



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 154

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 12, 2008

No. 42

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TIERNEY).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

March 12, 2008.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN F. TIERNEY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

### PRAYER

The Reverend W. James Thomas, II, Shiloh Church of Memphis, Memphis, Tennessee, offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, we come before You today to praise You for Your goodness to our Nation and for blessing us in ways we do not deserve. We celebrate the diversity of languages and cultures that have shaped and enriched our national life. With the many problems we face in our Nation, we thank You for leaders who are passionate about our Nation's future.

And now, dear God, give us Your light and Your truth to guide us. Keep our faces toward You and our feet in paths of righteousness. Give our Nation's leaders the fortitude to stand strong for what is right. Keep us, sustain us, and do not allow us to lose sight of You. Deliver us from sin, pardon our offenses, and absolve us from all wickedness. Grant us the highest joy, that of glorifying and enjoying You.

This we pray in Your holy name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the

last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. 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. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CUELLAR led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1593. An act to reauthorize the grant program for reentry of offenders into the community in the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, to improve reentry planning and implementation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has agreed to without amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 270. Concurrent resolution to make corrections in the enrollment of the bill H.R. 1593.

H. Con. Res. 306. Concurrent resolution permitting the use of the Rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2516. An act to assist members of the Armed forces in obtaining United States citizenship, and for other purposes.

### WELCOMING REV. W. JAMES THOMAS, II

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, our pastor today was Pastor W. James Thomas, II.

Pastor Thomas is God's visionary for Shiloh Church of Memphis, located in Memphis, Tennessee. Serving as pastor since 1994, his consistent obedience to God has taken the Shiloh congregation from glory to glory. The membership has grown from 75 to 600 and counting. During these years, Pastor Thomas has been preaching and teaching God's uncompromising Word with a boldness that has changed the lives of the people at Shiloh and throughout the country.

To accommodate the vision and growth of the church membership, Pastor Thomas led the congregation in the acquisition of a 19,000 square foot worship and educational facility in 1998. In

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1541

2003, the sanctuary was completely renovated and office complex expanded.

Spiritually, Pastor Thomas was saved and received much of his spiritual development in the Church of God in Christ. He was called to the ministry at the age of 14 and began pastoring at the age of 18 in Knoxville, Tennessee. He graduated cum laude from Crichton College in Memphis with a bachelor of science degree in Biblical studies and is currently a candidate for the master of divinity degree. He has also attended and received degrees from Harvard University and Yale University, where he had completed the first Graduate School of Theological Studies' special intensive course at Harvard Divinity School in Cambridge and the Yale School of Divinity in September 2006.

He's very active in our community in Memphis, Tennessee. He is married to Minister Antonia R. Thomas, who serves alongside him in the ministry. And even possibly as important or more important than this congregation, he has two children. One is Private First Class Reginald Cleveland, who is an officer and security person for this Chamber, from Memphis, Tennessee, who is here today; and he has a daughter in middle school.

I appreciate Pastor Thomas serving the United States House of Representatives as our pastor this morning.

#### CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KIND). Today is the day of Calendar Wednesday. The Clerk will call the roll of committees.

The Clerk called the committees.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SESSIONS (during the call). I have a point of parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas may state his inquiry.

Mr. SESSIONS. I understand that the procedure that the Chair just went through is known as Calendar Wednesday. Is it correct that any bill reported by a committee and placed on the Union or House Calendar could have been called up by the chairman as the committee name was read?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Calendar Wednesday business may be called up only on formal authorization by the reporting committee.

Mr. SESSIONS. A further point of parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. SESSIONS. On February 12, a bipartisan majority in the Senate passed S. 2248, a responsible bill to provide long-term authority for our intelligence community to help detect and prevent acts of terrorism. For a month now, it has been sitting at the desk in the House awaiting action. Would it have been in order for the chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence or the chairman of the Judiciary Committee or their designee to call up S. 2248 at this time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No.

Mr. SESSIONS. Further point of parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. SESSIONS. H.R. 5440, the House counterpart to this bipartisan Senate legislation, was introduced by Congressman FOSSELLA on February 14. Would it be possible for Mr. HOEKSTRA, the ranking member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, to call up this bill under his committee's jurisdiction or for any of the 21 members of the Democrat majority who signed a letter to Speaker PELOSI on January 28 asking her to move this legislation to "ensure a strong national security apparatus that can thwart terrorist attacks across the globe and to save American lives here in this country," for them to call up this bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A committee member other than the chairman must have specific authorization of the committee to call up a bill on Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. SESSIONS. Further point of inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. SESSIONS. Is it in order for any member of the minority to call up a long-term FISA modernization bill that would strengthen the Nation's intelligence capacities while protecting the civil liberties of Americans during the call of the committees?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Again, a committee member other than the chairman must have specific authorization of the committee to call up a bill on Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the gentleman for letting us know that it's up to the chairman or the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will continue.

The Clerk called the committees.

□ 1015

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIERNEY). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

#### MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

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

Mr. DREIER. 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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 5, nays 375, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 124]

YEAS—5

Davis, Lincoln	Johnson (IL)	Miller, George
Honda	Kingston	
	NAYS—375	
Abercrombie	Dingell	Kucinich
Ackerman	Doggett	Kuhl (NY)
Aderholt	Donnelly	LaHood
Akin	Doyle	Lamborn
Alexander	Drake	Lampson
Allen	Dreier	Langevin
Altmire	Duncan	Larsen (WA)
Andrews	Edwards	Larson (CT)
Arcuri	Ehlers	Latham
Baca	Ellison	LaTourette
Bachmann	Ellsworth	Latta
Baldwin	Emanuel	Lee
Barrett (SC)	Emerson	Levin
Barrow	Engel	Lewis (CA)
Bartlett (MD)	English (PA)	Lewis (GA)
Barton (TX)	Eshoo	Lewis (KY)
Bean	Etheridge	Linder
Becerra	Everett	Lipinski
Berkley	Fallin	LoBiondo
Berman	Farr	Loeb
Berry	Fattah	Loftgren, Zoe
Biggert	Feeney	Lowe
Bilbray	Ferguson	Lucas
Bilirakis	Filner	Lungren, Daniel
Bishop (GA)	Flake	E.
Bishop (NY)	Forbes	Lynch
Blackburn	Fortenberry	Mack
Blumenauer	Foster	Mahoney (FL)
Blunt	Fox	Maloney (NY)
Boehner	Frank (MA)	Manzullo
Bonner	Franks (AZ)	Marshall
Bono Mack	Frelinghuysen	Matheson
Boozman	Gallely	Matsui
Boren	Garrett (NJ)	McCarthy (CA)
Boswell	Gerlach	McCarthy (NY)
Boustany	Giffords	McCollum (MN)
Boyd (FL)	Gillibrand	McCotter
Boyda (KS)	Gohmert	McCreery
Brady (PA)	Gonzalez	McDermott
Brady (TX)	Goode	McGovern
Braley (IA)	Goodlatte	McHenry
Broun (GA)	Granger	McHugh
Brown (SC)	Graves	McIntyre
Brown-Waite,	Green, Al	McKeon
Ginny	Green, Gene	McMorris
Buchanan	Gutierrez	Rodgers
Burton (IN)	Hall (NY)	McNerney
Butterfield	Hare	McNulty
Buyer	Harman	Meeks (NY)
Calvert	Hastings (FL)	Melancon
Camp (MI)	Hastings (WA)	Mica
Campbell (CA)	Hayes	Michaud
Cannon	Heller	Miller (FL)
Cantor	Hensarling	Miller (MI)
Capito	Hergert	Miller (NC)
Capps	Herseth Sandlin	Miller, Gary
Capuano	Higgins	Mitchell
Carney	Hill	Mollohan
Carter	Hinojosa	Moore (KS)
Castle	Hirono	Moore (WI)
Castor	Hobson	Moran (KS)
Chabot	Hodes	Moran (VA)
Chandler	Hoekstra	Murphy (CT)
Clarke	Holden	Murphy, Patrick
Cleaver	Holt	Murphy, Tim
Clyburn	Hoyer	Musgrave
Coble	Hulshof	Myrick
Cohen	Hunter	Nadler
Cole (OK)	Inglis (SC)	Napolitano
Conaway	Inslee	Neal (MA)
Conyers	Israel	Neugebauer
Cooper	Issa	Nunes
Costa	Jackson (IL)	Obey
Courtney	Jackson-Lee	Oliver
Cramer	(TX)	Ortiz
Crenshaw	Johnson, E. B.	Pallone
Crowley	Johnson, Sam	Pascarell
Cuellar	Jones (NC)	Pastor
Davis (AL)	Jordan	Paul
Davis (CA)	Kagan	Payne
Davis (IL)	Kanjorski	Pearce
Davis (KY)	Keller	Pence
Davis, David	Kennedy	Perlmutter
Davis, Tom	Kildee	Peterson (MN)
Deal (GA)	Kilpatrick	Petri
DeFazio	Kind	Pickering
DeGette	King (IA)	Pitts
Delahunt	King (NY)	Platts
DeLauro	Kirk	Poe
Dent	Klein (FL)	Pomeroy
Diaz-Balart, L.	Klaine (MN)	Porter
Diaz-Balart, M.	Knollenberg	Price (GA)

Price (NC)	Scott (VA)	Tiberi
Putnam	Sensenbrenner	Tierney
Radanovich	Serrano	Towns
Rahall	Sessions	Tsongas
Ramstad	Sestak	Turner
Regula	Shadegg	Udall (NM)
Rehberg	Shays	Upton
Reichert	Shea-Porter	Van Hollen
Reyes	Sherman	Velázquez
Reynolds	Shimkus	Viscosky
Richardson	Shuler	Walberg
Rodriguez	Shuster	Walden (OR)
Rogers (AL)	Sires	Walsh (NY)
Rogers (KY)	Skelton	Walz (MN)
Rogers (MI)	Slaughter	Wamp
Rohrabacher	Smith (NE)	Wasserman
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NJ)	Schultz
Roskam	Smith (TX)	Waters
Ross	Smith (WA)	Watson
Rothman	Snyder	Watt
Roybal-Allard	Solis	Waxman
Royce	Souder	Weiner
Ruppersberger	Space	Welch (VT)
Ryan (WI)	Spratt	Weldon (FL)
Salazar	Stark	Weller
Sánchez, Linda T.	Stearns	Westmoreland
	Stupak	Whitfield (KY)
Sanchez, Loretta	Sullivan	Wilson (NM)
Sarbanes	Tanner	Wilson (OH)
Saxton	Tauscher	Wilson (SC)
Schakowsky	Taylor	Wittman (VA)
Schiff	Terry	Wolf
Schmidt	Thompson (CA)	Wu
Schwartz	Thornberry	Yarmuth
Scott (GA)	Tiahrt	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—49

Bachus	Gingrey	Pryce (OH)
Baird	Gordon	Rangel
Bishop (UT)	Grijalva	Renzi
Boucher	Hall (TX)	Rush
Brown, Corrine	Hinches	Ryan (OH)
Burgess	Hooley	Sali
Cardoza	Jefferson	Simpson
Carnahan	Johnson (GA)	Sutton
Clay	Jones (OH)	Tancredo
Costello	Kaptur	Thompson (MS)
Cubin	Marchant	Udall (CO)
Culberson	Markey	Wexler
Cummings	McCauley (TX)	Woolsey
Dicks	Meek (FL)	Wynn
Doolittle	Murtha	Young (AK)
Fossella	Oberstar	
Gilchrest	Peterson (PA)	

□ 1040

Ms. KILPATRICK, Mrs. GILLI-BRAND and Messrs. DUNCAN, PENCE, LINDER, PASTOR, BARTON of Texas, LEWIS of Georgia and SESTAK changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2745. An act to extend agricultural programs beyond March 15, 2008, to suspend permanent price support authorities beyond that date, and for other purposes.

QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I have a privileged resolution at the desk.

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

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1039

Whereas on January 5, 2007, the House of Representatives adopted a rule of the House

amending clause 2(a) of rule XX to include that, “A record vote by electronic device shall not be held open for the sole purpose of reversing the outcome of such vote.”;

Whereas on the evening of March 11, 2008, the Speaker pro tempore repeated an announcement regarding enforcement of such rule, stating “An alleged violation of clause 2(a) of rule XX may subject the vote to collateral challenge in the form of a question of the privileges of the House pursuant to rule IX.”;

Whereas a press release dated October 7, 2005 from then Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi stated, “Democrats have proposed guidelines for how we think the House of Representatives should operate, a Minority Bill of Rights.” Included in this document is the declaration that “No vote shall be held open in order to manipulate the outcome. When we take back the People’s House, we will heed that declaration.”;

Whereas H. Res. 1031 provided that “House Resolution 895, amended by the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, is hereby adopted.”;

Whereas on March 11, 2008 the publication Roll Call reported, “Republicans nearly defeated the measure on a procedural maneuver, but House leaders held the vote open for at least 10 additional minutes to turn a handful of Democrats—sealing the win with the votes of Reps. Emanuel Cleaver (D-Mo.), Sanford Bishop (D-Ga.), G.K. Butterfield (D-N.C.) and Bart Stupak (D-Mich.). With their support, the bill was allowed to come to the floor.” (“House Passes Ethics Bill; Pelosi Hails Victory,” Roll Call, March 11, 2008.);

Whereas on March 11, 2008 the publication The Politico reported, “Republicans, backed by 18 Democrats, thought they had won a parliamentary vote prior to consideration of the new ethics office, a victory that would have derailed [sic] But Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) and the Democratic leadership held the vote open for 16 minutes beyond the allotted 15-minute deadline, and in that period, convinced several Democrats to switch their votes.” (“New Ethics Office Approved by House After Controversial Quote,” The Politico, March 11, 2008.);

Whereas on March 11, 2008 The Politico further reported, “In response to GOP manipulation of votes during their years of control, Pelosi promised at the beginning of the 110th Congress that floor votes would only last 15 minutes, and ‘no vote shall be held open to manipulate the outcome.’ Pelosi, however, appeared to go back on that promise during the previous question vote, which was open for a total of 31 minutes before it was gavelled closed.” (“New Ethics Office Approved by House After Controversial Quote,” The Politico, March 11, 2008.);

Whereas on March 11, 2008 The Politico further reported, “The most vocal Democratic opponent of the OCE, Rep. Neil Abercrombie (D-Hawaii), who made an impassioned speech on the floor urging his colleagues to vote against the measure, insisted that the opposition had actually won the parliamentary vote, regardless of the final outcome. ‘We did win,’ Abercrombie declared afterwards. ‘This thing is totally discredited.’” (“New Ethics Office Approved by House After Controversial Quote,” The Politico, March 11, 2008.);

Whereas on March 12, 2008 Associated Press reported, “Republicans yelled in protest as Democrats held the 15-minute vote open for 27 minutes while Democratic leaders urged holdouts in the party to support the party position.” (“House Approves Ethics Panel,” Associated Press, March 12, 2008.);

Whereas on March 11, 2008, Roll Call reported, “‘There are still plenty of people trying to keep it from coming to the floor,’ said one Democratic lawmaker, who spoke in advance of the vote on the condition of anonymity, fearing reprisals from party leadership. The Member added that colleagues ex-

pressed a ‘lot of unhappiness’, as many acknowledged they would have to vote for the bill once it reached the floor.”;

Whereas at 9:31 p.m. the vote on Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 1031, was ordered and was to be a 15-minute vote;

Whereas that vote was held open for 27 total minutes;

Whereas 413 Members of the House, which was the total number of Members present and voting, had registered their votes after 21 minutes had elapsed;

Whereas no new Member of the House voted after 21 minutes into the vote who had not previously recorded their vote;

Whereas at 21 minutes elapsed, the vote was 204 yeas and 209 nays, the motion failing;

Whereas for approximately the next 5 minutes, no further votes were cast or changed and the previous question vote was held open for the sole purpose of changing the outcome of the vote;

Whereas during the final moments of Roll Call Vote 121, after conversing with Democratic leaders in full view of the House, three Democratic Members changed their votes from Nay to Aye;

Whereas Speaker Nancy Pelosi left the floor during this time and returned with Representative Bart Stupak who changed his vote from a no to a ye;

Whereas Speaker Nancy Pelosi and Majority Whip James Clyburn approached Representatives Sanford Bishop and Emanuel Cleaver on the Democratic side of the aisle and had them change their votes from a no to a ye;

Whereas according to Speaker Nancy Pelosi’s document entitled “A New Direction for America,” page 24 states that “floor votes should be completed within 15 minutes with the customary 2 minute extension to accommodate members’ ability to reach the House Chamber to cast their votes. No vote shall be held open in order to manipulate the outcome.”;

Whereas the result of the 3 Democratic vote changes, after 12 minutes of extended vote time and pressure from Democratic leadership, manipulated the outcome and changed the result from 204 yeas and 209 nays, the motion failing, to 207 yeas and 206 nays, the motion passing; and

Whereas a Democratic Member approached Members and staff of the minority following the announced outcome of the vote and revealed that, “Deals were made to get Cleaver and Bishop;”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That

(1) the House denounces this action in the strongest terms possible, rejects the practice of holding votes open beyond a reasonable period of time for the sole purpose of circumventing the will of the House, and directs the Speaker to take such steps as necessary to prevent any further abuse;

(2) The votes on ordering the previous question and adoption of House Resolution 1031 are hereby vacated;

(3) the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is directed to investigate without further delay violations of House rules by Speaker Nancy Pelosi and other Members of the Democratic leadership and report its findings and recommendations to the House, including a recommendation regarding the appropriate actions for the Speaker’s activities; and,

(4) The Select Committee to Investigate the Voting Irregularities of August 2, 2007, is hereby directed to investigate and include in the report its findings and resulting recommendations concerning the actions of the Speaker, concerning the time the vote was held open and the changes in votes cast by

members, resulting in passage of the previous question vote to H. Res. 1031 on March 11, 2008.

□ 1045

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution presents a question of the privileges of the House.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the resolution on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. BOEHNER. As the gentleman called the vote, I couldn't hear, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair noted that the ayes had it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 215, nays 193, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 125]

YEAS—215

Abercrombie	Dingell	Lampson
Ackerman	Doggett	Langevin
Allen	Donnelly	Larsen (WA)
Altmire	Doyle	Larson (CT)
Andrews	Edwards	Lee
Arcuri	Ellison	Levin
Baca	Ellsworth	Lewis (GA)
Baird	Emanuel	Lipinski
Baldwin	Eshoo	Loebsack
Barrow	Etheridge	Lofgren, Zoe
Bean	Farr	Lowe
Becerra	Fattah	Lynch
Berkley	Filner	Mahoney (FL)
Berman	Foster	Markey
Berry	Frank (MA)	Marshall
Bishop (GA)	Giffords	Matheson
Bishop (NY)	Gillibrand	Matsui
Blumenauer	Gonzalez	McCarthy (NY)
Boren	Green, Al	McCollum (MN)
Boucher	Green, Gene	McDermott
Boyd (FL)	Grijalva	McGovern
Boyd (KS)	Gutierrez	McIntyre
Brady (PA)	Hall (NY)	McNerney
Braley (IA)	Hare	McNulty
Brown, Corrine	Harman	Meek (FL)
Butterfield	Hastings (FL)	Meeks (NY)
Capps	Hereth Sandlin	Michaud
Capuano	Higgins	Miller (NC)
Carnahan	Hill	Miller, George
Carney	Hinche	Mitchell
Castor	Hinojosa	Mollohan
Chandler	Hirono	Moore (KS)
Clarke	Hodes	Moore (WI)
Clay	Holden	Moran (VA)
Cleaver	Holt	Murphy (CT)
Clyburn	Honda	Murphy, Patrick
Cohen	Hoyer	Murtha
Conyers	Inslee	Nadler
Cooper	Israel	Napolitano
Costa	Jackson (IL)	Neal (MA)
Courtney	Jackson-Lee	Obey
Cramer	(TX)	Olver
Crowley	Jefferson	Ortiz
Cuellar	Johnson, E. B.	Pallone
Cummings	Jones (OH)	Pascarell
Davis (AL)	Kagen	Pastor
Davis (CA)	Kanjorski	Payne
Davis (IL)	Kaptur	Perlmutter
Davis, Lincoln	Kennedy	Peterson (MN)
DeFazio	Kildee	Pomeroy
DeGette	Kilpatrick	Price (NC)
Delahunt	Kind	Rahall
DeLauro	Klein (FL)	Reyes
Dicks	Kucinich	Richardson

Rodriguez	Shuler
Ross	Sires
Roybal-Allard	Skelton
Ruppersberger	Slaughter
Ryan (OH)	Smith (WA)
Salazar	Snyder
Sánchez, Linda	Solis
T.	Space
Sanchez, Loretta	Spratt
Sarbanes	Stark
Schakowsky	Stupak
Schiff	Sutton
Schwartz	Tanner
Scott (GA)	Tauscher
Scott (VA)	Thompson (CA)
Serrano	Tierney
Sestak	Towns
Shea-Porter	Tsongas
Sherman	Udall (CO)

NAYS—193

Aderholt	Gallegly	Neugebauer
Akin	Garrett (NJ)	Nunes
Alexander	Gerlach	Paul
Bachmann	Gilchrest	Pearce
Bachus	Gohmert	Pence
Barrett (SC)	Goode	Peterson (PA)
Bartlett (MD)	Goodlatte	Petri
Barton (TX)	Granger	Pickering
Biggart	Graves	Pitts
Bilbray	Hall (TX)	Platts
Bilirakis	Hastings (WA)	Poe
Bishop (UT)	Hayes	Porter
Blackburn	Heller	Price (GA)
Blunt	Hensarling	Pryce (OH)
Boehner	Herger	Putnam
Bonner	Hobson	Radanovich
Bono Mack	Hoekstra	Ramstad
Boozman	Hulshof	Regula
Boustany	Hunter	Rehberg
Brady (TX)	Inglis (SC)	Reichert
Broun (GA)	Issa	Reynolds
Brown (SC)	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (AL)
Brown-Waite,	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (KY)
Ginny	Jones (NC)	Rogers (MI)
Buchanan	Jordan	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Keller	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton (IN)	King (IA)	Roskam
Buyer	King (NY)	Royce
Calvert	Kingston	Ryan (WI)
Camp (MI)	Kirk	Sali
Campbell (CA)	Kline (MN)	Saxton
Cannon	Knollenberg	Schmidt
Cantor	Kuhl (NY)	Sensenbrenner
Capito	LaHood	Sessions
Carter	Lamborn	Shadegg
Castle	Latham	Shays
Chabot	LaTourette	Shimkus
Chabot	LaTourette	Shuster
Coble	Latta	Simpson
Cole (OK)	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NE)
Conaway	Lewis (KY)	Smith (NJ)
Crenshaw	Linder	Smith (TX)
Culberson	LoBiondo	Souder
Davis (KY)	Lucas	Stearns
Davis, David	Lungren, Daniel	Sullivan
Davis, Tom	E.	Terry
Deal (GA)	Mack	Thornberry
Dent	Manzullo	Tiahrt
Diaz-Balart, L.	Marchant	Tiberi
Diaz-Balart, M.	McCarthy (CA)	Turner
Doolittle	McCaul (TX)	Upton
Drake	McCotter	Walberg
Dreier	McCrery	Walden (OR)
Duncan	McHenry	Walsh (NY)
Emerson	McHugh	Wamp
English (PA)	McKeon	Weldon (FL)
Everett	McMorris	Weller
Fallin	Rodgers	Westmoreland
Feehey	Melancon	Whitfield (KY)
Ferguson	Mica	Wilson (NM)
Flake	Miller (FL)	Wilson (SC)
Forbes	Miller (MI)	Wittman (VA)
Fortenberry	Miller, Gary	Wolf
Fossella	Moran (KS)	Young (FL)
Fox	Murphy, Tim	
Franks (AZ)	Musgrave	
Frelinghuysen	Myrick	

NOT VOTING—21

Boswell	Gordon	Rothman
Cardoza	Hooley	Rush
Costello	Johnson (GA)	Tancredo
Cubin	Maloney (NY)	Taylor
Ehlers	Oberstar	Thompson (MS)
Engel	Rangel	Woolsey
Gingrey	Renzi	Young (AK)

□ 1122

Mr. McCAUL of Texas changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. ALTMIRE, WEXLER, BERMAN, COHEN and HILL changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Please state your inquiry.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Is it true that the rule that was the subject of the motion of the gentleman from Ohio with respect to not holding a vote open for the purpose of changing votes was adopted by this Congress at the beginning of this Congress?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry. Is it true that that rule was, in fact, a separate title and voted separately by this House by a vote of 430-0?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is not currently aware of the exact vote on that.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry. Consistent with the rulings of the Chair last night, is it true that the only enforcement mechanism of that rule adopted by this House is a privileged resolution such as offered by the gentleman from Ohio?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. If such a privileged resolution is tabled, as was just done by this body, is it true that there is no alternative enforcement mechanism?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The minority leader's resolution, House Resolution 1039, was held to present a question of privilege and was considered as such. The will of the House was that it be laid on the table.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Is it available to other Members of this House who feel aggrieved by the vote last night to bring a privileged resolution similar to that brought by the gentleman from Ohio?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes, it is.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Is it true, Mr. Speaker, that if individual Members brought such motion seriatim that that would not be considered dilatory but, rather, within the authority of each Member of this House as a separate and individual Member of this House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot render such an advisory opinion.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry. Is the enforcement mechanism referred to previously, exercised by the gentleman from Ohio, also available to other individual Members of this House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Rule IX may be invoked by any Member of the House.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SHADEGG. Is it correct that the motion just brought by the gentleman from Ohio was brought pursuant to rule IX and was on a question of the privileges of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. SHADEGG. And is it correct that that motion was then tabled and that was the action the House just took?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The minority leader's resolution (H. Res. 1039) was held to present a question of privilege and was considered as such. The will of the House was that it be laid on the table.

Mr. SHADEGG. Further parliamentary inquiry. If it had not been tabled, then it would have been debatable for 1 hour, is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not answer a hypothetical question. The majority leader's resolution was held to present a question of privilege and was considered as such. The will of the House was that it be laid on the table.

Mr. SHADEGG. Is it not true that earlier this year there have been questions of the privileges of the House where they have not been tabled and they have been debated for an hour?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot serve as historian for the House, but the gentleman is correct that a question of privilege could be considered by the House.

Mr. SHADEGG. And could be debated for an hour?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. And could be debated.

Mr. SHADEGG. Is it not true that in the last Congress, the then minority leader and the now Speaker raised a similar question of the privileges of the House pursuant to rule IX after a vote was held open and that on that question of privileges of the House, in fact, the majority, the then majority, now minority, allowed a debate of an hour and that the conduct of the House in holding a vote open to change the result of the vote was debated for an hour?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is not the function of the Chair to render historical perspectives. The Member will have to look to the RECORD for that.

Mr. SHADEGG. I'm sorry. The gentleman is correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is not prepared to render historical perspectives. The Member will have to look at the RECORD for that answer.

Mr. SHADEGG. So the effect of immediately tabling the question of privileges raised by the gentleman from Ohio was to deny the minority the ability to debate that issue for an hour as was done when the same thing happened last Congress, is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is a summary, adverse disposition.

Mr. SHADEGG. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Please state your inquiry.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, is it not true that the last vote was called at 10:52?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is not prepared to give exact figures. The gentleman can look at the RECORD for that.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Please state your inquiry.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Is it not true that the vote was closed at 11:22, which is approximately 30 minutes?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is not prepared to render an historical perspective. The gentleman can look to the RECORD for that.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Further parliamentary inquiry. According to the Democrats' election manifesto, floor votes should be completed within 15 minutes with a customary 2-minute extension to accommodate Members' ability to reach the House Chamber to cast a vote. No vote shall be held open in order to manipulate the outcome.

Was that the rule that we passed on January 5, 2007?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is not appropriate for the Chair to render an opinion on a document of the nature cited by the Member.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 14, noes 384, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 126]

AYES—14

Campbell (CA)	Hulshof	Lewis (KY)
Carter	Johnson (IL)	Linder
Cole (OK)	Lewis (CA)	

Marchant Regula	Sessions Shadegg	Sullivan Whitfield (KY)
	NOES—384	
Ackerman	Doggett	Klein (FL)
Aderholt	Donnelly	Kline (MN)
Akin	Doolittle	Knollenberg
Alexander	Doyle	Kucinich
Allen	Drake	Kuhl (NY)
Altmire	Dreier	LaHood
Andrews	Duncan	Lamborn
Arcuri	Edwards	Lampson
Baca	Ehlers	Langevin
Bachmann	Ellison	Larsen (WA)
Baldwin	Ellsworth	Larson (CT)
Barrett (SC)	Emanuel	Latham
Barrow	Emerson	LaTourette
Bartlett (MD)	English (PA)	Latta
Barton (TX)	Eshoo	Lee
Bean	Etheridge	Levin
Becerra	Everett	Lewis (GA)
Berkley	Fallin	Lipinski
Berman	Farr	LoBiondo
Berry	Fattah	Loehsack
Biggert	Feeney	Lofgren, Zoe
Bilbray	Ferguson	Lowey
Bilirakis	Filner	Lucas
Bishop (GA)	Flake	Lungren, Daniel
Bishop (NY)	Forbes	E.
Bishop (UT)	Fortenberry	Lynch
Blackburn	Fossella	Mack
Blunt	Foster	Mahoney (FL)
Boehner	Foxx	Maloney (NY)
Bonner	Franks (AZ)	Manzullo
Bono Mack	Frelinghuysen	Markey
Boozman	Gallegly	Marshall
Boren	Garrett (NJ)	Matheson
Boswell	Gerlach	Matsui
Boucher	Giffords	McCarthy (CA)
Boustany	Gilchrest	McCarthy (NY)
Boyd (FL)	Gillibrand	McCaul (TX)
Boyda (KS)	Gohmert	McCotter
Brady (PA)	Gonzalez	McCrary
Brady (TX)	Goode	McDermott
Braley (IA)	Goodlatte	McGovern
Broun (GA)	Granger	McHenry
Brown (SC)	Graves	McHugh
Brown, Corrine	Green, Al	McIntyre
Brown-Waite,	Green, Gene	McKeon
Ginny	Grijalva	McMorris
Buchanan	Gutierrez	Rodgers
Burgess	Hall (NY)	McNerney
Burton (IN)	Hall (TX)	McNulty
Butterfield	Hare	Meek (FL)
Buyer	Harman	Meeks (NY)
Calvert	Hastings (FL)	Melancon
Camp (MI)	Hastings (WA)	Mica
Cannon	Hayes	Michaud
Cantor	Heller	Miller (FL)
Capito	Hensarling	Miller (MI)
Capps	Herger	Miller (NC)
Capuano	Hersteth Sandlin	Miller, Gary
Carnahan	Higgins	Mitchell
Carney	Hill	Mollohan
Castle	Hinchesy	Moore (KS)
Chabot	Hinojosa	Moore (WI)
Chandler	Hirono	Moran (KS)
Clarke	Hobson	Moran (VA)
Clay	Hodes	Murphy (CT)
Cleaver	Hoekstra	Murphy, Patrick
Clyburn	Holden	Murphy, Tim
Coble	Holt	Murtha
Conaway	Honda	Musgrave
Conyers	Hoyer	Myrick
Cooper	Hunter	Nadler
Costa	Inglis (SC)	Napolitano
Courtney	Inslee	Neal (MA)
Cramer	Issa	Neugebauer
Crenshaw	Jackson (IL)	Nunes
Crowley	Jackson-Lee	Obey
Cuellar	(TX)	Olver
Culberson	Jefferson	Ortiz
Cummings	Johnson, E. B.	Pallone
Davis (AL)	Johnson, Sam	Pastor
Davis (CA)	Jones (NC)	Paul
Davis (IL)	Jones (OH)	Payne
Davis (KY)	Jordan	Pearce
Davis, David	Kagen	Pence
Davis, Lincoln	Kanjorski	Perlmutter
Davis, Tom	Kaptur	Peterson (MN)
Deal (GA)	Keller	Petri
DeFazio	Kennedy	Pickering
DeGette	Kildee	Pitts
Delahunt	Kilpatrick	Platts
DeLauro	Kind	Poe
Dent	King (IA)	Pomeroy
Diaz-Balart, L.	King (NY)	Porter
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kingston	Price (GA)
Dingell	Kirk	Price (NC)

Pryce (OH)	Scott (VA)	Tierney
Putnam	Sensenbrenner	Towns
Radanovich	Serrano	Tsongas
Rahall	Sestak	Turner
Ramstad	Shays	Udall (CO)
Rehberg	Shea-Porter	Udall (NM)
Reichert	Sherman	Upton
Reyes	Shimkus	Van Hollen
Reynolds	Shuler	Velázquez
Richardson	Shuster	Visclosky
Rodriguez	Simpson	Walberg
Rogers (AL)	Sires	Walden (OR)
Rogers (KY)	Skelton	Walsh (NY)
Rogers (MI)	Slaughter	Walz (MN)
Rohrabacher	Smith (NE)	Wamp
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NJ)	Wasserman
Roskam	Smith (TX)	Schultz
Ross	Smith (WA)	Waters
Roybal-Allard	Snyder	Watson
Royce	Solis	Watt
Ruppersberger	Souder	Waxman
Ryan (OH)	Space	Weiner
Ryan (WI)	Spratt	Welch (VT)
Salazar	Stark	Weller
Sali	Stearns	Westmoreland
Sánchez, Linda	Stupak	Wexler
T.	Sutton	Wilson (NM)
Sanchez, Loretta	Tanner	Wilson (OH)
Sarbanes	Tauscher	Wilson (SC)
Saxton	Taylor	Wittman (VA)
Schakowsky	Terry	Wolf
Schiff	Thompson (CA)	Wu
Schmidt	Thornberry	Wynn
Schwartz	Tiahrt	Yarmuth
Scott (GA)	Tiberi	Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—31

Abercrombie	Frank (MA)	Rangel
Bachus	Gingrey	Renzi
Baird	Gordon	Rothman
Blumenauer	Hooley	Rush
Cardoza	Israel	Tancredo
Castor	Johnson (GA)	Thompson (MS)
Cohen	McCollum (MN)	Weldon (FL)
Costello	Miller, George	Woolsey
Cubin	Oberstar	Young (AK)
Dicks	Pascrell	
Engel	Peterson (PA)	

□ 1150

Ms. SHEA-PORTER changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

### QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1 of rule IX, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has been made aware of a valid basis for the gentleman's point of personal privilege.

The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, no one in this House takes more seriously than I do the rules governing confidentiality of matters before the House Ethics Committee.

Each of us privileged to serve on the committee signs an oath pledging not to disclose information related to our work in the committee except as authorized under our committee rules.

During nearly 8 years of service on the Ethics Committee, including 2 years as the chairman, I have never found it necessary to disclose committee documents or any other privileged information. Mr. Speaker, that

changed yesterday when it became clear that the Democrat leadership would, indeed, force Members to vote on a proposed independent ethics entity.

You see, I knew, and Chairwoman STEPHANIE TUBBS JONES knew, something that the other Members of this House did not know. Several months ago, we had been advised by the non-partisan, professional attorneys at the Ethics Committee that they believed the proposed independent ethics entity would infringe upon Members' due process protections under the rules of the House and that it would seriously hamper the Ethics Committee's ability to carry out its important responsibilities.

When the ranking member of the bipartisan task force, Mr. SMITH of Texas, sent a letter asking for our committee's official comments on Representative CAPUANO's proposal, I took his request to Chairwoman TUBBS JONES and asked her to prepare a formal response with me to the ranking member of that task force. I did so because I felt strongly that the proposed entity would so greatly impact the work of the Ethics Committee that it would be irresponsible, Mr. Speaker, irresponsible not to share with task force members our official views of this plan.

Last night, in a Dear Colleague letter to every Member of this HOUSE, that was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it was printed in Roll Call, it was printed in other publications, Representative TUBBS JONES has attempted to rewrite the history on this issue.

For reasons that I have trouble fathoming, she now claims, and I quote, Mr. Speaker, “Both Representative HASTINGS and I agreed that the Ethics Committee could not and should not give advice to the committee charged by House leadership with reviewing the ethics process itself.”

Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth. I could not possibly have stated more clearly to Mrs. TUBBS JONES my desire to respond fully and jointly to Ranking Member SMITH's request for guidance on how the task force proposal would affect our committee.

Now I recognize the difficulty that she must have explaining to her colleagues why she did not believe that they should be made aware of the concerns expressed by our nonpartisan attorneys on the committee. But, Mr. Speaker, those attorneys don't work for her and they don't work for me. They work for every Member of this House. So, I don't understand, I didn't understand then and I don't understand now, why my distinguished colleague, the gentlelady from Ohio, sought to keep that information from every Member of the House, but she did. And I do not stand by and permit her to call into question my integrity on setting that record straight, as I did so with a letter I sent out to every Member,

along with the e-mail of the attorneys on their advice on that issue.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Members should be advised that this is not the first time that I have had to set the record straight following ill-considered public comments by Representative TUBBS JONES. Last June, she issued a press release declaring that the Ethics Committee would empanel an investigative subcommittee into the matter of Representative WILLIAM JEFFERSON. Under the committee's rules, Representative TUBBS JONES had no authority to issue such a statement and lacked the authority to establish such a subcommittee. She not only knew that such an action would require a bipartisan vote of the committee, but she also knew that the committee had never voted on the matter. And she knew, Mr. Speaker, that I had pressed her for months to reestablish the Jefferson subcommittee which had lapsed at the end of the last Congress before it completed its work. And I said so, Mr. Speaker, when she issued that because she did not consult with me and ask me to give permission for her to release that statement. She simply did not do so. So, once again, I cannot fathom her reason for making such an inaccurate and irresponsible statement as I mentioned earlier.

Mr. Speaker, I make no apology to this House for insisting that Members benefit from the advice and counsel of the skilled attorneys at the Ethics Committee before voting on a proposed independent entity. After all, Mr. Speaker, this affects them. I'm a Member, also, of the Rules Committee. And at the Rules Committee 2 weeks ago, when we had testimony on this issue, I expressed my concern then as to what would come of this outside entity.

So, Mr. Speaker, I resent the claim by Representative TUBBS JONES that I have violated the rules of the House and the Ethics Committee in this manner. As she no doubt intended, Representative TUBBS JONES' false allegations have now made their way into the news, bringing further discredit to the House. But most disturbing, Mr. Speaker, is her public threat to use her position as chairman of the House Ethics Committee to bring sanctions against me. Such a threat can only be motivated by a desire to intimidate and embarrass, while distracting attention from her decision to keep every Member of this House from receiving information that I think every Member deserved to have before we voted on that proposal last night.

Mr. Speaker, I think her action in calling into question and impugning my reputation, and what she did last night, is wrong, and I think she failed in her effort of trying to do that.

So I rise today, point of personal privilege, to point out the history of this, and my position, and the reason why I felt that every Member of this House had to have this important information, notwithstanding the fact that we had a very short time frame to even debate the matter at hand.

So, Mr. Speaker, with that, I appreciate your indulgence. And I would like to yield time to my friend from Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF).

Mr. HULSHOF. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I haven't had the privilege of meeting the newest Member of this body who took the oath of office yesterday, Mr. FOSTER, but I, as everyone did, rose to my feet and applauded as he swore to protect this country. And I'm mindful of what was said last night on the floor of the House, that I wonder what's passing through his mind as the first vote he cast as we all became caught up in this maelstrom of ethics discussion. And I would say to him, I know he's not in the Chamber, but perhaps as he reviews the RECORD, as an incoming freshman in January of 1997, as we commenced the 105th Congress, and I see some of my classmates here on the floor, I remember the first vote I cast was for the Speaker of the House, Newt Gingrich, who was then under a cloud of ethics. And I remember the last vote I cast as a freshman Member was whether or not to impeach a sitting President of the United States.

□ 1200

So my freshman term began and ended with this issue of ethics.

Ironically, as my days in this Chamber wind down, we are embroiled once again in a partisan struggle about the integrity of this institution. I was on the floor last night during the debate, and many who spoke don't even know where the Ethics Committee is located in the Capitol. That's a good thing. That means, then, that you've never had the occasion to be called in front of the committee or to render testimony or to provide some information. And yet it is so vitally important to the integrity of this institution.

My bona fides, again, I listened with some interest to incoming freshmen Members who debated this last night, that the Ethics Committee has been broken, hasn't worked for however many years, and yet I beg to differ in the sense that I was tapped as a non-committee member to sit on an investigative subcommittee, and we sat and we resolved, appropriately, I think, the matter with a former Member from Alabama. I don't need to name his party. It's irrelevant. The House rules apply to everyone equally. Whether you're a backbencher or whether you're one of the most powerful members of leadership, it doesn't matter. But I participated in that investigative subcommittee and then was actually appointed to the committee itself.

I remember standing right here in this very spot as this body voted to expel a Member from Ohio, that extraordinary remedy of substituting the will of this House for the will of the voters of then the 17th District of Ohio. And we did that. And the process worked.

The Ethics Committee continued to handle many sensitive matters, many

of those never seeing the light of day, appropriately, because when a baseless or meritless claim is brought against one of the number of this House, it shouldn't be debated or discussed on the front pages of the newspaper but should be dealt with down in the basement and, as appropriate, then brought to the attention of the American public. So those confidentiality rules are important and necessary.

I objected to the rules changes that were made, my friend from Tennessee mentioned that as well last night, that unilaterally forced upon then the minority, and I objected to those. And let me point out again, as my friend from Tennessee did, that we changed those rules because it was a unilateral action, and that was appropriate for our majority at the time then to say we should redo this in a bipartisan fashion.

And then, of course, may I claim, the "infamous" vote on Medicare part D and allegations that were made. And then suddenly in my time on the committee, I was the chairman of the investigative subcommittee to investigate allegations. We didn't know where the allegations were going to lead us. I issued the report and admonished publicly the then-majority leader on our side of the aisle. I was removed from the committee because of that. More disturbing was the fact that there were professional staff that were fired as a result of that, good, decent, honorable professionals who were fired as a result of that report. Certainly not our finest hour. And there are still some relationships on our side of the aisle that have been strained personally to this day because of those actions.

But the wisest man I ever knew, my father, he never finished college. May he rest in peace. He had a single mantra that I remember from a kid growing up on the farm to those hallowed Halls, and that mantra was simply: The only thing worth keeping in life is keeping your good name, and you keep your good name by standing up and doing what's right. And I will leave this body with that name intact.

I used to believe that an outside entity had no place in the ethics process. But after this renewed partisanship on a committee that should not be partisan, I came to a different conclusion, and I voted with the majority last night as one of the handful on our side that believed that perhaps this might be the way out. And as I leave this august body, I hope and pray that I have not damaged the institution by my vote, but that will be for a future Congress and future Congresses to determine.

The former chairman of the committee, my friend from Washington's predecessor, Mr. Hefley of Colorado, he and I used to believe that if we simply provided the resources for the committee to reward staff, not punish them for doing their jobs, to provide some subpoena power, that the committee itself could continue to hold up

the integrity of this institution. But again, seemingly, that is not the way forward as far as it relates to ethics, and so last night I crossed the aisle and voted for this.

But we are here today for a further purpose. A good and decent, honorable man who has the integrity of this institution at stake has been impugned, in my view; so, unfortunately, we then come to this point of personal privilege.

I have reviewed the letter from my friend, and she is my friend, the March 11 letter that suggests that rules have been violated by the disclosure of a professional opinion about the merits or lack of merits of the proposal we voted on last night. And I will say again for the purpose of the RECORD that, in my view, rule 7, subparagraph d, and the subparagraphs beneath that rule, that there has been no violation of those matters as it relates to the disclosure. This was not the disclosure of any fact or nature of a complaint. This was not the disclosure of any executive session proceedings. It was not the disclosure of any report, study, or document that expresses views, findings, or recommendations in connection with activities of ethics investigation. So as I go through those subparagraphs, those words are important, as we know, not just legally but ethically to determine whether or not this disclosure by Mr. Kellner, who I know personally, having worked with him on the committee, is a very professional, capable individual. I do not find as a sitting Member that anything of the disclosure of Mr. Kellner's letter has violated House rules.

Having said that, I am mindful again of what the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER) had to remind us of, and it, hopefully, was a reminder, that we have a privilege to serve here. This is a privilege granted to us. Each of us has taken the same oath of office that Mr. FOSTER took in the well yesterday. And inherent in that oath of office is the belief that the integrity of this institution is more important than any single Member serving here. To think that these same feet that used to walk barefoot down our cotton rows have had the privilege of walking the marble Halls of Congress for the last, now, 12 years, this is something that the integrity of the institution is more important than a single Member. And I can only wonder about those who are here witnessing today, as they excitedly have come to Washington, DC, maybe for their first-ever visit, and they come to the House Gallery, and there must be thrust upon them this discussion about whether Members of Congress are ethical or not, and it saddens me.

So I implore simply all that are here and those that aren't here and for those that are going to come to this body, in order to bring about and reinforce the trust that the 300 million people across the country from sea to shining sea have in this institution, we must have a functioning ethics process.

We don't. And when there are charges and countercharges that, unfortunately, necessitate bringing a point of personal privilege, we do not serve this institution well.

And so I tell the gentleman, with whom I have occasionally disagreed as it relates to ethics, that I think you are an honorable, decent man who has the integrity of this institution deeply in your heart, and I support you and urge all colleagues to consider the institution and the damage that we perhaps are doing by this partisan warfare.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE), one of my classmates.

Mr. LATOURETTE. I thank Mr. HASTINGS for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am not happy to have the opportunity to speak today. The gentleman from Washington is my classmate. We were both elected in 1994. The distinguished chairwoman of the Ethics Committee I've known for 25 years. I served on the Ethics Committee for 4 years, had some of the same circumstances that Mr. HULSHOF was previously talking about at the time. Mr. HASTINGS and Mrs. TUBBS JONES were also members of the Ethics Committee.

And there's a reason that we take that oath of secrecy, and it's why, unlike Mr. HULSHOF, I voted "no" last night. My belief has always been that the ethics process here has worked when left to its own devices, and by "left to its own devices," when leadership on either side stays out of it and permits five good Democrats and five good Republicans to consider what is sometimes a messy business. But it needs to be not aired in public as, sadly, this new whatever we did last night will do, because, and I used to be a prosecuting attorney, as did the chairwoman of the committee, there are many times when a case is brought to you and there are no facts to support that case, but you will be accused on page 1 and the case will be dismissed on page 45, and when you're in public life, by the time you get to the retraction on page 45, your career is ruined.

So every Member that embarks upon the ethics process takes the oath that we will hold close to us and not discuss with our colleagues, not discuss with the press, not discuss with others if we have a Member under investigation, if allegations are made against a Member, not to protect a Member, not to shield that Member from scrutiny, but so that we don't shoot the Member until there has been an adjudication that he or she has done something wrong. I took that oath. Every member of the committee takes that oath. We take that seriously.

Now, yesterday evening when I was preparing to make a determination as to how to vote, I received a memo from DOC HASTINGS, Representative HASTINGS, that had included in it the opinion of the nonpartisan, bipartisan

professional staff of the Ethics Committee where they opined on how, if at all, what was being done last night would impact upon the ethics process of this House. I have to tell you that the memorandum wasn't written for Republicans. It wasn't written for Democrats. It was nonpartisan, bipartisan, and I found a lot in it that I thought that's an interesting point and I hadn't actually thought about it. I was grateful to receive that memorandum from DOC HASTINGS, not knowing how it came to my possession or attention other than DOC HASTINGS provided it.

I'm dismayed on this point of personal privilege, however, to then be in receipt of a letter written by my friend the chairwoman of the committee that, in my opinion, has a tortured construction of rule 7 of the committee. It correctly indicates that we take the oath of secrecy and matters should only be discussed in accordance with the rules of the House. Mr. HULSHOF, I think, has adequately talked about 7(d), and what that indicates is that we're not supposed to talk about if Representative Y is under investigation until that matter moves to the public phase, that being the adjudicatory hearing, which we achieved against the gentleman from Ohio a number of years ago and which we were all involved in.

□ 1215

It does not, in my opinion, indicate that when a memorandum that might be instructive to the other Members of the House on a matter before the House should remain secret. And I would just say that we would then read paragraph 7(g) that indicates that, "Unless otherwise determined by a vote of the committee, only the chairman or ranking minority member of the committee, after consultation with each other, may make public statements regarding matters before the committee of any subcommittee."

The gentleman from Washington says that is what he did. And if the gentleman from Washington did that, I find no violation of the committee rules. I find no violation of the House rules. And I think what is most unfortunate, and it really goes into why the matters before the Ethics Committee need to remain secret, the letter suggests, it doesn't suggest, it says that Representative HASTINGS has broken the rules of the House, and if he does it again, there is going to be a complaint. Well, if someone feels that way, then file a complaint. But it is entitled to the confidentiality which it is now indicated has somehow been broken.

And I want to indicate that besides my disappointment, that what is roiling this House, and I think those of us that are centrists, moderates, those of us that are institutionalists, we now are roiled in the House because the rules don't seem to be the rules. The rules apply when people think they should apply. And if the rules don't apply, well, then we will make a new rule.

And last night's example, and it ties in directly to this point of personal privilege, couldn't be any clearer. The new majority, because of the Medicare part D vote that Representative HULSHOF talked about that we wrongly held open for 3 hours to achieve a certain result, in outrage in response to the culture of corruption that permeated this place until 2007, led to a rule change. And the rule change was that we will hold no vote open in this House for the sole purpose of affecting the outcome or changing the outcome.

Well, that is just what we did last night, sadly, Mr. Speaker. For 12 minutes, 12 minutes after the final vote was cast, the vote was held open. It was 204-209. And during those 12 minutes, four Members of the majority party were persuaded to switch their votes. There is no other explanation. But where we find ourselves, and why this point of personal privilege is so important, where we find ourselves is that the rule is written in such a way that says you can't hold the vote open for the sole purpose of affecting or changing the outcome.

Now, we are going to have to bring in Kreskin. We are going to have to have ESP to climb into the mind of the presiding officer. And unless the presiding officer says, do you know what, I know what the rule is, I know what clause 9 of rule XX says, but I kept the vote open to affect the outcome. Short of that, there is no way to enforce the rule. And it puts us in a very difficult place. And I would ask my friends that are today in the majority to remember the 12 years that they were in the minority that they felt so oppressed, and in many cases had the right to feel oppressed, by some of the heavy-handed tactics that were employed on the conduct of this floor.

When you have a rule that can never be enforced, when you have rules that you don't pay attention to, it leads to discontent. It destroys the fabric of the institution. The minority serves an important purpose in the House of Representatives. It is the loyal dissent. It is to make sure that the majority just can't run roughshod and do what they choose to do in violation of rules, practices, precedents and procedures.

I fear, Mr. Speaker, that last night the rules were once again broken. I believe that the totality of the circumstances will demonstrate that. But what I do not find is that my friend and classmate from the State of Washington violated rule 7 of the Ethics Committee.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I want to yield now to the minority Republican whip, Mr. BLUNT of Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I come today to express my great appreciation for him, the work he has done in this and past Congresses, the work he has done as part of our whip team, the consistent good judgment I

think he shows as a Member of this body. And I was surprised last night with the letter that appeared on the floor. I was surprised yesterday, frankly, that there could have been information available to the Members of this House from the staff of the Ethics Committee that deals with the proper work of the internal committee that has overseen the ethics of this House for a long time that that information would be out there and not made available to us, and frankly pleased that Mr. HASTINGS followed the procedure that the rules call for and let that information be available to Members.

And then, on the floor of the House last night, I received a letter from the chairman of the committee. And I appreciate her work too. The Ethics Committee is not an easy committee to serve on. Being the chairman is not an easy role to fill in this Congress, and I think Members of the House should be and are grateful to their colleagues who are willing to serve on the Ethics Committee.

But when I saw this letter last night, I was particularly taken by a paragraph, the third paragraph from the end which says, "Representative Hastings' reliance on rule 7(g) which states 'Unless otherwise determined by a vote of the committee, only the chairman or ranking minority member of the committee, after consultation with each other, may make public statements regarding matters before the committee of any subcommittee.'" And then it went on to say after it quotes that rule, that that rule "does not relieve him of the obligation to comply with the rules of confidentiality."

First of all, I don't know what purpose that rule would serve if it doesn't allow the ranking member and the chairman to tell the other person, as the rule says, here is something that I have decided is important to the Members of the House to understand or important for others to understand. That is what the rule is for. The rules of confidentiality as I read them, appear to clearly be talking about investigation, not opinions of outside ethics efforts that may or may not impede the work of the Ethics Committee. And that was important for us to have. It went on in the last sentence to say, the last two sentences to say, "I do however want to make it clear that if he continues to release confidential communication, I will seek to have him sanctioned for violations of the Code of Official Conduct."

The relationship here may be such that this is not intimidating, but it certainly seems intimidating to me. And I join my good friend in rising to this moment of personal privilege to explain how he was working within the rules, how he is a long-term member of this committee, understood the rules, and how he properly, in my opinion, arrived at the conclusion that if we are voting on the floor on something that is likely to impede the efforts of the in-

ternal Ethics Committee as the bipartisan, nonpartisan staff of the committee said it would, that that is something that Members had a right to know, and I rise in support of my friend and the actions he has taken.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I have other Members that wish to speak, and I will call on them at this point.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. My question is will the gentleman yield at some point?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I will not yield at this point.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. At any time during the hour?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, it is my time, and I will decide.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PAS-TOR). The gentleman from Washington controls the time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield to Mr. LAHOOD from Illinois, another one of my classmates.

Mr. LAHOOD. I thank my friend for yielding.

Congressman DOC HASTINGS is one of the most respected Members of the House of Representatives. And RAY LAHOOD doesn't have to say that. I am saying it. But the people of his district have said it on seven different occasions. It is called an election. An election is a referendum on one's service. And no one has served for the last 14 years in his district better than he has. And the people have said that.

When a letter like this from the chairman of the Ethics Committee is disclosed publicly, it gets on the front page of DOC HASTINGS' hometown newspaper. And it plants a seed in the minds of the people who have sent him here on seven different occasions that he may have done something wrong, that he may have violated the rules.

And the truth is DOC HASTINGS has violated no rules. He has done nothing wrong. He hasn't violated any rules of the House. He has been on the Ethics Committee, when I asked him how long he has been on, he said too long, but I believe he has been on 6 years. It's the hardest committee to serve on. It's the hardest committee to find Members to serve on, because of decisions you have to make against your colleagues.

And for one member, particularly the Chair of the committee, to try and impugn his motives or to suggest that he violated the rules is simply wrong. And hopefully that wrong can be righted today during this 1 hour of his opportunity to try and regain his reputation in the House of Representatives.

There's a saying where I come from, once you tar and feather someone, you can never get the tar off. What happened here with the disclosure of this letter, made public in DOC's district, is that he will always have a little bit of this tar on him, that somehow he might have violated the rules. That's wrong, folks. What good is it for us to

trash one another? What good is it for the institution to try and criticize someone for no other good than to try and make a point on a piece of legislation that your side of the aisle wanted to pass.

I believe that the chairwoman of the Ethics Committee owes DOC HASTINGS an apology for trying to besmirch and impugn his integrity and his honesty and his service on the Ethics Committee and in the House of Representatives. If the chairwoman, Mr. Speaker, would be willing to do that, it might get on page 40 of his local newspaper. It won't be on page 1 the way the headlines read today. We owe it to DOC HASTINGS, to the people that sent him here, to do this for him.

And if I can be so bold, Mr. Speaker, I would also suggest that because of the threat that was made in the last paragraph of the letter, that perhaps the chairwoman, in the event that Representative HASTINGS would do this again that she might file charges against him, that we need a new chairperson of the Ethics Committee. Because I think when you use your position as the Chair of the Ethics Committee to threaten a member of the committee, you not only owe that member an apology, you need to take a different place on that committee. You can't use that kind of power against a member of the committee. That is wrong, Mr. Speaker. That hurts the whole House. It hurts Congressman HASTINGS. It hurts the people that sent him here. We need to do better in this House. We do no good by trashing one another, by besmirching and trying to discredit people who come here to serve honestly, with integrity, by the rules. The rules have not been broken. There is nothing in the memo that was disclosed that has anything to do with another Member, anything to do with any investigation. It was information to be shared with Members about a piece of legislation that some of us thought was pretty bad. And apparently people on that side of the aisle didn't want your Members to have it. So you put out a letter discrediting the ranking member of the committee. That is wrong.

And so I encourage, Mr. Speaker, the Speaker of the House to find a different place for the Chair of the Committee on Ethics and to ask the Chair of the Committee on Ethics to apologize to Mr. HASTINGS so he can have some semblance of his reputation, one of honesty and integrity and hard work for 14 years on behalf of the people of the State of Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman very much for his sentiments.

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN), the former attorney general.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I've served in this body for 14 years stretched over 30. Twenty-nine years

ago, I think it was the first official action I took on this floor, was to bring a resolution to expel a Member. It was not something I wanted to do as a freshman. But we had a true ethics problem at the time. And frankly, I didn't think we were dealing with it in the appropriate way. That was sort of my baptism of fire here.

Since I returned to Congress 4 years ago after an absence of 16 years, I have applauded the work of the Ethics Committee because often I and my staff consult with the staff of the Ethics Committee to ensure that we are acting within the rules of this House. And I must say the return that we have received in terms of information, advice and counsel from the Ethics Committee staff has been professional, exceptional and helpful. And so, when I see memos or letters that are addressed to the membership from the Ethics Committee, I pay attention to it.

□ 1230

I try and incorporate that information in my decisionmaking. So when I received the letter from Congressman HASTINGS with the memo enclosed, I thought it was a benefit to me as an individual Member of this House in making my decision.

I came to the floor, frankly, not knowing what I was going to do on that ethics package. I sat with the gentleman from Missouri and went over it. We, in fact, went over the memo that was given to us by DOC HASTINGS, not just because it was given to us by DOC HASTINGS, but because it was a professional opinion of those on the staff of the Ethics Committee that I have learned to trust. It doesn't mean that I follow blindly their opinion, but it does mean that I am educated by that information.

For the life of me, I could not understand any rule adopted by this House or the committee that would deny me, as an individual Member, the benefit of that information when, in the judgment of the ranking member, he thought it might help me and others make a decision. And when you review the rules cited by the gentlewoman in the letter that contained the threat of a complaint to be filed against the gentleman from Washington, I cannot find the basis for a complaint.

Now, I have not served on the Ethics Committee, I will admit. I have practiced law for 30-some years. I have been the attorney general of the State of California. I have prosecuted people. I have put people in prison. I have done investigations of other elected officials.

I have had to compartmentalize, and understand that when you do a criminal investigation and it doesn't rise to the level of a complaint or an indictment, you cannot, as a matter of honor, as a matter of ethics, use that information in debate, in informing the public, even though you may find that the individual that was under investigation happened to be stupid, hap-

pened to be unethical, because you got that information by way of an investigation of a criminal matter.

So, while I haven't served on the Ethics Committee, I believe I have over the course of my political and legal career been able to read legislation, read rules, and not only find out what the spirit of the law is, but the letter of the law. And I cannot find in the citation by the gentelady from Ohio any basis for making a claim against the gentleman from Washington.

Now, we can disagree on that. I am not on that committee. She is the Chair. However, the thing that troubles me perhaps the most is that this was made public. A complaint about the gentleman breaching confidentiality about a matter that was not of interest to an individual Member, that is, was not directed at a Member in terms of an investigation, that alleged breach is revealed by a breach of confidentiality that gives the gentleman from Washington very little opportunity to defend himself. And that is part of the crux of the debate last night.

Yes, as the Speaker said, we all are subject to criticism, some fair, some unfair. That is part of the business of being in politics. But the fact of the matter is, we here should not enhance that kind of platform for irresponsible allegations against one another. And one of the ways we ensure that we don't do that is the confidentiality with respect to complaints against somebody.

So, I would just hope that the people of the gentleman's district in Washington would understand that in the judgment of many, I would say most in this body, virtually universal, there is no basis for a claim of complaint against the gentleman from Washington. He did nothing to reveal anything with respect to an investigation, anything with respect to the business of the Ethics Committee. What he did was give us the benefit of judgment of professionals on that committee pertaining to an upcoming legislative debate.

Have we gone so far in this House that we deny ourselves of information that would inform the debate? Is that what we are talking about? Talk about turning the first amendment on its head, saying that the House of Representatives, which is supposed to be the great debating society of this institution, ought to be denied an opportunity to debate when informed.

I love this House. I came back to this House. I may die in this House. I love the institution, this House. And I think we who believe this institution is important to the American people believe it is also important to those who have been privileged to serve here. If we do not have respect for ourselves, how can we ask the public to have respect for us? If we do not have respect for ourselves, how can we have respect for this institution?

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise in sorrow about the accusations made against my

friend from Washington and want to stand here and say I have found him in every way to be an honorable man, and that his actions over this last week were anything but dishonorable, were in fact efforts to inform this House, which is what we all ought to be about when we vote.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I would like to yield to my friend from the neighboring State of Idaho, Mr. SIMPSON.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding.

I have known DOC HASTINGS since I came here in 1999. He has always been kind of a mentor of mine, because we come from adjacent States, and a lot of the issues we deal with are similar. So I have consulted with him and sought his advice on many of the issues that affect our two States. We have done things together. I have known that he has served on the Ethics Committee, has been an honorable member of the Ethics Committee.

In fact, at times, we have been out doing a variety of things, whether it is out to dinner or out playing golf or something together, and there is always a case before the Ethics Committee which sometimes is of interest to other Members of the House. And I have inquired of him, how is that going, what is going on there in that case, or whatever. DOC has never failed to look at me and say, I can't talk about that. He has always kept the confidentiality of that committee on everything that has proceeded before it, and I respect him for that, even though many of us would like to know what is going on behind the closed doors.

