ask Congress and ask the executive branch to make sure that our National Guard has the equipment at home they need.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COHEN). Pursuant to House Resolution 275 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. 99.

□ 1015

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. 99) revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2007, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2008, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2009 through 2012, with Mrs. TAUSCHER (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, March 28, 2007, all time for general debate had expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the concurrent resolution is considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 99

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress determines and declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2007 is revised and replaced and that this is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008, including appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2009 through 2012.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 201. Reserve fund for the State Children's Health Insurance Program.
Sec. 202. Reserve fund for reform of the alternative minimum tax.
Sec. 203. Reserve fund to provide for middle-income tax relief and economic equity.
Sec. 204. Reserve fund for agriculture.
Sec. 205. Reserve fund for higher education.
Sec. 206. Reserve fund for improvements in medicare.
Sec. 207. Reserve fund for creating long-term energy alternatives.
Sec. 208. Reserve fund for affordable housing.
Sec. 209. Reserve fund for equitable benefits for Filipino veterans of World War II.
Sec. 210. Reserve fund for Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act reauthorization.
Sec. 211. Reserve fund for receipts from the Bonneville Power Administration.
Sec. 212. Reserve fund for Transitional Medical Assistance.

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 301. Program integrity initiatives.
Sec. 302. Advance appropriations.
Sec. 303. Overseas deployments and emergency needs.
Sec. 304. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
Sec. 305. Adjustments to reflect changes in concepts and definitions.
Sec. 306. Compliance with section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.
Sec. 307. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE IV—POLICY

Sec. 401. Policy on middle-income tax relief.
Sec. 402. Policy on defense priorities.
Sec. 403. Policy on college affordability.

TITLE V—SENSE OF THE HOUSE

Sec. 501. Sense of the House on servicemembers' and veterans' health care and other priorities.
Sec. 502. Sense of the House on the Innovation Agenda: A commitment to competitiveness to keep America #1.
Sec. 503. Sense of the House on homeland security.
Sec. 504. Sense of the House regarding the ongoing need to respond to Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.
Sec. 505. Sense of the House regarding long-term sustainability of entitlements.
Sec. 506. Sense of the House regarding the need to maintain and build upon efforts to fight hunger.
Sec. 507. Sense of the House regarding affordable health coverage.
Sec. 508. Sense of the House regarding extension of the statutory pay-as-you-go rule.
Sec. 509. Sense of the House on long-term budgeting.
Sec. 510. Sense of the House regarding pay parity.
Sec. 511. Sense of the House regarding waste, fraud, and abuse.
Sec. 512. Sense of the House regarding the importance of child support enforcement.
Sec. 513. Sense of the House on State veterans cemeteries.

TITLE VI—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 601. Reconciliation.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2012:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2007: $1,904,706,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $2,050,797,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,106,926,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,163,721,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,394,551,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,597,096,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be adjusted are as follows:

Fiscal year 2007: $0.
Fiscal year 2008: $0.
Fiscal year 2009: $0.
Fiscal year 2010: $0.
Fiscal year 2011: $0.
Fiscal year 2012: $0.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2007: $2,380,614,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $2,495,291,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,516,301,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,569,952,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,684,936,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,716,188,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2007: $2,300,065,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $2,465,888,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,565,305,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,600,718,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,691,358,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,700,809,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2007: –$395,359,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: –$415,091,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: –$458,379,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: –$436,997,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: –$296,807,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: –$103,713,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the debt subject to limit are as follows:

Fiscal year 2007: $8,927,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $9,461,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $10,036,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $10,591,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $11,001,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $11,231,000,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2007: $5,042,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $5,269,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $5,524,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $5,743,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $5,805,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $5,663,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2007 through 2012 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $525,797,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $534,270,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $506,995,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $514,401,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $534,705,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $524,384,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $545,171,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $536,433,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $550,944,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $547,624,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $559,799,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $548,169,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $28,795,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,308,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $34,675,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,096,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, $35,428,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,557,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $35,623,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,687,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $36,083,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,006,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $36,530,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,613,000,000.
(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $25,079,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,516,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $27,611,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,472,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $28,641,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,411,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $29,844,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,485,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $31,103,00,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,089,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $32,438,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,367,000,000.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $2,943,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,369,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $3,240,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,092,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $3,051,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,454,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $3,136,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,641,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $3,228,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,697,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $3,307,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,997,000,000.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $31,332,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,919,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $32,813,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $33,529,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,332,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $34,483,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,574,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $35,152,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,952,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $36,194,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,543,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $21,471,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,738,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $20,381,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,549,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $20,933,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,059,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $21,138,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,112,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $21,156,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,436,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $21,402,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,863,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $5,515,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$3,522,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $9,158,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,985,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $9,973,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $996,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $13,775,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,460,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $8,822,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,931,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $8,822,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,097,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $81,282,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,739,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $82,657,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $80,802,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $76,343,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $83,948,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $77,261,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $86,127,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $78,289,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $87,018,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $79,169,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $88,761,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $15,717,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,281,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $15,032,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,017,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $13,928,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,474,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $14,129,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,220,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $14,328,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,649,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $14,528,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,131,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $92,780,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $92,224,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $92,461,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $91,119,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $96,810,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,978,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $98,333,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $96,041,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $98,409,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $97,276,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $98,654,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $96,909,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $267,892,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $268,197,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $286,767,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $286,261,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $307,842,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $305,984,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $325,885,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $325,716,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $347,621,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $346,553,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $370,780,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $369,739,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $365,152,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $370,180,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $389,586,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $389,696,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $416,731,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $416,382,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $442,369,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $442,589,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $489,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $489,109,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $468,828,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $486,440,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $360,365,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $364,204,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $379,927,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $383,546,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $391,073,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $393,458,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $401,429,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $402,422,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $417,016,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $416,907,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $402,874,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $402,130,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $19,089,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,089,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $19,644,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,644,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $21,518,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,518,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $23,701,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,701,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $27,009,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,009,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $29,898,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,898,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $73,896,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $72,342,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $85,192,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $82,772,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $87,787,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $87,681,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $90,414,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $89,710,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $96,033,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $95,410,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $93,325,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $92,599,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, $45,504,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,659,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $46,940,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,155,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $46,111,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,311,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $47,168,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,504,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $48,379,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,164,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $49,610,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,207,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $18,193,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,574,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $18,614,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,998,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $19,264,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,328,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $19,886,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,765,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $20,647,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,370,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $21,359,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,193,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $344,431,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $344,431,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $369,454,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $369,454,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $389,194,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $389,194,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $413,140,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $413,140,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $431,192,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $431,192,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $442,528,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $442,528,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $785,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $755,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $30,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, –$69,714,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$69,714,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, –$70,979,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$70,979,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, –$66,560,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$66,569,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, –$66,933,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$66,933,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, –$69,575,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$69,595,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, –$71,857,000,000.
(B) Outlays, –$71,860,000,000.
(21) Overseas Deployments and Other Activities (970):
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $124,310,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,506,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $145,163,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $114,914,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $50,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $109,425,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $42,324,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $13,561,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $4,485,000,000.

TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 201. RESERVE FUND FOR THE STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM.

In the House, with respect to a bill or a joint resolution (or an amendment to or a conference report submitted on such a bill or joint resolution) reported from the Committee on Energy and Commerce that increases new budget authority that would result in no more than $50,000,000,000 in outlays for fiscal years 2008 through 2012 for expanding coverage and improving children's health through the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) under title XXI of the Social Security Act and the program under title XIX of such Act (commonly known as medicaid), the chairman of the Committee on Budget may make the appropriate adjustments in allocations of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in budget authority and outlays of other committees as may be necessary pursuant to such adjustment for the Committee on Energy andCommerce, and budgetary aggregates, but only to the extent that such bill or joint resolution (as amended, in the case of an amendment) in the form placed before the House by the Committee on Rules would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012 and the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2017. The adjustments may be made whenever a rule providing for consideration of such a bill or joint resolution is filed, such a bill or joint resolution is placed on any calendar, or an amendment is offered or considered as adopted or a conference report is submitted on such a bill or joint resolution.

SEC. 202. RESERVE FUND FOR REFORM OF THE ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX.

In the House, with respect to any bill or joint resolution (or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon) that provides for reform of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 by reducing the tax burden of the alternative minimum tax on middle-income families, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make the appropriate adjustments in allocations of a committee or committees and budgetary aggregates, but only to the extent that such bills or joint resolutions (as amended, in the case of an amendment) in the form placed before the House by the Committee on Rules would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012 and the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2017. The adjustments may be made whenever a rule providing for consideration of such bills or joint resolutions is filed, such bills or joint resolutions are placed on any calendar, or an amendment is offered or considered as adopted or a conference report is submitted on such bills or joint resolutions.

SEC. 203. RESERVE FUND TO PROVIDE FOR MIDDLE-INCOME TAX RELIEF AND ECONOMIC EQUITY.

In the House, with respect to any bill or joint resolution (or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon) that provides for tax relief for middle-income families and taxpayers and enhanced economic equity, such as extension of the child tax credit, extension of marriage penalty relief, extension of the 10 percent individual income tax bracket, modification of the Alternative Minimum Tax, elimination of estate taxes on all but a minute fraction of estates by reforming and substantially increasing the unified credit, extension of the research and experimentation tax credit, extension of the deduction for State and local sales taxes, and a tax credit for school construction bonds, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make the appropriate adjustments in allocations of a committee or committees and budgetary aggregates, but only to the extent that such bills or joint resolutions (as amended, in the case of an amendment) in the form placed before the House by the Committee on Rules would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012 and the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2017. The adjustments may be made whenever a rule providing for consideration of such bills or joint resolutions are filed, such bills or joint resolutions are placed on any calendar, or an amendment is offered or considered as adopted or a conference report is submitted on such bills or joint resolutions.

SEC. 204. RESERVE FUND FOR AGRICULTURE.

In the House, with respect to a bill or a joint resolution (or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon) that provides for the reauthorization of the programs of the Food Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 or prior Acts, authorizes similar programs, or both, that increases new budget authority by no more than $20,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make the appropriate adjustments in allocations of a committee or committees and budgetary aggregates, but only to the extent that such bill or joint resolution (as amended, in the case of an amendment) in the form placed before the House by the Committee on Rules would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012 and the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2017. The adjustments may be made whenever a rule providing for consideration of such a bill or joint resolution is filed, such a bill or joint resolution is placed on any calendar, or an amendment is offered or considered as adopted or a conference report is submitted on such a bill or joint resolution.

SEC. 205. RESERVE FUND FOR HIGHER EDUCATION.

In the House, with respect to a bill or a joint resolution (or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon) that makes college more affordable through reforms to the Higher Education Act of 1965, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make the appropriate adjustments in allocations of a committee or committees and budgetary aggregates, but only to the extent that such bill or joint resolution (as amended, in the case of an amendment) in the form placed before the House by the Committee on Rules would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012 and the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2017. The adjustments may be made whenever a rule providing for consideration of such a bill or joint resolution is

filed, such a bill or joint resolution is placed on any calendar, or an amendment is offered or considered as adopted or a conference report is submitted on such a bill or joint resolution.

SEC. 206. RESERVE FUND FOR IMPROVEMENTS IN MEDICARE.

In the House, with respect to a bill or a joint resolution (or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon) that improves the medicare program for beneficiaries and protects access to care, through measures such as increasing the reimbursement rate for physicians while protecting beneficiaries from associated premium increases and making improvements to the prescription drug program under part D, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make the appropriate adjustments in allocations of a committee or committees and budgetary aggregates, but only to the extent that such bill or joint resolution (as amended, in the case of an amendment) in the form placed before the House by the Committee on Rules would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012 and the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2017. The adjustments may be made whenever a rule providing for consideration of such a bill or joint resolution is filed, such a bill or joint resolution is placed on any calendar, or an amendment is offered or considered as adopted or a conference report is submitted on such a bill or joint resolution.

SEC. 207. RESERVE FUND FOR CREATING LONG-TERM ENERGY ALTERNATIVES.

In the House, with respect to a bill or a joint resolution (or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon) that fulfills the purposes of section 301(a) of H.R. 6, the Clean Energy Act of 2007:

(1) The chairman of the Committee on Budget may make the appropriate adjustments in allocations of a committee or committees and budgetary aggregates, but only to the extent that such bill or joint resolution (as amended, in the case of an amendment) would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012 and the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2017. The adjustments made under this paragraph may be made whenever a rule is filed for a bill or joint resolution that attributes the offsets included in H.R. 6 to the bill or joint resolution.

(2) The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make appropriate adjustments to the allocations provided for under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations to the extent a bill or joint resolution in the form placed before the House by the Committee on Rules provides budget authority for purposes set forth in section 301(a) of H.R. 6 in excess of the amounts provided for those purposes in fiscal year 2007. Any adjustments made under this paragraph shall not include revenues attributable to changes in the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and shall not exceed the receipts estimated by the Congressional Budget Office that are attributable to H.R. 6 for the year in which the adjustments are made.

SEC. 208. RESERVE FUND FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

In the House, with respect to a bill or a joint resolution (or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon) that provides for an affordable housing fund, offset by reforming the regulation of certain government-sponsored enterprises, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make the appropriate adjustments in allocations of a committee or committees and budgetary aggregates, but only to the extent that such bill or joint resolution (as amended, in the case of an amendment) in the form placed before the House by the Committee on Rules would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012 and the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2017. The adjustments may be made whenever a rule providing for consideration of such a bill or joint resolution is filed, such a bill or joint resolution is placed on any calendar, or an amendment is offered or considered as adopted or a conference report is submitted on such a bill or joint resolution.

SEC. 209. RESERVE FUND FOR EQUITABLE BENEFITS FOR FILIPINO VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II.

In the House, with respect to a bill or a joint resolution (or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon) that would provide for or increase benefits to Filipino veterans of World War II, their survivors and dependents, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make the appropriate adjustments in allocations of a committee or committees and budgetary aggregates, but only to the extent that such bill or joint resolution (as amended, in the case of an amendment) in the form placed before the House by the Committee on Rules would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012 and the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2017. The adjustments may be made whenever a rule providing for consideration of such a bill or joint resolution is filed, such a bill or joint resolution is placed on any calendar, or an amendment is offered or considered as adopted or a conference report is submitted on such a bill or joint resolution.

SEC. 210. RESERVE FUND FOR SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SELF-DETERMINATION ACT REAUTHORIZATION.

In the House, with respect to a bill or a joint resolution (or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon) that provides for the reauthorization of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act (Public Law 106-393), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make the appropriate adjustments in allocations of a committee or committees and budgetary aggregates, but only to the extent that such bill or joint resolution (as amended, in the case of an amendment) in the form placed before the House by the Committee on Rules would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012 and the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2017. The adjustments may be made whenever a rule providing for consideration of such a bill or joint resolution is filed, such a bill or joint resolution is placed on any calendar, or an amendment is offered or considered as adopted or a conference report is submitted on such a bill or joint resolution.

SEC. 211. RESERVE FUND FOR RECEIPTS FROM THE BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION.

In the House, with respect to a bill or a joint resolution (or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon) that prohibits the Bonneville Power Administration from making early payments on its Federal Bond Debt to the Department of the Treasury, the chairman of the Committee on Budget may make the appropriate adjustments in allocations of a committee or committees and budgetary aggregates, but only to the extent that such bill or joint resolution (as amended, in the case of an amendment) in the form placed before the House by the Committee on Rules would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012 and the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2017. The adjustments may be made whenever a rule providing for consideration of such a bill or joint resolution is filed, such a bill or joint resolution is placed on any calendar, or an amendment is offered or considered as adopted or a conference report is submitted on such a bill or joint resolution.

SEC. 212. RESERVE FUND FOR TRANSITIONAL MEDICAL ASSISTANCE.

In the House, with respect to a bill or a joint resolution (or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon) that extends the Transitional Medical Assistance program, included in title 19 of the Social Security Act, through fiscal year 2008, the chairman of the Committee on Budget may make the appropriate adjustments in allocations of a committee or committees and budgetary aggregates, but only to the extent that such bill or joint resolution (as amended, in the case of an amendment) in the form placed before the House by the Committee on Rules would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012 and the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2017. The adjustments may be made whenever a rule providing for consideration of such a bill or joint resolution is filed, such a bill or joint resolution is placed on any calendar, or an amendment is offered or considered as adopted or a conference report is submitted on such a bill or joint resolution.

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 301. PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES.

(a) ADJUSTMENTS TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—

(1) CONTINUING DISABILITY REVIEWS AND SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME REDETERMINATIONS.—If a bill or joint resolution is reported making appropriations for fiscal year 2008 that appropriates $264,000,000 for continuing disability reviews and Supplemental Security Income redeterminations for the Social Security Administration, and provides an additional appropriation of up to $213,000,000 and the amount is designated for continuing disability reviews and Supplemental Security Income redeterminations for the Social Security Administration, then the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of the additional budget authority and outlays flowing from that budget authority for fiscal year 2008.

(2) INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE TAX COMPLIANCE.—If a bill or joint resolution is reported making appropriations for fiscal year 2008 that appropriates up to $6,822,000,000 to the Internal Revenue Service and the amount is designated to improve compliance with the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and provides an additional appropriation of up to $406,000,000, and the amount is designated to improve compliance with the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, then the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of the additional budget authority and outlays flowing from that budget authority for fiscal year 2008.

(3) HEALTHCARE FRAUD AND ABUSE CONTROL PROGRAM.—If a bill or joint resolution is reported making appropriations for fiscal year 2008 that appropriates up to $183,000,000 and the amount is designated to the healthcare fraud and abuse control program at the Department of Health and Human Services, then the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays flowing from that budget authority for fiscal year 2008.

(4) UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE IMPROPER PAYMENTS.—If a bill or joint resolution is reported making appropriations for fiscal year

2008 that appropriates $10,000,000 for unemployment insurance improper payment reviews for the Department of Labor, and provides an additional appropriation of up to $40,000,000 and the amount is designated for unemployment insurance improper payment reviews for the Department of Labor, then the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of the additional budget authority and outlays flowing from that budget authority for fiscal year 2008.

(b) PROCEDURE FOR ADJUSTMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) CHAIRMAN.—After the reporting of a bill or joint resolution, or the offering of an amendment thereto or the submission of a conference report thereon, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make the adjustments set forth in subparagraph (B) for the incremental new budget authority in that measure (if that measure meets the requirements set forth in paragraph (2)) and the outlays flowing from that budget authority.

(B) MATTERS TO BE ADJUSTED.—The adjustments referred to in subparagraph (A) are to be made to—

(i) the allocations made pursuant to the appropriate concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(ii) the budgetary aggregates as set forth in this resolution.

(c) OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE.—In the House, all committees are directed to review programs within their jurisdiction to root out waste, fraud, and abuse in program spending, giving particular scrutiny to issues raised by Government Accountability Office reports. Based on these oversight efforts and committee performance reviews of programs within their jurisdiction, committees are directed to include recommendations for improved governmental performance in their annual views and estimates reports required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on the Budget.

SEC. 302. ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, except as provided in subsection (b), a bill or joint resolution making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation, or an amendment thereto may not provide for advance appropriations.

(b) ADVANCE APPROPRIATION.—In the House, an advance appropriation may be provided for fiscal year 2009 or 2010 for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this resolution under the heading ''Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations'' in an aggregate amount not to exceed $25,558,000,000 in new budget authority.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''advance appropriation'' means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2008 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2008.

SEC. 303. OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENTS AND EMERGENCY NEEDS.

(a) OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENTS AND RELATED ACTIVITIES.—In the House, any bill or joint resolution or amendment offered or considered as adopted or a conference report thereon, that makes appropriations for fiscal year 2008 or fiscal year 2009 for overseas deployments and related activities, and such amounts are so designated pursuant to this subsection, then new budget authority, outlays or receipts resulting therefrom shall not count for the purposes of titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(b) EMERGENCY NEEDS.—In the House, any bill or joint resolution, or amendment offered or considered as adopted or conference report thereon, that makes appropriations for nondefense discretionary amounts, and such amounts are designated as necessary to meet emergency needs, then the new budget authority, outlays, or receipts resulting therefrom shall not be counted for the purposes of titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

SEC. 304. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget.

SEC. 305. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

Upon the enactment of a bill or joint resolution providing for a change in concepts or definitions, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make adjustments to the levels and allocations in this resolution in accordance with section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as in effect on September 30, 2002).

SEC. 306. COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 13301 OF THE BUDGET ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1990.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House and the Senate, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—In the House, for purposes of applying section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any discretionary amounts provided for the Social Security Administration.

SEC. 307. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the House, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House.

TITLE IV—POLICY

SEC. 401. POLICY ON MIDDLE-INCOME TAX RELIEF.

It is the policy of this resolution to minimize fiscal burdens on middle-income families and their children and grandchildren. It is the policy of this resolution to provide immediate relief for the tens of millions of middle-income households who would otherwise be subject to the Alternative Minimum Tax (AMT) under current law in the context of permanent, revenue-neutral AMT reform. Furthermore, it is the policy of this resolution to support extension of middle-income tax relief and enhanced economic equity through policies such as—

(1) extension of the child tax credit;

(2) extension of marriage penalty relief;

(3) extension of the 10 percent individual income tax bracket;

(4) elimination of estate taxes on all but a minute fraction of estates by reforming and substantially increasing the unified tax credit;

(5) extension of the research and experimentation tax credit;

(6) extension of the deduction for State and local sales taxes;

(7) extension of the deduction for small business expensing; and

(8) enactment of a tax credit for school construction bonds.

This resolution assumes the cost of enacting such policies is offset by reforms within the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that promote a fairer distribution of taxes across families and generations, economic efficiency, higher rates of tax compliance to close the ''tax gap'', and reduced taxpayer burdens through tax simplification.

SEC. 402. POLICY ON DEFENSE PRIORITIES.

It is the policy of this resolution that—

(1) recommendations of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States (commonly referred to as the 9/11 Commission) to fund cooperative threat reduction and nuclear nonproliferation programs at a level commensurate with the risk is a high priority, and the President's budget should have requested sufficient funding for these programs;

(2) ensuring that the TRICARE fees for military retirees under the age of 65 remain at current levels;

(3) funds be provided for increasing pay to ensure retention of experienced personnel and for improving military benefits in general;

(4) the Missile Defense Agency should be funded at an adequate but lower level and the elimination of space-based interceptor development will ensure a more prudent acquisition strategy, yet still support a robust ballistic missile defense program;

(5) satellite research, development, and procurement be funded at a level below the amount requested for fiscal year 2008, which amounts to a 26 percent increase above the current level, but at a level sufficient to develop new satellite technologies while ensuring a more prudent acquisition strategy;

(6) sufficient resources be provided to implement Government Accountability Office (GAO) recommendations, such as improving financial management and contracting practices at the Department of Defense (DOD), and that substantial savings should result from the identification of billions of dollars of obligations and disbursements and Government overcharges for which the Department of Defense cannot account;

(7) that the Department of Defense should do a more careful job of addressing the 1,378 Government Accountability Office recommendations made to the Department of Defense and its components over the last six years that have yet to be implemented,

which could produce billions of dollars in savings; and

(8) accruing all savings from the actions recommended in paragraphs (4) through (7) should be used to fund higher priorities within Function 050 (Defense), and especially those high priorities identified in paragraphs (1) through (3) and to help fund recommendations of the bipartisan ''Walter Reed Commission'' (the President's Commission on Care for America's Returning Wounded Warriors) and other United States Government investigations into military healthcare facilities and services.

SEC. 403. POLICY ON COLLEGE AFFORDABILITY.

It is the policy of this resolution that the reconciliation directive to the Committee on Education and Labor shall not be construed to reduce any assistance that makes college more affordable for students, including but not limited to assistance to student aid programs run by nonprofit state agencies.

TITLE V—SENSE OF THE HOUSE

SEC. 501. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON SERVICEMEMBERS' AND VETERANS' HEALTH CARE AND OTHER PRIORITIES.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) the House supports excellent health care for current and former members of the United States Armed Services, who have served well and honorably and have made significant sacrifices for this Nation;

(2) this resolution provides $43,055,000,000 in discretionary budget authority for 2008 for Function 700 (Veterans Benefits and Services), including veterans' health care, which is $6,598,000,000 more than the 2007 level, $5,404,000,000 more than the Congressional Budget Office's baseline level for 2008, and $3,506,000,000 more than the President's budget for 2008;

(3) this resolution provides funding to implement, in part, recommendations of the bipartisan ''Walter Reed Commission'' (the President's Commission on Care for America's Returning Wounded Warriors) and other United States Government investigations into military and veterans health care facilities and services;

(4) this resolution assumes the rejection of the enrollment fees and co-payment increases in the President's budget;

(5) this resolution provides additional funding above the President's inadequate budget levels for the Department of Veterans Affairs to research and treat veterans' mental health, post-traumatic stress disorder, and traumatic brain and spinal cord injuries; and

(6) this resolution provides additional funding above the President's inadequate budget levels for the Department of Veterans Affairs to improve the speed and accuracy of its processing of disability compensation claims, including funding to hire additional personnel above the President's requested level.

SEC. 502. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON THE INNOVATION AGENDA: A COMMITMENT TO COMPETITIVENESS TO KEEP AMERICA #1.

(a) It is the sense of the House to provide sufficient funding that our Nation may continue to be the world leader in education, innovation and economic growth. This resolution provides $450,000,000 above the President's requested level for 2008, and additional amounts in subsequent years in Function 250 (General Science, Space and Technology) and Function 270 (Energy). Additional increases for scientific research and education are included in Function 500 (Education, Employment, Training, and Social Services), Function 550 (Health), Function 300 (Environment and Natural Resources), Function 350 (Agriculture), Function 400 (Transportation), and Function 370 (Commerce and Housing Credit), all of which receive more funding than the President requested.

(b) America's greatest resource for innovation resides within classrooms across the country. The increased funding provided in this resolution will support important initiatives to educate 100,000 new scientists, engineers, and mathematicians, and place highly qualified teachers in math and science K–12 classrooms.

(c) Independent scientific research provides the foundation for innovation and future technologies. This resolution will put us on the path toward doubling funding for the National Science Foundation, basic research in the physical sciences across all agencies, and collaborative research partnerships; and toward achieving energy independence through the development of clean and sustainable alternative energy technologies.

SEC. 503. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON HOMELAND SECURITY.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) this resolution assumes additional homeland security funding above the President's requested level for 2008 and every subsequent year;

(2) this resolution assumes funding above the President's requested level for 2008, and additional amounts in subsequent years, in the four budget functions: Function 400 (Transportation), Function 450 (Community and Regional Development), Function 550 (Health), and Function 750 (Administration of Justice) that fund most nondefense homeland security activities; and

(3) the homeland security funding provided in this resolution will help to strengthen the security of our Nation's transportation system, particularly our ports where significant security shortfalls still exist and foreign ports, by expanding efforts to identify and scan all high-risk United States-bound cargo, equip first responders, strengthen border patrol, and increase the preparedness of the public health system.

SEC. 504. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING THE ONGOING NEED TO RESPOND TO HURRICANES KATRINA AND RITA.

It is the sense of the House that:

(1) Critical needs in the Gulf Coast region should be addressed without further delay. The budget resolution creates a reserve fund that would allow for affordable housing that may be used to focus on areas devastated by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, as well as new funding for additional recovery priorities.

(2) Additional oversight and investigation is needed to ensure that recovery efforts are on track, develop legislation to reform the contracting process, and better prepare for future disasters. Those efforts should be made in close consultation with residents of affected areas. The budget resolution provides additional 2007 funding for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, some of which may be used for this purpose.

SEC. 505. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING LONG-TERM SUSTAINABILITY OF ENTITLEMENTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The aging of the United States population is going to put unprecedented pressure on the Nation's retirement and health care systems.

(2) The long-term strength of social security would be improved through a fiscally responsible policy of reducing the deficit and paying down the debt that has accumulated since 2001, thus reducing debt service payments and freeing up billions of dollars that can be dedicated to meeting social security's obligations.

(3) A policy of reducing and eventually eliminating the deficit and paying down the debt is a key factor in improving the long-term strength of the economy as a whole, because a lower debt burden frees up resources for productive investments that will result in higher economic growth, provide a higher standard of living for future generations, and enhance the Nation's ability to meet its commitments to its senior citizens.

(4) The most significant factor affecting the Nation's entitlement programs is the rapid increase in health care costs. The projected increasing costs of medicare and medicaid are not unique to these programs but rather are part of a pattern of rising costs for the health sector as a whole.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that the growing cost of entitlements should be addressed in a way that is fiscally responsible and promotes economic growth, that addresses the causes of cost growth in the broader health care system, and that protects beneficiaries without leaving a legacy of debt to future generations.

SEC. 506. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING THE NEED TO MAINTAIN AND BUILD UPON EFFORTS TO FIGHT HUNGER.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) More than 35 million individuals (12.4 million of them children) are food insecure, uncertain of having, or unable to acquire enough food. 10.8 million Americans are hungry because of lack of food.

(2) Despite the critical contributions of the Department of Agriculture nutrition programs and particularly the food stamp program that significantly reduced payment error rates while increasing enrollment to partially mitigate the impact of recent increases in the poverty rate, significant need remains.

(3) Nearly 25 million people, including nine million children and three million seniors, sought emergency food assistance from food pantries, soup kitchens, shelters, and local charities last year.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that the Department of Agriculture programs that help fight hunger should be maintained and that the House should seize opportunities to enhance those programs to reach people in need and to fight hunger.

SEC. 507. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING AFFORDABLE HEALTH COVERAGE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) More than 46 million Americans, including nine million children, lack health insurance. People without health insurance are more likely to experience problems getting medical care and to be hospitalized for avoidable health problems.

(2) Most Americans receive health coverage through their employers. A major issue facing all employers is the rising cost of health insurance. Small businesses, which have generated most of the new jobs annually over the last decade, have an especially difficult time affording health coverage, due to higher administrative costs and fewer people over whom to spread the risk of catastrophic costs. Because it is especially costly for small businesses to provide health coverage, their employees make up a large proportion of the nation's uninsured individuals.

(b) SENSE OF THE HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House that legislation consistent with the pay-as-you-go principle should be adopted that makes health insurance more affordable and accessible, with attention to the special needs of small businesses, and that lowers costs and improves the quality of health care by encouraging integration of health information technology tools into the practice of medicine, and promoting improvements in disease management and disease prevention.

SEC. 508. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING EXTENSION OF THE STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO RULE.

It is the sense of the House that in order to reduce the deficit Congress should extend PAYGO in its original form in the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.

SEC. 509. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON LONG-TERM BUDGETING.

It is the sense of Congress that the determination of the congressional budget for the United States Government and the President's budget request should include consideration of the Financial Report of the United States Government, especially its information regarding the Government's net operating cost, financial position, and long-term liabilities.

SEC. 510. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING PAY PARITY.

It is the sense of the House that rates of compensation for civilian employees of the United States should be adjusted at the same time, and in the same proportion, as are rates of compensation for members of the uniformed services.

SEC. 511. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE.

It is the sense of the House that all committees should examine programs within their jurisdiction to identify wasteful and fraudulent spending. To this end, section 301 of this resolution includes cap adjustments to provide appropriations for three programs that accounted for a significant share of improper payments reported by Federal agencies in 2006: Social Security Administration Continuing Disability Reviews, the Medicare/Medicaid Health Care Fraud and Abuse Control Program, and Unemployment Insurance. Section 301 also includes a cap adjustment for the Internal Revenue Services for tax compliance efforts to close the $300,000,000,000 tax gap. In addition, the resolution's deficit-neutral reserve funds require authorizing committees to cut lower priority and wasteful spending to accommodate new high-priority entitlement benefits. Finally, section 301 of the resolution directs all committees to review the performance of programs within their jurisdiction and report recommendations annually to the Committee on the Budget as part of the views and estimates process required by section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act.

SEC. 512. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING THE IMPORTANCE OF CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) additional legislative action is needed to ensure that States have the necessary resources to collect all child support that is owed to families and to allow them to pass 100 percent of support on to families without financial penalty; and

(2) when 100 percent of child support payments are passed to the child, rather than administrative expenses, program integrity is improved and child support participation increases.

SEC. 513. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON STATE VETERANS CEMETERIES.

It is the sense of the House that the Federal Government should pay the plot allowance for the interment in a State veterans cemetery of any spouse or eligible child of a veteran, consistent with the pay-as-you-go principle.

TITLE VI—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 601. RECONCILIATION.

(a) INSTRUCTIONS.—The House Committee on Education and Labor shall report changes in laws to reduce the deficit by $75,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012.

(b) MANDATORY SAVINGS.—Not later than September 10, 2007, the House Committee on Education and Labor shall submit its recommendations to the House of Representatives.

(c) SUBMISSION OF REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—Upon the submission to the House of a reconciliation bill or conference report thereon, that complies with this reconciliation instruction, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may file with the House appropriately revised allocations and budgetary aggregates. Such revisions shall be considered to be the allocations and aggregates established by the concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. No amendment to the concurrent resolution is in order except the amendments printed in House Report 110–79. 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 read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. KILPATRICK

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 110–79, which is debatable for 40 minutes.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 1 offered by Ms. KILPATRICK:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008.

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2009 through 2012 are set forth.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $2,125,897,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,195,626,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,257,721,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,434,651,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,618,596,000,000.00.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be reduced are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $75,100,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2009: $88,700,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2010: $94,000,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2011: $40,100,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2012: $21,500,000,000.00.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $2,563,074,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,569,841,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,612,809,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,719,483,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,746,964,000,000.00.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $2,503,314,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,620,443,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,647,959,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,730,582,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,734,344,000,000.00.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $ – 377,417,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2009: $ – 424,817,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2010: $ – 390,237,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2011: $ – 295,931,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2012: $ – 115,749,000,000.00.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $9,423,000,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2009: $9,965,000,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2010: $10,473,000,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2011: $10,882,000,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2012: $11,124,000,000,000.00.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $5,231,000,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2009: $5,452,000,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2010: $5,625,000,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2011: $5,686,000,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2012: $5,556,000,000,000.00.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2008 through 2012 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $506,955,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $514,401,000,000.00.

Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $534,705,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $524,384,000,000.00.

Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $545,171,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $536,433,000,000.00.

Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $550,944,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $547,624,000,000.00.

Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $559,799,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $548,169,000,000.00.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $37,745,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $34,785,000,000.00.

Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $37,577,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $34,660,000,000.00.

Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $37,127,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $34,466,000,000.00.

Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $37,136,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $34,405,000,000.00.

Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $37,267,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $34,592,000,000.00.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $27,772,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $26,561,000,000.00.

Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $28,754,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $28,521,000,000.00.

Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $29,923,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $29,578,000,000.00.

Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $31,158,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $30,162,000,000.00.

Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $32,477,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $31,418,000,000.00.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $3,494,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $1,194,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $3,229,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $1,627,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $3,260,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $1,800,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $3,315,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $1,821,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $3,368,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $2,084,000,000.00.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $33,895,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $35,459,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $34,286,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $36,073,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $35,013,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $36,201,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $35,180,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $36,256,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $36,214,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $36,653,000,000.00.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $20,945,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $19,972,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $21,328,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $20,496,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $21,414,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $20,418,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $21,349,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $20,650,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $21,537,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $21,013,000,000.00.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $10,610,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $3,074,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $10,989,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $2,121,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $14,486,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $4,248,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $9,320,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $2,482,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $9,171,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $1,483,000,000.00.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $83,657,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $81,202,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $77,043,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $84,628,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $77,751,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $86,753,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $78,632,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $87,506,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $79,409,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $89,103,000,000.00.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $17,166,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $22,551,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $15,422,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $21,488,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $15,175,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $20,463,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $15,060,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $18,946,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $15,040,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $16,039,000,000.00.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $121,203,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $101,179,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $121,552,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $119,883,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $120,276,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $120,003,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $117,706,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $118,433,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $116,785,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $115,930,000,000.00.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $302,810,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $298,678,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $322,072,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $320,093,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $338,846,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $339,499,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $359,694,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $359,503,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $382,231,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $381,804,000,000.00.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $389,886,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $389,996,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $417,031,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $416,682,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $442,669,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $442,889,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $489,400,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $489,409,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $487,128,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $486,740,000,000.00.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $384,558,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $387,232,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $394,570,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $397,238,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $404,132,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $405,323,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $419,163,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $419,193,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $404,632,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $403,985,000,000.00.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $19,644,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $19,644,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $21,518,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $21,518,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $23,701,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $23,701,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $27,009,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $27,009,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $29,898,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $29,898,000,000.00.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $88,602,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $85,330,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $90,174,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $90,324,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $92,085,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $91,560,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $97,203,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $96,705,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $94,144,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $93,505,000,000.00.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $49,267,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $47,900,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $47,740,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $49,114,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $48,308,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $48,766,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $49,177,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $49,048,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $50,169,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $49,826,000,000.00.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $19,114,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $19,373,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $19,614,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $19,716,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $20,131,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $20,036,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $20,819,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $20,560,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $21,479,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $21,326,000,000.00.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $368,582,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $368,582,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $386,707,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $386,707,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $408,810,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $408,810,000,000.00.

Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $425,770,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $425,770,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $437,358,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $437,358,000,000.00.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $2,985,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $2,269,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $2,090,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $2,313,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $1,463,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $1,619,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $1,024,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $1,134,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $717,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $793,000,000.00.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $−70,979,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $−70,979,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $−66,560,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $−66,569,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $−66,933,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $−66,933,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $−69,575,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $−69,595,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $−71,857,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $−71,860,000,000.00.
(21) Overseas Deployments and Other Activities (970):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $145,163,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $114,914,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $50,000,000,000.00.
(B) Outlays, $109,425,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $00.00.
(B) Outlays, $42,324,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $00.00.
(B) Outlays, $13,561,000,000.00.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $00.00.
(B) Outlays, $4,485,000,000.00.

TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE REPORT TO CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) between 2001 and 2006, GAO provided the Department of Defense with 2544 recommendations, many related to improving their business practices and, to date, the Department of Defense has implemented 1014 recommendations and closed 152 recommendations without implementation; and

(2) the GAO estimates that the 1014 implemented recommendations have yielded the Department of Defense a savings of $52.7 billion between fiscal years 2001 and 2006.

(b) ASSUMPTION; REPORT.—

(1) ASSUMPTION.—This resolution assumes $300,000,000 to be used by the Department of Defense to implement the remaining 1378 recommendations of the Government Accountability Office.

(2) REPORT.—The Secretary of Defense should submit a report to Congress within 90 days that demonstrates how each such recommendation will be implemented, and, in the case of any such recommendation that cannot be implemented, a detailed reason for such inability to implement such recommendation.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK) and a Member opposed each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Madam Chairman, at this time we are very happy to present our Congressional Black Caucus budget for 2008. Our budget is balanced. It takes us to surplus in 5 years. It reduces the deficit, and it invests in America's families.

We are happy today to present to you a budget. The full budget is $2.9 trillion. That would be $3 trillion if it were rounded off.

