs of Americans.

Ms. SUTTON. Has the gentleman had all of his people speak?

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the inquiry from the gentlewoman. I will assume that the gentlewoman is still going to hold her time with no additional speakers?

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

It's an interesting discussion that we have here about taxation policy. As you know, this budget is going to increase the taxes to the American consumer more than any single time in our history.

But why should that matter? Why is that important? I will tell you that the Governor of New Mexico, Governor Bill Richardson, a staunch Democrat said it best, when he is passing tax increases for New Mexico, tax cuts create jobs. He said Democrats should get over it. They should understand the economic principle. If tax cuts create jobs, then the reverse is true, that tax increases are going to outsource jobs.

So what we have here is one of the largest outsourcing of jobs in American history.

Now, if you would like an example of it, you could take a look at Irish miracle. We are all familiar with an Irish economy that was slugging along, so what they did is they cut taxes to their internal companies. If you are internal, you paid like an 8 percent or maybe a 10 percent tax. If you were an external company, maybe someone outside of Ireland, they still paid a 36 percent tax. Their economy began to boom.

At that point the European Union said, you know, you Irish people have got it wrong. You must change the tax structure. We are not going to listen to this. We are not going to allow for it.

The Irish, being the Irish, looked at it and said, yes, you are right. Our tax structure is wrong. So they lowered the taxes to all the external companies. They did increase to 12 percent their internal companies, lowered everyone to 12 percent, and that boom continued tremendously.

New Mexico had a boom after we began to cut taxes. The United States government, people would ask me, why did we cut taxes in a period of deficit spending? We cut taxes to grow the economy. It has worked, and over the last 3 or 4 years we have created over 7 million jobs in this economy, which has been spurred on by tax cuts.

So what our friends on the other side of the aisle are doing is it does not matter about the health of the economy. It does not matter about the jobs that we are going to outsource. We are going to tax people more in this country.

That's the fundamental difference between Republicans, Democrats, and I would bring that to the attention of our audience today and ask you to oppose the Democrat budget that increases taxes more than any other budget in American history.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I will be urging my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that I may offer an amendment to the rule, which will

stop this Chamber from hiding behind a cheap procedural maneuver invented by former Democrat Majority Leader Dick Gephardt. This rule allows Members to duck the responsibility of taking a vote on raising a limit on a public debt, a painful but necessary exercise of this Chamber's legislative responsibilities.

Because of this rule invented by Democrats, Members who vote for this underlying conference report will also be recorded as voting to raise the public debt. Members need to be aware of this. They need to know exactly what they are voting for.

For a long time, Members on both sides of the aisle have been appalled by this practice. Members of growths as ideologically diverse as the RSC, Blue Dogs and the New Democrat Coalition alike have called for its repeal. It's time for members of the Blue Dogs and New Democrat Coalition to demonstrate the courage of their convictions and end this bait-and-switch practice.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment and extraneous material just prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PASTOR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, what we are debating here today is the largest tax increase that will take place in American history. As the Republican majority has done for a number of years, we recognize that America needs to be more competitive with the world in cutting taxes, making sure that the budgets, very clearly, help protect this country, help protect the men and women of the United States military. They are doing their daily job in trying to not only protect this country, but to defeat terrorists all around the world.

Today we have an opportunity to stand very clearly, talking about what a budget does. We have heard it's a moral piece of paper. It defines very clearly about what someone's priorities are. Well, we know what those priorities are. They are tax and spend.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

□ 1330

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) yielding time to me.

As a member of the Budget Committee, we worked very hard to craft a budget that was reasonable in previous Congresses and in this Congress as well. And I want to congratulate the ranking member on the Budget Committee, Mr. RYAN from Wisconsin, on his hard work, and I also want to congratulate my colleague to the south, in South Carolina, for his leadership as chairman of the Budget Committee. But I respectfully disagree on this budget, and I will tell you why. The

Democrats are poised to pass a \$217 billion tax increase on the American people. This is the second largest tax increase in American history.

A quick history lesson here. You might be wondering who holds the record for the largest tax increase. A Democrat Congress and President Bill Clinton, and they raised taxes by \$241 billion in 1993, one year before the 1994 Republican revolution.