Now, I am not an attorney, but I will tell you, I have been, when I served in the Idaho legislature as Speaker of the House, I care an awful lot about the institution. That is some of the debates we are currently having between the administration and the legislative branch and the rights and privileges of the institution in maintaining the rights and privileges of this institution.

So I care deeply about this institution and its future. It is one of the reasons that I had a problem with the legislation that was proposed last night on the ethics reform. As I said, I am not an attorney. What I rely on, and all of us become specialists in some areas when we come here, things that interest us, but what I rely on is the advice of other people.

When it comes to the advice of the Ethics Committee and what they do and the role they play and the impact that the legislation that was presented to us last night has, the impact that would have on the way our Ethics Committee works and the ethics of the House, I thought the information that was presented by DOC HASTINGS was not only important, it was vital to me being able to make a decision. And I think that type of information, as the

gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) said, is vital to the debate on any issue that comes before the House.

How can we deny Members opinions from people who are experts in the area, whether we agree with them or not? I might have read all that and said, you know, that is interesting; I hadn't thought about that, but I disagree with that. But Members rely on other people's and experts' opinions on issues that come before the House. We have not only a right, we have an obligation to have that information if we are going to make informed decisions about issues that come before us. And certainly the ethics of this House and how we proceed is an issue for this House to deal with.

So, to suggest that somehow the information that DOC HASTINGS gave to the Members of this House so that they could weigh it in making a decision on the legislation presented to us last night was vital.

I was very, very disappointed to read what I took to be a threatening letter from the chairwoman of the Ethics Committee suggesting that Mr. HASTINGS had done something improper. I can find nothing improper that he did. In fact, what he did I thought was advance the debate. We happened to lose that debate last night. That is okay. That is the way the process worked. But to suggest that Members shouldn't have that information is a joke. And to then put out a letter saying that Congressman HASTINGS did something wrong, as has been mentioned several times, stains the reputation of this good man, and he deserves an apology from the Chair. And to suggest that if this happened again the chairwoman would sanction him brings into question her objectivity in judging him in the future, particularly if an ethics charge were charged against him. I agree with those who suggest that it may have placed in jeopardy her position as chairwoman of the committee.

So, I think at the very least she owes this good man from Washington, who has served us and those Members that serve on the Ethics Committee, an apology, and I hope that she would be big enough to apologize.

I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for the time that he has served on the Ethics Committee. It is kind of a standard joke around here that, yes, I am on the Ethics Committee. Do you want to be on it, because it is not one of those thankful positions to serve on in this House.

I thank you for the time you have served on that committee. It is a service to all of us and to this institution.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the gentleman very much for his very kind remarks.

I am happy to yield to the distinguished chairwoman of the Ethics Committee, if she would acknowledge that I did consult with her on this matter.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Thank you, but I won't.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that that was the response, because let me go back and again review this, at least chronologically on the issue that we debated last night and my involvement with that and my involvement with the professional attorneys that wrote their opinion on the impact this would have on the ethics process.

I was sent a letter by the ranking member, Mr. SMITH of Texas, the first part of November. It was addressed to me. It was also addressed to the committee. We had our regularly scheduled meetings at that time, and I asked the chairwoman that I think that we should respond to this in a way, and in further fact, would you be interested, and she said no. I said okay, I respect that. But the attorneys went about their business, as was asked, and rendered their thoughts on what this would do to the whole committee process.

Now, this was in November, Mr. Speaker. That plan of this outside group was not made public until the end of December. There was time, I am not sure of the exact time frame, when those attorneys went down and consulted with the task force. There is a bipartisan group there, at least from a staff standpoint, I am not sure, because I wasn't a member of that task force, but I was advised that they went down and shared their concerns. So there was some involvement from our staff attorneys with the task force on the issue and the policy, and I want to emphasize this, Mr. Speaker, on the policy that would confront the House later on.

Now, two weeks ago when I was in the Rules Committee, I am a member of the Rules Committee, we had what I thought was a very, very good discussion when Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. SMITH came up and testified on the merits or demerits of this outside bill. There was a lot of angst on the other side, I have to say. The distinguished chairwoman of the Rules Committee expressed her displeasure at that time, and my other colleagues on the Rules Committee did too. But we had a very, very open discussion. And I expressed at that time, Mr. Speaker, what I thought would be at least a partial remedy for the ethics process.

□ 1245

I felt that there needs to be more transparency some way while still keeping and not violating confidentiality. I thought that Mr. SMITH's position was a very, very good position the way it was set up, and I felt that should have at least been debated on the floor. That's probably another issue.

But as this process moved forward, and the fact that, I believe it was 2 weeks ago the issue was pulled from the floor, the distinguished majority leader said new information has come

to us. That information came in Mr. SMITH's proposal. He said it deserves looking into.

At that time, if my memory serves me correctly, Mr. WAMP and Mr. HILL, Republican and Democrat, both stood up and announced that they too had a bipartisan suggestion that should be looked at. So I thought, well, okay, maybe this will go in a way that I think is very beneficial.

I have long felt, and I said at that Rules Committee meeting before, that when you do ethics you need to do it in a bipartisan way. It has been alluded to. My friend, Mr. HULSHOF, made this observation earlier on.

I am absolutely convinced in this body you cannot, you cannot make ethics legislation unilaterally. It comes back to bite you because of the nature, I guess, of the issue. We painfully learned that, as Mr. HULSHOF pointed out in his remarks. I have stated this a number of times upstairs in the Rules Committee when this issue has come up.

I thought this task force, frankly, moving forward, would be a way to settle that. But as we know, we had a great deal of problems on our side of the aisle with an outside group. It apparently couldn't come to an agreement on that. As a result it went forward unilaterally.

At that time, I felt that the information, the information that our professional attorneys downstairs had come up with the proposal, was worthy to be shared by everybody in this House so that we could make a determination as to what is the best course for the institution. Sometimes I truly believe that we think too much in 2-year cycles, which coincides with our term. I think we ought to think longer term. I really think that the rules change that we made last night was the wrong rules change, but that will be judged, I suppose in the future.

I came to the conclusion, knowing that this memo was there, and so I went, had a meeting with the distinguished chairwoman and, again, consulted with her. She, of course, disagreed with my position, and I said that I was going to do so, and I did. Now, before I released that, I might say, I asked my staff to contact the chairwoman's staff to let her know that I was going to go forward with this, which, of course, I did.

I was very surprised when I came to the floor and saw this letter that was sent out. Thus I felt that I needed to rise today on a point of personal privilege to explain my position.

I suppose, like all positions that we have, and positions that we take in this body, there is always more than what is on the surface. I felt that needed to be explained as fully as I possibly could. But I have to say if I am guilty of anything, that my motivation was to allow the Members of this body to get as much information as possible. I have had Members from the other side of the aisle last night and this morning

who came up to me and said I wonder why this information didn't want to be shared. Well, I don't know that. I don't have the answer to that.

But I felt absolutely within my rights, without violating the rules of the committee or the House, to share that with all of my colleagues. I did so, and I did so in a way that I think is in the best tradition of this House for as much openness as we can possibly have.

Mr. Speaker, I have no more requests for time. I thank the House for its indulgence, and I yield back the balance of my time.

#### MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

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

Mr. LAHOOD. 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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 3, nays 382, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 127]

YEAS—3

Johnson (IL) Mc Nerney Paul

NAYS—382

Abercrombie Brown-Waite, Davis, David  
Ackerman Ginny Davis, Tom  
Aderholt Buchanan DeFazio  
Akin Burgess Delahunt  
Alexander Burton (IN) DeLauro  
Allen Butterfield Dent  
Altmire Buyer Diaz-Balart, L.  
Andrews Calvert Diaz-Balart, M.  
Arcuri Camp (MI) Dicks  
Baca Campbell (CA) Dingell  
Bachmann Cannon Doggett  
Baird Cantor Donnelly  
Baldwin Capito Doolittle  
Barrett (SC) Capps Drake  
Barrow Capuano Dreier  
Bartlett (MD) Cardoza Duncan  
Bean Carnahan Edwards  
Becerra Carney Ehlers  
Berkley Carter Ellison  
Berman Castle Ellsworth  
Berry Castor Emerson  
Biggart Chabot Engel  
Bilbray Chandler English (PA)  
Bilirakis Clarke Eshoo  
Bishop (GA) Cleaver Etheridge  
Bishop (NY) Clyburn Everett  
Bishop (UT) Coble Fallin  
Blackburn Cohen Farr  
Blumenauer Conaway Fattah  
Blunt Conyers Feeney  
Boehner Cooper Ferguson  
Bonner Costa Filner  
Bono Mack Costello Flake  
Boozman Courtney Forbes  
Boren Cramer Fortenberry  
Boswell Crenshaw Fossella  
Boustany Crowley Foster  
Boyd (FL) Cuellar Foxx  
Boya (KS) Culberson Franks (AZ)  
Brady (PA) Cummings Frelinghuysen  
Brady (TX) Davis (AL) Gallegly  
Brale (IA) Davis (CA) Garrett (NJ)  
Broun (GA) Davis (IL) Gerlach  
Brown (SC) Davis (KY) Giffords

Gilchrest  
Gillibrand  
Gingrey  
Gohmert  
Gonzalez  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Gordon  
Granger  
Graves  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hall (NY)  
Hall (TX)  
Hare  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Heller  
Hensarling  
Herseth Sandlin  
Higgins  
Hill  
Hirono  
Hobson  
Hodes  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Hulshof  
Inglis (SC)  
Inslee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee (TX)  
Jefferson  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Jones (OH)  
Jordan  
Kagen  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Keller  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Klein (FL)  
Kline (MN)  
Knollenberg  
Kucinich  
Kuhl (NY)  
LaHood  
Lamborn  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Latta  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loebach  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lucas

Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Lynch  
Mack  
Mahoney (FL)  
Maloney (NY)  
Markey  
Marshall  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul (TX)  
McCollum (MN)  
McCotter  
McCrery  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McHugh  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNulty  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Mitchell  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (KS)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murphy, Tim  
Murtha  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Neugebauer  
Nunes  
Obey  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pence  
Peterson (MN)  
Petri  
Pitts  
Platts  
Poe  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Reyes  
Reynolds  
Richardson  
Rodriguez  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross

Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Salazar  
Sali  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Saxton  
Schiff  
Schmidt  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sestak  
Shadegg  
Shays  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sires  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Souder  
Space  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stearns  
Sutton  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Tsongas  
Turner  
Udall (NM)  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walberg  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh (NY)  
Walz (MN)  
Wamp  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Welch (VT)  
Weller  
Wexler  
Whitfield (KY)  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (OH)  
Wilson (SC)  
Witman (VA)  
Wolf  
Wu  
Wynn  
Yarmuth  
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—44

Bachus Emanuel Mollohan  
Barton (TX) Frank (MA) Moran (VA)  
Boucher Herger Oberstar  
Brown, Corrine Hinchey Perlmutter  
Clay Hinojosa Peterson (PA)  
Cole (OK) Hooley Pickering  
Cubin Hunter Rangel  
Davis, Lincoln Issa Renzi  
Deal (GA) Manzullo Rush  
DeGette Marchant Schakowsky  
Doyle Melancon Shimkus

Smith (NJ) Thompson (MS) Westmoreland  
Stupak Towns Woolsey  
Sullivan Udall (CO) Young (AK)  
Tancredo Weldon (FL)

□ 1313

Messrs. INSLEE, KUCINICH, and LATHAM changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

#### QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I have a privileged resolution at the desk.

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

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1040

Whereas on June 13, 2007, the publication *The Politico* reported, "Democratic leaders gave in to Republican demands that lawmakers be allowed to challenge individual member-requested projects from the final version of each appropriations bill."

Whereas on November 15, 2007, Representatives Jack Kingston and Frank Wolf introduced H. Con. Res. 263, to establish a Joint Select Committee on Earmark Reform, and for other purposes;

Whereas on March 6, 2008, The Hill reports in "Obey Criticizes Kingston on earmarks" that "Kingston said Obey has been 'very irritated' with his push for reform.;"

Whereas on March 5, 2008, House Appropriations Chairman David Obey sent a Dear Colleague to Republican Members stating "In light of the continuing discussion on earmarks in the Republican Conference, the Appropriations Committee needs to determine how it would proceed."

Whereas on March 6, 2008, The Hill reports in "Task Force Looking Beyond Earmarks" that "Obey issued a memo to Republicans in multiple-choice format asking them to check one of two boxes, stating whether they believed in a one-year moratorium and therefore would not be submitting earmark requests, or did not believe in a moratorium and would be submitting requests. Obey spokeswoman Kristin Brost said Obey called the memo his 'anti-hypocrisy memo, aimed at House Minority Leader John Boehner's (R-Ohio) repeated calls for a moratorium.'";

Whereas the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee Dave Obey stated in said letter: "Because it is important for the Committee to move ahead with bills in a timely fashion, I will assume that any Member not returning this form by March 19, 2008 wishes to see Congressional earmarks discontinued and will therefore be submitting no request for fiscal year 2009."

Whereas House Rule XXIII Clause 16, states that a Member may not condition the inclusion of language to provide funding for a congressional earmark on any vote cast by another Member.

Whereas the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Dave Obey, has conditioned the receipt of an earmark from the Committee on Appropriations on a Member's opposition to a moratorium on earmarks: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is directed to investigate without further delay violations of House rules by Representative Dave Obey and report its findings and recommendations to the House, including a recommendation

regarding the appropriate action for Representative Obey's violations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution presents a question of privilege.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the resolution on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 193, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 128]

YEAS—219

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

Wasserman Waxman Wu  
 Schultz Weiner Wynn  
 Waters Welch (VT) Yarmuth  
 Watson Wexler  
 Watt Wilson (OH)

NAYS—193

Aderholt Frelinghuysen Neugebauer  
 Akin Gallegly Nunes  
 Alexander Garrett (NJ) Paul  
 Bachmann Gerlach Pearce  
 Barrett (SC) Gilchrest Pence  
 Bartlett (MD) Gingrey Gohmert Peterson (PA)  
 Barton (TX) Goode Petri  
 Biggert Goode Pickering  
 Bilbray Goodlatte Pitts  
 Bilirakis Granger Platts  
 Bishop (UT) Graves Poe  
 Blackburn Hastings (WA) Porter  
 Blunt Hayes Price (GA)  
 Boehner Heller Pryce (OH)  
 Bonner Hensarling Putnam  
 Bono Mack Herger Radanovich  
 Boozman Hobson Ramstad  
 Boustany Hoekstra Regula  
 Brady (TX) Hulshof Rehberg  
 Broun (GA) Hunter Reichert  
 Brown (SC) Inglis (SC) Reynolds  
 Brown-Waite, Issa Rogers (AL)  
 Ginny Johnson (IL) Rogers (KY)  
 Buchanan Johnson, Sam Rogers (MI)  
 Burgess Jones (NC) Rohrabacher  
 Burton (IN) Jordan Ros-Lehtinen  
 Buyer Keller  
 Calvert King (IA) Roskam  
 Moran (VA) King (NY) Royce  
 Campbell (CA) Kingston Ryan (WI)  
 Cannon Kirk Sali  
 Cantor Kline (MN) Saxton  
 Capito Knollenberg Schmidt  
 Carter Kuhl (NY) Sensenbrenner  
 Castle LaHood Sessions  
 Chabot Lamborn Shadegg  
 Coble Latham Shaays  
 Cole (OK) LaTourette Shimkus  
 Conaway Latta Shuster  
 Crenshaw Lewis (CA) Simpson  
 Cubin Lewis (KY) Smith (NE)  
 Culberson Linder Smith (NJ)  
 Davis (KY) Davis, David Smith (TX)  
 Davis, David Lucas Souder  
 Deal (GA) Davis, Tom Stearns  
 Dent E. Sullivan  
 Diaz-Balart, L. Mack Terry  
 Diaz-Balart, M. Manullo Thornberry  
 Doolittle Marchant Tiahrt  
 Drake McCarthy (CA) Tiberi  
 Dreier McCaul (TX) Turner  
 Duncan McCrery Upton  
 Ehlers McHenry Walberg  
 Emerson McHugh Walden (OR)  
 English (PA) McKeon Walsh (NY)  
 Everett McMorris Wamp  
 Fallin Rodgers Weldon (FL)  
 Feeney Mica Weller  
 Ferguson Miller (FL) Westmoreland  
 Flake Miller (MI) Whitfield (KY)  
 Forbes Miller, Gary Wilson (NM)  
 Fortenberry Moran (KS) Wilson (SC)  
 Fossella Murphy, Tim Wittman (VA)  
 Foxx Musgrave Wolf  
 Franks (AZ) Myrick Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—17

Bachus Hooley Spratt  
 Boucher Oberstar Tancredo  
 Clyburn Rangel Thompson (MS)  
 Gutierrez Renzi Woolsey  
 Hall (TX) Rothman Young (AK)  
 Hinchey Rush

□ 1342

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Messrs. PAYNE, MARKEY, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Messrs. CLEAVER, MELANCON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. RICHARDSON, Messrs. HOLT, LYNCH, SKELTON and MCNERNEY changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 312, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1036 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1036

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 312) revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2008, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2009, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2010 through 2013. The first reading of the concurrent resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. General debate shall not exceed four hours, with three hours confined to the congressional budget equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget and one hour on the subject of economic goals and policies equally divided and controlled by Representative Maloney of New York and Representative Saxton of New Jersey or their designees. After general debate the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. No amendment shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by a proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. All points of order against the amendments printed in the report are waived except that the adoption of an amendment in the nature of a substitute shall constitute the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment. After the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendment as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to final adoption without intervening motion except amendments offered by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to achieve mathematical consistency. The concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

SEC. 2. After a motion that the Committee rise has been rejected on a legislative day, the Chair may entertain another such motion on that day only if offered by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget or the Majority Leader or a designee. After a motion to strike out the resolving words of the concurrent resolution (as described in clause 9 of rule XVIII) has been rejected, the Chair may not entertain another such motion during further consideration of the concurrent resolution.

SEC. 3. During consideration in the House of House Concurrent Resolution 312 pursuant

to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the concurrent resolution to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

SEC. 4. After adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 312, it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table Senate Concurrent Resolution 70 and to consider the Senate concurrent resolution in the House. All points of order against the Senate concurrent resolution and against its consideration are waived. It shall be in order to move to strike all after the resolving clause of the Senate concurrent resolution and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 312 as adopted by the House. All points of order against that motion are waived.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 1036.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1036 provides for consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 312, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for FY 2009, under a structured rule.

The rule provides a total of 4 hours of general debate, 3 hours to be controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget and 1 hour on the subject of economic goals and policies to be controlled by Representative MALONEY of New York and Representative SAXTON of New Jersey.

The rule makes in order the three substitute amendments: one by Representative KILPATRICK of Michigan; one by Representative LEE of California; and a final substitute by Representative RYAN of Wisconsin. Each amendment is debatable for 60 minutes. The rule also permits the chairman of the Budget Committee to offer amendments in the House to achieve mathematical consistency. Finally, the rule provides that the concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, this is the traditional rule for consideration of the budget resolution, and I welcome today's debate on the alternative budgets that will be presented by the Republican leadership, the Congressional Black Caucus and the Congressional Progressive Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by expressing my thanks and appreciation to Budget Committee Chairman SPRATT and Ranking Member RYAN for their leadership and hard work on the House Budget Committee. Although they hold very different points of view, the committee always operates in a cordial and collegial manner. I have served on the Budget Committee for 2 years, and it has been a privilege to learn from two such distinguished Members how to work in a bipartisan way despite sharp philosophical differences. And all of us are supported, Mr. Speaker, by a superb and dedicated committee staff.

Mr. Speaker, budgets are moral documents. They reflect our priorities. And for too long, this Congress passed budgets with the wrong priorities. For too long, our budgets put the desires of the powerful before the needs of the poor. For too long, our budgets pretended that people who were struggling didn't even exist, let alone matter. That has begun to change. The Democratic budget before us today is a budget with a conscience.

Today, we continue the new direction set last year to bring the Federal budget back to fiscal health and responsibility. As we begin this debate, our country faces major challenges: a looming recession, a crisis in the credit markets, a plunging housing market, rising unemployment, declining family income, skyrocketing costs in health care, aging infrastructure, and a safety net struggling to keep up with the growing number of Americans unable to meet their basic needs.

Faced with these challenges, President Bush proposed the same tired, worn-out, failed fiscal and economic policies. After 7 years, the Bush legacy is the highest deficits in our Nation's history. Let us remember, Mr. Speaker, when President Bush took office, when the Republicans had total control over the White House, the Senate and this House, they were welcomed with a \$5.6 trillion projected 10-year budget surplus, the financial gift of the last Democrat to sit in the White House. That has been completely squandered, resulting in the largest fiscal deterioration in American history. And the President's FY 2009 budget proposed only more of the same.

The national debt exploded under President Bush and his Republican rubber-stamp Congress. At the end of 2008, CBO projects a \$9.6 trillion debt, an increase of nearly \$4 trillion, brought to you courtesy of George Bush. Future generations, our children and our grandchildren, will be forced to pay the price for this unprecedented rise in debt thanks to the Republicans' fiscally reckless and irresponsible policies.

And to top it off, the President's budget continues the Bush legacy of deep cuts in many of the most important programs and services for the American people:

\$500 billion in cuts to Medicare.

\$100 billion in cuts to Medicaid, which serves the poorest Americans, including families with children.

The elimination of the Community Services Block Grant and the Social Services Block Grant, and deep cuts in the Community Development Block Grant, which provides nearly every city and town in America with Federal support for basic services.

Elimination of the Community Oriented Policing grants, the COPS grants, and deep cuts for State and local law enforcement at a time when States and local communities are finding it hard to meet the needs of their first responders.

And deep cuts in many other vital programs that provide health care, infrastructure, environmental protection, and other services to our States and to our neighborhoods.

Let me give but one example, Mr. Speaker, the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, or LIHEAP. Last week, the worst snow storm in a century hit the people of Ohio and the Midwest. Two weeks ago, the people of central Massachusetts were facing over three feet of snow. Across the country, people are suffering in the cold. Home heating costs have gone up by 80 percent under George Bush. A barrel of oil now costs \$108. But President Bush decided to cut \$570 million out of the LIHEAP program. The President decided to turn off the heat for 1.2 million households, forcing families to choose either to heat or to eat. And why? So we could continue tax cuts for the wealthiest, most fortunate billionaires in America.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic budget rejects the President's priorities. It rejects the callous view of the Republican Party that tens of millions of American families are expendable, that our communities can manage without basic services, that our roads, bridges and water systems should be allowed to crumble and fail, and that we can run up America's credit card without costs or consequences.

Instead, the Democratic budget restores fiscal responsibility to the Federal budget, returning it to balance in the year 2012. It rejects the President's harmful cuts to basic services, and invests in proven programs that boost economic growth, create jobs, and make America safer.

The Democratic budget helps families struggling to make ends meet in this economic downturn, and provides fiscally responsible tax relief to millions and millions of households.

Finally, the Democratic budget remembers those who serve at home and abroad. It provides strong and substantial funding for national defense, including quality of life for our troops and our families.

It provides more funding for homeland security programs, including first responders, than the President would. And finally, it takes care of our veterans and rejects President Bush's cynical new fees for veterans health care.

Instead, the Democratic budget increases health care funding for our veterans well above current services, enough to allow the VA to treat 5.8 million patients in 2009, including over 333,000 Iraq and Afghanistan war veterans.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying legislation, House Concurrent Resolution 312, the fiscal year 2009 budget resolution, is a budget all Americans who believe in fiscal responsibility and the common good can support.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, there are only two ways to balance a budget, whether it's your family budget or the Federal budget. You can either spend less, or you can increase the amount of money coming in. The majority, as reflected in their budget, have flat out rejected option one and have chosen higher spending, higher taxes, and an ever-growing Federal Government.

The Republicans have chosen what I believe is a more responsible approach by committing to spending less and letting workers, families and small businesses keep more of their hard-earned income to save, invest, and spend as they see fit.

While Republicans have faith in the ability of families and workers to decide how best to use their paychecks, the majority budget reflects their belief that the Federal Government can make better choices at spending money than individual Americans. And that's really a fundamental difference between Democrats and Republicans.

In order for the majority to fund their government spending, their budget raises taxes, Mr. Speaker, by two-thirds of a trillion dollars over the next 5 years. Let me repeat that, two-thirds of a trillion dollars.

Now, you can call this a tax increase or you can call it letting tax cuts expire, but the bottom line is that under the Democrats' budget every American will pay more of their paycheck to the Federal Government.

Although the majority will try to claim otherwise, the numbers in their own budget document show that taxes will increase nearly three times more under their budget than the largest enacted tax increase to date in history, making this the largest tax increase in American history.

While the majority claims that their budget will protect middle-class families, their budget numbers tell a different story. Under the massive tax increases in the majority's budget, the average taxpayer in the State of Florida, for example, will see their annual tax bill rise over \$3,000.

The majority's budget does not extend tax relief from the marriage tax penalty. This means approximately 48 million married couples will face an average tax increase of \$3,000 a year. It does not extend the \$1,000 tax credit that many young families use. The majority's budget would cut that credit in half. It doesn't extend the State sales tax deductibility fairness. The majority's budget, Mr. Speaker, even manages to resurrect the death tax. It doesn't fix the alternative minimum tax for middle-class families. It does not protect those who pay the lowest tax rate either. It would again impose taxes on six million lower income Americans who now pay no taxes thanks to the 2001 tax relief law passed by Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in order to boost our economy to incentivize growth, increase investment in the United States and create jobs, Congress should not be raising taxes by the largest amount in history. This critically important tax relief should not be repealed or allowed to expire to pay for the majority's spending plan. It should be made permanent.

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

□ 1400

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

I will insert into the RECORD letters from The Hamilton Project and the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, which state clearly and unequivocally that the Democratic budget resolution does not raise taxes.

THE HAMILTON PROJECT,

Washington, DC, March 7, 2008.

Congressman JOHN SPRATT,  
Longworth Bldg.,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SPRATT: Per your request, I have analyzed the House Budget Committee's budget resolution. The budget would not raise taxes. The revenue levels in the budget are, in net total, the same as the baseline revenue levels projected by the Congressional Budget Office. These revenue levels are consistent with continuing current law, not with changes to the law that would raise or lower taxes.

The purpose of a budget baseline is to establish a neutral starting point to debate and evaluate alternative priorities for spending, taxes, and the debt. The budget resolution adopts the baseline recommended by several respected, non-partisan groups including the Concord Coalition, the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, and the Committee for Economic Development.

But the choice of a baseline does not commit policymakers to any specific tax or spending policy. Instead a baseline, in conjunction with the restoration of the pay-as-you-go rules, would provide a framework for making tradeoffs between different priorities. Indeed, your budget indicates that one of your priorities is making up-front cuts in taxes for alternative minimum tax relief that would ultimately be paid for without increasing the budget deficit.

The founding strategy paper of The Hamilton Project states that one of the greatest economic risks our nation faces today is our country's large fiscal imbalance. The papers

notes that "the decisions necessary to restore fiscal balance might be easier to enact and to enforce if policymakers reinstated credible budget rules governing both spending and taxes." The pay-as-you-go proposal in the budget resolution will hopefully help policymakers make the tough choices required to put America on a path to a balanced budget.

I hope this analysis is helpful and please do not hesitate if you have any follow-up questions.

Thank you,

JASON FURMAN.

CENTER ON BUDGET AND  
POLICY PRIORITIES,  
Washington, DC, March 7, 2008.

CLAIM THAT CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET PLANS CALL FOR "LARGEST TAX INCREASE IN HISTORY" IS INACCURATE

Some are claiming that the budget plans adopted this week by the House and Senate Budget Committees—the full House and Senate are scheduled to consider their respective committee's plan next week—would constitute "the largest tax increase in history." This claim is inaccurate, just as the same claim was inaccurate with regard to the budget resolution the Congress adopted last year. Neither of the plans recommended this week by the budget committees include a tax increase. The House plan simply assumes the same level of revenues over the 2008-2013 period as projected by the Congressional Budget Office under its current policy baseline, which essentially assumes no change in current laws governing taxes. The Senate plan actually calls for a small reduction in revenues, reflecting its assumption that Alternative Minimum Tax relief will be extended for one year without any offset of the revenues that will be lost as a result of that extension and that a second stimulus bill this year may include a small tax cut.

The charge that the budget plans proposed by the House and Senate Budget Committees include a large tax increase arises not from any policy changes proposed in those plans, but instead from policies enacted in 2001 and 2003. Legislation enacted in those years put in place tax cuts proposed by President Bush but provided for those tax cuts to expire at the end of 2010, unless current law is changed. Both the House and Senate Budget Committee plans assume that current law will be amended to extend some of the expiring tax cuts (especially those affecting middle-class families) and make other changes in tax policy, but they assume (except in the case of temporary AMT relief and stimulus legislation in the Senate plan) that the cost of such changes will be offset by other changes in policy. They do not assume that total revenues will be increased above what is expected to be collected under current policies.

It should be recalled that the President's tax cuts expire in 2010 because their supporters deliberately designed them that way, in order to fit the tax cuts within the cost constraints imposed by the Congressional budget resolutions adopted in 2001 and 2003. While acknowledging that their real goal was to make the tax cuts permanent, supporters of those measures opted to "sunset" the tax cuts before the end of the ten-year budget window, partly in order to avoid recognizing the cost of permanent tax cuts. Now, a few years from the tax cuts' expiration, some of these same supporters are trying to act as though the tax cuts are already permanent and any proposal to offset the cost of extending them is a "tax increase."

To extend the tax cuts without paying for them—and to attack those who simply seek to require that any extension of the tax cuts

be paid for—further heightens the irresponsible fiscal nature of the original actions.

Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to point out to the gentleman that in the budget resolution it is specifically mentioned that we endorse the extension of the middle class tax cuts, including things like the marriage penalty relief, the child tax credit, and the 10 percent tax bracket. Our budget also provides paid-for relief from the alternative minimum tax.

I think the difference between the Democrats and Republicans is we believe in paying for these tax cuts so that we don't add to the debt and further burden our kids and our grandkids.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, a member of the Budget Committee, (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, some folks think that President Bush's term ends on January 20, 2009. Many Americans have a big red circle or a happy face on their calendar already on that date, or perhaps on their key chains, and their watches that tick down ever so slowly, backwards toward that happy time.

But while President Bush may be gone from the White House in 314 days, this administration and its congressional enablers have done so much damage that generations of American families will be footing the bill for their fiscal recklessness, with compounded interest, long, long after President Bush retires to Texas. This administration has consistently chosen to sacrifice long-term fiscal stability on the altar of political expediency. They have offered the "free lunch" plan, the "pain-free" solution to almost every challenge that our country has encountered. And the greatest sacrifice that they have demanded at a time of national peril for most Americans is to tell them to "go shopping".

Well, this administration has now created a record \$3 trillion of additional national debt on its own during the Bush years. What would even just one of those trillions of dollars of debt have accomplished had it been expended in a more appropriate manner?

One trillion, that's millions of public school teachers; that's health care for hundreds of million children; that's university scholarships for millions of students. And in Iraq, this administration this week, every week, week after week, month after month, year after year, \$3 billion. With the cost of the war in Iraq in 2 weeks, we could pay for the entire cancer budget of the National Institutes of Health for a year. Showering tax breaks on the richest, the most privileged few, while hemorrhaging \$12 billion every month in Iraq, this administration has created more than a Federal deficit; it has created deficits, opportunity deficits, for millions of American families.

The administration's failure to address our educational needs means that

there's an opportunity deficit, that millions of young people are not able to achieve their full God-given potential because of the lack of support at both the public education level and for student financial assistance.

The failure of the Bush administration to address our health care problems means a health care deficit for millions of American families, the largest single cause of personal bankruptcy in America today, the health care crisis.

And the failure of the Bush administration to address our energy deficit, that is a deficit that every American feels at the pump when they get all their money taken out of their pocket and shifted over to some tyrant in an oil-producing area. The cost of the Bush administration's budget approach, their fiscal failure, is felt the most by those, who are least able to bear it: our students, our uninsured, our minimum wage workers, the elderly, and small business owners.

This Democratic budget attempts to bail out, to bail us all out. But it's mighty hard to keep this country afloat and keep our families afloat when the administration is still so busy drilling holes in the bottom of the boat.

I urge support for the rule and support for the Democratic budget as the best hope we have to do that in this difficult time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 7 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, ranking member of the Budget Committee, in my view, the premier economic mind in the Congress of the United States (Mr. RYAN).

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

Mr. Speaker, we are about to decide which path we want to take in America. We are about to decide what budget is right for Americans. Well, let's think about what Americans are facing today as we consider their budget for the next 5 years. What's happening in America today?

Well, joblessness is up. The economy is in a downturn. It may be going into a recession. Prices are up. People are having a hard time to afford the cost of living. Gas prices are at an all-time high. Health care costs are at an all-time high and growing very fast. Home heating costs are very high. And it's a lot more expensive just to pay for food today because food prices are up. So the question is, as we debate the values that are underneath this budget, can the American people afford this Democratic budget?

Now, my friends on the other side of the aisle are going to try to say all day today they're not raising taxes. We really aren't, believe us, trust us.

Well, my friends, numbers don't lie. And this budget is a series of numbers. And the numbers they're bringing before this House in their budget resolution requires, assumes, banks, plans on

the largest tax increase in American history.

When we looked at the 1993 budget that passed last decade, even then Senator Patrick Moynihan, a Democrat, a very, very wise man, a statesman, adored by both sides, said at that time that that was the largest tax increase in history. That tax increase was \$241 billion. Under the same logic, under the same math, under the same process that we have here today, the tax increase in this budget is \$683 billion.

But let's look at what kinds of taxes we're talking about. And this begs the question, can the American people afford this budget? This increases the marriage penalty in 2½ years. Can the American people afford that? It cuts the \$1,000 child tax credit in half. It eliminates the marriage penalty tax relief and increases marginal tax rates. It eliminates capital gains and dividends relief, and it brings back the death tax.

Let's take a look at what the numbers are. Income tax rates go up across the board to the top rate of almost 40 percent. Capital gains and dividends, which are the taxes on our pensions and our savings and our 401(k)s, go up across the board as high as 40 percent. The death tax comes back in to 55 percent. The marriage penalty comes and hits an average of \$1,400 per couple. The child tax credit goes from \$1,000 down to \$500. And the lowest tax bracket goes from 10 percent up to 15 percent.

Let me just give you some numbers of what this will mean to average Americans. Roughly 116 million taxpayers will see their taxes increase, on average, by \$1,833. An estimated 84 million women would sustain, on average, a tax increase of \$2,121. Approximately 48 million married couples would incur an average tax increase of over \$3,000. Taxes would increase by an average of \$2,323 for 43 million families with children. Some 12 million single women with children would see their taxes increase, on average, by \$1,091. For 18 million elderly individuals, taxes would increase, on average, \$2,181. And the tax bills for 27 million small business owners would rise, on average, by more than \$4,000. More than 6 million taxpayers who previously owed no taxes at all would become subject to the individual income tax as a consequence of the tax increase in this budget.

These aren't rich people. These are ordinary Americans working paycheck to paycheck trying to get by. The problem we have today is our paychecks aren't going as far as they did before because we have rising gas prices, high home heating costs, high health care costs.

So the question is, can the American people afford this budget?

I ask people watching this to send us your e-mail. Give us a call. Call your Member of Congress and tell us, is that what you want us to do?

And the more important question is, should we balance the budget? Yes.

Both Republicans and Democrats say we ought to balance the budget. Here's the difference: We believe we ought to balance the budget by controlling spending, not by raising taxes. And, unfortunately, what the Democrats choose to do is increase spending and taxes.

So their budget will show, by the Congressional Budget Office in their numbers, they will achieve balance. The way they achieve balance is they spend an extra \$280 billion over 5 years, but they increase taxes a whole lot more than that to get to a balanced budget.

What's more important about this budget for our children and grandchildren is not the economic damage that would be done by this budget with these huge tax increases for every income taxpayer, for married people, for people with children, for small businesses, for farmers, for investors. What really is troubling about this budget is not as much as what is in this budget, the largest tax increase in history. What's really almost the most troubling about this budget is doing nothing, doing nothing to save money, doing nothing to reform our entitlement programs. We just heard my friend from Texas. I'm on two committees with the gentleman. He said a \$3 trillion increase in debt over the last 5 years. This budget proposes, in just two programs, to increase the debt by \$14 trillion.

Let me go through that again. By doing nothing to rescue and save Social Security and Medicare, this budget proposes, by its own virtue, to increase the debt to those two programs by \$14 trillion.

We have an obligation to the next generation to be good stewards of taxpayer dollars. We have an obligation to the next generation to leave them with a better fiscal state.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle have chosen to walk away from that responsibility. They have chosen to have more money to spend today, to raise taxes, and to make matters worse for the next generation.

We think that's the wrong way to go. We don't think the American people at this time of economic downturn, at this time of high prices, we can afford a tax increase of all times. We don't think there ever should be a time where we increase taxes, because you know what, Mr. Speaker? Washington doesn't have a tax revenue problem; Washington has a spending problem. And our friends on the other side of the aisle are making it worse by not only increasing spending but even increasing taxes.

That's the wrong recipe for this Congress. That's the wrong message to send our children and grandchildren. And that's the dead wrong thing to do at a time of high prices and economic downturn.

I think we should vote this budget down and do so on behalf of our children and our grandchildren and the

American taxpayer so we can give a chance to our economy to actually grow. You're not going to grow an economy by giving us the largest tax increase in American history. That's for certain.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROSS). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

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

The gentleman asked the right question: What are American families facing? What are American families facing after 7 years of Bush budgets and Republican budgets? What they're facing are challenges like never before.

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the real income of a typical family has fallen by almost \$1,000 since George Bush became President. The Democratic budget provides funds to keep up with rising food, housing, and heating and transportation costs.

In the area of education, the Democratic budget provides \$7.1 billion more for education and job training than the Bush budget. It increases funding for Head Start, special education, No Child Left Behind, and title I. Under George Bush, only four out of 10 children eligible for Head Start received services. The Democratic budget increases funding for Head Start so that more children will enter school ready to learn.

And, again, let me repeat, Mr. Speaker. The Hamilton Project of the Brookings Institution, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, and the Concord Coalition have all sent Members of Congress letters stating emphatically that the Democratic budget does not increase taxes.

Let me say one thing the Democratic budget does do, and that is it relieves the burden of debt that has been thrust upon our kids and our grandkids. The Republicans, during these last several years, have increased the debt to historic highs, and in doing so, they have created a debt tax on our kids and our grandkids. We want to remove that tax burden from future generations.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia, a member of the Budget Committee (Mr. SCOTT).

□ 1415

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule because it makes in order the Congressional Black Caucus alternative. The Congressional Black Caucus budget offers this Congress and the American people the choice between fiscal and moral responsibility and tax cuts for the wealthy. Under the stewardship of the Congressional Black Caucus alternative, the Federal budget returns to balance, as this chart show, in the fourth year and the fifth year. The President's budget is in red, in deficit, all the way through. It even returns to deficit in the fifth year.

If compared to the President's budget, we save \$564 billion better on the

bottom line. In fact, we save so much that we save \$48 billion in interest compared to the President's budget. At the same time, we provide significant funding for essential priorities, for example, education, health care, veterans, justice programs, all much better funded under the Congressional Black Caucus budget than the President's budget.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard that we do this by canceling the tax cuts that got us in the fiscal mess that we are in today, except for those tax cuts that primarily affect that portion of your income under \$200,000. Now, canceling those tax cuts has been called the greatest tax increase or whatever they want to call it. Mr. Speaker, all we are doing is canceling the tax cuts that got us in the ditch. When these tax cuts first passed, we had a projected surplus of \$5.5 trillion for a 10-year budget. Those 10 years look like they are going to come in at a \$3 trillion deficit.

We haven't created jobs at the same time. We have a choice. We can have fiscal responsibility and address our important needs, or we can fund those tax cuts for the wealthy. The Congressional Black Caucus chooses fiscal responsibility and a morally supportable budget addressing our priorities. And therefore, I support the rule that makes the Congressional Black Caucus budget in order.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would ask Mr. MCGOVERN if he has any additional speakers.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I am the last speaker.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

On February 14, the majority decided to leave Washington to take a Presidents Day recess and allowed the Protect America Act to expire 2 days later, rendering U.S. intelligence officials unable to begin new terrorist surveillance without cumbersome bureaucratic hurdles. At the end of this week, the House and Senate plan to adjourn for a 2-week district work period. Therefore, we only have a few days left to address one very important issue, and that is taking action on permanently modernizing the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

This didn't have to happen, Mr. Speaker. In February, the Senate passed, by a bipartisan vote of 68-29, legislation updating the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, FISA, a bill that the chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee said "is the right way to go, in terms of the security of the Nation."

We could have easily considered that legislation. But the majority, instead, decided to head home. And they may just do that again this week. The House should vote on the Senate measure, and we should do it now. We must always stay one step ahead of those who wish harm on Americans. Now is not the time to, in any way, tie the

hands of our intelligence community. The modernization of foreign intelligence surveillance into the 21st century is a critical national security priority.

I am pleased that several of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle agree. On January 28, 21 members of the Blue Dog Coalition sent a letter to the Speaker in support of the Senate FISA legislation. The letter states, "The Rockefeller-Bond FISA legislation contains satisfactory language addressing all these issues and we would fully support that measure should it reach the House floor without substantial change. We believe these components will ensure a strong national security apparatus that can thwart terrorism around the globe and save American lives here in our country."

Today, I will give all Members of the House an opportunity to vote on the bipartisan, long-term modernization of FISA. I call on all my colleagues, including members of the Blue Dog Coalition that signed the letter to the Speaker, to join with me in defeating the previous question so that we can immediately move to concur in the Senate amendment and send the bill to the President to be signed into law.

I will remind my colleagues that defeating the previous question will not prohibit consideration of the budget, but would merely require that we first take a vote on FISA.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the amendment and extraneous material inserted into the RECORD prior to the vote on the previous question.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question and in favor of a bipartisan permanent solution that helps protect American lives from international terrorism.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me say to my colleagues that security also means the economic well-being of our citizens. And because of Republican priorities over the last 7 years, record numbers of our citizens are struggling like never before. The very rich have done very well. And the rest have not. Those are the facts.

The Democratic budget that has been put forward restores fiscal responsibility. It rejects the President's harmful cuts in programs like Medicare and Medicaid. It rejects the President's proposal to impose new fees for our veterans and our military retirees. It strengthens our economy. It invests more in innovation. It invests more in energy, renewable and clean energy. It invests more in education and in our infrastructure. It also provides tax relief to help struggling families. It accommodates the tax relief from the alternative minimum tax for more than

20 million households, as well as middle income tax cuts and other tax relief so long as they comply with the pay-as-you-go rule.

It invests more in children's health. It provides more funding for safety net programs. Record numbers of our citizens are literally falling through the cracks in our country. It invests in defense, in veterans, and in homeland security.

The facts are, Mr. Speaker, that for years we have been forced to accept the priorities of George Bush and his Republican colleagues who have controlled the Congress. That is now changing. For nearly 7 years, we have watched as they have accumulated huge debt, historical debt. We have watched as they have chipped away at some of the most important programs that help some of the most desperate people in our country. The American people have had enough. That is what the last election was about. They have had their chance. They have shown us their priorities. And the American people have rejected them. It is now time to create a budget that has a conscience that responds to the needs of the struggling middle class in this country. The Democratic budget that will be offered today will do that and change the course of this country.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1036, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for FY 2009, introduced by my distinguished colleague from South Carolina, Chairman SPRATT.

This Rule will allow this body to debate the economic goals and policies of this great Nation. At a time, when this country is on the verge of a recession and the housing market is at one of its worst points in history, there is little else that is as important as our Nation's fiscal security.

A quality education continues to be the best pathway to social and economic mobility in this country. As a Member and Senior Whip of the Congressional Black Caucus, I have consistently advocated for the maintenance of historically Black Colleges and Universities. This budget provides greater funding to our Nation's schools and colleges.

We must not only be economically healthy, but assist in the physical health of our citizens. This budget will properly fund SCHIP, to help one of our most vulnerable populations—children. Our President proclaims his support for securing our Nation's current and future economic success. However, it is our children that will bring forth a successful future. We need to invest in tomorrow by investing in them today. This starts with their physical well-being. Children, who cannot see the doctor when they are sick, will not be in anyone's classroom.

For African Americans, health and education concerns spill beyond budgetary issues into the criminal justice consequences. In Texas, over 87,000 African-Americans are incarcerated compared to approximately 48,000 African-Americans attending college or university.

The disparity between the percentages of our youth in prison versus the number of young people in college, particularly in the African-American community, is disturbing to say the least. Higher education continues to be

one of the main pathways to social and economic mobility, particularly in the African-American and Hispanic communities.

Under the Republican Budget the national debt continues to explode. The gross federal debt reached \$9.0 trillion at the end of 2007. The CBO projects that the debt will rise by a total of \$3.9 trillion at the end of 2008. This unprecedented rise in debt puts our President in the history books. During the seven years of the current Administration, the government has posted the highest deficits in this Nation's history. The President's 2009 Budget continues the failed policies that brought us to this point.

The amount of foreign debt has doubled since 2001, with most of this increased debt purchased by foreign lenders. Since 2001, the increases in foreign holdings of Treasury securities account for over 80 percent of the newly accumulated public debt—a trend that has more than doubled foreign holding of Treasury securities.

This high level of indebtedness to foreign investors heightens the economy's exposure to potential instability with additional burdens on our children and grandchildren.

Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to claim that the budget resolution being considered on the floor this week raises taxes, when in fact, the budget resolution does not raise taxes by one penny. The budget resolution accommodates tax cuts and indeed prioritizes tax cuts that would benefit middle-income families, while ensuring that the burden of paying for the tax cuts will not fall undeservedly on our future generations.

Section 501 of the budget resolution specifically calls for additional middle-income tax relief subject to the pay-as-you-go rule, including but not limited to:

- AMT relief (both immediate/temporary, and more permanent reform measures);

- Extension of "middle-class" elements of 2001 tax cuts: child tax credit, marriage penalty relief, and 10 percent bracket;

- Eliminating the estate tax on all but a minute fraction of estates;

- Extension of the research and experimentation tax credit;

- Extension of the deduction for state and local taxes;

- Extension of small business expensing;
- Enactment of a tax credit for school construction bonds; and

- Tax incentives for energy efficiency and renewable energy which are accommodated in a separate deficit-neutral reserve fund.

The budget resolution honors PAYGO and the new House rules on using reconciliation in a fiscally responsible way. By abiding by the pay-as-you-go principle, we immediately begin digging our way out of the mountains of debt that have accumulated as a result of the Bush Administration's fiscal policies.

The President's budget and the Republican alternatives violate PAYGO and the fiscal responsibility that reconciliation is intended to achieve, by proposing tax cuts that are not offset.

The sunsets for the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts were part of the tax legislation which Republicans voted for and passed. The expiration of the tax cuts is their policy. The Democratic budget actually calls for the extension of many of these tax cuts, but responsibly requires that tax cut extensions, like other policies, must be fiscally sound, and not make the deficit worse.

This important piece of legislation gives us a budget that is balanced fiscally and morally.

It does not sacrifice the many programs and services that this Nation needs for a war that the President seems never to end.

Defense of our Nation is important; however, we must not support only one portion of the budget to the detriment of everything else. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Res. 1036 and the Democratic Budget for FY2009.

The material previously referred to by Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1036 OFFERED BY MR. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART OF FLORIDA

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 5. "That upon adoption of this resolution, before consideration of any order of business other than one motion that the House adjourn, the bill (H.R. 3773) to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to establish a procedure for authorizing certain acquisitions of foreign intelligence, and for other purposes, with Senate amendment thereto, shall be considered to have been taken from the Speaker's table. A motion that the House concur in the Senate amendment shall be considered as pending in the House without intervention of any point of order. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader or their designees. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to final adoption without intervening motion."

(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.

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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 yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption, if ordered; and the motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 5563.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 196, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 129]  
YEAS—222

Abercrombie	Capps	DeGette
Ackerman	Capuano	Delahunt
Allen	Cardoza	DeLauro
Altmire	Carnahan	Dicks
Andrews	Carney	Dingell
Arcuri	Castor	Doggett
Baca	Chandler	Doyle
Baird	Clarke	Edwards
Baldwin	Clay	Ellison
Bean	Cleaver	Ellsworth
Becerra	Clyburn	Emanuel
Berkley	Cohen	Engel
Berman	Conyers	Eshoo
Berry	Cooper	Etheridge
Bishop (GA)	Costa	Farr
Bishop (NY)	Costello	Fattah
Blumenauer	Courtney	Filner
Boren	Cramer	Foster
Boswell	Crowley	Frank (MA)
Boucher	Cuellar	Giffords
Boyd (FL)	Cummings	Gillibrand
Boyd (KS)	Boyd (AL)	Gonzalez
Brady (PA)	Davis (CA)	Gordon
Braley (IA)	Davis (IL)	Green, Al
Brown, Corrine	Davis, Lincoln	Green, Gene
Butterfield	DeFazio	Grijalva

Hall (NY)	Matsui	Sarbanes
Hare	McCarthy (NY)	Schakowsky
Harman	McCollum (MN)	Schiff
Hastings (FL)	McDermott	Schwartz
Hereth Sandlin	McGovern	Sherman
Higgins	McIntyre	Scott (VA)
Hill	McNerney	Serrano
Hinchey	McNulty	Sestak
Hinojosa	Meek (FL)	Shea-Porter
Hirono	Meeks (NY)	Sherman
Hodes	Melancon	Shuler
Holden	Michaud	Sires
Holt	Miller (NC)	Skelton
Honda	Miller, George	Slaughter
Hoyer	Mitchell	Smith (WA)
Inslée	Mollohan	Snyder
Israel	Moore (KS)	Solis
Jackson (IL)	Moore (WI)	Space
Jackson-Lee	Moran (VA)	Spratt
(TX)	Murphy (CT)	Stark
Jefferson	Murphy, Patrick	Stupak
Johnson (GA)	Murtha	Sutton
Johnson, E. B.	Nadler	Tanner
Jones (OH)	Napolitano	Tauscher
Kagen	Neal (MA)	Taylor
Kanjorski	Obey	Thompson (CA)
Kaptur	Olver	Thompson (MS)
Kennedy	Ortiz	Tierney
Kildee	Pallone	Towns
Kilpatrick	Pascrell	Tsongas
Kind	Pastor	Udall (CO)
Klein (FL)	Payne	Udall (NM)
Kucinich	Perlmutter	Van Hollen
Langevin	Peterson (MN)	Velázquez
Larsen (WA)	Pomeroy	Visclosky
Larson (CT)	Price (NC)	Walz (MN)
Lee	Rahall	Wasserman
Levin	Reyes	Schultz
Lewis (GA)	Richardson	Waters
Lipinski	Rodriguez	Watson
Loeb sack	Ross	Watt
Lofgren, Zoe	Rothman	Waxman
Lowey	Roybal-Allard	Weiner
Lynch	Ruppersberger	Welch (VT)
Mahoney (FL)	Ryan (OH)	Wexler
Maloney (NY)	Salazar	Wilson (OH)
Markey	Sánchez, Linda	Wu
Marshall	T.	Wynn
Matheson	Sanchez, Loretta	Yarmuth

NAYS—196

Aderholt	Diaz-Balart, L.	King (IA)
Akin	Diaz-Balart, M.	King (NY)
Alexander	Donnelly	Kingston
Bachmann	Doolittle	Kirk
Bachus	Drake	Kline (MN)
Barrett (SC)	Dreier	Knollenberg
Barrow	Duncan	Kuhl (NY)
Bartlett (MD)	Ehlers	LaHood
Barton (TX)	Emerson	Lamborn
Biggert	English (PA)	Lampson
Bilbray	Everett	Latham
Bilirakis	Fallin	LaTourette
Bishop (UT)	Feeney	Latta
Blackburn	Ferguson	Lewis (CA)
Blunt	Flake	Lewis (KY)
Boehner	Forbes	Linder
Bonner	Fortenberry	LoBiondo
Bono Mack	Fossella	Lucas
Boozman	Fox	Lungren, Daniel
Boustany	Franks (AZ)	E.
Brady (TX)	Frelinghuysen	Mack
Broun (GA)	Gallely	Manzullo
Brown (SC)	Garrett (NJ)	Marchant
Brown-Waite,	Gerlach	McCarthy (CA)
Ginny	Gilchrest	McCaul (TX)
Buchanan	Gingrey	McCotter
Burgess	Gohmert	McCreery
Burton (IN)	Goode	McHenry
Buyer	Goodlatte	McHugh
Calvert	Granger	McKeon
Camp (MI)	Graves	McMorris
Campbell (CA)	Hall (TX)	Rodgers
Cantor	Hastings (WA)	Mica
Capito	Hayes	Miller (FL)
Carter	Heller	Miller (MI)
Castle	Hensarling	Miller, Gary
Chabot	Herger	Moran (KS)
Coble	Hobson	Murphy, Tim
Cole (OK)	Hoekstra	Musgrave
Conaway	Hulshof	Myrick
Crenshaw	Hunter	Neugebauer
Cubin	Inglis (SC)	Nunes
Culberson	Issa	Paul
Davis (KY)	Johnson (IL)	Pearce
Davis, David	Johnson, Sam	Pence
Davis, Tom	Jones (NC)	Peterson (PA)
Deal (GA)	Jordan	Petri
Dent	Keller	Pickering

Pitts	Royce	Tiahrt	Larson (CT)	Neal (MA)	Slaughter	Stearns	Upton	Westmoreland
Platts	Ryan (WI)	Tiberi	Lee	Obey	Smith (WA)	Sullivan	Walberg	Whitfield (KY)
Poe	Sali	Turner	Levin	Oliver	Snyder	Terry	Walden (OR)	Wilson (NM)
Porter	Saxton	Upton	Lewis (GA)	Ortiz	Solis	Thornberry	Walsh (NY)	Wilson (SC)
Price (GA)	Schmidt	Walberg	Lipinski	Pallone	Space	Tiahrt	Wamp	Wittman (VA)
Pryce (OH)	Sensenbrenner	Walden (OR)	Loeb	Pascarella	Spratt	Tiberi	Weldon (FL)	Wolf
Putnam	Sessions	Walsh (NY)	Lofgren, Zoe	Pastor	Stark	Turner	Weller	Young (FL)
Radanovich	Shadegg	Wamp	Lowe	Payne	Stupak	NOT VOTING—11		
Ramstad	Shays	Weldon (FL)	Lynch	Perlmutter	Sutton	Gutierrez	Oberstar	Tancredo
Regula	Shimkus	Weller	Mahoney (FL)	Peterson (MN)	Tanner	Hastings (FL)	Rangel	Woolsey
Rehberg	Shuster	Westmoreland	Maloney (NY)	Pomeroy	Tauscher	Hooley	Renzi	Young (AK)
Reichert	Simpson	Whitfield (KY)	Markey	Price (NC)	Taylor	Linder	Rush	
Reynolds	Smith (NE)	Wilson (NM)	Marshall	Rahall	Thompson (CA)	ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE		
Rogers (AL)	Smith (NJ)	Wilson (SC)	Matheson	Reyes	Thompson (MS)	The SPEAKER pro tempore (during		
Rogers (KY)	Smith (TX)	Wittman (VA)	Matsui	Richardson	Tierney	the vote). Members are advised there		
Rogers (MI)	Smith (TX)	Wolf	McCarthy (NY)	Rodriguez	Towns	are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.		
Rohrabacher	Souder	Young (FL)	McCollum (MN)	Ross	Tsongas			
Ros-Lehtinen	Stearns		McDermott	Rothman	Udall (CO)			
Roskam	Sullivan		McGovern	Roybal-Allard	Udall (NM)			
	Thornberry		McIntyre	Ruppersberger	Van Hollen			
			McNerney	Ryan (OH)	Velázquez			
			McNulty	Salazar	Visclosky			
			Meek (FL)	Sánchez, Linda	Walz (MN)			
			Meeks (NY)	T. Sanchez, Loretta	Wasserman			
			Melancon	Sarbanes	Schultz			
			Michaud	Schakowsky	Waters			
			Miller (NC)	Schiff	Watson			
			Miller, George	Schwartz	Watt			
			Mitchell	Scott (GA)	Waxman			
			Mollohan	Scott (VA)	Weiner			
			Moore (KS)	Serrano	Welch (VT)			
			Moore (WI)	Sestak	Wexler			
			Moran (VA)	Shea-Porter	Wilson (OH)			
			Murphy (CT)	Sherman	Wu			
			Murphy, Patrick	Shuler	Wynn			
			Murtha	Sires	Yarmuth			
			Nadler	Skelton				
			Napolitano					

## NOT VOTING—11

Cannon	Rangel	Terry
Gutierrez	Renzi	Woolsey
Hooley	Rush	Young (AK)
Oberstar	Tancredo	

□ 1448

Mr. PICKERING changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. ESHOO, and Messrs. HILL, JOHN-SON of Georgia and DELAHUNT changed their 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.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 195, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 130]

## YEAS—223

Abercrombie	Cohen	Gordon
Ackerman	Conyers	Green, Al
Allen	Cooper	Green, Gene
Altmire	Costa	Grijalva
Andrews	Costello	Hall (NY)
Arcuri	Courtney	Hare
Baca	Cramer	Harman
Baird	Crowley	Herseth Sandlin
Baldwin	Cuellar	Higgins
Barrow	Cummings	Hill
Bean	Davis (AL)	Hinche
Becerra	Davis (CA)	Hinojosa
Berkley	Davis (IL)	Hirono
Berman	Davis, Lincoln	Hodes
Berry	DeFazio	Holden
Bishop (GA)	DeGette	Holt
Bishop (NY)	Delahunt	Honda
Blumenauer	DeLauro	Hoyer
Boren	Dicks	Inslie
Boswell	Dingell	Israel
Boucher	Doggett	Jackson (IL)
Boyd (FL)	Donnelly	Jackson-Lee
Boyd (KS)	Doyle	(TX)
Brady (PA)	Edwards	Jefferson
Braley (IA)	Ellison	Johnson (GA)
Brown, Corrine	Ellsworth	Johnson, E. B.
Butterfield	Emanuel	Jones (OH)
Capps	Engel	Kagen
Capuano	Eshoo	Kanjorski
Cardoza	Etheridge	Kaptur
Carnahan	Farr	Kennedy
Carney	Fattah	Kildee
Castor	Filner	Kilpatrick
Chandler	Foster	Kind
Clarke	Frank (MA)	Klein (FL)
Clay	Giffords	Kucinich
Cleaver	Gillibrand	Langevin
Clyburn	Gonzalez	Larsen (WA)

Lee	Neal (MA)	Slaughter
Levin	Obey	Smith (WA)
Lewis (GA)	Oliver	Snyder
Lipinski	Ortiz	Solis
Loeb	Pallone	Space
Loeb	Pascarella	Spratt
Lofgren, Zoe	Pastor	Stark
Lowe	Payne	Stupak
Lynch	Perlmutter	Sutton
Mahoney (FL)	Peterson (MN)	Tanner
Maloney (NY)	Pomeroy	Tauscher
Markey	Price (NC)	Taylor
Marshall	Rahall	Thompson (CA)
Matheson	Reyes	Thompson (MS)
Matsui	Richardson	Tierney
McCarthy (NY)	Rodriguez	Towns
McCollum (MN)	Ross	Tsongas
McDermott	Rothman	Udall (CO)
McGovern	Roybal-Allard	Udall (NM)
McIntyre	Ruppersberger	Van Hollen
McNerney	Ryan (OH)	Velázquez
McNulty	Salazar	Visclosky
Meek (FL)	Sánchez, Linda	Walz (MN)
Meeks (NY)	T. Sanchez, Loretta	Wasserman
Melancon	Sarbanes	Schultz
Michaud	Schakowsky	Waters
Miller (NC)	Schiff	Watson
Miller, George	Schwartz	Watt
Mitchell	Scott (GA)	Waxman
Mollohan	Scott (VA)	Weiner
Moore (KS)	Serrano	Welch (VT)
Moore (WI)	Sestak	Wexler
Moran (VA)	Shea-Porter	Wilson (OH)
Murphy (CT)	Sherman	Wu
Murphy, Patrick	Shuler	Wynn
Murtha	Sires	Yarmuth
Nadler	Skelton	
Napolitano		

## NAYS—195

Aderholt	Feeney	McCaul (TX)
Akin	Ferguson	McCotter
Alexander	Flake	McCrery
Bachmann	Forbes	McHenry
Bachus	Fortenberry	McHugh
Barrett (SC)	Fossella	McKeon
Bartlett (MD)	Poxx	McMorris
Barton (TX)	Franks (AZ)	Rodgers
Biggart	Frelinghuysen	Mica
Bilbray	Gallely	Miller (FL)
Bilirakis	Garrett (NJ)	Miller (MI)
Bishop (UT)	Gerlach	Miller, Gary
Blackburn	Gilchrest	Moran (KS)
Blunt	Gingrey	Murphy, Tim
Boehner	Gohmert	Musgrave
Bonner	Goode	Myrick
Bono Mack	Goodlatte	Neugebauer
Boozman	Granger	Nunes
Boustany	Graves	Paul
Brady (TX)	Hall (TX)	Pearce
Broun (GA)	Hastings (WA)	Pence
Brown (SC)	Hayes	Peterson (PA)
Brown-Waite,	Heller	Petri
Ginny	Hensarling	Pickering
Buchanan	Herger	Pitts
Burgess	Hobson	Platts
Burton (IN)	Hoekstra	Poe
Buyer	Hulshof	Porter
Calvert	Hunter	Price (GA)
Camp (MI)	Inglis (SC)	Pryce (OH)
Campbell (CA)	Issa	Putnam
Cannon	Johnson (IL)	Radanovich
Cantor	Johnson, Sam	Ramstad
Capito	Jones (NC)	Regula
Carter	Jordan	Rehberg
Castle	Keller	Reichert
Chabot	King (IA)	Reynolds
Coble	King (NY)	Rogers (AL)
Cole (OK)	Kingston	Rogers (KY)
Conaway	Kirk	Rogers (MI)
Crenshaw	Kline (MN)	Rohrabacher
Cubin	Knollenberg	Ros-Lehtinen
Culberson	Kuhl (NY)	Roskam
Davis (KY)	LaHood	Royce
Davis, David	Lamborn	Ryan (WI)
Davis, Tom	Lampson	Sali
Deal (GA)	Latham	Saxton
Dent	LaTourrette	Schmidt
Diaz-Balart, L.	Latta	Sensenbrenner
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lewis (CA)	Sessions
Doolittle	Lewis (KY)	Shadegg
Drake	LoBiondo	Shah
Dreier	Lucas	Shimkus
Duncan	Lungren, Daniel	Shuster
Ehlers	E.	Simpson
Emerson	Mack	Smith (NE)
English (PA)	Manullo	Smith (NJ)
Everett	Marchant	Smith (TX)
Fallin	McCarthy (CA)	Souder

## NOT VOTING—11

Gutierrez	Oberstar	Tancredo
Hastings (FL)	Rangel	Woolsey
Hooley	Renzi	Young (AK)
Linder	Rush	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1458

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.