The Ways and Means Committee that handles the entitlements will handle Medicare for over 44 million seniors' health insurance; Medicaid for over 45 million disabled, low-income seniors' programs; and our veterans programs. Our Appropriations Committee will handle $930 billion of those dollars in our 2008 discussions on this budget.

I am happy to present to you a balanced budget from the Congressional Black Caucus that takes care of our veterans, that invests in the war, that makes sure that our seniors are taken care of, and that our children and their SCHIP program for children's health care is fully funded so that all children in America can have an adequate health care system.

Madam Chairman, the Congressional Black Caucus budget is a good budget. I would urge our colleagues to accept it, to vote for the CBC budget.

Madam Chairman, I am proud that Congress is considering an amendment that I, along with my colleague ROBERT SCOTT from Virginia, am introducing that will change course, confront crises, and continue the legacy of not only the Congressional Black Caucus, but of America. This budget changes our fiscal course from a sea of debt, deficit and despair to financial stability and responsibility. The Kilpatrick/Scott amendment confronts the crises faced by our senior citizens who will not have enough money to heat their homes in the winter or cool them in the summer; it will confront the crises faced by our veterans and those wounded warriors who do not have adequate health care, mental health treatment, or physical therapy; the Kilpatrick/Scott amendment to the budget continues the legacy of this Nation's historic mission of caring for the least of our sisters and brothers.

As the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, and as an appropriator, I know that the American people demanded a change last year. Rounding out for even numbers, we have a $2.9 trillion dollar budget. Six hundred billion of that spending will go to defense. A little more than 300 hundred billion will go to the people. We can do better. The Kilpatrick/Scott amendment will do just that. It ensures that our Nation is safe; it takes care of all Americans; and it gets America on the path to fiscal stability.

The Kilpatrick/Scott amendment is fiscally responsible.

The Kilpatrick/Scott amendment eliminates tax cuts for the top two income brackets. Studies show that 99.7 percent of the benefits of the tax cuts go to those households with incomes over $200,000, 86 percent go to households with incomes above $500,000, and 65 percent go to households with incomes above $1 million. The CBC budget would rescind those tax cuts and restore the more fiscally responsible tax rates that were in place in 2001 and throughout much of the economic boom of the 1990s. This results in $90.6 billion over 5 years for the American people.

The Kilpatrick/Scott amendment eliminates the capital gains and dividend tax cuts. Again, 70 percent of the benefits of these tax cuts go to households with more than $200,000 in income. This results in $98 billion over 5 years for the American people. The bill applies more than $6 billion to reduce the deficit created by these unfair tax cuts and the war.

The Kilpatrick/Scott amendment, for fiscal years 2008–2012, has a total deficit that is $339 billion less than the President's budget and $107 billion less than that of the House Committee on the Budget. These are savings that not only reduce our debt to foreign nations, but allows more money to be used to the needs of the American people.

The Kilpatrick/Scott amendment protects Social Security.

The Congressional Black Caucus strongly opposes private accounts. Privatizing what is arguably the most successful social insurance program in the world would only divert resources from the Social Security Trust Fund and generate trillions of dollars in new debt over the next few decades. Furthermore, the Congressional Black Caucus is strongly opposed to the use of the Social Security surplus to finance the deficit in the rest of the budget. The Kilpatrick/Scott amendment protects Social Security by opposing the use of the Social Security surplus to finance the deficit in the budget.

The Kilpatrick/Scott amendment fights for our warriors at home and abroad.

The amendment also reallocates $300 million in savings in the Department of Defense, using recommendations from the General Accounting Office. These savings will be used to implement the GAO's recommendations for: health facility renovation upgrades at bases; mental health services for post traumatic stress disease; public school Initiatives, aka the Troops to Teachers initiative; cancer research; tuberous sclerosis research; and Parkinson's disease research.

The Kilpatrick/Scott amendment will take care of our veterans, by fully funding the construction of new and improved VA hospitals, providing more funds for more VA workers, and the local clinic initiative for non-urban areas. It is simply shameful that those who have volunteered or were drafted to fight for this country cannot have the best in health care our country has to offer.

The Kilpatrick/Scott amendment improves the international stature of America.

Our reputation as an international savior has taken a significant hit over the past 6 years. The Kilpatrick/Scott amendment addresses our stature and improves our relationship with our global partners. As you know, the Congressional Black Caucus has focused on issues of interest on the continent of Africa. The fact

that we have not addressed the issues of Darfur, global AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria is a shame on America and the Congress. The Kilpatrick/Scott amendment addresses these challenges with more than $3 billion going to the Darfur Initiative; the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria; Child Survival and Health, and International Family Planning Programs.

Darfur Initiative	+$50,000,000
Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria	+1,000,000,000
HIV/AIDS—Latin America and the Caribbean	+50,000,000
Child survival and health	+1,040,000,000
Migration and refugee assistance	+80,000,000
Contributions to international peacekeeping	+600,000,000
International family planning programs	+100,000,000
UNFPA	+50,000,000

The Kilpatrick/Scott amendment helps all Americans.

Social needs have taken a back seat to tax cuts and this war for far too long. Among other things, the CBC amendment will fully fund the Community Development Block Grant at $1.5 billion; provide $1 billion for the construction of new and technologically advanced elementary and secondary schools; fully fund the No Child Left Behind Act, the first time in that program's history that it will be fully funded. This full level of funding will include the complete funding of the science and math program, a program that trains teachers in math and science, and emphasizes math and science in our Nation's elementary, secondary and high schools. The amendment fully funds the Pell grant program, the SCHIP health care program for poor and low income children, the Women's, Infants and Children's—WIC—program, Head Start and the Food Stamp program.

For a balanced budget; for funds that will address the needs of our Nation's wounded warriors from wars in the past, present and future; for fiscal responsibility and accountability; for the protection of our Nation's children, safety and seniors, a responsible vote is a vote for the Kilpatrick/Scott amendment on the budget.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chairman, at this time I would like to address why we are here today. We are here to balance the budget, and what is very good about this debate we are having here today is we are talking about not if we should balance the budget; we are talking about how to balance the budget.

So for that point we have come to a good part of this debate, where I believe, based on the numbers I have seen, all of these amendments we are going to experience today and the base Democrat budget balances by 2012. That is a good start. So now we here in Congress are agreeing, let us balance the budget. That is good.

The question then becomes how do we balance the budget. This is where there are enormous differences between the two parties.

The three budgets on the other side of the aisle, the Progressive budget, the Congressional Black Caucus budget and the base Democrat budget, all have one big thing in common: they raise taxes. They raise a lot of taxes, anywhere from $400 billion to $1 trillion just over the next 5 years.

What kind of taxes are we talking about? Well, let's look at the tax relief that occurred. In 2003, if you take a look at what happened to our country in 2001 with 9/11, with the Enron scandals, with the dot-com bubble bursting, the fact that we went to war and we went into a recession, we lost a lot of jobs. We were losing over 100,000 jobs a month at that time. We went into a recession. Three years of revenues declined. We had a big deficit. So while revenues went down because people lost jobs, we went into deficit and spending went up.

Why? Because we had unemployment. We had programs to help people who lost their jobs. We had war costs, and so what ended up happening was we needed to get people back to work. We needed to get this economy growing again.

So what did we do? At that time, we were in the majority. We decided we needed a package of reforms, of tax cuts to get the economy growing again, to get people working again. So we cut taxes on families, cut taxes on small businesses, cut taxes on business investment.

What happened? 7.6 million new jobs were created since those tax cuts in 2003. We went from growing our economy at an anemic 1.1 percent prior to the tax cuts to growing our economy at an average of 3.5 percent. We went to creating about 160,000 jobs per month since those tax cuts.

What also happened? Revenues went up. Revenues went up for double digits the 2 years following. This year so far the revenues are up about 10 percent. So revenues came in, why? Because we actually cut taxes. We have lower tax rates, but we have higher revenues because people went back to work. People went to work, to jobs and paid more taxes.

What happened? The deficit went as high as $412 billion. Now it is as low as $176 billion. I would like to say that it is because we did a great job on controlling spending. No, that is not the case. The reason the deficit for the most part went down is because revenues went up, because the economy grew, people went back to work, paid their taxes.

So, Madam Chairman, we do not have a revenue problem in Washington. Revenues are coming in fast. We have a spending problem in Washington, and this is the difference between our philosophies, our budgets.

We believe that the money people make really is their money, not the government's money. We believe that when someone starts a business, when someone goes to work, that is the fruit of their own labor and they ought to keep more of their hard-earned money, because at the end of the day, if government takes more money out of the person's paycheck, you are taking more freedom out of their lives. If you take more money out of a family budget, you are taking more freedom away from that family. That is the difference.

We believe that people ought to keep more of what they earn. We believe that small businesses, which are the engine of economic growth in this society, which create all these jobs, should not be taxed at tax rates higher than large corporations, but that is what will happen if any of these three budgets pass, if the Progressive budget, the Congressional Black Caucus budget, or the Democrat budget passes.

We believe that we need to focus on spending and not on raising taxes, because more important than that, I want to show you one chart, Madam Chairman. If you take a look at these revenue lines, even if we take the low line, the blue line, that is the line of revenues coming in if we don't raise taxes. That is the line the Republicans are using for our budget, and we balance our budget by controlling spending instead of raising taxes, and we control spending to the point where we stop the raid on the Social Security trust fund and we pay down $100 billion in debt in the fifth year alone.

The red line, not much higher, but the red line says, let's raise taxes by $400 billion. That is the smallest of the tax increases we are looking at of these budgets today. That still shows, but it is a lot lower than the green line, the spending line.

Spending is the problem. If we do nothing to control spending, by the time my children are my age, the Federal Government will double in size simply by growing on the current path that it is on.

This has to be dealt with, Madam Chairman. This has to be dealt with, and no matter how much you propose to raise taxes, no matter how much you want to raise taxes on small businesses, take away the per-child tax credit, bring back the marriage penalty, reinstate the death tax, raise taxes on businesses and capital investment and seniors and dividends and capital gains, no matter how much you want to raise taxes here, if you pass one of these other three budgets, we still will not have enough to meet the spending line, the spending appetite, the spending trajectory of this Federal Government. That has to be dealt with.

Why does that have to be dealt with? Because we do not want to pass onto our children and our grandchildren a mountain of debt. The debt has increased. Sadly, over the last 8 years, it went up $3 trillion. I think you are going to hear that from other people. I have got news for you, Madam Chairman, just Social Security alone by doing nothing to address this program

over the next 5 years, that debt will go up by $3 trillion.

Medicare, if we do not address Medicare's growth, if we do not reform and maintain and save Medicare, the debt to just Medicare will go up almost $20 trillion over the next 5 years by doing nothing.

So, Madam Chairman, let's not raise taxes. Let's work on spending, and let's reform these programs.

I want to reserve the balance of my time, but I want to say one thing before I do, and that is these three programs which we commonly refer to as our entitlements are the most important domestic programs in the Federal Government. Medicare helps people who are an older age get health care. Medicaid helps people who are low income get health care. Really, really important missions, Madam Chairman. And Social Security helps provide people with retirement security.

These programs are too important to let slip into bankruptcy. These programs are too important to go for five more years without any reforms designed to extend their solvency and make them work better and be more responsive to the needs of the American people.

I think that is where we should place our efforts.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Madam Chairman, the Congressional Black Caucus does not raise taxes, the budget does not, and it protects Social Security and will not privatize it.

I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the chairperson of our Congressional Black Caucus.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Michigan for her leadership in the Congressional Black Caucus.

We first need to start off with the Congressional Black Caucus of where we are. We were in a ditch in 1993 and Democratic policies dug us out of the ditch, and Republican policies put us right back into the ditch. This is where we are, and this is what we are trying to dig ourselves out of.

Now, we have gotten in this ditch. We just need to respond a little bit. We heard that we created all these jobs. Go back, this administration, count them up, add them, subtract them, add them up, tied for worst job performance since Herbert Hoover. This is what they are bragging about.

They talk about economic growth. The Dow Jones Industrial Average for the last 4-year increments, this administration's 6 years has not done what anybody since 1980 has been able to do in 4 years.

They talk about increased revenues: you cut taxes, you increase revenues. Since 1960, only 2 years did we not set a brand-new revenue record, and then we set a new record the following year until we get to this policy. We have gone 6 consecutive years without new record revenues, three consecutive years in decline. That has never happened since they started keeping records in 1934.

What we do is we repeal part of what got us in the mess. This is one of the tax cuts we repeal, and you want to look and see, we call it tax cuts for the wealthy. They get mad, but this is who gets $20 billion in tax cuts that we repeal: over $1 million, $200,000 to $1 million, $100,000 to $200,000, under that zero. This is what you get. This is one of those that we repeal. We are able, after we repeal that, we use part of it for fiscal responsibility.

The Congressional Black Caucus deficit is better than the President's deficit every year. We balance and go into surplus in the fifth year. In the fifth year, we save $14 billion in interest alone compared to the President.

Now, we use the rest of that money to address our priorities: health care that we hear about, education, veterans, justice, making our communities safer, diplomacy.

Madam Chairman, just to close, let's see what we would have to do to go from the Congressional Black Caucus' responsible budget to the President's budget. We would have to cut $150 billion out of education. We would have to cut $100 billion out of child care, eliminating the promised health care for all children, putting 9 million children out in the street without any health care. We would have to whack $42 million out of the veterans' budget and many other priorities that we are going to describe in a few minutes.

□ 1030

Then we would have to borrow $339 billion, mostly from foreign countries, in order to fund tax cuts that primarily benefit that portion of a family's income over $200,000, that portion of the income under $200,000 virtually unaffected. To fund the tax cuts that put us in the mess that we are in, we would have to cut education, health care, veterans, other things, and then borrow $339 billion from foreign countries. That is a bad choice.

Fiscally responsible and address our priorities, that is the Congressional Black Caucus budget. We are proud of it and would hope that you would support it.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

May I inquire about the time allotment remaining between the two parties.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 12 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Michigan has 15½ minutes.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Madam Chairman, at this time, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the medical doctor in our caucus, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN).

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Madam Chairman, unlike the Ryan budget, which cuts just about every important health program and would hurt working families, we have a good budget in the Democratic base budget. But because it does not restore funding drained from this country's needs to provide tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans, it can't go far enough to meet the needs of the poor, rural families, African Americans and other people of color which have been neglected for far too long.

After the war and tax cuts have created huge deficits and unprecedented debt, after corporations and the rich have gotten theirs, the neediest in this country are being told to wait. We are not willing to wait any more for a decent education for our children, for quality health care, for adequate housing, for communities with clean air and housing, or for jobs.

That is why the CBC budget is so important. With the additional funding, it creates the environment for healthier families, for healthier communities and for a healthier nation. We invest significantly more in health care for children and pregnant women, for mental care and substance abuse, for the training of minority and other professionals, to end the AIDS epidemic in our own country and abroad and for research and community health centers. We help our sickest communities to help themselves with health empowerment zones and provide a health equity fund that would close the deficits that would allow over 100,000 people of color to die, who should not, every year in this, the richest country in the world. It still balances the budget by 2012 and creates a $141 billion surplus.

Vote for a stronger, a better America. Vote for the CBC budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, this is an important moment for our time of fiscal responsibility in America. I would like to read from a few quotes. We have had great hearings in the Budget Committee. I want to compliment the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for holding great hearings. In all of these hearings, we had fiscal experts coming to testify from both parties, from nonpartisan organizations like the Congressional Budget Office, the Government Accountability Office, from the Federal Reserve.

I would like to read a few quotes about the fiscal condition that is staring us in the face that this budget should be addressing today.

On the urgency of entitlement reform, we had Ben Bernanke, the chairman of the Federal Reserve, come in and say, ''Without early and meaningful action to address entitlements, the U.S. economy could be seriously weakened, with future generations bearing much of the cost.''

Then we had the Comptroller General, Mr. Walker, on 60 Minutes say, ''Health care is the number one fiscal challenge for the Federal and State governments. If there is one thing that

can bankrupt America, it is health care. We need dramatic and fundamental health care reforms.'' That's at a hearing.

On 60 Minutes, he said, ''The rising cost of government entitlements is a fiscal cancer that threatens catastrophic consequences for our country and could bankrupt America.''

Here is what Mr. Walker is talking about. If you take a look at this chart, it shows you that, consistently, our government has been taxing the American economy at about 18 percent of our gross domestic product. What that means is, basically, since about 1960, to finance our Federal government, we have had to tax the American economy, families, businesses, all those things, at about 18 percent of our economic output. It has been remarkably consistent.

Because of the unsustainable growth of government spending programs, of our entitlement programs, they are growing at such a quick pace that by the time my 5-, 3-, and 2-year-olds are in my age bracket, they will have to tax the American economy at 40 percent just to pay the bills.

Let me put it another way around. We have very important programs. We call them our entitlement programs. They meet critical missions of the Federal Government. When they were set up, they made sense at the time the way they were financed. They were called pay-as-you-go. Current workers pay taxes, particularly payroll taxes, to pay the benefits for current retirees, for current beneficiaries. It worked fine for many years.

Not now, though. Because as the baby boomers begin to retire, which begins next year, we will double the amount of retirees in this country; and we will only increase the amount of workers coming to this country by 17 percent. For all of those who had kids during that baby boom generation, they had a lot of kids; and it was wonderful. Our birth rates went up. But, since then, we haven't had as many kids.

Heck, in my own hometown of Janesville, Wisconsin, where I come from an Irish Catholic family, I had 65 cousins in just Janesville, Wisconsin. But I am a Generation Xer; and at my family level, we didn't have as many kids. That is what is happening across the world and across the country.

Why am I saying all of this? What did it mean? It means that these programs are going to double the amount of consumers to the programs and not double the amount of payers into the programs.

We have to reform these programs. We have to make them work better, and we have got to prevent our kids from having their taxes doubled. That is what this is about at the end of the day, Madam Chair. It is about our children and our grandchildren.

Now, this seems to be a cliche thing that everybody says when they get up to a microphone. But, quite honestly, if we don't get a handle on our fiscal situation, if we don't recognize the fact that if all you do is raise taxes to balance the budget in 2012, you are going to go right back into deficit soon thereafter if we don't control spending, if we don't reform government, if we don't fix our entitlement perhaps. If we don't do this, the debt we have today will pale, pale in comparison to the debt we are going to be passing on to our children and our grandchildren.

We have new economic challenges and threats unlike any we have ever seen before in this country. We don't have oceans that separate us anymore. We have broadband, Internet, digital technology. We have to compete with workers on a daily basis from countries like China and India overnight.

We have real economic challenges facing us, and we can't survive and thrive in this era of globalization. We can't continue to be America's economic superpower, the world's economic superpower, if we are going to double the taxes on future generations.

You can't tax your way into prosperity. We already today tax our businesses, our capital, more than any other country in the industrialized world except for one, Japan. They just finished two decades of recession.

We have got to wise up to the fact that we have to be lean and mean and compete with China and India and these other countries. We have got to make sure that the way we run our health care system works for patients, that the way we have our entitlement benefits gives us income security, retirement security, health security. We have got to make sure that it doesn't do it in such a way that it literally doubles the entire tax burden on the American economy, on the American family. If we do that, we will push more jobs overseas. We will lose our standard of living, the great gift of America of a generation to the next.

The legacy of the American Dream is that each generation bequeaths unto the next a higher and better standard of living. That is exactly what my parents and grandparents told me. We are at risk of severing that tie. We are at risk of discontinuing that legacy of giving our kids and our grandkids a better standard of living, a better economy, things better off than when we found them.

Budgets matter, and the budget that we have before us today, whether it's the CBC budget, the Progressive budget or the Democrat budget, raises taxes by anywhere from $400 billion to $1 trillion over the next 4 years and does absolutely nothing, nothing, nothing to control spending, to reform government, to prevent this mountain of debt going onto our children's backs.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Madam Chair, I yield myself 20 seconds.

The Congressional Black Caucus does not raise taxes. I would like to remind the gentleman that if it were not for the permanent tax cuts for 1 percent of the wealthiest and the cost of this ill-advised war, we could fund all the major programs like Medicare and Medicaid.

Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the Congresswoman from Dallas, Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Let me thank our chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mr. SCOTT, our colleagues, for their unwavering support for the development of the CBC alternative budget that encompasses progressive and visionary funding motivated by principle and compassion.

I also would like to thank all of the members of the CBC and their staffs for helping to complete this very important task. I appreciate and applaud their efforts on issues important to all of us.

Madam Chairman, the CBC alternative budget understands that our Nation's transportation system is the backbone of our economy and our way of life. We could not afford to short-change our transportation system, nor ignore the need for greater competitiveness in science and technology.

As a senior member of the Science Committee, I feel the CBC budget supports these initiatives to invest in our children's future, our future, our Nation's future. Federal entitlements such as NASA and the National Science Foundation need funding to inspire today's youth so that we can have a future in research and competitiveness. The science budget funds our scientific and engineering workforce, supports teacher enrichment programs and helps inspire future generations of researchers.

Our Nation's future depends more and more on the quality of our innovative ideas. The fruits of these investments meet vital national needs and improve the quality of life for all Americans. The CBC alternative budget also provides funding for the minority health initiatives, health insurance for the uninsured, child nutrition programs, job creation programs, the SBA, and the extension of unemployment insurance benefits and the elimination of the disabled veterans tax.

I urge my colleagues to support this budget, and don't listen to the rhetoric of taxes being raised. We have different priorities.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Michigan has 11¾ minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Madam Chair, I yield 2½ minutes at this time to the Congresswoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Chairwoman, let me thank the chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus, CAROLYN KILPATRICK, and Mr. BOBBY SCOTT for joining with us as the Congressional Black Caucus so that we could really emphasize what compassion and the American dream is all about and equate it to the Congressional Black Caucus budget that really responds to the tragedy that has occurred under this administration.

The surplus, as you can see, that we had in 2000 under the Bush administration declines $8.4 trillion. That is what we attack.

In fact, the Congressional Black Caucus budget reduces the deficit $107 billion less of a deficit than even the Democratic budget and $339 billion less cumulative deficit than the President's budget. In fact, we saved some $18.3 billion less in interest than the Democratic budget and $27.7 billion in interest than the President's budget. We take this deficit and turn it around. We save the country this enormous burden that they have with respect to the deficit and the interest.

In addition, as you can see, interest payments on the debt weren't the priority under this President's budget and under this administration. They have gotten completely out of control. That is why we are feeling the pinch, and the Congressional Black Caucus budget responds to that immediately.

Now, let me talk specifically about what we do, why we represent the American dream, why we focus on real compassion, and we do it in a fiscally secure and responsible manner.

We look at this map, we will see the numbers of children that are uninsured in America. Some of the States that we would think are prosperous States, such as Florida and Texas, the President's own State, my State, has over 12% and going as high as 40 percent of the children are uninsured; California, 12 percent or more are uninsured. Vote for the Compassionate Budget and for the CBC budget and vote for the Democratic Budget that strongly represents the needs of Americans.

□ 1045

Numbers of us in these different colors here, 8 to 12 percent are uninsured.

The Congressional Black Caucus budget is compassionate. Why? Because we provide resources for housing. We provide resources for transportation. We don't leave any firefighter or law enforcement officers behind. And we ensure homeland security.

But we are the compassionate budget. We are the American Dream. We ensure that children, who are our precious resources, have the ability to get complete children's health insurance.

I ask my colleagues to support a budget that ensures compassion and the American Dream and believes in eliminating the deficit. Vote for the Congressional Black Caucus Budget.

Madam Chairwoman, I rise to support H. Con. Res. 99, the Congressional Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2008. But more than that, I rise to welcome a new day. For the past six years, the federal budgets put forward by the Bush Administration and the Republican Congress have cut funds for critical American priorities and, incredibly, turned a $5.4 trillion surplus into a $8.8 trillion deficit over the same period. Starting today, the new Democratic majority in the House leads America in a new fiscal direction. And we do it without raising taxes. In fact, Madam Chairwoman, thanks to the treatment and applicability of the alternative minimum tax (AMT) called for in the budget resolution, 19 million Americans will pay less in taxes that they otherwise would. This week we will pass a fiscally responsible budget with the right priorities for the American people, present and future.

For that, I wish to thank the Chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. SPRATT, a man of uncommon grace and mastery of budgetary arcane. 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 real Americans confronting the real problems of their real lives in the real world. 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 America better.

Madam Chairwoman, H. Con. Res. 99, 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.

Madam Chairwoman, America and the world can be proud of the choices we make in this budget resolution. Unlike the budgets of the last six years, the budget brought to the floor by the new House majority reflects the best angels of our nature. As I discuss in more detail, H. Con. Res. 99 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, Madam Chairwoman, 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.

The new Democratic-led Congress has instituted "pay as you go" or "PAYGO" budgeting, requiring that new spending be offset, which in the 1990s helped turn deficits to surpluses. We have also reformed the earmark process, cutting in half the number of budget "earmarks" for specific Member projects, requiring transparency in the process, and exposing such earmarks as the infamous "Bridge to Nowhere."

Madam Chairwoman, nothing engenders more public cynicism than the shameful conduct of some to avoid paying taxes legitimately owed. The overwhelming majority of Americans obey the law, play by the rules, pay their taxes, and work to improve their communities. There is, however, a small but significant percentage of Americans and corporations that do not. That is going to end. In this budget, we invest in an increased effort to make sure that taxpayers pay the taxes they owe. The Internal Revenue Service has estimated that the tax gap—the amount of taxes owed under current law but not collected—has ballooned to $345 billion since 2001. This has left middle-class families picking up the tab for those who refuse to obey the law. It is shocking to think, Madam Chairwoman, that amount of taxes owed by these scofflaws approximates the costs Americans have paid to date to finance the Iraq War.

The new Democratic-led Congress also will save millions by investing in efforts to identify and eliminate wasteful spending and improve government efficiency in Social Security, Medicare, and unemployment insurance. Every dollar invested in conducting Social Security ongoing disability reviews results in $10 of savings. The savings could total $3 billion.

Madam Chairwowan, this budget resolution correctly assumes that substantial savings can be realized from more vigorous efforts by the 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. Defense auditors estimate that more than one of six dollars they have audited for Iraq is suspect, including $2.7 billion in sole-source, single-bidder contracts.

The American people can have confidence that lax financial controls and fiscal mismanagement are a thing of the past now that Democrats are the majority party in Congress. Under this budget resolution, House Committees will conduct performance reviews to make sure that government programs are working as intended. We will work to eliminate unnecessary and wasteful spending. We know that oversight and financial controls work. Similar efforts produced 385 recommendations for smarter ways to improve government services, saving billions during the Clinton Administration.

Madam Chairwoman, 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 2008 budget resolution advances these priorities. The budget balances in 2012 while accommodating additional tax relief for millions of middle-income families. It allocates funding for national priorities like children's health care and education. It begins to reverse six 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.

And, as I have stated, it does all this without raising taxes.

Madam Chairwoman, discretionary spending, or the amount available to be allocated through the annual appropriations process, accounts for about one-third of all federal spending. The budget resolution provides the Appropriations Committee with $954.9 billion in discretionary budget authority in FY 2008, $22.1 billion more than the administration's request as re-estimated by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO). The Appropriations Committee will subdivide this amount (known as a 302(a) allocation) among the various appropriations bills.

In addition to the $954.9 billion in regular FY 2008 appropriations, the resolution assumes $145.2 billion in emergency appropriations for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan for FY 2008, as requested by the administration. When this emergency funding is added to the $954.9 billion in regular appropriations, a total of $1.1 trillion in discretionary spending could be available in FY 2008 under the resolution. I think it important that the American people know where and how their money will be spent.

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

The resolution calls for defense discretionary budget authority or appropriations at the levels recommended by the Administration for fiscal years 2008 through 2012. Thus, the resolution calls for defense appropriations of $503.8 billion in FY 2008, $531.6 billion in FY 2009, $542.0 billion in FY 2010, $548.0 billion in FY 2011, and $566.9 billion in FY 2012. The totals include funding for the Defense Department as well as nuclear-weapons-related activity in the Energy Department.

The resolution also assumes $145.2 billion in emergency funds in FY 2008—that would not count against the cap on discretionary spending—for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, as recommended by the administration. When added to the $503.8 billion in regular defense appropriations, total defense spending under the resolution would be $649 billion in FY 2008. Like the Administration, the resolution assumes $50 billion for these wars in FY 2009.

While the resolution assumes the same total amount of spending for defense as the Administration recommends, it does not propose to spend the funds the same way. Specifically, the resolution assumes that nuclear non-proliferation programs will be given a greater priority and higher funding than the administration proposes.

Madam Chairwoman, in our resolution health care for active duty forces is a very high priority, as will be caring for those who return wounded from combat. Specifically, the resolution rejects the administration's proposals for increased fees for Tricare, the military health program, and calls for a substantial increase in the veterans' health care system.

The resolution assumes continued funding of missile defense and satellite procurement programs, but at a lower level than proposed by the administration. The budget resolution recognizes the need for the Defense Department to root out wasteful spending with far more diligence, noting that the Defense Department has awarded contracts for its foreign deployments that have been grossly more wasteful than domestic contracts, especially in Iraq.

NON-DEFENSE DISCRETIONARY SPENDING

The resolution calls for a non-defense discretionary budget authority of $451.1 billion in FY 2008, which is $22 billion (5 percent) more than the Administration's request. This includes an additional $2 billion in advance FY 2009 appropriations that would be available for appropriation in FY 2008, resulting in a total non-defense discretionary total of $453.1 billion, $24 billion more than the administration's request. This non-defense discretionary total includes funding for international affairs programs as well as for domestic.

The resolution's FY 2008 level for non-defense discretionary spending is about $10 billion more than the FY 2007 level, adjusted for inflation. For fiscal years 2009 through 2012, the level of non-defense discretionary spending generally increases at the rate of inflation.

EDUCATION, TRAINING, EMPLOYMENT & SOCIAL SERVICES

Funding for education, training, employment and social services programs has lagged during the past six years, so the resolution attempts to compensate by increasing such funding by 11 percent ($82.3 billion in FY 2008) over the president's budget.

Madam Chairwoman, 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.

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.

HEALTH

The resolution proposes $54.2 billion in budget authority in FY 2008 for discretionary health programs, and higher levels of spending for these programs in each of the four succeeding years. By FY 2012, funding for these programs under the measure would increase to $58.9 billion. The FY 2008 discretionary level for this function is $2 billion (4 percent) more than recommended by the president.

Discretionary health spending does not include the federal government's main health care spending programs, such as Medicaid and Medicare, both of which are mandatory spending programs.

VETERANS' BENEFITS AND SERVICES

The resolution calls for the budget authority of $43.1 billion in FY 2008 for discretionary veterans' programs, which consist mainly of veterans' health programs—$3.5 billion (9 percent) more than the president's request. The resolution calls for increased funding for these veterans' programs in each of the succeeding four years. By FY 2012, funding for these veterans' programs would reach $48.3 billion.

The resolution rejects the president's proposals to increase enrollment fees in veterans health care programs and rejects his proposals to increase co-payments. The resolution assumes funding to implement the recommendations of the bipartisan ''Walter Reed Commission'' as well as the recommendations of other investigations into military and veterans' health care facilities and services.

The increases above the president's proposed level would address veterans' mental health, post-traumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injury, and spinal cord injury. Additional funding could also be used to reduce the backlog of disability claims.

LOW-INCOME PROGRAMS

Madam Chairwoman, other reason I support this resolution is that it provides $52 billion, nearly $3 billion (6 percent) more than the president recommends, for low-income programs, including unemployment compensation, low-income housing assistance (including Section 8 housing), food and nutrition assistance (including food stamps and school lunch subsidies), and other income-security programs.

TRANSPORTATION

The resolution provides $25.4 billion, an increase of $2.1 billion over the president's budget, for transportation funding, which includes non-homeland-security funds for the Federal Highway Administration; the Federal Transit Administration; Amtrak; highway, motor-carrier and rail-safety programs; the Federal Aviation Administration; the aeronautical activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA); the Coast Guard; and the Maritime Administration.

The resolution provides full funding of the highway, safety, and transit programs authorized by the 2005 surface transportation law Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A legacy for Users. We also maintain Amtrak, provide for additional funding for grants to airports and reject the president's proposed cuts to aviation programs in NASA.

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).

The measure proposes to spend $13.7 billion in budget authority in FY 2008 on community and regional development programs, with increases of $200 million in each succeeding year, reaching $14.5 billion in FY 2012.

The FY 2008 funding level for discretionary programs in this function is $2.7 billion (24 percent) more than the president's request. The measure rejects the president's proposed cuts to the CDBG program. It assumes additional funding for this program as well as for rural development and disaster preparedness programs.

NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

The resolution calls for $31.4 billion in discretionary budget authority in FY 2008 for natural resources and environmental programs,

$2.6 billion (9 percent) more than the president's request. The resolution rejects the president's proposed cuts to the Land and Water Conservation Fund, Fish and Wildlife Service's wildlife refuge system, the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) grants to state sand tribe for water and aid quality and other EPA programs. The resolution accommodates the president's proposed increases in funding to National Park operations and maintenance.

ENERGY

The budget resolution provides for funding civilian energy and environmental programs of the Energy Department, the Rural Utilities Service of the Agriculture Department, the TVA, the U.S. Enrichment Corporation, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. It does not include the Energy Department's national security (nuclear weapons) activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration or its basic research and science activities.

The resolution provides $4.6 billion in funding for discretionary energy programs in FY 2008, about $300 million (7 percent) more than the president's request. The resolution generally calls for spending between $4.6 billion and $4.8 billion in each year covered by the resolution.

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. Major agencies in this function include the State and Treasury departments, the U.S. Agency for International Development, and the Millennium Challenge Corporation which administers special assistance to developing countries that meet certain political and economic standards set by the U.S. government.

For international affairs, the resolution calls for $35.3 billion in discretionary budget authority in FY 2008, $2 billion more than the amount needed to maintain purchasing power at the FY 2007 level. Compared to the president's request, the resolution provides $1.2 billion less than the request. The resolution assumes the president's request for overseas military deployments and the Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, which includes the Global HIV/AIDS Initiative. The committee report also notes the importance of adequate funding for U.S. development assistance.

The resolution assumes full funding to continue the U.S. agreements with Israel and Egypt made in 1998 on military financing and economic support. The measure also assumes additional funding for the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program.

SCIENCE, SPACE AND TECHNOLOGY

The function contains general science funding, including the budgets for the National Science Foundation and the fundamental science programs of the Energy Department, and programs at NASA, except for aviation programs.

The resolution calls for $27.5 billion in budget authority in FY 2008 for discretionary science, space and technology programs, about $200 million more than the president's request. The resolution projects gradually increasing levels of discretionary funding for these programs, reaching $32.3 billion in FY 2012.

For all 5 years covered by the resolution, the space funding is higher than the president's recommendations and the levels required to maintain purchasing power at the previous year's level.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

For federal judicial and law enforcement activities, the measure calls for $44.7 billion in discretionary budget authority in FY 2008—$1 billion (2 percent) more than the president's request. The resolution calls for increases in each of the succeeding 4 years, reaching $49.3 billion in FY 2012.

The resolution rejects the president's proposals to cut local law enforcement and first responders programs, including his proposed cuts to the Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grants program. Increases above the president's requested level could also be used to fund recommendations of the Sept. 11 commission.

CONCLUSION

Madam Chairwoman, correcting the fiscal course of the country cannot be achieved overnight. The fiscal outlook we are confronting has deteriorated dramatically over the past 6 years. In 2001, the Administration inherited a projected 10-year (2002–2011) budget surplus of $5.6 trillion. Within 2 years, that surplus was gone and the United States began accumulating a mountain of national debt, adding $2.8 trillion to our federal debt burden since 2001. Most of this debt has been purchased by foreign investors, making the U.S. economy more susceptible to economic and political pressure from abroad.

Madam Chairwoman, 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 our children and grandchildren who will have to pay off that debt. 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. By contrast, 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.

Madam Chairwoman, last November 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. 99. I urge all members to support the resolution.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Madam Chairman, I would now like to yield 2½ minutes to our first Vice Chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentlewoman from Oakland, California, Congresswoman LEE.

Ms. LEE. Madam Chairman, first let me thank our chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus for her tremendous leadership on this issue and so many other issues. And I want to salute you, Congresswoman KILPATRICK and Congressman BOBBY SCOTT, for your hard work, your diligent work in putting forth a budget that we can all be proud of. And also I want to thank our staffs for their dedication and their expertise in putting this together.

A budget is a road map that identifies and invests in the critical priorities of a Nation, and I am pleased to say that this budget does exactly that.

For example, this budget takes the very important step, and this is important, to address the waste, fraud and abuse at the Department of Defense by urging the implementation of GAO's recommendations to the Department of Defense. By incorporating just a fraction of GAO's suggestions, DOD, for example, has saved over $52 billion over the last few years. Imagine how much more could be saved by fully implementing these recommendations which are included in the Congressional Black Caucus budget.

While addressing critical reforms at the Defense Department, this will go a long way also in shoring up our national security. I am pleased to say that this budget shows an understanding that really the Republicans have never shown during their years in power, namely, that domestic security is national security.

This budget invests in our communities. It invests in our health care. It invests in our future. It helps to lift the 37 million people living in poverty into a standard of living which each and every American deserves, living in the wealthiest and most powerful country in the world.

It puts $1.5 billion into HOPE VI, into public housing and homeless assistance programs. It allocates another $1.5 billion to the Community Development Block Grants and brownfields redevelopment. These are all critical plus-ups that strengthen and add value to our communities and provide that national security and economic security of our people.

This balanced budget also adds over $1.3 billion to the Ryan White CARE Act and the Minority AIDS initiative, and $10 billion into children's health to ensure that no child is without health care in this country.

Madam Chairman, this takes a good budget, our Democratic budget, and makes it simply much better. This budget is balanced. It is fair, it truly is a moral document, which budgets should be.

So, Madam Chair and Mr. SCOTT, I want to thank you for giving our country really a moral document.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Madam Chairman, I would like to yield myself 2 minutes.

This bill does not raise taxes. This bill does rescind the permanent tax cut

for the 1 percent of the wealthiest Americans and then reinvests that money into American families.

This bill balances the budget. We reduce the deficit that the other party got us in over the last decade, the highest budget deficit in the history of our country.

This budget takes care of our troops, protects Americans. This budget is fiscally responsible. We make sure, in our budget, that we invest in health care for all the children of America. We also take care of those seniors who find themselves in need of adequate health care. Yes, and we fund and make sure Medicare, the health insurance for 44 million seniors, and Medicaid, programs for low-income and disabled Americans, are taken care of.

Have we spent too much? No, we haven't. Is the budget in balance? Yes, it is. We want to make sure in our Congressional Black Caucus budget that we are leaders. We come here as 43 Members of Congress representing 26 States and 40 million Americans. Ten of our Members have districts that are not majority African Americans. We represent Asian Americans, Latino Americans, European Americans, Indian Americans.