Back to the present day, though. The American people should know, when Democrats spend too much and future surpluses fail to materialize, a second tax hike triggers automatically. Therefore, the \$217 billion tax hike could nearly double to \$400 billion. In other words, the Democrats will eclipse Bill Clinton's record for the largest tax increase in American history. It is outrageous, and the American people need to know that. The Democrats said that they would raise taxes, and they actually are doing it, and as part of this \$2.9 trillion Federal budget, again, the largest spending bill ever passed by Congress. So it is not just the largest tax increase, but it is the largest spending piece as well. It shows their priorities, that they actually want to take more from the American people.

Their tired old philosophy ignores the fact that tax receipts this month were \$70 billion above the same month in 2006. Tax cuts have worked. In fact, this year government revenue is the highest it has ever been in the history of our country. Let me repeat that. The revenue to the Federal Government is the largest it has ever been in the history of our country. And, in fact, there is more government revenue coming in to our Federal Treasury this year than any time in the Earth's history for any government, period.

Yet, it is not enough for the Democrats. They want to spend more, they want to tax more, they want every American to pay more in taxes, and they are going to do it through this budget.

And that is why, Mr. Speaker, I think this tax and spend, tax and spend, tax and spend policy of the Democrat Party is the wrong thing for our economy, it is the wrong thing for our communities, it is the wrong thing for small business people who will be paying more taxes. It is wrong for the single mother who is trying to make ends meet, it is wrong for the American people and our economy. And that is why we should vote down this rule and vote down this budget.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority a few years ago heard the American people loud and clear that they wanted America to be competitive with the world. We were tired of losing jobs overseas. That is not happening. It has not happened in a couple years. As a matter of fact, there are signs all over this country that say "workers needed." We need more workers in this country. And that comes as a result of the tax cuts that were offered to allow American business, cor-

porations become competitive with the world, an opportunity to attract new capital, to retool our companies here in this country to give us the newest tools and the tool kits that are available.

We have a strong and vibrant economy. We have a strong and vibrant economy because we have people who have money in their own pockets creating jobs. We have some 5 million new jobs just in the last few years, 7 million since 2001, that have been created.

This economy is doing the right thing. It is giving the Americans their own dreams, their dreams to not only have their own homes, the highest level ever of people who own their own homes, but it is also giving America to save for our future because our stock market is back.

Just a few years ago, after 9/11, everybody was worried about their retirement. Big worries. At that time, what did we hear from the Democrat Party? Raise taxes. But that is not what the Republican majority or President Bush did. We cut taxes; we grew our economy. We have a strong and great economy today.

The Republican Party stands forth today on this day in Washington, D.C., to say we will vote against the largest or second largest tax increase in the history of the United States of America.

This budget that comes from the Democrat Party will raise taxes and raise spending. The Republican Party disagrees with that. The Republican Party disagrees with saying that we will have taxpayers who will be without jobs in this country, because we will take away the investment and the opportunity that goes forth to make investment possible to where jobs are available. The Republican Party stands today and says we are opposed to this new bill because of what it does by having all sorts of special accounts, just spending opportunities that sit out there in the future, undefined, but ready to spend money if the money comes in.

We believe that we should have had more responsibility, as we have tried to do for years, to do something responsible about Social Security. But we have heard from the Democrats for the last 6 years, there is nothing wrong with Social Security. There is no problem. Mr. Speaker, we disagree with that. Republicans are going to oppose this today. I ask my Members to join me in defeating the previous question.

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

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin my closing remarks by returning us to the painful reality of what we begin with today.

This administration and these past Congresses took a \$5.6 trillion surplus and turned it into a \$9 trillion debt. This Democratic budget, in contrast, reaches balance by 2012, and strictly adheres to PAYGO rules.

This budget contains not a dollar, not a quarter, not a dime, not a penny

of tax increases. And you don't just have to take my word for it. The Concord Coalition says that the budget resolution does not have a tax increase. "Thus to be clear, the budget resolution does not call for or require a tax increase," the Concord Coalition said on March 28. The Center on the Budget and Policy Priorities says the budget resolution does not have a tax increase. "This claim is incorrect. The House plan does not include a tax increase," made on March 28, 2007. The Brookings Institution says, "The Democratic budget would not raise taxes." "The budget would not raise taxes." March 28.

Mr. Speaker, we have made it clear why passing this rule and passing this budget is so important for our Nation, so let me wrap up this debate by highlighting the facts about our budget.