## GENERATIONS INVIGORATING VOL-UNTEERISM AND EDUCATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5563, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5563.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 277, nays 140, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 131]

## YEAS—277

Abercrombie	Castor	Etheridge
Ackerman	Chandler	Farr
Allen	Clarke	Fattah
Altmire	Clay	Ferguson
Andrews	Cleaver	Filner
Arcuri	Clyburn	Fortenberry
Baca	Cohen	Foster
Bachus	Conyers	Frank (MA)
Baird	Cooper	Frelinghuysen
Baldwin	Costa	Gerlach
Barrow	Costello	Giffords
Bean	Courtney	Gilchrest
Becerra	Cramer	Gillibrand
Berkley	Crowley	Gonzalez
Berman	Cuellar	Gordon
Berry	Cummings	Graves
Bilirakis	Davis (AL)	Green, Al
Bishop (GA)	Davis (CA)	Green, Gene
Bishop (NY)	Davis (IL)	Grijalva
Blumenauer	Davis, Lincoln	Hall (NY)
Bono Mack	DeFazio	Hare
Boozman	DeGette	Harman
Boren	Delahunt	Hastings (FL)
Boswell	DeLauro	Herseth Sandlin
Boucher	Dent	Higgins
Boustany	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hill
Boyd (FL)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hinche
Boyd (KS)	Dicks	Hinojosa
Brady (PA)	Dingell	Hirono
Braley (IA)	Doggett	Hodes
Brown, Corrine	Donnelly	Holden
Butterfield	Doyle	Holt
Capps	Edwards	Honda
Capuano	Ehlers	Hoyer
Cardoza	Ellison	Hulshof
Carnahan	Ellsworth	Inslie
Carney	Emanuel	Israel
Castor	Emerson	Jackson (IL)
Chandler	Engel	Jackson-Lee
Clarke	English (PA)	(TX)
Clay	Eshoo	Jefferson

Johnson (GA)	Miller, George	Scott (VA)
Johnson (IL)	Mitchell	Serrano
Johnson, E. B.	Mollohan	Sestak
Jones (OH)	Moore (KS)	Shays
Kagen	Moore (WI)	Shea-Porter
Kanjorski	Moran (KS)	Sherman
Kaptur	Moran (VA)	Shimkus
Kennedy	Murphy (CT)	Shuler
Kildee	Murphy, Patrick	Sires
Kilpatrick	Murphy, Tim	Skelton
Kind	Murtha	Slaughter
King (NY)	Nadler	Smith (NJ)
Kirk	Napolitano	Smith (WA)
Klein (FL)	Neal (MA)	Snyder
Knollenberg	Obey	Space
Kucinich	Olver	Spratt
Kuhl (NY)	Ortiz	Stark
LaHood	Pallone	Stupak
Lampson	Pascrell	Sutton
Langevin	Pastor	Tanner
Larsen (WA)	Payne	Tauscher
Larson (CT)	Perlmutter	Taylor
Latham	Peterson (MN)	Thompson (CA)
LaTourette	Peterson (PA)	Thompson (MS)
Lee	Platts	Tierney
Levin	Pomeroy	Towns
Lewis (GA)	Porter	Tsongas
Lipinski	Price (NC)	Turner
LoBiondo	Pryce (OH)	Udall (CO)
Loebsack	Rahall	Udall (NM)
Lofgren, Zoe	Ramstad	Upton
Lowe	Reichert	Van Hollen
Lynch	Reyes	Velázquez
Mahoney (FL)	Reynolds	Visclosky
Maloney (NY)	Richardson	Walsh (NY)
Markey	Rodriguez	Walz (MN)
Marshall	Rogers (AL)	Wasserman
Matheson	Ros-Lehtinen	Schultz
Matsui	Ross	Watson
McCarthy (NY)	Rothman	Watt
McCaul (TX)	Roybal-Allard	Waxman
McCollum (MN)	Ruppersberger	Weiner
McDermott	Ryan (OH)	Welch (VT)
McGovern	Salazar	Wexler
McHugh	Sánchez, Linda	Wilson (OH)
McIntyre	T.	Wittman (VA)
McNerney	Sanchez, Loretta	Wolf
McNulty	Sarbanes	Wu
Meek (FL)	Saxton	Wynn
Meeks (NY)	Schakowsky	Yarmuth
Melancon	Schiff	
Michaud	Schwartz	
Miller (NC)	Scott (GA)	

NAYS—140

Aderholt	Feeney	McHenry
Akin	Flake	McMorris
Alexander	Forbes	Rodgers
Bachmann	Fossella	Mica
Barrett (SC)	Fox	Miller (FL)
Bartlett (MD)	Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)
Barton (TX)	Galleghy	Miller, Gary
Bilbray	Garrett (NJ)	Musgrave
Bishop (UT)	Gingrey	Myrick
Blackburn	Gohmert	Neugebauer
Blunt	Goode	Nunes
Boehner	Goodlatte	Paul
Bonner	Granger	Pearce
Brady (TX)	Hall (TX)	Pence
Brown (GA)	Hastings (WA)	Petri
Brown (SC)	Hayes	Pickering
Brown-Waite,	Heller	Pitts
Ginny	Hensarling	Poe
Burgess	Hergert	Price (GA)
Burton (IN)	Hobson	Putnam
Buyer	Hoekstra	Radanovich
Calvert	Hunter	Regula
Camp (MI)	Inglis (SC)	Rehberg
Campbell (CA)	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Cannon	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (MI)
Cantor	Jones (NC)	Rohrabacher
Carter	Jordan	Roskam
Chabot	Keller	Royce
Coble	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Cole (OK)	Kingston	Sali
Conaway	Kline (MN)	Schmidt
Crenshaw	Lamborn	Sensenbrenner
Cubin	Latta	Sessions
Culberson	Lewis (CA)	Shadegg
Davis (KY)	Lewis (KY)	Shuster
Davis, David	Lucas	Simpson
Davis, Tom	Lungren, Daniel	Smith (NE)
Deal (GA)	E.	Smith (TX)
Doolittle	Mack	Souder
Drake	Manzullo	Stearns
Dreier	Marchant	Sullivan
Duncan	McCarthy (CA)	Terry
Everett	McCotter	Thornberry
Fallin	McCrery	Tiahrt

Tiberi	Weldon (FL)	Wilson (NM)
Walberg	Weller	Wilson (SC)
Walden (OR)	Westmoreland	Young (FL)
Wamp	Whitfield (KY)	

NOT VOTING—12

Gutierrez	Oberstar	Tancredo
Hoohey	Rangel	Waters
Linder	Renzi	Woolsey
McKeon	Rush	Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain on this vote.

□ 1507

So (two-thirds not being in the affirmative) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, before we resolve into the Committee of the Whole, I ask unanimous consent that Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks, and submit matters relevant to consideration of H. Con. Res. 312, Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2009.

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

There was no objection.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1036 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 312.

□ 1511

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 312) revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2008, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2009, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2010 through 2013, with Mrs. TAUSCHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

General debate shall not exceed 4 hours, with 3 hours confined to the congressional budget, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, and 1 hour on the subject of economic goals and policies, equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON). The gentleman from

South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) each will control 90 minutes on the congressional budget.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 14 minutes.

Madam Chairman, today we take up the budget resolution. Passing it, like many things in this House, is never easy, and sometimes contentious. But it is crucially important if we care about fiscal soundness and the future of our country.

Our country faces right now a host of different challenges: the specter of recession, a crunch in the credit markets, rising unemployment, declining family income, constant inflation in the cost of health care, aging infrastructure, and a porous safety net. And that is not to mention the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, costing us close to \$200 billion this year, and even more dearly in human lives and wounded.

The President's budget for 2009 does little to turn this tide. In fact, the policies of the last 7 years have created some of these problems and compounded others. Eight short years ago, in 2000, our budget was in surplus, big-time surplus. In that year, we had a surplus of \$236 billion. Having worked for years to bring the budget to this status, we warned the President and our colleagues across the aisle not to bet it all on a blue-sky forecast; but it was to no avail.

The President's economists looked out 10 years and saw nothing but surpluses, \$5.6 trillion in all. We worried that if these rosy projections didn't pan out, we would be right back where we had been, deep in deficit.

□ 1515

Well, the President told the country, in effect, that we could have it all, guns, butter and tax cuts, too, and never mind the deficits.

I'll have to admit it looked as though we were sitting on an island of surpluses, but, in truth, we were surrounded by a sea of debt, of long-term unfunded liabilities for Social Security and Medicare, coming due just over the horizon.

Seven years later, under this administration's policies, those surpluses are history. They're gone, vanished, replaced with record deficits and mounting debt.

This one chart here which shows in tabular form the increase in the debt over the last 8 years, says it as simply as we can on one piece of paper. When the President came to office, the debt of this country was \$5.7 trillion. When he leaves in a few months, it will probably be close to \$10 trillion, more than \$4 trillion in debt accumulation on the watch of the Bush administration.

The budget we take up today is no grand solution, I'll grant you that, but it moves us in the right direction. It restores fiscal responsibility, but not to the exclusion of other values that

we hold dear such as our children's education and their good health care. And that's why, right off the bat, we part company with the President's budget and with Mr. RYAN's substitute.

We think Medicare is one of our country's crowning achievements, so we reject his cuts that would emasculate Medicare, in the President's budget, \$556 billion over 10 years, and we reject his cuts in Medicaid, \$118 billion over 10 years.

The Ryan substitute over 5 years would cut Medicare by \$253 billion by our calculation, and Medicaid by \$116 billion. We can't vote for that.

We would not wipe out the Social Services Block Grant or cripple the Community Services Block Grants as the President proposes, because we have seen in our own communities the roles they play. They hold up the safety net in an economy where it's sorely needed. And with fuel prices at record highs, the last thing we would slash is LIHEAP and low-income home weatherization. These are minimum benefits for Americans with maximum needs.

Ten years ago when we first ran a surplus, we resolved in both Houses to use some of that surplus each year to double the resources of the National Institutes of Health, the NIH, over a period of 5 years. We reached that goal in a bipartisan way, only to backslide year by year in this administration. In our budget this year we stop the backsliding at NIH, and we restore the President's cuts at the equally important Centers For Disease Control.

Our budget targets other resources to strengthen our economy and our society. We invest more in innovation, more in energy, more in infrastructure, and we provide \$7.1 billion more than the President for education.

To move our country one step closer to health care for all, we facilitate up to \$50 billion to expand SCHIP, the children's health insurance program, consistent with PAYGO, requiring that the costs be fully offset. We also accommodate fiscally responsible relief from the alternative minimum tax in order to shelter those middle-income taxpayers for whom it was never intended.

To make America safe, we fully fund defense, and we keep our promises to those who have fought for our defense, providing \$3.6 billion above current services for veterans health care.

Now Mr. RYAN puts another billion on top of that in his budget, but he also puts in function 920, this is budget esoterica, but he puts in function 920 a call for \$400 billion in undistributed cuts. One of those cuts would likely be that apparent increase in veterans health care.

Although we fix the AMT for another year, providing a tax cut of \$70 billion to middle-income Americans, our Republican colleagues will accuse us of raising taxes. You've already heard it. The fact is, our budget doesn't raise taxes by one penny. But don't take my word for it. Stop by the manager's

table right here on the House floor and read the letters that we've received from groups like the Concord Coalition, or look at the posters that we just posted here.

Here's what the Concord Coalition says: "Allowing some or all of the tax cuts to expire would not be the result of Congress raising taxes; it would be the result of sunsets that were included when these tax cuts were originally enacted to avoid the level of fiscal scrutiny that PAYGO is designed to ensure." That's what the Concord Coalition has to say about our resolution.

If you want to see more, turn to section 501 in our budget resolution, title 5, section 501, and we enumerate, from item A through H, child tax credit, marital penalty relief, the 10 percent bracket, estate taxes, extension of research experimentation tax credit, extension of the State and local sales tax deduction, extension of the deduction for small business expenses and it goes on. These are the tax cuts that we embrace and commit ourselves to seeing renewed when they do eventually expire.

We believe that tax relief can come in a deficit-neutral tax bill in some cases, and we offer the AMT as an example. On more than one occasion, high-ranking officials in the Bush administration have testified before our committee, and when they're asked about the AMT and its impact on middle-income taxpayers, they've insisted that they could fix the AMT with changes in the Tax Code so that there would be no net loss of revenues.

For example, in February 2006 Josh Bolten was the director of OMB. He told our committee that the AMT could be corrected in the context of overall deficit-neutral tax reform, his words.

In February 2007, his successor, Rob Portman, told the Budget Committee, "Our budget assumes it will have a revenue-neutral correction to the AMT."

The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. RANGEL, has taken the same stance, but Mr. RANGEL has delivered. He's put a revenue-neutral bill on the table to kindle the debate. The Bush administration asserts it too has a plan, but has failed to follow through by disclosing any plan of its own.

One of the first steps that we took in the 110th Congress was to restore the pay-as-you-go rules that had helped us in the 1990s turn record deficits into record surpluses. This resolution fully complies with the PAYGO rule.

Partly because we've held mandatory spending in check with PAYGO and, at the same time, kept domestic discretionary spending close to the rate of inflation, this budget returns to surplus in 2012. Our bottom line beats the President's budget going away. Between 2009 and 2013, our net deficits are \$262 billion. Over the same period the President's net deficits are \$674 billion. And using CBO's latest forecast, our budget should be in surplus by 2012 in the amount of \$178 billion. And from

2012 through 2018 our cumulative surplus should reach \$1.4 trillion, all told.

Now we could have used the lion's share of those surpluses to offset the revenues lost to renewal of expiring tax cuts, and surpluses of \$1.4 trillion would indeed offset a huge amount of revenues forgone. We chose instead to leave those decisions to a time closer to December 31, 2010, when the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts expire. But when the time is right, if those surpluses materialize, they can be used to offset the renewal of numerous expiring tax cuts, disproving our opponents' claim that we don't intend to renew and extend any of the expiring cuts.

In our resolution we also provide \$940 million for program integrity, much of it going to the Internal Revenue Service for audits and compliance. The Commissioner told us not so many months ago that there's a huge tax gap, maybe \$500 billion, between taxes owed and taxes paid, the so-called tax gap. If we can close that gap just a bit, we can raise tax revenues without raising tax rates. These funds can likewise be used as offsets.

So there are many ways to look at tax cuts in the code. And what we are saying here is that we should use the next several years, before the tax cuts expire, to do all of the above so that we will have the revenues to renew many of these tax cuts and restructure the AMT in keeping with PAYGO principles. That's simply what we are proposing.

Our budget parallels the President's budget with respect to national defense. It funds the basic defense budget at the levels the President requested for 5 years, but does not include supplemental funds beyond the \$700 billion sought by the President. The President's budget for 2009 does include a \$70 billion item which the Pentagon calls a placeholder. To compare our budget to the President's budget, apples to apples, our resolution includes a \$70 billion placeholder equal to the President's request for overseas deployments and activities in theaters that include Afghanistan and Iraq. This budget resolution is not an authorization bill. It's not an appropriations bill, and therefore, it cannot prescribe how much should be spent for these activities or specify where the funds should be spent. Those decisions are left to the authorization and appropriation process, in committee and on this floor. These funds, however, can be used for whatever purpose the Congress eventually chooses in authorizing and appropriating legislation.

When we set out to do this budget, our overriding objective, Madam Chairman, was a balanced budget, because we're appalled at the amount of debt being left our children, and at our stature in the world as the greatest debtor nation. But we want more than arithmetic balance; we want our priorities balanced; we want a budget that does more for our children's education and their health care as well, a budget that

makes our workers more competitive and our scientists more innovative.

We want to revive America, restore our fiscal soundness, reclaim our future. This budget is just one step, but it's one step in the right direction.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 12½ minutes.

Madam Chairman, in many ways I believe our two parties agree on many things. We both agree on the need to balance the budget. We agree on the need for solid, sustained economic growth that produces an abundance of good-paying American jobs. And we agree that the looming entitlement crisis is the greatest threat to our Nation's economic and budgetary future.

But as this budget makes clear, there is a glaring disagreement on how best to achieve these goals, or as in the case of entitlements, even to address this challenge.

Republicans believe that the best America is an America free from the burden of Big Government. We believe that the nucleus of our society, the engine of economic growth in this country, is the individual, the family, the entrepreneur, not the government. And we believe that the more the Federal Government expands demands and takes from these citizens, the less freedom they will have and the less opportunity to realize their own potential.

Clearly, the Democrats have a much different philosophy. They believe that bigger government is better government, and they believe that the best way, the only way to meet our Nation's myriad challenges is with an ever larger Federal Government fueled by even higher spending, financed by ever higher taxes. With this budget, the Democrats have proven their commitment to this philosophy. And as it did last year, the first thing this budget does is tout a whole lot of new spending for, as we heard in last week's speeches and press conferences and as we heard today, for everyone and everything.

But right next to this budget's much hyped new spending priorities and promises are somewhat less advertised big new tax hikes on American workers, families and small businesses, many of whom are already struggling to make ends meet.

In recent months, we've seen a whole host of legitimate concerns in the economy. Growth and job creation are slowing, and many Americans are seeing their home values falling. At the same time their food, energy and health care bills are going up. The worst thing we could do to these families or the struggling economy is raise taxes. But if we pass this budget, that's exactly what we will be doing. Passing this budget means imposing on the economy and on our constituents the largest tax increase in American history.

One of the most ironic things about the Democrats' tax increase is that it comes on the heels of this bipartisan

economic stimulus plan. Just last month, Congress passed a stimulus package to give struggling families some of their tax dollars back and provide incentives for businesses to expand and create jobs. But before we could even get these checks out the door, the Democrats unveiled this budget that will take all that money back plus demand hundreds of billions more new higher taxes. Far from consistent tax policy, that's not even coherent tax policy. Is \$600 really going to make a difference to somebody in Janesville, Wisconsin with a tax increase of nearly \$3,000 per year looming on the horizon? Does a one-time check of \$1,200 really make up for later raising taxes on that same family of four by \$6,000 each and every year?

This budget will raise marginal tax rates on all income taxpayers, including low-income individuals who are benefitting from the 10 percent bracket. This budget will slash the \$1,000 per child tax credit in half. It will reinstate the marriage tax penalty. It will make it that much harder for families to pay their mortgages, pay their grocery bills and send their kids to college.

□ 1530

Unlike the Democrats' rhetoric would have you believe, we are not just talking about hurting rich people. I know a whole lot of people back in Wisconsin who paid taxes, who are married and who have kids who do not consider themselves anything close to rich. But this budget's tax cuts will hit every single American taxpayer, whether or not they checked some imaginary "rich" box on their tax form.

Now, again, my friends on the other side of the aisle insist this isn't their plan, that they're really not going to raise your taxes. They've got all of these groups from the left saying that's not happening. But yet they keep writing those tax hikes in their budget. Why? Because their numbers would never work. Their budget would never show balance. And without those massive tax hikes, this budget requires, includes, assumes, mandates a \$683 billion tax increase over just 5 years.

First, because it exhumes the complete expiration of the 2001 and 2003 tax laws. And because of their own PAYGO rule, just to continue those same laws which are already in place, they're required to offset those current provisions with an equal tax increase of \$683 billion. So whatever way you cut it, you can't avoid it. It is a tax increase, a big one, the biggest we've ever seen.

And second, because they're already committed, every one of those tax dollars, to pay for their new spending. Beyond admitting the burden these tax hikes will put on our constituents and the economy, this Congress has got to understand that we will never rid our government of deficits and debt by simply raising taxes.

Our problem has never been that Americans aren't sending enough of

their taxpayer dollars to Washington. Our problem has always been, and is clearly today, that Washington is spending too much money and far too quickly to be sustained.

But for all of the Democrats' purported concern about the deficit, all they've chosen to do since they came into the majority is spend more and more money. This year's budget would certainly continue that trend. The Democrats' budget proposes to increase entitlement spending by untold amounts of the use of numerous reserve funds. At the same time, they want to increase nonsecurity discretionary spending by more than \$22 billion over the President's request.

But even while demanding billings and new spending, they fail to do anything to reduce the wasteful spending already included in these budgets. In fact, last year, the majority's appropriations bill included over 11,000 earmarks at a cost of nearly \$15 billion to taxpayers.

This year, the majority has already rejected Republican calls for an earmark moratorium or even earmark reform to reduce the wasteful, self-serving spending. In this regard, we can expect more of the same; another year and another choice by the majority of pork over paychecks. But for all of the additional spending, the worst thing that is not in this budget is not what it does, but the many things it fails to do.

First, I think it's fair to note that if we apply the Democrats' own standards, this budget doesn't even achieve balance. That's because this budget suffers from the same shortcomings that the Democrats criticized the President's budget for doing just weeks ago.

This budget doesn't pay for the AMT fix and it doesn't pay for the war, as the chairman so eloquently criticized the Bush budget just a couple weeks ago. As a result, this chart shows that this budget doesn't really balance in 2012; instead, it remains in the red for as far as the eye can see.

Finally, for the second straight year, the majority budget fails to include even one meaningful reform to address our entitlement crisis. This means that even if this budget were to balance in 2012, it would be quickly driven right back into deficit by these programs' current path of growth. By ignoring this problem, this budget ignores every one of the witnesses we've called before the Budget Committee who have warned that our largest entitlement programs, particularly Medicare and Medicaid and Social Security, simply cannot be sustained as currently structured.

These experts have told us unequivocally that if we fail to reform these programs, not only will they grow themselves right into extinction, they will impose a crushing burden on our debt, on our budget, and all but eliminate our Nation's ability to compete in the global marketplace.

Our Nation's chief accountant, GAO Comptroller General Walker, recently

testified that the long-term fiscal obligation of the U.S. Government is \$53 trillion, or about \$180,000 in unfunded liability for every man, woman, and child in the United States. It is \$180,000 per person. You can buy really nice homes in Wisconsin for \$180,000.

And we know that this problem, once dismissed as somewhere off in the future, is already upon us. On February 12 of this year, last month, the first baby boomer, a retired teacher from Maryland, received her first Social Security check. And right on her heels are over 80 million other baby boomers who will qualify for both Social Security and Medicare right after her. And just last month, the Medicare trigger was set off sending a clear warning shot to Congress that we must act immediately to get this program on a sustainable path.

In fact, by doing nothing, by ignoring this problem for another 5 years, the Democrats' budget will add another \$14 trillion in unfunded liability for future generations. And this is just in the next 5 years. Over the long run, the problem will grow much worse than that.

As this chart shows, by the year 2040, our three largest entitlement programs alone will consume 20 percent of our economy, equivalent to the cost of the entire Federal Government today. By this time, the overall size of government will consume 40 percent of our Nation's GDP, more than double the historic average of 18.3 percent.

What that means in real life is my three children, who are 3, 4, and 6 years old, by the time they are exactly my age, they will have to pay twice the level of taxes we pay today just to keep today's Federal Government afloat for them at that time. Add no new programs and take none away, for my three kids, when they are my age, they will have to bear twice the burden we bear today just to pay the bills of the Federal Government before they can keep any money left in their own paychecks.

The only choice we would leave them would be to pay the crippling tax burden or simply accept the fact that their Nation can no longer afford health care, education, or even defense or national security. I can't imagine any one of us who finds that kind of future acceptable, but this is exactly what this budget confines them to do.

Everyone talks about this common entitlement as our greatest challenge, and rightfully so, but it is also our greatest opportunity. Today, with this budget, we have an opportunity to save our largest retirement and health safety net programs from financial ruin. We can make these programs better, stronger, more responsive, more resilient, more sustainable, and more in line with the way our economy works today.

And if we act now, we have the opportunity to make these reforms in a rational, well-thought-out way. We don't have to wait for the crisis to hit.

But regrettably, that's exactly what the Democratic majority would have us do. With this budget, they are simply accepting that we are going to continue to pile up massive amounts of debt for our children and we are going to force them to pay double what we do in taxes to keep these programs afloat in the future.

In closing, let me say that I have come to know and respect many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. In particular, I think the gentleman from South Carolina is the definition of a true Southern gentleman. He's a class-act man, and I don't have any doubt in my mind that every one of them on the other side of the aisle are just as well intentioned and just as concerned about our Nation's future as anyone is on this side of the aisle.

Every one of us wants our Nation to remain strong, safe, prosperous, and free today and well into the future. Every one of us wants to pass on to the next generation a world that is even better than the one our parents gave us. By giving us these jobs, by sending us to Congress, that's exactly what our constituents entrusted us to do.

With that great responsibility in mind, I will be opposing this budget that we are considering today. This budget misses an historic opportunity to put our Nation on a better path. Instead, they choose the path of Big Government, higher spending, higher taxes, higher debt. I can only hope that this Congress will choose to change its course before it's too late, because if we fail, we may be the first generation to sever that precious, fragile American legacy of leaving a better standard of living for future generations.

With that, Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Chairman, I yield 14 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Madam Chairman, before I talk about how this budget will help keep America secure, let me just respond by saying I'm glad we live in a country where speech is free. But when I hear my Republican colleagues talk about the burden of crushing debt as they try to attack our budget this year, I would remind the American people that these were the architects of \$4 trillion in national debt over the last 8 years; \$4 trillion of national debt that will lead to an annual tax of \$188 billion on my children until the day they die just to pay interest on the debt they created in the last 4 years with their partisan budgets.

Madam Chairman, keeping America safe and secure should always be a top national priority. That's why, with this budget, House Democrats provide for a strong national defense and invest billions more on homeland security, veterans health care than the President's budget request.

Here are 10 reasons why this budget helps keep America safe and secure:

First, it increases the national defense budget by \$37.5 billion over last

year to a 7.5 percent increase, excluding costs for wars in Iraq and Afghanistan;

Second, this budget will improve military readiness, especially for the National Guard and Reserves;

Third, we say "no" to the administration's ill-advised cuts of \$430 million in programs to protect Americans from the threat of nuclear terrorism;

Fourth, this budget provides funds to implement the 9/11 Commission recommendations, such as better screening of cargo and passenger aircraft and ship containers coming from foreign seaports;

Fifth, we say "no" to the administration's proposed billion dollars in cuts for first responders such as firefighters and police officers;

Sixth, the Democratic budget rejects the administration's proposal to cut \$705 million from the State's Homeland Security grant program;

Seventh, we actually fund the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, in contrast to the administration, which zeroes out this program which helps communities incarcerate illegal criminal aliens;

Eighth, the Democratic budget increases veterans health care and benefits by \$3.2 billion above the President's request. We believe our Nation should keep its promises to those who've kept their promise to serve. The fact is, with this budget, in 2 years, the Democratic-led Congress will have increased veterans funding by more than the Republican-led Congress did in 12 years;

Ninth, the Military Officers Association of America, MOAA, applauds this bill for honoring our military troops and retirees by replacing the administration's \$1.2 billion shortfall in defense health care and for rejecting massive fee increases to the military TRICARE health program;

Tenth, and finally, the DAV, American Legion, AMVETS, Paralyzed Veterans of America, and numerous other veterans organizations respected across our land have applauded what this bill does for veterans. Listen to what the executive director of the Veterans for Foreign Wars said about the budget bill we passed last year and this one: It is an unparalleled commitment to veterans service and sacrifice.

Madam Chairman, I think that says it well.

At this time, I would like to recognize and yield to the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER), who's been a tireless champion of America's veterans.

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chairman, we have an administration that says support the troops, support the troops, support the troops. Then they give us the budget that cuts support for veterans over the next 5 years, year by year by year, and with a modest increase for health care that barely covers inflation. It cut every single account in the veterans budget, including

construction, including research, all of the way through. So we restore, if I'm correct, Mr. EDWARDS, we restore all of those cuts.

And for the seventh year in a row, the President said, Let's increase enrollment fees. Let's double the pharmaceutical copays, and we, for the seventh year in a row are saying "no." But not only did they increase the fees, they made a calculation that several hundred thousand veterans would not be able to pay those fees and be thrown out of the health care system. That, in a time of war where we got our troops fighting, they're going to throw veterans out of the VA health care system. That is disgraceful, and we said "no" to that.

And I thank the gentleman for making sure that we respected these warriors. It's part of the cost of war to treat the veterans correctly. Mr. EDWARDS and Mr. SPRATT, you provided for those veterans. The whole country thanks you.

Mr. EDWARDS. Madam Chairman, at this point, for engaging in a colloquy, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE.)

Mr. ALTMIRE. Madam Chairman, I'm proud of this budget because it continues on the great work that we did last year after years and years of chronic underfunding of the veterans health care system. We added \$13 billion in funding for the VA, which is the largest increase in the 77-year history of the VA, and that was great work. And we are following that up this year by adding \$4.9 billion in increased funding and including steady increases over each of the next 5 years.

□ 1545

This budget is true to our American veterans.

In contrast, the President's budget, which does include a modest \$1.7 billion increase this year, it decreases funding in real dollars over the next 4 years, and over the 5-year period, contains a cut in veterans health care spending. And there are 120,000 new veterans entering the system this year. Is there anyone in this body that thinks that health care costs aren't going to go up, that the number of veterans isn't going to go up, people entering the VA health care system? And instead of following the President's lead and cutting veterans health care spending, we're increasing spending to the largest levels in history.

It's endorsed by the VFW, the American Legion, the Vietnam Veterans of America, just to name a few. And this funding means that we're going to clear up the 500,000 case backlog that currently exists in the VA due to that chronic underfunding that took place over the past several years before we increased funding last year. It's going to make improvements at VA clinics, help keep up with growing populations of veterans, including in my home district a \$180 million expansion of the VA health care facility.

It's going to increase research on traumatic brain injury and prosthetics to help our wounded warriors and our wounded veterans. It's going to help us recruit and retain the highest quality health care professionals to ensure that our veterans get nothing less than the highest quality health care available anywhere in the country right at our VA centers.

So, lastly I would say to the gentleman, we have stepped up to the plate. We are going to support our veterans not just with our words, but with our actions. We're going to continue the great work we did last year with a \$4.9 billion increase this year.

I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Mr. EDWARDS. I thank the gentleman for his words and his actions in this Congress on behalf of our Nation's veterans and veterans in your district.

It is now my privilege to yield to Congresswoman BOYDA, the gentlelady from Kansas, for purposes of a colloquy. And I want to thank her for working so hard on behalf of our troops, their families, and our veterans and their families.

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. It has been a pleasure to work with you on behalf of our active duty military and the two VA hospitals that we have in the Second District of Kansas. It's such an important issue for so many people in my district, and they want to know that somebody is fighting for them.

I would just say that it's almost laughable if it weren't so sad to hear the gentleman from Wisconsin talk about this debt as if for the last 7 years we haven't seen a tremendous increase in our national debt.

I, too, am absolutely worried sick about the fact that my children are going to have to pay the \$4 trillion of debt that we've incurred since they've been in the majority, or actually, in the last 7 years. But Mr. Chairman, let me just say that what makes me feel so good about this new majority and this budget that we've brought forward, in those years since we've seen that increase in debt that's going to be so devastating to us, what have we gotten for it? In 12 years, we've seen the debt double, and yet we only saw \$16 billion go into veterans benefits at a time when they needed them so badly. In the last year, with our fiscally responsible budget, we will have added in the last 2 years \$17 billion. It's just a matter of priorities.

We all are very concerned about the budget deficit that the Republicans have just escalated beyond control. You and I are working together to make sure that we have priorities that reflect the priorities of the American people. Since 2003, the backlog has increased by 50 percent. We have cut so much funding out. And so, thank God that we have put some of this money back in.

And I know the people of Kansas want to make sure that the money

they are sending to Washington, D.C. is used well and is used for the veterans that have gone out and fought so bravely for our country.

Mr. Chairman, I am so pleased to be a strong supporter of this budget and a strong supporter of the veterans. It's easy, very easy to put a yellow ribbon on your car. And I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania who just spoke, we need to have action, not just words.

Mr. EDWARDS. I thank the gentlelady from Kansas for your powerful advocacy on behalf of our veterans and our military.

I would now like to recognize and yield for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARNEY).

Mr. CARNEY. I would like to thank the gentleman from Texas for the opportunity to engage in this colloquy. Thank you, Mr. EDWARDS.

It is sort of ironic that under the previous Congresses, their idea of fiscal discipline was to raise the debt ceiling to \$9 trillion, I find that interesting, while at the same time we have seen homeland security funding only being paid lip service to and not really being taken care of.

As you know, nine out of 10 Americans live in areas that are prone to natural disasters, and of course we're not prepared to take care of them. The Coast Guard itself said that we are only 25 percent along the way to meeting the needs to protect our ports, that 75 percent of those needs have gone unmet in homeland security.

We can fulfill the 9/11 Commission requests here, H.R. 1, take care of those funding priorities that make us all safer.

The cuts to first responders I can't believe. I worked my way through college, actually, as a paramedic/EMT back in Cedar Rapids, Iowa. It's unconscionable the kinds of cuts that have been done. The State Homeland Security grants, I just want to make a quick list here, the administration cut it by \$705 million. The Urban Area Security Initiative, cut by \$9 million. Fire grants, the very grants that protect us in the rural areas, cut by \$463 million by the administration. The Byrne Justice Assistance Grants, zeroed out, eliminated entirely. The COPS program, cut by \$599 million. We make sure we put \$417 million back into the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, the administration zeroed that out, the very program that enables local communities to handle undocumented criminals that they capture.

Finally, the President's budget only funds \$210 million of the \$400 million authorized to make sure the Coast Guard takes care of our ports. This is irresponsible, never mind unconscionable.

I'm proud of this budget. This budget goes a long way towards protecting this country, a lot further than previous budgets.

Thank you, Mr. EDWARDS.

Mr. EDWARDS. I thank the gentleman for pointing out that it takes budgets to defend our Nation, our communities and our families, not just rhetoric.

At this time I would like to recognize the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) for a colloquy. And I want to thank the gentleman for his year-in, year-out work on behalf of our servicemen and -women, their families and our veterans.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. I want to personally thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your leadership throughout the country and your efforts in providing for our veterans.

I know I had the pleasure of serving on the Veterans Committee, and nothing was more frustrating than during the period of time that I served to just give nothing but lip service, and at the same time see the major cuts of the administration when it came to our veterans after having served our country. When I saw the budgets of the administration continuously bring forth additional fees and copayments on our veterans when both sides were saying that that was not appropriate, he continues to do that with this present budget. And if that was not enough, I know that he cut priority 8 veterans. And I'm glad to see that this budget includes that on there, so I want to personally thank you for that.

In addition, the Democratic budget calls for advance pay and benefits to improve the quality of life of our troops and their families, including the emphasis on providing support and assistance to our troops and their families while they are deployed. And that is essential. It's unfortunate, and we cannot even comprehend how this has come about.

Let me just say, this budget also calls for a \$15.9 billion cut for the next 5 years on our soldiers, on TRICARE. As it is, the reimbursements on TRICARE are real low, to the point that some of our doctors are not going to take some of those soldiers and provide access to health care that they need.

But I want to take this opportunity to thank the chairman and the leadership on this budget effort for making sure that our troops have the resources that are necessary, and to make sure that our veterans, after they come back, have the services that they're entitled to. We need to push forth on making sure those polytrauma centers get built so that access to health care is essential.

Thank you very much for this colloquy.

Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of this Budget resolution. This budget provides for among many other elements the much needed resources for our country's defense needs.

As you know, I represent a very large district that spans from San Antonio in the east to El Paso County in the west and south to the Mexico border. The U.S. military is very

important to my district as evidenced by the BRAC decisions that centralize military medical training in San Antonio and bring soldiers from Europe back to Fort Bliss in El Paso. While the defense budget is important to the Nation as a whole, it has a particularly strong significance to my constituents.

#### EXCELLENT AND AFFORDABLE HEALTHCARE

San Antonio is poised to be the military center of excellence for medical issues with the completion of the current BRAC construction.

The President's budget calls for increases in Tri-care fees for military retirees under the age of 65 by \$15.9 billion over five years.

The military's own have opposed these fees as evidenced by the Military Offices' Association of America's rejection of the fee increases.

MOAA supports the Democratic budget that avoids Tri-care fee hikes and places a continued emphasis on addressing problems such as those identified at Walter Reed Medical Center.

#### READINESS

The Commission on the Guard and Reserve issued a report on January 30, 2008 citing a lack of readiness to respond to a catastrophic attack on the United States.

A major reason for this is the Administration budget that continually prioritizes funding wars in Iraq and Afghanistan while leaving the defense of our homeland at risk.

The Democratic Budget provides greater attention to improving military readiness, in particular for the National Guard and Reserve.

#### ADDITIONAL PAY AND BENEFITS TO THE TROOPS

The Democratic Budget calls for advanced pay and benefits to improve the quality of life of the troops and their families, including an emphasis on providing support and assistance to troops and their families while they are deployed and when they return from deployments to readjust to civilian life.

This is what we owe the Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen, and Marines who have so selflessly fought for our Nation's freedom.

Mr. EDWARDS. I thank the gentleman.

I will conclude by saying that this is a solid budget that defends our Nation, supports a strong national defense, and just as importantly, honors in a meaningful way those who have risked their lives to defend our Nation, our veterans and our military retirees.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds only to say that this budget that's before us raises the national debt by \$646 billion this year, the largest annual increase ever. And that's \$14 trillion of unfunded debt to just two programs, Medicare and Social Security.

With that, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, the vice ranking member of the Budget Committee, Mr. BARRETT.

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, our friends on the other side of the aisle have spent a great deal of time over the past few years railing against deficits and railing against the debt. And last year, their first time in the majority in over a decade, the Democrats finally got

their chance to show their version of what a fiscally responsible Congress should actually look like. But all they've done since they've come into power is mismanage the fiscal situation.

The key to managing and to budgeting is to set priorities, and everyone who has ever had a family or run a business knows this. You have to make difficult choices, and you can't always have everything you want right when you want it.

But the Democrats have refused to set priorities. They simply want to spend more on everything and everyone within the reach of the Federal Government. And we've even seen things that they spend money on that the Federal Government has absolutely nothing to do with.

And to pay for all this new spending? Well, they're simply going to raise taxes, this time by \$683 billion. That tax hike lets them show balance, at least on paper, for this round of spending. But their plan to chase ever-higher spending with ever-higher taxes can only work for so long. Pretty soon, as their spending continues to spiral out of control without any priorities, without any effort to cut waste, and without any effort to reform entitlements, they're simply going to run out of people to pay for it all. Then what?

Again, budgeting is about setting priorities and making decisions. But the decisions this budget makes, and perhaps more importantly, those that it fails to make, sets up a vicious cycle of tax and spend that neither the budget nor the American taxpayer can sustain for long.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, Madam Chairman, I will yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the ranking member.

The Democrats' budget clearly shows, and depends on collecting, the largest increase in taxes in our Nation's history.

Most tax experts agree that one of the hallmarks of good tax policy is consistency and stability in that code. A high degree of uncertainty about future tax policy makes long-term planning difficult for both families and businesses, and that uncertainty can have a negative impact on economic growth, yet this majority continues to actively foster that uncertainty, again producing a budget that depends on the collection of the largest increase in taxes in American history.

Congress recently passed a bipartisan stimulus package that will give struggling families some of their tax dollars back with the hopes that they will spend this money and bolster our economy. But before they can even get these checks out the door, the Democrats have unveiled a budget that will take back all of that money, plus billions of dollars more. Do we really expect families to go out and spend

money when they've got a host of new income taxes that will dramatically decrease their discretionary income hanging over their heads?

Last year, the new Congress waited until the 11th hour to pass a 1-year AMT patch, in effect threatening more than 20 million Americans with an average tax hike of \$2,000. This AMT slow walk, according to the Treasury, has now forced 3 million taxpayers to delay filing their tax returns to collect child care, education, and energy credits.

If, as the Democrats claim, they actually intend to stick to their PAYGO rule from now on, and as an aside, last night's ethics bill completely ignored the PAYGO impact, Americans can expect to see their tax burdens rise to a level never seen before in our Nation. But just whose tax bills are going to explode, and when, we're not sure.

My point here is that, beyond the damage they will do when taxes actually go up in 2011, 2012 and 2013, the majority is doing a great disservice to American workers and businesses and our economy as a whole by maintaining this tax uncertainty. As a result, we have a whole Nation of workers and businesses with no idea of what their tax burden will look like in the future, let alone in this coming year. And I can't imagine too many folks going out and buying new refrigerators, or too many businesses investing, expanding and the creating new jobs necessary to get our economy back on track with that kind of uncertainty hanging over their heads.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, Madam Chairman, I would like to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, a member of the Budget Committee, Mr. HENSARLING.

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairman, for as many shortcomings as this budget has for what it contains, the largest single tax increase in American history threatening, over the next few years, an increase in family taxes of over \$3,000 a year, an explosion of new government spending in bureaucracy, the largest Federal budget ever, earmarks as far as the eye can see, taking money out of paychecks so some Member of Congress can keep their paycheck, for as bad as this budget is for what it contains, it's even worse for what it doesn't contain.

□ 1600

There is nothing, nothing in this budget that will reform out-of-control entitlement spending. This budget, this Democrat budget, threatens the retirement security of future generations.

And don't take my word for it. Go to the Social Security and Medicare Trustees Report. It's going broke. It is going broke. The Nation can't afford all of the spending that the Democrats are putting forth. Already these programs are threatening future generations with an unconscionable tax hike. We are looking at a fiscal fork in the

road already so that future generations are either, A, going to have to have their taxes doubled, or there will be no Federal Government to speak of except Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security.

Now, our friends on the other side of the aisle say, well, give us a few years and maybe we'll get around to doing something about it. Well, we don't have a few years. We don't have a few years, Mr. Chairman, because every single year that the Democrats choose to kick the can down the road, every single year they choose to ignore the problem, an extra \$2 trillion of debt that they decry is put on our children and our grandchildren.

Mr. Chairman, I got into the parent business 6 years ago. I have a 6-year-old daughter and a 4-year-old son. I know many on that side of the aisle have children and grandchildren. So I'm so perplexed that they don't care about this problem. Every year they ignore it, it's an extra \$8,000 of debt or taxes that are going to be placed on our children and our grandchildren.

But don't take my word for it. Listen to the Federal Reserve: "Without early and meaningful action to address the rapid growth of entitlements, the U.S. economy could be seriously weakened with future generations bearing much of the cost."

Comptroller General Walker: "The rising cost of government entitlements are a fiscal cancer, a fiscal cancer that threatens catastrophic consequences for our country and could bankrupt America."

Those aren't my words, Mr. Chairman. Those are the words of the Comptroller General. Those are the words of the Chairman of the Federal Reserve.

So right now already as the Democrats decry the current debt, do they not believe that Medicare is a debt of the government? Do they not believe Medicaid is a debt of the government? Do they not believe Social Security is a debt of the government? And if so, it is their budget, their budget that is increasing debt and heaping it upon future generations.

This \$8,000 a year that they are putting on future generations, that's enough money for every family in my district to send two children to Texas A&M University for 4 years. It will pay an average mortgage for 2 years. And yet, again, the Democrats know about this problem, Mr. Chairman; they just don't do anything about it.

Now, somebody who grew up listening to a lot of rock and roll, there's a song that I'm very fond of called "Ohio" by Neil Young, and there's a line in that song that says, "How can you run when you know?" And that's what I ask about this budget. How can the Democrats run when they know what they are doing to future generations?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California, the ranking

member of the Appropriations Committee (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, our friends on the other side of the aisle are fond of saying that a budget is a moral document. It shows what we care about. I couldn't agree more.

The majority's bloated budget blueprint is a clear demonstration to families across America that the Democratic majority in Congress is intently focused on dipping its fingers into their pockets to take more and more of their hard-earned money. It shows that the Democratic majority will raise taxes, without hesitation, to support its addiction to spending. And it shows that Democrats in Congress are not interested in making difficult choices, setting priorities, or rooting out waste in government spending.

What we are considering today is the Democrat majority's "more, more, more resolution." More spending, more budget gimmicks, and more taxes.

As my colleagues well remember, we held the line on spending last year thanks solely to the President and Republicans in Congress. The President's budget requested this year \$59 billion, or a 6.3 percent increase, in discretionary spending over the present fiscal year. Most people would think \$59 billion is plenty, but it's not enough for the "more, more, more budget."

We hear our Democrat colleagues pay a great deal of lip service to the poor. But here's what failing to extend these tax cuts in the years ahead will do to the poor:

Six million low-income American families will no longer qualify for earned income tax credits;

Low-income families with one or two children will no longer be eligible for the refundable child tax credit;

Roughly 12 million single women with children will see their taxes increase by \$1,100 a year.

As disconcerting as all of this may be, the real 800-pound gorilla sitting in the corner of the room is the problem, and that is entitlement spending. Presently, mandatory spending and interest on the national debt consumes nearly two-thirds of the Federal budget, and it is rising at an alarming and unsustainable pace.

If we ignore the 800-pound gorilla, we are walking away from the dire needs, desperate needs, of the American public.

Mr. Chairman, our friends on the other side of the aisle are fond of saying that a budget is a moral document—it shows what we care about. I couldn't agree more.

The majority's bloated budget blueprint is a clear demonstration to families across America that the Democrat majority in Congress is intently focused on dipping its fingers into their pockets to take more and more of their hard-earned money. It shows that the Democrat majority will raise taxes—without hesitation—to support its addiction to spending. And, it shows that Democrats in Congress are not interested in making difficult choices, setting priorities, or rooting out waste in government spending.

What we are considering today is the Democrat majority's "More, More, More Budget Resolution"—more spending, more budget gimmicks, more taxes. For the first time in history, the discretionary budget that is being proposed by this majority will exceed one trillion dollars.

As my colleagues well remember, we held the line on spending last year thanks solely to the President and Republicans in Congress. In spite of the desire of our Democrat colleagues to spend far more, this Congress passed appropriations bills that totaled roughly \$933 billion in discretionary funding.

The President's budget requested a \$59 billion, or 6.3 percent, increase in discretionary spending over the present fiscal year. Most people would think that a \$59 billion increase in spending would be enough. But not this majority. They are proposing a whopping \$82 billion, or nine percent, increase over current year levels.

In addition to the tens of billions of additional taxpayer funds they're proposing to spend next year, this majority intends to play budget games and increase advance appropriations by another \$2 billion above what was provided this year.

The notion of advance appropriations is arcane budget talk so I'll try to break it down into real English. The majority is committing an additional \$2 billion in funding for next year—remember, we don't pay for it this year, we pay for it next year.

My colleague from New York, Mr. WALSH, correctly pointed out during consideration of the fiscal year 2008 Labor/HHS bill that advance funding is a dangerous proposition because if Congress does not keep providing at least the same level of advance funding year after year, drastic cuts will be needed to live within the allocations each appropriations subcommittee receives.

I want to address another troubling aspect of this budget proposal. We have heard—and will continue to hear—our friends on the other side of the aisle talk about how this budget cuts taxes. Nothing could be further from the truth. By failing to make permanent the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts, this budget actually increases the tax burden on American citizens by \$683 billion over the next five years.

That's a pretty big number, but let me break this number down in a manner that makes sense to the average family sitting around their kitchen table. Under this budget, the average American family of four that earns \$50,000 per year will send an additional \$2,100 to Washington in 2011.

We hear our Democratic colleagues pay a great deal of lip service to the poor, but here's what failing to extend these tax cuts does to low-income Americans: 6 million low-income Americans will no longer qualify for the Earned Income Tax Credit; low-income families with one or two children will no longer be eligible for the refundable child tax credit; roughly 12 million single women with children will see their taxes increase by \$1,100 per year; and about 18 million seniors living on fixed incomes will be subjected to tax increases of more than \$2,100 per year.

As disconcerting as the rampant spending is, let's not lose sight of the fact that this budget ignores the 800-pound gorilla sitting in the corner of the room—entitlement spending. Presently, mandatory spending and interest on the national debt consumes nearly two-thirds

of the Federal budget and it is rising at an alarming, unsustainable pace.

In 1990, we spent the equivalent of \$893 billion of today's dollars on entitlement programs—mostly Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid. Today we are poised to spend \$1.6 trillion on those same entitlements. For those who like to talk in percentages, that represents a 74 percent increase in inflation adjusted dollars. We ignore this sleeping giant at our own peril.

So my friends, let's ask ourselves this question: who will pay for this budget? The simple answer is our children and our grandchildren.

They will pay for it in the form of higher taxes because this budget refuses to make permanent the tax cuts enacted in 2001 and 2003 that spurred roughly 6 years of economic growth.

They will pay for it in the form of reduced future prosperity because Government will continue to spend and spend and spend.

They will pay for it because their Government would consume more and more of what they earn rather than allowing them to invest, create jobs, and improve their quality of life.

In short, Mr. Chairman, this "big government, Washington-knows-best" budget suggests that politicians and bureaucrats in Washington are better stewards of the public's money than the very families who send it here.

My advice to the American taxpayer is this: Hold onto your wallet because the big spenders in Congress are coming to take more of what you can earn.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to reject the majority's bloated budget resolution. It's time to put Uncle Sam on a diet.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the newest member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, for those Americans brave enough to be watching this proceeding right now on TV, I'd ask them to sit down because I have some shocking news to share with them. And here it is: The Federal Government spends a lot of money.

Big surprise; right?

How much money are we talking here? How about \$23,000 per year per household.

My guess is that with the exception of our military, it's tough for the average American to name one thing the Federal Government does well.

This budget proposes to spend more than \$3.1 trillion. That, Mr. Chairman, is not an easy thing to do. To reach \$3.1 trillion, the Federal Government will have to spend \$100,000 a second, 6 million bucks a minute, over 350 million bucks an hour every day for the next year. Whoever thought that Senator Dirksen's line about "a billion here, a billion there" would become outdated?

Mr. Chairman, we've heard of tax-and-spend politicians, but I believe it's spending that drives taxes. And reckless out-of-control spending has put us on a path for economic disaster.

And don't take my word for it. Ask outgoing Comptroller General David

Walker, who is sounding the alarm across the country about the unsustainable rate at which Congress is spending.

The American people instinctively know that Congress has an insatiable appetite for spending. They can see it. In terms of real dollars, Congress has quadrupled spending over my lifetime.

The question is, for what? Why do we need four times more Federal Government today than we did in 1964? It's not the military. Defense spending's impact on the budget has decreased by almost two-thirds in real dollars. This, while earmarks have skyrocketed and mandatory spending has grown tenfold.

The real change has been in the mindset. Simply put, Congress has grown to accept the "nanny state." Some Members of this body have grown accustomed to the numbers in this budget. But believe me, they are staggering to the American people, and the people of the Fourth District of Ohio. How staggering? What if, instead of spending \$23,000 per family, the Federal Government spent only \$20,000 per family? We could jump-start this economy with \$400 billion in tax cuts, and we could balance our budget virtually in 1 year.

Mr. Chairman, the sirens are blaring. The alarms are ringing. We need to answer the call and put our fiscal house in order. And we can start by voting "no" on the Democrat budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Chairman, 25 years ago I stood on this floor and didn't quote rock and roll but quoted a country singer called Johnny Paycheck and his famous song "Take This Job and Shove It." It was the lament of the working man imposed upon by many outside forces but predominantly the government's telling him what to do and taking his money. And here I am 25 years later, now a member of the Budget Committee, once again in the minority, and I hear the same thing from my good friends across the aisle: tax and spend, tax and spend, tax and spend, and pretend you're not doing it.

Let's be very clear about this budget. You can talk about everything else, but I would like to talk about one thing: taxes. Taxes. I didn't think you would be able to do it.

Mr. Chairman, last year we had the largest tax increase in the history of the United States, which means the largest tax increase in the history of the world, by the way. But they did themselves one better. This is even larger. This tax increase is \$683 billion. Now, that's not the total tax. That's the tax increase we're talking about. I really thought last year we would never see that topped, but we almost double it this year.

Now, what does this mean? When we were debating in the committee, I said,

and I must apologize for this to my constituents in California, that if adopted and implemented, the Democratic budget would impose on my California constituents an increase, average tax hike, of \$3,000. Well, I am corrected. I am corrected. It will actually give an increase, average tax hike, to Californians of \$3,331.

Luckily, my constituents don't live in Connecticut, because there they would get an average tax hike of \$4,311. This is the gift that keeps on giving, or I guess we should say keeps on taking.

So if you want to know if you can stand on the floor of the House and set a record, if you want to be the Olympic champion on steroids of taxes, vote for this budget. Vote for this budget.

Now, I understand if you're an adherent of Big Government, you need big taxes. So if you do believe that we don't have a large enough government, then vote for this budget, because it will increase the size of the Federal Government relative to local government, relative to State government, relative to the average taxpayer, relative to the rest of the world. It will break all records. The largest single tax increase in the history of the world, \$683 billion. Remember that number: \$683 billion.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California, a member of the Budget Committee (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard and we know this budget has the largest tax increase in American history and it also doubles the deficit from what the last Republican budget was. But somehow the majority seems to want to convince us all that this is good for America.

Well, in considering that, I'm reminded of this commercial I see on TV, this guy named Matthew Lesko. Have you seen it? He wears this funny suit with these symbols on it, and they film it right out here on the west side of the Capitol. And he clearly makes a great living. He publishes books to tell people how to get their hands on government money. He says in the commercial: "Let Matthew Lesko be your guide to join the millions each year who get free money, grants, loans, giant contracts, and free assistance from the Federal Government."

Here are some of his book titles: "Free Money for Business"; "Free Money for a Better Home"; "Free Money to Pay Your Bills"; and, my personal favorite, "Free Money to Quit Your Job."

Now, the Democrats would have you believe that they're perpetuating with this budget the concept put forward in this commercial, that government money is free. But you know what? It's not. Because every dollar that the government sends out in free money to somebody is a dollar they took, this

government took, from some American who earned it or that this government borrowed from some American who has yet to earn it but will have to pay it back, plus interest, in the future.

The majority in this budget has refused to set priorities and, instead, is just spending everybody's money on everything and demanding more and more of that money that they would like to think of as free. But we all know every single dollar will eventually come from us.

□ 1615

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me first thank Chairman SPRATT for his leadership and for his work on this budget. And I want to also thank his staff and my staff for really helping us put together I think a very good budget that we support.

This is a budget that, as compared to the Bush budget, I think the Bush budget is really the worst that we have seen in his long line of bad budgets. And with the staggering \$12 billion a month with regard to the cost of the occupation of Iraq, I think it is about \$3 trillion being projected, this is dragging our economy further into what we are calling an "Iraq recession."

It is particularly shameful that the administration would cut programs at this point in health care, in food assistance and in education which would help so many people who desperately need it right now.

That is why I am pleased that the Democratic budget before us rejects those draconian cuts. And I am also pleased that this budget is really war neutral. In fact, as the chairman stated earlier, the \$70 billion placeholder in this budget can be used for whatever policy the Congress eventually chooses in authorizing and appropriating legislation, including redeployment of our troops. Now, over 90 Members of Congress signed a letter to President Bush and said that we would not vote for one more dime for combat operations. Only we will vote for money to redeploy our young men and women and bring them home. So as we approach this fifth anniversary of the invasion and occupation of Iraq, it is far past time that we act on the will of the American people by doing exactly that.

So I want to thank the chairman for this budget. And I urge my colleagues to support this budget and to work quickly toward redeploying our troops, toward addressing the waste, fraud and abuse in the Pentagon budget and begin to bring our troops and our military contractors out of Iraq and refocus our efforts and our budget on the many domestic needs here at home, which this budget does.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. May I inquire how much time remains between the two sides.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. WEINER). The gentleman from Wisconsin has 60½ minutes remaining.

The gentleman from South Carolina has 62 minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I will reserve.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this budget, which represents a down payment on our commitment to restore middle class prosperity. It offers a clear and practical approach to strengthen our economy in a way that helps our workforce thrive. It allows families to reach for that American Dream.

Today, the Bush economy continues to weigh heavily on America's families and businesses. Our Republican colleagues call for fiscal responsibility. That call is a sham. George Bush has added more to the Federal debt than every single President from George Washington to Ronald Reagan. And at the same time, median household income has dropped \$1,000. In the Clinton years, median income rose to \$6,100. Poor economic growth has left nearly 1.6 million more workers unemployed, and long-term unemployment is up by 62 percent. There are over 3.3 million fewer manufacturing jobs today than at the start of this administration. Incomes are flat while everything else goes up, gas prices, food prices, the cost of health care and education.

This is a budget that is strong. It gets us back to basics. It maintains fiscal discipline while making strong economic growth possible, benefiting all American families. It means crucial funding for the Democratic Innovation Agenda and reforms for our tax policy to reduce burdens on middle class families. It means rejecting the President's cuts to critical unemployment programs. Now is not the time to undermine already vulnerable communities. We can act to rebuild crumbling bridges, fix our roads, reduce congestion and make a serious investment in our infrastructure, paving the way for new growth and opportunity.

This budget makes real investments to help workers and create jobs in a fiscally responsible way. It is a budget that reaches balance in 2012. It reflects our priorities as a Nation and our belief that government has a commitment to its citizens to make critical investments in efficient and renewable energy sources, education, job training and health care, the foundation of a strong economy and future growth. It is about making our workforce more productive and making opportunity real. It is about staying competitive. And we share a mutual obligation to get it right.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) for the purposes of engaging in a colloquy.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to note that this budget resolution rejects the many proposed cuts in public education

by the President. The President proposes in his budget to eliminate a total of 47 programs. They are vocational education programs. They are programs for people who repair our plumbing in our homes, who build our houses, who build our roads, who supply the electrical work that gets done, programs like the Perkins Loan cancellations, Even Start, mentoring efforts, and the Reading is Fundamental initiative.

The Spratt budget would also restore initiatives designed to improve teacher quality like Teachers for a Competitive Tomorrow, Advanced Credentialing, and the Teacher Quality Enhancement initiative. If we are going to teach our children, let's have qualified people in the classroom. And it doesn't just automatically happen. It takes money. Industry will tell you that for every person they have, they spend a lot of money in investing in those people. And as the only former State school chief serving in this body, I am particularly pleased about the provision for education initiatives and innovations that have been included in the Spratt resolution.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This resolution provides greater investment in our Nation's schools, including school construction bonds. I have been working on this with Congressman RANGEL for almost 10 years. We need quality places for our children to go to school. And there's important investments in things like Head Start, special education for those who really have needs, and to provide more money to fully fund secondary education.

The chairman's mark also provides for funding for America COMPETES Act. What is this? It expands math and science education at the secondary level. That is in high school. We can't get them in the universities if we can't get them through high school. And Lord knows that in this economy, we need them. Education is the single most important investment that we can make in our future.

I support this budget resolution. I urge my colleagues to vote for it and support it.

I thank the gentlelady for this opportunity to speak.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman. You are right in terms of the resolution and its reflection on our priorities. Nothing could be more important than access to education and ensuring that our schools and our students have the resources to succeed.

I would now like to yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) for engaging in a colloquy.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

The chairman's mark is \$6.9 billion above the fiscal year 2008 enacted level for education and \$7.1 billion above the President's request for education. And as a member of both the Budget Committee and the Education Committee, I am proud of that. And I think all of our colleagues should be proud of that. Mr.

ETHERIDGE just talked about the 47 programs that the President's budget cuts but that this budget resolution restores. I want to talk about just three of them.

The President's budget resolution or proposal cuts \$750 million out of the SEOG program, the Supplemental Education Opportunity Grant, fully eliminating the program. And it also eliminates the Perkins Loan revolving fund another \$750 million. That is \$1.5 billion on an annual basis taken out of the student loan delivery system. And that completely undercuts what this Congress, on a bipartisan basis, passed and enacted into law this fall when we passed the College Cost Reduction Act. So the Congress has gone on record as saying that the Federal Government needs to take a larger role in supporting student financial aid programs. And the President is ignoring that and, in fact, pushing us in the opposite direction. We need to push back and continue to fund those programs.

And the other is the Perkins Vocational Education program, \$1.2 billion, that the President again recommends be eliminated. These are job training programs. And at a time when we are hemorrhaging jobs, and at a time when we need to remain competitive globally, to take away job training programs makes absolutely no sense.

So I am proud that the budget resolution addresses these three vital areas. I am hopeful we will be able to appropriate the moneys to keep these funds going. And I thank the chairman for his leadership on this and many other important issues.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman from New York, and I thank him for his commitment.

You've said it well when you talk about investing in the next generation and you talk about our children being in a competitive marketplace and in a global economy. And what this budget does, as you actually stated, is it gives them the skills to compete in that competitive world. And again I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield now to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) for the purposes of engaging in a colloquy.

