

spending. Unfortunately, the Republican rhetoric about controlling spending does not match the reality of their own record.

In the 8 years since Republicans took control of Congress, discretionary spending has increased by an average of 6.5 percent per year, compared to an average of 1.6 percent in the previous 8 years. President Bush signed spending bills increasing spending by nearly 22 percent in the first 2 years he was in office.

Now, some of that was uncontrollable, due to the war and 9/11, but not all of it. When Republicans took control of Congress in 1994, total spending was \$1.4 trillion. Under their budget they propose to spend \$2.2 trillion next year, an increase of over \$800 billion over 10 years.

If we are going to come to the floor day after day, tax cut after tax cut, a tax cut a week, if that is your strategy, and you say we are going to control spending, you have got to do something about your record.

This is the way spending is going to increase under the budget that the majority has put forward this year. By the end of this decade, total spending under the Republican budget will be more than double what it was when Republicans gained control of Congress. You would not gather that by the rhetoric we heard again today. We just keep talking over each other.

But these are the facts of what is happening. If we are going to cut taxes and if we are going to do the things that you propose to do every week, then you have got to cut spending. Otherwise we are going to run this country into the ground. And you are not proposing to do it.

Earlier this week, the administration and Republican leadership have already agreed to increase discretionary spending for the next year by \$5.2 billion, an increase above the budget resolution they passed just 2 months ago.

Just today, the administration has informed the Committee on Appropriations that they will request another \$1.6 billion in supplemental spending for the current fiscal year, an increase. The Blue Dog budget called for tough spending limits by adopting the President's overall spending levels.

I have no quarrel with what the majority proposed on discretionary spending. This is the green line. I have no quarrel with that.

The budget conference report the Republicans passed earlier this year is essentially adopting the spending levels we had in the Blue Dog budget, and that was supported by a majority of Democrats. The Blue Dogs are willing to work with Republicans to hold the line on spending at levels in their budget resolution. Unfortunately, the actions of the last few days show that the Republicans are not willing to stick with the spending levels in their own budget, but yet we keep talking about we are going to control spending.

The Republican budget policies are increasing the most wasteful spending

in the Federal budget, the \$332 billion collected from taxpayers simply to cover our national interest payments. This debt tax consumed a whopping 18 percent of all Federal tax dollars this year, and will increase to 20.1 percent by 2013. This is an increase in the debt tax that working men and women are going to have to pay in order to fulfill the economic policy that we keep hearing about every day.

The bill that passed the House today would add another \$31 billion in spending, spending, spending. We had a \$3.48 billion problem, and what does the leadership on this side of the aisle propose to do? Spend \$30.39 billion more to solve a \$3.48 billion problem.

I do not know how much longer we can do that. It does not seem to bother anybody on the other side of the aisle. I used to join with you day after day after day in saying we need to balance our Federal budget. I used to vote with you. I have not changed my voting pattern.

Under the Republican budget plan, the national debt will increase to over \$12 trillion by 2013. Now, that may not bother anyone, and we can have another tax cut next week, which I understand we are going to have.

But let me say at this point, in closing, Mr. Speaker, the Blue Dogs have issued a letter of challenge to the Republican Message Group. I have spoken with the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON). We would like to have a little debate on this. We have got responsible people on both sides of the aisle that are just as worried about this as we are.

Instead of talking over each other and reading our 2-minute speeches and acting like we are not even in the same world, the Blue Dogs are challenging at least once every week, every night, for the rest of this year, if that is what we agree to do, to talk about these issues, and not just have me standing up pointing to the charts, but having my friends on the other side stand up and say, "You are all wet, Charlie. That is not the way it is," even though these come right out of your budget and the OMB.

I think we need to have a real debate on this issue. So we are making this challenge, I am making it publicly right now, and I look forward to Special Orders next Monday, Tuesday or Wednesday, in which we can sit down and talk about this.

If we are going to talk about controlling spending, then let us propose a budget that does it. Let us not vote down the Blue Dog budget that would have been balanced. Let us not talk about a constitutional amendment, which, by the way, I am for and we will be starting the charge on that also next week to require a balanced budget.

If you are going to talk about it, you have to be prepared to do those things necessary to do it. And you do not cut taxes and increase the debt cost, the interest debt cost by \$30 billion to

solve a \$3 billion problem. It will not work.

As we say back home in Texas, "that dog won't hunt."

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.)

CHILD TAX CREDIT

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, I rise tonight to discuss the refundable child tax credit that we voted on earlier this evening.

I appreciate the remarks of my good friend and next-door neighbor from Texas, but, Mr. Speaker, I have to ask, how did we get here?

Our friends on the other side of the aisle have characterized the recently passed Jobs and Growth Tax Act as "misdirected" and targeted to the wrong people. They say that in order to stimulate the economy we do not need to return the tax dollars to people who pay taxes.

Well, in 2001, and, of course, I was not here then, but this House did pass a tax bill that did return tax dollars to people who do not pay taxes, but the stimulatory effect to the economy from that activity was minimal. So 2 weeks ago we did something different, and we passed the President's economic stimulus plan, which put tax dollars back in the hands of the people who make our economy go. The other side complained about the deficit again, and yet this week they advocated extending the refundable child credit another \$3.5 billion.

Mr. Speaker, the fact remains that small businesses are becoming more and more important to the Nation's overall business activity. They create the majority of new jobs and account for half of the economy's private output.

The jobs and growth plan gives small businesses the ability to immediately expense up to \$100,000, instead of the current write-off of \$25,000 in capital purchases. This encourages small businesses to buy technology, machinery and other equipment that they need to expand their business and meet the needs of their consumers.

The jobs and growth plan increased the child tax credit and eliminated the marriage penalty and exempted another 3.8 million workers from Federal tax liability. And low-income families in particular benefited from this economic growth and tax relief package through a number of provisions.

We accelerated the expansion of the 10 percent bracket. This means workers