The Democratic budget puts together the broken pieces left to us by the mismanagement of previous Congresses and this administration. Our budget returns fiscal responsibility to Congress, and allocates funding for some of our most important national priorities. Our children, our veterans, and our working families will be provided with the key resources they need and deserve. Our budget protects tax cuts for middle class families, and it does not raise taxes on anyone.

Mr. Speaker, this is the responsible budget that the American people have been calling for, and it deserves our support. I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

The material previously referred to by Mr. SESSIONS is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 409 OFFERED BY REP. SESSIONS OF TEXAS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new section:

SEC. 2. Rule XXVII shall not apply with respect to the adoption by the Congress of the conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 21) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2008 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2007 and 2009 through 2012.

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the

control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly's "American Congressional Dictionary": "If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business."

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative Plan.)

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 193, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 375]

YEAS—224

Abercrombie	Grijalva	Neal (MA)
Ackerman	Gutierrez	Neberstar
Allen	Hall (NY)	Obey
Altmire	Hare	Ortiz
Andrews	Hastings (FL)	Pallone
Arcuri	Hersteth Sandlin	Pascarell
Baca	Higgins	Pastor
Baldwin	Hill	Payne
Bean	Hinchee	Perlmutter
Becerra	Hinojosa	Peterson (MN)
Berkley	Hirono	Pomeroy
Berman	Hodes	Price (NC)
Berry	Holden	Rahall
Bishop (GA)	Holt	Rangel
Bishop (NY)	Honda	Reyes
Blumenauer	Hooley	Rodriguez
Boren	Hoyer	Ross
Boswell	Inslee	Rothman
Boucher	Israel	Roybal-Allard
Boyd (FL)	Jackson (IL)	Ruppersberger
Boyd (KS)	Jackson-Lee	Rush
Brady (PA)	(TX)	Ryan (OH)
Braley (IA)	Jefferson	Salazar
Brown, Corrine	Johnson (GA)	Sánchez, Linda
Butterfield	Johnson, E. B.	T.
Capps	Kagen	Sanchez, Loretta
Capuano	Kanjorski	Sarbanes
Cardoza	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Carnahan	Kildee	Schiff
Carney	Kilpatrick	Schwartz
Carson	Kind	Scott (GA)
Castor	Klein (FL)	Scott (VA)
Chandler	Kucinich	Serrano
Clarke	Lampson	Sestak
Clay	Langevin	Shea-Porter
Cleaver	Lantos	Sherman
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Shuler
Cohen	Larsen (CT)	Sires
Conyers	Lee	Skelton
Cooper	Levin	Slaughter
Costa	Lewis (GA)	Smith (WA)
Costello	Lipinski	Snyder
Courtney	Loeb sack	Solis
Cramer	Lofgren, Zoe	Space
Crowley	Lowe y	Spratt
Cuellar	Lynch	Stark
Cummings	Mahoney (FL)	Stupak
Davis (AL)	Maloney (NY)	Sutton
Davis (CA)	Markey	Tanner
Davis (IL)	Marshall	Tauscher
Davis, Lincoln	Matheson	Taylor
DeFazio	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Delahunt	McCollum (MN)	Tierney
DeLauro	McDermott	Towns
Dicks	McGovern	Udall (CO)
Dingell	McIntyre	Udall (NM)
Doggett	McNerney	Van Hollen
Donnelly	McNulty	Velázquez
Doyle	Meehan	Visclosky
Edwards	Meeke (FL)	Walz (MN)
Ellison	Meeke (NY)	Wasserman
Ellsworth	Melancon	Schultz
Emanuel	Michaud	Waters
Eshoo	Miller (NC)	Watson
Etheridge	Miller, George	Watt
Farr	Mitchell	Waxman
Fattah	Mollohan	Weiner
Filner	Moore (KS)	Welch (VT)
Frank (MA)	Moore (WI)	Wexler
Giffords	Moran (VA)	Wilson (OH)
Gillibrand	Murphy (CT)	Woolsey
Gonzalez	Murphy, Patrick	Wu
Gordon	Murtha	Wynn
Green, Al	Nadler	Yarmuth
Green, Gene	Napolitano	