Mr. BAIRD. I thank the gentlelady.

One of the things I am most proud of about this budget, and I want to commend Chairman SPRATT for his work on, is his emphasis on keeping America competitive. And I want to talk about two ways it does that.

First of all, as my colleagues have mentioned, it fully funds the America COMPETES Act. It provides funding allowances to make sure that we have adequately trained teachers in science and mathematics to make sure that we have research investments.

This morning, on the 50th anniversary of the creation of the Science Committee, we heard from Bill Gates, the CEO of Microsoft. Chairman Gates spoke about the absolutely essential importance of training the next gen-

eration of scientists and engineers and of funding critical basic research in applied sciences. If we want our economies to be strong, we must invest in science. This budget provides for that.

The other side, which my colleagues have also mentioned, is career and technical education. I am proud to have cofounded the Career and Technical Education Caucus in this Congress. And I can tell you if you talk to business people throughout this country, they will tell you they desperately need trained and skilled workers. The President's budget would zero out the Perkins grant program, which provides essential resources for our career and technical education programs. Our Democratic budget restores that funding. If you or your child want a job in a highly skilled profession, career and technical education can provide that. Our budget makes sure those programs have the resources needed.

I am proud to support this budget.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman.

And I just will reiterate that I think Mr. Gates has it right, and you have it right. It is about an innovation agenda, innovation and what our future is. We can't be stuck where we are. We need to deal with the resources that allow us to compete in a global economy, to have a competitive edge and look at the technology for the future, as well.

Mr. Chairman, I would now like to yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for the purposes of engaging in a colloquy.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you. I appreciate the gentlelady's courtesy.

It is a little frustrating to listen to our friends repudiate the legacy of Ronald Reagan and Dick Darman who believed in the PAYGO philosophy. These people feel that they cannot balance revenue and spending, and they don't even want to try. We heard them in our committee propose adjustments that would have added over \$1 trillion to the deficit.

This budget demonstrates the Democratic commitment to the environment, public health and livable communities in a fiscally sustainable fashion. This budget addresses the 7 years of cutting environmental programs and failing to address our energy needs and challenges of this country.

We reject the President's cuts to these programs and begin to reinvest in our public lands and domestic economy. This President's budget severely cuts important core environmental programs at a time when a third of our Nation's waters don't meet water quality standards and 150 million people live in areas that exceed EPA's air pollution standards. And the President's budget would provide some of the lowest levels of funding for clean water and drinking water revolving funds in their history, hurting communities' ability to meet their water infrastructure needs, which the EPA of the administration has estimated to be over a quarter of a billion dollars.

Finally, the President's budget cuts the USDA farm bill conservation programs which provide farmers with critical technical and financial assistance to reduce erosion, protect wildlife habitat and limit adverse impacts from agriculture on land and water.

Our budget rejects those cuts to natural resources environmental program. This provides 10 percent more to discretionary funding than the President's budget.

On the environment, over 5 years the chairman's mark is more than \$26 billion higher than the President's budget.

This budget accommodates the legislation that the House has passed three times to increase tax incentives for renewable energy and conservation. It rejects the President's cuts to research as well as weatherization assistance for low-income families to cut down on energy bills. Instead, this bill increases funding for energy efficient and renewable energy programs and vehicle technologies that move our economies forward.

□ 1630

Ms. DELAURO. Just to conclude, I do want to say a thank you to the gentleman from Oregon. The real progress that we can make in this budget does require the critical long-term investments in our local communities in energy and in infrastructure, in which the gentleman has been a leader, and that is all contained in this budget proposed by Chairman JOHN SPRATT. I thank the gentleman, and I urge my colleagues to vote for the Spratt budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to a senior member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the Democrats' leadership may not want to admit that they are going to impose on our Nation's workers, on our taxpayers, on the small and mid-sized businesses of this country the largest tax increase in American history. But, regrettably, as this Democratic budget again proves, raising taxes is exactly not only what they have planned, but what they are doing in this budget, and it is important that taxpayers know what these massive tax hikes will mean to them, to you, to the American people. So, let's take a look at how this budget impacts the American people, the American family, the American taxpayer.

A family of four with \$50,000 in annual income would see a tax increase of over \$2,100, \$2,100 by 2011, as a result of this budget. That is a tax increase of 191 percent.

Forty-eight million married couples. So listen up, if you are one of those 48 million. Chances are you are. Forty-eight million married couples will see their tax bills rise by an average of \$3,000.

Twelve million single women with dependents will face a tax increase of nearly \$1,100.

Eighteen million seniors, 18 million seniors, will see a tax increase of more than \$2,100 by 2011.

Twenty-seven million small business owners, who are the backbone of our national economy that create the jobs, will see their taxes increase by over \$4,000.

More than 6 million low-income taxpayers, yes, 6 million low-income taxpayers who previously paid no Federal income tax, because of the changes in the Tax Code due to the elimination of the 10 percent tax rate, will see a huge tax increase.

These are just a few of the examples of what this budget does. I respectfully ask Members to oppose this budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY), a member of the budget committee.

Mr. MCHENRY. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Last year our friends on the other side of the aisle declared that they were going to "clean up the swamp" and get rid of the budget and its rampant waste, fraud, and abuse. In December of 2005, Speaker PELOSI proudly said, "The budget is a statement of national priorities and our values as a Nation."

Well, sadly, the Democrat values represented in this budget are waste, fraud, and abuse. It is very sad. But for my district, Mr. Chairman, this budget represents an average tax increase per taxpayer of \$2,631 per year. Additional loss of income in a number of studies, because rising taxes will curb economic growth, an additional loss of \$1,600. This budget is harmful to American values and American families.

I asked my Democrat colleagues to justify this for me. Why must we raise taxes by this rate? And yet nothing. I would be happy to yield to my colleagues to answer that question, why rising taxes are good for the American people. I hear nothing. I am willing to yield, but they have nothing. And what for? Waste, fraud, and abuse. Rising taxes. A government that is so large, and yet nothing is done to reform.

There are thousands of ways that we can eliminate this rampant growth of government. There are 91 programs that the administration targeted for elimination; 85 of them continue to be funded. In fact, half of them had increased funding last year under this Democratic Congress.

But what else is egregious, if you look at a Treasury Department report, you will find a section called "Unreconciled Transactions." Well, they account for \$25 billion worth of taxpayer funding that they know it was spent, but they don't know who, what, when, where, how, or why it was spent. This is rather disturbing.

We have the opportunity to right-size government, to reform government. When the U.S. Department of Education bureaucrats in these beautiful buildings down the street here, when

they have an average wage of \$93,000 a year, yet our average teacher in America only makes \$47,000 a year, we know these values are wrong in this Democrat budget. I asked my Democrat colleagues to justify this. Yet nothing. I hear nothing.

Mr. SPRATT. If the gentleman wants to yield, I will gladly respond to his question. The gentleman keeps throwing these rhetorical questions.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina controls the time.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. MCHENRY. Instead of making the government bigger, we need to right-size government and reform government. Rather, this Democrat budget represents the efficiency and effectiveness of FEMA, the customer service of the IRS, and the real thoughtful approach of our immigration policy. And they want to expand these things. We need immigration reform. We need to reform government. We need to make sure we right-size government rather than expand this and grow it, which is what this Democrat budget does.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Republican alternative budget for fiscal year 2009. Overall, the Republican budget is \$95.6 billion, the Democratic budget is \$94.6 billion, and the President's mark is \$93.6 billion.

Our budget will provide \$49.2 billion in discretionary funding for veterans health care and programs. This is \$2 billion above the administration's overall request and it is \$1 billion over the Democrats' budget, and we do all of this without a \$683 billion tax hike.

Out of the \$49.2 billion in discretionary, \$44.2 billion is medical care for FY 09. The House Republicans would provide nearly \$1 billion more than the President's request. Included in that: We have about \$213 million for mental health care; we increase \$200 million more for improving health care to rural veterans; \$150 million more on long-term care; \$50 million more on medical care for veterans for OEF and OIF; we have \$50 million more on dental care, which we also ought to be billing the Army for providing a lot of this. We also have \$50 million more than the administration for polytrauma care and for caring for veterans with brain injury, i.e., traumatic or mild.

Republicans would also provide nearly \$100 million more than the administration's request for medical and prosthetic research. We also add an additional \$300 million for medical facilities and nonrecurring maintenance.

Mr. Chairman, to assist in the decreasing of the claims backlog and increased cybersecurity, we increase \$200

million for the Office of Information Technology. Part of this money we are investing in funding to create rules-based adjudication systems for the veterans disability compensation claims.

The alternative also includes increases over the President's level in all funding categories, including the Office of Inspector General, grants for State cemeteries and extended care facilities and the National Cemetery Administration, among others.

Now, when we look at what the Democrat budget is doing, we have got a tax increase. This tax increase would hit middle-income veterans and their families, veterans who are low-income earners, and veterans who own small businesses. However, the Republican alternative would increase spending for veterans by \$1 billion more than the Democrat budget, and we do this without increasing taxes on veterans.

I also would like everyone to note that I noticed, when I was back in my office watching the floor debate, there was a lot of waving going around of VSO letters. Well, the VSO letters, I think they would also love this Republican budget, because we increased veterans spending \$1 billion more than the Democrats.

We also need to remember this: The very same Democrat majority this past year in the committee voted to cut \$1 billion in veterans benefits. They did this on a party-line vote. They voted to cut \$1 billion of veterans benefits, from who? From wartime disabled, elderly, and indigent veterans. So if you want to talk about who is going to stand for veterans, just go look at the vote in the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. They cut \$1 billion.

Chet, that hurts. I know it is tough for you to defend. You didn't do it, and I know you will not stand for it.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair will remind all Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to a senior Member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to this, the largest tax increase on the American family in history. The average New Jersey taxpayer under this plan will see their tax increase by over \$3,700. That is the second highest increase of any State in the Union under this budget. With property taxes in my State soaring out of control and the high cost of living in New Jersey, the last thing any member from the New Jersey delegation should want to do is to drastically increase the Federal taxes on New Jersey families, as the Democrat budget now does.

What about jobs? In an independent analysis by the Heritage Foundation for the Fifth District that I represent, we will lose 2,000 jobs due to this tax increase.

So I hope that everyone who is watching this debate will pay attention

very closely to see how their Member from their State will vote, because if they vote in favor of this, they will see their taxes go up by around four grand in the future.

Last week, the day this budget was passed in committee, we had one of those late nights. It began around 10:30 in the morning; it ended a little after midnight. During that time, almost 30 amendments were tried by our side of the aisle, and almost every one of them was voted "no" and defeated by the Democrat side of the aisle.

Now, because that debate went so late in the evening, let me recap some of those, which I think was an intriguing debate that we had. I would like to go through and highlight a number of commonsense, good government initiatives that the Democrats voted against on every one.

One, Democrats unanimously voted against totally repealing the AMT.

Two, Democrats unanimously voted against all attempts to rescue Social Security and Medicare and make these and other programs sustainable for future generations.

Third, Democrats unanimously voted against eliminating air-drop earmarks and dedicating \$1 billion, that was just indicated, for veterans programs.

Democrats also remain committed, apparently, to eliminating the 10 percent bracket for low-income individuals and raising taxes on families by \$500 per child and reinstating the marriage penalty and reimposing the death tax.

The Democrats also unanimously voted against protecting the Social Security surplus. Instead, what they did, they chose to raid that fund simply to pay for more of their earmarks.

Democrats also unanimously voted against strengthening PAYGO. Instead, they preserved gaping holes that allow them to scam the system with the rules that maintain the guise of fiscal responsibility.

Democrats also unanimously voted against putting the House Members on record every time they vote to increase the debt.

Even more astoundingly, Democrats unanimously voted against their own legislation, a leading Blue Dog reform bill that would have required greater transparency and accountability in the budget process. Instead, what do they do, as with so many other good things, they put this commonsense idea off to another day.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I want the American people to realize and understand that the Democrat members of the committee unanimously voted against all the proposals I just mentioned. They had the chance to improve this legislation. They refused to do so. And I encourage all of my colleagues to vote against this terrible budget and the largest tax increase burden on the American family.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gen-

tleman from Texas, a senior member of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. JOHNSON.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I support the priorities of the Republican budget to control spending and keep taxes low. I commend the Budget Committee ranking member, PAUL RYAN, for putting together a budget alternative that prevents expansion of the alternative minimum tax for 3 years and then achieves repeal of this tax system in 2013.

This is a huge step in modernizing the Tax Code, and it will give Americans certainty about their tax situation. The Democrat budget only puts the AMT on a leash for 1 year before allowing it to ravage more American families.

□ 1645

Our Republican budget would also ensure that American families continue to be free of the stupidity of the marriage penalty and that families get to keep tax credits for children. Finally, our budget would continue to help make sure that investment in American capitalism and jobs will continue to thrive by allowing the tax rate on dividends and long-term capital gains to stay at the 15 percent rate.

The Democrat budget would raise taxes on my constituents by \$2,669. I don't see how we can support that. We balance the budget by 2012 by putting spending under control. It's important to know that total government spending does rise every year of the American budget, but there will be a lot of people claiming that we are actually cutting spending. Only in Washington can more spending be translated as a cut.

We pick and choose programs to cut by millions of dollars, and there are spending priorities that would get more money. That's what we are paid to do here in the Capitol, set priorities for what's important to the Nation.

Republicans in our budget take on the big issue of entitlement reform. I am very disappointed that the Democrat budget fails to seriously address the pending crisis in our country's entitlement programs. Congress has been warned many times that an entitlement reform is needed now. You would think the countless reports, testimonies and letters sent to Congress would get the attention of the majority. But if you look at their budget, you will see only the real action on reforming Social Security, Medicare or Medicaid is to kick the can down the road.

The cost is roughly \$14 trillion. By refusing to make the tough decisions on how to resolve the serious financial trouble these programs are facing, the Democrats have decided to leave those decisions to someone else.

Medicare and Medicaid need real reform to stop the slippery slope these programs are currently on. We cannot tweak the edges and make small changes and expect dramatic results.

We need to take a look at some real success stories in Medicare and Medicaid and see how we can apply the lessons.

For example, independent actuaries again this year have announced that the projected costs for Medicare part D will be lower than expected. Beneficiaries have enjoyed premiums that are 40 percent lower than original estimates. Compare that to the fact that part B premiums have doubled in price over the last 6 years.

The Republican budget is a better proposal. I suggest you vote for it.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California) having assumed the chair, Mr. WEINER, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. Con. Res. 312) revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2008, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2009, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2010 through 2013, had come to no resolution thereon.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 316

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, March 13, 2008, or Friday, March 14, 2008, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, March 31, 2008, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Thursday, March 13, 2008, through Friday, March 28, 2008, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, March 31, 2008, or such other time on that day as may be specified in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the*

time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, or their respective designees, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate if, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

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

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. 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, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the concurrent resolution will be followed by 5-minute votes on motions to suspend the rules with regard to House Resolution 936 and S. 2733.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 211, nays 204, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 132]

YEAS—211

Abercrombie	Doggett	Levin
Ackerman	Doyle	Lewis (GA)
Allen	Edwards	Lipinski
Altmire	Ellison	Loeb
Andrews	Emanuel	Lofgren, Zoe
Arcuri	Engel	Lowey
Baca	Eshoo	Lynch
Baird	Etheridge	Mahoney (FL)
Baldwin	Farr	Maloney (NY)
Becerra	Fattah	Markey
Berkley	Filner	Matsui
Berman	Foster	McCarthy (NY)
Berry	Frank (MA)	McCollum (MN)
Bishop (GA)	Gonzalez	McDermott
Bishop (NY)	Gordon	McGovern
Blumenauer	Green, Al	McIntyre
Boren	Green, Gene	McNulty
Boswell	Grijalva	Meek (FL)
Boucher	Hall (NY)	Meeks (NY)
Boyd (FL)	Hare	Melancon
Boyd (KS)	Harman	Michaud
Brady (PA)	Hastings (FL)	Miller (NC)
Bralley (IA)	Higgins	Miller, George
Brown, Corrine	Hill	Mollohan
Butterfield	Hinchee	Moore (KS)
Capps	Hinojosa	Moore (WI)
Capuano	Hirono	Moran (VA)
Cardoza	Hodes	Murphy (CT)
Carmey	Holden	Murphy, Patrick
Castor	Holt	Murtha
Chandler	Honda	Nadler
Clarke	Hoyer	Napolitano
Clay	Inslee	Neal (MA)
Cleaver	Israel	Obeys
Clyburn	Jackson (IL)	Olver
Cohen	Jackson-Lee	Ortiz
Conyers	(TX)	Pallone
Cooper	Jefferson	Pascarella
Costa	Johnson (GA)	Pastor
Costello	Johnson, E. B.	Paul
Courtney	Jones (NC)	Payne
Cramer	Jones (OH)	Perlmutter
Crowley	Kagen	Peterson (MN)
Cuellar	Kanjorski	Pomeroy
Cummings	Kaptur	Price (NC)
Davis (AL)	Kildee	Rahall
Davis (CA)	Kilpatrick	Reyes
Davis (IL)	Kind	Richardson
Davis, Lincoln	Klein (FL)	Rodriguez
DeFazio	Kucinich	Ross
DeGette	Lampson	Rothman
DeLauro	Langevin	Roybal-Allard
Dicks	Larsen (WA)	Ruppersberger
Dingell	Larson (CT)	Ryan (OH)
	Lee	Salazar

Sanchez, Linda T.	Snyder	Visclosky
Sanchez, Loretta	Soles	Walz (MN)
Sarbanes	Spratt	Wasserman
Schakowsky	Stark	Schultz
Schiff	Stupak	Waters
Schwartz	Sutton	Watson
Scott (GA)	Tanner	Watt
Scott (VA)	Tauscher	Waxman
Serrano	Taylor	Weiner
Sestak	Thompson (CA)	Welch (VT)
Shea-Porter	Thompson (MS)	Wexler
Sherman	Tierney	Wilson (OH)
Sires	Towns	Wu
Skelton	Tsongas	Wynn
Slaughter	Udall (NM)	Yarmuth
Smith (WA)	Van Hollen	
	Velazquez	

NAYS—204

Aderholt	Foxx	Moran (KS)
Akin	Franks (AZ)	Murphy, Tim
Alexander	Frelinghuysen	Musgrave
Bachmann	Gallely	Myrick
Bachus	Garrett (NJ)	Neugebauer
Barrett (SC)	Gerlach	Nunes
Barrow	Giffords	Pearce
Bartlett (MD)	Gilchrest	Pence
Barton (TX)	Gillibrand	Peterson (PA)
Bean	Gingrey	Petri
Biggart	Gohmert	Pickering
Bilbray	Goode	Pitts
Bilirakis	Goodlatte	Platts
Bishop (UT)	Granger	Poe
Blackburn	Graves	Porter
Blunt	Hall (TX)	Price (GA)
Boehner	Hastings (WA)	Pryce (OH)
Bonner	Hayes	Putnam
Bono Mack	Heller	Radanovich
Boozman	Hensarling	Ramstad
Boustany	Herger	Regula
Brady (TX)	Herseth Sandlin	Rehberg
Brown (GA)	Hobson	Reichert
Brown (SC)	Hoekstra	Reynolds
Brown-Waite,	Hulshof	Rogers (AL)
Ginny	Hunter	Rogers (KY)
Buchanan	Inglis (SC)	Rogers (MI)
Burgess	Johnson (IL)	Rohrabacher
Burton (IN)	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Buyer	Jordan	Roskam
Calvert	Keller	Royce
Camp (MI)	King (IA)	Ryan (WI)
Campbell (CA)	King (NY)	Sali
Cannon	Kingston	Saxton
Cantor	Kirk	Schmidt
Capito	Kline (MN)	Sensenbrenner
Carter	Knollenberg	Sessions
Castle	Kuhl (NY)	Shadegg
Chabot	LaHood	Shays
Coble	Lamborn	Shimkus
Cole (OK)	Latham	Shuler
Conaway	LaTourette	Shuster
Crenshaw	Latta	Simpson
Cubin	Lewis (CA)	Smith (NE)
Culberson	Lewis (KY)	Smith (NJ)
Davis (KY)	Linder	Smith (TX)
Davis, David	LoBiondo	Souder
Davis, Tom	Lucas	Space
Deal (GA)	Lungren, Daniel	Stearns
Dent	E.	Sullivan
Diaz-Balart, L.	Mack	Terry
Diaz-Balart, M.	Manzullo	Thornberry
Donnelly	Marchant	Tiahrt
Doolittle	Matheson	Tiberi
Drake	McCarthy (CA)	Turner
Dreier	McCauley (TX)	Upton
Duncan	McCotter	Walberg
Ehlers	McCrery	Walden (OR)
Ellsworth	McHenry	Walsh (NY)
Emerson	McHugh	Wamp
English (PA)	McKeon	Weldon (FL)
Everett	McMorris	Weller
Fallin	Rodgers	Westmoreland
Feeney	McNerney	Whitfield (KY)
Ferguson	Mica	Wilson (NM)
Flake	Miller (FL)	Wilson (SC)
Forbes	Miller (MI)	Wittman (VA)
Fortenberry	Miller, Gary	Wolf
Fossella	Mitchell	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—14

Carnahan	Marshall	Tancredo
Gutierrez	Oberstar	Udall (CO)
Hooley	Rangel	Woolsey
Issa	Renzi	Young (AK)
Kennedy	Rush	

□ 1715

Messrs. DOOLITTLE and KIRK changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. WYNN, CARDOZA, JONES of North Carolina and GENE GREEN of Texas changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### HONORING 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF GALLATIN REPORT ON ROADS AND CANALS, AND RECOGNIZING THE VAST CONTRIBUTIONS NATIONAL PLANNING EFFORTS HAVE PROVIDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 936, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 936, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 0, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 133]

YEAS—411

Abercrombie	Brown (SC)	Davis (AL)
Ackerman	Brown, Corrine	Davis (CA)
Aderholt	Brown-Waite,	Davis (IL)
Akin	Ginny	Davis (KY)
Alexander	Buchanan	Davis, David
Allen	Burgess	Davis, Lincoln
Altmire	Burton (IN)	Davis, Tom
Andrews	Butterfield	Deal (GA)
Arcuri	Buyer	DeFazio
Baca	Calvert	DeGette
Bachmann	Camp (MI)	Delahunt
Bachus	Campbell (CA)	DeLauro
Baird	Cannon	Dent
Baldwin	Cantor	Diaz-Balart, L.
Barrett (SC)	Capito	Diaz-Balart, M.
Barrow	Capps	Dicks
Bartlett (MD)	Capuano	Dingell
Barton (TX)	Cardoza	Doggett
Bean	Carnahan	Donnelly
Berkley	Carney	Doolittle
Berman	Carter	Doyle
Berry	Castle	Drake
Biggert	Castor	Dreier
Bilbray	Chabot	Duncan
Bilirakis	Chandler	Edwards
Bishop (GA)	Clarke	Ehlers
Bishop (NY)	Clay	Ellison
Bishop (UT)	Cleaver	Ellsworth
Blackburn	Clyburn	Emanuel
Blumenauer	Coble	Emerson
Blunt	Cohen	Engel
Boehner	Cole (OK)	English (PA)
Bonner	Conaway	Eshoo
Boozman	Conyers	Etheridge
Boren	Cooper	Everett
Boswell	Costa	Fallin
Boucher	Costello	Farr
Boustany	Cramer	Fattah
Boyd (FL)	Crenshaw	Feeney
Boyd (KS)	Crowley	Ferguson
Brady (PA)	Cubin	Filner
Brady (TX)	Cuellar	Flake
Braley (IA)	Culberson	Forbes
Broun (GA)	Cummings	Fortenberry

Fossella	Lowey	Roskam
Foster	Lucas	Ross
Fox	Lungren, Daniel	Rothman
Frank (MA)	E.	Roybal-Allard
Franks (AZ)	Lynch	Royce
Galleghy	Mahoney (FL)	Ruppersberger
Garrett (NJ)	Maloney (NY)	Ryan (OH)
Gerlach	Manzullo	Ryan (WI)
Giffords	Marchant	Salazar
Gilchrest	Markey	Sali
Gillibrand	Marshall	Sánchez, Linda
Gingrey	Matheson	T.
Gohmert	Matsui	Sanchez, Loretta
Gonzalez	McCarthy (CA)	Sarbanes
Goode	McCarthy (NY)	Saxton
Goodlatte	McCaul (TX)	Schakowsky
Granger	McCollum (MN)	Schiff
Graves	McCotter	Schmidt
Green, Al	McCrery	Schwartz
Green, Gene	McDermott	Scott (GA)
Grijalva	McGovern	Scott (VA)
Hall (NY)	McHenry	Sensenbrenner
Hall (TX)	McHugh	Serrano
Hare	McIntyre	Sessions
Harman	McKeon	Sestak
Hastings (FL)	McMorris	Shadegg
Hastings (WA)	Rodgers	Shays
Hayes	McNerney	Shea-Porter
Heller	McNulty	Sherman
Hensarling	Meek (FL)	Shimkus
Herger	Meeks (NY)	Shuler
Herseth Sandlin	Melancon	Shuster
Higgins	Mica	Simpson
Hill	Michaud	Sires
Hinche	Miller (FL)	Skelton
Hinojosa	Miller (MI)	Slaughter
Hirono	Miller (NC)	Smith (NE)
Hobson	Miller, Gary	Smith (NJ)
Hodes	Miller, George	Smith (TX)
Hoekstra	Mitchell	Smith (WA)
Holden	Mollohan	Snyder
Holt	Moore (KS)	Solis
Honda	Moore (WI)	Souder
Hoyer	Moran (KS)	Space
Hulshof	Moran (VA)	Spratt
Inglis (SC)	Murphy (CT)	Stark
Inslee	Murphy, Patrick	Stearns
Israel	Murphy, Tim	Stupak
Jackson (IL)	Murtha	Sullivan
Jackson-Lee	Musgrave	Sutton
(TX)	Myrick	Tanner
Jefferson	Nadler	Tauscher
Johnson (GA)	Napolitano	Taylor
Johnson (IL)	Neal (MA)	Terry
Johnson, E. B.	Neugebauer	Thompson (CA)
Nunes	Nunes	Thompson (MS)
Obey	Obey	Thornberry
Oliver	Oliver	Tiahrt
Ortiz	Ortiz	Tiberi
Pallone	Pallone	Tierney
Pascrell	Pascrell	Townes
Pastor	Pastor	Tsongas
Paul	Kaptur	Turner
Payne	Keller	Udall (NM)
Pearce	Kildee	Upton
Pence	Kilpatrick	Van Hollen
Perlmutter	Kind	Velázquez
Peterson (MN)	King (IA)	Visclosky
Peterson (PA)	King (NY)	Walberg
Petri	Kingston	Walden (OR)
Pickering	Kirk	Walsh (NY)
Pitts	Klein (FL)	Walz (MN)
Platts	Kline (MN)	Wamp
Poe	Knollenberg	Wasserman
Pomeroy	Kucinich	Schultz
Porter	Kuhl (NY)	Waters
Price (GA)	LaHood	Watson
Price (NC)	Lamborn	Watt
Pryce (OH)	Lampson	Waxman
Putnam	Langevin	Weiner
Radanovich	Larsen (WA)	Welch (VT)
Rahall	Larson (CT)	Welch (FL)
Ramstad	Latham	Weller
Regula	LaTourette	Westmoreland
Rehberg	Latta	Wexler
Reichert	Lee	Whitfield (KY)
Reyes	Levin	Wilson (NM)
Reynolds	Lewis (CA)	Wilson (OH)
Richardson	Lewis (GA)	Wilson (SC)
Rodriguez	Lewis (KY)	Wittman (VA)
Rogers (AL)	Linder	Wolf
Rogers (KY)	Lipinski	Wu
Rogers (MI)	LoBiondo	Wynn
Rohrabacher	Loeb	Yarmuth
Ros-Lehtinen	Lofgren, Zoe	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—18

Becerra	Courtney	Gutierrez
Bono Mack	Frelinghuysen	Hooley

Hunter	Oberstar	Tancredo
Issa	Rangel	Udall (CO)
Kennedy	Renzi	Woolsey
Mack	Rush	Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1723

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: “Resolution reaffirming the goals and ideals that formed the impetus for Albert Gallatin’s national plan for transportation improvements 200 years ago, and for other purposes.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 132 and 133, I was speaking at the National Press Club on the National Neurotechnology Initiative Act. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

#### HIGHER EDUCATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2733, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2733.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 4, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 134]

YEAS—411

Abercrombie	Bishop (UT)	Camp (MI)
Ackerman	Blackburn	Campbell (CA)
Aderholt	Blumenauer	Cannon
Akin	Blunt	Cantor
Alexander	Boehner	Capito
Allen	Bonner	Capps
Altmire	Bono Mack	Capuano
Andrews	Boozman	Cardoza
Arcuri	Boren	Carnahan
Baca	Boswell	Carney
Bachmann	Weldon (FL)	Carter
Bachus	Weller	Castle
Baird	Westmoreland	Castor
Baldwin	Wexler	Chabot
Barrett (SC)	Whitfield (KY)	Chandler
Barrow	Wilson (NM)	Clarke
Bartlett (MD)	Wilson (OH)	Clay
Barton (TX)	Wilson (SC)	Cleaver
Bean	Wittman (VA)	Clyburn
Becerra	Wolf	Coble
Berkley	Wu	Cohen
Berman	Wynn	Cole (OK)
Berry	Yarmuth	Conaway
Biggert	Young (FL)	Conyers
Bilbray		Cooper
Bilirakis		Costa
Bishop (GA)		Costello
Bishop (NY)		Courtney

Cramer Jackson (IL)  
 Crenshaw Jackson-Lee  
 Crowley (TX)  
 Cubin Jefferson  
 Cuellar Johnson (GA)  
 Culberson Johnson (IL)  
 Cummings Johnson, E. B.  
 Davis (AL) Johnson, Sam  
 Davis (CA) Jones (NC)  
 Davis (IL) Jones (OH)  
 Davis (KY) Jordan  
 Davis, David Kagen  
 Davis, Lincoln Kanjorski  
 Deal (GA) Kaptur  
 DeFazio Keller  
 DeGette Kennedy  
 Delahunt Kildee  
 DeLauro Kilpatrick  
 Dent Kind  
 Diaz-Balart, L. King (IA)  
 Diaz-Balart, M. King (NY)  
 Dicks Kingston  
 Dingell Kirk  
 Doggett Klein (FL)  
 Donnelly Kline (MN)  
 Doyle Knollenberg  
 Drake Kucinich  
 Dreier Kuhl (NY)  
 Duncan LaHood  
 Edwards Lamborn  
 Ehlers Lampson  
 Ellison Langevin  
 Ellsworth Larsen (WA)  
 Emanuel Larson (CT)  
 Emerson Latham  
 Engel LaTourette  
 English (PA) Latta  
 Eshoo Lee  
 Etheridge Levin  
 Everett Lewis (CA)  
 Fallin Lewis (GA)  
 Farr Lewis (KY)  
 Fattah Lipinski  
 Feeney LoBiondo  
 Ferguson Loebsock  
 Filner Lofgren, Zoe  
 Forbes Lowey  
 Fortenberry Lucas  
 Fossella Lungren, Daniel  
 Foster E.  
 Foxx Lynch  
 Frank (MA) Mack  
 Franks (AZ) Mahoney (FL)  
 Frelinghuysen Maloney (NY)  
 Gallegly Manzullo  
 Garrett (NJ) Marchant  
 Gerlach Markey  
 Giffords Marshall  
 Gilchrest Matheson  
 Gillibrand Matsui  
 Gingrey McCarthy (CA)  
 Gohmert McCarthy (NY)  
 Gonzalez McCaul (TX)  
 Goode McCollum (MN)  
 Goodlatte McCotter  
 Gordon McCrery  
 Granger McDermott  
 Graves McGovern  
 Green, Al McHenry  
 Green, Gene McHugh  
 Grijalva McIntyre  
 Hall (NY) McKeon  
 Hall (TX) McMorris  
 Hare Rodgers  
 Harman McNerney  
 Hastings (FL) McNulty  
 Hastings (WA) Meek (FL)  
 Hayes Meeks (NY)  
 Heller Melancon  
 Hensarling Mica  
 Hergert Michaud  
 Herseeth Sandlin Miller (FL)  
 Higgins Miller (MI)  
 Hill Miller (NC)  
 Hinchey Miller, Gary  
 Hinojosa Miller, George  
 Hirono Mitchell  
 Hobson Mollohan  
 Hodes Moore (KS)  
 Hoekstra Moore (WI)  
 Holden Moran (KS)  
 Holt Moran (VA)  
 Honda Murphy (CT)  
 Hoyer Murphy, Patrick  
 Hulshof Murphy, Tim  
 Hunter Murtha  
 Inglis (SC) Musgrave  
 Inslee Myrick  
 Israel Nadler

Napolitano  
 Neal (MA)  
 Neugebauer  
 Nunes  
 Obey  
 Upton  
 Van Hollen  
 Velázquez  
 Visclosky  
 Pastor  
 Payne  
 Pearce  
 Pence  
 Perlmutter  
 Peterson (MN)  
 Peterson (PA)  
 Petri  
 Pickering  
 Pitts  
 Platts  
 Poe  
 Pomeroy  
 Porter  
 Price (GA)  
 Price (NC)  
 Pryce (OH)  
 Putnam  
 Radanovich  
 Rahall  
 Ramstad  
 Regula  
 Rehberg  
 Reichert  
 Reyes  
 Reynolds  
 Richardson  
 Rodriguez  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rogers (MI)  
 Rohrabacher  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Ross  
 Rothman  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Royce  
 Ruppertsberger  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Ryan (WI)  
 Salazar  
 Sali  
 Sánchez, Linda  
 T.  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Sarbanes  
 Saxton  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schmidt  
 Schwartz  
 Scott (GA)  
 Scott (VA)  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Serrano  
 Sessions  
 Shadegg  
 Shays  
 Shea-Porter  
 Sherman  
 Shimkus  
 Shuler  
 Shuster  
 Simpson  
 Sires  
 Skelton  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (NE)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Smith (WA)  
 Snyder  
 Solis  
 Souder  
 Space  
 Spratt  
 Stark  
 Stearns  
 Stupak  
 Sullivan  
 Sutton  
 Tanner  
 Moran (VA)  
 Tauscher  
 Taylor  
 Terry  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Thornberry  
 Tiahrt  
 Tiberi

Walz (MN)  
 Wamp  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Waters  
 Watson  
 Watt  
 Waxman  
 Weiner  
 Welch (VT)  
 Weldon (FL)  
 Weller  
 Westmoreland  
 Wexler  
 Whitfield (KY)  
 Wilson (NM)  
 Wilson (OH)  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wittman (VA)  
 Wolf  
 Wu  
 Wynn  
 Yarmuth  
 Young (FL)

NAYS—4

Doolittle  
 Flake

Linder  
 Paul

NOT VOTING—14

Davis, Tom  
 Gutierrez  
 Hooley  
 Issa  
 Oberstar  
 Rangel  
 Renzi  
 Roskam  
 Rush  
 Sestak  
 Tancredo  
 Udall (CO)  
 Woolsey  
 Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1730

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JACKSON of Illinois). Pursuant to House Resolution 1036 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 312.

□ 1730

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 312) revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2008, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2009, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2010 through 2013, with Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, 96 minutes of debate remained on the concurrent resolution.

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 49½ minutes remaining and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) has 46½ minutes remaining.

Sixty minutes remain on the subject of economic goals and policies.

Who yields time?

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Chairman, I yield 17 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD).

Mr. BOYD of Florida. Madam Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman, my friend, Chairman SPRATT, for yielding the time.

I rise today to speak in support of the budget resolution that Chairman SPRATT and his committee have crafted and brought to the House floor. Madam Chairman, in 2001, January of 2001, when this Republican administration came into office, and since that time, the 47-strong Blue Dog Coalition, fiscally conservative Blue Dog Coalition, has been sounding the alarm about the terrible financial management of our country's resources and financial resources, and we have been calling for fiscal sanity in terms of how we perform our duties as a government and how we pay for those duties.

Unfortunately, for the first 6 years of this administration, those calls fell on deaf ears of this Republican administration and in the Republican Congress. Since last January, a year ago, there has been a change in course in how this country, this government, this Congress does its business as it relates to managing the fiscal resources that our citizens here in the United States of America give to us to perform our community functions and our government functions.

And so we have before us today a budget resolution which meets the guiding principles that the Blue Dogs have laid out over the last 2 years in how we should manage ourselves fiscally.

And so I am extremely delighted to be here today to support the budget resolution that Chairman SPRATT brings and tell you that those guiding principles of having a balanced budget by 2012, an AMT fix that's paid for, abide by PAYGO rules, which is a very important tool, providing for the resources for the defense of our country. As a matter of fact, we used the President's defense number. All of those principles have been met in this budget, and I'm delighted to support that budget.

At this time, I would like to recognize the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) to address the budget resolution.

Mr. TANNER. Madam Chairman, we have seen, as Mr. BOYD pointed out, an unprecedented amount of borrowing take place since 2001. No political leadership in this country has borrowed as much money as quickly as we have seen over the last 80 months or so. That's just part of the story. Let me tell you the other part of the story.

This administration has borrowed more money from foreign sources than all 42 administrations before it put together. And apparently, some here on the floor want to keep doing what we've been doing.

This budget resolution is like an aircraft carrier. It takes seven miles to turn an aircraft carrier. This starts the turn back toward some degree of fiscal sanity. Let me tell you what the consequences of what we have witnessed are with this foreign borrowing.

Today, because of these practices, we are borrowing. Remember, now, we are in war in Iraq and Afghanistan. We are borrowing from foreign sources \$505 million a day, \$21 million an hour, which means we've borrowed probably close to \$80 million since we started this debate, \$351,000 a minute, \$5,852 a second, for a total a year of \$182 billion a year that everybody around the world is letting us have so that we can maintain, as some would suggest, our standard of living.

All of you know that when you downgrade your financial base to the extent that we have and that we are continuing to do unless we begin to change courses, as this budget does, this country is going to wind up in the trash bin of history. No country can continue to do this. You would be interested to know that we owe China almost half a billion dollars. We owe Mexico \$35 billion. We owe Taiwan \$38 billion. Maybe Taiwan will give us a loan so we can defend them against China if that ever occurs. We owe Switzerland \$39 billion, Japan over a half a trillion, the UK, Brazil, Caribbean Banking. We owe Luxembourg \$70 billion, and it's going up every day to the tune of \$500 million a year.

This budget starts to turn back toward some degree of fiscal sanity. Everybody in this country knows we can't continue to do what these people want to continue to do without bankrupting ourselves and our children.

Mr. BOYD of Florida. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee. He's been a leader on this issue for a long time and the leader of the Blue Dogs.

And at this time, I would like to recognize another one of our leaders from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS).

Mr. ROSS. Madam Chairman, earlier today my Blue Dog colleagues and I stood together to offer our official endorsement of Chairman SPRATT's budget because it is clear that we share the common goal of eliminating wasteful government spending, adhering to strict PAYGO principles, and finally addressing the long-term fiscal challenges facing this country. Not only does this budget resolution begin to address our long-term fiscal challenges, it also includes measures that crack down on wasteful government spending so that no tax dollar is wasted.

This budget continues to take steps to reverse the reckless fiscal policies of the past 7 years of Republican rule by incorporating strict PAYGO rules. It does this in two ways: First, it provides for fiscally responsible tax relief for 23 million middle-income Americans by including a fully offset fix to the alternative minimum tax; second, Chairman SPRATT's budget resolution includes a commitment to the extension of the same statutory PAYGO requirements which proved instrumental in turning the large deficits of the early 1990s under a Republican into record-budget surpluses under a Democrat for the first time in over 40 years.

The Blue Dogs are committed to addressing the serious long-term fiscal challenges facing the United States, and we should confront these challenges earlier rather than later so that we do not pass the burden of unmanageable debt on to our children and grandchildren.

This administration, this Republican administration, has borrowed more money from foreigners in the past 7 years than the previous 42 Presidents combined. It is time to restore common sense and fiscal discipline and accountability to our government. That's what this budget resolution does, and I'm pleased to stand and speak in support of it.

Mr. BOYD of Florida. Madam Chairman, it's my privilege to recognize at this time one of what we call our "Blue Puppies," the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAHONEY).

Mr. MAHONEY of Florida. Madam Chairman, I rise today to enter into this colloquy with Mr. BOYD to express my support for the House budget resolution for fiscal year 2009. A budget is a reflection of our national priorities. For far too long, the administration's priorities have been misplaced. In fact, the budget submitted by the President earlier this year makes cuts to Medicaid, Medicare, and the environment. In addition, it taxes our veterans by requiring them to pay new fees for health care.

As a result of this administration's misplaced priorities, the \$5.6 trillion projected 10-year surplus that they have inherited has been squandered. As a result, our children and grandchildren are confronted with the challenge of paying back a \$9.3 trillion debt.

This budget before us today, however, is a good budget for Florida and the Nation. The House budget protects our homeland by rejecting the President's cuts to first responder programs, reinstates funding for the COPS program, and that will put 247 more police on the street in Florida. This budget helps Florida's kids. It provides substantially more money for schools and education than the President's budget. It will allow our schools to hire the highly skilled teachers that over 25,000 Florida children need desperately to help them grow up and compete in the global economy. It rejects the President's irresponsible new fees that he wants to put on the backs of our veterans. It increases health care funding to allow our Veterans Administration to treat the 5.8 million more patients, including 333,000 from the Iraq and Afghanistan wars.

I support this budget because it is fiscally responsible, it balances the budget by 2012, and it adheres to all of the PAYGO rules. Finally, I support this budget because it protects the most vulnerable among us: our Nation's seniors. Specifically, the budget resolution improves support of housing for the elderly.

I would like to thank Chairman SPRATT for working with me to ensure

that the Section 202 Housing for the Elderly program is adequately funded. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. BOYD of Florida. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MAHONEY). He's been a great leader, and he's been successful before he got here, and he's going to be a successful Member of Congress.

I will call at this time on really the fiscal conscience of this House of Representatives, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER).

Mr. COOPER. Madam Chairman, I'm happy to support this budget. One of the reasons is the extraordinary leadership of the chairman of the House Budget Committee, JOHN SPRATT from South Carolina. A true gentleman, a man of wisdom, he has done the difficult work of pulling a very diverse caucus together, and we appreciate his listening to Blue Dog concerns.

We are proud of our role as Blue Dogs as having pulled the Democratic Caucus towards the middle. That's a good thing and help make the Democratic Party the party of fiscal responsibility in America.

People who know me know that I am not a very partisan person. I admire greatly the ranking member, Mr. RYAN. I think he has done a great job in his conference of pulling the many diverse elements together. It is a tough job. My primary concern is actually the long-term, reforming entitlement programs. Sadly, there's very little of that in either of the budgets. There needs to be a lot more.

I'm championing a bill right now called H.R. 3654, the Cooper-Wolf bill, and I appreciate very much Chairman SPRATT allowing us to have hearings on that measure. I'm hoping those hearings will allow this Congress to focus attention on the need to have an expert bipartisan commission that will advise the new President, because problems of this dimension will take Presidential leadership to help work on making sure that Medicare and Social Security and Medicaid are solvent for the next generation.

So I'm excited about the prospect of those hearings. I think it is a real opportunity for this Congress to take a long-term view and to make sure that the next President is successful in addressing these problems. My friend from Wisconsin knows the dimension of these things. These are not easily tackled, but they can and must be addressed in a prompt fashion.

So I think that slowly but surely we are turning the ship of state here in the right direction. The statistics that my colleague from Tennessee mentioned about President George W. Bush having borrowed more money from foreign nations than every previous President in American history, that's an amazing thing. That's George Washington through Bill Clinton. To have borrowed more money from foreigners, all of them put together, is truly an astonishing fact.

□ 1745

We've got to change the course of this Nation. The American people are demanding change. I'm hoping that we'll get change in this election. And this budget is one way to start demonstrating that change.

I thank my friend from Florida for yielding and for his important work in leading the Blue Dog Coalition in this Congress.

Mr. BOYD of Florida. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee.

May I inquire of the Chair how much time we have left.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida has 3½ minutes left.

Mr. BOYD of Florida. Let me simply close, Madam Chairman, by saying that there is always a lot of rhetoric and accusations flying around at budget time in the House of Representatives, and you will hear much talk about this budget raising taxes. Let me tell you, this budget does not raise taxes. The independent, nonpartisan groups outside of this body say that. Listen to them. They certainly would come at this in an objective manner.

What this budget does do is it sticks to the principles that the Blue Dogs have laid out. It adheres strictly to the PAYGO principle, a principle that helped us get the Federal Government budget back in balance in the nineties that this Congress in 2002 allowed to expire, the PAYGO principle.

This budget also provides for a fully offset AMT fix, fully offset. What does that mean? It's paid for. You either find spending cuts or other revenue sources to do it.

This budget also provides for adequate defense funding. One of the things that we said is let's not have the debate in this budget about the war. We know what the policy is now of this administration; let's provide the funds for our troops overseas and not have that debate here. This budget does that.

And most importantly, Madam Chairman, it provides a glide path for balance, gets this Nation's fiscal issues back into balance by 2012.

If I could, Madam Chairman, the gentlelady from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN) has just arrived and I would like to yield to her.

Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN. I thank the gentleman. And I thank Chairman SPRATT and Mr. BOYD for their leadership on the Budget Committee in fashioning a budget resolution for fiscal year 2009 that is putting our fiscal condition on a course toward far better health than we've seen in the first 6 years of the Bush administration and the continued proposals that we've seen from the administration in the substantial cuts, but also the imbalance that we've been experiencing and adding to the national debt.

I am proud, as a member of the Blue Dog Coalition, to support this resolution because of so many of the core principles of our organization and fis-

cal responsibility that Mr. BOYD and Mr. COOPER and others have identified here in our endorsement, our strong and enthusiastic endorsement of this budget resolution that will bring us to balance by 2012, that will include in reconciliation instructions in light of what happened to us last year, the full offsets to pay for alternative minimum tax relief for middle-class families across the country, and that also maintains the principle of PAYGO, but also recognizes the importance of a strong national defense in accepting the President's number, as well as increasing the amount of money we are spending on veterans health care, because ongoing costs of national security include taking care of our Nation's fighting men and women.

I applaud Chairman SPRATT for his great work and encourage my colleagues to support this important budget resolution.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes, 2 minutes to say, "wow." We just heard from the sort of self-proclaimed fiscal conservative wing of the Democratic Party talking about, while it's wrong to increase debt, it's bad to send this to future generations, and then to have all of them come here and say how great it is that they're spending so much more money on all these new programs in their budget.

We've also heard another claim, that there are no tax increases in this budget. Well, I've got the budget right here. The budget is a series of numbers, and the numbers are crystal clear. The numbers raise taxes.

We heard from two gentlemen from Florida, two gentlemen from Tennessee and the gentlelady from South Dakota. The average annual tax increase on the average taxpayer in Arkansas is \$2,462 per year. The average tax increase for the taxpayer under this budget in Florida is \$3,040. The average annual tax increase for the average taxpayer in South Dakota is \$2,596. And the average tax increase for the average taxpayer in Tennessee is \$2,611.

Now there is this thing at the end of this budget resolution in section 5, and it's a policy title. And it says, basically, we don't want to raise these taxes, we hope not to do it, but this resolution, Madam Chairman, is worth no more than the paper it's printed on. It's simply a sense of the Congress resolution. It's the legislative equivalent of passing a bill and saying, "Have a nice day."

This budget unequivocally, extremely clearly, relies on, depends on the largest tax increase in American history. Repealing the marriage tax penalty relief, raising income tax rates across the board, cutting in half the marriage tax penalty, bringing back the death tax in full force, raising the dividends in the capital gains tax. Real taxpayers paying really high taxes, about \$3,000 on average: \$2,400 in Arkansas, \$3,000 in Florida, \$2,600 in South Dakota, \$2,600 in Tennessee. That's real money.

With that, Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. MCCRERY.

Mr. MCCRERY. Madam Chairman, the speakers from the majority side for the last 15 minutes or so are among the Members of the House that I have the most respect for, Mr. COOPER, Mr. TANNER, Mr. BOYD. I have watched them over the last few years show courage when it comes to fiscal discipline, when it comes to entitlement reform and suggesting a need for entitlement reform. So it was with some surprise that I heard them today endorse the majority's budget as crafted by the majority on the Budget Committee.

And the reason I say I was somewhat surprised is that I believe those gentlemen over the years have talked about the need to constrain spending at the Federal level, to restrain spending. That's the whole point of talking about entitlement reform. They know that the entitlement programs, Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, are unsustainable as currently structured. And with some courage, they have talked over the last few years about the need to tackle those problems and get this spending under control.

And so when my friend, Mr. TANNER, talked about turning this ship, and it takes so many miles and so long to turn a ship and this budget starts the turn and that's a great thing, well, the minority budget does the same thing. It starts to turn that ship in the right direction, also, toward a balanced budget. The difference is the majority's budget turns that ship with the energy source of higher taxes, whereas our ship, the minority ship, is being turned with the energy source of restrained spending.

So I hope, Madam Chairman, that my good friends, for whom I have much respect, will see the light before the vote comes and join us in supporting a budget that does what they want to do, that gets the ship of state turned in the right direction, but does it through what they have advocated very soundly over the last few years, which is spending restraint, not increases in taxes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chairman, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER).

Mr. HERGER. Madam Chairman, we are now in year two of the Democrat majority. For the second year in a row they're proposing a budget that calls for the largest tax increase in American history, \$683 billion significantly more than last year's budget. For our constituents, this means eliminating the lower marginal tax rates, a new penalty on marriage, a lower child tax credit, and new taxes on investment and retirement savings.

In California, taxpayers can look forward to an additional \$3,331 in taxes. Meanwhile, anticipating a tax hike, our Nation's employers would think twice before hiring that next worker or

investing in new infrastructure. Madam Chairman, we need permanent tax relief, not higher taxes. What's more, this Democrat budget fails to address the long-term solvency of Social Security and Medicare.

Every year we do nothing, as prescribed in the budget before us, our future debt goes up by another \$2 trillion. Without reform, our three largest entitlement programs will keep growing until they crowd out everything else in the Federal budget, from national defense to transportation, to assistance for the poor. Ignoring the problem will not make it go away.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this budget and support our more responsible Republican alternative.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chairman, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to a senior member of the Ways and Means Committee, the ranking member of the Health Subcommittee, Mr. CAMP from Michigan.

Mr. CAMP of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Under the budget resolution put forth by the majority, every American should be aware that their wallets are going to get a lot lighter. As the economy softens and we lose jobs, the Democrat budget resolution prescribes an overpowering combination of tax hikes and wasteful spending that will have our economy reeling.

The one positive thing I will say about this budget resolution is that it provides Americans with an excellent glimpse into the future under a Democrat majority; more spending, more taxes, and more of Washington telling you what to do.

The majority has written a budget blueprint that imposes a massive, unheard-of \$3.9 trillion tax hike that will cause the average American household to pay \$3,000 extra in Federal taxes next year. Washington doesn't need this money. Washington doesn't need to spend an extra \$3.9 trillion of the American people's money on redundant wasteful government programs.

The bureaucracy is far from being starved of revenue. Especially under these economic circumstances, it is wrong for this House, for this Congress, for this government to raise taxes.

Under the Democrats' budget resolution Washington spending will increase because 44 million children will no longer qualify for the \$1,000 child tax credit. It will increase because American couples will be hit by the marriage penalty.

Don't believe these taxes will just be on the rich. Under this budget, low-income Americans will be forced into a higher tax bracket. Worse yet, Federal spending will increase because Americans will no longer be able to pass on a lifetime of dedication, devotion and hard work to the next generation. Instead, Uncle Sam will reap a whopping 55 percent death tax. Taxing the living isn't enough for the Democrats; under this budget resolution, they even go after the dearly departed.

We should be cutting spending to balance our budget, not raising taxes. With rising food prices, energy costs, health care spending and other everyday bills going up, this is no time for Congress to ask Americans to pay more and make do with less.

I urge my colleagues to reject this massive tax hike and vote "no" on the budget resolution.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN).

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin, who is doing a wonderful job presenting this today on the budget.

Mr. Chairman, it was about this time last year that we came to the House floor, I was a brand new freshman, and I have to say my jaw dropped when I looked at the budget proposal. Being a mom of five kids, 23 foster kids, just an average family, we know what it is to balance a budget just in our own home. And I saw the Democrats lay out their budget proposal which was the largest tax increase in American history.

And here we are, it's *deja vu* all over again because we see the Democrats are now having a tax increase that's even higher than last year, \$683 billion. It's hard to count that high, Mr. Chairman, \$683 billion in tax increases, hitting Americans at the most inauspicious time when we're in an uncertain economy, when families clearly across the Nation are paying more for health care, for education, certainly for gas, certainly for groceries.

□ 1800

And in Minnesota in particular, this means an average individual tax increase of \$3,088.

Yes, Minnesotans, this means an average tax increase for you of \$3,088. I know you have many other places where you could use \$3,088.

And it's an average loss in income for people in my district, Mr. Chairman, of \$1,609.

Unfortunately, it gets worse. It means over 2,665 fewer jobs for people in Minnesota, \$292 million less in our local economy.

Those are real people's lives that are impacted by those figures. They aren't just numbers. They're real people's lives. And it's pain and it's suffering that this Congress does not have to deliver to normal average American taxpayers. In total, this budget increases our Federal tax burden, unbelievably, from 18 percent of GDP to over 20 percent of GDP in 2013.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I thank the gentlewoman for her comments.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of fiscal responsibility, and, therefore, conscience demands that I

rise in opposition to the budget of the liberal Democratic majority in Congress.

The American people deserve to know. We have a \$9.3 trillion national debt. They also deserve to know that there are some \$53 trillion in unfunded obligations that this government has committed to in Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid that our children and grandchildren will have to find some way to resolve and to fund. Frankly, if this government was a business back in Indiana, we'd have to file bankruptcy.

Now, tomorrow Republicans will offer a budget to deal with this fiscal crisis at the national level that's based on spending restraint, entitlement reform. It balances the Federal budget without taxes and without earmarks.

But the answer from the Democrat majority in Congress: The largest budget in American history, \$3.1 trillion. The largest 1-year increase in public debt in American history, some \$646 billion. More earmarks, higher taxes, and nothing to reform the entitlement spending that threatens the vitality of our economy and the very future of our children and grandchildren.

In 2006, the American people voted for change in Washington, D.C., but they weren't referring to what would be left in their pockets after the Democrats took control. We must balance the Federal budget with fiscal discipline and reform, not with more spending and more taxes. We must reject the policies of the new liberal Democrat majority in Congress and reject this budget.

I urge my colleagues to vote for fiscal discipline and reform and join me in voting against the budget priorities of the liberal Democrat majority in Congress.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Agriculture Committee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the ranking member for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this bloated budget resolution.

Facing a slowing economy and an increased cost of living, Americans have to tighten their belts and carefully budget their hard-earned money. It's time the Federal Government did the same.

Instead, the budget proposed by the majority exceeds the President's spending levels by \$276 billion over 5 years. This budget increases discretionary spending and fails to touch entitlement reform.

To pay for the massive spending increases, the bill passes the cost on to lower and middle class American taxpayers. This budget resolution calls for the largest tax increase in American history, \$683 billion over the next 5 years, which means 116 million taxpayers will face an average tax hike of more than \$1,800. Worst of all, it raises the debt by \$646 billion.

Mr. Chairman, Washington has a spending problem, not a revenue problem. This budget makes no attempt to rein in wasteful government spending or balance our Federal budget. I believe it should be the highest priority in this House to balance the budget, which is why, on the first day of this Congress, I introduced House Joint Resolution 1, a constitutional amendment to require that the Federal budget be balanced, with 160 bipartisan cosponsors.

When families across the country are preparing their budget, they know that they can't spend more than they take in. It's a simple concept but one that Congress has not adhered to for far too long. We must balance the budget and cut the national debt, not by raising taxes but by being good stewards of taxpayer money.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting this fiscally irresponsible budget and rein in wasteful spending.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 17 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I'd first like to begin by sincerely congratulating the chairman of the committee and the ranking member from Wisconsin for, I think, a very thoughtful and substantive approach to a very serious set of problems. I think that the tone and quality of the debate on the House floor this afternoon has served the country well and has served the institution well, and it is entirely owing to the leadership of the chairman and ranking member and the men and women who serve the Members' committee so well, and I appreciate that.

I strongly support the gentleman from South Carolina's (Mr. SPRATT) budget. I think it's the right thing for the country based upon an analysis of facts, choices, and consequences. The most important factual reason that the gentleman from South Carolina's (Mr. SPRATT) budget benefits and strengthens families in our country is it operates on the principle that American families operate under, which is you can't live on borrowed money forever. You can't run your credit card up forever and hope that you win the lottery someday to get yourself out of that mess. The gentleman from South Carolina's (Mr. SPRATT) budget, just as American families do across this country, recognizes the reality that you have to make choices.

Now, the other fact that I think is very important that Members realize is that this budget does not have a tax increase for anyone this year or anyone next year or anyone last year. One of our friends on the other side, Mr. Chairman, said that this was *deja vu*, this budget. She was exactly right because most of us were here almost exactly a year ago and heard a ritualistic

incantation from the minority side that this was the largest tax increase in American history, the largest tax increase in the history of the world, the largest tax increase in the history of the universe, the largest tax increase in whatever's larger than the universe.

Mr. Chairman, I'd just invite the people of this country to evaluate the validity of that claim. When they sit down and fill out their tax return this year, they should ask themselves the question, did my income tax rates go up? No, they didn't. Did the capital gains tax rates go up? No, they didn't. Did the excise taxes go up? No, they didn't. And the same answer would be true for this year and the year after that.

Now, I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that people listen to this debate and they say, how can this be that the Democrats get up and say there are no tax increases in this budget and the Republicans get up and say it's the largest tax increase in the history of civilization or whatever the latest version of it is? Here's the answer:

In 2010 the tax cuts enacted earlier in this decade expire, and the Congress will have to make a choice. Until then, there is no tax raised on anyone for anything. When that day occurs, this budget contemplates that we will do what families across the country do and make an intelligent decision. If the economy bounces back and grows, there's a very good chance there will be plenty of revenue to renew all of those tax cuts. If it doesn't, then the Congress has the choice of reducing spending in given areas to finance tax cuts for all or some of the people who would be affected.

But what we will not do is what the erstwhile majority elevated to an art form during its reign, which is to borrow the money to pay the bills. We won't indebt the children of this country to the People's Republic of China and our other creditors because we don't have the discipline to make a decision here.

There's a big choice. Our budget believes that the economy grows and American families prosper by stopping the practice of borrowing money to run the government, by investing in the education and health care and development of our people, and by expanding economic opportunity. We believe that works.

The other side, with great sincerity, believes that massive tax breaks for the wealthiest people will trickle down to the rest of us and that will work.

This is the big choice we have to make, but there is a record for this choice. We do not have to make this choice in the empty vacuum of political theory. You see, because we tried their way for 6 years when they had control of both Chambers and the White House, and our strategy of stopping the practice of borrowing money, investing in people, expanding economic opportunity is what we tried for most of the 1990s, and there's a record.

They created some jobs through their strategy. But for every one job they created, we created five. There was some economic growth under their strategy, but for every dollar of economic growth they created or facilitated, we created a dollar and a half.

What was the impact of their strategy on the American families that this budget supports? Well, over a 6-year period, the purchasing power of a typical middle class American family shrunk by \$1,100. During the years in which our strategy was the policy of this country, the purchasing power of a middle class family increased by \$6,000.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Isn't it the case that the Republicans controlled Congress from 1995 on?

Mr. ANDREWS. Yes.

Reclaiming my time, it's also the case that every single Republican there in 1993 voted against the plan that put that into effect and, therefore, they have no ownership.

So I would say the record is very, very clear, that I think our friend from Wisconsin and his fellow colleagues on the committee are very well intentioned about the policy they followed to help American families. I just think they're wrong, and I think the record shows that they're wrong.

Now, what are some of the consequences in this budget between their way and our way? Well, one of them is the issue of middle class tax cuts. Now, they are going to say that all these middle class taxes are going to go up.

Here's the reality: The budget contains what we call a reserve fund for the purpose of financing middle class tax cuts. And, again, when we reach that point, we will make a decision as to how best to preserve those, either based upon growth in the economy, which we certainly hope will occur, in offsets in spending, which we are prepared to make, or in other sources of revenue which we have brought to this floor before.

□ 1815

Look at the issue of children's health care. Last year, we attempted to provide health insurance for 5 million additional children. These are the children of people that work in convenience stores, gas stations and retail stores. These are very hardworking people who are struggling to get ahead. And there is a program that has worked very well since 1997 to help those families and their children. Now, we wanted to expand that coverage to 5 million more children, and we paid for it. A great number of Members on their side voted for this, and a great number of Members of the other body on their side voted for this, but not quite enough, because we ran into a Presidential veto, and we couldn't quite override it here.

Our budget will do the same thing. It will say let's find health insurance for

5 million more children who do not have it, and let's pay for it. Let's not pay for it by borrowed money.

For those who are trying to live by collecting child support enforcement, there are more resources for it. For those women who are pregnant or have small children and want to promote their well-being, there is more money for it. For Americans struggling to deal with getting by and paying the grocery bills on food stamps, there is more resources for this. Public health issues, whether it is the spread of disease or the prevention of disease, there is more resources for this, as well.

This budget proceeds on the powerful principle on which American families proceed. Don't try to survive on borrowed money forever. It puts us in position to make difficult and sometimes unpopular choices. It does not raise taxes on anyone in the fiscal year that is in front of us, and it makes investments in the strategy for economic growth that has worked in the past and we believe will work again.