We are the conscience of the Congress. We bring to you a budget that, we believe, is balanced. It is the best budget, and we ask for your support.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, I reserve the right to close, and I think that they still have more speakers, so I will just reserve my time.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Madam Chairman, I would like to yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Virginia, Congressman BOBBY SCOTT, the chairperson of the Congressional Black Caucus budget, the gentleman who has worked tirelessly with our staff, with the Members, is a member of the House Budget Committee, and knows the needs of our country.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Chairman, we need to review, again, where we are, because we have heard lectures about fiscal responsibility, and this chart shows where we are in fiscal responsibility, way down in the ditch.

In fact, in 2001, we were on a trajectory to pay off the entire national debt by 2013.

The gentleman from Wisconsin had a chart that showed that by 2040 we would almost have enough money to pay interest on the national debt and a little bit of Social Security, and that was it. Well, the main change in that was interest on the national debt. There would be zero interest on the national debt if we hadn't gotten into this mess.

In fact, at this point, the gentleman talked about what he called entitlement reform. For those that aren't aware what entitlement reform means, that means cutting Social Security.

Well, in 2001, we had a 10-year surplus of $5.5 trillion. We needed $4 trillion at that point to make sure that we had enough money to pay Social Security for the next 75 years without cutting benefits. So we had entitlement reform covered.

The gentleman mentioned jobs that have been created: remind him, worst job performance since Herbert Hoover. The gentleman mentioned economic development: worst Dow performance in a quarter of a century. The gentleman mentioned all these revenues we have gotten: worst revenue performance in the history of recordkeeping back to 1934.

We repeal some of the policies, some of the policies that got us in the mess to begin with. This is one of the tax cuts that got us in the problem, and you can see who gets the benefits. But not only do we eliminate some of the tax cuts that put us in the mess, we are fiscally responsible. We use that to improve the deficit. Our deficit has improved, over the Democratic budget, $100 billion, over the President's budget, $300 billion.

And, finally, we saved so much that we saved interest on the national debt, $14 billion in the last year of the budget. And we are able to fund children's health care, enough money in our budget to fund health care for all children in America, enough in our budget to fund $158 billion more on education than the President's budget.

$158 billion. If you have a city, 300,000, $158 billion is enough for $158 million in additional funding for education over 5 years. Imagine what your city could do with $158 million.

We have enough for veterans, $42 billion more than the President's budget. We make sure that our cities and communities are secure with investments in gang prevention, juvenile justice, COPS and other programs in the justice area. We help our communities with community development grants, billions of dollars. Diplomacy.

That is a compassionate budget. It is compassionate, but it is also fiscally responsible.

Madam Chairman, we have a budget that gets us out of the mess that we got into. It compassionately invests in our priorities. It is a proud budget.

On behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus, I ask for your support for the Congressional Black Caucus budget. I thank the gentlelady from Michigan for her leadership on this budget and particularly her leadership in the Congressional Black Caucus.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, I will address the House for the remainder of my time from the well.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5½ minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chair, I wish to compliment the Congressional Black Caucus with their budget today because they are bringing a serious budget to the floor. They are bringing a budget that does achieve balance. They are bringing a budget that reflects their philosophies and their policies, and that is important. I commend the Black Caucus under the leadership of Ms. KILPATRICK for that.

This is what we do. We come to the floor with our budgets to encapsulate our priorities and what are the visions we have for the future of our country.

This budget does raise taxes. You simply can't get around the fact that it calls for $711.9 billion in additional tax revenues over the next 5 years to make the budget balance. But that is fine.

I wish to talk, at this time, about the underlying Democrat budget. And let me just quote from The Washington Post this morning. The article in The Washington Post this morning, in talking about the Democrat budget says: ''And while the House Democrats say they want to preserve key parts of Bush's signature tax cuts, they project a surplus in 2012 only by assuming that all of these tax cuts expire on schedule in 2010.''

Now, we understand that people say, on the other side of the aisle, they don't want to raise taxes. I hear those words. I even hear that they say they have these sort of mythical reserve funds, which is really nothing more than a wish list.

So we had all these votes in the Budget Committee. We said, okay, if you really don't want to raise these taxes, then let's put it into the budget. Let's make it clear. Let's put it into the numbers of the budget so that we clearly can tell the American people we are not going to raise your taxes.

So we had a whole series of votes in the Budget Committee to amend the budget to make sure taxes weren't being raised. We had an amendment to make sure that we didn't increase marginal tax rates. We had an amendment to make sure we didn't eliminate the $1,000 per-child tax credit. We had an amendment to make sure we didn't eliminate marriage tax penalty relief. We had an amendment to make sure we didn't eliminate the capital gains and dividends tax relief. We had an amendment to make sure we didn't eliminate the State and local sales tax relief which applies to States like Texas and Tennessee and Florida. We had an amendment to make sure we didn't bring back the death tax. Amendment after amendment after amendment, which would have made this clear and simple that we weren't going to raise taxes was defeated, every single one of them, by party-line votes. The Democrats defeated every single amendment in attempts to stop these tax increases from coming into this budget.

Now, let's take a look at what kind of tax increases we are talking about. The Democrat budget only reaches balance because of this. This is how their budget achieves balance.

□ 1100

They have $32.5 billion in higher taxes coming from higher tax rates on dividends and capital gains. They have $40 billion in higher revenues because they cut in half the per child tax credit. They bring back the marriage tax

penalty, which makes people pay taxes simply because they are married. They get $91 billion in extra tax revenues by bringing the death tax back in full force, and they gain another $78 billion by taking away the lower 10 percent bracket for low-income Americans. They bring into the government an extra $104 billion by raising all other marginal tax rates, and that is also the tax rate that small businesses pay.

So small businesses, which are the engine of economic growth of America, and most jobs come from small businesses, under their plan small businesses will pay a tax rate at about 40 percent, when we are going to actually be giving a tax rate to the largest companies in America, IBM, Exxon, Microsoft, at 35 percent.

This is how their budget balances: Raise taxes on businesses, raise taxes on small businesses, raise taxes on investment in seniors' pension funds, raise taxes on people with children, raise taxes on people who get married, raise taxes on people who die, and raise taxes on low-income Americans. That is the only way, the only reason, the only ability that the Democrat budgets actually achieve balance.

We can do better, Madam Chairman, and the reason we can do better is because we have to attack out-of-control spending.

Washington does not have a revenue problem, Madam Chairman. Money is coming in as fast as it ever has. Money is going out too fast. Both parties are to blame for this. I am not going to be here and sanctimoniously say that our party has been wonderful on spending. No, we have not. What I am saying is we have to agree spending is out of control. That is the problem. Let's control spending.

The budget we are bringing to the floor later on does just that. We give the tools to get rid of pork. We give the tools to let the American people see exactly how their tax dollars are being spent. We bring more accountability and transparency to the Federal budget process. We reform our entitlement programs so we can extend their solvency, so we can make sure that people can better count on Medicare and Medicaid. These are the things that we have got to do so we don't crank up our debt, raise our taxes, and put a huge burden on our children and grandchildren.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of the Congressional Black Caucus Alternative Budget offered today. The CBC budget will change a 6 year Republican policy that I call Reverse Robin Hood, stealing from the poor to give to the rich.

You might ask why the Democratic Budget, which I support, needs improvement. The Democratic Budget needs improvement because when America has a cold, African-Americans have pneumonia. The CBC budget reverses the deep cuts that have been made in the programs that serve the neediest Americans.

Over a 5 year period, compared to the President's budget the CBC spends: $158 billion more on education, training, employment and social services; $101 billion more on healthcare; $19 billion more on community and regional development; $42 billion more on veterans benefits and services; $12 billion more on administration of justice; $21 billion more on homeland security; and $5.8 billion more on international affairs.

Even after funding these priorities, the CBC alternative budget still manages to balance the budget in Fiscal Year 2012 and in fact, creates a surplus of $141 billion.

As an African American woman who represents one of the poorest districts in the state of Florida, I am proud to say that the Congressional Black Caucus's Budget demonstrates that fiscal responsibility and spending on programs that are important to the African-American people are not mutually exclusive. I encourage all my colleagues to support the CBC Budget.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the CBC budget and feel extremely proud to do so. This budget raises revenue by rescinding the tax cuts for the top two income tax rates. It rescinds the capital gains and divided tax cuts, eliminates the phase out and repeal of PEP (personal exemption phase out) and PEASE, (which makes more wealthy income subject to taxation). It eliminates corporate tax incentives for offshoring jobs, closes corporate tax loopholes, abusive tax shelters and methods of tax avoidance and closes the tax gap. The CBC budget is balanced in FY12 and in fact creates a surplus of $141 billion dollars.

The CBC Budget provides adequate resources to deal with the shortage of nurses in this country by providing training resources, it protects Hospital Graduate Medical Education and increases funding for the National Family Caregivers Support Services Program by $8 million dollars. The CBC budget shifts some of the resource allocation from the military industrial complex, to domestic spending to deal more appropriately and realistically with domestic needs. It is a rational, logical commonsense budget which prioritizes peace and economic development rather than war and military action.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mrs. TAUSCHER). All time for debate on the amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 115, noes 312, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 209]

AYES—115

Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Becerra
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carson
Castor
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
Delahunt
Dingell
Doyle
Ellison
Engel
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Langevin
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Markey
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Miller (NC)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Price (NC)
Rangel
Rodriguez
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Solis
Stark
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—312

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Arcuri
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Gene
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Hill
Hinojosa
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Kagen
Keller
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)

Miller, Gary	Renzi	Spratt
Miller, George	Reyes	Stearns
Mitchell	Reynolds	Stupak
Mollohan	Rogers (AL)	Sullivan
Moore (KS)	Rogers (KY)	Sutton
Moran (KS)	Rogers (MI)	Tancredo
Murphy (CT)	Rohrabacher	Tanner
Murphy, Patrick	Ros-Lehtinen	Tauscher
Murphy, Tim	Roskam	Taylor
Musgrave	Ross	Terry
Myrick	Royce	Thompson (CA)
Nadler	Ryan (WI)	Thornberry
Neugebauer	Salazar	Tiahrt
Nunes	Sali	Tiberi
Ortiz	Sanchez, Loretta	Turner
Paul	Saxton	Udall (NM)
Pearce	Schiff	Upton
Pence	Schmidt	Walberg
Perlmutter	Schwartz	Walden (OR)
Peterson (MN)	Sensenbrenner	Walsh (NY)
Peterson (PA)	Sessions	Walz (MN)
Petri	Sestak	Wamp
Pickering	Shadegg	Waxman
Pitts	Shays	Weiner
Platts	Shea-Porter	Welch (VT)
Poe	Shimkus	Weldon (FL)
Pomeroy	Shuler	Weller
Porter	Shuster	Westmoreland
Price (GA)	Simpson	Whitfield
Pryce (OH)	Skelton	Wicker
Putnam	Smith (NE)	Wilson (NM)
Radanovich	Smith (NJ)	Wilson (OH)
Rahall	Smith (TX)	Wilson (SC)
Ramstad	Smith (WA)	Wolf
Regula	Snyder	Yarmuth
Rehberg	Souder	Young (AK)
Reichert	Space	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Davis, Jo Ann	Lampson	Murtha
Faleomavaega	McCrery	Slaughter
Hobson	Millender-McDonald	Visclosky
Kanjorski		Watt

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1129

Messrs. ALTMIRE, PETRI, YOUNG of Alaska, STUPAK and CUELLAR and Mrs. GILLIBRAND changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. RODRIGUEZ, BECERRA, RUSH, SERRANO, HINCHEY, CROWLEY and ROTHMAN changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 209, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

□ 1130

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. WOOLSEY

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 110–79, which is debatable for 40 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment made in order by the rule.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 2 offered by Ms. WOOLSEY:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008.

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2009 through 2017 are set forth.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2017:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $2,150,937,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,222,766,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,310,761,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,540,991,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,644,436,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,734,699,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,865,665,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,006,549,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,156,674,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,317,482,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be increased are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $100,140,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $115,840,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $147,040,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $146,440,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $47,340,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $27,640,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $27,440,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $27,140,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $27,140,000,000
Fiscal year 2017: $27,140,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $2,353,935,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,442,610,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,535,026,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,652,452,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,717,674,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,828,667,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,937,865,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,055,071,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,217,325,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,322,445,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $2,402,616,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,465,058,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,538,061,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,646,858,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,697,966,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,810,051,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,918,322,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,034,657,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,202,993,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,303,257,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS OR SURPLUSES (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $ − 251,678,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $ − 242,291,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $ − 227,299,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $ − 105,868,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $ − 53,530,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $ − 75,352,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $ − 52,656,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $ − 28,107,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $ − 46,320,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $14,224,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $9,295,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $9,654,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $10,000,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $10,219,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $10,399,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $10,599,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $10,778,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $10,934,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $11,102,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $11,209,000,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $5,104,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $5,142,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $5,152,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $5,023,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $4,831,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $4,653,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $4,448,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $4,215,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $4,000,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,727,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2008 through 2017 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $398,744,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $493,286,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $409,871,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $446,218,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $421,524,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $430,322,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $433,189,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $435,605,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $445,237,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $435,975,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $457,936,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $451,495,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $470,915,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $464,070,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $484,527,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $477,291,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $497,989,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $495,508,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $512,131,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $504,943,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $53,558,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,562,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $54,617,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,046,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $55,138,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,298,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $55,936,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,663,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $56,714,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,721,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $57,548,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,368,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $58,435,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,018,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $59,261,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,822,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $60,033,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,603,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $60,898,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,403,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $25,619,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,449,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $26,126,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,764,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $26,656,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,764,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $27,192,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,669,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $27,732,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,182,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $28,298,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,731,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $28,868,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,291,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $29,468,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,871,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $30,047,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,453,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $30,654,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,045,000,000.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $32,126,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,764,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $31,937,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,691,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $32,022,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,250,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $32,114,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,583,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $32,193,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,883,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $32,288,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,858,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $32,381,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,182,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $32,479,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,417,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $32,573,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,532,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $32,679,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,649,000,000.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $32,713,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,681,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $33,429,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,798,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $34,383,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,769,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $35,052,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,963,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $36,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,443,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $37,066,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,441,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $38,147,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,536,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $38,843,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,189,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $41,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,481,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $43,384,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,664,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $20,481,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,047,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $21,033,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,146,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $21,238,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,207,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $21,256,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,534,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $21,502,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,963,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $21,843,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,341,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $22,323,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,813,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $21,855,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,376,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $22,478,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,959,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $23,072,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,478,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $8,847,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,836,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $8,652,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $189,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $8,616,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $222,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $8,641,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $8,822,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $557,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $8,952,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $563,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $9,002,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $358,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $9,226,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $264,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $9,271,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $14,397,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,090,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $92,701,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $85,871,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $84,918,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $91,260,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $85,736,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,558,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $86,664,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $94,170,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $87,544,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $95,773,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $88,465,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $97,245,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $89,401,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $99,052,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $90,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $101,080,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $91,406,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $103,132,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $92,440,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $105,218,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $18,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,590,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $17,755,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,471,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $18,028,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,599,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $18,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,218,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $18,571,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,455,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $18,854,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,519,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $19,141,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,344,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $19,441,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,626,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $19,730,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,927,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $20,029,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,230,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $114,824,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $102,279,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $118,436,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $112,310,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $122,096,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $117,654,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $124,407,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $121,544,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $127,025,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $123,668,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $129,926,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $126,517,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $133,423,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $129,974,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $137,070,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $133,574,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $140,884,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $137,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $144,874,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $141,298,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $310,767,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $305,039,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $331,814,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $328,766,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $349,838,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $349,457,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $311,549,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $370,401,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, $394,682,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $393,687,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $405,069,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $403,648,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $432,515,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $430,676,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $462,190,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $459,904,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $494,433,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $491,703,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $534,065,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $531,073,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $389,566,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $389,685,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $416,710,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $416,364,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $442,347,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $442,569,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $489,077,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $489,087,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $486,804,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $486,417,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $540,509,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $540,743,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $578,438,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $578,437,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $621,256,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $620,761,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $697,785,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $698,014,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $729,187,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $729,166,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $384,578,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $388,437,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $397,573,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $399,481,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $408,429,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $409,273,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $424,216,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $424,074,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $410,474,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $409,717,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $426,369,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $425,129,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $438,065,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $436,839,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $449,761,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $448,287,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $466,647,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $465,168,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $473,677,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $471,998,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $19,644,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,644,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $21,518,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,518,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $23,701,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,701,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $27,009,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,009,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $29,898,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,898,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $32,656,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,656,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $35,652,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,652,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $38,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $42,535,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,535,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $46,483,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,483,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $90,207,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $90,887,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $91,641,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $91,619,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $93,063,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,024,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $97,416,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $97,409,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $128,472,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $128,297,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $132,946,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $132,770,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $134,557,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $134,405,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $136,261,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $136,087,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $141,593,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $141,562,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $140,005,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $140,030,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $46,220,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,091,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $45,797,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,024,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $46,968,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,258,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $48,179,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,941,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $49,410,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,998,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $50,659,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,142,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $51,959,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,440,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $56,434,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,893,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $58,153,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,619,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $59,826,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,276,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $19,126,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,058,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $19,776,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,752,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $20,398,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,292,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $21,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,890,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $21,871,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,706,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $22,578,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,177,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $23,299,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,888,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $23,885,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,498,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $24,638,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,418,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $25,415,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,984,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $365,581,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $365,581,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $376,713,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $376,713,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $390,894,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $390,894,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $399,750,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $399,750,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $405,529,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $405,529,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $411,266,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $411,266,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $418,293,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $418,293,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $424,021,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $424,021,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $429,637,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $429,637,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $432,297,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $432,297,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $820,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $808,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $854,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $852,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $884,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $883,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $921,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $921,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $957,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $957,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $996,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $996,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $1,033,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,033,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $1,075,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,075,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $1,115,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,115,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $1,160,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $1,160,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $−70,979,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−70,979,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $−66,560,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−66,569,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $−66,933,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−66,933,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $−69,575,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−69,595,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $71,857,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−71,860,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $−75,557,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−75,555,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $−77,982,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−77,979,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $−81,282,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−81,279,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $−84,781,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−84,780,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $−94,228,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−94,228,000,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) and a Member opposed each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is really important that Americans hear every side of the budget argument. That is why I am proud to rise today to bring before the House the Congressional Progressive peace and security budget alternative.

The peace and security budget balances by the year 2010, which is 2 years ahead of the Democratic budget, 2 years ahead of the Republican substitute, and light years ahead of the administration's budget, a budget that doesn't balance anywhere in a 10-year horizon.

This chart, Madam Chairman, shows the Progressive budget, it shows the Congressional House budget, and it shows the President's budget. Very clear, indeed. This is about domestic spending, and we will get to that later.

Now, let's look at exactly what happens when we meet our deficit and when we go into balance.

This is the Progressive budget. This is the President's budget. Here we are. Here he is. We are light years ahead of the President's budget, and 2 years ahead of the Democratic budget.

The peace and security budget cuts defense spending by $108 billion below the President's budget, all the while keeping America safe. Actually, the Congressional Progressive Caucus budget spends $395 billion on defense. That is a lot of money. At the same time, the CPC alternative increases domestic discretionary spending to $483 billion, and this is this chart. Our spending is $89 billion over the President, $58 billion over the Democrats, and if you can believe this, it is $33 billion more than the social justice groups have been asking for.

So here you are. We have the President's budget spending on domestic funding, we have the Democrats, and we have the Progressive Caucus.

How do we get there? It's not as hard as you may think. You can vest in domestic programs if you aren't spending precious tax dollars on a misguided occupation of another nation. Because of this, we assume an end to the occupation of Iraq by the end of 2007. This will save us hundreds of billions of dollars in the next year alone.

We also roll back the Bush tax cuts for the top 1 percent of income earners. That's people who make over $1 million a year. And we target waste, fraud and abuse at the Department of Defense, including savings of $60 billion a year by eliminating and reducing Cold War era relics that are still being produced in this country. With these savings, we are able to put money where it is most needed.

The peace and security budget keeps its promise to a strong public education by fully funding No Child Left Behind, title I, which would expand services about $30 billion a year, and it also fully funds our commitment to special education, to IDEA.

Our substitute moves us closer to the promise of a universal health care system by putting $75 billion over 5 years into SCHIP to cover all eligible children.

We support a leaner, smarter and more effective national security program by investing in emphasizing greater diplomacy and less combat. Our budget makes the veterans health care an entitlement, including mental health services.

The progressive budget invests $30 billion a year over 10 years to completely transform our energy policy to ensure that our children and our grandchildren will have clean and renewable energy sources.

And, finally, we increase spending for domestic priorities like HIV/AIDS, section 8 housing, and Community Development Block Grants.

Madam Chairman, it is time we stand up and challenge what is possible in a Federal budget. The alternative prepared and brought here today by the Congressional Progressive Caucus does that and does it boldly. It puts money where we need it, it cuts programs that have for so long been sacred cows, and it says to our country, we want to take your tax dollars and invest them in the people of this Nation.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 20 minutes.

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

Madam Chairman, we have three different versions of essentially the same Democrat budget that is being presented today. They are all fiscally irresponsible. They all promote the Federal budget over the family budget. They all compromise the future of our children and grandchildren.

Let me tell you, Madam Chair, what they have in common. Each one would represent the single largest tax increase in the history of the United States of America.

Now this particular chart, Madam Chairman, because I didn't have the numbers available in the Progressive budget, shows what the Democrat Conference budget would do: Almost $400 billion of new taxes on working families; single largest tax increase in America's history. What did the Democrats do last time they were in power, Madam Chair? Well, that was back in 1993. And guess what? They gave us the single largest tax increase in America's history. This particular version of the Democrat budget, see that red there? I would have to have another chart to represent that tax increase because I believe they actually double what the Democrat Conference budget is doing.

And, Madam Chairman, people need to know that every time you are increasing the Federal budget, you are decreasing some family budget. Some hardworking family in America is trying to make ends meet. Many of those families are in my district, the Fifth Congressional District of Texas.

I heard from one of those families recently. I heard from Linda, I will use her first name, in Roulette, Texas. And she writes:

''Dear Congressman, that tax increase would mean the difference of whether my daughter and her husband would be able to purchase a car or not. For my husband and I, it helps us to continue for his radiation treatments for his prostate cancer. It allows us to continue to provide in-home assistance for my elderly parents, one who has Parkinson's and one who has dementia. Please allow us to retain this money for our needs. Please don't allow our government to take additional tax dollars from us. Please allow us to decide how this money will be spent.''

Madam Chairman, again, when they take money to fuel the Federal budget, to fuel the Federal bureaucracy, they are taking money away from hardworking families. They need that money for their educational needs, for their health care needs, for their housing needs.

When is it that you ever have enough of the taxpayers' money? Already in Washington we are spending over $23,000 per American household for the first time in American history since World War II. We must protect the family budget from the Federal budget and prevent this single largest tax increase in American history from being imposed on hardworking American families.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman

from California, BARBARA LEE, the co-Chair of the Progressive Caucus.

Ms. LEE. Madam Chairman, first, I would like to thank my friend and colleague, our co-Chair of the Progressive Caucus, Congresswoman WOOLSEY, for her leadership on this issue and so many issues that relate to peace and security.

Also to our executive director, Mr. Goold, for all of your hard work and all of our staff. You all have done a phenomenal job in putting this together.

As I said with regard to the Congressional Black Caucus budget, a budget is a moral document. It defines what we as a community, as a Nation, as a society hold as sacred. That is why I am pleased that this Progressive Caucus budget also is a reflection of our values and our priorities.

There are several key elements in this budget I would like to focus on, especially five main items.

First, this budget will save up to $623 billion over the next 10 years by ending the occupation of Iraq and bringing our troops home starting at the end of the year. The costs are simply untenable. CRS estimates that we will have spent over a half trillion dollars by the end of fiscal 08 on this unnecessary occupation of Iraq. This rate of expenditure, not to mention the cost in lives and cost to our international stability and credibility, is simply untenable.

Next, this budget takes steps at reducing our bloated military budget without compromising, actually, in fact, it enhances our national security. It accounts for eliminating obsolete Cold War era weapon systems and saves $600 billion over the next 10 years.

Additionally, this budget would save tens of billions of dollars over the next 10 years by implementing recommendations by the Government Accountability Office, which they have actually made, to eliminate waste, fraud and abuse at the Department of Defense, which our taxpayers should not allow to occur any longer.

This budget increases funding for critical components to help rebuild our communities, including those ravaged by Hurricane Katrina. For example, our budget increases funding to the Community Development Block Grants to $4.1 billion in 2008, whereas the President has repeatedly targeted this program for cuts.

This budget also invests an additional $1.6 billion per year in section 8 housing vouchers to ensure decent and affordable housing for all of those who need housing assistance.

Fourth, this budget contributes to our national security interests by doing more to meet the growing humanitarian needs throughout the world, especially with regard to increasing our contribution to the Global Fund to Fight HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. We increased this by $100 billion.

Also, let's just say our Nation's security is predicated on a strong and healthy domestic population. It is critically important to adequately fund prevention and treatment of HIV/AIDS in the United States.

The statistics, as it relates to HIV/AIDS here in America, are staggering. According to the Center for Disease Control and Prevention, racial and ethnic minorities represent 71 percent of new AIDS cases and 64 percent of Americans living with HIV/AIDS. African Americans represent 50 percent of new AIDS cases, although only 12 percent of our population. Latinos account for 19 percent of new AIDS cases, although 14 percent of the population.

I urge our colleagues to support this budget. It clearly is a budget that is fiscally responsible and is a moral document.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chairman, at this time, I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER).

□ 1145

Mr. HERGER. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to the alternative budget before us now and the Democrat budget. The Democrat majority party seems intent on raising taxes and increasing spending. American families, seniors, and small businesses would all experience major tax hikes. Virtually no American would be spared.

The budget before us ignores the benefits of the tax relief passed since 2001. This tax relief has spurred economic growth and created literally millions of new jobs. Meanwhile, tax revenue to the Federal Treasury is surging, helping to reduce the deficit. Their budget also ignores the out-of-control growth in entitlement spending. This is deeply irresponsible. The tax-tax/spend-spend philosophy supported by my friends across the aisle is bad economics and bad for the American people. Vote ''no.''

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chair, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California, the Chair of the Veterans' Committee, BOB FILNER.

Mr. FILNER. I thank the gentlelady, and I thank the leadership of Ms. WOOLSEY and Ms. LEE of the Progressive Caucus.

Madam Chair, I rise this morning as the Chair of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee in proud support of the Progressive Caucus budget.

Other budgets fund the war; this budget funds the warrior. I am going to repeat that: Other budgets fund the war; this budget funds the warrior.

Most of us in the Progressive Caucus are against the war in Iraq, but we are united in our view that when these young men and women come home and all the other young men and women who came home in the past, that they get all the care, the support, the honor, the dignity, the love that a grateful Nation can bestow.

We are united in saying we will honor those who come home. They have done everything we have asked, they have been brave and courageous, they have had incredible wounds both physically and mentally, and we are going to give them the care, love, respect, and honor that they deserve.

This is the only budget before us today that says we will have what is called ''mandatory funding'' of veterans health care. Mandatory funding means we don't have to wait 5 months like the Republicans did last year when they didn't fund the Veterans Administration for the first 5 months of the fiscal year. Assured funding, mandatory funding, means that they will be funded on the first day of the fiscal year, and they will get automatic funding that doesn't have to go through a political fight.

We have a President that says support the troops, support the troops, support the troops. The speakers on the other side say support the troops, support the troops, support the troops. But when they get home, who is supporting them? Who is supporting these brave young men and women when they come back? We saw what happened at Walter Reed. We saw what happened to Bob Woodruff when he had traumatic brain injury—and those who were less fortunate than he didn't get the treatment they needed. We heard about the young marine who went to a Minnesota hospital saying he had PTSD and was thinking about committing suicide, and they said he was number 28 on the waiting list, come back in a month. He went home and he committed suicide. That is not a Veterans Administration, that is not a country that is welcoming its troops home. It is time that we fund the warrior and not just the war. Vote for the Progressive Caucus budget.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chair, the Republican budget allocates more to veterans than the Democrat Conference budget.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise today in opposition to the Progressive Caucus budget.

This debate today could be described as a debate about the good, the bad, and the ugly. A kinder way you could describe it is the responsible, the irresponsible, and the reckless.

We are going to have the House Republican budget brought forward on this floor today, brought forward by our chairman, Mr. RYAN, a responsible budget, a good budget, a budget that comes to balance in 5 years without raising taxes and tries to address the challenge that we face in the category of entitlements.

We have the Democrat leadership budget that is going to be brought forward, a budget that has the biggest tax increase in our Nation's history, and a budget, I might add, that not only includes significant increases in spending, but as well makes no effort to deal with the challenge of entitlements. I will just quote from the chairman of the Federal Reserve, Chairman Bernanke, who said, ''Without early

and meaningful action to address entitlements, the U.S. economy could be seriously weakened, with future generations bearing much of the cost.''

Now, the budget alternative that we have right now in front of us I would describe as the ugly or the reckless or the completely irresponsible, because not only does it include the biggest tax increase in our Nation's history and significant increases in spending; it runs up entitlement spending even further. And the part that I think is the most egregious, it actually calls the effort of our brave women and men fighting in Afghanistan, fighting in Iraq to establish a beacon of liberty in that dark area of the world, it calls that effort the single largest waste of taxpayers' money and the biggest current drain on the U.S. Treasury today.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this alternative budget and vote ''yes'' on the Republican budget.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to bring to the gentleman from Florida's attention that his budget actually cuts Medicare and Medicaid by $250 billion, taking almost $98 billion out of Energy and Commerce and $154 billion out of Ways and Means.

And then when he speaks about veterans and what our budget does or does not do in supporting veterans, I would like to remind him that the Progressive Caucus budget makes veterans' health care, including mental health, an entitlement. It no longer throws veterans out there to be debated every year, whether they deserve what we know we have promised them and they more than deserve.

At this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California, HILDA SOLIS, a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Environmental and Hazmat Subcommittee.

Ms. SOLIS. I thank the gentlewoman from California and my colleagues of the Progressive Caucus.

Madam Chair, I rise today in support of this budget resolution. And as you know, Members, this budget marks a new direction for our country. It reflects the values of millions of hard-working people across the country. And I am proud that this budget rejects the President's cuts to core public health and environmental programs. These core programs include Superfund programs, land and water conservation funds, drinking water State revolving funds, State and tribal assistance grants, Leaking Underground Storage Tank programs, environmental justice programs, and brownfield programs.

Under the misguided priorities of the Bush administration, funding for these programs at the EPA, if you didn't know this, have been dramatically cut back by 22 percent, and our communities continue to suffer. Under the President's fiscal year 2008 budget, States will have lost over $1 billion in Federal funds since 2004 and may be forced to lay off numerous staff, leave vacancies unfilled, shut down existing air monitors, or otherwise curtail monitoring programs. Regional or contract personnel are making judgments about water safety systems despite not even being qualified. And environmental justice, those programs are on the chopping block right now. Two-thirds of already overburdened cities that are working to create economic opportunities by revitalizing formerly blighted communities in our country known as the brownfields programs have not received sufficient funding.

Our budget, this budget, rejects these cuts by appropriating $31.4 billion for these programs, $2.6 billion over the President's budget. This is a down payment so that we can begin to reinvest in our neighborhoods and communities, and we are doing it without raising taxes for the middle class. I am proud that this budget will help improve health care for all our families, secure education, address global warming issues, and keep our promise to our Nation's veterans. I strongly urge my colleagues to support the health, well-being, and economic security of all working families in our country, and I support this budget.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to a coauthor of the American Taxpayer Bill of Rights, the gentlelady from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

You know, it is so interesting as we always debate these budgets. It seems that the liberal elites always think they are smarter than everybody else in America, and that they need to have the authority to come down here and decide how our communities are going to spend their money, how families are going to spend their money, because government never gets enough of your money. That is one thing you can count on. They want government to have it all.

Well, let me tell you, I have got a little box in my office on my desk; it is a tax box. And if you don't think you are paying enough, come to 509 Cannon, write out how much you want to give the government, and stick it in there. There is nothing that is stopping you. But the Democrat budget increases taxes on Tennesseans $2,611 a year. The Progressive budget is going to increase it about $6,000 a year. They just can't get enough of the taxpayers' money.

And the fact that they would cut military spending and call it the single largest waste, you know what, Madam Chair, if it were not for the brave men and women in the U.S. military, there would be no need for us because we would not be a free, secure Nation. We are free. We remain free because we are ever vigilant. That is the cost of freedom. And to deny what they need and to say it is a waste, I am very sorry to see that. And at the same time, to increase domestic spending with new programs when our friends across the aisle have repeatedly said they were going to cut it out, they were going to cut programs, they were going to cut spending, that is unfortunate.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois, JAN SCHAKOWSKY, who is a valued progressive voice in this Congress and a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Global Warming Select Committee.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Chair, budget resolutions give us the opportunity to debate national priorities, the vision that we have not just for the next 5 years, but for our future. And nothing is more important for that future than providing opportunities for our children.

Over the past weeks, many of my constituents have called and written to ask that we reject the President's budget priorities, particularly in the area of children's health. Nine million children are uninsured. Every 46 seconds, a baby is born without health coverage. In the richest country in the history of the world, every day children are forced to go without the medical care that they need. The President's budget doesn't solve this crisis. It doesn't even come close.

The President wants to cut Medicaid, and his budget provides $7 billion less than what is needed just to maintain current caseloads in the State Children's Health Insurance Program. Shortfalls would continue. States would have to put more children on waiting lists. Benefits would be reduced.

The Progressive Caucus believes that no child should be forced to stand in a long line when it comes to health care. Our budget provides enough funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program to cover every eligible child. Our budget truly puts children first. Like the Spratt budget, which provides an additional $50 billion in SCHIP money, we are setting the priorities that will keep American children healthy and make our country strong.

The Republicans care about families all right, rich families. And they care about children. It just doesn't happen to be the children of ordinary working families in this country. The Progressive Caucus budget does take care of those families.

□ 1200

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), the chairman of the Budget and Spending Task Force of the Republican Study Committee and the coauthor of the American Taxpayer Bill of Rights.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

You know, I would like to give some credit to my colleague from California, the author of this particular budget. It raises taxes; it raises taxes a whole, whole bunch.

But the lady from California, my colleague, stood up here and admitted

that. She said, yeah, we're raising taxes in this budget. That's what we're doing.

Raising taxes is a legitimate policy decision. It is something, Madam Chair, that people can make a decision to do. And in all three Democratic budgets, the authors have made the decision to raise taxes. They have made the decision to raise taxes. But in this budget, the people behind this are standing up here and are proud about it. We admit it, we're proud of it, and that's what we're doing. They are standing behind that policy decision to raise taxes. They are raising taxes on almost everyone, and they are proud to do that.

I think it is not a particularly good policy decision, but it is a legitimate one. They are raising taxes in all three of these budgets anywhere from $3,000 per taxpayer to $7,500 per taxpayer per year. It is a legitimate policy decision. I think it happens to be not a particularly good one, but at least they are standing up and saying, that's what we want to do, and that's what we're going to do, and that's how we're going to raise the budget.

Democrats have put together these three budgets that are raising taxes. Be proud that you are raising taxes if that's what you want to do, because that's what you're doing. Be proud of it. Stand behind it. Don't pretend like you're not doing it.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chair, I would like first to yield for a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Chair, I rise in support of the Democratic budget resolution.

The best word to describe this budget is "balanced."

First, it balances our Nation's books by bringing our country back to surplus by 2012, thanks in large part to the PAYGO rules this Chamber passed as part of our fiscal responsibility package.

This budget also balances our Nation's many priorities by providing adequate funding for our defense and homeland security, while also paying much-needed attention to our deserving domestic priorities and social programs.

This budget proves that Democrats pay more than lip service to our Nation's veterans by providing $6.6 billion over last year's funding for veterans' services.

As a member of Energy and Commerce, I would like to thank the Budget Committee for including a $50 billion reserve fund for the expansion of the S–CHIP program.

Of course, we understand that our reauthorization bill will be subject to PAYGO rules, but this reserve fund is an important first step in increasing access to health care for the nearly 6 million children who are eligible for S–CHIP but not enrolled.

I applaud the Budget Committee for rejecting the administration's cuts to Medicare and Medicaid.

I also appreciate the budget's refusal to incorporate the administration's cuts to LIHEAP, which should be further expanded to ensure that millions of low-income folks in southern States receive the assistance they need to cool their homes during the oppressive summer months.

What a difference a year makes, Madam Chair, and I am proud to support Chairman SPRATT and this budget, which strikes the right balance between investing in the American people and their future and keeping our fiscal houses in order.

I urge my colleagues to support this budget.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to Mr. RUSH from Illinois, a leader on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. RUSH. Madam Chair, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California and the other gentlewoman from California for their stellar and steadfast leadership on these and other matters that the American people are facing.

Madam Chair, as a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and both the Congressional Black Caucus and the Progressive Caucus, I am pleased to come to the floor in support of three budget alternatives that reflect the Democratic priorities and values.

Today, I want to highlight the value added to the Democratic budget by the two alternatives and thank my colleagues who supported the CBC budget alternative. The CBC and Progressive budget alternatives offer to the American people and to this Congress rational budgets that are fiscally sound and morally responsible.

The Congressional Black Caucus and Progressive Caucus alternative budgets invest Federal resources in programs that benefit the constituencies of all the Members of this House: education, health care, economic opportunity, retirement security, and homeland security.

The CBC and Progressive alternative budgets make these investments while reducing the Federal deficit, which has spiraled out of control and out of sight over the last 6 years of Republican rule.

The CBC and Progressive Caucus alternatives make necessary investments in minority health care and for community health centers that provide critical health services to urban-based congressional districts like mine, and rural-based congressional districts as well, and investment in the care and treatment of victims of HIV and AIDS.

The CBC and Progressive Caucus alternatives invests in our Nation's veterans by restoring the cuts the President's budget proposed in the veterans health care and veterans benefits.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of the American people and in support of the CBC and Progressive Caucus alternative budgets.

As a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and both the Congressional Black Caucus and the Progressive Caucus, I am pleased to come to the floor in support of three budget alternatives that reflect the Democratic priorities and values.

For the first time in more than 13 years, the Budget Committee's resolution fulfills many of the critical commitments that Democrats made to the American people in the last election: that we would reduce the Federal deficit and make investments in the key domestic programs that are so important to our constituents, and I will be proud to support it. Today, I want to highlight the value added to the Democratic budget by the two alternatives.

The CBC and Progressive Caucus alternatives offer to the American people and to this Congress rational budgets that are fiscally sound and morally responsible. The CBC and Progressive Caucus alternative budgets invest Federal resources in the programs that benefit the constituencies of all of the Members of this House: education, health care, economic opportunity, retirement security and homeland security. The CBC and Progressive Caucus alternative budgets makes these investments while reducing the Federal deficit—which has spiraled out of control and out of sight over the last 6 years.

The Congressional Black Caucus and Progressive budget alternatives focus on addressing the disparities that exist in America's communities and invest in the future of this Nation by fully funding the No Child Left Behind Act, expanding the Head Start programs, and funding the SCHIP program so that every uninsured child can have access to medical care. The CBC alternative also provides needed funds to rebuild schools and colleges damaged by Hurricane Katrina.