NAYS—193

Aderholt	Bono	Castle
Akin	Boozman	Chabot
Alexander	Boustany	Coble
Bachmann	Brady (TX)	Cole (OK)
Bachus	Brown (SC)	Conaway
Baker	Brown-Waite,	Crenshaw
Barrett (SC)	Ginny	Culberson
Barrow	Buchanan	Davis (KY)
Bartlett (MD)	Burgess	Davis, David
Barton (TX)	Burton (IN)	Davis, Tom
Biggert	Buyer	Deal (GA)
Bilbray	Calvert	Dent
Bilirakis	Camp (MI)	Diaz-Balart, L.
Bishop (UT)	Campbell (CA)	Diaz-Balart, M.
Blackburn	Cannon	Doolittle
Blunt	Cantor	Drake
Boehner	Capito	Dreier
Bonner	Carter	Duncan

Ehlers	Kuhl (NY)	Rehberg
Emerson	LaHood	Reichert
English (PA)	Lamborn	Renzi
Everett	Latham	Reynolds
Fallin	LaTourette	Rogers (AL)
Feeney	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (KY)
Ferguson	Linder	Rogers (MI)
Flake	LoBiondo	Rohrabacher
Forbes	Lucas	Ros-Lehtinen
Fortenberry	Lungren, Daniel	Royce
Fossella	E.	Ryan (WI)
Fox	Mack	Sali
Franks (AZ)	Manzullo	Saxton
Frelinghuysen	Marchant	Schmidt
Gallegly	McCarthy (CA)	Sensenbrenner
Garrett (NJ)	McCaul (TX)	Sessions
Gerlach	McCotter	Shadegg
Gilchrest	McCrery	Shimkus
Gillmor	McHenry	Shuster
Gingrey	McHugh	Simpson
Gohmert	McKeon	Smith (NE)
Goode	Mica	Smith (TX)
Goodlatte	Miller (FL)	Souder
Granger	Miller (MI)	Stearns
Graves	Miller, Gary	Sullivan
Hall (TX)	Moran (KS)	Tancredo
Hastert	Murphy, Tim	Terry
Hastings (WA)	Musgrave	Thornberry
Hayes	Myrick	Tiahrt
Heller	Neugebauer	Tiberi
Hensarling	Nunes	Turner
Herger	Paul	Upton
Hobson	Pearce	Walberg
Hoekstra	Pence	Walden (OR)
Hulshof	Peterson (PA)	Walsh (NY)
Issa	Petri	Wamp
Jindal	Pickering	Weldon (FL)
Johnson (IL)	Pitts	Weller
Johnson, Sam	Platts	Westmoreland
Jones (NC)	Poe	Whitfield
Jordan	Porter	Wicker
Keller	Price (GA)	Wilson (NM)
King (IA)	Pryce (OH)	Wilson (SC)
King (NY)	Putnam	Wolf
Kingston	Radanovich	Young (AK)
Kirk	Ramstad	Young (FL)
Kline (MN)	Regula	

NOT VOTING—15

Baird	Inglis (SC)	McMorris
Cubin	Jones (OH)	Rodgers
Davis, Jo Ann	Kaptur	Olver
Engel	Knollenberg	Shays
Harman	Lewis (KY)	Smith (NJ)
Hunter		

□ 1402

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. COSTELLO changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 225, noes 194, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 376]

AYES—225

Abercrombie	Berkley	Brady (PA)
Ackerman	Berman	Braley (IA)
Allen	Berry	Brown, Corrine
Altmire	Bishop (GA)	Butterfield
Andrews	Bishop (NY)	Capps
Arcuri	Blumenauer	Capuano
Baca	Boren	Cardoza
Baldwin	Boswell	Carnahan
Barrow	Boucher	Carney
Bean	Boyd (FL)	Carson
Becerra	Boyd (KS)	Castor

Chandler
 Clarke
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costa
 Costello
 Courtney
 Cramer
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Davis (AL)
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis, Lincoln
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doyle
 Duncan
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Ellsworth
 Emanuel
 Eshoo
 Etheridge
 Farr
 Fattah
 Filner
 Frank (MA)
 Giffords
 Gillibrand
 Gonzalez
 Gordon
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutierrez
 Hall (NY)
 Hare
 Hastings (FL)
 Herseht Sandlin
 Higgins
 Hinchey
 Hinojosa
 Hirono
 Hodes
 Holden
 Holt
 Honda
 Hooley
 Hoyer
 Inslee
 Israel
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson-Lee
 (TX)