I know that the gentlelady from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) who is new to the institution, but in no way new to serving her constituents, has a special concern about block grants. I would like to encourage her to engage in a colloquy at this time.

Ms. TSONGAS. I would like to thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

Like my colleagues, I was disappointed that the President's budget made such a poor investment in the health of our Nation's cities and communities at a time when strong action is necessary to stave off economic ruin for many hardworking Americans. Our cities are our Nation's economic engines, providing vital infrastructure, the foundation for an educated workforce, and for the health of our communities.

For any of us who represents a city of any size, we know what a challenge it is, and yet how important it is that the Federal Government be a strategic partner with them. When I asked leaders in the cities of my district how the Federal Government could best help, the answer was unhesitating and unequivocal: Community Development Block Grant funding. CDBG funding has improved the quality of life in the cities of the Merrimack Valley in my district and in thousands of other cities across the country by helping to improve parks, add green space, and create affordable housing.

In Lowell, CDBG funds were used to reclaim a contaminated site creating the potential to attract new companies to employ city residents. And they are not alone in putting these funds to such good use. Most recently, the City of Lawrence suffered a devastating fire which destroyed businesses and homes downtown. CDBG funding has been critical for razing and rebuilding these destroyed properties.

If CDBG funding is not adequately in place, communities like this, faced with disaster, would have few alter-

natives to help finance their recovery effort, not to mention the loss of support for vital housing and community and economic development activities that States and local governments have come to rely on.

I would like to confirm with the gentleman from New Jersey that the budget resolution before us today thankfully rejects the President's cuts to the grant programs that have proven so critical to helping our communities and provide additional funding for CBDG and other economic development and affordable housing priorities.

I would also like to confirm that the budget before us today rejects the President's proposal to eliminate the Social Services Block Grant. Cities in my district rely on social service and community service grants to carry out programs ranging from parenting classes and consumer and tax counseling to child enrichment and adult literacy classes. Without these funds, critical elements of our social safety net will be lost exactly when American families need them most.

I thank the gentleman for engaging in a colloquy and for presenting us with a budget that makes both a moral statement about our priorities and a reality-driven investment in the continued growth and vitality of our communities.

Mr. SPRATT. I can assure the gentlelady that the programs that are of concern to her from the Community Development Block Grant, the Social Services Block Grant and the Community Services Block Grant are all accommodated in this budget resolution, and we definitely oppose certainly the repeal of the Social Services Block Grant.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin) having assumed the chair, Mr. ALTMIRE, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 312) revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2008, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2009, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2010 through 2013, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3773, FISA AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2008

Mr. WELCH of Vermont, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-549) on the resolution (H. Res. 1041) providing for the consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 3773) to amend

the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to establish a procedure for authorizing certain acquisitions of foreign intelligence, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1036 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 312.

□ 1822

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 312) revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2008, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2009, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2010 through 2013, with Mr. ALTMIRE (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) had 23 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) had 32½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SPRATT. Could the Chair please inform us of the time allotted to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), how much remains available.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SPRATT. I yield to the gentleman the balance of his time.

Mr. ANDREWS. At this time I am pleased to yield to the gentlewoman who has been a leader on child support efforts for purpose of a colloquy, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

The Democratic budget resolution is a lifeline to families during this economic downturn. One aspect of the chairman's mark before us calls on Congress to restore the harmful cuts made to the Child Support Enforcement program, and as a result of the only bipartisan amendment brought forth by the ranking member and me, it restores the ability of States to pass along every cent of child support collected to families rather than nickeling and diming them out of this child support to make repayments to government bureaucracies.

Since we have demanded that parents move off welfare and take financial responsibility for their families, child

support has become the premier safety net for children. Therefore, Congress should make every effort to ensure that child support is collected and that all of it goes to families.

The Child Support Enforcement program collected more than \$24 billion for 17 million children participating in the program in 2006. The Child Support Enforcement program doubled its collection rate in the past 10 years and is consistently among the Office of Management and Budget's top-rated government programs. Why? Because research has shown that it is a very cost-effective program, that for every \$1 spent on child support enforcement, \$6.50 of child support is collected.

With this budget resolution, which restores the Child Support Enforcement cuts, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that \$11 billion in child support payments would go uncollected over the next 10 years, even if States backfilled half of the lost Federal funds.

Additionally, Child Support Enforcement supports domestic violence services and initiatives to help fathers work, support their children and stay out of prison. Families need their child support payments to pay for their children's basic needs because children represent a disproportionate share of the poor in the United States. While they are only 25 percent of the population, they represent 35 percent of the poor. Loss of child support income could not come at a worse time for families. Their ability to make ends meet has already been battered by unemployment, rising gas and home energy costs and rising food costs.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. If the gentleman would yield, I simply wanted to chime in and compliment the gentlelady as well, my friend from Wisconsin. She and I coauthored an amendment to this budget resolution on this issue.

It makes no sense for child support payments not to go to the children. That is unfortunately what is happening today. And I would very much like to work with the gentlelady and anybody who is interested in coming up with the offsets in the Ways and Means Committee, from which this jurisdiction derives, to find a way to fix this problem. I think this is an area that has wide bipartisan support. And this is one of those areas where I surely would like to think we can come up with the savings to fix this injustice.

I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. SPRATT. That was one amendment that was agreed to in the markup, and I think it would behoove us all, the gentlelady particularly, if we get together and see if we couldn't move the legislation. That would be great.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the gentlelady for her contribution.

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. And I thank the ranking member, the chairman and all of the members of the Budget Committee for looking at this very serious issue.

Mr. ANDREWS. At this time I would like to engage in colloquy the gentlelady from New Hampshire who has seen firsthand the ravages of neglect of people out in the community when you don't fund important programs, and I know she supports this budget because it does, Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Thank you for the time, and I thank Chairman SPRATT and the Budget Committee for producing a fair and responsible budget, a moral document that is fiscally responsible.

Mr. Chairman, I have been deeply concerned about the President's proposed cuts to the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program known as LIHEAP. LIHEAP provides critical assistance to millions of families in America. Every winter, tens of thousands of families in New Hampshire rely on this program to heat their homes. Over 40,000 members each year for the past 2 years have applied to the fuel assistance program for help with heating bills. This winter, the average cost of heating a home with heating oil is expected to climb to over \$2,000 per family, more than three times the \$627 that it cost just 6 years ago. But LIHEAP has not failed to keep pace with the dramatic cost. It has actually dropped.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey's time has expired.

The gentleman from South Carolina has 18½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SPRATT. Does the gentlewoman require further time?

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Yes.

Mr. SPRATT. I yield to the gentlewoman 1 additional minute.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. For fiscal year 2009, the President proposed just \$2 billion for LIHEAP, a \$570 million painful cut from what Congress provided for 2008. This irresponsible cut could force New Hampshire to lose over \$2.5 million in funding next year.

I applaud the committee for rejecting these proposed cuts and for increasing funding for LIHEAP and other programs that will help the middle-income and lower-income families in New Hampshire and across the country. And I thank you.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains between the two sides.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina has 17½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 32½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), a senior member of the Budget Committee.

□ 1830

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the ranking member for yielding, and I am sorry that my friend from New Jersey has apparently left the floor. No, I see

him there. We had the occasion to debate this budget earlier today. I believe that he just said every Republican voted against OBRA in 1993 and that is what unleashed economic growth, but if I did my homework correctly, I think the gentleman from New Jersey voted against it as well. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman if I was incorrect in my assertion.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ANDREWS. I mostly certainly did, and I am about to say something that I think the chairman can confirm we very rarely hear around here. I was wrong. You see, I thought what you guys now think. I thought that an increase in the top marginal rates would, as the former Speaker at the time said, cause a recession in the country, and the evidence showed it didn't happen. And I am willing to admit that that is a vote I should have cast the other way, and I was wrong to do it, and so were all your guys.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. If the gentleman would yield, it is also interesting that after that tax increase, from that tax bracket, the Federal Government actually brought in less money under those higher tax rates.

Mr. HENSARLING. Well, I thank the gentleman once again for yielding.

There is a big question again about tax increases, and I have heard many of my friends on the other side of the aisle argue that there is no tax increase included in their budget; yet, Mr. Chairman, they claim that they are going to balance the budget in 2012. Well, the only way they can do that is by capturing all these tax revenues.

Now, some of them use very clever Washington language. They say, well, we are not raising taxes on working men and women in America. We are just letting tax relief expire.

Well, that is a very fine distinction that is lost upon the working men and women of America. I mean, there is this odd quirk in Washington that somehow spending is forever and it grows exponentially at the expense of the family budget, and yet tax relief somehow is temporary.

The bottom line is that very soon, within two budget years, there is going to be a massive tax increase upon the American people. There will be, again, the largest single tax increase in American history. Now, we were just talking about the earlier record when the Democrats were in control of Congress of \$241 billion. The tax increase they are proposing now will dwarf that, \$683 billion, the largest tax increase in American history.

Again, they want to claim credit for balancing the budget, and I certainly salute their goal. The Republican budget, it balances the budget without tax increases. But if you look and actually read the numbers, and ultimately the numbers are the only thing you can count on in a budget, well, Mr. Chairman, this is their budget right here.

That is them taking in all of these tax increases. That is how they claim to balance the budget. So, again, there is going to be huge, massive tax increases, scheduled, automatic tax increases. The Republican budget prevents those tax increases from coming into fruition.

Now, I have heard our chairman, and I have the greatest amount of respect for the chairman, say on many occasions, well, you know, this is the way the law was written. But, Mr. Chairman, if I did my homework correctly, there have been at least 21 different occasions over the last 5 years to make sure that these automatic tax increases on hardworking American people didn't take place. And as I look at the voting record, the overwhelming majority of Democrats voted to make sure that these tax increases do take place, so I am sure they don't want to admit to the American people that they are raising taxes. But they are.

So, Mr. Chairman, what is going to happen? Well, let me tell you what is going to happen under this Democrat budget.

Number one, 116 million taxpayers will see an average tax increase of more than \$1,800 per year.

More than 6 million low-income individuals and couples who currently pay no taxes, no taxes, will no longer be exempt and will have to start paying income taxes.

A family of four earning \$50,000 will see their taxes increase by \$2,100.

Low-income families with one or two children will no longer be eligible for the refundable child tax credit in 2011.

Tax bills for an estimated 27 million small business owners will increase by more than \$4,000 each.

Mr. Chairman, I was a small businessman before I came to Congress, and let me tell you, excess taxation prevents small businesses from creating jobs. A job is the greatest housing program, nutritional program, and educational program in the history of mankind. It is a paycheck, not a welfare check. Yet the Democrat tax increase is a dagger aimed at the heart of small business throughout our Nation.

The capital gains tax is going to go up 33 percent, the capital of capitalism. If you want to be able to have job growth, you have to have capital. Taxes on dividends go up 164 percent under their plan.

Mr. Chairman, the death tax, that is a tax that is immoral. It ought to be illegal. It goes away, and under this Democrat budget, it comes back as high as 55 percent.

The child tax credit is cut in half. The lowest tax bracket is increased 50 percent.

These are just the tax increases that have been passed into law. How about the others that the Democrats attempted to pass? H.R. 6 attempted to increase taxes \$7.7 billion. H.R. 976 attempted to raise taxes \$1.4 billion; H.R. 3963 tried to raise taxes \$71.5 billion.

Now we have Chairman RANGEL of the Ways and Means Committee want-

ing to raise taxes trillions of dollars in the years to come for the AMT. We have a 50 cent increase in gasoline tax recommended by the Energy and Commerce chairman, Mr. DINGELL of Michigan, and an additional 5 cent increase per gallon gas hike proposed by Representative JAMES OBERSTAR, chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

There is no getting around it. This is the largest single tax increase on American history. It is going to cost American families an average of \$3,000 a year as they try to educate their children, as they try to keep a roof over their head, as they try to realize their American Dream.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. McCOTTER), the chairman of the Republican Policy Committee.

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Chairman, I come from Michigan, a State that respects honesty, even when one is in error, so I must admit that I was pleasantly surprised by the integrity, if not the ultimate decision, that we heard from the gentleman from New Jersey.

We heard a lot about change over the course of a year or two, and I too must be honest. We have seen change in how Washington budgets. We have seen change. We have gone from bad to worse.

Now, as I recall sitting in Michigan, living there with my wife and children, I have seen a similar instance out of my State government which, in a one-State depression, faced the choice of allowing working families to keep their money and protect their budgets or raising taxes and protecting the State budget.

They started with the smokers. They went after them. They took their money. Nobody likes smokers. Who cares? Then they had a one-time-only property tax advance. They never did tell us when the property tax relief comes, but I am sure one day it will. It is only once. And then they raised our income taxes. They raised our income taxes because by then it was for the greater good. And whose family budget wants to stay in the way of the greater good? Certainly not somebody like me, somebody whose children are looking at college, somebody whose mother may be getting older and may need care, somebody who worries that their dreams of their future for their children might go up in ashes in a State that is mismanaged by a government that cares more about itself than it cares about the sovereign citizens who elected it.

And then I come out here to do their work as their servant and I see the same thing. I see the same thing. I hear the same talk. I see the change that was promised and delivered. The sad part is the promise was implied.

I remember hearing the government spent too much. Got to stop. The government spent too much. We are going

to change that. I didn't hear the part where you said the government spends too much. We are going to spend more.

I heard people talk about working families struggling, and we are only going to tax the rich. We are only going to tax the rich. Evidently we must not be doing too well. There is not enough rich to back up the promises. So what do we do? The largest tax increase in American history on everybody. Well, that is a change. I concede the point. It is a change.

But I was shocked again with both the honor and the erroneous conclusion of the gentleman from New Jersey. I never in my life expected to see a Member of Congress apologize for not raising taxes on the American people. That is a change. I grant you that.

The question is then, if the American people need to have their taxes raised to come into prosperity, surely you know what the ultimate number is. How high, how fast until we get to prosperity? How much more of my money has to go the Federal Government before I can dream for my family and feed them? Surely somebody must know that number.

Is this largest tax increase in American history going to be the last? Are we then going to reach the American Dream? Are we going to have our liberty and economics to pursue that dream through our own works, or will government have to do that for us? Are we going to get bureaucrats as life coaches? What is going to be necessary? Give me a number. I haven't heard that number. I haven't heard that percent.

I think the one thing that we do need to change immediately right now in rejecting this budget scheme to bloat, to soak your family budget, to bloat the Federal Government's budget, is I want to hear somebody admit that America's economic prosperity comes from our free people, not from the growth of government, for that is a truth to hear that would be a refreshing change of late.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the budget resolution. We have received repeated warnings about Medicare and Social Security, that they are on their way to insolvency. I think we all know that. In fact, CBO recently projected that Social Security will begin to pay out more than it takes in by the year 2020, and at the same time Medicare spending will likely double over the next 10 years.

But inexplicably, this budget does nothing. It contains no action over the next 5 years to change this course. Instead, it would allow the unfunded liabilities of both of these programs to grow from almost \$39 trillion today to about \$52 trillion by 2013. That is a 2 to \$3 trillion increase every year. This means that over the next 5 years alone,

every American household will be responsible for more than \$450,000 to keep these programs functioning as is.

We can't ignore this ever-increasing, this massive problem. I have seen reports, press reports, that Medicare and Social Security aren't the priorities anymore. I would submit that, if we don't start working on a real solution, the taxpayers will quickly see either drastic cuts to their benefits or a spike in their taxes, unless we change the trend that we have.

Mr. Chairman, I am disappointed that instead of confronting this issue, we are again burying our heads in the sand. It is not realistic. We can't continue to do this. It is a huge disservice to everyone in this country. I must oppose this budget.

Also let me say, it is not just the level of spending that is problematic; it is the type of spending. We have had a lot of arguments lately about earmarking. This budget, the Democratic budget, does nothing to change the practice. Last year we had some \$15 billion spent on earmarks, and a lot of those earmarks were never vetted on the House floor. In fact, the vast majority of them, 99 percent of them, were never given a thorough vetting on the House floor, and, in fact, about a billion dollars, just under a billion dollars was spent on earmarks that were air-dropped into the conference reports that never got any vetting at all, that was never subject to any House decision. That is nearly \$1 billion. But what do we have in this budget to prevent that? Nothing. Nothing. We are on track to do it again or perhaps even worse.

We have got to do better, both on the level of spending and the type of spending that we are doing. In Congress, we have had a process for centuries called authorization, appropriation, and oversight, and over the past several years we have gotten away from that. Instead, we do very little authorizing, a lot of appropriating, and very, very little oversight.

There is nothing in this budget to change that process. We are doing the same. And the Democrats will say, hey, over the past several years you Republicans have done wrong as well. And we have. That is the biggest reason we are here in the minority today. But at least you could say it took Republicans awhile to get to this point. In the meantime, there were balanced budgets. There was the reformation of welfare. There were some good things that happened. Then we got fiscally lazy and we started having budgets much like this, and the voters turned us out, as I would suggest they will do to the majority party, who got into this much more quickly than Republicans did.

I hope that they change. I would like nothing more than to support a good budget here, but this is not, and I would urge my colleagues to reject it.

□ 1845

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 3 minutes to

the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

Mr. CULBERSON. Thank you, Mr. RYAN.

Mr. Chairman, the American people face the greatest financial challenge we have ever encountered in the history of the Nation. The free people of Great Britain overcame the greatest challenge they ever faced in their history during the early days of the Second World War because Winston Churchill told them the truth.

They won the Battle of Britain because they were told by their leaders the truth, and they could deal with the truth as Americans can deal with the truth, but we have got to be told the truth. Today at 5 o'clock, unfortunately, one of our great public servants retired, the Comptroller General of the United States. David Walker, when he left work today, has moved on to the private sector.

David Walker is a great public servant who has told the truth, and I want to reiterate it here on this House floor, how urgently important it is for the majority that now that controls this House to step up and accept responsibility for dealing with this great financial challenge that David Walker has laid out for us that we in the old Republican majority lost the majority because we did not deal with it.

That's why you saw conservatives like me and many of my colleagues here today vote against Medicare prescription drugs, vote against the farm bill, vote against all the expansions of the government that took place over the last 7 years because we saw this challenge.

Mr. Chairman, I have a letter from David Walker, Comptroller General of the United States, dated March 13, 2008, which I would enter into the RECORD.

U.S. GOVERNMENT  
ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE,  
Washington, DC, March 13, 2008.

Hon. JOHN CULBERSON,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CULBERSON: Per our conversation, this letter discusses our nation's deteriorating financial condition and the need for timely action to turn things around.

Our real fiscal problem is not our current deficit and debt levels but where we are headed absent meaningful reforms. Given the retirement of the baby boomers and soaring health care costs, government outlays are set to rise dramatically. The federal government's liabilities and current unfunded commitments for future spending on Social Security and Medicare are now estimated at \$53 trillion and are growing by \$2 to \$3 trillion a year. This effectively translates into an IOU of around \$455,000 per American household. Clearly, our government has already made a range of promises that it is unlikely to be able to keep.

Because the personal savings rate in this country is so low, we have been turning to overseas investors to finance our nation's debt. Foreign investors, particularly foreign governments, have greatly increased their holdings of U.S. Treasury securities, and some of these government lenders may, either today or over time, have political and economic interests that diverge from our own. The risk is that some of them may eventually use their U.S. financial holdings as leverage against us.

If we continue as we have, policymakers will eventually have two options: slash government programs and services that the American people depend upon or raise taxes to levels that would seriously harm America's economic growth and competitiveness. In my view, we probably have at most a 5- to 10-year window of opportunity to act. Inaction comes with a steep price tag. Recent projections from Moody's and an analyst at Standard & Poor's suggest that, absent policy changes, our nation is heading toward "junk bond" status as early as 2020. By 2030, without reforms to entitlement programs and spending or tax policies, income tax rates would have to more than double to prevent a continued erosion of our financial position.

Fortunately, by facing facts and making meaningful changes to the budgetary process, entitlement programs, other spending, and tax policies, we can avoid this fiscal train wreck and ensure that America's future is better than its past. Our fiscal clock is ticking, however, and the time for action is now.

I appreciate the opportunity to express my thoughts on this important subject.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID M. WALKER,

Comptroller General of the United States.

David Walker wrote me a letter explaining in a one-pager the financial challenge facing America. David Walker points out that America's real financial challenge is not our current deficit and debt levels, but where we are headed without meaningful reform.

Given the retirement of the baby boomers and soaring health care costs, David Walker has certified that the Federal Government's liabilities, the current financial obligations that all of us must pay, are so massive that we are now in a \$53-trillion hole, America. That means every household needs to write a check today to pay this off. Every household would have to write a \$455,000 check to pay off that financial obligation, \$175,000 a head.

Every American would have to write a check today for \$175,000 to pay off this liability. It's unsupportable, it's inexcusable. We have got to deal with it because David Walker also points out that we have about 5 to 10 years to deal with it.

Now that's critically important information. Everyone says this election is the most important in our lifetime. We can say that truly this year. We know we will need a conservative anchor in Congress here to restrain spending. We need to get these entitlement programs, Federal spending under control, which David Walker estimates is 5 to 10 years, a window of opportunity to act, or he points out that Moody's and Standard & Poor's have already warned the U.S. Treasury that by the year 2020, U.S. Treasury bonds will be rated as junk bonds.

Let me reiterate that, folks. If we don't get our financial house in order, the Comptroller of the United States has already pointed out that Moody's and Standard & Poor's have already warned us that our Nation is heading toward junk bond status for Treasury bills.

It's outrageous. It's unacceptable. We need to reject this budget. We need to

stop spending money and stop raising taxes on Americans by rejecting this irresponsible Democrat budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, let me inquire as to how much time is remaining for each side.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 16 minutes remaining. The gentleman from South Carolina has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I have sat here all afternoon, and last week through the markup, listening to this mantra about tax increases, all of which is a fabricated argument, and could not and cannot avoid the conclusion that to some extent this is a red herring.

It's a way of distracting attention from the real problems at hand, a way of avoiding discussion of a \$236-billion surplus, which is where our economy and our budget stood in the year 2000, the year before Mr. Bush came to office, the \$4 trillion in debt added by the Bush administration over the last 7 years, over median family income which has fallen under the Bush administration, avoiding discussion about a debt-burdened economy, which is losing steam near a recession and a dollar, a mighty dollar, which is plummeting, avoiding all of that so that we can talk about something that is not going to happen.

First of all, we made it as clear as we possibly could that we have endorsed, embraced and pledged to see continued the middle-income tax cuts which are included in the 2001–2003 tax cuts. They add up for the renewal over a 5-year period of time to \$230 billion. If we follow our budget resolutions we have laid out, we will have a surplus in 2012 of \$178 billion.

By 2018 the cumulative surpluses will be at \$1.4 trillion. If we choose then, and we are not making the decision now, but if we choose then that will offset the extension of most of the taxes, most of the tax cuts that were adopted in 2001 and 2003.

We have put that in black and white, title V policy, policy on middle income tax relief, and we have laid out from item A through item H the different tax cuts that we support and are pledged or seeing renewed and extended. We can't make it any clearer than this.

Let me say something else for anybody listening wondering whether or not his taxes are about to shoot up and whether he should go cash in some stocks and bonds and get ready for this huge tax increase, it's not coming. Even if we adopted something that called for it to happen, it would have to go through Ways and Means. It would have to go through Senate Finance. It's a long way from ever being passed.

We simply say in our budget resolution, as we get ready for 2010, let's see if we can't have a conservative budget that will move us toward surplus so that some of that surplus, at least, can be used to offset some of these tax cuts. Let's see if we can't put some

money into program integrity with the Internal Revenue Service and shrink the tax gap so we can use some of the money there, raise tax revenues without raising tax rates, use some of the money thus gained to offset some of these tax cuts when they come up for renewal.

Go through the code as we did in 1986, give it a good closet cleaning. It needs a scrub down as an accretion of the deductions and credits and exemptions and preferences, all of these things. If we muster our efforts, if we marshal our efforts, we can do and lay the basis for the renewal of many of these tax cuts in 2010.

But we primarily delayed the decision about those tax cuts in 2010 on the basis that we need to know more. What will be the state of the economy? Will we still be in two different theaters, Afghanistan and Iraq, fighting a war that is costing \$12 billion a month? Will we still have an enormous deficit or will we be in surplus?

Better that we determine it than guess at it now. We are simply saying we would lay the basis. First of all, we would lay down the principle that we would protect these middle income tax cuts. Second, we will put the budget in place to begin generating surpluses so that they can afford the renewal of some of these tax cuts.

That can be done in this budget resolution. We are not pushing the biggest tax increase in American history. I don't know even where the numbers arrived from in the first place. I don't think it's supportable, but it is totally fantastic. It's an argument that is a complete red herring and a complete deviation from what we are all about today.

We should be talking about the savings rate in this country, about what deficits are doing to our economy, our country, and our standing in the world. There is plenty to talk about that is relevant. This subject is not because it's not about something that is about to happen.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I believe you spoke for all of us on our side in putting in context the basis of this budget and the arguments of our friends on the other side.

I want to just add a few things about what this budget really is ultimately about. It's about real people, with real lives and real challenges, and the fundamental responsibilities of a governing body are to meet a budget and present a budget that meets the needs of its people. I want to tell a couple of stories about folks from Vermont.

Scott West, a veteran, of the National Guard, he lives in the town of Albany, in the Northeast Kingdom of Vermont. He used to drive a truck for a living before he went to Iraq. While he was deployed over in Kuwait in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom he suffered very serious injuries to his shoulder, back and wrist.

In May the pain from his injuries got so bad he was no longer able to do his job as a truck driver. Nearly 9 months ago, Mr. West filed a claim for increased disability compensation from the VA. As of today, he has yet to have a hearing.

Now, the budget that we presented last year and passed, because you had foresight, has finally put in place new people to adjust these claims. We have got 1,800 new claims processors who are now going to help ensure that veterans like Scott will receive the support that they deserve in a timely manner.

I thank you for your leadership. That's the meaning of this budget to a man from Albany, and it's going to make a real difference to his family.

Peter and Irma McShane, they live in the southern Vermont town of Pownal. They are senior citizens. They live on \$1,452 a month, so you can imagine how hard it is for them to make ends meet. Now it turns out that's \$22 more than would be available if they were going to be eligible for food stamps.

So they have to scrimp and save every way they can. They get hit with this huge fuel bill. We have had a cold winter in Vermont. The budget presented by the administration cut low-income heating assistance. The budget that the committee is presenting tries to protect that, and it is absolutely indispensable to families like Peter and Irma McShane that they have the ability to heat their homes and not have to make a choice between medication and heat, between food and heat. This budget recognizes that.

I want to also share a letter I received from a couple from Fletcher, Vermont, in northern Vermont. Margaret Kinne and her husband. They are talking about the rising cost of health care.

They have worked in a woodworking business for 13 years, often 6 or 7 days a week. They don't complain about that. They like to work hard. But their insurance has gotten increasingly expensive and now their deductibles have gone from \$5,000 to \$10,000 to \$25,000. What they wrote to me is this, this translates to me to no insurance. The administration budget would cause over a half a trillion dollars in cuts to Medicare and Medicaid that would increase the cost shift and make that unaffordable insurance even more out of reach of this family.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the tremendous work that you have done in putting together a very good budget in very tough times.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington, Dr. McDERMOTT.

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, the President's proposed budget can mean only one thing, the lights are on down at the White House but nobody's home. He has the House Republicans carrying the water, but their budget is his will,

make no mistake about it. If the President gets his way, lights will go off across America and people will suffer because of the President's complete disregard of the state of the economy, the plight of the American middle class and the domestic casualty from his irresponsible war in Iraq, that is, meeting the critical, unmet social needs of this country.

For instance, the President proposes slashing the Social Services Block Grant Program by \$500 million this year and eliminating it altogether next year. In my home State of Washington, these funds are critical for providing child care for vulnerable families, Meals On Wheels and services to prevent child abuse.

But the President is more interested in helping the rich get richer and leaving the rest of America down and out. The President is willing to feed their greed by starving the U.S. economy and hurting the American people.

The American people deserve a budget that recognizes reality, and that's what the Democrats have offered. We provide tax relief to the middle class by demanding tax fairness for everyone. We include extended unemployment benefits, but I proposed a separate legislation this year because the American people expect their government to respond when an economic downturn hits and hurts them. They don't want any more New Orleans experiences.

We provide a budget based on reality, meeting the defense needs of the Nation, and meeting the unmet social needs of the American people.

In other words, the lights are on here, and the Democrats are home working for the American people.

The President has offered a budget that shouts it's all about funding a hopeless Iraq war while the Democrats have offered a budget that says it's about the economy and hope and help for the American people.

Vote for the American people and vote for the Democratic budget.

□ 1900

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina, and I particularly thank him for his work and for the work of the Budget Committee and I look forward to a bipartisan, cooperative effort towards the agenda that all of us are committed to, and that is a budget that responds to the needs of the American people.

And so I think it is important to at least address what I think as a member of the Homeland Security Committee and the committees dealing with our judiciary issues in this Nation and foreign affairs to be able to at least assess what I think the Budget Committee attempted to do, and that is to cure the ills here in America.

One of the ills is to highlight where we are today with this number one

issue that I hear about in my district in Houston and all over America which is the loss of jobs. And 63,000 jobs were lost last month. When we look at the analysis, we can see that, unfortunately, the present administration is number two in the infusion into the job market. And that is the testimony that Americans will make about when they think the economy is churning. This administration falls as number two in the lack of job creation. So this budget attempts to be a job creator, and I think it does it very well. How does it do that? It does it by giving relief to the middle class, so even as they are struggling with loss of jobs, we are recognizing there is a value to giving tax relief.

So someone got up on the floor and talked about we are, in essence, spending dollars. I must say that I hope we can find a way to bring our troops home. That is \$120 billion. But this budget is the kind of tax cut that I want to endorse. It is, of course, AMT relief. Let me find out my friends on the other side of the aisle that want to get rid of the alternative minimum tax relief that is given and don't want to give it to those middle class, hard-working Americans.

An extension of the child tax credit which benefits, again, working Americans. The marriage penalty relief, 10 percent bracket, estate tax relief, research and experimentation tax credit. I believe that today Bill Gates was indicating how many jobs are generated as we promote R&D research.

Deduction for State and local sales tax. States like the State of Texas, how many of you want to reject that kind of relief for hardworking Texans and others who have State and local sales tax and cannot get deductions? This is what the Democratic budget stands for.

Small business expensing. I consider small businesses the backbone of America. They create jobs. They created jobs in Houston. They created jobs in Jackson, Mississippi. They created jobs in Utah and South Carolina and New York and California. That is the crux of what this budget stands for.

At the same time, of course, let me suggest to my colleagues that it does not ignore the relief that we need in education and infrastructure. It invests in highways, water, and other infrastructure. It protects concerns that I have like NASA and the Children's Health Insurance Program and like the relief for education and many of the programs that provide relief for poor and minority children.

Let me conclude by saying this is the kind of budget that I want to affirm, a working America budget, a middle class budget. This is a good budget. I know we can do this in a bipartisan way. Support this budget and support America.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 312, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for FY 2009, introduced by my distinguished colleague from South Carolina, Chairman SPRATT.

I wish to thank our great Speaker, Ms. PELOSI, for never letting us forget that we are here for one reason only, and that is to address the real needs and priorities of Americans.

Finally, let me thank the remarkable leadership team which has worked long, hard, and tireless to keep us informed, cooperative, and united in our resolve to do the necessary work to make America better.

Our Republican colleagues ask if we can afford the Democratic budget . . . and I ask—How we can afford to continue to cheat the American people? What we can not afford is to continue with the Bush Administration's fiscal irresponsibility which has led us to almost \$9.6 trillion dollar deficit. What we can not afford is to hear rhetoric from the other side of the aisle about balancing the debt and curbing taxes while the administration they support continues to dig deeper and deeper into the deficit. Let's not ask how we can afford to support the Democratic budget, let's ask how we can not afford to support it.

#### EDUCATION

A quality education continues to be the best pathway to social and economic mobility in this country. As a Member and Senior Whip of the Congressional Black Caucus, I have consistently advocated for the maintenance of Historically Black Colleges and Universities. This budget provides greater funding to our nation's schools and colleges. The increased spending can and should be used for several purposes, including Head Start, Title I Compensatory Education program, and job training and national service programs. It could also be used to increase the Federal share of the cost for educating handicapped children, and to help improve access to colleges, and broadening access to Hispanic Serving and Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

#### SCHIP

We must not only be economically healthy, but assist in the physical health of our citizens. This budget will properly fund SCHIP, to help one of our most vulnerable populations—children. Our President proclaims his support for securing our nation's current and future economic success. However, it is our children that will bring forth a successful future. We need to invest in tomorrow by investing in them today. This starts with their physical well-being. Children, who cannot see the doctor when they are sick, will not be in anyone's classroom.

#### AFRICAN-AMERICANS—HEALTH AND EDUCATION IN TEXAS

For African Americans, health and education concerns spill beyond budgetary issues into the criminal justice consequences. In Texas, over 87,000 African-Americans are incarcerated compared to approximately 48,000 African-Americans attending college or university.

The disparity between the percentages of our youth in prison versus the number of young people in college, particularly in the African-American community, is disturbing to say the least. Higher education continues to be one of the main pathways to social and economic mobility, particularly in the African-American and Hispanic communities.

#### REPUBLICAN BUDGET ALTERNATIVE

Under the Republican Budget the national debt continues to explode. The gross federal debt reached \$9.0 trillion at the end of 2007. The CBO projects that the debt will rise by a total of \$3.9 trillion at the end of 2008. This unprecedented rise in debt puts our President

in the history books. During the seven years of the current Administration, the government has posted the highest deficits in this nation's history. The President's 2009 Budget continues the failed policies that brought us to this point.

Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to claim that the budget resolution being considered on the floor this week raises taxes. In fact, the budget resolution does not raise taxes by one penny. The budget resolution accommodates tax cuts and indeed prioritizes tax cuts that would benefit middle-income families, while ensuring that the burden of paying for the tax cuts will not fall undeservedly on our future generations.

#### FOREIGN DEBT

The amount of foreign debt has doubled since 2001, with most of this increased debt purchased by foreign lenders. Since 2001, the increases in foreign holdings of Treasury securities account for over 80 percent of the newly accumulated public debt—a trend that has more than doubled foreign holding of Treasury securities.

This high level of indebtedness to foreign investors heightens the economy's exposure to potential instability with additional burdens on our children and grandchildren.

#### SECTION 501—STATISTICS

Section 501 of the budget resolution specifically calls for additional middle-income tax relief subject to the pay-as-you-go rule, including but not limited to: AMT relief (both immediate/temporary, and more permanent reform measures); Extension of "middle-class" elements of 2001 tax cuts: child tax credit, marriage penalty relief, and 10 percent bracket; Eliminating the estate tax on all but a minute fraction of estates; Extension of the research and experimentation tax credit; Extension of the deduction for State and local taxes; Extension of small business expensing; Enactment of a tax credit for school construction bonds; and tax incentives for energy efficiency and renewable energy which are accommodated in a separate deficit-neutral reserve fund.

The budget resolution honors PAYGO and the new House rules on using reconciliation in a fiscally responsible way. By abiding by the pay as you go principle, we immediately begin digging our way out of the mountains of debt that has accumulated as a result of the Bush Administration's fiscal policies.

#### REPUBLICANS AND TAXES

The President's budget and the Republican alternatives violate pay-go and the fiscal responsibility that reconciliation is intended to achieve, by proposing tax cuts that are not offset.

The sunsets for the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts were part of the tax legislation which Republicans voted for and passed. The expiration of the tax cuts is their policy. The Democratic budget actually calls for the extension of many of these tax cuts, but responsibly requires that tax cut extensions, like other policies, must be fiscally sound, and not make the deficit worse.

#### SUPPORT FOR THE DEMOCRATIC BUDGET BASED ON THE AMERICAN VALUES

This important piece of legislation gives us a budget that is balanced fiscally and morally. It does not sacrifice the many programs and services that this nation needs for a War that the President seems never to end.

Mr. Chairman, this budget better reflects the priorities and values of the American people.

After all, a budget is much more than a balance sheet, an income statement, a financial scorecard. Rather, it the expression in fiscal terms of who we are and what we believe. In short, a budget is a financial reflection of our national character. And as it is by a person's character that you know her, so too it is with a nation.

Look at a nation's budget and you will see how it treats its children in the dawn of life; its elderly in the twilight of life; its poor and disabled and helpless in the shadows of life; and the earth, the sustainer of life. Look closely at the choices it makes regarding the neediest and most vulnerable of its people, and you will know the true character of a nation.

Mr. Chairman, America and the world can be proud of the choices we make in this budget resolution. Unlike the budgets of the last seven years, the budget brought to the floor by the new House majority reflects the best angels of our nature. This budget expands health care for our children. It provides our soldiers and veterans with the care worthy of their sacrifice; it is faithful to President Lincoln's injunction "to care for him who has borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan."

This budget resolution supports education for a 21st century workforce and a growing economy. It invests in renewable energy for an energy independent America that faces up to the challenge of global warming.

Equally important, Mr. Chairman, the majority's budget resolution represents a return to fiscal responsibility and budgetary accountability. I am proud to support a budget that reflects the care and fidelity of a wise steward of the taxpayers' hard-earned money. The American people can be assured that the new majority in Congress will not be profligate with the public treasury.

Mr. Chairman, this budget resolution correctly assumes that substantial savings can be realized from more vigorous efforts by Defense Department (with increased Congressional oversight) to root out fraud, abuse, and wasteful spending. It is totally unacceptable that unlike the typical taxpayer, small business, or large corporation, the Defense Department still cannot pass a standard audit. The Pentagon cannot adequately track what it owns or spends. We just know that it's a lot.

Mr. Chairman, the new House majority pledged that we would work together to restore our economic health, reclaim our leadership position in the world, advance our national security, and invest in the future. We promised to restore fiscal responsibility and began by instituting tough pay-as-you-go rules. And we have been delivering.

For example, in the first 100 hours of the 110th Congress, we passed with bipartisan support procedures imposing discipline and transparency in congressional spending. With bipartisan support, we also passed legislation to implement recommendations of the 9/11 Commission, increased the minimum wage, paved the way for lower prescription drug costs, cut student loan costs, and redirected oil subsidies towards investments in renewable energy. We did all of this while maintaining our commitment to fiscal discipline.

The 2009 budget resolution advances these priorities. It begins to reverse seven years of disinvestment in education, infrastructure, and innovation. The budget resolution is the crucial next step to realizing the initiatives we have

developed to move the country forward and to set us on a course to build the future we want for our children and grandchildren.

Mr. Chairman, we reject the President's proposed cuts to education programs, including rejection of his proposals to eliminate many education programs. We also reject the president's proposed steep cuts in job training and social service programs, including the Community Services Block Grant and the Social Services Block Grant.

#### COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The community and regional development function includes programs that provide Federal funding for economic and community development in both urban and rural areas, including Community Development Block Grants, CDBG, and the non-power-related activities of the Tennessee Valley Authority, TVA.

#### INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

The international affairs function includes international development and humanitarian assistance, international security assistance, the conduct of foreign affairs, foreign information and exchange activities, and international financial programs.

#### CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, correcting the fiscal course of the country cannot be achieved overnight. The fiscal outlook we are confronting has deteriorated dramatically over the past seven years. In 2001, the Administration inherited a projected ten-year, 2002–2011, budget surplus of \$5.6 trillion. Within two years, that surplus was gone and the United States began accumulating a mountain of national debt. Most of this debt has been purchased by foreign investors, making the U.S. economy more susceptible to economic and political pressure from abroad.

Mr. Chairman, we have a responsibility to clean up the fiscal mess that we have inherited. The choice to live beyond our means comes at the expense of future generations, who will bear the weight of the fiscal irresponsibility of our current administration.

Large deficits also hurt economic growth by depressing national saving, generating less capital for investment for the future. This leads to lower productivity and wages.

The President's budget continues the fiscal approach that has brought us large deficits and growing debt. In comparison, our budget resolution takes the necessary steps toward eliminating our long-term budget deficit by adhering to the pay-as-you-go principle.

But a balanced budget must be accompanied by balanced priorities. While regaining control over our economic future is critical, we must do so within the context of honoring our obligations. This budget is a critical first step toward fulfilling our commitments to the American people. We will balance the budget. We will be fiscally responsible. We will defend our country. We will put children and families first. We will grow the economy. We will cherish and protect our environment. We will conduct the Nation's affairs in an accountable and efficient manner.

Mr. Chairman, the people have asked for change. They have asked for greater accountability, they have asked for a balance of defense and sustaining programs. The American people entrusted us with the responsibility of leading our country in a new direction. The part we have charted in this budget resolution will lead to a brighter future for children and

better America for generations to come. It reflects very well on our national character. For all these reasons, I stand in strong support of H. Con. Res. 312. I urge all members to support the resolution.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), a senior member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding to me. I have listened with great interest as my friends from the other side of the aisle, the Democrats, attempted to do everything they could to distance themselves from their single largest tax increase in American history contained in their budget.

Again, Mr. Chairman, here are \$683 billion worth of tax increases. This is what we call the CBO baseline, the Congressional Budget Office, which assumes that, as current law says, we are going to have huge automatic tax increases, most of which kick in in 2011. That is this red line.

Well, our friends on the other side of the aisle claim they are balancing the budget in 2012, but they can only do it through these huge, automatic tax increases. And this isn't my baseline. They appointed the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, so if they have some problem with this particular revenue curve, they need to take it up with him. You can't have it both ways. You can't claim you are not increasing taxes and at the same time claim, claim that you are balancing the budget in 2012.

Now, I listened very carefully when my distinguished chairman said that he wants to prevent these tax increases. I know he wants to prevent it. And I listened to the gentlelady from Texas saying that she endorses middle income tax relief. But they just don't seem willing to vote that way, Mr. Chairman.

If I did the math correctly, there have been at least 21 occasions over the last 6 years when Democrats could have voted to prevent these huge, automatic tax increases, which will amount to an average tax increase on the American family of \$3,000 a year. So the rhetoric is nice. The language is comforting. But when will somebody on that side of the aisle put their vote where their rhetoric is? I don't see it, Mr. Chairman. It reminds me of the old adage that your actions are so loud I can hardly hear your words.

Now I hear a lot of talk on the other side of the aisle about how compassionate their budget is and somehow our budget is not compassionate. I'm not sure what is really compassionate about raising taxes on hardworking American families because, Mr. Chairman, every time you plus-up the Federal budget, guess what, it comes out of some family budget. And I hear from those families. I hear from the families in the Fifth Congressional District of

Texas that I have the honor of representing.

I heard from the White family of Mesquite, Texas: "Regarding the news that the average Texas family may soon be burdened with extra taxes, it is not good news to a family with \$24,000 a year in income and two expensive stroke-prevention medications, among other critical medications to maintain." Their \$3,000 a year tax increase, the largest tax increase in American history, is going to decimate the family health care budget.

Now, I heard from the Sessions family in Quitman, Texas, also in my district: "Any increase in income taxes would cut into my Social Security money so much, to such an extent I would not be able to purchase my medications." Again, their single largest tax increase in American history is going to decimate the family health care budget.

Mr. Chairman, I heard from the Swanson family from Wills Point, Texas: "A tax increase of that size will prevent me from receiving the medications necessary to prolong my life."

Once again, the single largest tax increase in American history are decimating, will decimate families, not just in the Fifth Congressional District of Texas, but all over America. I wish that my friends on the other side of the aisle would just take a moment and think about who has to pay all of these taxes while Americans are struggling to pay for their health care bills and to make sure that they keep a roof over their head, to send their children to college, to fill up their cars and pickup trucks, to try to start small businesses. How are they going to be able to afford the single largest tax increase in history? Where is the compassion in taking money away from these hardworking families?

What does it do to their housing? Well, I heard from the Stevens family in Mesquite, Texas: "I wanted to let you know that I am a single mom that does not receive any type of child support, and an increase of this amount would break me. I would be at risk of losing my home with this type of increase."

The single largest tax increase in American history, an average of \$3,000 per American family, most of it due to hit right there, 2011, coming very soon to a neighborhood near you. It is going to decimate the housing budget. It is going to decimate the health care budget. It is going to decimate the education budget of hardworking American families all across the Nation.

Where is the compassion there? There is no compassion there.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Chairman, I first want to start off by congratulating the chairman of the Budget Committee, a good man, a man I have a lot of respect for who has a hardworking staff and a diligent staff. I want to compliment them.

These budget resolutions are not easy to write.

He has a tough job because he has to defend this budget. This is a budget I wouldn't want to come to the floor to defend. I just have to bring one point to bear, and I do so respectfully. You cannot say that you are balancing the budget and not raising taxes. It is illogical and axiomatically impossible. Let me explain why.

This red line is the baseline that the Democrats are using for their budget. It is what we also refer to as the CBO baseline. This green line is the baseline minus the tax increases. They are using the red line, not the green line. This means in order for them to achieve a balanced budget, what must happen, what is required to happen, what has to happen, all of these taxes have to be raised, specifically by \$683 billion over the next 5 years.

Now, my friend from New Jersey, another very conscientious, skillful Member, said that was a tax vote he regretted not taking. And the Senator from New York at that time, Senator Moynihan, said that was the largest tax increase in American history. That was \$240 billion. This one is \$683 billion. This is the largest tax increase in American history.

The point is this: You cannot claim you are balancing the budget and not raising taxes because you are relying on these very tax increases to balance the budget. That is what this budget does. Now, no amount of reserve funds, no amount of senses of Congress, no amounts of "we have delayed the decision on the tax cuts for now" gets them out of this bind. They can't. It is impossible. You have to have it one way or the other. Either you are not balancing the budget or you are not raising these taxes because, Mr. Chairman, they are not saving any money. There is no savings in this budget.

The piece of paper I have in my hand is more valuable than the amount of savings they have in this budget. This paper, may it cost 1, 2 pennies. That is more money than they are saving in this budget over the next 5 years. In fact, they are expanding spending. They are increasing discretionary spending by \$280 billion. What is worse is they are going to add, in just two programs, an unfunded liability of \$14 trillion, to just two programs, Medicare and Social Security.

Let's look at the Medicare program. Today, the Medicare unfunded liability, according to David Walker, our GAO Comptroller General, is at \$34 trillion. That is an average per household bill of \$300,050. Every household in America right now, if we want to make Medicare whole for my children when they need it, 300 grand.

Under this budget, because they do nothing, they are adding \$11 trillion to that liability. That is \$395,650, almost \$400,000 for one household to cover Medicare so my children can maybe get it. That's for our kids. That is wrong.

□ 1915

We have got to address these issues.

Now, Mr. Chairman, surely, there's waste in government. Surely, there's efficiencies we can get. But this budget concludes that there is not. This budget is basically saying, Washington's not wasting any money. All of these earmarks, the 11,000 we passed last year, are perfect, they're justified; we should do 11,000 more. And there's no waste, fraud or abuse anywhere in the Federal Government. In fact, they're doing such a good job in Washington spending our tax dollars, let's give them \$280 billion more to spend. And on top of it, given the fact that our entitlements are going bankrupt, given the fact that we have an unsustainable course, let's just add more to the debt; and we're going to raise taxes while we do it. But we won't tell people. We'll pass this kind of cute reserve fund, sense of the Congress that says we really don't want to raise those taxes, but we're balancing the budget. That means you're raising taxes if you're going to balance the budget.

But let's look at the brass tacks. And this is what I want to ask the American people. Can you afford this budget?

People are struggling right now. People are losing jobs. We just finished 52 consecutive months of positive job growth, very impressive growth. Finished, I said. The last couple of months they've been bad months.

Also, prices; the cost of living is going up to America, the cost of health insurance, the cost of food, the cost of filling your gas tank when you take your kids to school, the cost of sending your kids to college. The cost of living is higher and higher, and people's pay checks are not getting as far along as they used to.

And so what does this budget do? It raises their taxes. It says you're going to have to send, on average, three more grand per person to Washington because we don't think Washington has enough of your money. We think Washington's great. There's no waste, there's no inefficiency, no fraud. We, in fact, need more of your taxpayer dollars, you, American men and women of America.

So I'd like to know, is that what America wants? Tell us. Call us, e-mail us. Call your Congressman. Because here's what this bill will do specifically. 116 million taxpayers will see their taxes on average go up \$1,800; 84 million women will sustain, on average, a tax increase of \$2,121; 48 million married couples will incur an average tax increase of over \$3,000. Taxes will increase by an average of \$2,323 for 43 million families with children. Some 12 million single women with children will see their taxes increase on average by \$1,091. For 18 million elderly individuals taxes will increase by an average of \$2,181. Tax bills for 27 million small business owners will rise on average by more than \$4,000. And more than 6 million taxpayers who previously owed no taxes at all will become subject to the individual income tax as consequence of these tax increases.

Mr. Chairman, we had an opportunity here. We had an opportunity to do something that I felt would be good and bipartisan. I've heard my colleagues on the other side talk about the need to do this.

We had all these witnesses come to the Budget Committee, saying we've got to get our fiscal house in order, that we owe the next generation a debt-free Nation, that we owe them the mission of health and retirement being fulfilled, which means reforming our entitlement programs.

This budget says for the next 5 years, let's not do any of it. Let's make sure that we're on the glide path so that our kids will pay literally twice what we pay today in taxes, just for our Federal Government today to be there for them when they're our age.

This is a lost opportunity. Under this budget, the unfunded obligation that are Medicare and Social Security themselves go up 37 percent, \$14 trillion. I'm upset at the debt that was racked up lately, but it pales in comparison to the debt that this budget proposes to rack up.

So what we really ought to be doing, Mr. Chairman, is we ought to be fixing this budget process, having real budget discipline, real spending caps. We ought to be making reform decisions. And the last thing we ought to be doing in this time of high prices, a tough standard of living to maintain, in this time of economic downturn which quite possibly could come into recession, the last thing we ought to be doing is raising taxes. That is what this budget does.

We will propose a different alternative tomorrow. We will propose a budget that balances the budget without raising taxes by controlling spending. And even in doing that, spending will still go up one year after the other. Instead of spending \$15.8 trillion over the next 5 years, we're going to propose to spend \$15.3 trillion. And by simply doing that, by simply exerting a little bit of discipline, we're going to make sure that we're not raising these taxes, and we're going to repeal the alternative minimum tax.

One more thing, Mr. Chairman. This earmark problem is getting out of control. Earmarks are an abuse. Some are worthy, some are right, but a lot of them aren't. We've got to control this. We are proposing a real earmark moratorium.

More importantly, we are saying let's take a timeout from earmarks and let's save that money. Our proposal tomorrow will not only have an earmark moratorium, it will save the money from an earmark moratorium. And if Congress just says no to earmarks for 1 year, you know what we can do? We can make permanent the child tax credit and the repeal of the marriage tax penalty. We can say, pass up your earmarks for a year in Congress and don't tax people for getting married. Pass up your earmarks for a year in Congress and don't cut the child tax credit in half.

These are the choices we are being confronted with. These are the choices that we must make. These are the values that we believe. We believe we owe our children a growing economy, a future of a higher prosperity, of a higher standard of living, and one in which the promise of health and retirement security is actually sustainable, is actually made good upon.

That's not what this budget does. There's no way you can split these hairs with the reserve funds, senses of Congress, flowery Washington rhetoric. This budget contains the largest tax increase in American history, not just on wealthy people, on all people. That's wrong. It's not right. We shouldn't do it because Washington doesn't have a tax revenue problem, Washington has a spending problem. Unfortunately, the Democrat budget makes it worse by spending even more money.

There is waste in Washington. There is waste in earmarks. There are entitlements that are out of control. We should confront those, instead of just throwing more money at Washington, because you know where that money comes from? It comes from the hard working men and women of America. It comes from families, it comes from entrepreneurs, it comes from small businesses, it comes from the individual of this country. That's wrong. They should be able to keep more of their own money and we should be able to clean up government.

I urge a "no" vote on this budget.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I can return all the compliments that Mr. RYAN paid to me. He's a pleasure to work with, and I have great respect for him.

But there's one thing he didn't mention at all in his presentation all afternoon and that is his budget substitute. And I think one of the reasons he didn't do it is that it won't bear scrutiny.

If you look at the Ryan substitute, the Republican minority substitute, you'll find, if you look very closely and know where to look, something called function 920. Now, function 920 is the catch-all. When you can't assign some expenditure or revenue raiser somewhere else, you put it in function 920. It means really we haven't yet completed the job.

When you look at 920 in this case, the minority has assigned \$817 billion in undefined savings or at least \$405 billion in discretionary spending cuts which are undistributed. They haven't been assigned to the Veterans Administration or to the Defense Department or to the Transportation Department. They are undistributed cuts, \$405 billion. I've never seen in all my years in the Budget Committee, anything that has a function 920, this catch-all in cuts of \$405 billion.

But in addition to that, it calls for \$412 billion in mandatory savings. Now, we don't know for sure where mandatory savings are coming from, which

programs are in jeopardy. But when Ways and Means is directed to reconcile \$253 billion over 5 years, the Energy and Commerce Committee is directed to reconcile \$116 billion over 5 years, we know the resolution has Medicare and Medicaid in its bore sights and the likely cuts are substantial. \$368 billion. We've never done anything that approaches that magnitude at Medicaid and Medicare cost reduction. Indeed, during the Gingrich era, Republicans were pushing something of that size. It never got off the ground, and it wouldn't here either, let me tell you. So that's unrealistic. And the 405 is unrealistic because the work hasn't been done.

And then finally Mr. RYAN calls for, in his resolution, \$1.2 trillion in tax cuts over the next 5 years. If you extend these tax cuts out, and you consider what he's doing, he wants to extend all the expiring tax cuts and, on top of that, also repeal the alternative minimum tax, just repeal it. The likely impact on revenues is about \$2.5 trillion over 10 years, which blows a big hole in the bottom of the budget. And I don't think that's realistic either. It certainly isn't realistic if we're in earnest about seeking a budget that will balance. And so here, buried in the budget resolution, which he's not mentioned all afternoon, are three major problems with his budget resolution. He hasn't done his work. He hasn't distributed the cuts. And I'll tell you what that does. When you have \$405 billion in function 920 undistributed, you can say to the veterans who come to you, we've got \$1 billion covered for you. You can say to others, with plausible deniability, oh, you won't be cut, you won't be cut. But in truth, \$405 billion is 20 percent of nondefense discretionary spending. That's where the cuts are going to fall every year at 20 percent. I don't believe it's going to happen. I don't think therefore that what he's presented is a valid, reasonable, defensible alternative to the budget resolution, and it strikes me as passing strange that we haven't discussed it all afternoon.

Now one final shot across the bow, one final statement about the mantra we've heard all afternoon. We do not propose to implement, in this budget resolution, any tax cuts whatsoever. We're laying down the policy as clearly as we know how in title V on middle-income tax relief, and specifying very clearly and pledging ourselves very, very committedly to the enactment, preservation and extension of these tax cuts. That's the policy of this budget resolution. Everyone should bear it in mind.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. WALZ of Minnesota). The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) each will control 30 minutes on the subject of economic goals and policies.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, as Vice Chair of the Joint

Economic Committee, I am pleased to speak in the time reserved by the Budget Act for a discussion of economic goals.

America has the strongest and wealthiest economy in the world. When government makes the right choices, economic growth helps all Americans live a better life today and provides a good future for our children tomorrow. Unfortunately, the Bush administration has not been making responsible choices over the past 7 years. We must chart a more sensible course for economic policy than has been pursued by this administration. Our Democratic majority has made important progress, but there is still much more to do.

President Bush was once fond of saying that his policies were working to make the economy strong. But the economy is now teetering on the brink of what may be the second recession of the Bush Presidency.

It is now clear that even the relatively weak economic growth experienced earlier in this administration was built on an unstable foundation.

The soaring housing prices that helped fuel our economic recovery now appear to have been a classic asset bubble. The collapse of that bubble is spreading throughout our entire financial and credit system.

American families are optimistic, by nature, but they are understandably worried about the future. Most American families have struggled just to hold their economic ground.

Under President Bush's management, our economy has set record after record, but they have been the wrong kinds of records, historically, poor levels of job growth, the greatest gap between the haves and the have not since the 1920s, record numbers of uninsured Americans. Over 47 million Americans lack health insurance.

□ 1930

A record \$9 trillion Federal debt, the largest in our history, and the largest single-year deficit in U.S. history. Record oil prices, record declines in the value of the dollar, record trade deficits that are the largest in history, record declines in housing prices and home equity that are leaving families owing more than their homes are worth.

Bush's job growth record is among the worst of any President since Hoover. As this chart shows, since the Great Depression, only his father has presided over a slower rate of job growth. As you see, the rate of job growth under President Clinton was four times higher than President Bush or Bush's father.

Wage growth has been even slower. Wages are up less than 4 percent in real terms since President Bush came into office. This chart shows the contrast between sluggish wage growth and soaring prices for such basic needs as education, health care, and gasoline. These basic costs of living have grown over 10 times faster than wages.

Look at this chart. The average wages are up 3.8 percent; public university tuition, 40 percent. Family health insurance premiums are up 46 percent, and a gallon of gas is up 87 percent. Middle class workers are being left behind because their hard work has not translated into bigger paychecks.

This chart shows the divergence between strong productivity growth, shown on the top blue line, and much weaker growth in real compensation for ordinary workers, shown in the bottom red line.

Workers' productivity and their compensation used to grow together, but now they grow apart, as this chart shows. This was still true as recently as the late 1990s, but it is not true today. So here you see that for decades the productivity per hour and real compensation per hour basically grew together at the same time, at the same rate. But now look at the great difference between the productivity per hour, the output per an average worker, and the real compensation that the average worker takes home.

If our increased wealth has not gone to ordinary workers, then where has it gone? One answer is that it has gone to a very few at the top of our economy. The divide between the haves and the have-nots is reaching yet another record, a poor record level. We have the largest gap between the haves and the have-nots in many a long time. This chart shows that the share of income held by the top 1 percent of taxpayers is not at the highest level, 19.4 percent, since the Roaring 20s.

The compensation growth that the middle class has received came much more from benefits than from wages. Benefit costs have been increasing because health insurance costs are increasing, are rising up 47 percent in inflation-adjusted terms since 2007.

As this chart shows, rising health costs have driven the number and percentage of uninsured Americans to record levels; 47 million Americans are uninsured today, up 8.6 million since President Bush took office. Yet again another unfortunate record from this administration.

Slow job growth and stagnant wages during much of the Bush administration have depressed families' real incomes. The typical American family is earning almost \$1,000 less than they did when the President took office and after taking inflation into account. As families struggle to make ends meet, they borrowed more and more from their major source of wealth and savings: the equity in their homes.

Under the Bush administration, families' equities stake in their homes has declined to the lowest level ever recorded. As housing prices drop, families will no longer be able to draw on this source of income to make up for slow wage and job growth. Yet, the President and his supporters react to these disturbing trends by pressing tax cuts that largely benefit our most fortunate families.

This chart shows the distribution of the benefits received from the tax cuts. The tall bar on the right shows that households earning \$1 million or more in 2007 income received over 100 times more money in these tax cuts than middle income families did. Incredibly, one-fifth of tax benefits went to these few families who make up just three-tenths of 1 percent of taxpayers.

The Bush administration claimed that these tax cuts would drive investment creating growth in wages and employment, but these claims have proven to be false.

To make matters worse, the tax cuts have been funded using borrowed money. According to the Brookings Institution, the Federal Government has already borrowed some \$1.6 trillion to fund the tax cuts.

When President Bush came into office in 2001, he inherited a projected 10-year budget surplus of \$5.6 trillion. He inherited a government in good financial shape prepared to deal with the budget challenges posed by the retirement of the baby boomer generation and prepared to invest in improving the future standard of living of all of our children and our grandchildren. But this administration has presided over a stunning reversal of fortune.

This year our gross Federal debt will top \$9.6 trillion, the largest in history, or more. That means that every American owes \$30,000 per person to pay off this staggering debt. As a share of our economy, that's the highest level since 1955 when we were paying off debts from World War II. This is the financial mess that we have to clean up.

Thanks to the President's policies, we are now a nation of debtors relying on the rest of the world to finance our budget deficits and the cost of the war in Iraq. As former Secretary of the Treasury Larry Summers has said: There is something very odd about the world's greatest power being the world's greatest debtor.

Our current account deficit, which is the broadest measure of our trade deficit with the rest of the world, rose to yet another record, a record smashing \$857 billion in 2006. And last year was likely even worse. The amount of Federal debt owned by foreigners has more than doubled under Bush's watch, rising to nearly \$2.4 trillion, with Japan and China alone holding more than \$1 trillion of our debt.

How does the administration address our financial problems? They turn to cuts and benefits from middle and working-class families. The President's proposed some \$30 billion in cuts to the Medicaid program. That's a program that provides health care for some 27 percent of our Nation's children. These cuts couldn't come at a worse time. A recent study by the staff of the Joint Economic Committee estimated that should the economy enter into even a mild recession, some 1 million additional children per year would require Medicaid benefits. So these cuts are especially cruel.

Even while proposing these cuts and benefits, the administration wishes to continue massive levels of spending on the misguided priorities that landed us in this fiscal mess. The President's budget calls for all of the 2001 and 2006 tax cuts to be made permanent. But Democrats are not about to mortgage anymore of our children's future for all of these irresponsible tax breaks.

What is more, we have heard no plans for lessening the enormous fiscal and economic drain created by the mismanaged war in Iraq. This chart shows the steady upward march in the administration's requested spending for the war. That's over \$600 billion just so far, with no end in sight. In fact, in this year's 2009 budget, the administration even refuses to tell us what the full-year cost for the war might be. Future costs will be truly massive if the Nation does not change course.