The CBC and Progressive Caucus alternatives make necessary investments in minority health and for Community Health Centers that provide critical health services to urban-based congressional districts like mine and rural-based congressional districts as well, and investments in the care and treatment of the victims of HIV and AIDS.

The CBC and Progressive Caucus alternatives invest in our Nation's veterans by restoring the cuts the President's budget proposed in veterans' health care and benefits. To meet these critical needs of America and its citizens, the CBC and Progressive alternatives repeal some of the tax cuts to the two top income brackets. Even after funding our domestic priorities, both of these alternatives achieve significant deficit reduction.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of the American people and in support of the CBC and Progressive Caucus alternatives.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Chair, I want to speak against this Progressive Caucus budget in the strongest terms available.

Over the last couple of weeks, I have somewhat tongue in cheek talked about when the Defeat in Iraq Caucus and when the Defeat in Afghanistan Caucus get their way that it won't be long before they declare a defeat dividend.

As you recall in the 1990s when the Soviet Union failed, this Chamber and others declared a peace dividend. They took money that would have otherwise

supported our troops in the fight and spent it somewhere else.

I thought it would take until the defeat actually occurred, but I come today and find that the Progressive Caucus has already declared a $781 billion defeat dividend.

We have men and women in harm's way right now giving their lives for this country. Whether you agree with it or not, that is what they are doing. Where was this group last week when they said let's keep them in the fight for 17 more months? Why did you stand up and say that was okay and yet call what they are doing the single largest waste of taxpayer money in American history? You cannot have it both ways.

Vote your convictions. Get them out of Iraq now. That is a legitimate position to defend. But to say we are going to keep them there for 17 more months, strip them of $781 billion in flak jackets and up-armored Humvees and all of the things you would take away from them is simply unfair and unconscionable.

I encourage my fellow colleagues to vote against this Progressive Caucus budget over and over. This is wrongheaded. It is not the way to lead this country. It sends a terrible message to our soldiers in the Armed Forces who are fighting this fight on our behalf.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chair, how much time do we have on both sides?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 8 minutes.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Chair, of all of the budgets before Congress, this one hits the taxpayers the hardest.

Over 5 years, the Progressive Caucus budget will raise taxes by $949.3 billion. Over 10 years, the Progressive Caucus budget will raise taxes by $2.4 trillion. Over the next 10 years, they will essentially double the budget.

There is nothing progressive about Democrats raising taxes. That has been their only fiscal strategy over the last 70 years. This budget spends $643 billion over 5 years and new entitlement spending over and above what the President has asked.

It also spends far less when it comes to military spending on our national defense. It drastically cuts military spending by $781 billion over 5 years. This is unconscionable.

Beyond that, it says that Iraq and Afghanistan and our global war against Islamic extremists is the largest single waste of U.S. taxpayer money. That is coming from their budget. Their budget assumes a dream world where we are not fighting a global war on terror. It is the ostrich approach, where you stick your head in the sand and hope everything goes away. It is ridiculous, and it is not safe for the American people.

Alternatively, the Republican budget that we propose here today takes Social Security off-budget, stops the raid on Social Security, and achieves balance while not raising taxes. It is a huge difference between what Republicans are proposing and the liberal left of the Democrat Caucus is proposing here on the House floor.

Beyond that, what the Democrats are saying with their full budget on the floor, as well as this Progressive Caucus budget, that they are going to punt on entitlement reform. Every known economist says we must reform entitlements. I oppose this budget.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chair, who has the right to close?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has the right to close.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chair, in that case, I am very honored at this time to yield 4 minutes to the author of the Republican budget that will balance the budget, preserve the Social Security surplus without raising taxes, the ranking member on the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for his wonderful expertise on budget issues. He has been a leader on this issue.

I also want to compliment the Progressive Caucus for coming to the floor with an earnest budget and for putting a budget together. These are not easy things to do. The Progressives have put together a budget that embodies their philosophies, their opinions, and I think that is good.

I completely disagree with the direction of the budget, deep cuts to defense, incredible increases in spending across the board, and a $949 billion tax increase. I think it is the wrong recipe for our economy, but I compliment the Progressives for bringing a budget to the floor that actually achieves balance, albeit by raising taxes.

Madam Chair, I want to give a little foreshadowing of our next budget. You are going to hear the word ''cut'' and the words ''drastic cuts'' and things like that. I think we are going to hear that from the other side of the aisle because they propose to control no spending. Those chose to cut nothing, not even controlling the growth of spending. Rather, they choose to raise taxes.

On Medicaid, our budget will propose, yes, to increase spending, albeit not as fast as it is going right now. This will extend the solvency of Medicaid. We propose to increase spending even faster than medical inflation.

What about Medicare? Again, our red line below the blue line, we propose to increase Medicare spending and reform the program.

What will our budget achieve? It will achieve savings that will extend the life and solvency of Medicare.

What does the Democrat budget achieve? An exacerbation of the problem.

Here is what our budget proposes to do on all entitlements. I don't even know if the viewer can see the difference between the blue line, which is the current trajectory of entitlement spending, and the red line.

We propose to increase entitlement spending each year at 4.1 percent a year, instead of 4.7 percent a year. Is that a drastic cut? Is that a terrible, awful cut to programs? Let me repeat it one more time. We are increasing entitlement spending 4.1 percent a year, instead of 4.7 percent. That is above inflation.

Here is the legacy of the Democrat budget. Right now, today, according to the Government Accountability Office, the current unfunded liability of Medicare and Social Security is $37 trillion. That will go to $62 trillion of money that we would have to set aside today to make these programs work for the next two generations, my generation and my children's generation, by 2012. By doing nothing to save Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security, the Democratic budget is actually increasing the liability of these programs. The Democrat budget is making matters worse by postponing the necessary reforms that must occur.

But there is one thing the Democrat budget does, and it was very well described in the Washington Post this morning. Let me quote: ''While the House Democrats say they want to preserve key parts of Bush's signature tax cuts, they project a surplus in 2012 only by assuming that all of these tax cuts expire on schedule in 2010.'' That means cap gains, dividends, income tax rates, per child tax credit, marriage tax penalty, all of those tax cuts go away.

Let me make it very clear. We use the Congressional Budget Office by law to develop our budgets, and this red line shows you that, in 2010, tax cuts go away, taxes increase, and revenues go up. That is the line that the Democrats are writing their budget based on. Their budget requires, assumes, legislates, needs these tax increases for them to balance the budget.

The green line is the line we use to write our budget. We balance the budget without raising taxes, and they raise taxes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chair, I would like to know how many more speakers they have on the Republican side?

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chair, I will close for our side as I understand I have the right to close.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), the co-Chair of the Progressive Caucus.

Ms. LEE. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I want to reiterate the point that this Progressive Caucus makes, and that is that our domestic security here in our own country is an integral part of our national security.

We have added $4.8 billion to our COPS program for local law enforcement efforts. We have provided additional funds for gang violence prevention efforts; and, also, we have provided additional funding for job training and after-school programs. In many of our communities, our young African American boys and Latino young boys are dropping out of schools in unbelievable numbers.

□ 1215

We need a strong, robust after-school program with tutoring, and our Progressive Caucus provides for that.

The American taxpayers are compassionate people. They want to see their tax dollars spent to eliminate poverty, to provide health care, for energy independence, to educate our children. The Progressive Caucus budget does just that. It is a document that reflects the morality of this country, the ethics of this country, and I am proud to support it.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Madam Chairman, this budget, the Progressive Caucus budget, proves without a doubt you can keep our Nation safe while investing needed necessary funds for domestic programs and you can do it and balance the budget at the same time. Our budget balances before the Democratic budget, before the Republican budget, and the President's budget does not ever balance, it appears.

We can do that, and at the same time we fully fund title I of No Child Left Behind, our investment and our promise to IDEA. We make veterans health care an entitlement.

Madam Chairman, it is time we stand up to the challenge that is possible in a Federal budget. This alternative provides that challenge to the Democrats and Republicans of the House of Representatives.

Please vote for this Congressional Progressive budget.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chair, may I inquire how much time is remaining on our side.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. There are 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Madam Chair, all of the Democrats' budgets are breathtakingly bad and fiscally irresponsible for what they do. They impose the single largest tax increase in American history on hard-working American families. They each represent the highest level of spending in the history of our Nation at a time when we are taking $23,000 away, spending $23,000 per family for only the first time since World War II.

But as breathtakingly bad as they are for what they do, they are even worse for what they do not do because, Madam Chair, they are absolutely stone cold silent on the number one fiscal issue facing this Nation, facing the next generation, and that is, reforming entitlement spending, which will plunge the next generation into trillions and trillions of dollars of debt.

Don't take my word for it. Take the word of the Comptroller General, the chief fiduciary officer of the United States of America, who has said that we are on the verge of being the first generation to leave the next generation with a lower standard of living. I mean, think about that, Madam Chair, because we are spending so much of the people's money that these programs that have been vital to people for generations will go away. If you do not reform Medicare and Social Security and Medicaid, they will not be here for the next generation.

Madam Chair, as the father of a 5-year-old daughter and a 3-year-old son, I cannot sit idly by and let that happen. We must keep faith with prior generations by keeping faith with future generations.

Let's reform entitlement spending. Let's give the next generation more opportunity and more freedoms. Vote down this Democrat budget.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of The Congressional Progressive Caucus Fiscal Year 2008–17 "Peace & Security" Budget Alternative. The American people spoke loud and clear last November. They wanted change, accountability, and a new course of action. This budget is a direct answer to the demands of the American people and steers us in a new direction. With this budget we can usher in a new era of fiscal responsibility that this current administration has failed to adhere to. The budget is morally sound, as it redirects funding to domestic spending programs that benefit the American middle class, the backbone of our great Nation. Most importantly this budget meets our moral obligation to all of our veterans. This budget ends the war and brings our troops home and moves this country toward an agenda of peace and security.

The news of the horrible living conditions at Walter Reed Army Medical Center raised our national consciousness regarding the need to do more—much more—for wounded and injured service members and to upgrade the administrative systems that support them. Simply put, this budget treats the heroic young men and women who sacrifice life and limb with the respect and dignity they deserve. This budget guarantees full funding for health care (including mental health care) for all veterans. The Progressive Caucus budget makes veterans' health care a new federal entitlement. It will require the U.S. Secretary of the Treasury to make mandatory appropriations for VA health care based upon the following formula: the amount of funds available for VA medical care in FY2008 would equal 130 percent of the total obligations made by the VA for medical care programs in FY2005.

Let us send the right message to our young men and women returning home from Iraq and Afghanistan. They deserve better, we owe it to them, and we have a duty to answer the will of the American people.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Progressive Caucus budget and I do so for a number of good reasons.

First off, all budgets are a way of assessing need and determining priorities and when one takes a serious look at the Progressive Caucus budget it:

(1) Projects complete U.S. military redeployment out of Iraq during 2007, saving at least $187 billion dollars over the next 2 years.

(2) You should not spend money if you do not have it, therefore the Progressive Caucus budget repeals the Bush tax cuts for the wealthiest 1 percent of taxpayers due to expire in 2010 saving at least $348 billion dollars.

(3) It fully funds NCLB and IDEA and improves teacher corp and job training.

(4) It adequately funds Medicare and Medicaid so that more Americans can have access to affordable quality healthcare.

(5) This budget helps to rebuild America's communities by substantially increasing funding for community development block grants, community policing, and clean up of underground storage tanks.

Madam Chairman, this is a budget I can take home to any constituent and they will say, right on.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Chairman, looking beyond all the rhetoric for a moment, we have a responsibility here as the elected stewards of the people's treasury to deliver a budget that honors our values and keeps our promises—and the proposal put together by my good friend from Wisconsin, Mr. RYAN, does exactly that.

Sadly, the Democrat majority has squandered its first opportunity in over a decade to set our fiscal priorities.

Despite the pledges of fiscal responsibility that echoed through this chamber at the start of this Congress, it did not take long for the heirs of tax-and-spend liberalism to return to their roots.

Just a few weeks into the new Congress, the majority took a victory lap for passing an omnibus spending bill that contained about $500 million in hidden earmarks.

And then last week, they patted themselves on the back for loading up an emergency troop funding bill with enough pork barrel projects to make Donald Trump blush.

And if it was not enough to use our young men and women in combat as oxen to carry that wagon load of pork across the President's desk, this budget will saddle their generation with a greater tax burden to bear and unbearable choices to make.

The Democrat budget takes the tax hammer to 115 million Americans—from married couples and families with children to senior citizens and small business owners.

We have got millions of Floridians filing their 2006 tax returns right now—these are folks still in need of significant property tax relief. And I am going to head down there soon and let them know that they better start getting their ducks in a row because not too long from now, the new Democrat Congress will slam them with an average tax increase of $3,039.

The proposal put together by Mr. RYAN protects caps gains and dividend tax relief, maintains the new, low 10-percent tax bracket, takes any marriage penalty rollback off the table, and keeps the death tax in the ground—where it belongs.

In addition, Mr. RYAN's proposal exerts discipline on the government spending machine—so we can have a ba1anced budget and a smaller, smarter, more efficient government that can deliver much-needed reforms on the fly.

And look, you can support the Democrat budget and spend all the taxpayer money you want on new programs, but if the generational crisis of runaway entitlement spending that looms over the horizon is not sufficiently addressed, we will not be able to have any of them—not a one.

The Congressional Budget Office has told us that if we do not implement significant entitlement reforms, then our shared goal of balancing the budget in the next 5 years is nothing more than a pipe dream.

If we wish to continue keeping the promises our government has made, but do not act soon, then we will have a choice to make: either raise taxes every year until they are nearly 60 percent higher than they are today or eliminate every single government program except Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security by 2045.

This is a coming crisis, and appallingly, it is one born of our indecision.

That's why I applaud Mr. RYAN for putting together a proposal that reforms our largest and least sustainable entitlement programs, achieving $279 billion in savings over 5 years.

That is a far cry from the budget resolution Democrats are putting forward today, which does not make a single courageous choice—it is an incubator of gimmicks and schemes designed to pass the buck to future Congresses and the bucket to tomorrow's taxpayers.

There is no fiscal responsibility to be found in a budget that makes our children foot the bill for our inability to make tough choices.

The sound fiscal blueprint laid out by Mr. RYAN shows that we can have a budget that holds us accountable for the choices that need to be made to ensure lasting prosperity for future generations.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my concern with certain provisions of the Republican Budget Substitute Amendment offered by Representative RYAN. I strongly support the tax provisions included in the Ryan Amendment. Republican tax relief has led to unprecedented economic growth and dropped the unemployment rate. More importantly, tax relief gives back to Americans their own money. The robust economic growth in this Nation over the past few years is proof that individual Americans use and invest their dollars much more wisely than the Federal Government does. I am pleased that the Ryan Amendment makes the tax cuts passed in 2001 and 2003 permanent and recognizes the reality of our Nation's fiscal situation by addressing the out-of-control growth of entitlement spending.

However, I want to make clear my views regarding certain budget process reforms included in the Ryan amendment. I am strongly opposed to giving any U.S. President the power to use a line item veto. Our Founding Fathers wisely attempted to curtail the power of each branch of the Federal Government by instituting a system of checks and balances. Granting the President additional power to veto specific portions of a bill instead of the bill as a whole cedes too much authority to the executive branch and could lead to unfair and unilateral power. I am very disappointed that the Ryan Amendment includes a provision granting the President this unconstitutional power.

While I strongly oppose the line-item veto provision and other attempts to reduce Congress's constitutional power of the purse included in the Ryan Amendment, it is clear to me that this proposal is preferable to an alternative that raises taxes by an average of $2,597 for each of my constituents.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my objections to the budget put forward by the new majority in the Congress. Their budget proposes the largest tax increase in American history and it presses the accelerator on government spending.

What Washington has is not a revenue problem, but a spending problem. Revenues from taxes flowing into the U.S. Treasury have been flowing at record levels. Even when you factor in the $1 trillion dollar tax relief that was enacted by President Bush and a Republican Congress, the taxes that came into the Treasury in 2006 were exactly what the Congressional Budget Office projected they would be back in March 2000—nearly 9 months before President Bush proposed such tax relief. Clearly, Washington's problem is not a revenue problem. Washington has a spending problem.

Yet the Democrat budget plan fails to recognize this and instead they choose more taxes and more spending. They fail to extend important tax relief that has given Americans more control over their lives and businesses. It will put the breaks on the economic expansion that has put the United States in the enviable position of having the most vibrant and growing economy over the last 4 years. We have led the developed world in the creation of new jobs over the past 4 years—creating 7.6 million new jobs for Americans.

Not only does the Democrat budget impose the largest tax increase in our Nation's history, but it also puts spending on an upward trajectory that will further imperil our children's future, saddling them with even more debt. Not only does the Democrat budget fail to address the growth of entitlement spending that is imperiling our children's future, but also it makes the problem worse by putting off needed changes and by increasing domestic discretionary spending at a rate that exceeds the rate of inflation.

With regard to tax increases, Democrats had a time during the House Budget Committee meeting to adopt amendments protecting the tax relief that Americans are enjoying today. The Democrats voted lock step against each and every amendment that would have protected the tax relief that Americans are currently enjoying and that is spurring our economy.

Don't take my word for it, just look at the Washington Post. They sum it up in today's paper:

> ''Democrats say they want to preserve key parts of Bush's signature tax cuts, they project a surplus in 2012 only by assuming that all of the cuts expire on schedule in 2010.''
>
> ''But the [Democrat budget] proposal, set for a vote today, requires either that millions of middle-class families be hit with higher taxes next spring or that somebody else pay an extra $50 billion. . . . That stark choice is the result of the inexorable expansion of the alternative minimum tax, a parallel tax structure that adds $6,800, on average, to a family's tax bill. Next month, an estimated 4.2 million Americans will pay the tax. Next spring, that number will balloon to 23 million unless Congress takes action.

Sadly, the Democrat's budget has no plan for addressing the Alternative Minimum Tax (AMT). Someone will face a $50 billion tax increase under the Democrats budget—we will have to see who is next on their hit list as they have already taken aim to repeal most all of the tax relief provided to Americans since 2001. Just what tax increases are already in store for Americans?

The Florida sales tax deduction is repealed in this budget. Floridians will be hit harder than most Americans by the Democrats tax plan, as Floridians will no longer be afforded the opportunity to deduct sales taxes. While resident's of states that have a state income tax can deduct those costs from their taxes, Floridians have no such deduction, so I was pleased when we were finally able to give Floridians equal treatment by allowing a sales tax deduction—about $650 dollars for a family of 5 earning $40,000 per year. The Democrat bill repeals this tax deduction.

Taxes on dividends will increase. This will hit senior citizens the hardest as they often rely on safe and secure investments to supplement their Social Security benefits in their golden years.

The child tax credit is cut in half falling from $1,000 per child to $500 per child as if the cost of raising and caring for children is going down.

Democrats resurrect the marriage tax penalty forcing married couples to pay more in taxes that those living together out of wedlock.

The death tax will be resurrected making it difficult for mom and pop businesses to be handed down to their children.

Marginal tax rates will increase for all Americans. The lowest wage income tax payers will see their tax bill increase by 50 percent, paying a 15 percent tax rate rather than a 10 percent tax rate.

Capital gains tax rates will be raised significantly. For any student of the recent economic growth in our Nation knows that the capital gains tax cuts have been a significant driver of economic growth in the U.S. over the past 4 years. And, the stimulative effect that the cut in capitals gains has had on our economy has actually resulted in more revenue flowing into the U.S. Treasury than would have flowed with out the cut in capital gains taxes. Raising these taxes, as the Democrats are doing will put the breaks on our economy and slow economic growth.

If there is any doubt about where the heart of the Democrat party in Congress lies on taxes and spending, only consider the votes that we just held. Over half of the Democrats in the House of Representatives just voted for the substitute budget offered by Representative KILPATRICK. That budget proposal raised taxes by more than $919 billion—more than 2 times the amount in the underlying Democrat budget. This is not really surprising given that the underlying Democrat budget is still $200 billion below the amount of increased taxes they will need to carry out their spending plans in their budget. So, Americans should be prepared, this proposed $400 billion budget that the Democrats are poised to approve today is just the opening shot. More tax hikes are in store.

I would like to briefly address the spending side of the Democrat budget. Their budget favors higher spending. They put both entitlement spending and spending through annual appropriations bills (known as discretionary spending) on a path to receive automatic increases each and every year.

Earlier this year, the Medicare Board of Trustees issued their report on the financial status of Medicare. They stated that Medicare will go bankrupt in a couple of years. Yet, rather that seeking to address this issue, the Democrats simply ignore the realities and pretend that this problem does not exist. It is irresponsible for the Democrats to simply stick their head in the sand and pretend that Medicare will not run out of money, but that is the path they have chosen—their budget does nothing to address this looming bankruptcy. I believe our seniors deserve better. If we simply allowed entitlement programs to grow at 4.1 percent a year rather than the 4.7 percent a year proposed in the Democrats budget, we could save Medicare and Social Security for future generations.

Their PAYGO rules continue not only to favor automatic increases in spending and higher taxes, but they also allow them to spend now and pay for the spending later. By spending now, they also increase the baseline budget so that it is easier to continue increased spending in future years.

The Democrat budget also eliminates the domestic emergency reserve fund contained in the current law, and provides no criteria for domestic emergency spending—which is exempt from budget disciplines. Absent a reserve fund, Democrats are destined to repeat in 2008, what they just did this month—designate another $28 billion in ''emergency spending'' bypassing all of the budgetary discipline rules. If there is any doubt about the Democrats' lack of budgetary discipline the fact that the majority of their caucus just voted for substitute budgets that increase taxes by between $950 and $717 billion. That is more than twice the tax increase in their base bill. And on the spending side, these alternative budgets would have increased spending by hundreds of billions of dollars more.

Another unrealistic assumption in the Democrat budget plan is their assumption that they will receive over $392.5 billion in new tax revenue that they will be able to use for spending and reducing the deficit by closing the mystical tax gap. Yet The Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service has testified the IRS could collect, at best, about $20 billion of these taxes 5 years after implementing specific policies recommended in the President's budget.

The Democrats remove the firewall between defense and non-defense spending enabling them to cut the defense spending further and spend the money on other programs.

If there was ever any doubt about that Congressional Democrats are the party of ''Tax and Spend'' those doubts are put to bed today, as they have come out in spades for both.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my support for Mr. RYAN's budget alternative. While I maintain that we could have done a better job balancing the budget in a shorter timeframe, it is a good first step in tackling runaway entitlement spending.

This debate is more that just a debate about numbers. It is a debate about who we are as Americans, what we believe and hold sacred, and what we want the future to hold for our children. It is also about how Congress spends hard working taxpayer's dollars.

Democrats and Republicans differ philosophically on these issues. John Locke, who inspired our Founding Fathers, wrote that one of the ends of political society is the preservation of one's property.

The Democrat budget violates this principle by redistributing your hard earned tax dollars to their favorite projects. They spend at a deficit rate, running up your national credit card, and the taxpayers end up getting the bill.

The big spending Pelosi budget maintains that more government is better government. In fact, if the Pelosi budget were a McDonald's combo meal, the Democrats would be saying—Super size me! And they are sticking you with the bill for their lunch. To protect taxpayers we need self-control and moderation. The Pelosi budget does nothing to curb the appetite for bigger government or trim Federal spending. True courage is taking a tough stand and choosing to cut spending.

I believe in limited government, not a government without limits on runaway spending and high taxes. I believe increased taxation chips away at our freedom to spend or save our own money.

As a small businessman who built his business from the ground up, I know that it is individuals who put their hard work and innovation to the test—not government.

I believe that the best way to balance the budget is to control spending—not to raise taxes. This Pelosi budget marks the largest tax increase in American history—raising taxes on the hard working American taxpayer by $400 billion. Each of my constituents in Iowa will have to pay an additional $2,777.00 annually in taxes.

One in five Americans has little to no personal property or savings. Additional taxation hurts American families who are trying to save for their retirement and children's education, to purchase a home, or to purchase a car. The Pelosi budget eliminates the 10 percent bracket that helps millions of low-income workers. Raising taxes on capital gains and dividends discourages investment and savings. Families will suffer from the Pelosi budget slashing the child tax credit in half and reinstating the marriage penalty.

We are told that when we die that ''you can't take it with you.'' This is true, but we all hope that we can pass on our nest eggs to our children without penalty. The Pelosi budget allows the elimination of the death tax in 2010 to expire.

We must keep American business competitive in the face of economic pressure from countries like China and India. Democrats, especially the gentlelady from Northwestern Ohio, like to keep a corporate casualty list of jobs lost, in the United States. They mention Hershey, Hoover, Stanley, Champion, Ford, Chrysler, Huffy, Zebco, Levis and Maytag, as companies who have shipped thousands of U.S. jobs to other countries. Some of these companies could no longer compete globally and were eventually bought out or shut down.

The Pelosi budget will accelerate this process and will burden American businesses, which employ and create new jobs for American workers. It will usher in the largest tax hike in history. It will raise taxes on our small businesses and the manufacturers making it that much harder for them to compete in the world economy. Our businesses already pay the second highest tax rates in the entire world.

Mr. Chairman, I implore my colleagues to stop this runaway spending, financed by a massive tax hike on American taxpayers. Let us turn around the ship and head for dry land. This Pelosi budget is a sinking ship, full of spending loopholes and budget gimmicks. I have no problem with Captain PELOSI going down with the ship—just do not take America down in the process.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. All time for debate on the amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentlewoman is recognized.

There was no objection.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Chairman, today this new Congress will put America's fiscal house in order. It will do so by presenting and voting on the Democratic budget as designed by Mr. SPRATT, the chairman of the Budget Committee, and the House Democrats. I wish that it were coming to the floor with bipartisan support in the Congress. I know it has bipartisan support in the country.

I commend Mr. SPRATT for his exceptional leadership in bringing to the floor a budget for the future, a budget that will initiate an era of accountability in government spending and in government accountability on our priorities. It is a budget that will come to balance in both the spending and also in terms of its priorities.

This putting our house in order is necessary because for the last 6 years the Bush administration and the Republicans in Congress have increased spending while giving tax cuts to the wealthiest few in our country, leaving our country awash in red ink, mortgaging our children's future. It is just not right.

When President Bush took office, he inherited a budget situation because of the PAYGO principles adopted by the Clinton administration with the Democrats in the Congress. Because of those principles, the last four Clinton budgets were budgets in surplus. Because of those PAYGO principles, coming out of the Clinton years, we were on a trajectory of $5.6 trillion in surplus, $5.6 trillion in surplus on our way to ridding ourselves of the national debt.

Because of the irresponsible budgeting of the Republicans in Congress and in the White House, we are now on a trajectory of $3 trillion in deficit, a swing of approximately $9 trillion. This is historic, and, again, it is wrong. It is wrong for our children. It mortgages their future. It is wrong for our economy.

The fiscal unaccountability will be corrected today with the passage of this budget, and I commend Chairman

SPRATT and the Democrats on the committee for taking us to this place. Just imagine, we were on our way to ridding ourselves of the national debt. We are now on our way to increasing it.

The budget put forth by the chairman is one that honors our responsibilities to the American people. A budget should be a statement of our national values. Our Federal budget should reflect what is important to us as a Nation. That is how we should allocate our resources. We should do it in an ethical way and a fiscally sound way and the most honest and open way. And we must do it always with an eye to the future, and that is what this budget does.

It honors our responsibility first and foremost to protect the American people, and that is why it has the endorsement of almost every veterans group, and they are actively supporting this legislation and advocating a ''yes'' vote.

It honors our commitment to grow our economy, to create good paying jobs for the future by investing in innovation, and that is why it has the support of the Council of Competitiveness and almost any entity that is geared to the future, to innovation and to make keeping America number one.

It honors our commitment to our children, how they are cared for, with their health care, with their education and the economic strengths of their families. That is why it has the support of so many organizations, religious organizations, who see a budget as a moral document.

It honors our commitment to preserve our planet for the future, and that is why it has the support right to left, Democratic and Republican, nonpartisan, nonconflict, any entity that you can name involved in preserving our planet, in energy independence and respecting God's creation, which nature is, honoring our commitment to nature and to the future, preserving the planet. This budget does that.

Again, it does it all in a fiscally sound way. No new deficit spending; pay-as-you-go.

Think about what was inherited by this Congress. Think about what was inherited by this Congress 6 years ago and the President, $5.6 trillion in surplus, now we are $3 trillion in a trajectory of deficit. It is just not right. We can reverse it today.

Again, the support outside this Congress indicates that the American people are so far ahead of the Congress of the United States when they think about our values and how our budget should reflect those values, about accountability and how responsible we should be for the taxpayers' dollars and about the future.

So I urge my colleagues to support the Spratt House Democratic budget. To vote ''aye'' on that is a vote for the future. It is a vote for a new era of accountability. It is a vote for a moral statement, a statement of our national values. I thank Mr. SPRATT for his leadership.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. WOOLSEY

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 81, noes 340, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 210]

AYES—81

Abercrombie
Baldwin
Becerra
Blumenauer
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carson
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cummings
Davis (IL)
Delahunt
Doyle
Ellison
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kilpatrick
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Lynch
Markey
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Miller, George
Moore (WI)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Olver
Pallone
Pastor
Payne
Price (NC)
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schakowsky
Serrano
Slaughter
Solis
Stark
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Velázquez
Waters
Watson
Waxman
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Woolsey
Wynn

NOES—340

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Gene
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Kagen
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Obey
Ortiz
Pascrell
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Kucinich

NOT VOTING—16

Boyda (KS)
Cardoza
Davis, Jo Ann
Faleomavaega
Hooley
Hunter
Kanjorski
Lampson
Lewis (CA)
Millender-McDonald
Moran (VA)
Oberstar
Pomeroy
Rangel
Smith (TX)
Watt

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1249

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. BOOZMAN and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. POMEROY. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 210, I was unavoidably detained on an important constituent matter and arrived at the House floor after the time for voting had expired. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas. Madam Chairman, on rollcall No. 210, I missed this vote because I was meeting with constituents from Kansas. I arrived moments after the vote was closed. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Ms. HOOLEY. Madam Chairman, on rollcall 210, on House Concurrent Resolution 99, on the budget for the fiscal year 2008, had I been present I would have voted ''no.''

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. THOMPSON of California). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 110–79, which is debatable for 40 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 3 offered by Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2009 through 2012 are set forth.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 201. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.

TITLE III—POLICY STATEMENTS

Sec. 301. Policy of the United States Congress on taxation.
Sec. 302. Policy of the United States Congress on entitlement spending.

TITLE IV—GENERAL BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 401. Restrictions on advance appropriations.
Sec. 402. Contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism and for unanticipated defense needs.
Sec. 403. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
Sec. 404. Adjustments to reflect changes in concepts and definitions.
Sec. 405. Compliance with section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.
Sec. 406. Exercise of rulemaking powers.
Sec. 407. Adjustments for tax legislation.
Sec. 408. Repeal of the Gephardt rule.
Sec. 409. Budget compliance statements.
Sec. 410. Cost estimates for conference reports and unreported measures.
Sec. 411. Roll call votes for new spending.
Sec. 412. Budget process reform.
Sec. 413. Treasury Department study and report.
Sec. 414. Assistance by Federal agencies to standing committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives.
Sec. 415. Budgetary treatment of the National Flood Insurance Program.

TITLE V—EMERGENCY RESERVE FUND

Sec. 501. Nondefense reserve fund for emergencies.
Sec. 502. Emergency criteria.
Sec. 503. Development of guidelines for application of emergency definition.
Sec. 504. Committee notification of emergency legislation.
Sec. 505. Up-to-date tabulations.

TITLE VI—LEGISLATIVE LINE ITEM VETO AUTHORITY

Sec. 601. Presidential recommendations.
Sec. 602. Procedures in United States Congress.
Sec. 603. Identification of targeted tax benefits.
Sec. 604. Additional matters.
Sec. 605. Expiration.
Sec. 606. Sense of Congress on deferral authority.
Sec. 607. Sense of Congress on abuse of proposed cancellations.

TITLE VII—EARMARK TRANSPARENCY

Sec. 701. Prohibition on obligation of funds for earmarks included only in congressional reports.
Sec. 702. Definitions.

TITLE VIII—PAY-AS-YOU-GO.

Sec. 801. Pay-as-you-go point of order.

TITLE IX—DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

Sec. 901. Discretionary spending limits in the House.

TITLE X—SENSES OF CONGRESS

Sec. 1001. Sense of the House regarding the importance of child support enforcement.
Sec. 1002. Sense of the House on State veterans cemetaries.
Sec. 1003. Sense of Congress on health insurance reform.
Sec. 1004. Sense of the House on the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $2,002,088,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,097,634,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,148,718,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,244,002,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,374,337,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be decreased are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $48,912,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $9,366,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $15,282,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $150,998,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $222,663,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $2,452,253,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,432,323,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,464,843,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,575,993,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,613,919,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $2,427,922,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,484,251,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,468,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,529,608,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,530,737,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $425,834,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $386,617,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $319,682,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $285,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $156,400,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $9,476,349,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $9,979,952,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $10,418,522,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $10,820,002,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $11,105,786,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $5,284,759,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $5,467,610,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $5,570,986,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $5,624,371,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $5,537,610,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2008 through 2012 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $648,770,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $617,792,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $584,705,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $626,892,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $550,790,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $561,384,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $564,117,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $536,057,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $579,375,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $525,407,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $31,989,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,637,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $32,387,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,263,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $32,199,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,873,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $32,268,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,679,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $32,336,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,774,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $27,461,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,413,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $25,083,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,674,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $25,083,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,531,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $25,083,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,915,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $25,083,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,894,000,000.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $1,513,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $488,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $2,751,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,258,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $2,754,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,340,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $2,748,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,294,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $2,726,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,499,000,000.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $30,564,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $30,425,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,411,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $29,958,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,754,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $29,365,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,129,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $29,250,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,890,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $20,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,401,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $20,183,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,412,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $19,988,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,120,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $19,502,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,876,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $19,099,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,645,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $8,127,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,237,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $8,020,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−413,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $7,731,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−638,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $7,486,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−1,105,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $7,384,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−845,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $79,363,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $79,252,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $73,326,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $80,458,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $73,419,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $80,553,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $73,445,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $79,371,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $73,441,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $79,041,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $13,376,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,123,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $11,020,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,179,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $10,930,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,106,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $10,968,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,695,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $11,052,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,306,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $84,465,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $84,263,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $87,802,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $86,146,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $88,652,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $86,697,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $87,541,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $86,709,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $87,560,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $85,480,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $276,635,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $277,551,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $289,549,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $289,960,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $301,940,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $302,472,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $316,550,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $317,366,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $332,483,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $334,000,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $379,676,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $379,821,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $398,904,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $398,592,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $414,261,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $414,518,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $450,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $450,147,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $436,189,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $435,845,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $376,258,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $381,323,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $383,853,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $383,617,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $392,348,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $391,046,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $406,091,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $403,954,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $405,114,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $402,614,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $19,644,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,644,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $21,518,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,518,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $23,701,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,701,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $27,009,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,009,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $29,898,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,898,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $84,493,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $84,512,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $89,019,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $89,033,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $92,397,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $90.798,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $98,286,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $96,779,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $96,528,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $94,838,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $45,765,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,432,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $45,471,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,631,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $45,742,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,466,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $45,995,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,323,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $46,198,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,166,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $17,873,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,353,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $17,844,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,013,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $20,270,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,262,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $17,801,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,649,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $18,264,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,230,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $370,521,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $370,421,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $388,836,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $387,436,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $410,258,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $405,258,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $431,411,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $421,411,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $450,561,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $434,561,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $6,439,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,544,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $−11,795,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−6,242,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $−5,709,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−6,972,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $−150,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $−3,007,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $4,167,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,286,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $−71,009,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−71,009,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $−66,578,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−66,587,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $−71,869,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−71,869,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $−69,623,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−69,643,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $−72,789,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−72,792,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSION TO PROVIDE FOR THE REFORM OF MANDATORY SPENDING.—(1) Not later than June 8, 2007, the House committees named in paragraph (2) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without substantive revision.

(2) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(A) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending by $452,000,000 for fiscal year 2008, $3,277,000,000 for fiscal year 2012, and $9,849,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2012.

(B) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—The House Committee on Armed Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending by $50,000,000 for fiscal year 2008, $100,000,000 for fiscal year 2012, and $410,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2012.

(C) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR.—The House Committee on Education and Labor shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending by $3,456,000,000 for fiscal year 2008, $400,000,000 for fiscal year 2012, and $4,906,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2012.

(D) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending by $8,344,000,000 for fiscal year 2008, $30,602,000,000 for fiscal year 2012, and $97,359,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2012.

(E) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The House Committee on Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending by $00,000,000 for fiscal year 2008, $140,000,000 for fiscal year 2012, and $400,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2012.

(F) COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS.—The House Committee on Foreign Relations shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending by $20,000,000 for fiscal year 2008, $90,000,000 for fiscal year 2012, and $250,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2012.

(G) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The House Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending by $265,000,000 for fiscal year 2008, $1,010,000,000 for fiscal year 2012, and $3,515,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2012.

(H) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—The House Committee on Natural Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending by $1,507,000,000 for fiscal year 2008, $535,000,000 for fiscal year 2012, and $4,647,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2012.

(I) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending by $460,000,000 for fiscal year 2008, $1,063,000,000 for fiscal year 2012, and $4,272,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2012.

(J) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending by $10,109,000,000 for fiscal year 2008, $41,543,000,000 for fiscal year 2012, and $153,122,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2012, sufficient to reduce revenues by not more than $48,912,000,000 for fiscal year 2008 and by not more than $447,221,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2012.

(b) SUBMISSION OF REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—(1) Upon the submission to the Committee on the Budget of the House of a recommendation that has complied with its reconciliation instructions solely by virtue of section 310(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the chairman of that committee may file with the House appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of such Act and revised functional levels and aggregates.

(2) Upon the submission to the House of a conference report recommending a reconciliation bill or resolution in which a committee has complied with its reconciliation instructions solely by virtue of this section, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House may file with the House appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of such Act and revised functional levels and aggregates.

(3) Allocations and aggregates revised pursuant to this subsection shall be considered to be allocations and aggregates established by the concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 301 of such Act.

TITLE III—POLICY STATEMENTS

SEC. 301. POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS ON TAXATION.

The United States Congress reaffirms the statement of principle that the Federal Government should not raise taxes on American families or reverse the policies that have led to strong growth in the United States economy, and instead should move towards balancing the budget by reigning in the Federal Government's spending; it is further the policy assumption underlying this resolution that the tax relief enacted in 2001 and 2003 should be continued.

SEC. 302. POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS ON ENTITLEMENT SPENDING.

(a) FINDINGS.—

(1) Entitlement growth is unsustainable. Entitlements are currently growing at 6 percent per yearsignificantly faster than our entire economy, and more than twice the rate of inflation.