NOES—194

Aderholt
 Akin
 Alexander
 Bachmann
 Bachus
 Baker
 Barrett (SC)
 Bartlett (MD)
 Barton (TX)
 Biggert
 Bilbray
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (UT)
 Blackburn
 Blunt
 Boehner
 Bonner
 Bono
 Boozman
 Boustany
 Brady (TX)
 Brown (SC)
 Brown-Waite,
 Ginny
 Buchanan
 Burgess
 Burton (IN)
 Buyer
 Calvert
 Camp (MI)
 Campbell (CA)

Jefferson
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Kagen
 Kanjorski
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilpatrick
 Kind
 Klein (FL)
 Kucinich
 Lampson
 Langevin
 Lantos
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (GA)
 Lipinski
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowey
 Lynch
 Mahoney (FL)
 Maloney (NY)
 Markey
 Marshall
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCollum (MN)
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McIntyre
 McNerney
 McNulty
 Meehan
 Meek (FL)
 Meeks (NY)
 Melancon
 Michaud
 Miller (NC)
 Miller, George
 Mitchell
 Mollohan
 Moore (KS)
 Moore (WI)
 Moran (VA)
 Murphy (CT)
 Murphy, Patrick
 Murtha
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal (MA)
 Oberstar
 Obey
 Olver
 Ortiz
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor
 Payne
 Perlmutter
 Peterson (MN)
 Pomeroy

Price (NC)
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Reyes
 Rodriguez
 Ross
 Rothman
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Salazar
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schwartz
 Scott (GA)
 Scott (VA)
 Serrano
 Sestak
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Shuler
 Sires
 Skelton
 Slaughter
 Smith (WA)
 Solis
 Space
 Spratt
 Stark
 Stupak
 Sutton
 Tauscher
 Taylor
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Tierney
 Towns
 Udall (CO)
 Udall (NM)
 Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walz (MN)
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watson
 Watt
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Welch (VT)
 Wexler
 Wilson (OH)
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Wynn
 Yarmuth

Johnson, Sam
 Jones (NC)
 Jordan
 Keller
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kirk
 Kline (MN)
 Knollenberg
 Kuhl (NY)
 LaHood
 Lamborn
 Latham
 LaTourette
 Lewis (CA)
 Linder
 LoBiondo
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Mack
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCaul (TX)
 McCotter
 McCreery
 McHenry
 McHugh
 McKeon
 Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller, Gary

Baird
 Cubin
 Davis, Jo Ann
 Engel
 Harman

NOT VOTING—13

Jones (OH)
 Kaptur
 Lewis (KY)
 McMorris
 Rodgers

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes are remaining in this vote.

□ 1409

Mr. MARCHANT changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the resolution was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:
 Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 376 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I inadvertently voted “aye” on rollcall No. 376, adoption of the rule for the Conf. Rpt. on the FY '08 budget. I would like the RECORD to reflect that I meant to vote “nay.”

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO BURMA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 110-35)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Reg-*

ister and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. I have sent the enclosed notice to the *Federal Register* for publication, stating that the Burma emergency is to continue beyond May 20, 2007.

The crisis between the United States and Burma arising from the actions and policies of the Government of Burma, including its policies of committing large-scale repression of the democratic opposition in Burma, that led to the declaration of a national emergency on May 20, 1997, has not been resolved. These actions and policies are hostile to U.S. interests and pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency and maintain in force the sanctions against Burma to respond to this threat.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
 THE WHITE HOUSE, May 17, 2007.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. CON. RES. 21, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 409, I call up the conference report on the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 21) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2008 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2007 and 2009 through 2012.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POMEROY). Pursuant to House Resolution 409, the conference report is considered read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of May 16, 2007, at page H5071.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

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

This budget resolution which we present today did not come easily. It comes from months of hard work, hearings, and negotiations. The end product is a good budget, not perfect, I will admit. Not complete but worthy of support. Indeed, it requires our support if we do not want the process to fail again, as it did last year when no concurrent resolution was passed and only two of 11 appropriation bills were enacted.

This budget moves us to balance over the next 5 years. Along the way, it posts smaller deficits than the President's budget. It adheres to the pay-as-you-go principle and contains no new