The Joint Economic Committee has submitted that over the next decade, a continued presence in Iraq will cost us a total of \$1.9 trillion in Federal spending and \$2.8 trillion in total impacts on the economy. You can find this report on my Web site.

But the good news is that we have a choice. We don't have to continue spending on the misguided priorities of the last 7 years. If we make responsible choices, our government can once again help middle class families improve their quality of life while saving and investing to improve the lives of future generations.

Our Democratic Congress has made important progress on this agenda. We have worked with the President to increase the minimum wage, expand Head Start, assist struggling homeowners, and increase opportunities in higher education. We've expanded investments in energy independence, green technology, and America's future competitiveness in science and technology.

What is more, we have paid for it all in a fiscally responsible manner. We've also worked with the President to pass an economic stimulus package that was truly targeted to middle class families who needed the assistance most.

Unfortunately, the President has blocked progress on many other initiatives. He has vetoed health insurance for America's uninsured kids, a change of course in Iraq he vetoed, and dozens of other bills. We must turn away from the failed policies of the past which has given us record levels of debt, trade deficit, and deficits of the highest records in history and an order to fully deliver on what the economy can do for all Americans.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Joint Economic Committee on behalf of our senior ranking Republican, the Honorable JIM SEXTON, I rise today to oppose the Democrats' irresponsible budget resolution that will only pave the way for major tax increases and hurt the economy.

You may recall that 15 months ago, Democrats took over the control of the House and the Senate vowing a new direction for America, and in truth, we've experienced that. Since Democrats took control of both Chambers, food prices are up, college tuition is up, health care costs are up, fuel prices are way up, unemployment is up, the deficit is up.

They vowed that they would do three things: They would pay every dime of this war, not mortgage the future. How much have they paid? Zero. They vowed they would not raise the debt limit. In fact, they called it immoral when we did it. So they did it very quietly without a vote in the first 60 days they were in control. And they vowed that they would pay as you go, that they would not allow any tax increases or relief to go forward without paying for them, and, of course, they failed at that as well.

And now we are at a time when the economy is on the brink of a severe downturn. The last thing we should be doing is telling Americans to expect to pay billions more in taxes in just 2 short years; \$683 billion worth, the largest single tax increase in American history. That averages out to almost \$3,000 per family every year. And I know \$3,000 doesn't sound like a lot in Washington, DC, where we squander billions, but for families back in Texas, and I think most middle class families, that is far too much to bear, especially with prices being what they are.

I guess the question we always have, those of us who believe we ought to have lower taxes and less spending, is why does the Democrat budget insist that families tighten their belt but they don't do anything to tighten the belt up here in Washington?

Our public wants us to spend more wisely, not more. And they believe tax is too high. This budget is just the opposite.

□ 1945

I don't know of any economist that thinks tax increases are good for an economy in an economic slowdown, and the timing now is particularly bad. Our economy has suffered some serious shocks: Skyrocketing oil prices, the housing meltdown and mortgage crisis. We certainly don't need another one from here in the Halls of Congress.

And I have to tell you, too, I enjoy hearing about all the class warfare issues. So, we just asked an independent source, the Congressional Budget Office, are the rich getting richer under President Bush? They say the facts are just the opposite. Quoting from them, the period between 2000 and 2005 has not been a time of surging income inequality. Instead, the income gains of the top wealthy 1 percent actually slowed during this period. In contrast, between 1992 and 2000, President Clinton's years, the average income of the top 1 percent skyrocketed by 84 percent. So the king of inequality is President Clinton. They just want to try to hang it on President Bush.

And if you look at the charts, again by the independent Congressional Budget Office, it shows that for middle-class America, after-tax household income actually increased, the highest level since they've been recording these values.

And if you take a look at the total effective tax rate, what we've seen as well is that the tax rates and the cost for middle-class Americans has gone down to a historic rate as well. So, they are earning a record amount of income. They are paying a record fewer amount of taxes. And so middle-class families in America are trying to battle these high prices that this new Democratic Congress is bringing us by trying to keep just a little more of what they earn.

A major tax increase now, when Americans are planning for the future, will only add fuel to the fire and threaten to throw us deep into a recession. You only have to take out a history book to remember the tax increases imposed during the 1930s worked to worsen economic conditions during that time. And the economic growth in the 1990s came about because of spending restraint, and then what turned out to be an artificial economy. But Democrats, as I've said, would like the American public to believe that these tax hikes will only affect the wealthy. Let me tell you, it's going to affect middle-class America. They are dead wrong.

These tax increases the Democrats propose, the largest tax increase in American history, will affect real working families. Any individual that gets married, that has children, that receives maybe a nest egg from their small business or the family farm, maybe makes a good investment, saves for retirement, all of them, all of you will pay more in taxes. Is this what the American people want or deserve? And the answer is no.

Today, while we have Democrats say they are shooting at the wealthy 1 percent, what they are really hitting is middle class America because, as I said before, the rate of taxes paid for by the wealthy 1 percent is actually growing. What we need to do is keep taxes low for middle-class America. Those tax hikes will hurt workers and small businesses, the very people we need investing and growing, by taxing them an average of 12 percent more than we do now. That's 12 percent less money that they can keep to grow their business or invest in their company or maybe create another new job here in America. And unfortunately, raising those taxes is a big incentive for companies to move investments overseas instead of here at home. It's bad enough this Congress has tried to outsource U.S. energy jobs, now we're trying to outsource the rest of America's jobs as well.

And this Democrat budget, I can tell you, does not provide funding to keep the State and local sales tax deduction in place. They don't have any money

for the research and development tax credit. They don't even have any money for the college tuition tax credit. What they say is, we endorse this tax relief. We endorse it. That's like having your son come to you and ask for allowance and you tell him, I don't have any money, but I endorse your idea of an allowance.

The Republican budget actually budgets for that tax relief to make sure that families aren't punished, middle-class families aren't hurt by \$3,000 more every year of new taxes. And what we say is Washington ought to tighten its belt before we ask American families to tighten theirs.

And I'll tell you, too, not only does the Democrat budget raise the deficit, but this budget fails greatly and does not address serious entitlement reform, which is critically needed if we are to sustain Medicare and Social Security for future generations.

It ignores the inevitable and punts the problem down the road. Instead of making the tough choices today, which is what the American public wants, their budget is long on words, but short on action. They call on experts to develop "options" and saying that action is "needed." More words, no action, and the problem gets bigger.

In just 7 short years, entitlement spending on Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security will consume nearly two-thirds of our entire Federal budget, and then it gets worse. These programs will grow to such a size that they will be equal to the cost of the entire Federal Government today, and Americans will have to pay twice the taxes just to keep it in place.

Our economic growth is at risk in this Democrat budget. It makes it more unfair for middle class America; it ignores Social Security and Medicare, which we need to make solvent and preserve once and for all; it raises the deficit; and it basically turns a blind eye to American families who are struggling to make ends meet with rising costs the way they are.

And they all say, well, we endorse the tax relief you have today. Well, Republicans don't endorse it, we embrace it. We include it. We pay for it. And we do balance the budget. And you know what we do? We make a huge sacrifice. We ask Washington to just slow spending by 3 percent. That's all we do. We're not asking to cut major programs. We're not asking for major sacrifices. We're saying, before you force our families to pay \$3,000 more a year, why don't you just tighten your belt just a little, just 3 percent over the next 5 years. That's all we do to balance this budget. That's the smart way to balance the budget. That's the fair way, especially for middle class families. And for our economy, it's the smart way to revive jobs, to create a strong economy, and keep jobs growing in America.

And with that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman for his testimony,

but I want to point out that you have to remember that the Republican Congress and President Bush have been in charge of this economy for 7 years. And when President Bush came into office in 2001, he inherited a projected 10-year budget surplus of \$5.6 trillion. And he inherited a government in good financial shape, prepared to deal with the budget challenges that the country confronts. And yet under his tenure, under his leadership and a Republican Congress, they turned this surplus into an \$8.8 trillion hole, the biggest reversal in history.

And we have to remember that President Bush gave us a series of records, but they're the wrong kinds of records. This country now has the largest debt in the history of our country, \$9.6 trillion. Each American owes \$30,000 of this debt. And we have the largest trade deficit. They have dug us into an \$8.8 trillion reversal, and this was given to us by the Bush administration and the Republican Congress.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to address the House tonight about the budget because there has been a lot of concern expressed here today on both sides of the aisle about the kind of financial trouble we're in. And there's no doubt about that. But sometimes I think we go back and forth spending more time blaming each other rather than dealing with the real problem.

One of the contentions I've had about the budget is that we look at it as an accounting problem rather than a philosophy problem because the spending occurs because of what we accept as the proper role of government. And right now, it's assumed by the country as well as the Congress that the proper role of government is to run our lives, run the economy, run the welfare state, and police the world. And all of a sudden, it puts a lot of pressure on the budget.

Today, the national debt is going up almost \$600 billion. And the economy is getting weaker, there's no doubt about it. We're in a recession, it's going to get much worse, which means that the deficit is going to get a lot worse. And I'm predicting within a couple of years, it will not surprise me one bit to see the national debt, the national obligation for future generations to rise in 1 year three-quarters of \$1 trillion. And that is a very possible number.

And like it has been expressed so often today, we need to do something about it. The question is, what are we going to do about it? One side, it seems like, well, if we just raise taxes, we're going to solve the problem. The other side says, well, all we have to do is get rid of the earmarks. Well, that argument, I think, falls short, too, because

you can vote to cut all the earmarks, but it doesn't cut any spending, it just delivers the authority to spend the money to the executive branch. I think the job of the Congress is to earmark the money. It's our obligation to tell people how the money is spent.

And those who think that we can solve this problem by just getting rid of earmarks, they never talk about the earmarks overseas, the hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars we spend overseas. We earmark them to certain countries, into building military buildings overseas. What about the earmark for the embassy in Iraq? It has cost \$1 billion. That's an earmark. But the side that said that we can solve this problem by cutting earmarks never talks about these earmarks.

Just think of the earmarks in the military budget. I mean, billions. And what do we do? We finally elect a different Congress to deal with some of these supplementals and emergency spending that we don't have the guts to put on the budget, so we elect a new Congress. And what do we do? We have the continuation, in all the budgets presented today, we're still going to finance the war as an off-budget emergency item. We're not being honest with ourselves. And we pretend that the problem is there, and that if you talk about it, it's going to go away.

The way I see it is there's only one way that we're going to attack this, and that is, decide what our government ought to be doing. And the Constitution is very clear, the government ought to preserve our liberties and give us a strong national defense. It shouldn't run our lives, it shouldn't run the economy, it shouldn't police the world. We're not supposed to be the policemen of the world. But everybody talks about it.

And both sides of the aisle have no hesitation to spend every cent the executive branch asked for to run a war that was never declared. We now spend \$1 trillion a year going up, this year it's going to go over \$1 trillion to run the operations overseas. That means all the foreign aid and all the military, \$1 trillion to do things we shouldn't be doing.

They interviewed 3,400 military personnel just recently, military leaders, and 82 percent of them said our military is weaker today than it was 5 years ago. So, all of this money spent and all this policing in the world, and all this deficit.

And financially we're coming down. I mean, just today the dollar went down 1.2 percent in one day, after this steady erosion. It comes from the fact of deficits. And why does that hurt the dollar? Because we don't have enough money. We don't tax enough. We can't tax anymore. People are overtaxed. We can't borrow anymore because interest rates will go up. So, we print the money. And the more money you print, the further the dollar goes down, and then everything goes up in price. So it's a cycle that's coming to an end.

The value of the dollar is really telling the whole story. We've over-extended ourselves because we do not challenge the whole notion of what we ought to be doing here and what our government ought to be all about because we have drifted so far from the original intent of the Constitution. There is no hesitation, there are debates that go on here endlessly. One side of the aisle says, well, we need more and more money for the military; we can't cut one single cent on overseas expenditure. And the other side says, oh, no, we can't cut the entitlements. And then there's an agreement, we raise both.

My idea is to have a strong national defense and to get this budget under control. Reject the notion that we need to run an empire; we can't afford it, it's going to come down, it always comes down. It has come down all throughout history because eventually the currency is destroyed.

□ 2000

We're in 130 countries. We have 700 bases. Our military now is in worse shape than it was 5 years ago, according to our military. So it's time we look at the strategic, the philosophic problems. And I will say, unless we do this, this will end badly. It's going to end with a major economic crisis. It's going to be worldwide, and we here at home will suffer, not only economically but inevitably. Under these conditions the people lose their liberty, and our liberties are being eroded every single day that we're here.

So, yes, we take an oath to obey and uphold the Constitution against foreign and domestic. But we're domestic, and we should protect our rights and our budget and the greatness of this country.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), one of our leaders in this conference and one of our most distinguished leaders.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. BRADY, thank you very kindly for yielding. I appreciate that very much.

Mr. Chairman, I rise tonight on behalf of the hardworking men and women of Michigan and particularly of my Ninth District.

It will come as no surprise to most to hear me say that Michigan has been struggling mightily of late. For the past 6 years, we have suffered from incomparable job losses throughout Michigan. In fact, Michigan was the only State in the Union to have lost jobs in each and every year of that time frame. Our unemployment rate has been the Nation's highest, or close to it, for longer than anyone can remember. Home foreclosures are up. Wages are down. Costs seem to be rising at every turn. To put it lightly, the people of Michigan are facing some tough times.

Not too long ago, the Governor of Michigan proposed an income tax in-

crease. The citizens were on the verge of revolt. The State government actually shut down for a bit. As Michigan families struggled, the last thing they thought they deserved from their government was a bigger tax bill. But, sadly, they got one anyway.

Now the leadership of this body wants to send the good people of Michigan and the people across the country another tax increase. In fact, they want to send, as has been said before, the biggest tax increase in American history.

Well, I'm here to say, and to say strongly, enough is enough. Enough with higher taxes. Enough with wasteful spending. Enough.

Analysts have calculated that the average family in my district would see their taxes go up by more than \$4,100 if this budget were to be enacted. That's \$4,100 that families in Oakland County simply cannot afford. Worse yet, we know that a tax increase this big would do serious harm to the economy, costing even more jobs and putting more people out of work.

The other problem is, and some have told me that my district alone would lose some 2,000 jobs in the wake of this scale of tax increase. I do not want to let that happen.

Many are concerned that the national economy is showing signs of weakness. I submit to my colleagues the weakness you may be seeing is just a common cold compared to the prolonged pneumonia Michigan has suffered from during its single-State recession.

I'm going to fight and fight hard to protect Michigan's families, as every Member here I know would protect the people from their own States, protect them from higher taxes. Taking more of their hard-earned money from their pockets will only lead to more problems, more job losses, and more hardships.

So I repeat: Enough with higher taxes. Enough with wasteful spending. Simply, enough.

If you're thinking of voting for a tax increase this big, I'd invite you to come to see me in Michigan. There you can see firsthand what higher taxes do to an economy. Higher taxes shutter factory doors. They close small businesses, and they hurt families right to the core. This budget, and the \$4,000 increase that comes with it for Oakland County's families, is simply unacceptable.

Instead of raising taxes, we should be focused on solutions that will strengthen the economy, create jobs, encourage investment, and foster innovation. Raising taxes would do the exact polar opposite.

So I strongly urge my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, to reject this massive tax increase on average Americans. I know firsthand how much harm it would do to Michigan's families, and I have every reason to believe it would do the same to families across America.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. May I inquire of the Chair how much time remains on the Democratic side and how much remains on the Republican side.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has 13½ minutes. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) has 10½ minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

To respond to some of the points made by the gentleman from Texas on the high cost of the war, the gentleman from Texas has pointed out that the war is not paid for, that it's off budget, and I support his recommendation that it should not be in a supplemental emergency spending bill.

This chart here shows the Federal spending on the Iraq war versus other priorities in the 2008 budget authorization. The Iraq war is costing, the request, twice as much as is in the Federal budget for transportation for the entire country, and it is five times more than what is in the budget now for the National Institutes of Health. It is seven times more than the college tuition assistance. So this is really costing Americans a great deal of money that could be spent on other priorities.

This chart here shows that the administration wants to spend \$435 million on Iraq every day. And each year that money could be used to enroll for an entire year 57,000 children in Head Start, fund an additional 150,000 Pell Grants for low-income students for an entire year, save 290,000 families from losing their homes. It could hire for an entire year an additional 10,000 Border Patrol agents. It could hire more than 9,000 police officers for a year, and provide health insurance for 330,000 low-income children through the SCHIP program. So, for \$435 million that they are requesting for Iraq every day, you could provide for an entire year health insurance for over 330,000 low-income children.

So I really want to join my colleague from Texas in his comments on the spending on the war.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 seconds.

I would make the point that this new Democrat leadership promised to pay for this war. They vowed riding into office that's what they would do. They had three opportunities last year and this year to fund that war. The budget of last year, the emergency spending, and the budget again for this year. Guess how much is paid for? Zero. Zero money.

It's one thing to make promises to be fiscally responsible. It's another thing not to be fiscally responsible.

Mr. Chairman, with that, I would yield 5 minutes to one of our conservative leaders in Congress, a woman who has fought very hard for middle class families in Tennessee and this country, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

And, Mr. Chairman, I am so pleased to come to the floor and participate in this debate. I think it's one of the most important debates that we have every single year.

And listening to all the comments that are taking place here this evening, Mr. Chairman, it is not lost on me. Budgets are supposed to be about priorities. Budgets should reflect the priorities of a nation, and they should lay out the funding for what we think is important, where we should spend the taxpayers' money.

And I think we have to stop there and pause just a moment because, Mr. Chairman, when I listen to some of our colleagues make comments, as my dear friend from New York just made, talking about all the good things that could be done with money, this is not our money. I do admit that the Federal Government has first right of refusal on the taxpayers' paycheck. I recognize they do that. I don't agree with that. But I think what we have to do is say having first right of refusal isn't right, but the taxpayer turns that money over willingly, and they have the right to know how we spend their money. They have the right to know what those priorities are going to be. So all the functions of the budget are supposed to lay those priorities out.

Now, Mr. Chairman, when I have talked with my constituents about this budget, the number one thing that they have said is this: With the way the taxes are going up, with the way the spending is going up in Washington, I am having too much month left over at the end of my money. And they think the priority reflected in this budget ought not to be the Federal Government's having first right of refusal on that paycheck. The first priority ought to be leaving that paycheck with the person that earned it. Well, what a novel idea. What a novel idea.

Well, let's just look at what we see in the Democrat leadership's budget. Well, the largest tax increase in American history. Here it is. And you can see previously we had \$241 billion in 1993. That was President Clinton's tax increase. But now look at the number over there: \$683 billion in tax increases over a 5-year period of time to pay for the spending that this House wants to participate in.

Well, we know this is going to be costly. So when you look at a chart of what it's going to cost every State, \$2,611 is what it will cost the average Tennessean. In my district in Tennessee, that number is \$2,668.

Well, taxes seem to be a priority, enough of a priority that this Democrat leadership wants to increase taxes on my constituents in the Seventh District of Tennessee \$2,668. But, Mr. Chairman, they had the opportunity to extend sales tax deductibility, which those of us in Tennessee have enjoyed because we don't have a State income

tax. And every Democrat on the Budget Committee voted against giving that tax relief to my constituents in Tennessee because they wanted higher taxes.

Well, the question is, what are they going to do with this tax money once they get it? And here is a chart that shows their discretionary increases. Well, we see \$23 billion above the request in fiscal 2009. And, whoops, look at what's going to happen over there: \$280 billion. And what does that discretionary spending buy the taxpayer? Well, Mr. Chairman, there are \$280 billion worth of earmarks. We're going to have another \$280 billion, not hundred, not thousand, not million, but billion with a "b," \$280 billion worth of earmarks that we are going to see over a 5-year period of time.

The American people have said enough is enough. They want that discretionary spending to come down. They want the earmark spending to come down.

Well, let's take a look at one more thing, and that is entitlements. And we don't even have enough time, obviously, to address that. This House has chosen not to address it. This leadership has chosen not to address it. And look at this chart. By the time we get to 2030, it is going to take every tax dollar coming in to pay for the entitlements of Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security.

□ 2015

We know there is a crisis coming with entitlements. We know that we are going to see earmarks increase. And my constituents are telling me they've had enough of it. They've got too much month left over at the end of that money, and they want to keep more of that money in their pocket.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. At this time, I would reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, how much time is left on the Democratic and Republican sides?

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. WILSON of Ohio). The gentlewoman from New York has 11 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 5¼ minutes remaining.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment on the statement that my good friend and colleague from the State of Tennessee claims that this is the largest tax increase in history. But all we are doing as Democrats is applying the basic rules of fiscal responsibility to expiring tax provisions.

Tax cuts should not be financed with borrowing. Tax cuts are not true tax cuts if they are not paid for. We have committed to preserve middle-class tax cuts if they can be properly paid for in 2010.

And if I could, Mr. Chairman, I will quote from nonpartisan budget groups that agree that the House budget resolution does not raise taxes. These are nonpartisan groups, The Hamilton Project of the Brookings Institute,

“The House Budget Committee’s budget resolution would not raise taxes.” The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, “Neither of the plans that the House and the Senate recommended this week by the Budget Committees include a tax increase.” The Concord Coalition, “Applying PAYGO, pay-as-you-go, rules to expiring tax cuts does not constitute a tax increase. It constitutes a policy decision requiring a balancing of priorities. That is what budgeting is all about.”

I reserve the balance of my time. I yield to my colleague, Congressman BRADY. And we have no other speakers on my side. So after you close, I then will close for my side.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I thank the gentlelady.

I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

I don’t know where those fairy tales come from, I don’t mean from the gentlelady, but some of these special interest groups. But I’m looking at the budget, page 37, I look at this title III called “reserve funds.” It doesn’t have any money in it, but it is called “reserve funds.” It is empty. It says they have all these reserve funds for tax relief, middle-income tax relief, alternative minimum tax relief, higher education, and sales tax deduction.

Here is the problem: I then turn to the page where the line item is for these reserve funds, and it is zero. It is zero in the budget. All these tax cuts that are so important for families and small businesses will go away. In fact, if you ask the question, will those taxes increase in order to balance the Democrat budget? The answer is absolutely yes. Absolutely yes.

And the reason you know this is that every independent organization from government who has examined this budget knows and states, we will see the largest tax increase in American history.

Let us get down to this point, though. We do have common ground, the Republicans and the Democrats, on balancing the budget. There is no question about it. We believe it needs to be done. Here is the difference between the two parties. Republicans believe that we should not raise taxes on families and small businesses, that we should have spending restraint, just a small amount, 3 percent, Washington tighten its budget belt before families do, we tackle Social Security and Medicare in a meaningful way to preserve it, and we enact a 1-year moratorium on frivolous earmarks so we can stop using those hippie museums and the bridges to nowhere and those just embarrassments of spending, that we can go back and come up with a commonsense way of do it in moderation.

The Democrat budget has a different approach. You may like it. They raise taxes about \$3,000 on every family every year in America. They have higher spending, the largest spending budgets in American history. There is no action to preserve Social Security or

Medicare, and earmarks continue unabated. And we have already seen the results of this in the past year. When Republicans held control of Congress, we spent too much. We spent too much, and the deficit got as high as \$412 billion in 2004. It was wrong. Every year we have whittled it down, until the last Republican budget was \$162 billion deficit. That is better than half, but that is not good enough. And in the 1-year budget Democrats have had, they have more than doubled, \$357 billion deficit projection according to the Congressional Budget Office, and this year’s deficit may be larger than that. The compass is going in the wrong direction. America doesn’t need to have their taxes raised. Washington needs to tighten its belt, especially before we ask our families to tighten their belt. We need to tackle Social Security and Medicare. We need to call a time-out on these frivolous earmarks. And we need some spending restraint that the American people believe that we can do.

This is a bad budget for the values and the future of America. It harms our families and small businesses and resorts to budget gimmicks. It will never be a balanced budget. The Republican alternative is a sensible one that will do that the right way. The right choice is the Republican budget.

With that, I yield back my time.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman for his participation tonight.

And I just would like to respond that the Republican budget proposal claims to pay for tax cuts with enormous, but unspecified, cuts in government spending. But when my Republican colleagues were in charge of Congress, along with the President, they did not cut spending. Instead, spending and earmarks grew massively. And so did the Federal debt.

My Republican colleagues and the President gave this country a series of records, but they were the wrong kinds of records. They gave us record debt, \$9.6 trillion, the largest in the history of this country. So when they talk about financial responsibility, this is what they gave this country when they inherited a surplus. They gave us the largest debt in history. Every American owes \$30,000 to this debt. They also gave us the largest trade deficit in history. And they also gave us the largest deficit in history.

So what we have before us, Mr. Chairman, is a responsible budget put forward by the Democratic leadership. And, Mr. Chairman, the challenge for this Congress is to return to the fiscal discipline that has been squandered by the President and his party over the past 7 years giving us the largest debt in history.

Today, Democrats in Congress present a realistic budget plan that adheres to PAYGO principles. We eliminate President Bush’s deficits by 2012 and make the investments necessary to strengthen our economy and make Americans safer.

I want to remind my colleagues that under the Clinton administration, every year the deficits got smaller. But under the Bush administration, every year they have gotten larger. Our budget, the Democratic budget, provides health care for millions of additional uninsured children. We make critical investments in defense and our veterans health care. We also restore crucial funding for Medicare and Medicaid, as well as State and local law enforcement programs.

In order to spur innovation that will keep America number one, we provide increased funding for math and science education and research. We also expand renewable energy and energy efficiency programs to reduce global warming and our dependence on foreign oil. And we provide new training opportunities to prepare workers for green collar jobs. Our budget makes important investments in infrastructure to begin to rebuild our crumbling bridges and levees.

Democrats target tax relief to families struggling to make ends meet in the face of an economic downturn. Our plan extends middle-income tax breaks, including the child tax credit and marriage penalty relief, and we protect 20 million middle-income American families from being snagged by the alternative minimum tax.

Mr. Chairman, this budget resolution is an important step towards putting our financial fiscal house back in order and creating greater economic opportunities and prosperity for all American families.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, when I’m back in Nebraska, I take the opportunity to listen to my constituents about the challenges they face in their day-to-day life.

The high cost of fuel, rising energy prices, and the overall strength of the American economy are all concerns for Nebraskans and all Americans.

Now is the time for Congress to step up to the plate and act with common-sense and fiscal responsibility.

The budget resolution we are debating, however, lets the American people down on those two fronts.

Instead of supporting common-sense budget process controls and responsible spending levels, this budget systematically guts a range of budget process tools, from the Majority’s own PAYGO rule to abandoning any criteria for emergency spending.

In other words, the policies which make it easiest to tax-and-spend.

This budget hikes discretionary spending by \$204 billion over 5-years on top of the Administration’s proposed increase, the Majority loaded up their resolution with over 20 so-called spending “reserve funds,” and increased reliance on budget gimmicks, such as advance appropriations.

Unfortunately, this budget increases spending, raises taxes to historic levels, refuses to fix the AMT—which will hit millions of middle-class taxpayers if nothing is done.

It does nothing to rescue Social Security, Medicare or Medicaid despite the fact the Budget Committee has heard time and time again that something must be done about entitlement spending.

Regrettably, the budget we will consider today appears to simply underscore this Majority's insistence on reckless spending, chased by record tax hikes on American workers and businesses, and massive debt burdens for future generations.

Nebraskans—and all Americans—have called for Congress to live up to its fiscal responsibilities.

Today, however, we are debating a bill which badly misses the mark.

I urge my colleagues to take a stand against this budget—which proposes hundreds of billions of dollars in new government spending paid for with the largest tax hike in American history.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply disappointed that the FY 2009 budget resolution we are considering today continues business as usual in the House. This resolution is another missed opportunity to come to grips with the financial crisis looming on the horizon for our Nation. We face enormous fiscal challenges and addressing them will take bipartisan commitment. The budget resolution—and all of the substitutes—fail to address the long-term spending crisis staring us right in the face.

JIM COOPER and I have been working together with almost 70 cosponsors from both sides of the aisle in offering a solution—the Cooper-Wolf SAFE Commission Act—to respond to what outgoing U.S. Comptroller David Walker characterizes as a “tsunami of spending and debt levels that could swamp our ship of state.”

At the Government Accountability Office, Mr. Walker has coordinated the country-wide “Fiscal Wake Up Tour” and has done a tremendous job of working to educate the American people on the grave condition of our country's fiscal health. I salute David Walker for the yeoman work he has done in bringing this issue to the front burner. He is leaving GAO this week, but he is not abandoning the cause in which he believes and into which he has poured his heart and soul over the past few years. He was quoted as saying, “I love my job. I love GAO. But I love my country more.”

Republicans and Democrats must take to heart David Walker's words—for the love of country—and come together to avert the financial tsunami coming closer and closer to our Nation's shores. It doesn't take an expert to understand that this nation is teetering on the edge of a financial crisis like no other time in our history.

We had the opportunity in this year's budget process to take the initial steps to get our financial house in order. But again this budget cycle, the House is choosing to look the other way and continue business as usual.

If we don't get our country's financial house in order and make the sacrifices necessary today, the future for our children and grandchildren will be bleak. Our economic growth will come to a grinding halt, our standard of living and even our national security will be at risk if we don't start actively working to change our current course. We cannot continue to keep borrowing and mortgaging our future to countries like China and Saudi Arabia that carry obscene amounts of our debt.

This issue is an economic and moral issue that hangs like an ominous cloud over everything we do as public servants, yet many ignore it. I understand we won't be able to fix our financial woes overnight, but we must

come together across the aisle if there is ever to be any hope of ensuring that our Nation's future is strong.

That's why Representative JIM COOPER and I joined efforts and have been calling for a national bipartisan commission that will put everything—entitlement spending, other Federal program spending and tax policy—on the table and come up with recommendations to halt the mounting debt.

Nothing would be off limits for discussion by the commission members.

A critical component of the commission's work will be to engage the American people in a national dialogue about the scope of the country's financial conditions and solutions to the problem. After spending 6 months conducting townhall-style meetings around the country, the commission will present a report to Congress describing the long-term fiscal problems, public suggestions and views, and policy options available to get us back on the right track.

Modeled after the Federal base-closing process, Congress would be required to vote up or down on the plan in its entirety. Mandating congressional action is what makes the SAFE Commission unique. If other viable bipartisan solutions are presented, I think we should look at those, too.

The Cooper-Wolf SAFE Commission legislation has been endorsed by groups across a wide political spectrum—groups who usually disagree more than they agree on policy issues—the Brookings Institution, the Heritage Foundation, the Concord Coalition, and the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget. The Business Roundtable and National Federation of Independent Business are also on board. National columnists David Brooks, David Broder, and Robert Samuelson all have written about the entitlement crisis facing our country and the SAFE Commission as a potential way forward. Senators CONRAD and GREGG have introduced similar legislation in the Senate.

The financial tsunami is moving closer to our shores and the longer we wait to act, the harder it will be to stop the tidal wave of red ink. If our children and grandchildren were on the beach with an actual tsunami off the coast, we would do everything we could to help them. We must move beyond politics and come to grips with the fact that the financial future of our country is an American issue and it's on our watch to fix.

How can this Congress sit by knowing full well that our financial woes will haunt generations to come?

I could easily use all the time for general debate today providing the evidence to support the critical need to address the nation's financial future. This should be the number one budget priority for this Congress. Let me give an example. In January, Moody's Investors Service released its annual report which concluded that the United States triple-A bond rating is at risk. The United States could lose its triple-A bond rating as early as 2012. What does that mean?

That means that respected credit-rating agencies are projecting that the United States will be on par with Greece and Estonia by 2015, Poland and Mexico by 2020, and below investment grade—junk debt—by 2025.

Here's more evidence: the retirement of the baby boomers started this year and presents a demographic challenge that is unprece-

ented. In 2006, Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security consumed 40 percent of the budget. That percentage is expected to jump to 51 percent in less than 10 years. It may be out of sight, out of mind for now, but it's simple math. As the number of Americans aged 65 and up rises, and the working population shrinks, more Americans will draw on promised benefits. The rubber will meet the road, and we will have done nothing to cushion the blow.

We cannot continue to avoid our responsibility to future generations of Americans by passing on a broken system in the form of unfunded Social Security and Medicare obligations and unsustainable spending.

Simply put, the budget resolution set forth this year represents a missed opportunity. We need to follow the example of David Walker and for the love of our country, and for our children and grandchildren, do what it will take to protect our Nation's future. The SAFE Commission is the bipartisan way forward. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert for the RECORD a letter I received from U.S. Comptroller General David Walker, a recent Financial Times article about our Nation's triple-A bond rating, and a Robert Samuelson op-ed from The Washington Post.

[From the Washington Post, October 3, 2007]

#### ESCAPING THE BUDGET IMPASSE

(By Robert J. Samuelson)

Almost everyone knows that the next president will have to wrestle with the immense costs of retiring baby boomers. Comes now a small band of Democrats and Republicans who want to do the new president a giant favor. They want to force the new administration to face the problem in early 2009. Why is this a favor? Because dealing with this issue is so politically unsavory that resolving it quickly would be a godsend. Otherwise, it could haunt the White House for four years.

Let's review the problem (again). From 2000 to 2030, the 65-and-over population will roughly double, from 35 million to 72 million, or from about 12 percent of the population to nearly 20 percent. Spending on Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid—three big programs that serve the elderly—already represents more than 40 percent of the federal budget. In 2006, these three programs cost \$1.1 trillion, more than twice defense spending. Left on automatic pilot, these programs are plausibly projected to grow to about 75 percent of the present budget by 2030.

Stalemate results because all the ways of dealing with these pressures are controversial. There are only four: (a) massive tax increases—on the order of 30 to 50 percent by 2030; (b) draconian cuts in other government programs (note that the projected increases in Social Security and Medicare, as a share of national income, are more than all of today's domestic discretionary programs); (c) cuts in Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid—higher eligibility ages or lower benefits for wealthier retirees; or (d) undesirably large budget deficits.

The proposed escape seems at first so drearily familiar and demonstrably ineffective that it's hardly worth discussing: a bipartisan commission. But what would distinguish this commission from its many predecessors is that Congress would have to vote on its recommendations. The political theory is that, presented with a bipartisan package that cannot be amended, most politicians would do what they believe (privately) ought to be done rather than allow pressure groups, including retirees, to paralyze the process.

There is precedent for this approach. Since 1988, Congress has allowed more than 600 military bases and facilities to be closed or streamlined using a similar arrangement. An independent Base Realignment and Closure Commission evaluates the Pentagon's proposed closings and listens to objections. With the president's approval, it then submits its own list, which goes into effect unless vetoed by both houses of Congress. This process provides members of Congress bipartisan "cover" and prevents amendments from weakening the package.

Two prominent proposals would adapt this approach to the budget. The first, offered by Sens. Kent Conrad (D-N.D.) and Judd Gregg (R-N.H.), the chairman and ranking minority member of the Budget Committee, would create a 16-member commission, evenly divided between Democrats and Republicans. All eight Democrats would be from Congress, as would six Republicans. The administration would have two members, including the secretary of the Treasury.

Conrad's notion is that the impasse is political and that only practicing politicians—people with "skin in the game"—can craft a compromise that can be sold to their peers. The commission would report in December 2008. Twelve of its 16 members would have to support the plan, with congressional passage needing 60 percent approval (60 senators, 261 representatives). These requirements, Conrad and Gregg argue, would ensure bipartisan support.

The other proposal comes from Reps. Jim Cooper (D-Tenn.) and Frank Wolf (R-VA.) It would also create a 16-member commission, with two major differences. First, only four of its members would be from Congress. Second, though Congress would have to vote on the commission's proposal, there would be some leeway for others—including the president—to present alternatives as long as they had the same long-term budget impact. Any proposal, however, would have to be voted on as a package without amendments.

A combination of these plans might work best. A 20-member group would be manageable and should include four outsiders to provide different perspectives and, possibly, to build public support. Perhaps the head of AARP should be included. And it would be a mistake to present the next president with a take-it-or-leave-it package. The Cooper-Wolf plan would allow a new administration to make changes—and get credit—without being able to start from scratch.

This commission approach has potential pitfalls: It might create a face-saving package that does little. But everything else has failed. The main political beneficiary would be the next president. It would be revealing if some of the hopefuls—Democrats and Republicans—would show that they grasp this by providing their endorsements. Otherwise, the odds that Congress will even create the commission are slim.

U.S. GOVERNMENT  
ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE,  
Washington, DC, January 22, 2008.

Hon. FRANK R. WOLF,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. WOLF: As we discussed by phone this morning, while it is understandable that many in Congress are rightfully concerned about our current economic slowdown and recent market declines, it is important that the Congress not forget about our much larger structural challenge. Specifically, we must not forget our large and growing fiscal gap which now totals approximately \$53 trillion (\$53,000,000,000,000) and it is growing by \$2 to \$3 trillion a year absent any meaningful reforms.

Approximately three years ago Standard and Poor's issued a publication stating that,

absent policy changes, the U.S. Government's debt to GDP ratio was on track to mirror ratios associated with speculative-grade sovereigns. Within the last month, Moody's Investors Service issued its annual report on the United States. In that report they noted their concern that, absent Medicare and Social Security reforms, the long-term fiscal health of the United States and our current Aaa bond rating were at risk. These not too veiled comments serve to note the significant longer-term interest rate risk that we face absent meaningful action of our longer range challenge as well. Higher longer-term interest costs would only serve to complicate our fiscal, economic and other challenges in future years.

I believe that it is critically important that this Congress not just address our short-term economic challenge but also our longer-range fiscal gap. The consequences of failing to do so will over time be much more dire than the current economic and market disruptions we are experiencing.

As you may know, while our annual deficits have declined for three straight years, our total fiscal imbalance has continued to grow. Absent meaningful budget, entitlement, spending and tax reforms, this imbalance, which is driven primarily by rising health care costs and known demographic trends, will result in a tsunami of spending and debt levels that could swamp our ship of state.

[From the Financial Times, Jan. 11, 2008]

UNITED STATES' TRIPLE-A CREDIT RATING  
'UNDER THREAT'

(By Francesco Guerrera, Aline van Duyn and Daniel Pimlott)

The U.S. is at risk of losing its top-notch triple-A credit rating within a decade unless it takes radical action to curb soaring healthcare and social security spending, Moody's, the credit rating agency, said yesterday.

The warning over the future of the triple-A rating—granted to U.S. government debt since it was first assessed in 1917—reflects growing concerns over the country's ability to retain its financial and economic supremacy.

It could also put further pressure on candidates from both the Republican and Democratic parties to sharpen their focus on healthcare and pensions in the run-up to November's presidential election.

Most analysts expect future administrations to deal with the costs of healthcare and social security and there is no reflection of any long-term concern about the U.S.'s financial health in the value of its debt.

But Moody's warning comes at a time when U.S. confidence in its economic prowess has been challenged by the rising threat of a recession, a weak dollar and the credit crunch.

In its annual report on the U.S., Moody's signalled increased concern that rapid rises in Medicare and Medicaid—the government-funded healthcare programmes for the old and the poor—would "cause major fiscal pressures" in years to come.

Unlike Moody's previous assessment of U.S. government debt in 2005, yesterday's report specifically links rises in healthcare and social security spending to the credit rating.

"The combination of the medical programmes and social security is the most important threat to the triple-A rating over the long term," it said.

Steven Hess, Moody's lead analyst for the U.S., told the Financial Times that in order to protect the country's top rating, future administrations would have to rein in healthcare and social security costs.

"If no policy changes are made, in 10 years from now we would have to look very seri-

ously at whether the U.S. is still a triple-A credit," he said.

Mr. Hess said any downgrade in the U.S. rating would have serious consequences for the global economy. "The U.S. rating is the anchor of the world's financial system. If you have a downgrade, you have a problem," he said.

Moody's did once threaten to cut the rating of some of the U.S. Treasury's debt when Congress refused to pass the president's budget in the mid-1990s. Other large economies, notably Japan in the 1990s, have had to suffer the symbolic blow of losing their top-notch credit rating.

Last year, David Walker, comptroller general of the U.S., caused controversy when he compared America's current situation with the dying days of the Roman empire and warned the country was on "a burning platform" of unsustainable policies.

Medicare and Medicaid spending, which has risen sharply over the past few decades and now accounts for about 45 percent of total Federal spending, up from about 25 percent in 1975, has long been a source of concern.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to argue against this proposed Democratic budget that would raise taxes on Louisiana taxpayers by an average of \$2,642 and contains egregious wasteful spending.

Extra money for tax hikes might be in the family budget for people in San Francisco, but families in southwest Louisiana do not have extra room in their budgets. Wasteful spending and tax hikes are irresponsible. The Democratic House leadership must understand that American families are facing higher costs at the pump, higher costs for healthcare and education, and more money to pay Federal taxes simply isn't there.

The Democratic budget proposal includes a massive \$683 billion tax increase spread over five years in order to finance wasteful Washington spending according to the Congressional Budget Office. Taxpayers in Louisiana face average tax increases of \$2,642. While failing to address growing entitlement programs, House Democrats are proposing tens of billions more in new Federal spending facilitated by the tax increase.

In addition, the Democratic budget contains the following: Cuts to the child tax credit, from \$1,000 to \$500 per child; Decreases to the adoption tax credit; Decreases in tax-free 401(k) and IRA contributions; Tax increases for small businesses averaging more than \$4,000 per business.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot in good conscience support a budget that is as irresponsible as this one. It is a hamper to American entrepreneurs, small businesses and economic growth. Additionally, it hurts American families who struggle to pay higher energy prices, healthcare costs, housing costs and education costs.

Our budget is a statement of priorities. Lowering taxes, growing our economy and providing for families are my priorities. This Democratic budget falls well short.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota) having assumed

the chair, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 312) revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2008, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2009, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2010 through 2013, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WILSON of Ohio). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

#### SHORT-TERM FARM BILL EXTENSION

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 2745) to extend agricultural programs beyond March 15, 2008, to suspend permanent price support authorities beyond that date, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The text of the Senate bill is as follows:

S. 2745

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS.

(a) EXTENSION.—Except as otherwise provided in this section and notwithstanding any other provision of law, the authorities provided under the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-171; 7 U.S.C. 7901 et seq.) and each amendment made by that Act (and for mandatory programs at such funding levels), as in effect on September 30, 2007, shall continue, and the Secretary of Agriculture shall carry out the authorities, until April 18, 2008.

(b) CONSERVATION PROGRAMS.—

(1) FARMLAND PROTECTION PROGRAM.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture (referred to in this subsection as the “Secretary”) shall continue the farmland protection program established under subchapter B of chapter 2 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3833h et seq.) at a funding level of \$97,000,000 per year.

(2) GROUND AND SURFACE WATER CONSERVATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall continue the ground and surface water conservation program established under section 1240I of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa-9) at a funding level of \$60,000,000 per year.

(3) WILDLIFE HABITAT INCENTIVES PROGRAM.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall continue the wildlife habitat incentive program established

under section 1240N of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839bb-1) at a funding level of \$85,000,000 per year.

(c) EXCEPTIONS.—This section does not apply with respect to the following provisions of law:

(1) Section 1307(a)(6) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 7957(a)(6)).

(2) Section 524(b) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1524(b)).

(3) Section 25 of the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 2034).

(4) Section 601(j)(1) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 (7 U.S.C. 950bb(j)(1)).

(5) Section 231(b)(4) of the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 (7 U.S.C. 1621note; Public Law 106-224).

(6) Section 9002(k)(2) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8102(k)(2)).

(7) Section 9004(d) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8104(d)).

(8) Section 9006(f) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 8106(f)).

(9) Subtitles A through C of title I of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 7911 et seq.), with respect to the 2008 crops (other than the 2008 crop of a loan commodity described in paragraph (11), (12), (13), or (14) of section 1202(b) of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 7932(b))).

(d) SUSPENSION OF PERMANENT PRICE SUPPORT AUTHORITIES.—The provisions of law specified in subsections (a) through (c) of section 1602 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (7 U.S.C. 7992) shall be suspended through April 18, 2008.

(e) RELATION TO CONSOLIDATED APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), this section does not apply to the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2008 (division A of Public Law 110-161; 121 Stat. 1846).

(2) REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED EXTENSION.—Section 751 of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2008 (division A of Public Law 110-161; 121 Stat. 1883) is repealed.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendment made by this section shall take effect on March 15, 2008.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 2745, a bill to extend current farm programs until April 18, 2008. Mr. Speaker, our farm policies ensure that all Americans have access to safe, secure and abundant food supply while providing a safety net for American farmers and ranchers. It also authorizes important nutrition programs for our country's neediest citizens, encourages vital conservation programs and supports the development of agriculturally based renewable energy.

Mr. Speaker, all of us on the Agriculture Committee would rather have a new farm bill signed into law rather

than be here today asking for an extension.

After hearing about the popularity of the 2002 farm bill from farmers and ranchers nationwide in a series of field hearings our committee held in 2006, we set out last year to build on a strong farm safety net while making new investments in rural America and for our Nation's neediest citizens who depend on Federal food programs for a square meal.

The new farm bill that this House passed last July makes those investments in nutrition, fruits and vegetable production and farm-based renewable energy. It reforms our farm programs and reinforces the strong farm safety net. It includes an agreement between industry and consumer groups on mandatory country-of-origin labeling for meat. All that progress will be lost if we do not get this bill finished and signed into law.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, we are taking steps toward a bipartisan, bicameral bill that Members can support. And I believe we have made enough progress in that endeavor to support a 1-month extension.

So, in closing, I would like to thank my friend and the ranking member, Mr. GOODLATTE from Virginia, for his work over the last few months and for standing alongside me in working with the Senate and the administration in order to get this farm bill to a conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 2745, a bill to extend current farm programs until April 18, 2008.

Mr. Speaker, our farm policies ensure that all Americans have access to a safe, secure and abundant food supply while providing a safety net for America's farmers and ranchers. Farm bills also authorize important nutrition programs for our country's neediest citizens, encourage vital conservation programs, and increasingly support the development of agriculturally based renewable energy, which will help reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

Mr. Speaker, all of us on the Agriculture Committee would rather have a new Farm Bill signed into law rather than to be here today to ask for an extension. When the House Agriculture Committee kicked off the Farm Bill process in 2006 with Farm Bill field hearings all across America, we hoped a new Farm Bill for American agriculture would have been signed into law by now. Even though the farmers and ranchers we heard from in those hearings were strongly supportive of the farm safety net of the 2002 law, we knew passing a new Farm Bill would not be easy in this kind of budget environment.

Mr. Speaker, the Farm Bill has been a victim of its own success. The 2002 law saved taxpayers billions but resulted in a 60 percent cut in budget authority for traditional farm programs when budget baselines were released a year ago.

Nevertheless, the Agriculture Committee wrote a Farm Bill from the ground up; a new Farm Bill that makes historic investments in fruit and vegetable production, conservation, nutrition, and renewable energy while reinforcing the strong safety net for America's

farmers. The House-passed bill institutes mandatory country-of-origin labeling for meat. And despite what is said by editorial boards in big cities, this Farm Bill contains significant reforms that just a few years ago many people thought would be impossible to pass. We have eliminated the three-entity rule. We have implemented direct attribution of payments for transparency. And thanks to a hard cap on eligibility, millionaires will no longer be receiving farm payments.

The Senate passed their Farm Bill in late December, and staffs have been working hard ever since the New Year to work out many of the policy issues we will face once an overall funding level is reached.

Mr. Speaker, we are taking gradual steps to reaching a bipartisan, bicameral bill that everyone can support, and I believe we have made enough progress to support a 1-month extension.

Many people would like to see different things with this Farm Bill, but the truth is, Mr. Speaker, that all of the advances we have made in fruit and vegetable production, nutrition, conservation, reforming farm programs, and encouraging farm-based renewable energy will go out the window if we do not get this bill done and signed into law. The forward progress we have made over the last few weeks lead me to believe that we can get this done. Our farmers and ranchers expect us to finish a new farm bill for a new age of agriculture.

In closing, I would like to thank my friend and Ranking Member Mr. BOB GOODLATTE of Virginia for his work over the last few months and for standing alongside me in working with the Senate and the Administration in order to get this Farm Bill to a conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2745, the short-term farm bill extension that will extend some provisions of the 2002 farm bill until April 18. The other body passed the same provision this morning, and this body must pass this bill so both bodies can continue to work on conference negotiations.

□ 2030

Mr. Speaker, I would like nothing more than to stand before you today and report that we are on the brink of an agreement on the farm bill. However, progress on a new farm bill agreement has been painfully slow, and this process has become a source of frustration for me and my colleagues, and the chairman I know as well, as well as millions of rural Americans awaiting a new farm bill.

If we do not seek prompt and substantive action on the farm bill, I believe we must pursue a different course of action, because our farmers and ranchers have already waited too long. Interminable delays in implementing a new farm bill may not have real ramifications in Washington, but in rural America the effects are real, and they are substantial.

I appreciate the efforts of our committee chairman to try to keep this process moving. I know at times he has shared my frustrations. We all recog-

nize the need for a new farm bill, and we continue to work toward completing a farm bill and getting it to the President for him to sign into law by April 18.

I urge my colleagues to support this farm bill extension to give us a little more time to try to overcome the budget obstacles that have been standing in the way of the farm bill finish line since last year.

We started this process together in a bipartisan fashion more than 2 years ago. We worked together in the committee to move a farm bill forward, but we have been hindered time and time again outside the committee by the fact that others in the Congress have failed to recognize the fact that this farm bill starts out \$58 billion below the last farm bill in terms of what it will cost to continue the farm legislation forward. That is a great thing. That is a tremendous savings for the American taxpayer. But when we are trying to write a modern, forward-looking farm bill that encompasses changes in conservation, in nutrition, in energy, in specialty crops, and we are trying to reform the commodity title of the farm bill, we needed to have some additional resources.

The chairman and I went to the Budget Committee last year in a bipartisan fashion and asked for some money above the baseline, not \$58 billion coming back to us, but \$5 billion, \$10 billion above that baseline, which still would have been a huge savings for the taxpayers and allowed us to write a farm bill inside the committee and bring it to the floor of the House without being dependent on another committee or another source. The same problem existed in the Senate.

The outcome has been that we have been spinning our wheels having to deal with other outside influences rather than getting the job done in the committee because of this funding not being available. We are going to have to look at some new alternatives if we don't get a breakthrough here in the next couple of days, because even this extension will expire very, very soon, and the time it takes to write a farm bill that encompasses a whole host of issues, from what goes on on the farm to all of our nutrition programs, to our environmental and conservation programs, to research programs for agriculture, to a whole host of other areas that are very, very important, not just to America's farmers and ranchers, not just to people living in rural America, but to every American consumer who depends upon our farm community to continue to provide the safest, most abundant, most affordable food supply in the world, and we will be working together.

I appreciate the chairman's working with me and with other Members on this side of the aisle to accomplish that goal. He has been tenacious in that effort. But we need to either move on, or we need to get the help that was promised a year ago to finally come to the committee so we can get the job done.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2745.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials thereon on S. 2745.

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

There was no objection.

#### PENSION PROTECTION TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT OF 2008

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3361) to make technical corrections related to the Pension Protection Act of 2006, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3361

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES TO ACTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—This Act may be cited as the "Pension Protection Technical Corrections Act of 2008".

(b) REFERENCES TO ACTS.—For purposes of this Act—

(1) AMENDMENT OF 1986 CODE.—The term "1986 Code" means the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(2) AMENDMENT OF ERISA.—The term "ERISA" means the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974.

(3) 2006 ACT.—The term "2006 Act" means the Pension Protection Act of 2006.

#### SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS RELATED TO TITLE I.

(a) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTIONS 101 AND 111.—

(1) AMENDMENTS TO ERISA.—

(A) Clause (i) of section 302(c)(1)(A) of ERISA is amended by striking "the plan is" and inserting "the plan are".

(B) Section 302(c)(7) of ERISA is amended by inserting "which reduces the accrued benefit of any participant" after "subsection (d)(2)" in subparagraph (A).

(C) Section 302(d)(1) of ERISA is amended by striking "the valuation date,".

(2) AMENDMENTS TO 1986 CODE.—

(A) Clause (i) of section 412(c)(1)(A) of the 1986 Code is amended by striking "the plan is" and inserting "the plan are".

(B) Section 412(c)(7) of the 1986 Code is amended by inserting "which reduces the accrued benefit of any participant" after "subsection (d)(2)" in subparagraph (A).

(C) Section 412(d)(1) of the 1986 Code is amended by striking "the valuation date,".

(b) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTIONS 102 AND 112.—

(1) AMENDMENTS TO ERISA.—

(A) Section 303(b) of ERISA is amended to read as follows:

“(b) TARGET NORMAL COST.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (i)(2) with respect to plans in at-risk status, the term ‘target normal cost’ means, for any plan year, the excess of—

“(A) the sum of—

“(i) the present value of all benefits which are expected to accrue or to be earned under the plan during the plan year, plus

“(ii) the amount of plan-related expenses expected to be paid from plan assets during the plan year, over

“(B) the amount of mandatory employee contributions expected to be made during the plan year.

“(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR INCREASE IN COMPENSATION.—For purposes of this subsection, if any benefit attributable to services performed in a preceding plan year is increased by reason of any increase in compensation during the current plan year, the increase in such benefit shall be treated as having accrued during the current plan year.”

(B) Section 303(c)(5)(B)(iii) of ERISA is amended by inserting “beginning” before “after 2008”.

(C) Section 303(c)(5)(B)(iv)(II) of ERISA is amended by inserting “for such year” after “beginning in 2007”.

(D) Section 303(f)(4)(A) of ERISA is amended by striking “paragraph (2)” and inserting “paragraph (3)”.

(E) Section 303(h)(2)(F) of ERISA is amended—

(i) by striking “section 205(g)(3)(B)(iii)(I) for such month” and inserting “section 205(g)(3)(B)(iii)(I) for such month”, and

(ii) by striking “subparagraph (B)” and inserting “subparagraph (C)”.

(F) Section 303(i) of ERISA is amended—

(i) in paragraph (2)—

(I) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

“(A) the excess of—

“(i) the sum of—

“(I) the present value of all benefits which are expected to accrue or to be earned under the plan during the plan year, determined using the additional actuarial assumptions described in paragraph (1)(B), plus

“(II) the amount of plan-related expenses expected to be paid from plan assets during the plan year, over

“(ii) the amount of mandatory employee contributions expected to be made during the plan year, plus”, and

(II) in subparagraph (B), by striking “the target normal cost (determined without regard to this paragraph) of the plan for the plan year” and inserting “the amount determined under subsection (b)(1)(A)(i) with respect to the plan for the plan year”, and

(ii) by striking “subparagraph (A)(ii)” in the last sentence of paragraph (4)(B) and inserting “subparagraph (A)”.

(G) Section 303(j)(3) of ERISA—

(i) is amended by adding at the end of subparagraph (A) the following new sentence: “In the case of plan years beginning in 2008, the funding shortfall for the preceding plan year may be determined using such methods of estimation as the Secretary of the Treasury may provide.”

(ii) by adding at the end of subparagraph (E) the following new clause:

“(iii) PLAN WITH ALTERNATE VALUATION DATE.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe regulations for the application of this paragraph in the case of a plan which has a valuation date other than the first day of the plan year.”, and

(iii) by striking “AND SHORT YEARS” in the heading of subparagraph (E) and inserting “, SHORT YEARS, AND YEARS WITH ALTERNATE VALUATION DATE”.

(H) Section 303(k)(6)(B) of ERISA is amended by striking “, except” and all that follows and inserting a period.

(2) AMENDMENTS TO 1986 CODE.—

(A) Section 430(b) of the 1986 Code is amended to read as follows:

“(b) TARGET NORMAL COST.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (i)(2) with respect to plans in at-risk status, the term ‘target normal cost’ means, for any plan year, the excess of—

“(A) the sum of—

“(i) the present value of all benefits which are expected to accrue or to be earned under the plan during the plan year, plus

“(ii) the amount of plan-related expenses expected to be paid from plan assets during the plan year, over

“(B) the amount of mandatory employee contributions expected to be made during the plan year.

“(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR INCREASE IN COMPENSATION.—For purposes of this subsection, if any benefit attributable to services performed in a preceding plan year is increased by reason of any increase in compensation during the current plan year, the increase in such benefit shall be treated as having accrued during the current plan year.”

(B) Section 430(c)(5)(B)(iii) of the 1986 Code is amended by inserting “beginning” before “after 2008”.

(C) Section 430(c)(5)(B)(iv)(II) of the 1986 Code is amended by inserting “for such year” after “beginning in 2007”.

(D) Section 430(f) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(i) by striking “as of the first day of the plan year” the second place it appears in the first sentence of paragraph (3)(A),

(ii) by striking “paragraph (2)” in paragraph (4)(A) and inserting “paragraph (3)”,

(iii) by striking “paragraph (1), (2), or (4) of section 206(g)” in paragraph (6)(B)(iii) and inserting “subsection (b), (c), or (e) of section 436”.

(iv) by striking “the sum of” in paragraph (6)(C), and

(v) by striking “of the Treasury” in paragraph (8).

(E) Section 430(h)(2) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(i) by inserting “and target normal cost” after “funding target” in subparagraph (B),

(ii) by striking “liabilities” and inserting “benefits” in subparagraph (B),

(iii) by striking “section 417(e)(3)(D)(i) for such month” in subparagraph (F) and inserting “section 417(e)(3)(D)(i) for such month”, and

(iv) by striking “subparagraph (B)” in subparagraph (F) and inserting “subparagraph (C)”.

(F) Section 430(i) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(i) in paragraph (2)—

(I) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

“(A) the excess of—

“(i) the sum of—

“(I) the present value of all benefits which are expected to accrue or to be earned under the plan during the plan year, determined using the additional actuarial assumptions described in paragraph (1)(B), plus

“(II) the amount of plan-related expenses expected to be paid from plan assets during the plan year, over

“(ii) the amount of mandatory employee contributions expected to be made during the plan year, plus”, and

(II) in subparagraph (B), by striking “the target normal cost (determined without re-

gard to this paragraph) of the plan for the plan year” and inserting “the amount determined under subsection (b)(1)(A)(i) with respect to the plan for the plan year”, and

(ii) by striking “subparagraph (A)(ii)” in the last sentence of paragraph (4)(B) and inserting “subparagraph (A)”.

(G) Section 430(j)(3) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(i) by adding at the end of subparagraph (A) the following new sentence: “In the case of plan years beginning in 2008, the funding shortfall for the preceding plan year may be determined using such methods of estimation as the Secretary may provide.”

(ii) by striking “section 302(c)” in subparagraph (D)(ii)(II) and inserting “section 412(c)”.

(iii) by adding at the end of subparagraph (E) the following new clause:

“(iii) PLAN WITH ALTERNATE VALUATION DATE.—The Secretary shall prescribe regulations for the application of this paragraph in the case of a plan which has a valuation date other than the first day of the plan year.”, and

(iv) by striking “AND SHORT YEARS” in the heading of subparagraph (E) and inserting “, SHORT YEARS, AND YEARS WITH ALTERNATE VALUATION DATE”.

(H) Section 430(k) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(i) by inserting “(as provided under paragraph (2))” after “applies” in paragraph (1), and

(ii) by striking “, except” and all that follows in paragraph (6)(B) and inserting a period.

(c) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTIONS 103 AND 113.—

(1) AMENDMENTS TO ERISA.—

(A) Section 101(j) of ERISA is amended—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking “section 206(g)(4)(B)” and inserting “section 206(g)(4)(A)”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following: “The Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary, shall have the authority to prescribe rules applicable to the notices required under this subsection.”

(B) Section 206(g)(1)(B)(ii) of ERISA is amended by striking “a funding” and inserting “an adjusted funding”.

(C) The heading for section 206(g)(1)(C) of ERISA is amended by inserting “BENEFIT” after “EVENT”.

(D) Section 206(g)(3)(E) of ERISA is amended by adding at the end the following new flush sentence:

“Such term shall not include the payment of a benefit which under section 203(e) may be immediately distributed without the consent of the participant.”

(E) Section 206(g)(5)(A)(iv) of ERISA is amended by inserting “adjusted” before “funding”.

(F) Section 206(g)(9)(C) of ERISA is amended—

(i) by striking “without regard to this subparagraph and” in clause (i), and

(ii) in clause (iii)—

(I) by striking “without regard to this subparagraph” and inserting “without regard to the reduction in the value of assets under section 303(f)(4)”, and

(II) by inserting “beginning” before “after” each place it appears.

(G) Section 206(g) of ERISA is amended by redesignating paragraph (10) as paragraph (11) and by inserting after paragraph (9) the following new paragraph:

“(10) SECRETARIAL AUTHORITY FOR PLANS WITH ALTERNATE VALUATION DATE.—In the case of a plan which has designated a valuation date other than the first day of the plan year, the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe rules for the application of

this subsection which are necessary to reflect the alternate valuation date.”.

(H) Section 502(c)(4) of ERISA is amended by striking “by any person” and all that follows through the period and inserting “by any person of subsection (j), (k), or (l) of section 101 or section 514(e)(3).”.

(2) AMENDMENTS TO 1986 CODE.—

(A) Section 436(b)(2) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(i) by striking “section 303” and inserting “section 430” in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), and

(ii) by striking “a funding” and inserting “an adjusted funding” in subparagraph (B).

(B) Section 436(b)(3) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(i) by inserting “BENEFIT” after “EVENT” in the heading, and

(ii) by striking “any event” in subparagraph (B) and inserting “an event”.

(C) Section 436(d)(5) of the 1986 Code is amended by adding at the end the following new flush sentence:

“Such term shall not include the payment of a benefit which under section 411(a)(11) may be immediately distributed without the consent of the participant.”.

(D) Section 436(f) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(i) by inserting “adjusted” before “funding” in paragraph (1)(D), and

(ii) by striking “prefunding balance under section 430(f) or funding standard carryover balance” in paragraph (2) and inserting “prefunding balance or funding standard carryover balance under section 430(f)”.