(2) Entitlements currently consume more than half of the entire Federal budget. If simply left on ''auto-pilot'' (assuming no new entitlement spending or benefits):

(A) By 2015 in less than a decade

(B) By 2040 social security, medicare, and medicaid alone will consume 20 percent of our economy

(C) By 2040 Americans will have to pay twice the current rate of taxes

(3) Entitlements must be reformed to survive with the retirement of the baby boomers, the situation will only get worse, making the necessary reforms more sudden and severe.

(4) Entitlements aren't all that's at risk. If left unreformed, these programs will also impose a crushing burden on both the budget and the economy. Our now strong economy, which has created millions of jobs and been the key factor in reducing the deficit. Entitlements will eventually crowd out all other priorities such as education, veterans, science, agriculture, environment, even defense and homeland security.

(5) The rising costs of government entitlements are a ''fiscal cancer'' that threaten ''catastrophic consequences for our country'' and could ''bankrupt America'' said America's chief accountant, U.S. Comptroller General David Walker.

(6) 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'' warned Fed Chairman Ben Bernanke.

(7) Spending is the problem. Massive Tax Hikes are Not the Solution. Even if taxes are raised to balance the budget in the short term, entitlements would quickly drive the Federal Government back into deficit.

(8) The U.S. Comptroller General testified that the United States Government ''cannot grow [its] way out of this problem; eliminating earmarks will not solve the problem; wiping out fraud, waste, and abuse will not solve the problem; ending the war or cutting way back on defense will not solve the problem''.

(9) The budget must drive entitlement reform. Entitlement programs are well-intended, and provide a critical safety net for millions of Americans, but their costs are out of control, and growing worse every yeartypically without regular reform or congressional oversight. Congress must use the budget process to promote reforms that will make these programs better, more efficient, and more sustainable for the long term.

(b) POLICY ON ENTITLEMENTS.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress must immediately address the out-of-control growth of entitlement spending that may do substantial harm to the United States economy and hurt the standard of living of future generations. Furthermore, Congress must also commit itself to consider during this fiscal year fundamental reform packages to secure the long-term solvency of medicare, medicaid and social security.

SEC. 303. BONNEVILLE POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATION.

It is the policy of this resolution that it does not specifically assume any savings from the President's proposal related to the Bonneville Power Marketing Administrations and the Energy and Commerce Committee will determine its own policies subject to the applicable numerical allocation limits and reconciliation directives.

TITLE IV—GENERAL BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 401. RESTRICTIONS ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) In the House, except as provided in subsection (b), an advance appropriation may not be reported in a bill or joint resolution making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation, and may not be in order as an amendment thereto.

(2) Managers on the part of the House may not agree to a Senate amendment that would violate paragraph (1) unless specific authority to agree to the amendment first is given by the House by a separate vote with respect thereto.

(b) ADVANCE APPROPRIATION.—In the House, an advance appropriation may be provided for the fiscal years 2009 and 2010 for

programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this resolution under the heading ''Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations'' in an aggregate amount not to exceed $23,565,000,000 in new budget authority in each year.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''advance appropriation'' means any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2008 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2008.

SEC. 402. CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS RELATED TO THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM AND FOR UNANTICIPATED DEFENSE NEEDS.

(a) EXEMPTION OF CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS RELATED TO THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM AND FOR UNANTICIPATED DEFENSE NEEDS.—In the House, if any bill or joint resolution is reported, or an amendment is offered thereto or a conference report is filed thereon, that makes appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, then the new budget authority, new entitlement authority, outlays, or receipts resulting therefrom shall not count for purposes of titles III or IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(b) CURRENT LEVEL.—Amounts included in this resolution for the purpose set forth in this section shall be considered to be current law for purposes of the preparation of the current level of budget authority and outlays and the appropriate levels shall be adjusted upon the enactment of such bill.

SEC. 403. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution__

(1) the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the appropriate Committee on the Budget; and

(2) such chairman may make any other necessary adjustments to such levels to reflect the timing of responses to reconciliation directives pursuant to section 201 of this resolution.

SEC. 404. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

Upon the enactment of a bill or joint resolution providing for a change in concepts or definitions, the appropriate chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make adjustments to the levels and allocations in this resolution in accordance with section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002).

SEC. 405. COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 13301 OF THE BUDGET ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1990.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House and the Senate, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—In the House, for purposes of applying section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any discretionary amounts provided for the Social Security Administration.

SEC. 406. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, or of that House to which they specifically apply, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change those rules (so far as they relate to that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

SEC. 407. ADJUSTMENTS FOR TAX LEGISLATION.

In the House, if the Committee on Ways and Means reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment is offered thereto or a conference report is submitted thereon, that amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 by extending the expiration dates for Federal tax policies that expired during fiscal year 2008 or that expire during the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2012, then the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make appropriate adjustments in the allocations and aggregates of budget authority, outlays, and revenue set forth in this resolution to reflect the budgetary effects of such legislation, but only to the extent the adjustments would not cause the level of revenue to be less than the level of revenue provided for in this resolution for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2012 and would not cause the deficit to exceed the appropriate level of deficits provided for in this resolution for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2012.

SEC. 408. REPEAL OF THE GEPHARDT RULE.

With respect to the adoption by the Congress of a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008, the clerk of the House shall not prepare an engrossment of a joint resolution increasing or decreasing, as the case may be, the statutory limit on the public debt.

SEC. 409. BUDGET COMPLIANCE STATEMENTS.

Each report of a committee on a public bill or public joint resolution shall contain a budget compliance statement prepared by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, if timely submitted prior to the filing of the report, which shall include assessment by such chairman as to whether the bill or joint resolution complies with the requirements of sections 302, 303, 306, 311, and 401 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

SEC. 410. COST ESTIMATES FOR CONFERENCE REPORTS AND UNREPORTED MEASURES.

It shall not be in order to consider a conference report or an unreported bill or joint resolution unless an estimate of costs as described in clause 3(d)(2) of Rule XIII has been printed in the Congressional Record at least one day before its consideration.

SEC. 411. ROLL CALL VOTES FOR NEW SPENDING.

The yeas and nays shall be considered as ordered when the Speaker puts the question on passage of a bill or joint resolution, or on adoption of a conference report, for which the chairman of the Budget Committee has advised the Speaker that such bill, joint resolution or conference report authorizes or provides new budget authority of not less than $50,000,000. The Speaker may not entertain a unanimous consent request or motion to suspend this section.

SEC. 412. BUDGET PROCESS REFORM.

Before September 30, 2007, the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives shall introduce, and the committee shall conduct hearings on, budget reform legislation that includes the following provisions:

(1) Statutory discretionary spending limits.

(2) Provisions to slow the growth of entitlement spending by requiring offsets for new benefits, and examining programs with annual increases higher than the rate of inflation.

(3) Presidential legislative line item veto authority that preserves Congress' constitutional power of the purse by requiring an expedited up or down vote on the President's proposals.

(4) Enforcement tools that restrict the definition of ''emergency'' so that emergency supplemental appropriation bills include only needs that are sudden, urgent, unforeseen, unpredictable, unanticipated, and temporary in nature.

(5) Accrual accounting of the Government's long-term obligations.

(6) Periodic reporting from the Government Accountability Office that examine the causes of long-term deficits and present options to reduce these deficits.

(7) Annual audit summaries from the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board for all departments of the Government that represent more than 20 percent of discretionary spending, with recommendations on how to improve the quality of financial information available to Congress.

SEC. 413. TREASURY DEPARTMENT STUDY AND REPORT.

(a) REQUEST.—Not later than June 1, 2007, the chairman or ranking member of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives shall submit a request to the Secretary of the Treasury for a study of the impact of the current United States tort system on global competition and gross domestic product (GDP) growth.

(b) SUBMISSION OF STUDY.—The results of the study described in subsection (a) shall be submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives not later than September 30, 2007.

SEC. 414. ASSISTANCE BY FEDERAL AGENCIES TO STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE AND THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) INFORMATION REGARDING AGENCY APPROPRIATIONS REQUESTS.—To assist each standing committee of the House of Representatives and the Senate in carrying out its responsibilities, the chairman of each authorizing committee of the House and Senate shall request the head of each Federal agency which administers the laws or parts of laws under the jurisdiction of such committee, to provide to such committee such studies, information, analyses, reports, and assistance.

(b) INFORMATION REGARDING AGENCY PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION.—To assist each standing committee of the House of Representatives and the Senate in carrying out its responsibilities, the chairman of each authorizing committee of the House and Senate shall request of the head of any agency under

his committee's jurisdiction, to furnish to such committee documentation, containing information received, compiled, or maintained by the agency as part of the operation or administration of a program, or specifically compiled pursuant to a request in support of a review of a program, as may be requested by the chairman and ranking minority member of such committee.

(c) SUMMARIES BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—Within thirty days after the receipt of a request from a chairman and ranking minority member of a standing committee having jurisdiction over a program being reviewed and studied by such committee under this section, the Comptroller General of the United States shall furnish to such committee summaries of any audits or reviews of such program which the Comptroller General has completed during the preceding six years.

(d) CONGRESSIONAL ASSISTANCE.—Consistent with their duties and functions under law, the Comptroller General of the United States, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, and the Director of the Congressional Research Service shall continue to furnish (consistent with established protocols) to each standing committee of the House of Representatives or the Senate such information, studies, analyses, and reports as the chairman and ranking minority member may request to assist the committee in conducting reviews and studies of programs under this section.

SEC. 415. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF THE NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM.

(a) TREATMENT.—For purposes of the allocations and aggregates in this resolution, the reconciliation directives established by this resolution, and for any other purpose under titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, amendment thereto, or conference report thereon, or any recommendations submitted pursuant to section 201 that includes the reforms set forth in subsection (b) shall be scored without regard to the obligations resulting from the enactment of Public Law 109–208. Such estimate shall assume the liquidating of the National Flood Insurance Fund's remaining contractual obligations resulting from claims made as a result of floods that occurred in 2005.

(b) LEGISLATION.—The legislation referred to in subsection (a) shall—

(1) establish more actuarially sound rates on policies issued by the National Flood Insurance Program; and

(2) end flood insurance subsidies on pre-FIRM structures not used as primary residences.

TITLE V—EMERGENCY RESERVE FUND

SEC. 501. NONDEFENSE RESERVE FUND FOR EMERGENCIES.

(a) NONDEFENSE SET ASIDE.—

(1) DISCRETIONARY SET ASIDE FUND.—In the House and except as provided by subsection (b), if a bill or joint resolution is reported, or an amendment is offered thereto (or considered as adopted) or a conference report is filed thereon, that provides new discretionary budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom), and such provision is designated as an emergency pursuant to this section, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make adjustments to the allocations and aggregates set forth in this resolution up to the amount of such provisions if the requirements set forth in section 504 are met, but the sum of all adjustments made under this paragraph shall not exceed $6,450,000,000 for fiscal year 2008.

(2) OTHER ADJUSTMENTS.—In the House, if a bill or joint resolution is reported or a conference report is filed thereon, and a direct spending or receipt provision included therein is designated as an emergency pursuant to this paragraph, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make adjustments to the allocations and aggregates set forth in this resolution.

(b) ADDITIONAL ADJUSTMENT PROCEDURES.—In the House, before any adjustment is made pursuant to this section for any bill, joint resolution, or conference report that designates a provision an emergency, the enactment of which would cause the total amount of the set aside fund set forth in subsection (a)(1) for fiscal year 2008 to be exceeded:

(1) The chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall convene a meeting of that committee, where it shall be in order, subject to the terms set forth in this section, for one motion described in paragraph (2) to be made to authorize the chairman to make adjustments above the maximum amount of adjustments set forth in subsection (a). If the Chairman does not call such a meeting within 24 hours of a committee reporting such a measure, any member of the Committee may call such a meeting.

(2) The motion referred to in paragraph (1) shall be in the following form: ''I move that the chairman of the Committee on the Budget be authorized to adjust the allocations and aggregates set forth in the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008 by the following amount: $_____ for fiscal year 2008.'', with the blank being filled in with amount determined by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget. For any measure referred to in subsection (a)(1), such amount shall not exceed the total amount for fiscal year 2008 designated as an emergency in excess of the applicable amount remaining in the set aside fund.

(3) The motion set forth in paragraph (2) shall be open for debate and amendment, but any amendment offered thereto is only in order if limited to changing an amount in the motion.

(4) Except as provided by paragraph (5), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may not make any adjustments under subsection (a) or subsection (b) unless or until the committee filing a report or joint statement of managers on a conference report on a measure including an emergency designation fulfills the terms set forth in section 504.

(5) The chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make any adjustments he deems necessary under this section if he determines the enactment of the provision or provisions designated as an emergency is essential to respond to an urgent and imminent need, the chairman determines the exceptional circumstances referred to in rule 3 of the rules of the committee are met and the committee cannot convene to consider the motion referred to in this section in a timely fashion.

(c) APPLICATION OF ADJUSTMENTS.—The adjustments made pursuant to subsection (a) or (b) shall

(1) apply while that bill, joint resolution, conference report or amendment is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that legislation; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

SEC. 502. EMERGENCY CRITERIA.

As used in this title:

(1) The term ''emergency'' means a situation that—

(A) requires new budget authority and outlays (or new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom) for the prevention or mitigation of, or response to, loss of life or property, or a threat to national security; and

(B) is unanticipated.

(2) The term ''unanticipated'' means that the underlying situation is—

(A) Sudden, which means quickly coming into being or not building up over time;

(B) Urgent, which means a pressing and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(C) Unforeseen, which means not predicted or anticipated as an emerging need; and

(D) Temporary, which means not of a permanent duration.

SEC. 503. DEVELOPMENT OF GUIDELINES FOR APPLICATION OF EMERGENCY DEFINITION.

In the House, as soon as practicable after the adoption of this resolution, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall, after consultation with the chairmen of the applicable committees, the Ranking Member of the Committee on the Budget, and the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, prepare additional guidelines for application of the definition of an emergency and shall issue a committee print from the Committee on the Budget for this purpose.

SEC. 504. COMMITTEE NOTIFICATION OF EMERGENCY LEGISLATION.

(a) COMMITTEE NOTIFICATION.—Whenever a committee of the House (including a committee of conference) reports any bill or joint resolution that includes a provision designated as an emergency pursuant to this title, the report accompanying that bill or joint resolution (or the joint explanatory statement of managers in the case of a conference report on any such bill or joint resolution) shall identify all provisions that provide amounts designated as an emergency and shall provide an explanation of the manner in which the provision meets the criteria set forth in section 502.

(b) CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.—If such a measure is to be considered by the House without being reported by the committee of jurisdiction, then the committee shall cause the explanation to be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

SEC. 505. UP-TO-DATE TABULATIONS.

The Committee on the Budget of the House shall publish in the Congressional Record up-to-date tabulations of amounts remaining in the set aside fund set forth in section 501, or authorized in excess thereof, as soon as practicable after the enactment of such amounts designated as emergencies.

TITLE VI—LEGISLATIVE LINE ITEM VETO AUTHORITY

SEC. 601. PRESIDENTIAL RECOMMENDATIONS.

(a) PROPOSED CANCELLATIONS.—If, within 45 calendar days after the enactment of any bill or joint resolution providing any discretionary budget authority, item of direct spending, limited tariff benefit, or targeted tax benefit, the President proposes, in the manner provided in subsection (b), the cancellation of any dollar amount of such discretionary budget authority, item of direct spending, or targeted tax benefit, such recommendation shall be introduced as a free-standing measure consistent with the terms of this title and shall be eligible for the expedited procedures set forth herein. If the 45 calendar-day period expires during a period where either House of Congress stands adjourned sine die at the end of a Congress or for a period greater than 45 calendar days, the President may propose a cancellation under this section and transmit a special message under subsection (b) on the first calendar day of session following such a period of adjournment.

(b) TRANSMITTAL OF SPECIAL MESSAGE.—

(1) SPECIAL MESSAGE.—

(A) CONTENTS OF SPECIAL MESSAGE.—Each special message shall specify, with respect to the discretionary budget authority, items of direct spending proposed, limited tariff benefits, or targeted tax benefits to be canceled—

(i) the dollar amount of discretionary budget authority, the specific item of direct spending (that OMB, after consultation with CBO, estimates to increase budget authority or outlays as required by section 1017(9)), the limited tariff benefit, or the targeted tax benefit that the President proposes be canceled;

(ii) any account, department, or establishment of the Government to which such discretionary budget authority is available for obligation, and the specific project or governmental functions involved;

(iii) the reasons why such discretionary budget authority, item of direct spending, limited tariff benefit, or targeted tax benefit should be canceled;

(iv) to the maximum extent practicable, the estimated fiscal, economic, and budgetary effect (including the effect on outlays and receipts in each fiscal year) of the proposed cancellation;

(v) to the maximum extent practicable, all facts, circumstances, and considerations relating to or bearing upon the proposed cancellation and the decision to propose the cancellation, and the estimated effect of the proposed cancellation upon the objects, purposes, or programs for which the discretionary budget authority, item of direct spending, limited tariff benefit, or the targeted tax benefit is provided;

(vi) a numbered list of cancellations to be included in an approval bill that, if enacted, would cancel discretionary budget authority, items of direct spending, limited tariff benefit, or targeted tax benefits proposed in that special message; and

(vii) if the special message is transmitted subsequent to or at the same time as another special message, a detailed explanation why the proposed cancellations are not substantially similar to any other proposed cancellation in such other message.

(C) DUPLICATIVE PROPOSALS PROHIBITED.—The President may not propose to cancel the same or substantially similar discretionary budget authority, item of direct spending, limited tariff benefit, or targeted tax benefit more than one time under this Act.

(D) MAXIMUM NUMBER OF SPECIAL MESSAGES.—The President may not transmit to the Congress more than 5 special messages under this subsection related to any bill or joint resolution described in subsection (a), but may transmit not more than 10 special messages for any omnibus budget reconciliation or appropriation measure.

(2) ENACTMENT OF APPROVAL BILL.—

(A) DEFICIT REDUCTION.—Amounts of budget authority, items of direct spending, limited tariff benefit, or targeted tax benefits which are canceled pursuant to enactment of a bill as provided under this section shall be dedicated only to reducing the deficit or increasing the surplus.

(B) ADJUSTMENT OF LEVELS IN THE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET.—Not later than 5 days after the date of enactment of an approval bill as provided under this section, the chairs of the Committees on the Budget of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall revise allocations and aggregates and other appropriate levels under the appropriate concurrent resolution on the budget to reflect the cancellation, and the applicable committees shall report revised suballocations pursuant to section 302(b), as appropriate.

(C) TRUST FUNDS AND SPECIAL FUNDS.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), nothing in this title shall be construed to require or allow the deposit of amounts derived from a trust fund or special fund which are canceled pursuant to enactment of a bill as provided under this section to any other fund.

SEC. 602. PROCEDURES IN UNITED STATES CONGRESS.

(a) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The majority leader or minority leader of each House or his designee shall (by request) introduce an approval bill as defined in section 1017 not later than the third day of session of that House after the date of receipt of a special message transmitted to the Congress under section 1011(b). If the bill is not introduced as provided in the preceding sentence in either House, then, on the fourth day of session of that House after the date of receipt of the special message, any Member of that House may introduce the bill.

(2) CONSIDERATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(A) REFERRAL AND REPORTING.—Any committee of the House of Representatives to which an approval bill is referred shall report it to the House without amendment not later than the seventh legislative day after the date of its introduction. If a committee fails to report the bill within that period or the House has adopted a concurrent resolution providing for adjournment sine die at the end of a Congress, such committee shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of the bill and it shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

(B) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—After an approval bill is reported by or discharged from committee or the House has adopted a concurrent resolution providing for adjournment sine die at the end of a Congress, it shall be in order to move to proceed to consider the approval bill in the House. Such a motion shall be in order only at a time designated by the Speaker in the legislative schedule within two legislative days after the day on which the proponent announces his intention to offer the motion. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a motion to proceed with respect to that special message. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(C) CONSIDERATION.—The approval bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against an approval bill and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on an approval bill to its passage without intervening motion except five hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and one motion to limit debate on the bill. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the bill shall not be in order.

(D) SENATE BILL.—An approval bill received from the Senate shall not be referred to committee.

(3) CONSIDERATION IN THE SENATE.—

(A) MOTION TO PROCEED TO CONSIDERATION.—A motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill under this subsection in the Senate shall not be debatable. It shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the motion to proceed is agreed to or disagreed to.

(B) LIMITS ON DEBATE.—Debate in the Senate on a bill under this subsection, and all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith (including debate pursuant to subparagraph (D)), shall not exceed 10 hours, equally divided and controlled in the usual form.

(C) APPEALS.—Debate in the Senate on any debatable motion or appeal in connection with a bill under this subsection shall be limited to not more than 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled in the usual form.

(D) MOTION TO LIMIT DEBATE.—A motion in the Senate to further limit debate on a bill under this subsection is not debatable.

(E) MOTION TO RECOMMIT.—A motion to recommit a bill under this subsection is not in order.

(F) CONSIDERATION OF THE HOUSE BILL.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—If the Senate has received the House companion bill to the bill introduced in the Senate prior to the vote required under paragraph (1)(C), then the Senate may consider, and the vote under paragraph (1)(C) may occur on, the House companion bill.

(ii) PROCEDURES AFTER VOTE ON SENATE BILL.—If the Senate votes, pursuant to paragraph (1)(C), on the bill introduced in the Senate, then immediately following that vote, or upon receipt of the House companion bill, the House bill shall be deemed to be considered, read the third time, and the vote on passage of the Senate bill shall be considered to be the vote on the bill received from the House.

(b) AMENDMENTS PROHIBITED.—No amendment to, or motion to strike a provision from, a bill considered under this section shall be in order in either the Senate or the House of Representatives.

SEC. 603. IDENTIFICATION OF TARGETED TAX BENEFITS.

(a) STATEMENT.—The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Senate acting jointly (hereafter in this subsection referred to as ''the chairmen'' shall review any revenue or reconciliation bill or joint resolution which includes any amendment to the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that is being prepared for filing by a committee of conference of the two Houses, and shall identify whether such bill or joint resolution contains any targeted tax benefits. The chairmen shall provide to the committee of conference a statement identifying any such targeted tax benefits or declaring that the bill or joint resolution does not contain any targeted tax benefits. Any such statement shall be made available to any Member of Congress by the chairmen immediately upon request.

(b) STATEMENT INCLUDED IN LEGISLATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other rule of the House of Representatives or any rule or precedent of the Senate, any revenue or reconciliation bill or joint resolution which includes any amendment to the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 reported by a committee of conference of the two Houses may include, as a separate section of such bill or joint resolution, the information contained in the statement of the chairmen, but only in the manner set forth in paragraph (2).

(2) APPLICABILITY.—The separate section permitted under subparagraph (A) shall read as follows: ''Section 1021 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 shall _____ apply to _____,_____,000,000'', with the blank spaces being filled in with—

(A) in any case in which the chairmen identify targeted tax benefits in the statement required under subsection (a), the word ''only'' in the first blank space and a list of all of the specific provisions of the bill or joint resolution in the second blank space; or

(B) in any case in which the chairmen declare that there are no targeted tax benefits in the statement required under subsection (a), the word ''not'' in the first blank space and the phrase ''any provision of this Act'' in the second blank space.

(c) IDENTIFICATION IN REVENUE ESTIMATE.—With respect to any revenue or reconciliation bill or joint resolution with respect to which the chairmen provide a statement under subsection (a), the Joint Committee on Taxation shall—

(1) in the case of a statement described in subsection (b)(2)(A), list the targeted tax benefits in any revenue estimate prepared by

the Joint Committee on Taxation for any conference report which accompanies such bill or joint resolution, or

(2) in the case of a statement described in section 13(b)(2)(B), indicate in such revenue estimate that no provision in such bill or joint resolution has been identified as a targeted tax benefit.

(d) PRESIDENT'S AUTHORITY.—If any revenue or reconciliation bill or joint resolution is signed into law—

(1) with a separate section described in subsection (b)(2), then the President may use the authority granted in this section only with respect to any targeted tax benefit in that law, if any, identified in such separate section; or

(2) without a separate section described in subsection (b)(2), then the President may use the authority granted in this section with respect to any targeted tax benefit in that law.

SEC. 604. ADDITIONAL MATTERS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) APPROPRIATION LAW.—The term ''appropriation law'' means an Act referred to in section 105 of title I, United States Code, including any general or special appropriation Act, or any Act making supplemental, deficiency, or continuing appropriations, that has been signed into law pursuant to Article I, section 7, of the Constitution of the United States.

(2) APPROVAL BILL.—The term ''approval bill'' means a bill or joint resolution which only approves proposed cancellations of dollar amounts of discretionary budget authority, items of new direct spending, limited tariff benefits, or targeted tax benefits in a special message transmitted by the President under this part and—

(A) the title of which is as follows: ''A bill approving the proposed cancellations transmitted by the President on _____'', the blank space being filled in with the date of transmission of the relevant special message and the public law number to which the message relates;

(B) which does not have a preamble; and

(C) which provides only the following after the enacting clause: That the Congress approves of proposed cancellations _____, the blank space being filled in with a list of the cancellations contained in the President's special message, as transmitted by the President in a special message on _____, the blank space being filled in with the appropriate date, regarding _____, the blank space being filled in with the Public Law number to which the special message relates;

(D) which only includes proposed cancellations that are estimated by CBO to meet the definition of discretionary budgetary authority or items of direct spending, or limited tariff benefits, or that are identified as targeted tax benefits pursuant to section 1014;

(E) if any proposed cancellation other than discretionary budget authority or targeted tax benefits is estimated by CBO to not meet the definition of item of direct spending, then the approval bill shall include at the end: The President shall cease the suspension of the implementation of the following under section 1013 of the Legislative Line Item Veto Act of 2006: _____, the blank space being filled in with the list of such proposed cancellations; and

(F) if no CBO estimate is available, then the entire list of legislative provisions proposed by the President is inserted in the second blank space in subparagraph (C).

(3) CALENDAR DAY.—The term ''calendar day'' means a standard 24-hour period beginning at midnight.

(4) CANCEL OR CANCELLATION.—The terms ''cancel'' or ''cancellation'' means to prevent—

(A) budget authority from having legal force or effect;

(B) in the case of entitlement authority, to prevent the specific legal obligation of the United States from having legal force or effect;

(C) in the case of the food stamp program, to prevent the specific provision of law that provides such benefit from having legal force or effect; or

(D) a limited tariff benefit from having legal force or effect, and to make any necessary, conforming statutory change to ensure that such limited tariff benefit is not implemented; or

(E) a targeted tax benefit from having legal force or effect, and to make any necessary, conforming statutory change to ensure that such targeted tax benefit is not implemented and that any budgetary resources are appropriately canceled.

(5) CBO.—The term ''CBO'' means the Director of the Congressional Budget Office.

(6) DIRECT SPENDING.—The term ''direct spending'' means—

(A) budget authority provided by law (other than an appropriation law);

(B) entitlement authority; and

(C) the food stamp program.

(7) DOLLAR AMOUNT OF DISCRETIONARY BUDGET AUTHORITY.—(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term ''dollar amount of discretionary budget authority'' means the entire dollar amount of budget authority—

(i) specified in an appropriation law, or the entire dollar amount of budget authority or obligation limitation required to be allocated by a specific proviso in an appropriation law for which a specific dollar figure was not included;

(ii) represented separately in any table, chart, or explanatory text included in the statement of managers or the governing committee report accompanying such law;

(iii) required to be allocated for a specific program, project, or activity in a law (other than an appropriation law) that mandates the expenditure of budget authority from accounts, programs, projects, or activities for which budget authority is provided in an appropriation law;

(iv) represented by the product of the estimated procurement cost and the total quantity of items specified in an appropriation law or included in the statement of managers or the governing committee report accompanying such law; or

(v) represented by the product of the estimated procurement cost and the total quantity of items required to be provided in a law (other than an appropriation law) that mandates the expenditure of budget authority from accounts, programs, projects, or activities for which budget authority is provided in an appropriation law.

(B) The term ''dollar amount of discretionary budget authority'' does not include—

(i) direct spending;

(ii) budget authority in an appropriation law which funds direct spending provided for in other law;

(iii) any existing budget authority canceled in an appropriation law; or

(iv) any restriction, condition, or limitation in an appropriation law or the accompanying statement of managers or committee reports on the expenditure of budget authority for an account, program, project, or activity, or on activities involving such expenditure.

(8) ITEM OF DIRECT SPENDING.—The term ''item of direct spending'' means any provision of law that results in an increase in budget authority or outlays for direct spending relative to the most recent levels calculated consistent with the methodology used to calculate a baseline under section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and included with a budget submission under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, in the first year or the 5-year period for which the item is effective. However, such item does not include an extension or reauthorization of existing direct spending, but instead only refers to provisions of law that increase such direct spending.

(9) LIMITED TARIFF BENEFIT.—The term ''limited tariff benefit'' means any provision of law that modifies the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States in a manner that benefits 10 or fewer entities (as defined in paragraph (12)(B)).

(10) OMB.—The term ''OMB'' means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(11) OMNIBUS RECONCILIATION OR APPROPRIATION MEASURE.—The term ''omnibus reconciliation'' or ''appropriation measure'' means—

(A) in the case of a reconciliation bill, any such bill that is reported to its House by the Committee on the Budget; or

(B) in the case of an appropriation measure, any such measure that provides appropriations for programs, projects, or activities falling within 2 or more section 302(b) suballocations.

(12) TARGETED TAX BENEFIT.—

(A) The ''term targeted tax benefit'' means any revenue-losing provision that provides a Federal tax deduction, credit, exclusion, or preference to ten or fewer beneficiaries (determined with respect to either present law or any provision of which the provision is a part) under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in any year for which the provision is in effect;

(B) FOR PURPOSES OF SUBPARAGRAPH (A).—

(i) all businesses and associations that are members of the same controlled group of corporations (as defined in section 1563(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) shall be treated as a single beneficiary;

(ii) all shareholders, partners, members, or beneficiaries of a corporation, partnership, association, or trust or estate, respectively, shall be treated as a single beneficiary;

(iii) all employees of an employer shall be treated as a single beneficiary;

(iv) all qualified plans of an employer shall be treated as a single beneficiary;

(v) all beneficiaries of a qualified plan shall be treated as a single beneficiary;

(vi) all contributors to a charitable organization shall be treated as a single beneficiary;

(vii) all holders of the same bond issue shall be treated as a single beneficiary; and

(viii) if a corporation, partnership, association, trust or estate is the beneficiary of a provision, the shareholders of the corporation, the partners of the partnership, the members of the association, or the beneficiaries of the trust or estate shall not also be treated as beneficiaries of such provision;

(C) For the purpose of this paragraph, the term ''revenue-losing provision'' means any provision that is estimated to result in a reduction in federal tax revenues (determined with respect to either present law or any provision of which the provision is a part) for any one of the two following periods—

(i) the first fiscal year for which the provision is effective; or

(ii) the period of the 5 fiscal years beginning with the first fiscal year for which the provision is effective;

(D) the ''term targeted tax benefit'' does not include any provision which applies uniformly to an entire industry; and

(E) the terms used in this paragraph shall have the same meaning as those terms have generally in the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, unless otherwise expressly provided.

SEC. 605. EXPIRATION.

This title shall have no force or effect on or after October 1, 2012.

SEC. 606. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON DEFERRAL AUTHORITY.

It is the sense of Congress that legislation providing the authority to temporarily defer spending on proposed rescissions should be enacted.

SEC. 607. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON ABUSE OF PROPOSED CANCELLATIONS.

It is the sense of Congress that no President or any executive branch official should condition the inclusion or exclusion or threaten to condition the inclusion or exclusion of any proposed cancellation in any special message under this title upon any vote cast or to be cast by any Member of either House of Congress.

TITLE VII—EARMARK TRANSPARENCY

SEC. 701. PROHIBITION ON OBLIGATION OF FUNDS FOR EARMARKS INCLUDED ONLY IN CONGRESSIONAL REPORTS.

(a) REQUIREMENT THAT EARMARKS MUST BE IN LEGISLATIVE TEXT.—Notwithstanding any other rule of the House, in addition to the requirements set forth in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, it shall not be in order to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment thereto, or conference report thereon, unless the list of congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, and limited tariff benefits, required by clause 9(a)of rule XXI are also set forth in the text of such measure.

(b) AVAILABILITY ON THE INTERNET.—Notwithstanding any other rule of the House, in addition to the requirements set forth in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, it shall not be in order to consider any bill, joint resolution, or conference report thereon, unless the lists required by paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of clause 9 of rule XXI are made available on the Internet in a searchable format to the general public for at least 48 hours before consideration.

SEC. 702. DEFINITIONS.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL EARMARK.—The term ''congressional earmark'' means a provision or report language included primarily at the request of a Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, or Senator providing, authorizing or recommending a specific amount of discretionary budget authority, credit authority, or other spending authority for a contract, loan, loan guarantee, grant, loan authority, or other expenditure with or to an entity, or targeted to a specific State, locality or Congressional district, other than through a statutory or administrative formula-driven or competitive award process.

(b) LIMITED BENEFITS.—

(1) LIMITED TARIFF BENEFIT.—The term ''limited tariff benefit'' means any provision of law that modifies the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States in a manner that benefits 10 or fewer entities (as defined in paragraph (12)(B)).

(2) LIMITED TAX BENEFIT.—(A) The term ''limited tax benefit'' means any revenue-losing provision that provides a Federal tax deduction, credit, exclusion, or preference to ten or fewer beneficiaries (determined with respect to either present law or any provision of which the provision is a part) under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in any year for which the provision is in effect;

(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A)—

(i) all businesses and associations that are members of the same controlled group of corporations (as defined in section 1563(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) shall be treated as a single beneficiary;

(ii) all shareholders, partners, members, or beneficiaries of a corporation, partnership, association, or trust or estate, respectively, shall be treated as a single beneficiary;

(iii) all employees of an employer shall be treated as a single beneficiary;

(iv) all qualified plans of an employer shall be treated as a single beneficiary;

(v) all beneficiaries of a qualified plan shall be treated as a single beneficiary;

(vi) all contributors to a charitable organization shall be treated as a single beneficiary;

(vii) all holders of the same bond issue shall be treated as a single beneficiary; and

(viii) if a corporation, partnership, association, trust or estate is the beneficiary of a provision, the shareholders of the corporation, the partners of the partnership, the members of the association, or the beneficiaries of the trust or estate shall not also be treated as beneficiaries of such provision;

(C) For the purpose of this paragraph, the term ''revenue-losing provision'' means any provision that is estimated to result in a reduction in federal tax revenues (determined with respect to either present law or any provision of which the provision is a part) for any one of the two following periods—

(i) the first fiscal year for which the provision is effective; or

(ii) the period of the 5 fiscal years beginning with the first fiscal year for which the provision is effective;

(D) the term ''limited tax benefit'' does not include any provision which applies uniformly to an entire industry; and

(E) the terms used in this paragraph shall have the same meaning as those terms have generally in the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, unless otherwise expressly provided.

(c) SPECIAL RULE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of the Rules of the House, the definitions set forth in this section shall apply for congressional earmarks, limited tariff benefits, and limited tax benefits.

TITLE VIII—PAY-AS-YOU-GO.

SEC. 801. PAY-AS-YOU-GO POINT OF ORDER.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the House or the Senate to consider any direct spending legislation, excluding the impact of any revenue provisions, that would increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit for any 1 of 4 applicable time periods as measured in paragraphs (5) and (6).

(2) APPLICABLE TIME PERIODS.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ''applicable time period'' means any 1 of the 4 following periods:

(A) The current fiscal year.

(B) The budget year.

(C) The period of the 5 fiscal years following the current fiscal year.

(D) The period of the 5 fiscal years following the 5 fiscal years referred to in subparagraph (C).

(3) DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION.—For purposes of this subsection and except as provided in paragraph (4), the term ''direct spending legislation'' means any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that affects direct spending as that term is defined by, and interpreted for purposes of, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(4) BASELINE.—Estimates prepared pursuant to this subsection shall—

(A) use the most recent baseline estimates supplied by the Congressional Budget Office consistent with section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 used in considering a concurrent resolution on the budget; or

(B) after the beginning of a new calendar year and before consideration of a concurrent resolution on the budget, the most recent baseline estimates supplied by the Congressional Budget Office consistent with section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(5) PRIOR SURPLUS.—If direct spending or revenue legislation increases the on-budget deficit or causes an on-budget deficit when taken individually, it must also increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit when taken together with all direct spending and revenue legislation enacted since the beginning of the calendar year not accounted for in the baseline under paragraph (5)(A), except that direct spending or revenue effects resulting in net deficit reduction enacted in any bill pursuant to a reconciliation instruction since the beginning of that same calendar year shall never be made available on the pay-as-you-go ledger and shall be dedicated only for deficit reduction.

(b) DETERMINATION OF BUDGET LEVELS.—For purposes of this section, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, and revenues for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committees on the Budget.

(c) POINT OF ORDER PROTECTION IN THE HOUSE.—In the House, it shall not be in order to consider a rule or order that waives the application of subsection (a). As disposition of a point of order under this paragraph, the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the rule or order that waives the application of subsection (a). The question of consideration shall be debatable for 10 minutes by the Member initiating the point of order and for 10 minutes by an opponent, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn.

TITLE IX—DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

SEC. 901. DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS IN THE HOUSE.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House to consider any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto, that provides new budget authority that would cause the discretionary spending limits to be exceeded for any fiscal year.

(b) DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—In the House and as used in this section, the term ''discretionary spending limit'' means—

(1) with respect to fiscal year 2008, for the discretionary category: $1,079,593,000,000 in new budget authority and $1,127,623,000,000 in outlays;

(2) with respect to fiscal year 2009, for the discretionary category: $1,004,865,000,000 in new budget authority and $1,121,730,000,000 in outlays;

(3) with respect to fiscal year 2010, for the discretionary category: $977,058,000,000 in new budget authority and $1,050,106,000,000 in outlays;

as adjusted in conformance with subsection (c).

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) CHAIRMAN.—After the reporting of a bill or joint resolution, the offering of an amendment thereto, or the submission of a conference report thereon, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make the adjustments set forth in subparagraph (B) for the amount of new budget authority in that measure (if that measure meets the requirements set forth in paragraph (2)) and the outlays flowing from that budget authority. The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may also make appropriate adjustments for the reserve funds set forth in this resolution.

(B) MATTERS TO BE ADJUSTED.—The adjustments referred to in subparagraph (A) are to be made to—

(i) the discretionary spending limits, if any, set forth in the appropriate concurrent resolution on the budget;

(ii) the allocations made pursuant to the appropriate concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(iii) the budgetary aggregates as set forth in the appropriate concurrent resolution on the budget.

(2) AMOUNTS OF ADJUSTMENTS.—The adjustment referred to in paragraph (1) shall be an amount provided and designated as an emergency requirement;

(3) APPLICATION OF ADJUSTMENTS.—The adjustments made for legislation pursuant to paragraph (1) shall—

(A) apply while that legislation is under consideration;

(B) take effect upon the enactment of that legislation; and

(C) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(4) APPLICATION OF THIS SECTION.—The provisions of this section shall apply to legislation providing new budget authority for fiscal years 2008 through 2010.