(E) Section 436(j)(3) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking “without regard to this paragraph and”,

(II) by striking “section 430(f)(4)(A)” and inserting “section 430(f)(4)”, and

(III) by striking “paragraph (1)” and inserting “paragraphs (1) and (2)”, and

(ii) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) by striking “without regard to this paragraph” and inserting “without regard to the reduction in the value of assets under section 430(f)(4)”, and

(II) by inserting “beginning” before “after” each place it appears.

(F) Section 436 of the 1986 Code is amended by redesignating subsection (k) as subsection (m) and by inserting after subsection (j) the following new subsections:

“(k) SECRETARIAL AUTHORITY FOR PLANS WITH ALTERNATE VALUATION DATE.—In the case of a plan which has designated a valuation date other than the first day of the plan year, the Secretary may prescribe rules for the application of this section which are necessary to reflect the alternate valuation date.

“(l) SINGLE-EMPLOYER PLAN.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘single-employer plan’ means a plan which is not a multiemployer plan.”.

(3) AMENDMENTS TO 2006 ACT.—Sections 103(c)(2)(A)(ii) and 113(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the 2006 Act are each amended—

(A) by striking “subsection” and inserting “section”, and

(B) by striking “subparagraph” and inserting “paragraph”.

(d) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTIONS 107 AND 114.—

(1) AMENDMENTS TO ERISA.—

(A) Section 103(d) of ERISA is amended—

(i) in paragraph (3), by striking “the normal costs, the accrued liabilities” and inserting “the normal costs or target normal costs, the accrued liabilities or funding target”, and

(ii) by striking paragraph (7) and inserting the following new paragraph:

“(7) A certification of the contribution necessary to reduce the minimum required contribution determined under section 303, or the accumulated funding deficiency determined under section 304, to zero.”.

(B) Section 4071 of ERISA is amended by striking “as section 303(k)(4) or 307(e)” and inserting “or section 303(k)(4)”,

(2) AMENDMENTS TO 1986 CODE.—

(A) Section 401(a)(29) of the 1986 Code is amended by striking “ON PLANS IN AT-RISK STATUS” in the heading.

(B) Section 401(a)(32)(C) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(i) by striking “section 430(j)” and inserting “section 430(j)(3)”, and

(ii) by striking “paragraph (5)(A)” and inserting “section 430(j)(4)(A)”.

(C) Section 401(a)(33) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(i) by striking “section 412(c)(2)” in subparagraph (B)(iii) and inserting “section 412(d)(2)”, and

(ii) by striking “section 412(b)(2) (without regard to subparagraph (B) thereof)” in subparagraph (D) and inserting “section 412(b)(1), without regard to section 412(b)(2)”.

(D) Section 411 of the 1986 Code is amended—

(i) by striking “section 412(c)(2)” in subsection (a)(3)(C) and inserting “section 412(d)(2)”, and

(ii) by striking “section 412(e)(2)” in subsection (d)(6)(A) and inserting “section 412(d)(2)”.

(E) Section 414(1)(2)(B)(i)(I) of the 1986 Code is amended to read as follows:

“(I) the sum of the funding target and target normal cost determined under section 430, over”.

(F) Section 4971 of the 1986 Code is amended—

(i) by striking “required minimum” in subsection (b)(1) and inserting “minimum required”,

(ii) by inserting “or unpaid minimum required contribution, whichever is applicable” after “accumulated funding deficiency” each place it appears in subsections (c)(3) and (d)(1), and

(iii) by striking “section 412(a)(1)(A)” in subsection (e)(1) and inserting “section 412(a)(2)”.

(3) AMENDMENT TO 2006 ACT.—Section 114 of the 2006 Act is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to plan years beginning after 2007.

“(2) EXCISE TAX.—The amendments made by subsection (e) shall apply to taxable years beginning after 2007, but only with respect to plan years described in paragraph (1) which end with or within any such taxable year.”.

(e) AMENDMENT RELATED TO SECTION 116.—Section 409A(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the 1986 Code is amended by inserting “to an applicable covered employee” after “under the plan”.

### SEC. 3. AMENDMENTS RELATED TO TITLE II.

(a) AMENDMENT RELATED TO SECTIONS 201 AND 211.—Section 201(b)(2)(A) of the 2006 Act is amended by striking “has not used” and inserting “has not adopted, or ceased using.”.

(b) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTIONS 202 AND 212.—

(1) AMENDMENTS TO ERISA.—

(A) Section 302(b)(3) of ERISA is amended by striking “the plan adopts” and inserting “the plan sponsor adopts”.

(B) Section 305(b)(3)(C) of ERISA is amended by striking “section 101(b)(4)” and inserting “section 101(b)(1)”.

(C) Section 305(b)(3)(D) of ERISA is amended by striking “The Secretary” in clause (iii) and inserting “The Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary”.

(D) Section 305(c)(7) of ERISA is amended—

(i) by striking “to agree on” and all that follows in subparagraph (A)(ii) and inserting “to adopt a contribution schedule with terms consistent with the funding improvement plan and a schedule from the plan sponsor,”, and

(ii) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

“(B) DATE OF IMPLEMENTATION.—The date specified in this subparagraph is the date which is 180 days after the date on which the collective bargaining agreement described in subparagraph (A) expires.”, and

(iii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) FAILURE TO MAKE SCHEDULED CONTRIBUTIONS.—Any failure to make a contribution under a schedule of contribution rates provided under this paragraph shall be treated as a delinquent contribution under section 515 and shall be enforceable as such.”.

(E) Section 305(e) of ERISA is amended—

(i) in paragraph (3)(C)—

(I) by striking all that follows “to adopt a” in clause (i)(II) and inserting “to adopt a contribution schedule with terms consistent with the rehabilitation plan and a schedule from the plan sponsor under paragraph (1)(B)(i),”,

(II) by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following new clause:

“(ii) DATE OF IMPLEMENTATION.—The date specified in this clause is the date which is 180 days after the date on which the collective bargaining agreement described in clause (i) expires.”, and

(III) by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(iii) FAILURE TO MAKE SCHEDULED CONTRIBUTIONS.—Any failure to make a contribution under a schedule of contribution rates provided under this subsection shall be treated as a delinquent contribution under section 515 and shall be enforceable as such.”.

(ii) in paragraph (4)—

(I) by striking “the date of” in subparagraph (A)(ii), and

(II) by striking “and taking” in subparagraph (B) and inserting “but taking”,

(iii) in paragraph (6)—

(I) by striking “paragraph (1)(B)(i)” and inserting “the last sentence of paragraph (1)”, and

(II) by striking “established” and inserting “establish”,

(iv) in paragraph (8)(C)(iii)—

(I) by striking “the Secretary” in subsection (I) and inserting “the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary”, and

(II) by striking “Secretary” in the last sentence and inserting “Secretary of the Treasury”, and

(v) by striking “an employer’s withdrawal liability” in paragraph (9)(B) and inserting “the allocation of unfunded vested benefits to an employer”.

(F) Section 305(f)(2)(A)(i) of ERISA is amended by adding at the end the following: “to a participant or beneficiary whose annuity starting date (as defined in section 205(h)(2)) occurs after the date such notice is sent.”.

(G) Section 305(g) of ERISA is amended by inserting “under subsection (c)” after “funding improvement plan” the first place it appears.

(H) Section 502(c)(2) of ERISA is amended by striking “101(b)(4)” and inserting “101(b)(1)”.

(I) Section 502(c)(8)(A) of ERISA is amended by inserting “plan” after “multiemployer”.

(2) AMENDMENTS TO 1986 CODE.—

(A) Section 432(b)(3)(C) of the 1986 Code is amended by striking “section 101(b)(4)” and inserting “section 101(b)(1)”.

(B) Section 432(b)(3)(D)(iii) of the 1986 Code is amended by striking “The Secretary of Labor” and inserting “The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor”.

(C) Section 432(c) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(i) in paragraph (3), by striking “section 304(d)” in subparagraph (A)(ii) and inserting “section 431(d)”, and

(ii) in paragraph (7)—

(I) by striking “to agree on” and all that follows in subparagraph (A)(ii) and inserting “to adopt a contribution schedule with terms consistent with the funding improvement plan and a schedule from the plan sponsor.”, and

(II) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

“(B) DATE OF IMPLEMENTATION.—The date specified in this subparagraph is the date which is 180 days after the date on which the collective bargaining agreement described in subparagraph (A) expires.”.

(D) Section 432(e) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(i) in paragraph (3)(C)—

(I) by striking all that follows “to adopt a” in clause (i)(II) and inserting “to adopt a contribution schedule with terms consistent with the rehabilitation plan and a schedule from the plan sponsor under paragraph (1)(B)(i).”, and

(II) by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following new clause:

“(ii) DATE OF IMPLEMENTATION.—The date specified in this clause is the date which is 180 days after the date on which the collective bargaining agreement described in clause (i) expires.”.

(i) in paragraph (4)—

(I) by striking “the date of” in subparagraph (A)(ii), and

(II) by striking “and taking” in subparagraph (B) and inserting “but taking”,

(iii) in paragraph (6)—

(I) by striking “paragraph (1)(B)(i)” and inserting “the last sentence of paragraph (1)”, and

(II) by striking “established” and inserting “establish”.

(iv) in paragraph (8)—

(I) by striking “section 204(g)” in subparagraph (A)(i) and inserting “section 411(d)(6)”,

(II) by inserting “of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974” after “4212(a)” in subparagraph (C)(i)(II).

(III) by striking “the Secretary of Labor” in subparagraph (C)(iii)(I) and inserting “the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor”, and

(IV) by striking “the Secretary of Labor” in the last sentence of subparagraph (C)(iii) and inserting “the Secretary”, and

(v) by striking “an employer’s withdrawal liability” in paragraph (9)(B) and inserting “the allocation of unfunded vested benefits to an employer”.

(E) Section 432(f)(2)(A)(i) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(i) by striking “section 411(b)(1)(A)” and inserting “section 411(a)(9)”; and

(ii) by inserting at the end the following: “to a participant or beneficiary whose annuity starting date (as defined in section 417(f)(2)) occurs after the date such notice is sent.”.

(F) Section 432(g) of the 1986 Code is amended by inserting “under subsection (c)” after “funding improvement plan” the first place it appears.

(G) Section 432(i) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(i) by striking “section 412(a)” in paragraph (3) and inserting “section 431(a)”, and

(ii) by striking paragraph (9) and inserting the following new paragraph:

“(9) PLAN SPONSOR.—For purposes of this section, section 431, and section 4971(g)—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘plan sponsor’ means, with respect to any multiemployer plan, the association, committee, joint board of trustees, or other similar group of representatives of the parties who establish or maintain the plan.

“(B) SPECIAL RULE FOR SECTION 404(c) PLANS.—In the case of a plan described in section 404(c) (or a continuation of such plan), such term means the bargaining parties described in paragraph (1).”.

(H) Section 412(b)(3) of the 1986 Code is amended by striking “the plan adopts” and inserting “the plan sponsor adopts”.

(I) Section 4971(g)(4) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking “first day of” and inserting “day following the close of”, and

(ii) by striking clause (ii) of subparagraph (C) and inserting the following new clause:

“(ii) PLAN SPONSOR.—For purposes of clause (i), the term ‘plan sponsor’ has the meaning given such term by section 432(i)(9).”.

(3) AMENDMENTS TO 2006 ACT.—

(A) Section 212(b)(2) of the 2006 Act is amended by striking “Section 4971(c)(2) of such Code” and inserting “Section 4971(e)(2) of such Code”.

(B) Section 212(e)(1) of the 2006 Act is amended by inserting “, except that the amendments made by subsection (b) shall apply to taxable years beginning after 2007, but only with respect to plan years beginning after 2007 which end with or within any such taxable year” before the period at the end.

(C) Section 212(e)(2) of the 2006 Act is amended by striking “section 305(b)(3) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974” and inserting “section 432(b)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986”.

#### SEC. 4. AMENDMENTS RELATED TO TITLE III.

(a) AMENDMENT RELATED TO SECTION 301.— Clause (ii) of section 101(c)(2)(A) of the Pension Funding Equity Act of 2004, as amended by section 301(c) of the 2006 Act, is amended by striking “2008” and inserting “2009”.

(b) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 302.—

(1) AMENDMENT TO ERISA.—Section 205(g)(3)(B)(iii)(II) of ERISA is amended by striking “section 205(g)(3)(B)(iii)(II)” and inserting “section 205(g)(3)(A)(ii)(II)”.

(2) AMENDMENTS TO 1986 CODE.—

(A) Section 417(e)(3)(D)(i) of the 1986 Code is amended by striking “clause (ii)” and inserting “subparagraph (C)”.

(B)(i) Section 415(b)(2)(E)(v) of the 1986 Code is amended to read as follows:

“(v) For purposes of adjusting any benefit or limitation under subparagraph (B), (C), or (D), the mortality table used shall be the applicable mortality table (within the meaning of section 417(e)(3)(B)).”.

(ii)(I) Except as provided in subclause (II), the amendment made by clause (i) shall apply to years beginning after December 31, 2008.

(II) A plan sponsor may elect to have the amendment made by clause (i) apply to any year beginning after December 31, 2007, and before January 1, 2009, or to any portion of any such year.

#### SEC. 5. AMENDMENTS RELATED TO TITLE IV.

(a) AMENDMENT RELATED TO SECTION 401.— Section 4006(a)(3)(A)(i) of ERISA is amended by striking “1990” and inserting “2005”.

(b) AMENDMENT RELATED TO SECTION 402.— Section 402(c)(1)(A) of the 2006 Act is amended by striking “commercial airline” and inserting “commercial”.

(c) AMENDMENT RELATED TO SECTION 408.— Section 4044(e) of ERISA, as added by section

408(b)(2) of the 2006 Act, is redesignated as subsection (f).

(d) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 409.— Section 4041(b)(5)(A) of ERISA is amended by striking “subparagraph (B)” and inserting “subparagraphs (B) and (D)”.

(e) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 410.— Section 4050(d)(4)(A) of ERISA is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of clause (i), and

(2) by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following new clauses:

“(i) which is not a plan described in paragraph (2), (3), (4), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10), or (11) of section 4021(b), and

“(iii) which, was a plan described in section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 which includes a trust exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code, and”.

#### SEC. 6. AMENDMENTS RELATED TO TITLE V.

(a) AMENDMENT RELATED TO SECTION 501.— Section 101(f)(2)(B)(ii) of ERISA is amended—

(1) by striking “for which the latest annual report filed under section 104(a) was filed” in subclause (I)(aa) and inserting “to which the notice relates”, and

(2) by striking subclause (II) and inserting the following new subclause:

“(II) in the case of a multiemployer plan, a statement, for the plan year to which the notice relates and the preceding 2 plan years, of the value of the plan assets (determined both in the same manner as under section 304 and under the rules of subclause (I)(bb)) and the value of the plan liabilities (determined in the same manner as under section 304 except that the method specified in section 305(i)(8) shall be used).”.

(b) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 502.—

(1) Section 101(k)(2) of ERISA is amended by filing at the end the following new flush sentence:

“Subparagraph (C)(i) shall not apply to individually identifiable information with respect to any plan investment manager or adviser, or with respect to any other person (other than an employee of the plan) preparing a financial report required to be included under paragraph (1)(B).”.

(2) Section 4221 of ERISA is amended by striking subsection (e) and by redesignating subsections (f) and (g) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively.

(c) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 503.—

(1) AMENDMENTS TO ERISA.—

(A) Section 104(b)(3) of ERISA is amended by—

(i) striking “section 103(f)” and inserting “section 101(f)”, and

(ii) striking “the administrators” and inserting “the administrator”.

(B) Section 104(d)(1)(E)(ii) of ERISA is amended by inserting “funding” after “plan’s”.

(2) AMENDMENTS TO 2006 ACT.—Section 503(e) of the 2006 Act is amended by striking “section 101(f)” and inserting “section 104(d)”.

(d) AMENDMENT RELATED TO SECTION 505.— Section 4010(d)(2)(B) of ERISA is amended by striking “section 302(d)(2)” and inserting “section 303(d)(2)”.

(e) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 506.—

(1) Section 4041(c)(2)(D)(i) of ERISA is amended by striking “subsection (a)(2)” the second place it appears and inserting “subparagraph (A) or the regulations under subsection (a)(2)”.

(2) Section 4042(c)(3)(C)(i) of ERISA is amended—

(A) by striking “and plan sponsor” and inserting “, the plan sponsor, or the corporation”, and

(B) by striking “subparagraph (A)(i)” and inserting “subparagraph (A)”.

(f) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 508.— Section 209(a) of ERISA is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “regulations prescribed by the Secretary” and inserting “such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe”, and

(B) by striking the last sentence and inserting “The report required under this paragraph shall be in the same form, and contain the same information, as periodic benefit statements under section 105(a).”, and

(2) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) If more than one employer adopts a plan, each such employer shall furnish to the plan administrator the information necessary for the administrator to maintain the records, and make the reports, required by paragraph (1). Such administrator shall maintain the records, and make the reports, required by paragraph (1).”

(g) AMENDMENT RELATED TO SECTION 509.—Section 101(i)(8)(B) of ERISA is amended to read as follows:

“(B) ONE-PARTICIPANT RETIREMENT PLAN.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term ‘one-participant retirement plan’ means a retirement plan that on the first day of the plan year—

“(i) covered only one individual (or the individual and the individual’s spouse) and the individual (or the individual and the individual’s spouse) owned 100 percent of the plan sponsor (whether or not incorporated), or

“(ii) covered only one or more partners (or partners and their spouses) in the plan sponsor.”

#### SEC. 7. AMENDMENTS RELATED TO TITLE VI.

(a) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 601.—(1) AMENDMENTS TO ERISA.—

(A) Section 408(g)(3)(D)(ii) of ERISA is amended by striking “subsection (b)(14)(B)(ii)” and inserting “subsection (b)(14)(A)(ii)”.

(B) Section 408(g)(6)(A)(i) of ERISA is amended by striking “financial adviser” and inserting “fiduciary adviser”.

(C) Section 408(g)(11)(A) of ERISA is amended—

(i) by striking “the participant” each place it appears and inserting “a participant”, and

(ii) by striking “section 408(b)(4)” in clause (i) and inserting “subsection (b)(4)”.

(2) AMENDMENTS TO 1986 CODE.—(A) Section 4975(d)(17) of the 1986 Code, in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), is amended by striking “and that permits” and inserting “that permits”.

(B) Section 4975(f)(8) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “subsection (b)(14)” and inserting “subsection (d)(17)”,

(ii) in subparagraph (C)(iv)(II), by striking “subsection (b)(14)(B)(ii)” and inserting “(d)(17)(A)(ii)”,

(iii) in subparagraph (F)(i)(I), by striking “financial adviser” and inserting “fiduciary adviser”,

(iv) in subparagraph (I), by striking “section 406” and inserting “subsection (c)”, and

(v) in subparagraph (J)(i)—

(I) by striking “the participant” each place it appears and inserting “a participant”,

(II) in the matter preceding subclause (I), by inserting “referred to in subsection (e)(3)(B)” after “investment advice”, and

(III) in subclause (II), by striking “section 408(b)(4)” and inserting “subsection (d)(4)”.

(3) AMENDMENT TO 2006 ACT.—Section 601(b)(4) of the 2006 Act is amended by striking “section 4975(c)(3)(B)” and inserting “section 4975(e)(3)(B)”.

(b) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 611.—(1) AMENDMENT TO ERISA.—Section 408(b)(18)(C) of ERISA is amended by striking “or less”.

(2) AMENDMENTS TO 1986 CODE.—Section 4975(d) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) of paragraph (18)—

(i) by striking “party in interest” and inserting “disqualified person”, and

(ii) by striking “subsection (e)(3)(B)” and inserting “subsection (e)(3)”,

(B) in paragraphs (19), (20), and (21), by striking “party in interest” each place it appears and inserting “disqualified person”, and

(C) by striking “or less” in paragraph (21)(C).

(c) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 612.—Section 4975(f)(11)(B)(i) of the 1986 Code is amended by—

(1) inserting “of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974” after “section 407(d)(1)”, and

(2) inserting “of such Act” after “section 407(d)(2)”.

(d) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 624.—Section 404(c)(5) of ERISA is amended by striking “participant” each place it appears and inserting “participant or beneficiary”.

SEC. 8. AMENDMENTS RELATED TO TITLE VII.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO ERISA.—(1) Section 203(f)(1)(B) of ERISA is amended to read as follows:

“(B) the requirements of section 204(c) or 205(g), or the requirements of subsection (e), with respect to accrued benefits derived from employer contributions.”

(2) Section 204(b)(5) of ERISA is amended—

(A) by striking “clause” in subparagraph (A)(iii) and inserting “subparagraph”, and

(B) by inserting “otherwise” before “allowable” in subparagraph (C).

(3) Subclause (II) of section 204(b)(5)(B)(i) of ERISA is amended to read as follows:

“(II) PRESERVATION OF CAPITAL.—An applicable defined benefit plan shall be treated as failing to meet the requirements of paragraph (1)(H) unless the plan provides that an interest credit (or equivalent amount) of less than zero shall in no event result in the account balance or similar amount being less than the aggregate amount of contributions credited to the account.”

(b) AMENDMENTS TO 1986 CODE.—(1) Section 411(b)(5) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(A) by striking “clause” in subparagraph (A)(iii) and inserting “subparagraph”, and

(B) by inserting “otherwise” before “allowable” in subparagraph (C).

(2) Section 411(a)(13)(A) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(A) by striking “paragraph (2)” in clause (i) and inserting “subparagraph (B)”,

(B) by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following new clause:

“(ii) the requirements of subsection (a)(11) or (c), or the requirements of section 417(e), with respect to accrued benefits derived from employer contributions.”

(C) by striking “paragraph (3)” in the matter following clause (ii) and inserting “subparagraph (C)”.

(3) Subclause (II) of section 411(b)(5)(B)(i) of the 1986 Code is amended to read as follows:

“(II) PRESERVATION OF CAPITAL.—An applicable defined benefit plan shall be treated as failing to meet the requirements of paragraph (1)(H) unless the plan provides that an interest credit (or equivalent amount) of less than zero shall in no event result in the account balance or similar amount being less than the aggregate amount of contributions credited to the account.”

(c) AMENDMENTS TO 2006 ACT.—(1) Section 701(d)(2) of the 2006 Act is amended by striking “204(g)” and inserting “205(g)”.

(2) Section 701(e) of the 2006 Act is amended—

(A) by inserting “on or” after “period” in paragraph (3),

(B) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by inserting “the earlier of” after “before” in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), and

(ii) by striking “earlier” and inserting “later” in subparagraph (A),

(C) by inserting “on or” before “after” each place it appears in paragraph (5), and

(D) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(6) SPECIAL RULE FOR VESTING REQUIREMENTS.—The requirements of section 203(f)(2) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and section 411(a)(13)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by this Act)—

“(A) shall not apply to a participant who does not have an hour of service after the effective date of such requirements (as otherwise determined under this subsection); and

“(B) in the case of a plan other than a plan described in paragraph (3) or (4), shall apply to plan years ending on or after June 29, 2005.”

(d) AMENDMENT OF ADEA.—Section 4(i)(10)(B)(i)(III) of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (29 U.S.C. 623(i)(10)(B)(i)(III)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “In the case of a governmental plan (as defined in the first sentence of section 414(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986), a rate of return or a method of crediting interest established pursuant to any provision of Federal, State, or local law (including any administrative rule or policy adopted in accordance with any such law) shall be treated as a market rate of return for purposes of subclause (I) and a permissible method of crediting interest for purposes of meeting the requirements of subclause (I), except that this sentence shall only apply to a rate of return or method of crediting interest if such rate or method does not violate any other requirement of this Act.”

SEC. 9. AMENDMENTS RELATED TO TITLE VIII.

(a) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 801.—(1) Section 404(o) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(A) by striking “430(g)(2)” in paragraph (2)(A)(ii) and inserting “430(g)(3)”, and

(B) by striking “412(f)(4)” in paragraph (4)(B) and inserting “412(d)(3)”.

(2) Section 404(a)(7)(A) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(A) by striking the next to last sentence, and

(B) by striking “the plan’s funding shortfall determined under section 430” in the last sentence and inserting “the excess (if any) of the plan’s funding target (as defined in section 430(d)(1)) over the value of the plan’s assets (as determined under section 430(g)(3))”.

(b) AMENDMENT RELATED TO SECTION 802.—Section 404(a)(1)(D)(i) of the 1986 Code is amended by striking “431(c)(6)(C)” and inserting “431(c)(6)(D)”.

(c) AMENDMENT RELATED TO SECTION 803.—Clause (iii) of section 404(a)(7)(C) of the 1986 Code is amended to read as follows:

“(iii) LIMITATION.—In the case of employer contributions to 1 or more defined contribution plans—

“(I) if such contributions do not exceed 6 percent of the compensation otherwise paid or accrued during the taxable year to the beneficiaries under such plans, this paragraph shall not apply to such contributions or to employer contributions to the defined benefit plans to which this paragraph would otherwise apply by reason of contributions to the defined contribution plans, and

“(II) if such contributions exceed 6 percent of such compensation, this paragraph shall be applied by only taking into account such contributions to the extent of such excess.

For purposes of this clause, amounts carried over from preceding taxable years under subparagraph (B) shall be treated as employer

(i) by striking “the earlier of” after “before” in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), and

(ii) by striking “earlier” and inserting “later” in subparagraph (A),

(C) by inserting “on or” before “after” each place it appears in paragraph (5), and

(D) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(6) SPECIAL RULE FOR VESTING REQUIREMENTS.—The requirements of section 203(f)(2) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and section 411(a)(13)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by this Act)—

“(A) shall not apply to a participant who does not have an hour of service after the effective date of such requirements (as otherwise determined under this subsection); and

“(B) in the case of a plan other than a plan described in paragraph (3) or (4), shall apply to plan years ending on or after June 29, 2005.”

(d) AMENDMENT OF ADEA.—Section 4(i)(10)(B)(i)(III) of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (29 U.S.C. 623(i)(10)(B)(i)(III)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “In the case of a governmental plan (as defined in the first sentence of section 414(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986), a rate of return or a method of crediting interest established pursuant to any provision of Federal, State, or local law (including any administrative rule or policy adopted in accordance with any such law) shall be treated as a market rate of return for purposes of subclause (I) and a permissible method of crediting interest for purposes of meeting the requirements of subclause (I), except that this sentence shall only apply to a rate of return or method of crediting interest if such rate or method does not violate any other requirement of this Act.”

SEC. 9. AMENDMENTS RELATED TO TITLE VIII.

(a) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 801.—(1) Section 404(o) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(A) by striking “430(g)(2)” in paragraph (2)(A)(ii) and inserting “430(g)(3)”, and

(B) by striking “412(f)(4)” in paragraph (4)(B) and inserting “412(d)(3)”.

(2) Section 404(a)(7)(A) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(A) by striking the next to last sentence, and

(B) by striking “the plan’s funding shortfall determined under section 430” in the last sentence and inserting “the excess (if any) of the plan’s funding target (as defined in section 430(d)(1)) over the value of the plan’s assets (as determined under section 430(g)(3))”.

(b) AMENDMENT RELATED TO SECTION 802.—Section 404(a)(1)(D)(i) of the 1986 Code is amended by striking “431(c)(6)(C)” and inserting “431(c)(6)(D)”.

(c) AMENDMENT RELATED TO SECTION 803.—Clause (iii) of section 404(a)(7)(C) of the 1986 Code is amended to read as follows:

“(iii) LIMITATION.—In the case of employer contributions to 1 or more defined contribution plans—

“(I) if such contributions do not exceed 6 percent of the compensation otherwise paid or accrued during the taxable year to the beneficiaries under such plans, this paragraph shall not apply to such contributions or to employer contributions to the defined benefit plans to which this paragraph would otherwise apply by reason of contributions to the defined contribution plans, and

“(II) if such contributions exceed 6 percent of such compensation, this paragraph shall be applied by only taking into account such contributions to the extent of such excess.

For purposes of this clause, amounts carried over from preceding taxable years under subparagraph (B) shall be treated as employer

SEC. 9. AMENDMENTS RELATED TO TITLE VIII.

(a) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 801.—(1) Section 404(o) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(A) by striking “430(g)(2)” in paragraph (2)(A)(ii) and inserting “430(g)(3)”, and

(B) by striking “412(f)(4)” in paragraph (4)(B) and inserting “412(d)(3)”.

(2) Section 404(a)(7)(A) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(A) by striking the next to last sentence, and

(B) by striking “the plan’s funding shortfall determined under section 430” in the last sentence and inserting “the excess (if any) of the plan’s funding target (as defined in section 430(d)(1)) over the value of the plan’s assets (as determined under section 430(g)(3))”.

(b) AMENDMENT RELATED TO SECTION 802.—Section 404(a)(1)(D)(i) of the 1986 Code is amended by striking “431(c)(6)(C)” and inserting “431(c)(6)(D)”.

(c) AMENDMENT RELATED TO SECTION 803.—Clause (iii) of section 404(a)(7)(C) of the 1986 Code is amended to read as follows:

“(iii) LIMITATION.—In the case of employer contributions to 1 or more defined contribution plans—

“(I) if such contributions do not exceed 6 percent of the compensation otherwise paid or accrued during the taxable year to the beneficiaries under such plans, this paragraph shall not apply to such contributions or to employer contributions to the defined benefit plans to which this paragraph would otherwise apply by reason of contributions to the defined contribution plans, and

“(II) if such contributions exceed 6 percent of such compensation, this paragraph shall be applied by only taking into account such contributions to the extent of such excess.

For purposes of this clause, amounts carried over from preceding taxable years under subparagraph (B) shall be treated as employer

SEC. 9. AMENDMENTS RELATED TO TITLE VIII.

(a) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 801.—(1) Section 404(o) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(A) by striking “430(g)(2)” in paragraph (2)(A)(ii) and inserting “430(g)(3)”, and

(B) by striking “412(f)(4)” in paragraph (4)(B) and inserting “412(d)(3)”.

(2) Section 404(a)(7)(A) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(A) by striking the next to last sentence, and

(B) by striking “the plan’s funding shortfall determined under section 430” in the last sentence and inserting “the excess (if any) of the plan’s funding target (as defined in section 430(d)(1)) over the value of the plan’s assets (as determined under section 430(g)(3))”.

(b) AMENDMENT RELATED TO SECTION 802.—Section 404(a)(1)(D)(i) of the 1986 Code is amended by striking “431(c)(6)(C)” and inserting “431(c)(6)(D)”.

(c) AMENDMENT RELATED TO SECTION 803.—Clause (iii) of section 404(a)(7)(C) of the 1986 Code is amended to read as follows:

“(iii) LIMITATION.—In the case of employer contributions to 1 or more defined contribution plans—

“(I) if such contributions do not exceed 6 percent of the compensation otherwise paid or accrued during the taxable year to the beneficiaries under such plans, this paragraph shall not apply to such contributions or to employer contributions to the defined benefit plans to which this paragraph would otherwise apply by reason of contributions to the defined contribution plans, and

“(II) if such contributions exceed 6 percent of such compensation, this paragraph shall be applied by only taking into account such contributions to the extent of such excess.

For purposes of this clause, amounts carried over from preceding taxable years under subparagraph (B) shall be treated as employer

contributions to 1 or more defined contribution plans to the extent attributable to employer contributions to such plans in such preceding taxable years.”.

(d) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 824.—

(1) Section 408A(c)(3)(B) of the 1986 Code, as in effect after the amendments made by section 824(b)(1) of the 2006 Act, is amended—

(A) by striking the second “an” before “eligible”;

(B) by striking “other than a Roth IRA”;

(C) by adding at the end the following new flush sentence:

“This subparagraph shall not apply to a qualified rollover contribution from a Roth IRA or to a qualified rollover contribution from a designated Roth account which is a rollover contribution described in section 402A(c)(3)(A).”

(2) Section 408A(d)(3)(B), as in effect after the amendments made by section 824(b)(2)(B) of the 2006 Act, is amended by striking “(other than a Roth IRA)” and by inserting at the end the following new sentence: “This paragraph shall not apply to a distribution which is a qualified rollover contribution from a Roth IRA or a qualified rollover contribution from a designated Roth account which is a rollover contribution described in section 402A(c)(3)(A).”

(e) AMENDMENT TO SECTION 827.—The first sentence of section 72(t)(2)(G)(iv) of the 1986 Code is amended by inserting “on or” before “before”.

(f) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 829.—

(1) Section 402(c)(11) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(A) by inserting “described in paragraph (8)(B)(iii)” after “eligible retirement plan” in subparagraph (A); and

(B) by striking “trust” before “designated beneficiary” in subparagraph (B).

(2)(A) Section 402(f)(2)(A) of the 1986 Code is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “Such term shall include any distribution to a designated beneficiary which would be treated as an eligible rollover distribution by reason of subsection (c)(11), or section 403(a)(4)(B), 403(b)(8)(B), or 457(e)(16)(B), if the requirements of subsection (c)(11) were satisfied.”

(B) Clause (i) of section 402(c)(11)(A) of the 1986 Code is amended by striking “for purposes of this subsection”.

(C) The amendments made by this paragraph shall apply with respect to plan years beginning after December 31, 2008.

(g) AMENDMENT RELATED TO SECTION 832.—Section 415(f) of the 1986 Code is amended by striking paragraph (2) and by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

(h) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 833.—

(1) Section 408A(c)(3)(C) of the 1986 Code, as added by section 833(c) of the 2006 Act, is redesignated as subparagraph (E).

(2) In the case of taxable years beginning after December 31, 2009, section 408A(c)(3)(E) of the 1986 Code (as redesignated by paragraph (1))—

(A) is redesignated as subparagraph (D); and

(B) is amended by striking “subparagraph (C)(ii)” and inserting “subparagraph (B)(ii)”.

(i) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 841.—

(1) Section 420(c)(1)(A) of the 1986 Code is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “In the case of a qualified future transfer or collectively bargained transfer to which subsection (f) applies, any assets so transferred may also be used to pay liabilities described in subsection (f)(2)(C).”

(2) Section 420(f)(2) of the 1986 Code is amended by striking “such” before “the applicable” in subparagraph (D)(i)(I).

(3) Section 4980(c)(2)(B) of the 1986 Code is amended by striking “or” at the end of

clause (i), by striking the period at the end of clause (ii) and inserting “, or”, and by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(iii) any transfer described in section 420(f)(2)(B)(ii)(I).”

(j) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 845.—

(1) Subsection (l) of section 402 of the 1986 Code is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting “maintained by the employer described in paragraph (4)(B)” after “an eligible retirement plan”, and

(ii) by striking “of the employee, his spouse, or dependents (as defined in section 152)”;

(B) in paragraph (4)(D), by—

(i) inserting “(as defined in section 152)” after “dependents”, and

(ii) striking “health insurance plan” and inserting “health plan”;

(C) in paragraph (5)(A), by striking “health insurance plan” and inserting “health plan”.

(2) Subparagraph (B) of section 402(l)(3) of the 1986 Code is amended by striking “all amounts distributed from all eligible retirement plans were treated as 1 contract for purposes of determining the inclusion of such distribution under section 72” and inserting “all amounts to the credit of the eligible public safety officer in all eligible retirement plans maintained by the employer described in paragraph (4)(B) were distributed during such taxable year and all such plans were treated as 1 contract for purposes of determining under section 72 the aggregate amount which would have been so includable”.

(k) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 854.—

(1) Section 3121(b)(5)(E) of the 1986 Code is amended by striking “or special trial judge”.

(2) Section 210(a)(5)(E) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking “or special trial judge”.

(l) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 856.—Section 856 of the 2006 Act, and the amendments made by such section, are hereby repealed, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be applied and administered as if such sections and amendments had not been enacted.

(m) AMENDMENT RELATED TO SECTION 864.—Section 864(a) of the 2006 Act is amended by striking “Reconciliation”.

#### SEC. 10. AMENDMENTS RELATED TO TITLE IX.

(a) AMENDMENT RELATED TO SECTION 901.—Section 401(a)(35)(E)(iv) of the 1986 Code is amended to read as follows:

“(iv) ONE-PARTICIPANT RETIREMENT PLAN.—For purposes of clause (iii), the term ‘one-participant retirement plan’ means a retirement plan that on the first day of the plan year—

“(I) covered only one individual (or the individual and the individual’s spouse) and the individual (or the individual and the individual’s spouse) owned 100 percent of the plan sponsor (whether or not incorporated), or

“(II) covered only one or more partners (or partners and their spouses) in the plan sponsor.”.

(b) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 902.—

(1) Section 401(k)(13)(D)(i)(I) of the 1986 Code is amended by striking “such compensation as exceeds 1 percent but does not” and inserting “such contributions as exceed 1 percent but do not”.

(2) Sections 401(k)(8)(E) and 411(a)(3)(G) of the 1986 Code are each amended—

(A) by striking “an erroneous automatic contribution” and inserting “a permissible withdrawal”, and

(B) by striking “ERRONEOUS AUTOMATIC CONTRIBUTION” in the heading and inserting “PERMISSIBLE WITHDRAWAL”.

(3) Section 402(g)(2)(A)(ii) of the 1986 Code is amended by inserting “through the end of such taxable year” after “such amount”.

(4) Section 414(w)(3) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “and” after the comma at the end,

(B) by striking subparagraph (C); and

(C) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (C).

(5) Section 414(w)(5) of the 1986 Code is amended by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting a comma, and by adding at the end the following:

“(D) a simplified employee pension the terms of which provide for a salary reduction arrangement described in section 408(k)(6), and

“(E) a simple retirement account (as defined in section 408(p)).”.

(6) Section 414(w)(6) of the 1986 Code is amended by inserting “or for purposes of applying the limitation under section 402(g)(1)” before the period at the end.

(c) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 903.—

(1) AMENDMENT OF 1986 CODE.—Section 414(x)(1) of the 1986 Code is amended by adding at the end of paragraph (1) the following new sentence: “In the case of a termination of the defined benefit plan and the applicable defined contribution plan forming part of an eligible combined plan, the plan administrator shall terminate each such plan separately.”

(2) AMENDMENTS OF ERISA.—Section 210(e) of ERISA is amended—

(A) by adding at the end of paragraph (1) the following new sentence: “In the case of a termination of the defined benefit plan and the applicable defined contribution plan forming part of an eligible combined plan, the plan administrator shall terminate each such plan separately.”; and

(B) by striking paragraph (3) and by redesignating paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) as paragraphs (3), (4), and (5), respectively.

(d) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 906.—

(1) Section 906(b)(1)(B)(ii) of the 2006 Act is amended by striking “paragraph (1)” and inserting “paragraph (10)”.

(2) Section 4021(b) of ERISA is amended by inserting “or” at the end of paragraph (12), by striking “; or” at the end of paragraph (13) and inserting a period, and by striking paragraph (14).

#### SEC. 11. AMENDMENTS RELATED TO TITLE X.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT.—

(1) Section 14(b) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 (45 U.S.C. 231m(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3)(i) Payments made pursuant to paragraph (2) of this subsection shall not require that the employee be entitled to an annuity under section 2(a)(1) of this Act: Provided, however, That where an employee is not entitled to such an annuity, payments made pursuant to paragraph (2) may not begin before the month in which the following three conditions are satisfied:

“(A) The employee has completed ten years of service in the railroad industry or, five years of service all of which accrues after December 31, 1995.

“(B) The spouse or former spouse attains age 62.

“(C) The employee attains age 62 (or if deceased, would have attained age 62).

“(ii) Payments made pursuant to paragraph (2) of this subsection shall terminate upon the death of the spouse or former spouse, unless the court document provides for termination at an earlier date. Notwithstanding the language in a court order, that portion of payments made pursuant to paragraph (2) which represents payments computed pursuant to section 3(f)(2) of this Act shall not be paid after the death of the employee.

“(iii) If the employee is not entitled to an annuity under section 2(a)(1) of this Act, payments made pursuant to paragraph (2) of this subsection shall be computed as though the employee were entitled to an annuity.”.

(2) Subsection (d) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act (45 U.S.C. 231d) is repealed.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) SUBSECTION (a)(1).—The amendment made by subsection (a)(1) shall apply with respect to payments due for months after August 2007. If, prior to the effective date of such amendment, payment pursuant to paragraph (2) of section 14(b) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 (45 U.S.C. 231m(b)) was terminated because of the employee’s death, payment to the former spouse may be reinstated for months after August 2007.

(2) SUBSECTION (a)(2).—The amendment made by subsection (a)(2) shall take effect upon the date of the enactment of this Act.

#### SEC. 12. AMENDMENTS RELATED TO TITLE XI.

(a) AMENDMENT RELATED TO SECTION 1104.—Section 1104(d)(1) of the 2006 Act is amended by striking “Act” the first place it appears and inserting “section”.

(b) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 1105.—Section 3304(a) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(1) in paragraph (15)—

(A) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A) as subclauses (I) and (II),

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii),

(C) by striking the semicolon at the end of clause (ii) (as so redesignated) and inserting “, and”.

(D) by striking “(15)” and inserting “(15)(A) subject to subparagraph (B),”.

(E) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) the amount of compensation shall not be reduced on account of any payments of governmental or other pensions, retirement or retired pay, annuity, or other similar payments which are not includible in the gross income of the individual for the taxable year in which it was paid because it was part of a rollover distribution;”.

(2) by striking the last sentence.

(c) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 1106.—Section 3(37)(G) of ERISA is amended by—

(1) striking “paragraph” each place it appears in clauses (ii), (iii), and (v)(I) and inserting “subparagraph”.

(2) striking “subclause (i)(II)” in clause (iii) and inserting “clause (i)(II)”.

(3) striking “subparagraph” in clause (v)(II) and inserting “clause”, and

(4) by striking “section 101(b)(4)” in clause (v)(III) and inserting “section 101(b)(1)”.

#### SEC. 13. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the amendments made by this Act shall take effect as if included in the provisions of the 2006 Act to which the amendments relate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota.

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

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in favor of moving the Pension Technical Corrections Act of 2008 forward in an expedited manner. The bill is most needed by employers who are committed to providing their employees with a financially secure retirement through a defined benefit plan.

Why do we need this bill? Why do we need to act this quickly? Let me just break it down for you.

On August 17, 2006, the President signed into law the Pension Protection Act. This bill imposed sweeping reform affecting how employers fund their defined benefits plans maintained for their employees. In addition, the bill imposed significant reforms for pension plans offered to many union workers who participated in multi-employer plans.

However, many provisions in the PPA became effective on January 1 of this year. The Treasury Department and the Internal Revenue Service cannot implement many of these provisions because they need further clarification of congressional intent. This bill provides the needed clarification for the Treasury Department, Internal Revenue Service, corporations and other businesses who sponsor retirement plans, as well as working families who contribute to and benefit from 401(k) plans or defined contribution plans.

For the employers who have weathered the storm and are persistently committed to providing a secured retirement for their workers, this bill is for you. For the beneficiary of a 401(k) plan who wants to keep money in a retirement plan savings vehicle to finance retirement rather than being forced to spend it currently, this bill is for you. This bill provides clarification for the correct application of the non-spousal rollover provision.

For the construction worker whose plan may be experiencing underfunding and could be subject to a benefit reduction, this bill will make it clear when the plan must provide you with the notice alerting you of the plan’s funding status. It would also clarify whether you are subject to such a reduction in pension benefits.

You see, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about quality-of-life issues for working families and about helping those employers who want to help their employees provide for a financially secure retirement.

I encourage my colleagues in this body and in the Senate to keep this bill clean and move it quickly. I encourage them to join me in doing what we were sent here by our constituents to do, provide legislation to help improve their lives. Let’s pass this bill and get it to the President before the end of the month, because people are waiting. We have kept them waiting long enough.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3361, the Pension Protection Technical Corrections Act. Given the complexity and broad reach of the Tax Code and ERISA, and the difficult interactions between them, the measure before us is necessary to correct drafting and other

errors in the Pension Protection Act of 2006.

Passage of the legislation will give certainty to plan administrators, individuals, as well as government regulators and ensure the intent of Congress is fully reflected in the governing statutes.

The technical corrections process is a complicated one which ensures all views are heard and which brings in experts from the relevant committees and Federal agencies.

In this case, it means that bipartisan staff from both the Ways & Means Committee and the Education & Labor Committee were joined by their counterparts from the Senate Finance Committee and the Senate HELP Committee as well as representatives from the Treasury and Labor Departments and the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

Led by the staff of the Joint Tax Committee, the technical corrections process gives all participants a chance to review proposed changes to ensure they reflect the intent of Congress and do not change the substance of the law itself.

There can be disagreements about what should and should not be considered technical. Each participant in the process has a veto. Thus, only items that were unanimously viewed as correcting a drafting mistake are included in the measure being debated today.

There is one item, called smoothing, that we viewed as a particularly important technical correction but is not included in this bill because one of the parties to the process said it was not technical. Regardless of whether smoothing is technical, it is extremely important and must be passed quickly. Given that smoothing was excluded from this bill, I urge that we take up a smoothing-only bill on suspension this week.

It is my understanding that the Joint Tax Committee will be publishing on their web page a complete summary of these items, and I encourage interested individuals to review it.

Two final observations, Mr. Speaker, on the differences between this bill and the version passed by the Senate in December.

First, since the Senate bill was passed, several additional technical items were identified, reviewed by the participants, and agreed to as being technical and conforming changes.

Second, the Senate-passed bill included smoothing and a second provision that is no longer relevant.

I hope that the Senate takes up the bill that we are passing today so that it can go to the President and be signed into law. I also hope that both houses quickly pass a smoothing-only bill.

Mr. Speaker, while hardly glamorous, the technical corrections process is an important one, providing clarity and certainty to plan administrators and the millions of Americans who rely on these plans to help provide a secure retirement.

I support passage of the bill.

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

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

As we have just made formally a matter of record, the Pension Protection Act was an imperfect piece of legislation. This technically corrects, not substantively changes, but technically corrects an imperfect bill. It should go forward.

We should be doing more, Mr. Speaker, and this is where I want to spend the balance of my time tonight. I am almost shaking with anger at what we are not doing to correct the Pension Protection Act before it will have a very negative impact on the very working people that we talk so much about trying to help. I will give you a couple of examples.

There is a provision in the bill, never discussed, that inadvertently changes funding requirements for public pension plans. A plan like the State of North Dakota offers for its employees has a rate of 7.5 percent. Well, the Pension Protection Act in its present form requires them to credit interest at no greater than market rate. Without correction, we are going to have State legislatures reducing the interest credited for their public employees under fully funded public plans. It makes no sense. It needs fixing. It is a mistake. But we can't get the critical people in the critical committees to agree to fixing this.

Let's make no mistake about who we are talking about. We are talking about the Education and Labor Committee and we are talking about the Ways and Means Committee. Those are the committees of jurisdiction. We have not been able to get critical an agreement between the leadership of those committees and ranking members on fixing this public provision. And, as a result, for no reason whatsoever, other than an act of Congress that wasn't meant to have this impact, people may have their pensions reduced by Federal requirement.

I want those workers to know, Congress didn't mean to do this. But Congress knows that that is the effect of the law we passed, and this is a Congress that can't fix it in a timely fashion because we haven't had the will, we haven't had the time to think about it. We don't care enough. Because of the inattention of this body, if workers are forced to take lower credited interest in these public plans, these workers get less of a pension, and for no reason whatsoever.

There is another provision we should be fixing. These provisions are a little more than technical, so maybe should have been another bill, maybe not under the technical corrections act, but a bill we could have brought like tonight under the suspension calendar, a bill to address funding in a reasonable way.

You know, a pension is paid over many, many years. Yet the funding balance is determined by things that capture where the stock market is today, what the interest rate is today. Now, that can give you a pretty dire picture if you have got a stock market that is tanking and a low interest rate environment. It may look suddenly like forevermore the plan isn't going to earn much money on its assets.

Now, we know that the interest rate is going to change and we know the stock market valuation is going to change. So if you project 30 years based

on today's picture, you are going to be coming up with a wrong number. There is something called asset smoothing that lets you basically average a bit so that a bad picture today doesn't mean a draconian funding requirement upon the employer to meet what looks like a funding requirement that is not in fact reality.

□ 2045

Now, some might think, well, gosh, if the employer has to put in more money than is really needed that just is a good thing for workers because that means there will be a lot of money in there, and in no way will that solve it. There is a hitch to this. Employers do not have to fund pension plans. Employers can freeze pension plans. They can get out of the pension business. In fact, my friends, 43 pensions have frozen since we passed the Pension Protection Act.

Here in a recession, where we have got businesses struggling, they are going to have to pony up on their pensions beyond what they ever have before because in the pension protection act we have got much stiffer funding requirements. Smoothing, which many of us intended to be in this bill, is not in the bill, and we need to add it to the bill.

But this Congress, failing to act, is going to leave employers to pay the full bill, no smoothing help. I truly believe, just as I stand here, that there will be plans deciding to freeze, workers losing their pensions because in this time, before we go out on break, we don't address smoothing.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield for a minute?

Mr. POMEROY. I will yield for a minute.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Just to be clear, it's my understanding that the minority side agrees with fixing the public pension problem along with the smoothing problem and consented to putting both of those in the bill, but the majority had rejected that offer.

Mr. POMEROY. Reclaiming my time, I am not putting this responsibility on the minority.

What the gentleman has alleged, I am not currently informed of. I don't dispute it, but I don't know it, but I do know that others that were needed to address this issue, others on the majority side did not act.

In the end, the majority has responsibility for what we bring in a suspension calendar like this. This majority didn't get the job done.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. If the gentleman would further yield, I would simply like to say that we in the minority are more than willing to work with the gentleman in the majority to include the smoothing in the public pension provision.

Mr. POMEROY. Reclaiming my time, I welcome that, because when the Pension Protection Act passed in the last Congress when the minority was the majority, I did not find that willing-

ness to work with me. The legislation, I believe, needed correcting. This is a pox on both parties.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Just one more friendly view. If you recall, this was a bipartisan bill when this passed when we were in the majority.

Mr. POMEROY. Reclaiming my time before I run out of time, this is a pox on both parties. Both parties passed it, and both parties have failed to fix it.

I believe the failure, relative to getting this fixed, is on both parties. But the majority party carries a disproportionate burden because we are the majority party.

I could not be more disappointed. Getting back to the point I was making about frozen plans, I believe plans will freeze and workers will lose their pensions because asset smoothing is not addressed on the suspension calendar before we go out, before this critical April 15 deadline for pension funding.

This is completely unacceptable. It's incompetent, and I am ashamed of this House in failing to address this before we leave. I hope that I have made some people angry by these comments. I have intended to.

We need to get after this, and we need to get after it when we are back. If we don't get after it, I assure you, I will be having more of these speeches, because those who pretend to protect the world, the world's workers, when what they are doing is protecting these workers out of their very pensions, the very thing they need for retirement, income security. They are not doing anybody any favors. The games have got to end. The posture has got to end. We have got to fix problems and fix them in a timely way and shame on us if we have fallen short.

Let me get back to the bill before us, because it's important. The bill before us is a technical corrections act. This one needs to pass. This is fine.

The problem is, there is so much more that needed to be done, that could have been done on a suspension calendar tonight and tomorrow. We didn't do it, and we need to do it in short order when we get back.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3361, the Pension Protection Technical Corrections Act of 2008, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. Speaker, in 2006, the Republican-led Congress passed, and President Bush signed into law, the Pension Protection Act of 2006, which represented the most comprehensive reform of our Nation's private pension system in a generation. After years of thorough examination, thoughtful legislative development, and careful coalition-building, we finally restored common sense to our Nation's pension system through enactment of this landmark law. Thanks to those reforms, today's retirement security laws match the new realities of the 21st century economy, meaning that more U.S. workers will be able to count on their retirement savings being there for them when they need it.

The Pension Protection Act included tough new funding requirements to ensure employers adequately and consistently fund their

pension plans, provided workers with meaningful disclosure about the financial status of their benefits, and protected taxpayers from a possible multi-billion dollar bailout of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation (PBGC).

The Pension Protection Act's reforms were built on six fundamental principles that helped ensure a stronger, more secure retirement for millions of American workers. Those principles were: certainty, with a permanent and more accurate calculation of employers' pension liabilities; common sense, which enabled employers to build up a cushion in their pension plans during good economic times; stability, achieved by closing funding loopholes and ensuring employers make adequate and consistent cash payments to their plans; transparency through timely and straightforward information given to employees about the health of their retirement plans; honesty from employers and union leaders, who are no longer permitted to make hollow promises of extra benefits that will never materialize because a plan is severely underfunded; and portability, established by ensuring that hybrid plans, such as cash balance pensions—which offer portable, more generous worker benefits—remain a viable part of the defined benefit system. Having served as the Chairman of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce during this process, I am pleased to have been part of this effort.

Of course, it is to be expected that in legislation of that magnitude, we did not get every word perfect, or every provision as clear as it could be. That is the point of the bill before us today—H.R. 3361 is a narrow, technical bill that corrects inadvertent errors in drafting contained in the original law, and provides necessary clarification and focus, to ensure that the law is administered as Congress intended. For that reason, I support the bill before us today, and hope that it will quickly be enacted into law.

I must note for the record, however, that more remains to be done. The bill before us is very narrow in scope, and addresses only those issues that are considered purely technical on a consensus basis. There are other issues that remain to be addressed.

For example, late last year, the Senate passed by unanimous consent its own version of a technical corrections bill, which included critical clarifications with respect to the issue of asset smoothing. I would hope that this issue is addressed in any final technical correction package that we consider.

Also, there are numerous provisions which Members and staff have discussed since enactment of the 2006 law, which enjoy broad, bipartisan support, but which did not fall within the scope of this narrow package of technical corrections. Going forward, it will be necessary for us to address these items, and I stand ready to work with my Chairman, Mr. MILLER, and the distinguished Chairman and Ranking Member of the Ways and Means Committee in doing so.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I reiterate my support for this narrow legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3361, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3361.

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

There was no objection.

#### RECOGNIZING THE EXCEPTIONAL SACRIFICE OF THE 69TH INFANTRY REGIMENT, KNOWN AS THE FIGHTING 69TH

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 991) recognizing the exceptional sacrifice of the 69th Infantry Regiment, known as the Fighting 69th, in support of the Global War on Terror.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

#### H. RES. 991

Whereas the 69th Infantry Regiment, or the Fighting 69th, with citizen-soldiers from Brooklyn, Queens, Manhattan, the Bronx, Staten Island, and Long Island, has faithfully answered America's call to arms since its formation in 1851;

Whereas the Fighting 69th was one of the first units to assist in the recovery effort at the World Trade Center in New York following the September 11, 2001, terrorist attack, where they lost a comrade, a firefighter;

Whereas the 69th Infantry Regiment, while deployed to Iraq as "Task Force Wolfhound", its first overseas combat since World War II, fought to defend the city of Al Taji against al-Qaeda terrorists, protected Iraq's first free elections, and secured the infamous "Route Irish", the most dangerous road in Baghdad;

Whereas 19 members of the Fighting 69th were killed in action and over 78 were wounded in Operation Wolfhound; and

Whereas the Fighting 69th has now served the Nation in 5 wars and over 20 campaigns, and Congress has awarded 6 members with the Congressional Medal of Honor: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the 69th Infantry Regiment, or the Fighting 69th, as one of the great regiments in American military history;

(2) recognizes that America owes a tremendous debt for the exceptional service, patriotism, and fidelity of the soldiers of the Fighting 69th;

(3) recognizes that the Fighting 69th has continually participated in the Global War on Terror since the attack on September 11, 2001; and

(4) acknowledges that as the 69th Infantry Regiment deploys to Afghanistan to fight in the central front in the Global War on Terror, that the proud traditions of the regiment will be respected and that the sacrifices of one of America's most storied combat units will not go unnoticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I would ask that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

I rise today in support of H. Res. 991 which recognizes the exceptional service of the 69th Infantry Regiment known as the Fighting 69th in support of the conflicts that they have been involved in around the world. The 69th Infantry Regiment has a proud and strong history dating back to 1851 when it was created as the 69th New York Militia.

The regiment has an Irish heritage because at its inception it was made up entirely of Irish Americans. Not only is it to honor for their current contributions to this country, but also it is only fitting that with the approach of St. Patrick's Day this coming Monday, when we honor our country's Irish heritage, it is also equally important to recognize that based upon this unit's history and its Irish heritage that we recognize this unit at this time.

This unit, while deployed to Iraq as Task Force Wolfhound, secured the infamous Route Irish, which was one of the most dangerous roads in Baghdad. With that said, the Fighting 69th has now served our Nation in five wars and in over 20 campaigns. They are made up of New Yorkers from Brooklyn, Queens, Manhattan, the Bronx, Staten Island and Long Island. These servicemembers are a tremendous credit to themselves, to their country and their unit.

Those individuals who have previously served in the Fighting 69th would be proud of those that are currently serving and who are now carrying the mantle and battle colors of one of the greatest regiments in American history. The actions of the Fighting 69th, both after 9/11, to include their assistance and recovery efforts of the World Trade Center in New York, and their deployment now to Iraq, show the tremendous service and sacrifices this regiment has made, and that these servicemembers have individually, and, of course, collectively given their country. When the call to serve and fight has come, the Fighting 69th continues to answer that call.

I would like to thank my colleague and my friend and fellow member of the Blue Dog Coalition, Congressman STEVE ISRAEL of New York, who is a former member of the House Armed

Services Committee and who now currently serves on the House Appropriations Committee and who was also a cochairman of both the Center Aisle Caucus and the Democrat Study Group on national security, for bringing this resolution to the floor at this time.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 991, which recognizes the continuing service of the 69th Infantry Regiment, New York National Guard, whose citizen soldiers have faithfully answered America's call to arms since the regiment's formation back in 1851.

Today, the 69th Infantry Regiment is again deploying to Afghanistan to continue America's fight in the global war on terror.

In this most recent of American wars, the 69th has borne already a distinguished part. It was one of the first units to assist, as was mentioned, in the recovery effort at the World Trade Center in New York following the September 11, 2001 terrorist attack. It subsequently deployed to Iraq as Task Force Wolfhound where it fought to defend the City of al Taji against al Qaeda terrorists, protected Iraq's free elections, first free elections, and secured the infamous Route Irish, the most dangerous road in Baghdad. During that service in Iraq, 19 members of the Fighting 69th were killed in action and 78 were wounded.

In its history, the regiment has served the Nation, and as was mentioned also, in five wars and 20 campaigns and six of its members have been awarded the Medal of Honor. It is fitting that this resolution recognizes not only the historic contributions of the 69th Infantry Regiment, but also the depth America owes the soldiers of the unit for their exceptional service, patriotism and fidelity in fighting in all fronts of the global war on terror since the attack on September 11, 2001.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank the distinguished gentleman, my very good friend from North Carolina, who has always been a tenacious advocate for the needs of the military and military families at Fort Bragg. I don't reside in North Carolina, but I do know from our friendship and our many conversations that no one fights harder and more effectively to represent the interests of those who are at Fort Bragg, including many of my constituents, who are there now waiting to deploy to Afghanistan.

I am very proud to stand here as a sponsor of this bill to honor New York's 69th Infantry Regiment, known

as the Fighting 69th, once fought as part of the Irish Brigade.

I also want to acknowledge my co-sponsor, Congressman PETER KING, the gentleman from New York, one of the earliest Republican sponsors of this measure which I have drafted.

Soon we will celebrate St. Patrick's day. That is a day when we will commemorate the enduring contributions of Irish Americans to the founding and development of this Nation.

In fact, if you read a book by Tom Cahill called "How the Irish Saved Civilization," you would know that not only have the Irish made an enduring contribution to the founding and development of our country, but that their contribution transcends our country. When the world was a dark place, when the Roman Empire fell, when barbarians ruled, they tore down libraries, they destroyed all literature.

But it was the Irish who built monasteries. It was the Irish who brought scribes in who literally copied all of the great works of civilization. They preserved it. They handed it down from one generation to the next so that we would have it today.

In fact, it was Irish who did save civilization and similarly, it is the Fighting Irish, the 69th Infantry, that has saved America time after time after time and always answered their country's call.

Tonight, we put aside whatever political differences many of us have had in the past with respect to whether we should go to war in Iraq or not have gone to war in Iraq. That's not what this is about. Because, together, every Member of this House, Democrats and Republicans, support those who are fighting for our country and have answered the country's call.

We support men and women when they are in battle. We support them when they come home. I have always said thank God we live in a country that gives us the right to agree with the decision to go to war, the right to disagree with that decision, the right to remain silent. But no one has any right at all to forget the contributions that servicemembers make when they are called into duty. That is what this resolution is about.

Tonight there are a group of men who are in my friend from North Carolina's district who are at Fort Bragg. They are waiting to deploy to Afghanistan with the Fighting 69th. They are continuing the proudest traditions of being deployed to some of the most dangerous places around the world.

In the French campaigns of World War I, the island-hopping battles of World War II, in Iraq. That has been the history of the Fighting 69th since 1851.

□ 2100

In fact, it is safe to say that it was the 69th that saved the Union during the Civil War. And I would say, with apologies to my friend from North Carolina, the fact of the matter is that

those of us on the north side of the Mason-Dixon Line recognize the fact that had it not been for the Fighting 69th, that we might have lost. Why is that? Because in 1861 there was a rumor that the British were going to assist and aid the Confederacy because the British needed cotton and textiles. Had they done that, that would have tilted the balance. That would have ended the cause for those of us north of the Mason-Dixon Line.

But you know what? President Lincoln did something very, very smart. Knowing that we could not afford for that to happen, he rallied the Irish boys. He went into New York City, and he mobilized many brand-new Irish American citizens in New York City and asked them to fight for freedom and to fight for the Union. And they fought. They fought at Malvern Hill in Virginia, not very far away from here. They fought against the dreaded and omnipotent Louisiana Tigers. And they won that battle. It was one of the first battles that the Union won. We were getting beaten in many of the early battles. And when Robert E. Lee asked his staff, Who beat us? Who did we just fight? His staff said, General, it was the 69th New York, to which Robert E. Lee, said, Ah, the Fighting 69th. And that is how they got their name, and they have carried that tradition with them ever since, through four wars and a fight to come in Afghanistan, 19 campaigns, six medals of honor.

On 9/11, many of them went to the Lexington Avenue Armory. I was there just a few weeks ago. And then they went to Ground Zero. One lost his life, Firefighter Gerard Batpees, a first lieutenant in the 69th. And then they went to Iraq, men like Chris Daniels from Centerport, Lou Delapizi from Bay Shore, and Col. Charles T. Crosby, the commander of the 69th in New York City.

Mr. Speaker, I want to wrap up by telling my colleagues that a few weeks ago I visited with men of the Fighting 69th at the Bay Shore Armory on Long Island, and we had some good old New York pizza together, and I plan to visit with them in Afghanistan this July.

Many of us marched in St. Patrick's Day parades last week. Many of us will march again in St. Patrick's Day parades this weekend. And as we do, I hope we will remember the marches of the Fighting 69th, on Malvern Hill, in France, on Okinawa, where Private Ruiz won a Congressional Medal of Honor for single handedly destroying a Japanese pillbox. Private Ruiz, not exactly an Irish name, but the courage was Irish. On Route Irish in Baghdad, in Kabul and Jalalabad within weeks, that is where they marched and will continue to march. When they visit Afghanistan, they will be on some high mountains and in some very rainy and windy places, and I know we will think of them and apply to them this Irish blessing:

"May you always have walls for the wind,

a roof for the rain,  
tea beside the fire,  
laughter to cheer you on,  
those you love near you,  
and all your heart may desire.”

Mr. Speaker, may they come home soon to a country safer and sounder because of their courage.

I want to again thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his leadership. I also want to thank Major John Mark Pierre, an Army Fellow assigned to my office. He understood how important this bill was to me and his assistance was invaluable. I want to also thank Chairman SKELTON and Ranking Member HUNTER for allowing this resolution to come to this floor.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise in support of this important legislation, H. Res. 991, honoring New York's famed 69th Infantry Regiment for its dedication and valorous service in the war against terror, particularly in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The Fighting 69th has been engaged in the war against terrorism since the very onset of the war, having been deployed to secure Ground Zero in the immediate aftermath of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001.

The 69th was deployed to Iraq in “Operation Wolfhound” and served with great distinction, defending the city of Al Taji, protecting Iraq's first free elections and, most significantly, securing “Route Irish” which had been the most dangerous travel route in Baghdad. Tragically the 69th had 19 troops killed in “Operation Wolfhound” and 78 wounded. At no time, however, did the Fighting 69th ever waver in its mission. The Fighting 69th is now being deployed to Afghanistan where it will once more take the fight to our enemy.

Having served in the Fighting 69th and being an active member of the 69th Infantry Veterans' Corps, I take particular pride in this regiment's achievements.

The Fighting 69th has served in five wars and six of its members have been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor. Its courageous service in Iraq and Afghanistan is adding new chapters to the regiment's historic and noble history.

I urge adoption of the resolution.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers that are available, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 991.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. MCINTYRE. 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 motion will be postponed.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES THAT ALL AMERICANS SHOULD PARTICIPATE IN MOMENT OF SILENCE TO REFLECT UPON SERVICE AND SACRIFICE OF MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 953) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that all Americans should participate in a moment of silence to reflect upon the service and sacrifice of members of the United States Armed Forces both at home and abroad, and their families, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 953

Whereas it was through the brave and noble efforts of the Nation's forefathers that the United States first gained freedom and became a sovereign nation;

Whereas there are more than 1,354,000 active component and more than 1,100,000 reserve component members of the Armed Forces serving the Nation in support and defense of the values and freedom that all Americans cherish;

Whereas the members of the Armed Forces deserve the utmost respect and admiration of their fellow Americans for putting their lives in danger for the sake of the freedoms enjoyed by all Americans;

Whereas the families of members of the Armed Forces make sacrifices commensurate with the men and women of the Armed Forces;

Whereas members of the Armed Forces are defending freedom and democracy around the globe and are playing a vital role in protecting the safety and security of all Americans;

Whereas the Nation officially celebrates and honors the accomplishments and sacrifices of veterans, patriots, and leaders who fought for freedom, this resolution pays tribute to those who currently serve in the Armed Forces;

Whereas all Americans should participate in a moment of silence to support our troops and their families; and

Whereas March 26th, 2008, is designated as “National Support Our Troops Day”: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that all Americans should participate in a moment of silence to reflect upon the service and sacrifice of members of the United States Armed Forces both at home and abroad, and their families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in support of H. Res. 953 honoring the service and sacrifice of the members of the United States Armed Forces, both at home and abroad, as well as their families.

Every day we have servicemembers who volunteer to serve in harm's way. They have volunteered to serve our great country and protect its citizens from threats to liberty and our way of life.

Indeed, by God's grace, our Nation now celebrates 232 years of freedom this year, and it is due to the service and sacrifices that have been made throughout our history by the men and women of this country who have served in its military.

This evening, it is no different. Just like in the past when young men and women stepped forward to serve, they continue to do so. However, the difference now of course is our Nation is at war. And today, these men and women are joining the military knowing they will be headed overseas, knowing they will be put in harm's way, knowing that they will be sent away from their families and their loved ones and their communities.

It takes tremendous courage, Mr. Speaker, and intestinal fortitude to come forward and wear the uniform, especially in today's environment where we are fighting conflicts literally all around the world. I have spent time with many of our men and women in uniform, both at home and abroad, in many different countries and on different continents, and I have seen it in their eyes and heard it from the deepest part of their hearts as they have expressed their commitment, as I have seen their courage, and I have understood their conviction to serve our country and to honor it, putting their very lives on the line. Their unselfish service and their sacrifice is quite evident.

Whether it is our active duty personnel who have heard the call to duty or our Reserve component members who are our citizen soldiers who stand up to be counted to go out and serve and defend our values and freedom whenever called upon, we all are so appreciative of the service that our men and women in uniform give.

And we realize it is not just the servicemembers themselves, but also their families who are making sacrifices. The parents, the spouses, the children who go many months, a year, and sometimes even longer without seeing their loved ones. It is they who are constantly concerned, and have to go about life here without their son or daughter or husband or wife or mother or father or brother or sister. It is they who also sacrifice for this great country by yielding up a family member to go and serve on behalf of all of us.

Whether it is missing the birth of a child or the first steps of a newborn, whether it is watching their child in a

baseball game, as we approach the spring of the year, or missing a birthday or an anniversary, these are times that we know our families always cherish and that families are sacrificing, to give up, in order to allow their loved ones to go and serve our country and protect all of our citizens so that all of us, from whatever background, whatever calling we may be answering in life, have the freedom to go about our daily lives and the businesses and other events in which we are involved.

Our servicemembers are defending freedom and democracy around the world, and they are playing a vital role in protecting the safety and security of all Americans.

This moment of silence this resolution puts forth will take place on March 26, 2008, to celebrate the National Support Our Troops Day. It is just a small way that we as Americans can all show our pride and thanks for the many sacrifices made by our servicemembers and their families both at home and abroad.

Although words are not enough to show how truly grateful we are to these families and to those in harm's way, it is one way that we can say thank you. It is one way we can say Godspeed. It is one way that we can show that we are praying for their safety and for their guidance and their wisdom.

I can tell you, as a member of the Armed Services Committee and as one who serves on the Subcommittee on Air and Land Forces and also on the Subcommittee on Terrorism, how indeed we truly do respect and are grateful for our troops and what they are doing.

As one who also represents a district that is sandwiched between Fort Bragg and Camp Lejeune, which is the home of many Reservists as well as National Guardsmen, we are very, very grateful for the service of all of those who are going forth on behalf of our country.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to an issue very dear to me and very important to our Nation. In this country, we use holidays to remember the heroes of our past. We have among them Memorial Day, Veteran's Day, Columbus Day, Martin Luther King Day, and President's Day. These are fitting tributes for worthy heroes, but what of today's living heroes, our brave men and women on the front lines fighting in defense of our freedom?

I believe that they, too, deserve special recognition and praise. Our very ability to assemble here today is a direct result of their actions.

Two years ago, a young constituent of mine, Alexandra McGregor, presented me with the idea of a "National Support the Troops Day." Alexandra had seen a news account of a fallen soldier, and she had the idea that we should set aside a day to honor our

great American heroes fighting on the front lines.

I couldn't agree with her more.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today, as I have before, because of Alexandra and others like her who believe we should and we must show our appreciation for the troops.

This resolution calls for Americans to participate in a moment of silence on March 26 to recognize all of our active duty troops. Alexandra chose this date for a very personal reason. It is the birth date of her grandfather, a World War II veteran who helped instill in her such a deep love of country.

I might add, Alexandra was just 16 years old. To this day, I'm moved to think that someone so young could have her priorities so straight.

She put in a considerable amount of time and personal effort to see her idea become a reality. She went as far as to call a high school in each and every State to convince them of the importance of this issue.

Such dedication only serves to underscore the very reason for that resolution. American families strongly support our troops, and while so many of them fight abroad on our behalf, we should do everything we can to show our appreciation and thanks. I hope you will all join with me in support of this resolution and in support of the more than 1.5 million active duty troops who defend our freedoms each and every day.

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

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, my thanks to Mr. KNOLLENBERG for his gracious comments.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 953 "Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that all Americans should participate in a moment of silence to reflect upon the service and sacrifice of members of the United States Armed Forces both at home and abroad," introduced by my distinguished colleague from Michigan, Representative JOE KNOLLENBERG. This praiseworthy legislation will honor the lives, the work, and the memory of the countless men and women who everyday sacrifice their lives for our freedom.

Our great Nation officially celebrates and honors the accomplishments and sacrifices of veterans, patriots, and leaders who fought for freedom, but does not yet officially pay tribute to those who currently serve in the Armed Forces.

Accordingly, I praise those individuals who currently continue to accept the challenges posed by fighting for our liberty. Let us look to the sky to honor the memory of these heroes who give their lives for the foundations of our democracy. These individuals represent the best in all of us and it is in their memory that we should devote ourselves to continuing what they began. By humbling ourselves and reserving a moment of silence, we give reverence and recognition for those who make the ultimate sacrifice. Everyday, the men and women of our Armed Forces commence on a risky journey that many brave ones travel. In passing this important legislation, we effectively recall the purpose for which our elite Armed Forces are so dedicated.

Mr. Speaker, there are currently more than 1,500,000 active and reserve component members of the Armed Forces serving the United States in support and defense of the values and freedom that all Americans cherish. Our Nation's brave men and women in uniform are willing to give the ultimate sacrifice in order to ensure the freedoms enjoyed by every American remain intact. The debt we owe our Nation's armed services cannot be quantified, the respect and admiration felt by all Americans hardly expressed; it is imperative that we show the men and women who offer their lives each day to protect our own just how much their courage means to us.

Mr. Speaker, words cannot convey or adequately repay the debt that is owed. We cannot sufficiently articulate the feelings of sorrow that are universally felt; however, we can pay those men and women of the Armed Forces no greater tribute than to honor their sacrifice with a moment of silence. The service that these brave individuals provide is priceless and will never go unrecognized.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation, and, in so doing, giving our men and women in uniform the respect and recognition they deserve.

Mr. MCINTYRE. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 953, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

---

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO IRAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 110-101)

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:*

The crisis between the United States and Iran constituted by the actions and policies of the Government of Iran that led to the declaration of a national emergency on March 15, 1995, has not been resolved. The actions and policies of the Government of Iran are contrary to the interests of the United States in the region and pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. Iran remains the world's most active state sponsor of terrorism, and continues to provide lethal support to Lebanese Hizballah, HAMAS, Palestinian Islamic Jihad and numerous other terrorist organizations in the region, as well as to the Taliban in Afghanistan and various

Iraqi militant groups. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared with respect to Iran and maintain in force comprehensive sanctions against Iran to respond to this threat.

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 Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the *Federal Register* for publication, stating that the Iran emergency declared on March 15, 1995, is to continue in effect beyond March 15, 2008.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 11, 2008.

□ 2115

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WILSON of Ohio). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### SOMETHING WE CAN ALL AGREE ON: OUR TAX SYSTEM NEEDS HELP

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, it's springtime in Washington. We're all anxiously awaiting the start of the spring baseball season, cherry blossoms, and of course April 15 when we all face the deadline for filing our Federal income tax.

Now questions are often asked, paper or plastic, regular or decaf, conservative or liberal. Americans don't always agree and don't always see eye to eye. But there is one thing which a majority of us do agree on and agree on hands down, that our Federal tax system needs serious help. According to a 2007 Tax Foundation Study, 78 percent of Americans think the tax system needs a major overhaul.

Everyone knows the problem. Each year Americans dedicate billions of hours and billions of dollars complying with a very complex Tax Code. In fact, in 2005, the average taxpayer paid almost \$1,900 per household in compliance costs. That means a taxpayer must work 6 days each year just to pay for the cost of preparing his or her Federal taxes for that year.

Time is precious. Time is money. Time is fleeting. Time is precious, and we never have enough for raising our families. Time is money, and valuable resources are lost that could be spent on productive activities such as grow-

ing the economy and creating jobs. Time is fleeting. And we can never reclaim those hours that we have spent complying with our very complex Tax Code.

We all complain about paying taxes. We all complain about navigating the complex code. And the fact is, if the system was fair and simple, it would be a lot easier to follow and a lot easier to swallow. Americans don't mind paying for roads, for a strong defense, or even for health care for your grandmother.

The fact is, right now, we have a situation where two families can be living side by side, earn exactly identical incomes and face a very different tax liability on April 15. The Smith family makes the same amount as the Jones family, and they're forced to pay a higher share of the tax burden.

The Declaration of Independence states that all men are created equal. Maybe it also should say all taxpayers should be created equal, and it should apply to the tax burden.

Changes could be made within our existing system to improve it in the short term. Full expensing of business capital, permanently repealing the estate tax, abolishing the alternative minimum tax are a few of the possibilities. But fundamental tax reform would pay larger dividends. Just think of the jobs and economic growth that resulted when President Ronald Reagan cut the code in half back in 1986. Let's apply some of that same common sense that President Reagan used back in 1986 to streamlining today's unruly code in the 21st century.

Simplicity and fairness demand that we replace our current system with a single rate system that taxes income only one time. Even the National Taxpayer Advocate, Nina Olsen, recommended that lawmakers simplify the tax code. That was one of her recommendations in the 2007 annual report to Congress.

A faster, a flatter, a fairer tax structure would work and it's pretty simple. Tax returns could be done on a single page, maybe even on a postcard. It could be accomplished in just a few steps.

Time me now. Multiply your income by a fixed percentage, subtract a standard deduction, and the process is over. Fourteen seconds. Gone will be the stressful hours figuring out whether your military service or your marital status will adversely affect your return. No more headaches trying to determine where the estimated tax payments go. Tax prep fees might be money spent on, I don't know, something more rewarding. Maybe a vacation, maybe a personal day off, maybe even creating a new job.

A single tax rate structure would eliminate taxes on capital gains, taxes and dividends and taxes on savings because again, remember, we're going to tax income only one time. Businesses could expand and create jobs. Personal savings would increase.

How many times we hear it said over and over again, Americans don't save

enough money. Americans don't save enough money because when they put some of their hard-earned money into savings, half of the interest earned goes away to Federal income tax. It's taxed as ordinary income. Where's the incentive in that? We ought to incent savings in this country, not punish it, not grind the saver into the dust when, in reality, if we increase savings in this country we might not face some of the problems that we face today.

Without the heavy corporate income tax which is currently the second highest in the industrialized world; let me say that again, the second highest in the industrialized world, companies would have less incentive to move their headquarters out of the United States and, more importantly, less incentive to offshore their earnings.

Recent polling by American Solutions show that 80 percent of Americans favor an optional one page tax return with one rate. After all, who could complain about making something easier, especially a process that comes at a high cost.

Former Speaker Gingrich said in this body over and over again, real change requires real change. Americans agree the Tax Code is unfair and should go. Let's take a cue and translate this agreement into real change. After all, fundamental tax reform is a worthwhile goal, and this Congress, this Congress should take it up and pursue it for the benefit of the American people.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it's an honor to be before the House once again. As you know, the 30-Something Working Group, we have been coming to the floor now for some 5 years to not only share with the Members but also with the American people on what's happening here in the Capitol.

I'm going to do a short segment because we have other Members that need to come to the floor. And the hour is late, and tomorrow we're going to be working pretty hard past this hour tomorrow, I'm pretty sure. And we want to make sure that everyone is able to make it home and do the things that they need to do to prepare for that day.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I just would like to say that we've been in debate now for a couple of hours on the budget, the 2009 budget. And I can tell you, Federal budget, as it relates to the House version, I can tell you what I've read and seen of the President's budget, we have a lot of patching up to do in that budget.

Tomorrow we will have a number of different caucuses coming to the floor presenting their budget, their ideas. Some of them came before us today to talk about some of those issues to be considered before the full House, and I'm glad that we are providing that opportunity for the Members to participate in that process; also, to be in debate with the Republicans on Democratic new ideas, moving in a new di-

rection. And I think it's so very, very important not only for the Members of the House to be a part of that exercise, but also for the American people to witness that exercise so that they will know, firsthand, who has the best priorities for the working American people that are out there, and those that are retired and those that are yet unborn, preparing this Nation to be able to bring them up in a way and to be able to have the resources in place so that they can see the kind of strong America that I witnessed when I came about.

Now, let me just share a little bit about this budget. And it supports fiscal responsibility and also accountability on government. I think a lot of the frustration with so many Americans right now is based upon a lack of accountability, a lack of oversight, a lack of restraint as it relates to spending. And I think when you have accountability, you're going to save money. I don't think it, I know it.

Now, 13 years in public service, and 8 years at the State level, I think it's important that we embody that. And this budget, it brings the budget back to balance by 2010, and our House budget, unlike the President's budget that he has proposed, not only to the House, but to the Senate, also the budget follows PAYGO rules which you say pay as you go, something that we adopted in our rules to say if we're going to spend it, we're going to show how we're going to pay for it. And I'm glad to see that we're still embracing not only that rule, but also that philosophy as it relates to the American people, of what they ask for.

The administration also continues in the fiscally irresponsible practices. And in this budget we bring it back to being responsible. And it's a real contrast, because since January 2001, a \$5.6 trillion, 10-year surplus has been converted into a record deficit. And as you know, Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor almost every night to share how that deficit has crippled America and hasn't allowed us to be able to do the things that we need to do back in our districts.

I think we look at the wasteful spending; this administration is littered with examples of wasted spending and lack of accountability. And I'm glad that Chairman SPRATT of South Carolina has embraced that in his budget that he's bringing to the floor. Our budget that we're bringing on the Democratic side, we're looking at not only strengthening the economy, but creating jobs and at the same time energy, education, jobs, infrastructure and innovation will be the watchwords as we move through this process as basic principles. And so many Americans can, and also the Members, can go on [www.budget.house.gov](http://www.budget.house.gov) to look at the Democratic budget because I think it's important that we have that level of transparency so that they can take a look at the proposals that we are going to put forward.

So many of my constituents and so many Americans are challenged by the cost of energy. And we do know on January 22 of 2001, gas prices were at \$1.47. And now, today it's at \$3.13 per gallon. And I know many of my constituents and many of the Americans that are paying attention to the proceedings here on the floor, they're saying, well, Congressman, you're a little bit off of that \$3.13, because as I moved around Washington, D.C. today I saw it as a lot greater.

□ 2130

We provide, with our budget, as it relates to dealing with some of these gas issues, it provides a \$6.1 billion funding for renewable energy and energy efficiency and other energy programs, which is \$1.1 billion, 21 percent more than the 2008 level.

So we are moving in that direction making those kinds of investments, and some may translate that into saying that we are pulling ourselves out of Iraq, out of the Middle East and investing in the Midwest and trying to not only push private sector but also Americans in the direction of being more energy efficient so that we don't find ourselves continuing to depend on the big oil companies.

If I can have my big oil company chart, I would appreciate it, because I think it's important to be able to reflect on it. Also, it rejects President Bush's budget cuts of energy efficiency and renewable energy programs, including the cuts to solar energy power, and also what the President did in terminating the weatherization-assistance program. We are replacing all of that, and I think it's important for Americans to understand what is happening here.

These big oil companies have reaped record profits under the Bush administration, and as you can see here in 2002, it was first \$30 billion in record-breaking profits. It then kicked over \$59 billion, \$82 billion, \$109 billion, \$118 billion and \$123.3 billion of these oil companies raking in these profits. And as you know, Mr. Speaker, we have moved legislatively to make sure that we call back some of those giveaways that the Republican Congress gave these oil companies.

And this has resulted in what I talked about a little earlier, \$1.47 when the Bush administration started in January 22, 2001, and it almost sounds like an inauguration date, and what we face now at \$3.13. The barrel of oil continues to go up.

So this energy investment and being efficient is very, very important to the country, also very, very important to national security.

We also invest in hundreds of billions of dollars in new investment and green jobs, green-collar jobs. These are jobs, Mr. Speaker, that we can't ship overseas. When we make our building greener, when we make our homes greener, these are jobs that anyone who can even be a high school dropout

with a skill would be able to participate in to that individual that became an engineer.

These are jobs that you just can't send overseas. And this is a real economy and not a credit card economy, not a second mortgage economy, or not an economy where one has to go out and continue to borrow to live. This is real money coming in for real working Americans that are here so that we can put folks to work and get them off the unemployment role.

I'm going to end right there, Mr. Speaker, as it relates to the energy investment because there are so many other investments in here as we look at education, transportation, and infrastructure. And today, just today, the Speaker had an infrastructure meeting in the Speaker's office with many individuals that felt that they had a way to not only incentivize an economy but also build on the infrastructure of America.

So many of my constituents and so many Americans are very concerned about the investment that's going on in Iraq right now. Crumbling bridges, railways are not what they should be as it relates to moving transportation. We have trains that can move freight almost 430 miles on one gallon of diesel fuel. I mean, these are things that we have to continue to work on to not only save our environment but also create American jobs.

And that's what I'm very excited about in this budget that we are putting forward, to give us the guideposts that we need in this country to not only do away with the debt by 2010 but also get the country moving in a direction so that it can be a safer place for our children and grandchildren.

With that, Mr. Speaker, we always want in the 30-Somethings to not only hear from the Members but also hear from the American people on various issues that are facing the Congress. Next week we are going to be on Easter break for the next couple of weeks once we finish our business this week. But the 30-Something staff continues to work to come up with the great ideas that we put forth on behalf of the American people. And we are talking about Democrat and Republican, Independent, those that are thinking about voting and those that can't even vote yet.

Our e-mail address is 30-SomethingDems@mail.house.gov. Again, 30-SomethingDems@mail.house.gov. Or if you want any of the information that we shared with you tonight about the budget, we know that you can go on [www.budget.house.gov](http://www.budget.house.gov). Again, [www.budget.house.gov](http://www.budget.house.gov). And any general information that you may want, what Democrats are doing here in Congress, [www.speaker.gov](http://www.speaker.gov), and I think that's easy enough to remember.

#### CHANGING THE DIRECTION OF THE COUNTRY'S BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 18, 2007, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) is recognized for the remainder of the hour.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to be here speaking on behalf of the American people and the class of 2006, the class that was elected to Congress to change the direction of the country, and that's what we've been set upon to do during these last 14 months.

And I appreciate very much the comments of my distinguished colleague from Florida (Mr. MEEK) and the great efforts he has made week after week to address the American people on the issues that are of critical importance to them.

We are going to talk tonight about the budget resolution as well because this is, above all things, the fundamental responsibility of the House of Representatives, the United States Congress. This is how we deal with all of the tax revenue that we generate in this country and how we essentially steward the funds of the population that depend on us to make good judgments for them.

And I'm joined tonight by my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. KAGEN) who has been a frequent participant in these sessions and someone who joins with us in our commitment to making life better for all Americans, making this an economy and a society that works for everyone and not just for the wealthiest.

There are lots of ways to frame budget debates, and there's always a risk that we get much too deep in numbers and we get way too deep in the weeds, and we don't talk about the big picture because the big picture is what most Americans want to deal with. They want the small picture of how it affects their daily lives. But they also want to know what we're about here, what our goals are, what our ambitions are for the American people, what we are trying to do as we work through this \$3 trillion budget that we have to do each Congress.

And it's been interesting to sit and to stand and to listen to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, those Members who have been in charge of this body and in charge of the Federal budget essentially for the last 6 years and even in the Congress before that for another 6 years, and listen to them try to frame the issues in ways that understandably try to benefit their position.

But it's fascinating to listen as they talk about our budget, and somehow, because we don't plan to keep all of the Bush tax cuts in effect ad infinitum, that that somehow represents a tax increase.

And I have to remind everyone when I talk about issues that you remember what the Bush administration did and this Congress did when they enacted these tax cuts. They basically provided a sunset. They provided in the legislation that these tax cuts would end, and the reason they did that was because they wanted to be able to project some-

where out in the future that there would be a balanced budget in spite of the fact that they knew they were destined for huge deficits.

So they put a sunset, they put an end on those dates. Just as if you were in a business and you say, Okay, for 2 days only we are going to have a sale. We are going to give you 30 percent off. And that's the terms of the deal. So you come in on the fourth day and you say, Wait a minute. I want to pay that lower price. And the store says, Wait a minute. No. This was two days only 30 percent off. So you didn't raise the prices. You can't argue that we raised the prices. This was the way the deal was set up.

So now they're trying to have it both ways. They're trying to say we provided a tax cut, most of which went to the very wealthiest Americans, and now we are going to, because you are not willing to extend that tax cut, you are going to raise our taxes. No. We are going to end that two-day sale.

But what is really more disturbing than anything else, and I listened earlier to one of our colleagues from Wisconsin, one of your colleagues, Mr. KAGEN, that when he was talking about what this budget would mean if we did not extend the Bush tax cuts, it said the average American would have their taxes raised by \$1,000 or \$1,200 or \$3,000 when, in fact, that is kind of the magic of numbers and what you can do with them. Because if you take someone who is making \$10 million a year and you raise that person's taxes by 4 percent, which would be essentially restoring the maximum tax rate, pre-Bush tax cut rate to that person, and then you average it over thousands of people, yes, you are going to get an average tax hike of \$1,000 per person. But the average American, the average person who is making \$30,000 a year is not going to see his or her taxes increased at all under this budget.

But you put that person with the person who's making \$10 million a year whose taxes might go up a couple hundred thousand dollars, you average all of that in, yeah, you can come up with an average tax increase on all Americans. But that's not the way it works, because the average American will not have his or her taxes increased under this budget. The average very wealthy American will have his or her taxes increased.

But that's the way we play games with numbers around here, and it's very disturbing.

So it's important that when we discuss these important issues, \$3 trillion worth of Federal budget, \$1 trillion dollars, essentially, that this Congress has to deal with in discretionary funding, that we be honest, that we be candid, that we paint the accurate picture for the American people and what it means to them.

And I would like now to yield to my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin who I know is very much focused on what this budget does and every budget does for the people he represents, everyday Americans in his district. So I'm proud to yield to my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. KAGEN).

Mr. KAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. YARMUTH from the great State of Kentucky. And I thought what I would do is I'd share with you some of my feelings about how things are going here in Washington.

We were presented with Bush's proposal, which, medically speaking, is dead on arrival. It just doesn't face up to and it doesn't really reflect our traditional American values of putting people before things. People ought to come first.

I am very much opposed to the President's budget which seeks to really destroy Medicare and take away Medicaid, which is the health care access for those of us who are in the greatest need. And so I think we have to take a look at the numbers. When the President suggested \$497 billion cut from Medicare, nearly \$100 billion cut from Medicaid, how are these people going to get the essential medical care that they need?

I look at it, in the big picture, as this way: We've been elected to change the direction of the country and to do four essential things: First, defend America. We have to enact, as we did, the 9/11 recommendations. We have to begin to move our troops away from Iraq and back after our real enemies, Osama bin Laden and his followers. And they weren't in Iraq when we went there; they were in Afghanistan. But we cannot remain in a hundred-year war and continue to borrow money from China and spend it in the sands of Iraq.

Everywhere I go in Wisconsin, my good friend, people are telling me, Look, you have got our hard-earned tax dollars. Spend it here at home. Build our roads. Build our bridges. Rebuild America. Let's not rebuild another country. Let's rebuild our own lands. This budget does not reflect our values. It doesn't protect anyone except corporate greed and those at the very top of the ladder. It doesn't do what we should be doing: educating our children, caring for our veterans.

The Democratic budget seeks to put in over \$3 billion above what we did last year because we have 330,000-plus soldiers coming back from Iraq and Afghanistan.

□ 2145

And they need help now more than ever, not just before and during their service in harm's way, but when they come home with PTSD and other injuries that you may not see that are mental, and also those physical injuries. We have to have a budget that makes sense not just for us here, but also for people at home.

I have here a chart that shows you the change in real median, which is

like your average household income, by Presidential term. If you look over here right by the right, this is something people in Wisconsin understand straight away. We are not better off today than we were before President Bush took office. And this Republican policy of borrow and spend and borrow and spend has put us in the drink.

There is a difference between Republicans and Democrats. Right now, the difference is about \$33 trillion of debt on an accrual basis. When President Bush took office, we had a debt of about \$20 trillion on an accrual basis. We are now up to \$53 trillion of debt. We have obligations we have to meet to those people that we serve and represent.

During the Clinton Presidency, there was an increase of \$6,100 of median household income; with Bush I, a decline of \$1,000. So we have to return and get back to the basics of balancing our budget, and most importantly, balancing our trade as well. We cannot continue to have a negative trade deficit with our partners overseas and have any kind of economy left at all.

This budget does not make sense. I thought I would go through with you, since you are from Kentucky, some of the things that might be happening if we followed President Bush's and the Republicans' budget. Homeland security grants. In the State of Kentucky, well, you would lose \$7 million. In Wisconsin, \$9 million. Homeland security grants are important sources of revenue for small governments and cities and towns to help defend America on the local level.

Assistance to firefighter grants, the AFG grants, puts valuable equipment into volunteer fire departments across the country, giving them communication gear so we can communicate during an emergency. Well, in Kentucky, oh, my poor friend, you're not even on the list. Let's go to Wisconsin. We're losing \$13 million. And Kentucky, \$12.5 million with the President's budget.

What about the Clean Water State Revolving Fund? This is an essential source of revenue for guaranteeing that we have infrastructure that makes sense, that functions as it should, wastewater treatment plants and the like. In Wisconsin, under President Bush's budget, we would lose \$4 million. In Kentucky, you would lose almost \$2 million. It goes on and on.

Community Development Block Grants, Dislocated Worker programs. These are people-oriented programs that need to have financing to make sure that people have a safety net that they can count on.

If you want it in general terms, you used the analogy about a sale, you know, 2 days only, or should we say, "to the rich only." That sale, that tax break, that has to end because otherwise we're passing the buck. We're passing our debt on not to our generation, but to our children and our grandchildren because sooner or later these debts must be paid.

We're seeing it now with the decline of the dollar. The decline of the dollar has caused what? The oil hasn't changed for 1 million years, but its value has gone up because our purchasing power for the dollar has gone down. The gold hasn't changed, but it now might take \$1,000 someday soon, real soon, to get 1 ounce of gold. So your purchasing power of the dollar has declined. Interest rates are going down, making your investments, if you saved any money at all and you're on fixed income, it's much harder for you now to make it through the week.

As we look at the budgeting process here in Washington, the essential difference is there are debt lovers and debt haters. We want to pay our bills. We want to be fiscally responsible and socially progressive to guarantee that people are more important than things and people are more important than corporations.

And I yield back.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank my distinguished colleague.

He raises an important point because there are two different types of expenditures that we make in this Congress and that everyone makes. You can spend money that basically goes down the drain and never yields any kind of positive return, or you can invest money that pays back in manifold times over the years.

I know that I call my colleague Mr. KAGEN; in fact, he is a physician. I should say Dr. KAGEN. I raise that because one of the things that the President's budget did, it would do if we were to enact it, which of course we won't, but is to cut funding for the National Institutes of Health. It seems to me that we're facing, as a country, this enormous exposure financially over the next several generations because of health care costs. We can try to tax our way out of it, raise more money to pay for it; we can try to use cost containment measures, which probably are not going to be that effective because every time you try to cut down on what you spend for health care, you reduce access to it; or we can invest money now in the type of research that will cure the very diseases that are going to cost us the most down the road. So if we spent \$20 billion and we're able to cure cancer within the next 5 years, that would save us trillions of dollars long term as a society. The same with diabetes, the same with almost every disease we can mention. Yet the President's budget reduces funding on an inflation basis from the last year's budget. This is the type of thing where we should be investing more money because down the road these will pay off, not necessarily for us, in fact, but for our children and future generations.

It's the same way with energy and it's the same way with infrastructure. These are the types of investments and expenditures which this budget, the Democratic budget, emphasizes. This is our focus. And this is the type of expenditure that the President's budget

ignores. And that represents a very fundamental difference in our approaches.

Clearly, we have one big elephant in the room. I don't say that in partisan terms. I will use gorilla. We have one big object in the room, and that is our expenditure in Iraq. If we continue to spend \$150, \$170, \$200 billion a year in Iraq, that is money that doesn't represent an investment. It represents money being flushed down the drain. That's something that we have a serious policy dispute with and that's a very controversial subject around the country, but it's the type of expenditure that is keeping us from doing the type of investment that will yield returns down the road.

I'm very happy that my colleague mentioned infrastructure and investment because that is where we're going to have to focus our activity, our attention. Because unless we do that, we are destined for the same type of borrow-and-spend society and economy as opposed to an invest-and-reap-the-reward society that we can have otherwise.

We have a fundamental debate with our colleagues from across the aisle and with the administration in the White House and we're going to have to continue to fight this until we can convince the American people that the long-term approach, investing in people and infrastructure and research, are the answers to our long-range problems. And the Republican budget, the President's budget, is something that takes us in the wrong direction.

With that, I would ask my colleague to respond to or react to those comments.

Mr. KAGEN. I couldn't agree with you more, and I appreciate your yielding.

Think about it. I'll ask it rhetorically: Can you name one thing that President Bush has done to help us become an energy independent Nation? Just one thing. I can't think of a thing that he has done. There is so much that we could be doing to become energy independent.

But let's look at taxes just for a minute. I can lower your taxes by investing in people, by having healthier children who will have healthier lives. They will get a better education if we educate them and invest in education. I can lower your taxes. I can lower the taxes of every city, every county and every State in this country if we would invest in a health care system that makes sense, that's affordable, and guarantees access to affordable care for everyone, especially our children on whose future we all depend. We can lower our taxes by having healthy senior citizens who walk straight, who don't need canes, who actually have access to the essential services that they require.

We have to invest in people, their education, their health care, and especially our veterans. And it's going to cost more and more and more the

longer we remain in a religious civil war in Iraq. We're spending \$12 billion of our tax money that we have to pay back sometime. Now 80 cents on the dollar that we're borrowing from foreign countries, 80 cents on the dollar we're taking from foreign countries right now. So who owns America? Who are we? And in which direction are we going to turn? We have become a debtor country.

Let's take a look at some of the numbers that are a bit frightening. I'm going to scare you for a reason. This is the way it is: 2.8 million homes are going to go through foreclosure in a short time through the subprime mortgage crisis. But the number at the end of the day, when this recession is done in 2011 or 2012, may be 20 million homes. Now if you have three people per home, that's 60 million American citizens. Sixty million people might have to lose their home. If I came up to you and said, hey, you know, 20 percent of the population in Cuba is homeless, you would say, well, yeah, it's a Third World country. We're already getting there.

Now 10 years ago, in conversations with my physician colleagues, we would have an agreement that we were doing fine in America so long as the value of the dollar was upheld and so long as Arabians took our dollar in payment for their oil. Well, last year, the Japanese started buying their oil and paying in the yen. Germany is now paying in the euro because they get more for their money. So our dollar has been devalued because of these failed and losing economic policies that we're now underneath because of President Bush.

We must turn a page. We must come back to the basics of being fiscally responsible and paying as we go as we've done in this House in the 110th Congress.

Now if we don't invest in our children's education, where are we going to get? We're getting nowhere. If we don't invest in our children's health care early on, we'll never be able to afford their expensive care later on. Remember the old tire commercial, "You can pay me now or you can pay me later"? That's true in the health care field as well.

I feel very strongly that we have to take on all of these issues. We have to have a fiscally responsible budget. And the very first thing we have to address is our skyrocketing, impossible costs for health care, which are a drag on every small business I get to meet with. I don't care if you're in farming or if you're a shoe salesman or if you're a small manufacturer, the number one cost you have of running your overhead is your health expense for your employees, if you're fortunate enough to have the money to pay for it.

Today, the average cost for a family of four is \$14,000 for health insurance, on average. If you're making \$50,000 annually, how can you afford to give \$14,000 to the insurance industry? You

can't afford it. That's why we have 47 million United States citizens with no health care coverage at all. I think we have to become fiscally responsible. This Congress will do it.

I yield back.

Mr. YARMUTH. Thank you. This is kind of a tangent, but it's important to mention because we hear from the other side so many times, I think from the Presidential candidate as well as so many Members, that the answer to the health care crisis is to give families a \$5,000 or so tax credit so they can pay for their health insurance. You've framed the issue extremely well; how many families of moderate income can afford to pay? The \$5,000 tax credit doesn't mean anything when their health insurance is costing them \$14,000 a year. First of all, they don't have the money to spend, so they probably are not paying a lot of tax to begin with. A tax credit is kind of a myth. It's just something that maybe sounds good, but in the real world doesn't work.

But you also mentioned a very important element to this, and that's the issue of education. The President and the Republicans have continued to underfund education in this country at almost negligent amounts for a number of years now.

We just had a press conference a few weeks ago in my district because we were able to get enough money, a Federal grant to provide scholarships for 500 citizens of my district that would enable them to get an associate's degree. We calculated the amount of increased earning capacity based on that \$1 million worth of scholarships and it ended up being \$13 million worth of increased revenue earning capacity based on a \$1 million investment. Because if you take somebody from a high school degree and you give him or her an associate's degree, all of a sudden their income potential increases by 50 to 100 percent. You're talking about over a lifetime of earning capacity, \$250,000 to \$300,000 just for that small investment.

These are the types of decisions that we have to make, that we're called on to make in these budgeting processes. And I think that represents the real distinction between our party and the party that has controlled this House up until 2007. They want to spend money in very different ways. We want to invest tax dollars to improve the lives of those people who can really generate increased activity in the economy, increased earning.

□ 2200

Just on the basis of the question of stabilizing Social Security and Medicare, if you increase somebody's salary from \$25,000 a year to \$50,000 a year, you've doubled their contribution to Social Security. You've doubled their contribution to Medicare. This is the way we dig ourselves out of the hole that we have been in. It's to make sure that every American is earning a decent living and, therefore, can contribute to these programs. It's not to

sit there and say we're going to continue to give Warren Buffett and Bill Gates and many of the wealthiest Americans in this country tax breaks and hope that somehow that results in a better way of life for every other American.

I think we have seen enough of trickle-down economics. They tried to sell us that under the Reagan revolution. They've tried to sell us that under two Bush administrations. I think the American people finally realized that that's not the answer to our economic problems and that's not the answer to our economic future.

We have seen, and not just in New Orleans with Katrina, that when you have trickle down, unfortunately, it doesn't lift all boats. It drowns a lot of people. And that chart demonstrates, as vividly as it can be demonstrated, what has happened in this country under trickle-down economics. We have drowned those people who are represented in red. Their boats didn't float. Our position is we want to make sure that everybody has the right kind of boat so that when the storms come, they're floating with everybody else.

And I think that is something that the American people are catching on to. I think that's why every survey of American attitudes, when you ask people, Who do you trust more to handle the economy, taxes, education, health care? they have said, We prefer the Democrats by substantial margins now.

That doesn't mean we're off the hook. That doesn't mean just because people think we have the right answers that we don't have to respond and that we don't have to perform. But I think they have recognized that the other answer is empty, and they have said, we put our faith in your philosophy. We put our stock in you. Now perform for us. That's what we're trying to do with this budget. That's what we hope to do as we move forward into the 111th and 112th and 113th Congresses.

I'll yield to my colleague on that.

Mr. KAGEN. Thank you for yielding. You bring up an interesting point about paying taxes. Do you really believe that people who are going down can pay more? It doesn't make any sense at all. Let's take a look at some of the numbers.

Twenty-five percent of all workers in the United States earn less than \$8.70 per hour. One half of all women working earn less than \$8.70 an hour. That's about \$18,000 in a year. One-fifth of all children in America are living in poverty, which is the highest among the 17 industrialized nations, and we are the only industrialized nation that doesn't have guaranteed access to health care for everyone. So who is going to end up paying?

Well, we had dinner tonight. Somebody has to pay the bill; right? So we can't just get up and turn it over to somebody else. Our kids aren't there. Our grandchildren aren't there. We had to come up with the money to pay for

our bills. But if you don't have any money, and I'm not accusing you, but if you don't have the money, I'm going to have to cover you.

Now, who has benefited from all these tax cuts? It's the people at the top of the income scale. It should be no surprise who is going to have to pay the bills when they come due. It's not going to be people that don't have any money. They're going to the banks now looking for money.

I was in a diner in Oconto, Wisconsin, Northeast Wisconsin, having a bite to eat on my way to an event. And I asked the guys who were working there that are city workers how I could help them with an economic stimulus package.

And they said, Doc, look out the window. It's right there. There's the price of gas. If you want to put more money in my pocket, cut the cost of gasoline.

Well, we haven't done it yet because we have got an oil Vice President and an oil President. We can't do it while they're in office.

The second thing he said was, look, the other thing you can do is knock down the cost when I go to the pharmacy to get my medication. I think I'm paying too much.

And let me share with you some reality. In the State of Wisconsin, we have a program for senior citizens who are in need of assistance in paying for their prescription drugs. So if you can't afford your prescription drugs and you're in need and you're lower income status, you will qualify for senior care, and by buying into it with \$30 a year, you get this kind of a benefit. Virginia, for her medications, pays over \$330 per month at the pharmacy for her medications. On senior care it's \$89. The same pharmacy, the same prescription drugs, the same drug makers. The only difference is the State of Wisconsin formed a purchasing pool.

I will give you a second example. The Veterans Administration has negotiated steep discounts for a vast number of very effective and therapeutic prescription drugs. And, on average, if you're a veteran getting your prescription drugs from the VA, you're paying 46 percent less than a Medicare part D patient. But, my friend, the veterans who fought for this country, for our freedom, for the right not just for themselves to get a discount, they fought for everybody. Don't you think it's only right but that everybody be able to get those same medications at that same steep discount? They didn't fight a war—they didn't defend America—for themselves. They did it for every citizen across this land. If the VA can use its resources to leverage down and purchase prescription drugs at a steep discount, shouldn't everyone benefit from that steep discount?

So we have to begin to think differently in America, about us. Not me, about all of us. We have to begin to return to the days when health insurance was sold to an entire community. You know those letters u-n-i-t-y, unity? We have got to put "unity" back into

"community." We have to return to community-based ratings so we can insure everyone in the community without any discrimination. And when we do that, we can leverage down the cost of prescription drugs and insurance coverage for everyone. So I think this is our time when we can begin to have a discussion with the American people about what's important to them.

In Wisconsin paying your bills is just the way of life. So is working. Two feet of snow, three feet of snow, we're still there on time. So from our Wisconsin point of view, and I am certain it's true in Kentucky as well, people want to pay their bills. But what's happening today in households across my district is people are running faster to stand still. They are working harder to make a little bit more. But their energy costs for their gasoline, for the diesel; for the farmers, for their fertilizers, their feed, for their cows, the energy cost is escalating. That's called inflation. And on top of that, they can't buy as much with their hard-earned dollar. So what good does it do if you're milking cows and you're getting \$20 per hundred weight and your overhead is eating it up? The margin, your profit, is almost the same as when it was \$12 per hundred.

So we have to begin to change our Federal policies, and our budget must reflect not just our Nation's values but our true American traditional family values of pay-as-you-go.

Now, when I was just 12 years old, my grandmother from Poland taught me, Steve, if you see something you like and you've got the money, go ahead and buy it. If you see something you like and you don't have the money, don't buy it. And that's all you need to know about money.

We have to take that idea here in Washington as well and say, look, there are things we must do. We must defend our country. We must grow our economy, expand the middle class. At the same time, we have to protect our planet from global climate change and global warming. All of these are very complex issues, but it begins with money.

Now, my friend, I look at money as a problem solver. If you've got money in your pocket, you can solve some problems. And this government has built up such debts that we are now getting handcuffs on us, monetary handcuffs. Our debt load is so heavy, we are having more and more restrictions on what problems we can solve. So I think we have to get our financial House of Representatives in order, not just our congressional House but our financial house.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank my colleague. And as we wind down, I want to do two things. One is to thank him for dinner, because that was very nice of him to be willing to stand in for me, not that I couldn't have paid, but he was generous enough to treat tonight; and, secondly, to talk about the concept of unity and community.

And on the dais to my colleague's right, there are several terms inscribed in that dais, but on my far left the term "union" is inscribed. And that's really what I think we have lost track of and lost awareness of in this country, that we are part of something that is very special. But it is a union. It's not 300 million individuals out on their own.

And we had an interesting hearing the other day in the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and basically the subject was on the subprime mortgage crisis, but it was also related to CEOs' salaries. And I'm not sure it was quite a good idea to combine the two, although they do provide kind of a stark contrast in which many of these companies, namely, Countrywide, had lost lots of money, and yet the CEO had left the company and was still making millions of dollars, \$37 million he left the company with.

But we also had the former chairman of Citigroup, the CEO of Time Warner, the former CEO of Merrill Lynch; so we had some of the giants of American industry there. And the topic of discussion kept alternating between the subprime mortgage crisis and also the question of CEOs' salaries. And it occurred to me, as we went through this discussion, that many of these CEOs make tens of millions of dollars a year in compensation, much of it related to stock options that they are given, so their compensation ultimately is related to their stock price.

And as the conversation went on, it finally came my turn to ask questions. And I addressed these giants of American industry, and I said, I can see how in a comparative market situation that the CEO of Citigroup, which is a \$35 billion company, may be worth \$10 million a year in salary. I don't have any complaint about that. And even if you lose money in a particular year, I mean if it hadn't been for the talents of the CEO, you might have lost more money; so maybe that was justified.

But what the American people see is CEOs making tens of millions of dollars, at the same time feeling, if not knowing explicitly what's on that chart, that their standard of living, even though they are working as hard as they have ever worked, is not improving. And if they are working for one of those companies at a relatively average position, while they are working hard, their standard of living is staying the same and the CEO's salary is increasing.

And we all know the data about the disparity between CEOs' salaries and their employees' salaries. It's gone from an average of 30 times in the early 1970s to now 400 or 500 times. And it doesn't matter whether you lose money; they still make these huge salaries. And I asked them, When you have these meetings in your compensation committees and you're deciding and discussing the salaries of your CEO and your upper management, is there

ever a conversation or have you ever heard of a conversation that related to how you might improve the lives of your employees, how you might stabilize the communities where your businesses are, how you might help to make this country a better place, or is all the conversation related to how you get the stock price up?

And the retired chairman of Citigroup said, very candidly and honestly, No, we only talk about share price. I said, That's a very unfortunate disconnect between what I think we all think is the objective, the ambition of this country, this Union, which is to make life better for everybody, to create jobs, to have everybody realize the American Dream, and yet our largest corporate citizens are only thinking about how they raise their stock price.

And I wonder, and I hope to be able to pursue this conversation with other CEOs of big corporations as I serve my terms in Congress, Do you ever talk about raising your standard of living of your employees? How do we get their wages up? How do we improve their benefits? How do we improve their health care situation? How do we stabilize that community and what can we do? And I know there are companies out there who are great corporate citizens. I have some in my own district who do that.

□ 2215

But if you don't have the corporate mentality that thinks about the same goals that the American people have, then we have a problem in this country. And I am not exactly sure how to go about it. But I know that the policies that are represented by our colleagues on the Republican side and by this been White House have been ones that say, we're going to do everything we can to facilitate that strategy of letting those companies do whatever they need to do to jack their stock prices up, and meanwhile we hope that it helps everybody else.

And I think that our budget says that we are not going to rely on just an abstract hope. We are going to take steps to invest in the American people, to put money in education, to put money in health care and to put money in infrastructure that will allow those people to make sure they improve their own standard of living.

So, we are going to have this debate for a long time. We will have it in this particular context in this budget debate, but as we go forward in this Congress, and in future Congresses. And I look forward to it because I think that the American people want us to do everything we can to help them realize their individual ambitions, and, again, to make ourselves a better Union.

So with that, I would just like to ask my colleague if he has any closing remarks, and then we will let everyone go home.

Mr. KAGEN. I appreciate your comments. And I have learned a great deal just working with you here in Con-

gress. And I appreciate your sacrifice of leaving your business and your life in Kentucky to work here in Washington even as you live back in Kentucky, as I work here in Washington and live in Wisconsin.

I will just remind you what we both agree on. We need to have not just a budget policy, but a tax policy that rewards work more so than wealth. Because what you see with this graph is that the people that are being rewarded are the wealthy who are not necessarily working as hard as people.

Now whose side are we on? We do not sit in a boardroom. We are standing on the workplace floor. We understand the pain and feel the stress that ordinary Americans are going through and families are making it just a tough time every single day. The policies that we are putting forward have to be people first, and our budget must not only be balanced, but we have to balance the other deficits that we face. We have a budget deficit, and we have a savings deficit. We have to become, once again, a Nation that saves money and not just spends money. We have to lead the way here in Congress.

And I look forward to working with you in the years to come and certainly in the next several weeks as we pass a budget here.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank my colleague. And as I close, I just what to repeat what I have said to many people, and that is that it is such a great honor to be in this wonderful group of people, men and women, elected in 2006, because most of us came to Congress well past the age of 50. We came because we had done what we wanted to do in our professional lives or our business careers, and we said we wanted to make a difference.

We weren't here because we expected to spend 25 or 30 years in Congress. We didn't want to be professional politicians. We came because we wanted to see what we could do to change the direction of the country. And nobody is a better example of that than my colleague from Wisconsin, and I thank him for joining me tonight. I look forward to further discussions as we move forward.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MITCHELL (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for March 10 and 11 on account of family obligations.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week on account of family illness.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURGESS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today, March 13 and 14.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today and March 13.

Mr. BONNER, for 5 minutes, March 13.

Mr. DENT, for 5 minutes, March 13.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today and March 13.

Mr. BURGESS, for 5 minutes, March 13.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 13, 2008, at 10:30 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5689. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — 1-Propanesulfonic acid, 2-methyl-2-[(1-oxo-2-propenyl)amino]—, monosodium salt, polymer with ethenol and ethenyl acetate; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2007-0223; FRL-8344-7] received February 15, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5690. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Methoxyfenozide; Pesticide Tolerance and Time-Limited Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2007-0495; FRL-8352-2] received February 28, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5691. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Acetic acid, [5-chloro-8-quinolinyl] oxy—, 1-methylhexyl ester (Cloquintocet-mexyl); Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2007-0555; FRL-8350-8] received February 28, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5692. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Formetanate Hydrochloride; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0916; FRL-8343-6] received February 15, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5693. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Mesotrione; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2007-0030; FRL-8349-7] received February 15, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5694. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Vitamin E, d-alpha tocopheryl, dl-alpha tocopherol acetate, and dl-alpha tocopheryl acetate; Inert Ingredients; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2005-0306; FRL-8347-8] received February 15, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5695. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Carfentrazone-ethyl; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2007-0193; FRL-8349-4] received February 15, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5696. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, South Coast Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2007-0621; FRL-8530-7] received February 28, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5697. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio [EPA-R05-OAR-2006-0879; FRL-8533-8] received February 28, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5698. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Iowa [EPA-R07-OAR-2007-1180; FRL-8535-9] received February 28, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5699. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; VOC Emissions from Fuel Grade Ethanol Production Operations [EPA-R05-OAR-2007-0293; FRL-8529-8] received February 15, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5700. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Redesignation of 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Areas to Attainment and Approval of the Areas' Maintenance Plans and 2002 Base-Year Inventories; Correction [EPA-R03-OAR-2007-0324; EPA-R03-OAR-2007-0476; EPA-R03-OAR-2007-0344; FRL-8536-6] received February 28, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5701. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Redesignation of the Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area to Attainment and Approval of the Area's Maintenance Plan and 2002 Base Year Inventory [EPA-R03-OAR-2007-0606; FRL-8536-5] received February 28, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5702. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; VOC and Nox RACT Determination for Merck and Co., Inc. [EPA-R09-OAR-2007-0534; FRL-8536-4] received February 28, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5703. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the report on Measuring Stability and Security in Iraq pursuant to Section 9010 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2006, Pub. L. 109-289, as amended by Section 1308 of Pub. L.

110-28 and Section 1224 of Pub. L. 110-181; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5704. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, (OCAO), GSA, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-23; Small Entity Compliance Guide [Docket FAR-2007-0002, Sequence 9] received January 31, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5705. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, (OCAO), GSA, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; FAR Case 2005-016, Performance-Based Payments [FAC 2005-23; FAR Case 2005-016; Item III; Docket 2007-0001; Sequence 13] (RIN: 9000-AK64) received January 31, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5706. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — 26 CFR 601.105: Examination of returns and claims for refund, credit, or abatement; determination of correct tax liability. (Also: Part 1, 280F; 1.280F-7.) (Rev. Proc. 2008-22) received March 7, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5707. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Alternative Disability Mortality Tables — Continued Reliance on Revenue Ruling 96-7 [Notice 2008-29] received March 7, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5708. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Update for Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates [Notice 2008-37] received March 10, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5709. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — 26 CFR 601.204: Changes in accounting periods and in methods of accounting. (Also Part 1, 446; 472; 1.446-1; 1.472-1; 1.472-8) (Rev. Proc. 2008-23) received March 10, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ARCURI: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1041. Resolution providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 3773) to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to establish a procedure for authorizing certain acquisitions of foreign intelligence, and for other purposes (Rept. 110-549). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CARNEY (for himself and Mr. KIRK):

H.R. 5595. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide dental care to veterans with service-connected disabilities,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H.R. 5596. A bill to extend the basic pilot program for employment eligibility confirmation; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BEAN:

H.R. 5597. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the new energy efficient home credit and to provide a credit against tax for the purchase of certain energy efficient homes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 5598. A bill to establish a program under which employing offices of the House of Representatives may agree to reimburse employees for child care expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. WYNN, Mr. HOYER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. TURNER, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. CANNON):

H.R. 5599. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 4600 Silver Hill Road in Suitland, Maryland, as the "Thomas Jefferson Census Bureau Headquarters Building"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia):

H.R. 5600. A bill to permit nonjudicial employees of the District of Columbia courts, employees transferred to the Pretrial Services, Parole, Adult Probation, and Offender Supervision Trustee, and employees of the District of Columbia Public Defender Service to have periods of service performed prior to the enactment of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 included as part of the years of service used to determine the time at which such employees are eligible to retire under chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PORTER (for himself and Ms. BERKLEY):

H.R. 5601. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7925 West Russell Road in Las Vegas, Nevada, as the "Sergeant Irving Joseph Schwartz Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GINGREY (for himself, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. SIMPSON):

H.J. Res. 77. A joint resolution expressing Congressional support for the goals and ideals of National Health Care Decisions Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SPRATT:

H. Con. Res. 316. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment or recess of the two Houses; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BOEHNER:

H. Res. 1039. A resolution raising a question of the privileges of the House.

By Mr. BOEHNER:

H. Res. 1040. A resolution raising a question of the privileges of the House.

By Mrs. BONO MACK (for herself and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H. Res. 1042. A resolution supporting the We Don't Serve Teens campaign; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY (for himself, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WAMP, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. HELLER, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. KIND, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ISSA, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. SHULER, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. BOREN, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H. Res. 1043. A resolution honoring the life and legacy of Chief Standing Bear, a pioneer in civil rights for Native Americans, on the 100th anniversary of Chief Standing Bear's death; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California (for herself and Mr. DELAHUNT):

H. Res. 1044. A resolution condemning the dismissal of the Supreme Court in Pakistan and calling for their reinstatement by the Government of Pakistan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS TO PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 245: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Mr. HILL.  
 H.R. 281: Mr. PALLONE.  
 H.R. 402: Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.  
 H.R. 406: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. ISSA, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. FURTUÑO.  
 H.R. 522: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania and Mr. SIREs.  
 H.R. 594: Mr. SKELTON.  
 H.R. 685: Mr. CHABOT.  
 H.R. 715: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. CARNEY.  
 H.R. 782: Ms. MATSUI.  
 H.R. 861: Mr. PENCE.  
 H.R. 1000: Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, and Mr. ISRAEL.  
 H.R. 1032: Mr. KING of New York.  
 H.R. 1074: Mrs. CAPPs.  
 H.R. 1110: Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia and Mr. HOEKSTRA.  
 H.R. 1134: Mr. TERRY and Mr. WALBERG.  
 H.R. 1142: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. SIREs, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SHULER, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. ROSS, Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia, and Mr. COOPER.  
 H.R. 1198: Mr. WYNN.  
 H.R. 1264: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.  
 H.R. 1273: Mr. TOWNS.  
 H.R. 1369: Ms. NORTON.  
 H.R. 1439: Mr. GALLEGLY and Mr. TERRY.  
 H.R. 1474: Ms. DEGETTE.  
 H.R. 1542: Mr. SIREs, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.  
 H.R. 1584: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 2208: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 2370: Mr. KNOLLENBERG and Mr. HAYES.  
 H.R. 2458: Mr. STARK.  
 H.R. 2564: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 2588: Mr. TERRY.  
 H.R. 2702: Mr. ISRAEL.  
 H.R. 2744: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. SIREs, Mr. BERRY, and Mr. KENNEDY.  
 H.R. 2833: Mr. DEFazio.  
 H.R. 2922: Ms. SOLIS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. PASTOR.  
 H.R. 2958: Mr. SOUDER.  
 H.R. 3005: Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BACA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. REYES, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. SIREs.  
 H.R. 3036: Ms. LEE.  
 H.R. 3088: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.  
 H.R. 3173: Ms. NORTON.  
 H.R. 3337: Mr. PASTOR.  
 H.R. 3452: Ms. RICHARDSON.  
 H.R. 3635: Mr. COHEN.  
 H.R. 3652: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.  
 H.R. 3660: Mrs. CAPITO.  
 H.R. 3681: Mr. FILNER.  
 H.R. 3811: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.  
 H.R. 3842: Ms. CLARKE.  
 H.R. 3892: Mr. CONYERS.  
 H.R. 4044: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SHAYS.  
 H.R. 4048: Mr. STARK.  
 H.R. 4055: Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. COHEN.  
 H.R. 4065: Mr. GOODE.  
 H.R. 4089: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. LOEBSSACK, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, and Mr. COURTNEY.  
 H.R. 4105: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. FEENEY.  
 H.R. 4116: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia.  
 H.R. 4138: Mr. DOYLE.  
 H.R. 4206: Mr. CONYERS.  
 H.R. 4218: Mr. ELLISON and Ms. CLARKE.  
 H.R. 4236: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. WELCH of Vermont.  
 H.R. 4460: Mr. KELLER.  
 H.R. 4544: Mr. TERRY.  
 H.R. 4900: Mr. EVERETT, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. GOODE, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. PENCE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.  
 H.R. 4930: Mr. LATOURETTE.  
 H.R. 5035: Mr. WATT.  
 H.R. 5038: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.  
 H.R. 5102: Mr. BACA, Mrs. BONO MACK, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 5109: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.  
 H.R. 5161: Mr. COHEN.  
 H.R. 5233: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey and Mrs. BIGGERT.  
 H.R. 5244: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.  
 H.R. 5312: Mr. FATTAH.  
 H.R. 5440: Mrs. BLACKBURN.  
 H.R. 5442: Mr. DOGGETT.  
 H.R. 5443: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. FORTUÑO, and Mr. ACKERMAN.  
 H.R. 5447: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. CLAY.  
 H.R. 5454: Mr. MCCOTTER.  
 H.R. 5489: Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mrs. MYRICK.  
 H.R. 5534: Mr. FARR.  
 H.R. 5546: Mr. CARNEY.  
 H.R. 5561: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina and Mr. BOOZMAN.  
 H.R. 5580: Mr. HINCHEY.  
 H.R. 5587: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.  
 H.J. Res. 68: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.  
 H. Con. Res. 280: Ms. RICHARDSON.  
 H. Con. Res. 295: Mr. MARSHALL and Mr. TERRY.

- H. Con. Res. 302: Mrs. EMERSON.  
H. Con. Res. 315: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. GOODE, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. KELLER, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.  
H. Res. 105: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.  
H. Res. 146: Mr. FARR.  
H. Res. 169: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
- H. Res. 424: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. KENNEDY.  
H. Res. 705: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.  
H. Res. 896: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. SIRES.  
H. Res. 937: Mr. HAYES and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.  
H. Res. 959: Mr. TOWNS.  
H. Res. 970: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. BURGESS.  
H. Res. 973: Mr. TOWNS.
- H. Res. 990: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.  
H. Res. 997: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.  
H. Res. 1005: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.  
H. Res. 1008: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.  
H. Res. 1018: Mr. KUCINICH.  
H. Res. 1021: Mrs. DRAKE and Mr. BLUMENAUER.  
H. Res. 1026: Mr. MELANCON, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. KILDEE.