(d) ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(1) WAIVER PROTECTION.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider a rule or order that waives the application of this section.

(2) CONSIDERATION IN THE HOUSE.—

(A) This subsection shall apply only to the House of Representatives.

(B) In order to be cognizable by the Chair, a point of order under this section must specify the precise language on which it is premised.

(C) As disposition of points of order under this section, the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the proposition that is the subject of the points of order.

(D) A question of consideration under this section shall be debatable for 10 minutes by each Member initiating a point of order and for 10 minutes by an opponent on each point of order, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn or that the Committee of the Whole rise, as the case may be.

(E) The disposition of the question of consideration under this subsection with respect to a bill or joint resolution shall be considered also to determine the question of consideration under this subsection with respect to an amendment made in order as original text.

(3) EXTENSION OF SPENDING LIMITS.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider a concurrent resolution on the budget as described in section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 unless such resolution incudes discretionary spending limits that are in the same amounts or less than those included in this section.

TITLE X—SENSES OF CONGRESS

SEC. 1001. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING THE IMPORTANCE OF CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT.

It is the Sense of the House that additional legislative action is needed to ensure that states have the necessary resources to collect all child support that is owed to families and to allow them to pass 100 percent of support on to families without financial penalty. It is further the Sense of the House that when 100 percent of child support payments are passed on to the child, rather than administrative expenses, program integrity is improved and child support participation increases.

SEC. 1002. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON STATE VETERANS CEMETARIES.

It is the sense of the House that the Federal Government should pay the plot allowance for the internment in a State veterans cemetery of any spouse or eligible child of a veteran, consistent with the pay-as-you-go principle.

SEC. 1003. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON HEALTH INSURANCE REFORM.

It is the sense of the Congress that legislation should be considered that does the following:

(1) Amends the Internal Revenue Code to allow individual taxpayers a refundable tax credit for health insurance costs paid for the benefit of the taxpayer, the taxpayer's spouse, and dependents.

(2) Requires business taxpayers who receive payments for certain employee health insurance coverage to file informational returns.

(3) Directs the Secretary of the Treasury to make advance payments of health insurance tax credit amounts to health insurance providers.

(4) Limits the tax exclusion for employer-provided health care coverage.

SEC. 1004. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE TERMINATION OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.—No tax shall be imposed by the Internal Revenue Code of 1986—

(1) for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 2010; and

(2) in the case of any tax not imposed on the basis of a taxable year, on any taxable event or for any period after December 31, 2010.

(b) EXCEPTION.—It is further the sense of the House of Representatives that legislation enacted pursuant to subsection (a) shall not apply to taxes imposed by—

(1) chapter 2 of such Code (relating to tax on self-employment income);

(2) chapter 21 of such Code (relating to Federal Insurance Contributions Act); and

(3) chapter 22 of such Code (relating to Railroad Retirement Tax Act).

(c) STRUCTURE OF A NEW FEDERAL TAX SYSTEM.—Congress declares that any new Federal tax system should be a simple and fair system that—

(1) applies a low rate to all Americans;

(2) provides tax relief for working Americans;

(3) protects the rights of taxpayers and reduces tax collection abuses;

(4) eliminates the bias against savings and investment;

(5) promotes economic growth and job creation; and

(6) does not penalize marriage or families.

(d) TIMING OF IMPLEMENTATION.—In order to ensure an easy transition and effective implementation, the Congress hereby declares that any new Federal tax system should be approved by Congress in its final form no later than July 4, 2010.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and a Member opposed each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, we are coming to the end of 2 days of debate on how to organize our Nation's finances; how do we want to prepare the budget for the next 5 years for our country.

This is a big debate. It is a debate that really underscores the different philosophies between our two parties.

The Democrats have chosen the path of higher spending and a lot higher taxes. The three Democrat budgets we had before us here on the floor today, one raised taxes by $400 billion, another raised taxes by $711 billion and a third one raised taxes by $949 billion.

The last tax increase we had was the last time the Democrats had the majority, and that was a $241 billion tax increase. Now, 3 months into their new majority, they are proposing anywhere from a $400 billion to a $1 trillion tax increase.

We don't believe that we should take more money out of the pockets of hard-working Americans. We don't believe we should tax, tax, tax and then tax more the American economy and the American family and the American workers.

We believe Washington has a spending problem, and that is why we are proposing to control spending, and that is how we achieve the balanced budget. Not only do we achieve a balanced budget, but we stop the raid of the Social Security trust fund and pay down $100 billion in debt in the fifth year of our budget.

Now, here is the difference. The blue line is our line, the revenue line, where we keep the tax cuts intact. The red line is the line where the Democrats raise the taxes. The green line is the current trajectory of spending.

We have to control spending if we are going to ever fully balance the budget. Even if we accept the Democrats' tax increases, the balance they achieve in 5 years will only last for a couple of short years because we will go right back into deficits if we do nothing to control spending.

Now, you are going to hear a lot of words about our budget in the next few minutes. Cut this, cut that, we are savaging this, we are taking a chain saw to that. We are pitting Medicare and Medicaid.

Let's be really clear. Medicare, spending goes up every year from here to the next to the next. Medicaid spending under our budget will go up faster than health care inflation. But we are going to reform the program so that it works better, doesn't cost as much, and extends its solvency so that it is there for people.

Medicare. Are we cutting Medicare? No, we are not cutting Medicare. We are growing Medicare. We are growing Medicare, not as fast as it is currently scheduled to grow because we are reforming Medicare. And what do we do? We extend the solvency of Medicare.

Overall, if you take a look at the difference in spending we propose over the next 5 years, on entitlement spending we propose growing, increasing, adding entitlement spending at 4.1 percent a year for the next 5 years, instead of 4.7 percent a year.

Now, at the end of the day, it is about how we get our fiscal house in order. Here is the devastation of the Democrat budget. And I am just going to pick one program.

Medicare, the unfunded liability of Medicare is $32 trillion. $32 trillion is how much money we would have to set aside today in current dollars to make sure that Medicare is there for my children when they receive Medicare.

Under the Democrat budget, the Medicare unfunded liability will go to $52 trillion. That means doing nothing to reform Medicare. Doing nothing to reform Medicare at all will actually lead to adding a huge debt onto the problem. It will mean that our children and grandchildren will have another $22 trillion in debt thrown onto them if we decide not to do a thing for the next 5 years to reform our entitlement programs. But that, in fact, is what the Democrat budget does.

The actual household burden today on Medicare is $282,400. That is what we would have to set aside today, per household, to make sure Medicare is there for my children when they retire. If we do nothing for the next 5 years, as the Democrats propose, that goes up to almost $476,000 a household.

We have got to fix these programs. We have got to reform these programs. We have got to reform them so that they work better. They were written in the 1960s. We are now in the 21st century. We can make these programs work better. We can better meet the mission of Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security, income security, health security; and we can do it without bankrupting our children.

The problem is, we can't put our heads in the sand for 5 years and do nothing. That is what the Democrat budget proposes to do. Absolutely no savings, no spending control, no reform.

We have to reform these programs, Mr. Chairman, because if we don't, our debt gets higher. We go back into deficits, and there isn't another tax you can raise to get out of that hole.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN).

Mr. CLYBURN. Thank you very much, Mr. SPRATT, for yielding me the time. And I want to thank you for putting together one of the most responsible documents that I have seen in my almost 15 years here in the House of Representatives.

This Democrat budget is a giant step in the right direction. This budget lowers taxes on middle-class families. It does not contain one penny of new taxes. Instead, our budget explicitly provides middle-income tax credits, including the marriage penalty, child tax credit, the 10 percent bracket, and the deduction for State and local taxes.

This House budget provides immediate relief for 23 million middle-income families who would otherwise be subjected to the alternative minimum tax and provides for a permanent fix.

I will tell you what I am particularly appreciative of in this budget. This budget responds to the ongoing recovery for the people of the gulf coast region here in our country. It creates a reserve fund of $3.4 billion and provides an additional $1 billion that could be used to meet urgent recovery needs.

This budget maintains the President's tax cuts for 2008, for 2009 and for 2010; and it says, explicitly, that we can extend tax cuts beyond the sunset that the Republicans put in for 2010. But if we extend these tax cuts, we must subject these tax cuts to the same PAYGO rules that we subject new programs to. So there is no cut here. There is responsibility here. And I thank JOHN SPRATT for meeting that responsibility.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, Mr. Chair, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California, a member of the Budget Committee, Mr. LUNGREN.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Republican substitute. There is a clear difference between the two proposals on the table.

□ 1300

The Democratic plan, despite the protestations of its proponents, does, in fact, contain the largest tax increase in American history. We have heard time and again their referring to the language that is in their bill which talks about tax cuts. But I would suggest their tax cut promises are written with invisible ink. They talk about how they want to do it, but there is no means by the way they will do it. And they also promise to have a balanced budget and yet, without the tax increases inherent in their proposal, they cannot reach it. We have no tax increases, period. None in this budget.

In the Democratic budget, they include a $22 billion increase in nondefense spending above the President's request, on top of the $22 billion of unrequested spending in the supplemental and $6 billion in the omnibus.

Our budget includes a freeze on nondefense, nonsecurity spending, while providing additional funds for veterans, for the war on terrorism, for Community Development Block Grants, for NIH, and Science and Technology.

In entitlements, they criticize us for attempting to look at entitlements and to bring across savings. We admit we attempt to do that, because we recognize the obligation we have as stewards of the people's money and stewards of the future of our children and grandchildren.

So come out here and criticize us for attempting to look at these entitlement programs to begin, just to begin, to get the courage to deal with what we know we have to deal with.

Now, our budgets can either be made so flimsy that they will fly away in the wind, or they can actually have some weight to them so that we begin the tough process, and it is a tough process, of dealing with reform of entitlements so that we do the job that is expected of us by our constituents and, more importantly, by our children and our grandchildren.

I rise in strong support of this substitute by the Republicans.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, to talk just a bit about what is truly contained in this budget resolution, the devastating cuts it imposes on sensitive areas, I yield 2 minutes to Mr. DICKS, the chairman of the Interior Subcommittee of Appropriations.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation, which, thankfully, reverses years of decline in Federal Government spending on environmental programs. JOHN SPRATT has made wise decisions on Function 300.

Last month, I testified before the Budget Committee, urging increased spending on these important programs. The chairman said he would consider my request, and he is a man of his word. I am pleased to say that the programs included in Function 300 will be funded at a level $2.6 billion, or 9 percent above what the President requested in his budget, and $15.7 billion between 2008 and 2012.

This budget resolution rejects the President's proposal to further cut the Land and Water Conservation Fund, the Fish and Wildlife Service Refuge Program, and EPA's Clean Water Assistance Program. In addition, the budget resolution accepts the best idea in the President's budget, and that is to increase funding for the national parks. The Ryan amendment in 2008 would cut $1.5 billion below current services and $4.6 billion between 2008 and 2012.

Many of the numbers contained in the President's budget were bleak. The President proposed a budget for these programs which was $2.8 billion less than what is required to maintain current levels of service. For example, funding for EPA faced a reduction of $508 million, the Forest Service down $343 million. The funding for the Park Service would have been reduced by $237 million. And, worse, the President's proposed cuts after 7 years of steady decline are severe. The Interior Department has been cut by 16 percent, EPA by 29 percent, the Forest Service by a whopping 35 percent. These cuts have evidently led to declines in services for visitors to our parks, refuges, and forests and to dramatic reductions in assistance to State and local communities for environmental and conservation activities.

I urge you to vote against the Ryan amendment and vote for the Spratt budget if you care about the environment of our country.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. MCCRERY of Louisiana.

Mr. MCCRERY. Mr. Chairman, unlike the budget put forward by the Democratic majority, the Republican alternative offered by Mr. RYAN avoids the largest tax increase in our Nation's history and begins to deal with the long-term problem of growing entitlements.

This chart here gives us an idea of the difference in the scenarios between the Republican budget, this line for tax revenues; and the Democratic budget, this top line for revenues. If you look at it in terms of the percentage of GDP consumed by Federal revenues, you should know that this year Federal revenues constitute about 18.6 percent of GDP. Under the Republican budget alternative, the bottom line, that stays about the same. About 10 years from now, it is approximately the same percent of GDP. But the Democratic budget, this top line, that figure is going to go up to over 20 percent of GDP, over 20 percent. Only once since 1962 has Federal revenues constituted that high a percentage of our GDP. Our economy is certain to drag under the weight of those kinds of tax increases.

And the worst will be yet to come, because the Democrats' budget ignores demographic reality and offers no reform of entitlements, no savings from entitlements. In 2009, the Social Security surplus will begin to decline. In 2017, we will have to pay out more money in Social Security benefits than we take in in taxes. The problem gets worse after that with more baby boomers in retirement, fewer workers to support them; and the difficulties facing Social Security are relatively manageable compared to those facing Medicare and Medicaid.

I shouldn't need to reiterate these facts. Everyone in this House should be familiar with them, but somehow the Democrats, budget ignores those facts completely.

The Republican budget would freeze nondefense discretionary and reform entitlements. Please reject the Democratic budget and support the Ryan budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD).

Mr. BOYD of Florida. I thank my friend Mr. SPRATT for yielding.

I rise today, Mr. Chairman, in strong support for the Democratic budget resolution.

Mr. Chairman, the Blue Dogs didn't submit our own budget this year because the Democratic budget under Chairman SPRATT's leadership includes many of the priorities that we advocate for and Mr. SPRATT put into the bill.

First, it adheres strictly to PAYGO rules, and this is the biggest difference between this budget and the failed budgets of the past 6 years. Our budgets put an end to new deficit spending. PAYGO has a proven record of success. It was instrumental in the return of budget surpluses during the 1990s. It has worked in the past, and it will work again. And this Congress let PAYGO expire in 2002.

Secondly, the Democratic budget will reach a glide path to balance by 2012, and it does so without using budgeting gimmickry or tricks.

You have heard a lot from the other side criticizing our budget and talking about debt, but let me tell you something. The Republicans in the past have refused to adopt PAYGO rules, and spending has skyrocketed under their leadership. They financed their plan by borrowing $3 trillion over the last 6 years from countries like China, and many times in the past the appropriations bills have not been enacted and we have had to do omnibus bills. Eighty percent of those were not enacted last year.

In short, Mr. Chairman, we have to return to fiscal sanity. We have created a mess in the last 6 years, and it is going to take this Congress working hard together in a bipartisan way to come up with a plan that will put us back on a glide path to balance. Mr. SPRATT's bill, the budget resolution, which we have a chance to vote on today, is the best start for us to return to that path; and I want to applaud him for his resolution and ask for your support for that resolution.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman SPRATT for his leadership and for yielding me this time.

As the only freshman Democrat on the Budget Committee, I rise to urge my fellow freshmen and all of my colleagues to support the Democratic budget.

Mr. Chairman, last November, the American people made it clear that they are ready for a government that will be fiscally responsible. This Nation spoke loud and clear when they elected us and put a new party in power in Congress. They are asking for responsibility and a new direction in our fiscal priorities. Education, health care, the care of our children and our seniors and our veterans, these are issues that Americans care about.

Our budget restores common sense to our national spending and sanity to our national priorities. It restores the President's attempt to cut children's health care programs and community block grants. It puts forth the single largest increase in veteran spending in our Nation's history and not a moment too soon. It funds math and science programs for our kids, programs like Head Start and Pell grants that provide access to education that so many of our children need. And this budget concerns itself with the need to create jobs and build a bright economic future. It restores funding for job training programs, and it does so while adhering to the PAYGO rules.

It has been a long 6 years for this Nation. Just 6 years ago, we were looking at a projected $5.6 trillion surplus. That has collapsed into a $9 trillion deficit. Every American in this country owes $29,000 worth of debt.

Under Republican leadership, the budget became woefully out of balance fiscally and out of balance with the priorities of the American people. The people elected us to take this country in a new direction. This budget will do so, and it will do so in a fiscally responsible manner.

Mr. Chairman, it is time for Congress to be accountable to the American people again.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, budgets are about values and vision. Where your treasure is, the Bible says, there also is your heart. But if you cut through all of the arcane detail, all the numbers, it is hard to find the heart in the Ryan resolution.

Buried in this budget resolution, if you dig deep enough, are some enormous cuts exceeding anything that has ever been proposed, much less passed, in the past, particularly with respect to health care, in which people are totally dependent. These cuts are so extreme, so deep that they go to the reality of this whole resolution. It turns on these cuts, and the real question is whether or not they are politically or practically possible.

These cuts are dictated by an extraordinary process called reconciliation. Here is what the cuts amount to: Our committee, the Budget Committee, if this resolution were adopted, would be dictating to the Energy and Commerce Committee, with jurisdiction over Medicare and Medicaid, cuts of $97 billion over the next 5 years.

With respect to Medicare, this committee, if this resolution were adopted, would direct that the Ways and Means Committee go back to Medicare and cut another $153 billion out of Medicare or, if they couldn't get that much out of Medicare, cut it out of the safety net programs that are in the province of the Ways and Means Committee, shredding the safety net for SSI, for TANF, and other programs.

Altogether, the cuts in the health care entitlements in this resolution come to $266 billion. And not just the health care entitlements are in jeopardy.

□ 1315

Education and labor, $4.9 billion. Where does that come from? Student loans, Pell Grants.

Natural resources. You heard Mr. DICKS a moment ago. Where does that come from? Clean water, Environmental Protection Agency, conservation. $22 billion less than we provide over 5 years.

Education, $46 million over 5 years for Function 500 less than we provide. There is a huge difference.

But it also goes to the veracity, the practical reality of this resolution, and begs the question: If cuts of this enormity have never been proposed before, why do we believe that they would be enacted now?

Instead, we have a sneaking suspicion that when all of these cuts are put together, we are going to be right back where we have been for the last 6

years, that is, deeper in deficit. That is because in addition to making spending cuts that total $278 billion, the same reconciliation instructions call for tax cuts, tax decreases, of $447 billion; and when you net the spending cuts against the tax cuts, you get an impact of $168.5 billion on the deficit. It makes it worse.

If this budget resolution would come back to the House as a concurrent budget resolution with these provisions, we would invoke the rule we passed on the House floor to the effect that you cannot abuse the process of reconciliation and use it for the purpose of worsening the deficit. It can only be used to improve the deficit, to use these extraordinary powers to improve the deficit.

That is why we say the Ryan resolution should be defeated. We think it is a sham. We don't think it will achieve its stated purposes. We think it will put us right back on this track of debt accumulation in which we have seen $3.1 trillion added to the national debt over the last 6 years.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I have always believed that government should live within its means. No one was a harsher critic of runaway Federal spending under Republican control than me. When our majority faltered, I said we didn't just lose our majority, we lost our way. But thanks to the leadership of the gentleman from Wisconsin, this Republican substitute budget alternative should be entitled ''Lessons Learned.''

The contrast between the Democrat plan and the Republican plan is startling. Under the Republican budget alternatives, no tax increases, period; a courageous freeze on non-defense/nonsecurity spending; $279 billion in savings through commonsense reform of entitlements; and real budget process reform.

The contrast? The Democrat budget allows for the largest tax increase in American history. It includes $22 billion in increases in non-defense spending and completely ignores budget process reform or the looming entitlement crisis that our Nation faces.

Mr. Chairman, the voters spoke last fall. Democrats promised voters a return to fiscal discipline and reform. But this budget proves only one party got the message.

I urge my colleagues to reject the Democrat majority's effort to return us to the tax-and-spend policies of the past and vote ''yes'' on the Republican substitute budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to a member of our leadership, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, in listening to the debate, I can't help but think about 5½ years ago and the 9/11 attacks and the simultaneous bursting of the technology bubble here in this country. It was the Bush tax cuts of 2001 and 2003 that provided a desperately needed shot in the arm, lifting us from our malaise and dispelling fears that the economy was sliding irrevocably into recession. But, today, after years of steady economic growth marked by a surging stock market, low inflation and low unemployment, a deflated housing market has shaken confidence in this economy.

With the tax cuts set to expire in 2010, the last thing investors and the American people need right now is the largest tax hike in the history of our country, and that is the reality they are smart enough to see, despite claims on the other side of the aisle otherwise.

The real difference between the Ryan budget and that of the majority is whether you believe that tax cuts expiring is a tax hike. I do, and I think the American families who will bear the brunt of a $400 billion tax increase will likewise.

In my State of Virginia, the effects are particularly acute, with taxpayers on average facing $3,120 in additional taxes each year. Around the country, 45 million families with children will be hit by an average tax increase of $2,864. Again, this is because the majority does not agree that expiring tax cuts are a tax hike. I do.

Instead of choking our economy, we need to make the tax cuts permanent. If we let the Democratic tax hike genie out of the bottle, it is going to be awfully hard to put it back in.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the chairman of the Budget Committee for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I speak on every one of these budgets; and because I have been here a long time, I know the history of these budgets going back a quarter of a century. I sometimes believe the talking points on the other side of the aisle are written by Lewis Carroll, the author, of course, of that famous book which had as its theme saying one thing and meaning another: ''black was white,'' ''up was down,'' et cetera, et cetera.

I have listened since 1981 to the economic observations of such people like Phil Gramm, such people like Dick Armey, an economist, the majority leader of your party, and I think to myself how confused the American public must be when the assertions are made, an article by Dave Stockman in today's paper, you may have seen. David Broder wrote an article about that. Mr. Stockman is in a little bit of trouble with assertions that things that he said were true were in fact not true. In fact, David Stockman admitted that in 1983 what he said was true was not true; what he said they thought, they did not think.

The American public needs to place it in that context.

I have heard a lot, I say to my friend from Missouri, over the last few hours about debates about we are going to make these tax cuts permanent, and we are not.

Now, I am sure the American public knows that the President for the last 6 years has been a Republican. I am sure they know that the leadership in the House for the past 6 years has been Republican, and I am sure they know that the leadership in the Senate has been Republican. And guess what? Never did you make those tax cuts permanent. Why not? Because you wanted to play fiscal games. That is why not.

You wanted to count your out-years as looking better than they did. Why are you having a $274 billion tax increase in this bill? How do I say that? Because you are not fixing the AMT. Why aren't you fixing it? Because it is STI, your ''stealth tax increase.'' You liked SDI. This is STI, a stealth tax increase, where you say one year we are going to fix it, but, guess what, for the next 4 years we will get that additional tax revenue. A stealth tax increase.

There are no tax increases in this bill. In fact, it provides for tax cuts for the middle class. But they have to be paid for.

George Bush I and Dick Gephardt, the leader of this House, came together and said, ladies and gentlemen, we have to have fiscal responsibility, and we are going to do it. And the way we are going to do it is we are going to have PAYGO. We are going to pay for what we buy. George Bush signed that. And guess what? The Republican side of the aisle excoriated the President of the United States, George Bush, for entering into an agreement that ultimately would bring us surpluses.

I have also listened to these debates and have seen some very earnest, very intelligent, very articulate young men. Mr. RYAN is the third in a series of those earnest, intelligent, energetic, articulate young men, who talk about their vision for America, talk about where they want to take America.

Mr. RYAN puts up the children. Now, unlike Mr. RYAN, who I think has children, I have children, I have got grandchildren, and, as some people know, I have a great-granddaughter. And I am very concerned about all of those children whose taxes you have raised almost every year you have been in charge that I have been here, starting in 1981. And you raised their taxes by not paying for what you buy.

You talk about cutting spending, I tell my friend.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, isn't the gentleman supposed to address the Chair, not specific Members?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair would ask the Members to address remarks to the Chair, rather than to others in the second person.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to tell my friend that there are more ways to skin a cat than one.

I tell the Chair that I have heard the argument of these earnest young men who have all stood on this floor. David Stockman at the age of 34 telling the country as director of OMB how we were going to balance the budget, how Ronald Reagan said we are going to balance the budget. Ronald Reagan ran over $1 trillion in deficits over his 8 years. Over $1 trillion in deficits.

There is one person in America who can stop spending in its tracks, only one, and that is the President of the United States. Ronald Reagan ran $1 trillion in deficits, actually $1.4 trillion. George Bush I in just 4 years ran $1 trillion in deficits. And this President in the 6 years he has been President has run over $1.6 trillion in deficits. $4.1 trillion of deficits during the Reagan administration, the Bush I administration and the Bush II administration.

Now, I tell the Chairman that my friend does not seem to be paying attention to these dramatic figures. But ladies and gentlemen of this House, I hope you are, and I hope all of our constituents are listening as well, because the rhetoric on this floor is cheap, but the performance is not.

During those 18 years of Republican leadership of this country, we ran $4.2 trillion in deficits. During the 8 years that Bill Clinton was President, we had a $62.9 billion surplus. The only President in the lifetime, I tell the Chairman, of my young friend from Wisconsin that that has been accomplished, notwithstanding Mr. Stockman or Mr. Kasich or Mr. Nussle, who all said they wanted to balance the budget, and none, none, none of them did it. None of them did it.

Now, we adopted a program in 1993, and I heard the same rhetoric, I tell my friends on this side of the aisle, that I am hearing today, the same rhetoric. Dick Armey not only was the majority leader of the Republican House, it wasn't a Republican House then, but he was also an economist, and an economist still. And Mr. Armey told the President of the United States, if we adopt this program, we are going to have deep debt, high unemployment and annual deficits.

□ 1330

That was the representation I tell my friends on this floor. Those representations were all wrong. That's why when we listen to debate on this floor today we see a balanced budget, a responsible budget that invests in our future.

Mr. Chairman, if I were speaking directly to him, I would tell my young friend, I have heard about these cuts that you talk about, for a quarter of a century I have heard about these cuts. Why is it that you spent more money as a party with the President with control of the Senate, control of the House by a factor of two, twice as much spending rise under the Bush Administration than under the Clinton Administration. Why is that?

Why do you come here and crow about cutting spending when you doubled the rate of growth when you controlled everything? That's what the American public needs to judge.

Now, I had some prepared comments here, and I apologize to my good friend who spent so much time doing this. But, ladies and gentlemen, Lewis Carroll is not writing this budget. Alice is not going to have to live under this budget. My children, my grandchildren, my great grandchildren and, more importantly, my country, are going to have to live under this budget.

We didn't adopt a budget last year. We didn't adopt appropriation bills last year. We didn't do any of the fiscal business that we should have done last year. Why? Because your party could not agree with one another. So you had no fiscal program. Your fiscal program was spending more money.

I hope that this House, for the first time in 6 years, adopts a responsible budget that will move us towards balance. It won't get there overnight. And when I say that, it is not empty rhetoric, because when we, in 1993, passed that program, we took this country for 4 straight years out of deficit.

Now, I know you will say, ''Well, we Republicans took over in 1995.'' And my response to that, of course, is, you didn't have the presidency. When you had it all, why couldn't you do it? When you had the presidency, when you had the Senate, when you had the House, tell me why you couldn't do it.

I will tell you why. Because it was the President of the United States who said this is the way we are going to do it or I am going to veto it. This President can veto it, and we won't be able to override his veto. I understand that. He is in charge. That's why we have these deficits, because he has not vetoed one spending bill. He vetoed one bill, embryonic stem cell research. Not one spending bill. Every nickel that has been spent in this country has been spent under the signature of George Bush, the President of the United States, every nickel.

So I ask my friends, vote for a responsible budget. Move us, as we did during the 1990s, 4 years out of debt, 4 years into surplus, the first time that had happened, and left you folks that took over with a $5.6 trillion surplus that you have squandered into a $3 trillion deficit. And, yes, 9/11 had an impact on that. And your tax cut, we had a very shallow recovery. You know that. Every economist says that. And a relatively shallow downturn in the economy.

This budget offered by Mr. SPRATT is a responsible budget that provides for tax cuts for the middle class, provides for investment in education and competitiveness of our country, provides for investment in our veterans, provides for investment in defense, using the same number that the President gave us so that we can keep America strong.

Mr. SPRATT, I thank you. I thank the members of your committee for having the courage and the wisdom and the fiscal soundness to come forth with this budget. It is worthy of support of every Member of this Congress.

I urge this House to adopt this budget this day.

Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to our republican colleagues, let me say that to hear them talk about fiscal responsibility is nothing less than surreal.

In this debate on the fiscal 2008 budget, many numbers have been used.

But only two are really relevant on the issue of fiscal responsibility, and the Republican Party's lack thereof—$5.6 trillion and more than $3 trillion.

When President Bush took office, he and the then-Republican majorities in Congress inherited a projected 10-year budget surplus of $5.6 trillion.

The President proclaimed: ''we can proceed with tax relief without fear of budget deficits, even if the economy softens.''

He promised that he would pay down the national debt, and some in the administration even worried publicly about paying down the debt too fast.

Well, as we have learned, the President's projections were unequivocally wrong and worries about paying down the debt were completely misplaced.

Over the last 6 years, the President and Republicans in Congress—after enacting the most reckless fiscal policies in American history—have turned a projected surplus of $5.6 trillion into record budget deficits and additional debt of more than $3 trillion.

In fact, the amount of foreign-held debt has more than doubled under the Bush administration—from about $1 trillion in 2001 to $2.1 trillion today.

And, interest payments on the national debt have increased from $206 billion in 2001 to a projected $256 billion under the President's budget for fiscal 2008—consuming more than 20 percent of all individual income taxes.

Let me say, too, that until the American people spoke last November and elected Democratic majorities in Congress, the President never—not once—budgeted the costs of the on-going war in Iraq, which today stand at more than $400 billion, with another $100 billion being considered.

Thus today, Mr. Chairman, with this budget written and offered by Chairman SPRATT, House Democrats will take our Nation in a new direction and begin to clean up the fiscal train wreck left by Republicans.

Our budget is a statement of our values and priorities, demonstrating our unwavering commitment to defend our Nation, grow our economy, protect our children and strengthen families, preserve our plant, and ensure that the Federal Government is accountable and efficient.

First, this fiscally responsible Democratic budget will bring the Federal budget back to balance by 2012. Over the next 5 years, the cumulative deficit in our budget is $234 billion lower than the President's budget.

Our budget strictly adheres to the pay-as-you-go budget rules that were reinstated in January by the new majority, and which Republicans allowed to expire in 2002. The Concord Coalition even says this budget is ''a successful first test of how seriously they [House

Democrats] plan to abide by [the PAYGO] rule.''

Furthermore, this Democratic budget invests in our priorities without increasing the deficit. It provides for a robust defense, boosting Homeland Security funding and providing $3.5 billion more for veterans' services than the President's request for 2008.

It also makes critical investments in education, children's health care, transportation infrastructure, and alternative energy research and development—while rejecting the President's request to cut Head Start, LIHEAP, COPS and First-Responder programs, and community development block grants.

And, our budget accommodates immediate relief for the tens of millions of middle-income households which would otherwise be subject to the alternative minimum tax—while calling for the extension of middle-class tax cuts that are not due to expire until December 31, 2010.

This is a budget that we can be proud of. And, it stands in stark contrast to the extraordinarily irresponsible policies of the last six years.

I urge all of my colleagues: vote for fiscal responsibility and a bright future for our children. Vote for the budget that reflects our values and meets the needs of the American people. Vote for this Democratic budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining on each side.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Both sides have 7½ minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chair, I yield myself 10 seconds, as I yield to our minority leader, simply to say the gentleman from Maryland comes from a State which under their budget will see an average household tax increase of $3,238 per household. This will affect 2,259,000 Maryland taxpayers.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, the minority whip (Mr. BLUNT).

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I'm confident that my 3 minutes will go quicker than my good friend's 1 minute just did.

I don't hardly know how to respond to what I just heard on the floor from my good friend from Maryland. Whenever we had budget chairmen in those years when we balanced the budget, apparently there is no credit given for that. Mr. Kasich did draft a budget that balanced; certainly Mr. Nussle did; certainly there was a precedent.

And I agree with my friend when he said 9/11 did have an impact. 9/11 did have an impact. The defense cost after 9/11 had an impact. The cost after 9/11 of homeland security had an impact. The flat economy coming out of 2000 had an impact and our tax policies had an impact. In fact, in 2005, the largest increase in revenue in the history of the Federal Government, 14.5 percent in 2005, because our tax policies worked and produced more than a shallow recovery.

Permanent tax cuts? We would like to see permanent tax cuts, but, as my good friend and others know, unless you have 60 people on the other side of the building in the 100-Member Senate, you can't have permanent tax cuts.

We have extended these tax cuts in a way that has extended our economy, extended our growth, increased our global competition in the marketplace. Mr. RYAN's alternative continues to do those things. The overall budget that we are talking about today as the underlying budget doesn't do that.

Our friends on the other side, in fact, my very good friend from Maryland just said that they aren't increasing taxes, they are just letting current tax policies expire. When you make the same income and your taxes go up, that explanation rings pretty hollow. Your taxes increase as this budget anticipates they would.

And then they say that many of these tax increases don't occur until the third year of this budget, so you're not going to see an immediate tax increase. But of course you're going to see an immediate increase in the spending of the money that those new tax revenues provide. Those tax increases do happen to start for some American families as early as the 1st of January, next year.

Take, for example, the line in the Tax Code allowing many of our Nation's veterans and warfighters to collect the earned income tax credit. This budget anticipates that when that expires on December 31, 2007, it does not come back as part of the Tax Code, and the money that is produced by that tax increase is part of what this budget spends.

The majority's budget renews the death tax. The majority's budget renews the marriage penalty that we have eliminated, and 48 million couples in 2011 would pay $2,900 more every year in Washington taxes than they did the year before.

For that and many other reasons, Mr. Chairman, I urge that we stick with the policies that have grown our economy, that let us compete, that appreciate families and support this alternative.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the minority whip for his comments.

And, yes, in the nineties we did balance the budget. I would just remind him, and I don't want to start my speech this way, but the first budget you proposed led to a government shutdown. It was President Clinton that led the way to a balanced budget and a surplus.

Now I want to thank you. Some of my colleagues have criticized you. I want to thank you. I want to thank you because to govern is to choose. We have two clear choices here, and there is no doubt about it. President Kennedy once said, ''to govern is to choose.''

We're offering a new direction. You are offering the status quo. There is no doubt about it. Because you have given us, and nobody has really quite said thank you enough to your $4 trillion of new debt, and you need to be appreciated for it. Because, as I've always said, if there is one thing you can say about George Bush and the Republicans when it comes to the economy, we will forever be in your debt. And that is the one thing that is absolutely clear about your stewardship with this economy.

Four trillion dollars, the largest accumulation of debt in the shortest period of time in American history. Don't look at your shoes when I'm saying it now, because you know that is your legacy.

Now, what are the priorities and the differences?

In Medicaid and Medicare, let's just take a look at health care, number one economic issue for the American people. You cut $250 billion for Medicare and Medicaid. Democrats double the size of the children's health care program in this country. Two choices: Status quo, a new direction.

You cut $5 billion from college assistance for people who are trying to achieve the American dream. We expand college assistance by $3.5 billion.

You have made a decision to make cuts in other areas like agriculture. We make sure that our farmers have a future where their children can inherit the farm and have a future in rural America.

The choices are clear. We have a balanced budget that is balanced with our priorities. You maintain an economic strategy that adds to the Nation's debt as you have in past years.

Every year of our budget, the deficit declines. Every year under our budget, 5 years in a row, the budget deficit declines until it reaches balance and eventually a surplus. Every year. You achieve your goals by cutting $250 billion from health care assistance, Medicare and Medicaid.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. GOHMERT. Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. GOHMERT. We would ask for the regular order that the rules be followed and comments be directed to the Chairman instead of directed to individual Members and people in the body.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair would ask Members to address their remarks to the Chair rather than to others in the second person.

The gentleman from Illinois may proceed.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have left?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois has 10 seconds remaining.

Mr. EMANUEL. Roosevelt once said, ''We have nothing to fear but fear itself,'' and you have taken that and turned it on its head and said, ''all we have to offer is fear.''

This is a new direction versus a status quo budget. There are clear

choices, and I am glad that we balance the budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, as I yield to my friend from Michigan, I will note that Illinois taxpayers will pay $3,282 higher every year. That hits 4,731,000 Illinois taxpayers budgets under their budget.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. McCOTTER. Very quickly. Through the Chairman, I would like to remind my friends that all spending bills originate in the House, not in the executive branch of Congress; and that a lot of those appropriation bills looked certainly bipartisan at the time.

What we have here in front of us is a clear choice, a choice to move America forward, as we have tried to do, or a choice to move America in a new direction, backwards.

We are going back to the 1970s. As a child of the 1970s in the Carter administration, I remember how we gutted defense, I remember how our Nation had no intelligence worth anything. And I look back to the Clinton era and I see how the budget deficit that we now have accumulated in a time of war was necessitated by the reduction in our military, the gutting of our intelligence network, the inability to defend America's basic needs. The rush to free trade, which was signed by the Clinton administration, and now the bill came home to roost on the watch of George Bush and the American people on September 11, 2001. It is a history lesson that I hope was not lost upon the America people.

Finally, to quote Lewis Carroll, as one of his admirers, ''Living is easy with eyes closed, misunderstanding all you see.''

It is time for America to be wide awake to the choice in front of them, and let us come back and move America forward.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, a member of the Ways and Means Committee (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. This debate underscores the genuine change, the new direction that we are charting here in Washington. We are beginning to rein in these endless Republican deficits. The old Republican way of budgeting doesn't just crunch numbers, it crunches people. We are concerned not only about the fiscal deficit but the ''opportunity deficit'' that occurs in communities across this country when all the members of the community are unable to contribute their full God-given potential, when young people are unable to pursue higher education, when families are denied health care, when veterans are denied the services that they have earned.

□ 1345

There are two fundamental ways in which the Democratic approach to tax relief differs from our Republican colleagues. First, we believe it is possible to target tax relief to working, middle-class families without letting the super-rich piggyback along and claim most of the benefits.

Second, we say if tax relief is worth having, then pay for it. Instead of going to our grandchildren and borrowing from our grandchildren, we say go to the Grand Caymens. How about going to all those giant corporations that have dodged their fair share of taxes by going offshore and asking them to bear a little of the burden of our national security? So we provide the tax relief that our middle-class families need, but we do it in a fiscally responsible way.

Some people have imaginary friends. These Republicans have imaginary demons about what might eventually happen with taxes. This budget is a welcome return to reality, fiscal reality, and responsibility.

To those who are at home and are trying to determine who is right about these Republican claims of the demon of tax relief, I think we need only turn to a bipartisan group like the Concord Coalition, which looked at the budget, having no axe to grind except an axe used for cutting to achieve fiscal responsibility, and it said no tax increase will result from this budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Our Republican friends have no credibility on fiscal affairs. They had three times to take a bite at the tax cut apple in 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004. They ducked solving the looming AMT crisis, instead implementing a grab bag of tax benefits for the most well off. Now this budget puts at the top of their list more tax cuts, $1 trillion for the top 1 percent, financed by cuts in Medicare, Medicaid, the environment, and education. When they had their hands on all the levers of power, they couldn't even pass a budget. They left unpassed 11 of the 13 appropriations bills.

I strongly suggest rejection of their misguided fanciful approach and support for the majority resolution.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

Here it comes, Mr. Chairman, the closing of this debate. We have heard it all. We have heard the quotes: these cuts are so deep, so extreme about the Republican budget.

Well, let's just see how deep and extreme these cuts are. Instead of spending over the next 5 years $14.976 trillion, our budget proposes $14.928 trillion over the next 5 years. Instead of growing entitlement spending at 4.7 percent a year, we will grow it at 4.1 percent a year.

What do we accomplish with this? What do we do with that? We balance the budget without raising taxes. We stop the raid on the Social Security trust fund and we pay down debt. That is what we accomplish with our budget.

What do the Democrats accomplish? No matter how they spin it, no matter how they duck it, no matter how they hide, they are raising taxes. Don't ask me. Just look at The Washington Post that said: ''And while the House Democrats say they want to preserve key parts of Bush's signature tax cuts, they project a surplus by 2012 only by assuming that all of these tax cuts go away.''

Meet the new Democrat majority, Mr. Chairman, the same as the old Democrat majority. And the last time they had the majority in 1993, what did they do? They passed the largest tax increase in American history, $241 billion. Now, 3½ months into the new majority, what are they planning to do? Passing the largest tax increase in American history, about $400 billion. Is that to control spending or something like that? No. They are engaging on a gorge of new spending. $50 billion is already being thrown out the door just this year, and it is not even April into their new majority.

Mr. Chairman, this is a direction. This is a choice between two visions. Do we or do we not let people keep more of their own hard-earned money? Or do we just keep taxing them more and more and more and spending more and more and more? That is the choice.

We believe in the people. We believe people should keep more of their own money. We believe people should keep their child tax credit. We don't want to tax people for being married. We believe small businesses should be taxed no more than large corporations. We believe seniors ought to be able to enjoy their retirement savings. We believe in preserving, saving, and enhancing our entitlement programs by extending their solvency.

What are they going to do? They are hastening the demise of our entitlements, they are accelerating the bankruptcy of these programs, and they are giving us the largest tax increase in American history.

Like it or not, the numbers are clear. You can reserve fund everything you want, you can put any wish list you want in a piece of legislation, but numbers don't lie. And the numbers are crystal clear and they tell the truth: this budget, the Democrat budget, gives us the largest tax increase in American history, and the Republican budget keeps taxes low, and it balances the budget by controlling spending and it stops the raid on the Social Security trust fund and it pays down debt.

Pass the Republican budget. Defeat the Democrat budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, here is the Ryan resolution on the back of an envelope: look at what it does for reconciliation, because it does it elsewhere within the budget proposal.

Mr. RYAN proposes crippling, emasculating Medicare and Medicaid totaling over $250 billion, $278 billion altogether in hypothetical, wholly impractical, and unlikely cuts. But what is the net effect? Because at the same time and in the same bill he lowers taxes, has a tax cut of $447 billion. The net effect is an

increase to the deficit of $168 billion. That is why we have with this kind of arithmetic, why they have added $3.1 trillion to the debt of the United States.

Alternatively, we offer the base budget, the Spratt resolution, the Democratic resolution. It moves to balance by 2012, it leaves in place all of the tax cuts passed in 2001 and 2003. They will be in place in 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009 and 2010; and it leaves until the future the decisions as to whether or not and to what extent to renew these tax cuts when they expire, not because of this resolution but because of the way you wrote them, in the year 2010.

We fully fund defense. We don't have a lot of left over, but we husband our resources to do more for education, more for science and innovation, more for veterans health care, and more for SCHIP which barely ranks an honorable mention in their budget. It is the centerpiece of our effort this year to see that more American children will be covered by the program known as the Children's Health Insurance Program.

Otherwise, we restrain spending, and throughout our budget resolution, we apply religiously the rule we adopted this January, the rule of pay-as-you-go. So that for every mandatory spending increase we make possible, we provide that it has to be offset by mandatory spending cuts elsewhere.

We protect the tax cuts, as I say. We present a good budget resolution. I say vote for the Spratt resolution. Vote for the Democratic resolution, and vote resoundingly ''no'' on the Ryan resolution.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. All time for debate on the amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 160, noes 268, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 211]

AYES—160

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Ehlers
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Upton
Walberg
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—268

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Herseth
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reichert
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Davis, Jo Ann
Duncan
Faleomavaega
Jefferson
Kanjorski
Lampson
Lewis (CA)
Lynch
Millender-McDonald
Watt

□ 1416

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin and Mr. PORTER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. NEUGEBAUER changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support for the Fiscal Year 2008 Budget Resolution, H. Con. Res. 99. For far too long, the former Republican leadership in Congress and the Bush Administration were complacent in allowing poor public policy and misguided spending priorities to become a driving force behind mounting Federal deficits and an ever increasing national debt. Additionally, trillions of dollars in tax cuts for the wealthy and billions of dollars for a deteriorating war in Iraq have resulted in the President proposing repeated cuts to vital domestic priorities such as healthcare, education, and the environment.

Today, the House of Representatives is finally considering a budget that meets the social and economic needs of the American people, while taking the necessary steps toward addressing the mounting fiscal hurdles facing the Federal Government.

Our Nation has been in a budgetary crisis for too long. According to the Congressional Budget Office, CBO, estimates, President Bush inherited an estimated 10-year budget surplus of $5.6 trillion when he arrived in office. Today, that same 10-year period (2002–2011) is projected to show a budget deficit of $3 trillion under the President's policies. The Democratic Budget Resolution will set the country's finances back on track by balancing the budget by 2012, and it does this without sacrificing programs vital to our national security, our economy, and most importantly to the social welfare of the American people.

This budget will provide the largest veterans' healthcare spending increase in our Nation's history, ensuring that the 1,788,496 veterans in Florida receive care worthy of their sacrifice. It will facilitate significant increases in healthcare funding to expand access to Florida's 733,000 uninsured children, and makes a firm commitment to support education and affordable housing programs. It

also promotes environmental protection and conservation, and accommodates important energy legislation aimed at investment in renewable resources that will move our country toward energy independence.

This budget resolution restores the fiscal responsibility and accountability that the American people deserve and reflects the values and priorities that the American people expect. It is time to put this country's finances back on track and truly invest in America's prosperity. I urge my colleague to support passage of this important resolution.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, today the House will consider H. Con. Res. 99, the House Budget Resolution. I rise in support of this budget resolution because it fulfills the pledge Democrats made when we regained the majority. I am pleased to say that the Democrats have delivered on their word—the proposed Democratic plan will balance the budget in 5 years, while ensuring that critical programs are fully funded and that the programs dearest to our families are fully funded. The Democratic budget will expand health care for our children; provide our soldiers and veterans with care worthy of their sacrifice; support education for a 21st century workforce and a growing economy; invest in renewable energy; and restore fiscal responsibility to the budget process.

When President Bush was elected, he inherited a budget surplus of $5.6 trillion. Yet by the end of his first term, the Bush Administration turned this surplus into a deficit of nearly $3 trillion. Instead of addressing this deficit, the President's budget increases our deficit by $507 billion over the next 5 years. In comparison, the Democratic budget will lower the deficit by $234 billion over the next 5 years using the newly resurrected pay-as-you-go rules.

We will also work to lower the deficit by putting an end to wasteful government spending through increased oversight over our government agencies, starting with the Defense Department. To date the Defense Department continues to fail a standard audit that tracks what it spends or owns in the annual budget. It is estimated by Defense auditors that one of every six dollars spent for Iraq is suspect—including $2.7 billion Halliburton has received in contracts. This budget resolution proposes to restore government program performance reviews instituted under the Clinton Administration, which produced 285 recommendations to improve government services.

I know that many back home are skeptical about whether this will help the working families in Michigan. Michigan has a troubled economy; its unemployment rate is 6.9 percent and family incomes have dropped $7,989 since 2000, while health care and energy costs continue to rise. Yet the President's budget proposes to eliminate $205 million in funding for job training and employment services in our state. This is funding that Michigan desperately needs to keep our workforce competitive.

One of the first steps we can take to repair our economy is to invest in our future workforce. Our budget meets the goals of the Democratic Innovation Agenda by providing an additional $2 billion for federal science and technology programs, putting us on the road to doubling funding for the National Science Foundation. These investments are necessary to maintain America's global competitiveness, particularly in the areas of technology, energy and innovation.

We are going to make sure that our children receive the best education possible; our budget provides $8 billion more in 2008 and over 11 percent more over the next 5 years for education and training programs. Under the President's budget, more than 120,000 children in Michigan would go without promised help in reading and math. Head Start—a vital program for more than 35,000 Michigan children—would be cut by the President by 1.5 percent. These programs provide critical services for nearly 1.8 million children enrolled in Michigan public schools.

The Democratic budget also supports middle-class tax cuts, which will put money back in the wallets of our families where it belongs. It will also protect middle-income families from a tax increase by setting up a reserve fund for a long-term fix for the alternative minimum tax, AMT. In 2004, 69,000 Michigan families were subject to the AMT and if this system is not adjusted for inflation, an estimated 507,000 families in Michigan will have to pay it in 2007. Without this fix, the President's budget would increase middle-income taxes by $230 billion. I know many are wondering how we will actually pay for the middle-class tax cut. We will pay for this by eliminating tax loopholes and closing the tax gap to make sure that those who are cheating the system pay up and those who are honest are rewarded.

In recent months, energy costs have skyrocketed, literally leaving many Michigan families in the cold. Gasoline prices in Michigan have increased 79 percent, up $1.12 a gallon since 2001. While the President travels the country promoting his renewable energy programs, his budget proposes holding funding for renewable energy and energy efficiency programs at the 2001 funding level, and cutting the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, LIHEAP, by 18 percent. It is obvious that we need to end America's addiction to foreign oil and begin to invest in renewable energy sources here at home. The Democratic budget rejects the proposed cut to LIHEAP and will create a reserve fund that will redirect oil subsidies to invest $14 billion over the next 10 years in clean, renewable alternative energy and energy efficiency programs. This investment will promote new technologies to lower energy costs and relieve families of this immense burden.

The Democratic budget rejects the President's proposal to cut the Community Development Block Grant program, and actually provides the first increase in funding for the Community Development Block Grant program. This program provides crucial funding to assist nearly 1,200 States and local governments with job creation, economic development and affordable housing efforts.

Not only does this budget recognize the needs of working families, it will also recognize the needs of our veterans. It is clear from the recent events at Walter Reed Army Medical Center that Congress needs to closely examine the health care that veterans are receiving. Veterans have sacrificed too much to come home to run-down health care facilities. We will make sure that our veterans will always have the best care available by providing the largest increase ever to the veterans' health care budget—$3.5 billion this year and $32 billion over the next 5 years. These resources are critical to help repair VA health care facilities, to increase and improve disability claims processing and to invest in mental health care and treatment for traumatic brain injury. Michigan is home to 836,948 veterans, 42,451 of whom recently returned from Afghanistan and Iraq. We need to let our soldiers know that they will not be forgotten after their service is completed.

The Democratic budget will ensure that our soldiers have the resources they need in Iraq and Afghanistan, and that our first responders and law enforcement officers here at home are equipped with what they need to protect our country. Under the administration's proposed budget, Michigan would be hit with a 52-percent cut in the State Homeland Security Grant Program and the Law Enforcement Terrorist Prevention Program would be eliminated completely. The President needs to heed his own advice and fully fund these programs to ensure the safety and security of our communities. The Democratic budget will increase homeland security funding by six percent, ensuring that our first responder and terrorism prevention programs have the resources they need.

After 6 years of irresponsible fiscal budgets and empty promises, today's resolution will take the first step to finally balancing our budget and delivering critical funding to programs that need it the most. I support this resolution and I urge my colleagues to vote yes on H. Con. Res. 99.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 99, the Fiscal Year 2008 Congressional Budget proposed by my esteemed colleague from South Carolina, the Chairman of the House Budget Committee JOHN SPRATT. I would specifically like to commend the hard work and expertise of my colleagues of the House Committee on the Budget that has brought forward this budget that prioritizes education, the environment, agriculture, health care, and positive international relations for the future of our Nation.

I never forget in my work within the walls of this House that I am my brother's keeper. To this end, I am willing to contribute financially what is necessary to complete that task. All citizens of America must take ownership of the vital services, which require Federal funding to maintain.

Mr. Chairman, every day in the House Rules Committee, Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle propose legislation that has financial implications. I hear about necessary programs for veterans affairs, education, alternative energy development, health care, and every other possible issue, all of which cost money to implement. Interestingly, though not surprisingly, no one ever comes to Committee talking about giving money back to pay for their requests. You see, it costs money to provide the necessary services and infrastructure to our constituents. But it is clear that Republican opponents of Chairman SPRATT's budget are not willing to pay.

The Fiscal Year 2008 Democratic budget is fiscally responsible in its projections for revenue generation and ability to pay for necessary services for our constituents. While we may have inherited an economic mess from the former Republican majority, this budget will repair the damage inflicted to our economy and provide for a budget surplus by 2012. It is fiscally sound and domestically and internationally responsible.

Mr. Chairman, the House today has an opportunity to consider an alternative budget offered by the Congressional Black Caucus.

While I wholeheartedly support the budget prepared by Chairman SPRATT, I would also like to express strong support for the Congressional Black Caucus Alternative Budget brought forth by my friend Congressman BOBBY SCOTT of Virginia. I commend Congressman SCOTT and my colleagues of the Congressional Black Caucus for their work on this budget.

The Congressional Black Caucus Alternative Budget meets a stringent test of fiscal responsibility by providing for a budget surplus of $141 billion in Fiscal Year 2012 while funding even more national priorities. More specifically, under Function 300: Natural Resources and the Environment, this budget allocates over $1 billion more than Chairman SPRATT's budget for Hurricane Katrina recovery, environmental justice, and national parks. Another key feature of this budget is that it funds the State Children's Health Insurance Program at a level that will provide insurance for every uninsured child in America.

Mr. Chairman, I could speak for quite some time about the phenomenal features of the Congressional Black Caucus Alternative Budget. I hope that all of my colleagues in this Congress recognize its innovation and merit as another possible means to overcome the budgetary challenges that were exacerbated by the former Republican majority. Both the Democratic and Congressional Black Caucus budgets are common sense solutions to the difficult financial situation with which we have been forced to deal. I urge my colleagues to support both plans.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 99, a budget resolution providing a number of common sense solutions to the budget crisis created by 12 years of Republican fiscal mismanagement.

I was here in 1993 when President Clinton and Congressional Democrats passed our budget resolution. And this year reminds me of 1993. We are hearing exactly the same complaints about this budget as we did that year. And we all know what happened when we passed our budget back then.

The Democrats helped create the longest economic expansion in our Nation's history. We balanced the budget after years of Republican Presidents had pushed us deeper and deeper into debt. We helped create more wealth than had ever been created in America. We created the largest surpluses in history. And we did this without a single Republican supporting our budget.

In fact, the minute the Republicans got back into power, they wiped out the surpluses we gave them, and began drowning us in debt. They took the economic expansion we gave them, and drove us into recession.

Mr. Chairman, once again we are faced with red ink as far as the eye can see. We have a debt of almost $9 trillion, and the Republicans have abdicated any attempt to solve this.

The budget resolution we have introduced incorporates the pay-as-you-go rule that was one of the first acts of the new Democratic Congress. We are also increasing funding for veterans in order to fulfill the promises we made to them long ago. Our budget provides $3.5 billion more than the President's budget for veterans' health care, and $6.6 billion more than was provided in the 2007 budget. This is the largest funding increase for veterans in our Nation's history. We are also providing $50 over the next five years to cover millions of uninsured children.

I strongly support the Democratic budget resolution. It will help put our fiscal house back in order, without relying on the massive middle class tax increase that the President's budget includes. I would encourage my colleagues to support this budget as well.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Fiscal Year 2008 Budget resolution.

I rise in support of this budget because I believe that it truly addresses the needs of all Americans, while restoring fiscal responsibility and accountability. Last year, Democrats pledged to move the country in a new direction and this budget is one more step in fulfilling that commitment. Republicans' irresponsible economic policies of the past six years have left a debt burden of $29,099 for a typical middle-income family of four in Rhode Island. This budget begins to reverse harmful cuts, restores critical domestic programs, and better reflects the priorities of all Americans by strengthening our national defense and investing in future generations.

This budget provides for the largest veterans' budget increase in American history, which will directly bolster healthcare services for 91,160 veterans in Rhode Island. It is also critical for the 4,082 brave Rhode Islanders, who have served their country in Afghanistan and Iraq since September 2001, many of whom will need VA health care services.

In 2004, 13,000 Rhode Island families were subject to the alternative minimum tax—and if nothing is done to fix the system, an estimated 98,000 families here in Rhode Island will be subject to the AMT in 2007. This budget supports middle-class tax cuts and protects middle-income families from a tax increase by setting up a reserve fund for a long-term fix for the alternative minimum tax.

In Rhode Island, there are 100,000 small businesses that serve as the engine of the economy. This budget rejects the President's proposal to cut the Small Business Administration by 26 percent from last year's request and 56 percent from 2001. It also rejects the President's cuts that eliminate $11,429,000 in funding for job training and employment services in Rhode Island. These investments to a growing economy for America's families are needed as family income in Rhode Island has only increased $574 since 2000 and health care and energy prices continue to climb.

In Rhode Island, 20,260 of our children do not have health insurance. This budget helps these children by increasing funding for State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP)—reducing the number of uninsured kids across America by millions. This budget also rejects the Administration's proposal to cut Medicare funding by $170,154,922 for Rhode Island hospitals, skilled nursing facilities and home health care providers—because those proposals would make health care less accessible and less affordable for many Rhode Islanders.

The House budget provides substantially more funding for Rhode Island's 159,600 children enrolled in public elementary, middle and high schools—providing nearly $8 billion more in 2008 and 11 percent more over the next five years for education and training programs than requested by the President. This will increase resources for No Child Left Behind, special education and Head Start—rejecting harsh cuts and under funding for these critical education programs included in the President's budget.

Gas prices have increased by $1.11 in Rhode Island since January 2001, an increase of approximately 73 percent. The Democratic House budget invests in renewable energy and energy efficiency to reduce our dependence on foreign oil, reduce global warming, and promote new technologies that can create American jobs. It will also restore funding for Rhode Island environmental programs cut by the President's budget—including $2,654,000 in Clean Water revolving loan funds that help Rhode Island improve wastewater treatment. Mr. Chairman, this budget is a critical step in a new direction. Today, for the first time in many years, this House will pass a budget that truly represents the priorities of the American people.

Mr. HALL of New York. Mr. Chairman, today it was with great reluctance that I cast my vote against the Woolsey substitute budget amendment. I say it was with great reluctance because the progressive budget put forth by the amendment contained a great many individual provisions that I strongly support.

I strongly applaud the inclusion of full funding for No Child Left Behind in the amendment, and believe that we as a Congress must continue to work toward that goal. For too long, the Republican majority and President Bush have forced local communities to bear the brunt of No Child Left Behind's mandates without sufficient Federal support. For the sake of our children, our schools, and our communities we need to rectify this.

Likewise, I admire, respect, and support the amendment's commitment to full, guaranteed funding for veterans' healthcare. As the ongoing wars in Iraq and Afghanistan create a new generation of veterans with critical new healthcare needs, we must make sure that the VA healthcare system will be able to accommodate them while caring for veterans from previous generations. As a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I remain committed to making sure that the VA can honor the sacred pact we make with our soldiers; that if they fight to defend our Nation, our Nation will make sure they have the care they need.

There are other highly commendable provisions in the amendment, including the repeal of the Bush tax cuts for the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans, tax cuts which I believe have helped to put us on the path to fiscal ruin without providing one bit of support for working families. The proposal also includes much-needed provisions to crack down on corporate welfare and a commitment to expand health coverage to all Americans.

I support these provisions, and it is my deep and abiding hope that they will be brought to the floor of this Chamber individually to be considered and adopted by the House. However, the option to consider them as such was not available today.

The previous majority left this House, and this Nation, with an astounding fiscal train wreck, and in order to restore budgetary balance we must make difficult decisions. I am also concerned that although there are many laudable goals included in the substitute amendment, it failed to reform the Alternative Minimum Tax, which unintentionally and unnecessarily burdens a tremendous number of the residents of the Hudson Valley.

The underlying budget resolution, for which I cast my vote, contains strong funding increases for many of the programs I have discussed, balances the budget, and provides vital AMT relief. In light of the fiscal challenges created by previous Congresses, I believe that the underlying budget represents a strong, responsible step forward and is deserving of support.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, today I voted for both the Congressional Black Caucus and the Progressive Caucus alternatives to the budget resolution, in addition to voting for the House Democratic Budget resolution. I believe all three of these proposals have a great deal of merit.

The Congressional Black Caucus's alternative provides high levels of funding for important national health initiatives, including increasing funding for the State Children's Health Insurance Program by $10 billion and increasing funding for veteran's benefits and services by $3.4 billion over the amounts provided by the House Democratic resolution. Importantly, the Congressional Black Caucus's alternative provides an increase over the House Democratic resolution in foreign aid spending by an additional $3.1 billion—providing much needed funds to fight AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria. The Progressive Caucus's alternative also showcased wise policy choices; it also would have provided increased funding for the State Children's Health Insurance Program and would have invested in America's future by funding educational opportunities, job training programs, and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. In addition, the Progressive Caucus's alternative reflected one of my highest priorities, which was to strip funding from obsolete Cold War era weapons programs that divert precious resources away from America's actual security interests, and its budget projections assumed a complete withdrawal from the Iraqi Civil War.

I was also proud to help craft and vote for the House Democratic Budget resolution, however, because it provides for increased veterans benefits and services, increased educational benefits, increased environmental initiatives, and leads to a budget surplus by 2012. In sum, it represents a reasonable balance of opportunities and it does so within our means—unlike the Republican proposals. A critical aspect of the House Democratic Budget resolution is its provisioning of reserve funds that enable this Congress to begin repairing the damage done by the Republicans to our Nation's fiscal stability by fixing the alternative minimum tax—a "stealth tax" on millions of middle class taxpayers—and preserving tax cuts for the middle class. I voted to express my support for the ideas contained in Congressional Black Caucus's and the Progressive Caucus's budgets, but I also voted to support the House Democratic Budget resolution because it provides a reasoned blueprint for the fiscal decisions facing this country.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, the FY 2008 budget is a monument to irresponsibility and profligacy. It shows that Congress remains oblivious to the economic troubles facing the Nation, and that political expediency trumps all common sense in Washington. To the extent that proponents and supporters of these unsustainable budget increases continue to win reelection, it also shows that many Americans unfortunately continue to believe government can provide them with a free lunch.

To summarize, Congress proposes spending roughly $3 trillion in 2008. When I first came to Congress in 1976, the Federal Government spent only about $300 billion. So spending has increased tenfold in 30 years, and tripled just since 1990.

About one-third of this $3 trillion is so-called discretionary spending; the remaining two-thirds is deemed "mandatory" entitlement spending, which means mostly Social Security and Medicare. I am sure many American voters would be shocked to know their elected representatives essentially have no say over two-thirds of the Federal budget, but that is indeed the case.

The most disturbing problem with the budget is the utter lack of concern for the coming entitlement meltdown. The official national debt figure, now approaching $9 trillion, reflects only what the Federal Government owes in current debts on money already borrowed. It does not reflect what the Federal Government has promised to pay millions of Americans in entitlement benefits down the road. Those future obligations put our real debt figure at roughly 50 trillion dollars—a staggering sum that is about as large as the total household net worth of the entire United States. Your share of this 50 trillion amounts to about $175,000.

For those who thought a Democratic Congress would end the war in Iraq, think again: their new budget proposes supplemental funds totaling about $150 billion in 2008 and $50 billion in 2009 for Iraq. This is in addition to the ordinary Department of Defense budget of more than $500 billion, which the Democrats propose increasing each year just like the Republicans.

The substitute Republican budget is not much better: while it does call for freezing some discretionary spending next year, it increases military spending to make up the difference. The bottom line is that both the Democratic and Republican budget proposals call for more total spending in 2008 than 2007.

My message to my colleagues is simple: If you claim to support smaller government, don't introduce budgets that increase spending over the previous year. Can any fiscal conservative in Congress honestly believe that overall federal spending cannot be cut 25 percent? We could cut spending by two-thirds and still have a Federal Government as large as it was in 1990.

Congressional budgets essentially are meaningless documents, with no force of law beyond the coming fiscal year. Thus budget projections are nothing more than political posturing, designed to justify deficit spending in the near term by promising fiscal restraint in the future. But the time for thrift never seems to arrive: there is always some new domestic or foreign emergency that requires more spending than projected.

Nobody in Washington will look back 5 years from now and exclaim, "Gee whiz, back in 2007 we promised to balance the budget by 2012, so I guess we better stick to that pledge and stop spending so much this year." The only certainty when it comes to Federal budgets is that Congress will spend every penny budgeted and more during the fiscal year in question. All projections about revenues, tax rates, and spending in the future are nothing more than empty promises. Congress will pay no attention whatsoever to the 2008 budget in coming years.

We should not let the debate over numbers distract us from the fundamental yet unspoken issues inherent in any budget proposal: What is the proper role for government in our society? Are the programs, agencies, and departments funded in the budget proposal constitutional? Are they effective? Could they operate with a smaller budget? Would the public even notice if certain items were eliminated altogether? These are the kinds of questions the American people should ask, even if Congress lacks the courage to apply any principles whatsoever to the budget process.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Republican budget alternative and in strong support of the Democratic budget.

I applaud my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for bringing forward a budget alternative, which is no small feat, so we can have a thorough debate about our Nation's priorities.

I would also like to add that I support their commitment to reforming mandatory spending programs. It is a significant problem on the horizon that Federal Reserve Chairman Bernanke, former Fed Chairman Greenspan, the Comptroller General, and others have forewarned us about. While I support their concept of reigning in mandatory spending, I suspect we differ in how to go about that.

What bothers me more about this process is not that we have disagreements, because we are going to have disagreements on where we spend the money and who pays for it. Those are legitimate arguments that should be vigorously debated. But the rhetoric that we use that surrounds it I think is unfair on both sides of the aisle.

I was not here in 2001, but I voted for about half of the 2003 tax cuts because I thought it was the right policy for this country. However, I did not agree with other budget policies. I don't believe that Republican budgets addressed critical health care and education priorities, or met the needs of our veterans. And the policies added staggering amounts to our Nation's debt. Regardless of how we got here, I think we ought to not fool ourselves about where we actually are. This is a train wreck that we find ourselves in, that the former Republican majority could not right. It was such a train wreck that Republicans could not pass a budget and could not finish the appropriations process last year. Democrats had to do a continuing resolution when we assumed the majority this year to clean up the mess that was left behind.

According to the Bush Administration's own numbers, the policies of President Bush and the Republican Congress put us on pace to increase the federal debt by well over $4 trillion by 2008. By comparison, it took the first 41 presidents combined to accumulate a total of $4 trillion in debt.

The debt and deficits we have racked up are not sustainable over time. They undermine America's economic strength by driving up interest rates and reducing investment. They force us to become increasingly beholden to foreign nations, as three-fourths of all new federal borrowing has come from foreign investors such as China and Japan. And they mortgage our children's future, forcing them to pay back the mountains of debt we are incurring today. We should be investing in our children's future, not borrowing from it.

We have a responsibility to begin cleaning up the fiscal mess that we inherited. The

Democratic budget does just that and promises a new direction for our country. What we are trying to do with the Democratic budget is to take tow trucks to this train wreck and pull those cars off the track. Then, somehow, we have got to straighten out the track. It is going to be a lot of tough work and a lot of hammering on those tracks to get them back in line. And then we have got to set those railcars back up on the railroad track and somehow get this train moving again.

Correcting the fiscal course of our country cannot be achieved overnight, but I believe that this budget is a good first step. It addresses our Nation's priorities. It institutes tough spending control measures and fiscal discipline. It provides for responsible tax relief. And it brings our budget back to balance within five years.

The gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. SPRATT, should be commended for helping to right this train. The budget may not be perfect, but he deserves a tremendous amount of credit for what he has done and the Blue Dog Coalition certainly appreciates his efforts. We think we are headed in the right direction and are on the right track.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, today we are living up to the promise we made at the beginning of the new Congress to bring discipline to the federal budget.

By passing this Resolution, we will take an important step toward balancing our nation's budget, begin generating a budget surplus by 2012, and provide resources for critical undertakings in our country.

It's been a long time since we've talked about budget surpluses. Back in 2001, a $5.6 trillion surplus was projected by 2011. In two short years, that surplus disappeared and instead $2.8 trillion was added to the national debt. It now stands today at more than $8.8 trillion.

Today we're turning the corner by upholding the principle of pay-as-you-go. Any new spending has to be offset by cuts to other parts of the budget and new tax cuts must be paid for.

This budget addresses several important national priorities: It provides relief to the middle-class from the Alternative Minimum Tax (AMT) which is causing an increasing number of Americans to absorb a higher tax burden, as well as imposing an enormous paperwork burden on taxpayers who must determine whether or not they have to pay this tax. In my Congressional District, 11 percent of taxpayers are subject to the AMT. On average, they pay $8,000 in additional taxes each year because of it. This budget allows for the extension of expiring middle-class tax provisions, including the child tax credit, marriage penalty relief, the 10-percent bracket, and the deduction for state and local sales taxes; it provides up to $50 billion to expand the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) to cover a million more uninsured children in our country.

Because we're committed to fiscal responsibility, each of these priorities will be paid for.

The budget also provides funding for priorities that have been neglected for too long: it provides $3 billion in additional funding for education, including the No Child Left Behind Act and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; it provides funding for the victims and communities devastated by Hurricane Katrina; it provides $5.4 billion for health care for veterans.

This Budget Resolution provides funding to carry forward the Innovation Agenda that House Democrats under Speaker PELOSI developed last year, a commitment to keep America #1 competitively by making major investments in education and research, and the Resolution delivers on this commitment: it puts us on the path toward doubling the funding for the National Science Foundation and basic research in the physical sciences; it supports important initiatives to educate 100,000 new scientists, engineers, and mathematicians and to ensure that highly qualified teachers are instructing elementary and secondary school students in science and math.

This budget is supported by a wide-array of scientists and innovators, including:

American Electronics Association (AeA)

American Chemical Society (ACS)

American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME)

Association of American Universities (AAU)

Computer & Communications Industry Association (CCIA)

Council on Competitiveness

Electronics Industry Association (EIA)

Information Technology Industry Council (ITI)

Information Technology Association of America (ITAA)

Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE)

National Venture Capital Association (NVCA)

National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC)

Science Coalition

Semiconductor Equipment and Materials International (SEMI)

TechNet.

Technology CEO Council

Mr. Chairman, I know it is not easy to create a budget that satisfies every need, but for the first time in years we have a budget that acknowledges fiscal realities and addresses our national priorities in a balanced and responsible manner. It is a worthy statement of our national values, and I urge my colleagues to vote for this legislation.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 99, the House Budget Resolution for fiscal year 2008. This bill proves that a responsible budget can both reflect the values of our country and ensure the growth of our economy.

For all too long the voice of the American people has not been heard in this Congress. Today, I am proud to say that the new Democratic-led Congress is listening and we are delivering. We have brought a budget to the floor that begins to reverse six years of harmful cuts and reckless fiscal policy, and invests in the Nation's future. This budget supports programs that help more working families help themselves. It keeps our promises to our children, seniors, and veterans.

Unlike the Administration's budget, this carefully crafted budget brings down the deficit by $234 billion over the next 5 years and balances it by 2012. It supports middle-class tax cuts and sets up a reserve fund for a long-term fix for the AMT—a tax that will effect over 580,000 Connecticut families in 2007. The bill also creates a reserve fund of up to $14 billion over 10 years for investments in clean, renewable alternative energy that is paid for by redirecting oil company subsidies.

This budget refuses to leave children behind—it provides $7.9 billion more in funding for education, which means more funding for No Child Left Behind, special education, and aid to help students afford college. The bill also includes a $50 billion reserve fund to expand the State Children's Health Insurance Program, SCHIP, to cover the more than 9 million children without health insurance, including the nearly 73,000 uninsured children in Connecticut. In addition, this budget ensures veterans receive the care that is worthy of their sacrifice. It provides $3.5 billion more this year to provide quality health care for veterans, repair VA health care facilities, and improve the accuracy and time of processing disability claims.

Our budget rejects the President's proposed cuts to Medicare and homeland security grants. Our budget refuses to increase the deficit. Our budget refuses to "stay the course" of the Bush Administration.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting the underlying bill, a budget that reflects the values and priorities of the American people.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, while I agree with many of the priorities in H. Con. Res. 99, the concurrent budget resolution for FY–08, unfortunately, I cannot support it.

I have serious concerns about increasing government spending and cannot support a budget that allows key tax cuts to expire.

I am also concerned about the partisanship that I have seen leading up to this vote.

Last fall, voters in my district told me they wanted to change the tone in Washington. They wanted Congress to ratchet down the rhetoric, and start working together to find sensible solutions to our common problems.

That included our nation's financial mess.

The current mess affects us all. Not just Democrats, and not just Republicans.

Sadly, listening to this week's budget debate, you would never know it.

I refuse to believe we cannot find a third way, a bipartisan way, to incorporate good ideas from both sides of the aisle.

It seems to me tax cuts should be a good place to start. Most of us support tax cuts for middle income families.

In my view, this should include reduced estate taxes and reduced capital gains.

It is true that, once upon a time, stock ownership was the province of the rich. But today, with the proliferation of 401(k)s and mutual funds, nearly half of all Americans own stock.

As stock ownership has grown mainstream, it has become increasingly important to keep capital gains low.

This and other tax cuts are scheduled to expire in 2010, and despite what some are saying, today's budget does, in fact, maintain them until that time.

What today's budget does not do, and what I hope future budgets will do, is find a way to extend these cuts beyond 2010.

Obviously, this is easier said than done, especially if we are serious about reducing the deficit. But I believe that, unless we make this a priority now, it will become that much harder to accomplish in the future.

I applaud today's budget for its commitment to education, transportation, and veterans. These are critical priorities, which have been short-changed in the recent past, and they deserve our utmost attention. In the rush to make improvements, however, we need to

make sure we are getting the most out of what we are already spending. Voters have a right to expect accountability. I encourage all my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, to ask tough questions as they review current Federal programs.

Working together, I know we can support our Nation's priorities and get our fiscal house in order.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 99.

For the last 6 years we have been swimming in serious red ink. Deep red ink. Thanks to President Bush and the Republicans in Congress we have added almost three trillion dollars to our Nation's debt. This red ink also seemed to be without end. In the past the other side of the aisle put forward budgets that did not reflect a serious commitment to responsible fiscal policy. Those budgets also failed to reflect the priorities of the American people.

Well, Mr. Chairman, Congress is under new management. That new management has produced a budget for the House to consider about which the American people can be proud.

The Democratic budget is fiscally responsible. It reimposes pay-as-you-go (PAYGO) budgeting principles and achieves balance in 2012. At the same time, this budget puts our priorities in the proper order.

For example, it provides tax relief to those who it needs it most—the middle-class. This tax relief includes the extension of certain tax breaks, such as the child tax credit, and reform of the Alternative Minimum Tax (AMT).

This budget also increases spending on the things that matter most to the American people, such as our children, education, health care, and veterans. Today we will be providing for a $50 billion increase in funds to provide health insurance to millions of more uninsured kids. Education, training, and related programs will receive three billion more than current levels and almost eight billion more than requested by the President. Funding for veterans' health care services is increased by 14.4 percent.

I am proud to support this budget. It reflects a responsible fiscal position and puts our limited resources towards programs and policies that are important to this nation. I encourage all of my colleagues to vote in favor of H. Con. Res. 99.

Mr. SALI. Mr. Chairman, today Members of Congress faced two budget resolutions. The choice is a clear one between bigger, more expensive and more intrusive government versus fiscal discipline based on key priorities.

Now, fiscal discipline is hard, which is why it is not always popular. It is easy for some to vote to increase government spending, but ultimately someone must pay for it. It is common to hear about the ''government'' doing this project or that project. We hear a lot about the ''government'' spending money, but we must not allow the idea of ''government'' doing something to lead us to forget that, ultimately, ''We the People'' are the ones who have to pay for what government does. The nineteenth century economist Frederic Bastiat once said that ''government is the great fiction through which everybody endeavors to live at the expense of everybody else.''

Although the Federal Government is not known for its fiscal discipline, we are now facing a budget that exceeds even the most fevered imaginings of history's biggest spenders. It would enact the largest tax increase in history—an almost $400 billion increase.

This is one path, and it is the one down which the new Majority proposes to take us. We also had the opportunity to take another path, a roadway to a balanced budget without raising taxes on working Americans.

The choice is clear. The Democratic budget would do serious harm to Idahoans, their families and their businesses. The Democratic budget would: Raise taxes on 436,000 Idahoans who benefit from the current 10 percent tax bracket; force 176,000 married couples in Idaho to pay for an increase in the marriage tax penalty; force 133,000 Idahoans with children to pay higher taxes because of the expiration of the current child tax credit; and raise tax rates on capital gains and dividends for 74,000 Idaho investors, including Idaho senior citizens.

The Democrats are demanding that hard-working Idahoans further subsidize the already bulging government coffers. More than that, the reckless increases in entitlement spending included in their bill would require that generations to come pay for our present unwillingness to make tough decisions.

As many know but few heed, the explosive rate of entitlement spending is simply not sustainable. If the current rate of federal entitlement spending remains unabated, Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid will consume 20 percent of the Nation's economy annually by 2040. If trends continue, entitlements will take up over 60 percent of the entire Federal budget in less than a decade. Our Nation is one of great prosperity, but no nation can expect to maintain economic and political greatness by feeding government programs at the expense of working families.

Few will be untouched by this vicious money-grab. Seniors, married couples, parents, small business owners, lower-income earners—all will be forced to turn over more of their earnings to the Federal Government.

In contrast, I support the Republican-offered substitute budget. The Republican budget reaches a balanced budget by 2012, but retains the important tax cuts adopted in 2001 and 2003. The Republican budget does not arbitrarily raise the 10 percent bracket to 15 percent; it preserves the current 10 percent rate. Lower-income earners need that money more than the government does. The Republican budget: Stops raiding the Social Security surplus; reins-in unsustainable, runaway entitlement spending by slowing the rate of annual entitlement spending growth, thereby saving money for the taxpayers; prepares for the future by budgeting in advance for national emergencies and crises; refines and strengthens the so-called ''pay as you go'' (PAYGO) rules to require that spending increases be offset with spending reductions instead of increasing taxes; caps discretionary spending through 2010 so Congress cannot simply throw more money at problems that require real solutions.

In short, we in Congress are accountable to our constituents. We must remember that real people and their livelihoods are at stake back home. If we wish to help those back in our districts, we must bear in mind that we do not have all the answers here in Washington. Congress did not earn the money that we took in taxes. It was hard-working Americans that earned it. If we fail to make the direly-needed tough choices about runaway spending, we are merely fostering a tax-and-spend culture that demands our constituents make pay a greater sacrifice in their earnings.

This is an unacceptable demand to make. Thankfully, the President has said he would veto the Democratic bill. Yet unless Congress begins to take seriously the need for economic growth, tax reduction for families and balancing the Federal budget, relying on the nation's Chief Executive to exercise his veto pen is like depending on a child to put his finger in the leak of a dyke. It will only work for a short time. We've got to do better, soon.

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Chairman, Federal budgets reflect our values as a nation. This Nation has rejected passing the monumental debt run up by this administration and past congresses on to their children. We are bringing a new fiscal direction to our budgeting process.

Correcting the fiscal course of the country will not be easy, or fast. We did it before, but success only comes with the hard work of passing budget and appropriations bills every year . . . unlike the way past Congresses did it: not paying the bills, running up huge waves of debt in the form of higher taxes on our children. We're about to start doing this right.

Our fiscal outlook deteriorated dramatically over the past 6 years. In 2001, the administration inherited a projected 10-year (2002–2011) budget surplus of $5.6 trillion. After paying for tax cuts for the richest among us, that surplus was gone. Between that and the 9–11 attacks, the United States accumulated a mountain of debt, adding $2.8 trillion to our Federal debt burden since 2001. Most of this debt has been purchased by foreign investors, making the U.S. economy more vulnerable to economic and political instability and political pressure from abroad.

Deficits matter. It is our moral responsibility to start cleaning up the fiscal chaos wrought by the last Congresses and the President. Living beyond our means comes at a cost to our children and grandchildren who will have to pay off that debt. The irresponsible economic policies of the past 6 years have left a debt burden of $29,075 for a typical middle-income family of four in Texas.

Deficits also hurt economic growth by slowing down national savings, which leaves us less to invest in our future. That means lower productivity and wages for future workers. The President's budget continued the fiscal approach that has brought us large deficits and growing debt.

This budget is in sharp contrast to the trend of spending our children's money like mad. Today's budget takes the necessary steps to eliminate our long-term budget deficit by adhering to the pay-as-you-go principle, just as families at kitchen tables do every day across the country.

A balanced budget must include balanced priorities. For the first time in 6 years, the congressional budget resolution will balance the Federal budget—in 2012—while also defending our country, delivering critical services to children and families, caring for our veterans, educating our children, and growing the U.S. economy.

The 2008 budget is the blueprint for the new direction we are taking the American people. It provides greater deficit reduction than the administration in the first 5 years, leading to a budget surplus in 2012 . . . we pay for the budget as we go, not as we hope we'll have a windfall of money . . .

I am particularly pleased at the matters affecting South Texas, including:

The largest veterans' budget increase in American history—$3.5 billion more this year ($32 billion over the next 5 years) for veterans' health care than the President's budget.

Greater investment in areas that deal with homeland security, rejecting the cuts to vital first responder and terrorism prevention programs included in the President's FY 2008 budget. Under the President's budget, the State Homeland Security Grant Program—which awarded $277,028,279 to Texas from 2003 to 2006—would be slashed by 52 percent. The Law Enforcement Terrorist Prevention Program (LETPP)—which awarded $70,936,283 to Texas from 2004 to 2006—would be eliminated.

Funds to begin implementing the 9/11 Commission recommendations to make Texas and our nation more secure.

Investments in a 21st Century Workforce for a growing economy and protects middle-class taxpayers.

Increasing funding for State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP)—in Texas, where previous budget cuts left 1,366,710 children without health insurance.

Rejecting the administration's proposal to cut Medicare funding by $1,586,784,434 for Texas hospitals, skilled nursing facilities and home health care providers.

Providing substantially more funding for Texas' 4,365,200 children enrolled in public elementary, middle and high schools—providing nearly $8 billion more in 2008 and 11 percent more over the next 5 years for education and training programs than requested by the President.

Increasing resources for No Child Left Behind, special education and Head Start—rejecting the harsh cuts and underfunding for these critical education programs in the President's budget.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this budget, and begin a new era of fiscal sanity and investment in our greatest resource—Americans.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 99, the Budget Resolution for FY 2008. This measure will provide robust funding for some of the most important programs to the American people, while simultaneously maintaining our commitment to fiscal discipline.

Last year, the Democrats promised to move the country in a new and better direction. The budget before us today restores many of the programs that the President proposed to cut, while allowing us to not only balance our budget but return to surplus by 2012. I am pleased that the Democratic budget meets our commitment to national defense and supports those who have served our country by providing significant increases for military and veterans' health care. We must not leave behind those who have risked their lives in defense of our Nation, and this budget includes $3.5 billion more than the President's to improve care in the areas of mental health, post-traumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injury and spinal cord injury—areas of great concern for our veterans returning from Iraq and Afghanistan.

As the Chairman of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Emerging Threats, Cybersecurity and Science and Technology, I am proud to support a budget that properly invests in our homeland security initiatives. Unlike the President's proposal, we provide considerable funding for programs important to state and local law enforcement in Rhode Island, including the State Homeland Security Grant Program, which awarded approximately $50 million to Rhode Island from 2003 to 2006, and the Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program, from which Rhode Island received $11.5 million from 2004 to 2006. By passing the Democratic budget, we can give first responders in Rhode Island the tools they need to keep our citizens safe.

In addition, the new Democratic leadership has made implementing the 9/11 Commission recommendations a top priority for the 110th Congress. This task was completed in the first 100 hours, and today we underscore our commitment to those recommendations by providing sufficient funding to carry them out.

The Democratic budget also meets our Nation's domestic priorities, notably in the area of health care. While the President proposed to cut children from the State Children's Health Insurance Program, SCHIP, our budget includes a $50 billion reserve fund to expand SCHIP to cover more of the nine million children without health insurance in this country. In Rhode Island's RIte Care program, federal SCHIP funds are leveraged to provide health insurance to many children living in families with at least one working parent or an income below 250 percent of the poverty level. RIte Care also covers certain pregnant women and parents, providing peace of mind for families who would otherwise face uncertainty about health care. Still, despite these relatively generous eligibility policies, there are still 18,680 uninsured children in the state, or 6.6 percent of all Rhode Island children, which is why additional support is needed to protect our most vulnerable. The Democratic budget provides that support.

This budget will also increase funding for education, social services, and job training programs by almost $8 billion over the 2008 program level in the President's budget, important steps that we must take to reverse 6 years of harmful cuts. Pell Grants, which offer so many American students the opportunity to access higher education, have seen a significant decline in purchasing power in recent years. Under this budget, we will raise the maximum Pell Grant to at least $4,600 and take significant steps toward making college a possibility for all of our Nation's young people.

The budget we are considering today also restores critical community development and social services programs that the President proposed to cut. Community and regional development programs like the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) provide vital funding for economic and community development in both urban and rural areas nationwide. This proposal will also restore funding to the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) which helps lower-income families cope with rising heating and cooling costs.

In another effort to lower energy costs and provide a new vision for America's energy policy, the Democratic budget makes a major investment in alternative and renewable energy research, which will move us closer to energy independence and improve our environment. It includes an additional $300 million this year for the Department of Energy, which could be invested in renewable and alternative energy development and energy efficiency initiatives. It also establishes a reserve fund that could provide as much as $14 billion over 10 years to invest in clean and renewable energy resources. Just as our Nation rallied around President Kennedy's call to put a man on the moon, we must similarly harness the creativity and expertise of our citizens and private industry to develop new technologies and work toward energy independence.

The Democratic budget also recognizes the importance of preserving our environment and public lands for future generations by providing an additional $2.6 billion for environmental programs—9 percent more than the President's request. It also blocks the President's proposed cuts to vital environmental programs such as the Land and Water Conservation Fund, EPA clean water grants and our National Wildlife Refuge system. Rhode Islanders have a long history of protecting our natural resources, and I am pleased that this budget reflects those values.

Finally, this budget includes several greatly needed extensions of tax provisions that will continue to help middle class families and small businesses to prosper. The Democratic budget establishes a reserve fund that will continue to provide tax cuts to millions of working families nationwide, and it will reduce the burden of the alternative minimum tax (AMT) that adversely affects thousands of Rhode Islanders each year. Democrats are committed to reducing the increasing tax burdens on middle-class Americans in a way that adheres to the fiscally responsible pay-as-you-go rules adopted by this Congress.

For too long the American people have been forced to choose between losing funding for vital domestic programs and running record deficits that will ultimately be passed along for our children and grandchildren to pay. Today, we finally have the opportunity to support a budget that will fund programs thousands of Rhode Islanders rely upon, while maintaining our commitment to fiscal responsibility. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting yes on the Democratic budget resolution.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, over the last 6 years, under one party control we had the largest and fastest accumulation of national debt in our Nation's history. The national debt skyrocketed to $8.8 trillion. Today we have a budget that changes the failed policies of the past and is, instead, a new direction to get the U.S. government back in the black with surpluses like those the country enjoyed at the beginning of this decade.

At the start of the 110th Congress, our party promised that when we took over as the majority party we would get the fiscal books back in order. This budget fulfills that promise by bringing the budget back to surplus by 2012. It gets us there by strictly adhering to the pay-as-you-go rules that was implemented at the beginning of this year. Additionally, this budget contains tough program integrity measures to crack down on wasteful spending, and it directs all committees to review their programs to promote efficiency and eliminate unnecessary spending.

This budget stands in stark contrast to the President's budget on many fronts. As I previously stated, this budget reaches balance in 2012 and starts paying down our debt. The President's budget does neither.

Budgets are all about priorities. This budget makes it clear that the priorities of this Congress are the priorities of the American people. Our budget provides for our national security, our veterans, our children, and working families across America.

The budget framework contains the necessary resources to meet critical threats to the Nation and to deliver excellent health care to those who have served in the armed forces. Funding for veterans' services is increased by $6.6 billion over the 2007 level, and by $3.5 billion above the President's request for 2008. This will cover the Veterans Administration's (VA) increasing patient load and the cost of forthcoming recommendations to improve health care facilities and treatment for service members and veterans. It is the largest expansion of veterans' healthcare funding since the creation of our VA system.

Most importantly, this budget reduces the deficit, which will decrease our reliance on foreign investors to buy our debt. Since 2001, foreign ownership of Treasury securities has more than doubled to $2.2 trillion, leaving our economy more vulnerable to foreign investment decisions and instability. The more we rely on our global competitors like China and India to finance our debt, the more vulnerable America's economic well-being—now and in the future—becomes. As the father of two little boys, I did not come to this Congress to leave a legacy of debt for them or future generations to climb out of. Let us pass this sensible, fiscally responsible budget that protects important American values so that years from now, we can look back and say, yes, we had to make some tough decisions, but they were the right decisions under the right circumstances, and American families are the primary beneficiaries as a result.

The Budget Resolution before us today makes the tough decisions to get us back to surpluses, while offering an economic stimulus plan now which is fair, quick, and responsible. It supports our troops, but it also supports our Nation's veterans, our seniors, and our children's education programs. I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this common sense fiscally responsible Budget Resolution.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, my opposition to this proposal is clear and fundamental. It raises taxes. It is not fiscally responsible. It does not protect Social Security, and it does not protect the interests of families, who as the cornerstone of our society, deserve to be the very first consideration in each of our legislative decisions.

I am pleased to support Mr. RYAN, ranking member of the Budget Committee, and my colleagues on the Republican Study Committee on the conservative alternative to the budget blueprint before us today. I was pleased to offer a tax cut amendment to this legislation that would have extended the tax cuts of 2001 and 2003 at least until 2012. Unfortunately, the amendment was not accepted, but I rise today to say that my opposition to H. Con. Res. 99 does not end with runaway taxes and spending.

True, the proposal has excessive spending that mortgages our children's future on government programs.

True, the proposal raises taxes on families and businesses, reinstates the ''marriage penalty'', reincarnates the death tax, and cuts the child tax credit in half.

True, these tax increases, the biggest in American history, will cost the average Ohio family thousands of dollars in higher taxes.

But what is most troubling is that the entire budget is based on a premise that is antithetical to what makes America great.

This budget postulates that economic security . . . a ''Great Society'' if you will . . . is just another government program away.

It says that the tax cuts currently in place, which have led to private sector growth with 7.6 million new jobs, 42 straight months of uninterrupted economic growth, the Dow Jones Industrial Average above 12,000, record levels of investment, and record low unemployment . . . tax cuts that have helped every American family regardless of income, are better left to expire.

It says that the $392.5 billion of additional tax dollars Democrats expect spend over the next 5 years are better spent on government programs than in the pockets of American families. It says that what we need is more government, not more jobs, not more economic growth, not more money working its way through our private sector economy.

Just 3 months into this new majority, the tax man has come twice, and he is coming again.

Mr. Chairman, April 15, the day American taxpayers love to hate, is still 18 days away. But today, March 29th, is the day the American taxpayer will come to fear.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting ''no'' on record tax hikes.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I support this budget resolution because it will begin the process of changing our budgetary course.

For 6 years, the Administration and the Republican leadership insisted on speeding ahead with misguided fiscal and economic policies. Ignoring all warning lights, they plowed ahead, taking us from projections of surpluses to the reality budgets deep in deficit and heaping higher the mountain of debt that our children will have to repay.

Many of us said it was urgent to stop persisting in that error and voted for alternatives, including those proposed by the Blue Dog Caucus.

But year after year our Republican colleagues insisted on taking their marching orders from the White House, moving in lockstep to endorse the Bush Administration's insistence that its economic and fiscal policies must continue without change.

I admired their discipline, but I could not support their insistence on driving us deeper into the swamp of fiscal irresponsibility that has left a debt burden of $30,951 for a typical middle-income family of four in Colorado.

And now, in this new Congress under new management, by passing this budget resolution we can begin to undo the damage they have done.

The resolution is better in its fiscal responsibility and in its priorities.

It follows the tough ''pay as you go'' budget rules to begin to reverse the budget deficits and to put us onto the path to a balanced budget. And under this plan, by 2012, domestic discretionary funding would fall to the lowest level, as a share of the economy, in at least a half century while spending as a percentage of GDP will be lower in 2012 than it has been in any budget adopted under President Bush—1 percent lower than it will be this year and lower than it has been in any year since 2001.

At the same time it provides for continuing middle-class tax cuts and reform of the Alternative Minimum Tax (AMT) to protect middle-income families from a tax increase by default. This is important because while in 2004 only 32,000 Colorado families were subject to the AMT, if nothing is done, this year that number will rise to 234,000 families in Colorado and hundreds of thousands more in other States.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I am particularly glad to note that the budget resolution is also realistic and responsible about the need to maintain our national defense and honor our promises to our troops and veterans.

It provides for investing $507 billion for national defense and another $145 billion for overseas deployment and other activities while reordering defense priorities in order to make sufficient funds available for nuclear non-proliferation programs, military health care, and military pay raises and benefits.

I think ensuring the people who protect our country are provided for is a significant part of meeting our national defense requirements. So, I'm pleased that the resolution rejects increases in TRICARE fees for military personnel under age 65.

And the budget committee worked with the chairman of our committee, Representative SKELTON, to assure that the resolution will allow Congress to support the implementation of recommendations of the Commission appointed to review conditions at Walter Reed and other military health facilities—a provision that is so important for our wounded warriors.

The resolution provides for a much-needed increase in veterans' programs—for veterans health care, no less than $3.5 billion more this year (and $32 billion over the next 5 years) than the President's budget—to provide health care for new veterans, repair VA health care facilities, make needed investments in veterans' mental health care and traumatic brain injury, and speed up and improve the accuracy of disability claims processing.

This is a priority for me, because it will help ensure that the 427,957 veterans in Colorado receive care worthy of their sacrifice. It is also critical for the 17,419 Coloradans, who have served their country in Afghanistan and Iraq since September 2001, many of whom will need VA health care services.

The resolution also provides for increases homeland security and rejects the cuts to vital first responder and terrorism prevention programs that would happen if we adopted the President's budget for fiscal 2008. I support that because following the President's budget would mean reducing the State Homeland Security Grant Program—which awarded $88,508,658 to Colorado from 2003 to 2006—would be slashed by 52 percent and the Law Enforcement Terrorist Prevention Program (LETPP)—which awarded $22,392,512 to Colorado from 2004 to 2006—would be eliminated.

And the resolution provides for beginning to implement the 9/11 Commission recommendations to make Colorado and our Nation more secure.

Similarly, the resolution recognizes the importance of research, development, and education in keeping our economy strong and our country secure.

It recognizes that scientific research provides the foundation for innovation and our ability to compete with other countries by setting us on a path toward doubling funding for

the National Science Foundation and research by other agencies while increasing collaborative research-purpose partnerships.

As a member of the Science and Technology Committee and Chairman of its Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, I am particularly supportive of the resolution because it rejects the President's proposed cuts to aviation programs within NASA in order to help ensure that such vital programs as development of the next-generation management system for air traffic can go forward.

Similarly, as one of the Chairs of the Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Caucus, I welcome the resolution's declaration that increased research and development of renewable and alternative energy technologies ''needs to come soon and be substantial.'' I think that sets exactly the right priority.

And I similarly welcome the resolution's allowing for additional emphasis on science, technology, and mathematics (''STEM'') education by increasing funding for National Science Foundation programs that support training qualified teachers in these important areas.

The resolution recognizes the importance of investing in renewable energy and energy efficiency to improve our security by lessening our dependence on foreign oil as well as to reduce global warming and promote new technologies that can create American jobs. So, it creates a reserve fund that could target up to $14 billion over 10 years to invest in clean, renewable alternative energy and energy efficiency paid for by redirecting oil subsidies.

And it restores funding for environmental programs cut by the President's budget—including $3,162,000 in Clean Water revolving loan funds that help Colorado communities improve their wastewater treatment facilities.

As for education, the resolution allows for substantially more funding for helping Colorado's public elementary, middle and high schools educate the 768,600 children now enrolled—nearly $8 billion more in 2008 and 11 percent more over the next 5 years for education and training programs than requested by the President.

This means more resources to implement the No Child Left Behind Act, special education and Head Start. By contrast, if we followed the President's budget, 31,296 Colorado children would not receive promised help in reading and math and the Head Start program—which serves 9,820 Colorado children—would be cut by 1.5 percent below the 2007 level.

Small businesses are essential for Colorado's economy—and the resolution rejects the President's proposal to cut the Small Business Administration by 26 percent from last year's request and 56 percent from 2000. It also recognizes the importance of job training for the kind of high-skilled workforce we need to keep America competitive—which is why it rejects the President's proposal to eliminate $54,403,000 in funding for job training and employment services in Colorado.

These investments to a growing economy for America's families are needed because, according to the Census Bureau, family income in Colorado has dropped by $4,041 since 2000, while health care and energy prices are climbing. But still more is needed.

So, I am glad that the resolution provides for increasing funding for State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP)—to help cover the 176,230 of Colorado's children do not have health insurance. And I am pleased that it also rejects the Administration's proposal to cut Medicare funding by $261,719,066 for Colorado hospitals, skilled nursing facilities and home health care providers—another misguided proposal that would make health care less accessible and affordable for many Coloradans.

Mr. Chairman, I can understand why the Bush Administration does not like this resolution. After all, it rejects the Administration's misguided priorities. But it's disappointing that so many of our Republican colleagues still are so willing to unquestioningly follow the president's lead. And, while I suppose it's to be expected, it's particularly unfortunate that they have decided to attack this budget resolution by resorting to recycling the old, tired—and false—claim that it is ''the largest tax increase in history.''

The fact is that this is no tax increase in the resolution. It assumes the same level of revenues between now and 2012 period as projected by the Congressional Budget Office under its current-policy baseline, which essentially assumes no change in current laws governing taxes.

In other words, this resolution does not affect the top-heavy tax cuts the Bush Administration and the Republican leadership pushed through since 2001—they remain in place as they stand, which means they will not expire for 4 years.

I did not vote for all of those tax cuts, but I did support some that are most important for middle-income Coloradans. So, I am glad that the resolution provides for extensions of those in 2011, including an extension of the child tax credit, marriage penalty relief, and the 10 percent individual income tax bracket.

And when the rest of the tax cuts come up for reconsideration, Congress can and should consider whether to extend them, as they are now or in modified form.

I support that approach, which is quite different from the alternative approach taken by the Republican alternative, which insists on locking in all of the Bush tax cuts—the ones I did not support as well as those I did—and would put top priority on making them all permanent.

There are some things in the Republican alternative that I do support—including a constitutionally-sound line-item veto similar to my Stimulating Leadership in Cutting Expenditures (''SLICE'') legislation—but overall I think it is not a responsible approach and I cannot support it, just as I cannot support the other alternatives that go too far in the other direction by calling for large tax increases.

Unlike all those alternatives, the resolution developed by the Budget Committee is the best balanced in its combination of fiscal responsibility and refocusing priorities. I will support it and I urge its approval by the House.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Democratic budget offered today. This budget is a stark contrast to the President's budget which proves to be entirely insufficient in meeting the needs of our Nation, and those of my constituents in the third district of Florida. A budget is about priorities, and the President's priorities are to ask our seniors, our students, our children, the middle class, and the working poor, to make fiscal sacrifices, while the rich count their money.

As an African-American woman who represents one of the poorest districts in the state of Florida, I am proud to say that Democrats are fighting for a budget that reflects the values of America's working families. For the first time in 6 years, the congressional budget resolution will deliver fiscal responsibility, economic prosperity, a strong national defense, affordable health care and energy prices, and strong public schools.

Let me give you some examples of the differences between the President's budget and the Democratic budget:

The President's budget has deficits as far as the eye can see with an increase of $507 billion over the next 5 years. The House Democratic budget lowers the deficit in 2008 and balances the budget in 5 years.

The President's budget cuts vital health care programs even when there are over 3 million Floridians without health insurance. The House Democratic budget puts children and families first by providing $50 billion to expand children's health insurance and creates a reserve fund that would allow Medicare improvements—such as increasing the reimbursement rate for physicians and improving the Medicare prescription drug program.

The President's budget fails to protect Americans here at home by slashing funding for the COPS program by 94 percent. COPS is regarded as an overwhelming success and has funded more than 118,400 police officers and sheriffs deputies. The House Democratic budget provides more homeland security dollars to fund the 9/11 Commission's recommendations, reject the President's cuts to first responders, and adequately address port security needs.

The President's budget forgets about the over 1.7 million veterans in Florida by cutting funds for their healthcare in 2009 and 2010 and imposing new health care fees on 1.3 million veterans. The House Democratic budget meets previously unmet needs for veterans by increasing funding for veterans' health care by $5.4 billion above current services.

The President's budget gives no relief to Americans struggling with high energy costs. Florida low-income energy assistance was slashed by $6.5 million and gas prices have increased approximately 69 percent since 2001. The House Democratic Budget expands renewable energy and energy efficiency by stimulating the economy with investments in the farm economy and in research to develop clean, sustainable energy alternatives to help America achieve energy independence in 10 years.

The President's budget betrays Florida's children by underfunding the No Child Left Behind Act for the 6th year. Nearly 160,000 children in Florida will go without promised help in reading and math. The House Democratic Budget has a $3 billion increase in funding for programs like No Child Left Behind, special education and aid to help students afford college.

In closing, I would like to reiterate that Democrats are committed to a new direction for America in which the interests of hard-working Florida families take priority over the special interests. This budget delivers fiscal responsibility, economic prosperity, a strong national defense, access to healthcare and high-quality public schools for the people in my district and for Americans overall.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to H. Con. Res. 99, which has been

called the single biggest tax increase in American history.

However, I rise today to express my extreme disappointment that the majority decided to oppose debate on an amendment I offered to express the sense of Congress that the money the Federal Government spends is not the Government's, but rather the hard-earned dollars of the American taxpayer. My amendment also declares that Congress has a duty to guard against waste and excessive spending, that Congress should balance the Federal budget, and that Congress should expeditiously pass a constitutional amendment requiring a balanced budget.

It is common sense to American families that they cannot spend more than they have—yet far too frequently, this fundamental principle has been lost on a Federal Government that is too busy spending to pay attention to the bottom line. Unless Congress is forced to balance the Federal budget, it will always have the all-too-tempting option of shirking this responsibility.

On the first day of this Congress, I introduced H.J. Res. 1, a constitutional amendment requiring Congress to balance the budget, which has garnered 159 bipartisan cosponsors. I hereby renew my call on Congress to pass this crucial legislation, which also makes it harder to raise taxes.

However, in the meantime, my simple amendment to the budget resolution would have been the least we could do to show the American people that Congress is committed to the same fiscal principles that America's families face each day. It is very telling that the majority thought it best to sweep this debate under the rug.

Regarding the merits of the underlying Democrat resolution, it assumes the expiration of all the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts, and adds those revenues, some $392 billion, into the budget over time. At the same time, they have chosen to increase discretionary spending. In fact, under the Democrat budget, appropriated spending is projected to increase faster than the rate of projected inflation. By increasing taxes on the American people in order to fund their own priorities, the Democrats assume that they know how to better spend the taxpayers' hard-earned dollars.

For America's farmers and ranchers already facing increased input costs, increased taxes would further add insult to injury. For many farmers and ranchers, this budget appears to hold the key to bolstering the budget for American agriculture. This bill purports to provide the Agriculture Committee with an extra $20 billion, seemingly tucked away in a "reserve fund" to be released at the discretion of the Budget Committee chairman. Although they've made it sound like there's an extra $20 billion just lying around waiting to be spent; this could not be further from the truth.

The $20 billon is only available if it can be offset by cuts in other spending or increased taxes. The Agriculture Committee, as well as every other Congressional committee, already has the authority to spend dollars created by offsets under existing rules.

This is either a poorly constructed hoax designed to create an illusion of increased funding, or it is part of a broader plan to continue to raise taxes to pay for increased program spending. In either case, there is nothing about the Democrat budget that does anything to relieve the budget crunch that farmers face in this farm bill.

I urge my colleagues to see this budget for what it is and vote "no."

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Democrat budget resolution. A majority of my colleagues on this side of the aisle have rightly spoken against this budget because it includes the largest tax increase in American history. And let there be no doubt: This tax increase would destroy jobs, take more money from working families, and bring our economic growth to a screeching halt.

However, I'd like to speak for a moment about a little-discussed provision in this resolution that could have significant negative consequences of its own. This resolution includes a reconciliation instruction for the Education and Labor Committee to find $75 million in savings from our mandatory programs. On its face, that seems harmless, although I think we can all agree that $75 million is hardly a serious effort at deficit reduction. After all, our committee is no stranger to this effort, having saved taxpayers some $12 billion through reconciliation in the last Congress while significantly improving the student aid programs for all our students.

However, make no mistake, this instruction is not as innocent as it looks. In fact, the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee recently called it a "stalking horse for a significant expansion of spending." And he's absolutely correct. This small reconciliation instruction may serve to have the largest impact on the Federal student loan program in history.

Simply put, the majority is trying to take advantage of the reconciliation process to jam through an expansion of the federally-run Direct Loan program—knowing that strong opposition to the expansion of this program would prohibit it from being successfully added to the Higher Education Act if its reauthorization was proceeding through regular order. The laundry list of reasons why giving the Direct Loan program a leg-up on the traditional, private-run student loan program would harm students and taxpayers alike is another discussion for another day. But let there be no mistake: This budget would allow for just that.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to amend the Senate Budget Committee chairman's words slightly and call this reconciliation instruction a "Trojan horse"—because if this largely unnoticed instruction remained in place, the negative consequences on our student lending system would be almost unimaginable. The Federal Government is not meant to be a clearinghouse for college loans, and the Department of Education's ability to manage the scant 20 percent of all loans currently administered through the Direct Loan program is shaky, at best.

Just think of what adding even more bureaucracy would do for the students counting on good customer service and taxpayers counting on a well-managed program. Once again, it's almost unimaginable. I urge my colleagues to oppose the Democrat budget resolution and support the Republican substitute.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my regret for missing several recorded votes during consideration of the budget resolution for fiscal year 2008. Unfortunately, I was called out of Washington to deliver the eulogy for a close friend of mine and my father's, Ed Bailey. Ed served the House of Representatives for 16 years as an aide to my late father, and I am honored to be making these remarks. This duty required that I leave for Knoxville prior to the final votes of Thursday, March 29, 2007.

I would like the RECORD to reflect that had I been in Washington, I would have supported the Republican Budget Substitute and opposed the underlying text of H. Con. Res. 99.

The reason for these votes is simple. I am fiscally conservative. The Democrat budget provides for tax hikes on Americans and America's businesses in order to pay for more Government spending. Also, this budget ignores the problems with our entitlement spending and defers these burdens to later generations.

I support the Republican budget because it continues to give American workers real tax benefits. It curbs out of control and inefficient discretionary spending.

The Ryan substitute also tackles the massive problem of entitlement spending and seeks to reform the Medicare and Medicaid systems. These reforms are absolutely necessary to ensure that these valuable programs are around for our children and their children.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Republican budget substitute, which is the most fiscally responsible budget before us today. It may not a perfect budget, but no real budget can be, because we live in a world of unlimited wants and needs but of limited resources.

I also want to take this opportunity to thank Ranking Member PAUL RYAN, my good friend and a fiscal conservative stalwart from Wisconsin, who has truly helped lead the way not only on the Republican budget but also on revealing the true effects of the Democrat budget and substitutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget, unlike those offered by the Democrats, does not, I'll repeat, the Republican budget does not raise taxes.

I know these numbers have been cited many times over in this budget debate, but it is important for the American people to fully understand the impact of the new majority's budget policy on their pocketbooks.

Mr. Chairman, the Democrat committee-passed budget raises taxes by almost $400 billion. The Congressional Black Caucus budget raises taxes by $711 billion. The Progressive Caucus Budget raises taxes by almost $950 billion.

Three Democrat budgets, three giant tax increases—and, since baseball season is upon us, I'll say these three budgets sound like strike one, strike two, and strike three—and you know how the rest goes.

However, Mr. Chairman, my Democrat colleagues don't have to strike out because they can vote for a budget that will balance in 5 years without raising taxes; they can vote for the Republican alternative.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, a budget is a moral document that demonstrates our values and priorities. I believe this budget by Chairman JOHN SPRATT repesents values I can be proud of. This budget funds education, healthcare, housing and development while brinnging the budget back to surplus by 2012.

At a time when more than 10 percent of students drop out of high school before graduating and only 4 out of 10 children eligible for Head Start are able to participate, the budget reverses the administration's policy of underinvesting in education for our children. The budget rejects the President's proposal to cut funding for the Department of Education by

$1.5 billion below the 2007 enacted level and to eliminate 44 different programs, and provides for substantial new investments to increase funding for vital programs such as Head Start, special education—IDEA, Title I and other programs under the No Child Left Behind Act. The bill also provides for funding the increase in Pell Grants so that high school students know that if they work hard, they can go to college.

The budget rejects the President's proposal to cut funding for the Community Development Block Grant by $1.1 billion below last year's level, and instead provides for the first CDBG increase since 2005. The cut advocated by the President would endanger job creation, economic development, and affordable housing efforts cutting CDBGs for nearly 1,200 State and local governments.

This budget rejects the President's proposal to cut the Child Care Development Block Grant and the Social Services Block Grant by a total of $520 million below the 2007 level. The President's budget would lead to a decline in children receiving assistance so their parents can work. Our budget would allow for the first increase in child care funding since 2002.

Further, knowing that we now have more uninsured Americans than 6 years ago, this budget blocks the President's proposed cuts to Medicare and Medicaid. These cuts would have made healthcare less affordable and accessible for millions of Americans. Additionally, this budget ensures that up to $50 billion over the next 5 years will be devoted to the State Children's Health Insurance Program—SCHIP—to help cover millions of uninsured children. New Jersey is a national leader in covering children through the SCHIP program and this additional funding is desperately needed to ensure our States' good work can continue.

This budget rejects the President's dangerous cuts to our Nation's first responders. What sense would it make to cut the Local Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention program, firefighter assistance grants, Byrne Justice Assistance grants, or the Community Oriented Policing Services—COPS—program? Our budget stands up for first responders and ensures that each of the programs receives appropriate levels of funding.

Mr. Chairman, I commend Mr. SPRATT for demonstrating that we can provide for our Nation's defense in a responsible way—both fiscally and from a policy standpoint. This budget will provide $507 billion in base DOD budget authority, an $18 billion increase over the President's request. This budget also emphasizes the right priorities for meeting our security needs.

For example, this resolution opposes TRICARE fee increases and calls for a substantial increase in the veterans' health care system. The budget resolution notes the upcoming recommendations of the President's Commission on Care for America's Returning Wounded Warriors and other Government investigations in connection with the substandard care at Walter Reed Army Medical Center, and allows funds for action when those recommendations are received. To help protect our Nation from a terrorist-sponsored nuclear attack, non-proliferation programs, such as the Cooperative Threat Reduction program, are given greater priority and higher funding.

Mr. Chairman, this budget will also help us keep our promises to our Nation's veterans. I'm pleased the committee has recommended raising increased discretionary funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs, from $36.5 billion to $43.1 billion—a $6.6 billion, 18.1 percent, increase over fiscal year 2007, and a $3.5 billion increase, 8.9 percent, over the administration request for fiscal year 2008. This budget provides a far more realistic spending plan than the President's proposal. Our proposed increase in this area will help meet some critical needs, including ensuring that medical inflation does not erode VA's ability to deliver quality health care to our veterans.

In order to maintain American competitiveness, we must make substantial investments in scientific research and education. The budget provides funding for initiatives to educate new scientists, engineers, and mathematicians in the next 4 years, and places more highly-qualified teachers in math and science K–12 classrooms. It makes critical investments in basic research, putting us on the path to doubling funding for the National Science Foundation, and bolstering investments in research and development throughout the budget. The reestablishment of the Office of Technology Assessment is made possible by Function 800, as is explicitly stated in the report language. The Office of Technology Assessment, an important tool for Congress's roles in fiscal planning, disaster mitigation, and oversight.

America's dependence on oil endangers our environment, our national security, and our economy. A sustained investment in research and development is crucial to creating cutting-edge technologies that allow us to develop clean, sustainable energy alternatives and capitalize on America's vast renewable natural resources. The budget provides increased funding for basic and applied energy research, to help America achieve energy independence in 10 years.

For the first time in 6 years, the budget resolution reflects a real commitment to protecting our most valuable natural resources by providing needed funding for our National Parks, the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and the national wildlife refuge system. H. Con. Res. 99 provides a total of $31.4 billion for environmental programs, which is $2.6 billion more than the President's request. I have been an advocate for the Land and Water Conservation Fund since I came to Congress 8 years ago and I am pleased that we are finally at a place where the budget includes adequate funding for both the State-side grant program and the Federal program. LWCF and the Forest Legacy program have done tremendous work in States across the country, including New Jersey, to protect open space, restore wetlands, and conserve forest lands. Why President Bush continues to turn a blind eye to our growing environmental needs is beyond me. Finally, we have a budget that realizes how important this investment is.

This budget achieves this without an increase in taxes. The budget would accommodate immediate relief for the tens of millions of middle income households who would otherwise be subject to the alternative minimum tax (AMT) while supporting the efforts of the Committee on Ways and Means to achieve permanent, revenue-neutral AMT reform. Unless the AMT is reformed, 19 million additional families will have to pay higher taxes in 2007. The budget would also accommodate extension of other middle-income tax relief, consistent with the Pay-As-You-Go principle. These tax cuts include: the child tax credit, marriage penalty relief, the 10 percent bracket, and the deduction for State and local sales taxes.

The past 6 years of fiscal irresponsibility have caused America's national debt to increase 50 percent, to nearly $9 trillion, or $29,000 for every American. Our ability to invest in the Nation's shared priorities is constrained by the cost of the debt run up over the last 6 years, when the administration and its partners in previous Congresses turned the largest surplus in American history into a record debt. About 75 percent of America's new debt has been borrowed from foreign creditors such as China, making our fiscal integrity a matter of national security. Over the last 6 years, President Bush has borrowed more money from foreign nations than the previous 42 U.S. Presidents combined.

Mr. Chairman, this budget restores the budget as a moral document that I can support. It funds the House Democratic innovation initiative, including commencing a doubling path for the National Science Foundation and providing significant increases for elementary and secondary math and science education. It accommodates a significant increase to expand children's health insurance to cover millions of uninsured children. It increases funding for veterans' health care and services so that returning soldiers will receive the care to which they are entitled. It accomplishes each of these goals without raising taxes on American citizens. I ask my colleagues to vote for the Spratt budget.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Chairman, I ask for unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Today, the House will consider a fiscally responsible budget which I proudly support because it contains the right priorities for America's families.

This budget strengthens our national defense and honors our promises to California's brave troops and veterans. It provides the largest increase for veterans' health care in the history of our country—providing $3.5 billion more than the President's budget. This will help to ensure that the 2,310,967 veterans in California receive care worthy of their sacrifice.

This budget also puts children and families first. For example, in California, 1,380,800 children do not have health insurance. It helps these children by increasing funding for the State Children's Health Insurance Program—SCHIP—reducing the number of uninsured children across the county.

In addition, this budget also provides substantially more funding for California's 6,518,000 children enrolled in public elementary, middle and high schools—providing nearly $8 billion more in 2008 and 11 percent more over the next 5 years for education and training programs than requested by the President. This will increase resources for No Child Left Behind, special education and Head Start—rejecting harsh cuts and underfunding for these critical education programs included in the President's budget. Under the President's budget, 421,277 California children will go without promised help in reading and math and Head Start—a vital program for 98,432 California children—is cut by 1.5 percent below the 2007 level.

It also recognizes that the 3,575,200 small businesses in California are the engine of the economy. To spur economic growth and support small businesses, the budget rejects the President's proposal to cut the Small Business Administration by 26 percent from last year's request.

And it restores funding for environmental programs cut by the President's budget—including restoring $28,270,000 in clean water revolving loan funds in California that help improve wastewater treatment.

Finally, this budget supports middle-class tax cuts and protects middle-income families from a tax increase by setting up a reserve fund for a long-term fix for the alternative minimum tax, AMT. In 2004, 606,000 California families were subject to the AMT—and if nothing is done to fix the system, an estimated 4,434,000 families here in California will be subject to the AMT in 2007.

In sum, this budget will restore fiscal responsibility and accountability to Washington; strengthen our national defense; and invest in the next generation and America's prosperity; and I urge my colleagues to support it.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEINER) having assumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON, 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. 99) revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2007, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2008, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2009 through 2012, pursuant to House Resolution 275, he reported the concurrent resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 210, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 212]

YEAS—216

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

NAYS—210

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

NOT VOTING—7

Davis, Jo Ann
Duncan
Kanjorski
Lampson
Lewis (CA)
Millender-McDonald
Watt

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1435

Mr. BOEHNER and Mr. HILL changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE TWO HOUSES

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 103) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 103

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, March 29, 2007, or Friday, March 30, 2007, 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, April 16, 2007, 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 Thursday, March 29, 2007, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Tuesday, April 10, 2007, or such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee 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.