

Harris	McCarthy (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen	Visclosky	Watt	Wexler
Hart	McCotter	Ross	Watson	Waxman	Woolsey
Hastings (WA)	McCrary	Royce			
Hayes	McHugh	Ruppersberger			
Hayworth	McInnis	Ryan (OH)	Bono	Greenwood	Tauzin
Hefley	McIntyre	Ryan (WI)	Boyd	Honda	Waters
Hensarling	McKeon	Ryun (KS)	Cummings	Jackson-Lee	
Herger	Meehan	Sanchez, Loretta	DeMint	(TX)	
Hinojosa	Meek (FL)	Sanders	Filner	Solis	
Hobson	Meeks (NY)	Sandlin			
Hoeffel	Mica	Saxton			
Hoekstra	Michaud	Schiff			
Holden	Millender-	Schrock			
Hooley (OR)	McDonald	Scott (GA)			
Hostettler	Miller (FL)	Sensenbrenner			
Houghton	Miller (MI)	Sessions			
Hulshof	Miller (NC)	Shadegg			
Hunter	Miller, Gary	Shaw			
Hyde	Miller, George	Shays			
Isakson	Moore	Sherwood			
Israel	Moran (KS)	Shimkus			
Issa	Moran (VA)	Shuster			
Istook	Murphy	Simmons			
Jefferson	Musgrave	Simpson			
Jenkins	Myrick	Skelton			
John	Nadler	Slaughter			
Johnson (CT)	Nethercutt	Smith (MI)			
Johnson (IL)	Neugebauer	Smith (NJ)			
Johnson, E. B.	Ney	Smith (TX)			
Johnson, Sam	Northup	Snyder			
Jones (NC)	Norwood	Souder			
Jones (OH)	Nunes	Stearns			
Kaptur	Nussle	Strickland			
Keller	Osborne	Stupak			
Kelly	Ose	Sullivan			
Kennedy (MN)	Otter	Sweeney			
Kennedy (RI)	Owens	Tancredo			
Kildee	Oxley	Tanner			
Kind	Pascarell	Tauscher			
King (IA)	Paul	Taylor (NC)			
King (NY)	Pearce	Terry			
Kingston	Pence	Thomas			
Kirk	Peterson (MN)	Thompson (MS)			
Klecza	Peterson (PA)	Thornberry			
Kline	Petri	Tiaht			
Knollenberg	Pickering	Tiberi			
Kolbe	Pitts	Toomey			
LaHood	Platts	Turner (OH)			
Lampson	Pombo	Udall (CO)			
Langevin	Pomeroy	Upton			
Lantos	Porter	Van Hollen			
Latham	Portman	Vitter			
LaTourette	Price (NC)	Walsh			
Leach	Pryce (OH)	Wamp			
Lewis (CA)	Putnam	Weiner			
Lewis (KY)	Quinn	Weldon (FL)			
Linder	Radanovich	Weldon (PA)			
Lipinski	Rahall	Weller			
LoBiondo	Ramstad	Wells			
Lofgren	Regula	Whitfield			
Lowey	Rehberg	Wicker			
Lucas (KY)	Renzi	Wilson (NM)			
Lucas (OK)	Reyes	Wilson (SC)			
Lynch	Reynolds	Wolfe			
Majette	Rodriguez	Wu			
Maloney	Rogers (AL)	Wynn			
Manzullo	Rogers (KY)	Young (AK)			
Marshall	Rogers (MI)	Young (FL)			
Matheson	Rohrabacher				

NAYS—89

Abercrombie	Hill	Olver
Andrews	Hinchev	Ortiz
Baird	Holt	Pallone
Becerra	Hoyer	Pastor
Berman	Inslee	Payne
Berry	Jackson (IL)	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Kanjorski	Rangel
Brady (PA)	Kilpatrick	Rothman
Capps	Kucinich	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Larsen (WA)	Rush
Carson (IN)	Larson (CT)	Sabo
Case	Lee	Sánchez, Linda
Clyburn	Levin	T.
Conyers	Lewis (GA)	Schakowsky
Cooper	Markey	Scott (VA)
Davis (FL)	Matsui	Serrano
Davis (IL)	McCarthy (MO)	Sherman
DeLauro	McCollum	Smith (WA)
Dicks	McDermott	Spratt
Dingell	McGovern	Stark
Doyle	McNulty	Stenholm
Emanuel	Menendez	Taylor (MS)
Fattah	Mollohan	Thompson (CA)
Frank (MA)	Murtha	Tierney
Green (TX)	Napolitano	Towns
Grijalva	Neal (MA)	Turner (TX)
Gutierrez	Oberstar	Udall (NM)
Hastings (FL)	Obey	Velázquez

Watt	Wexler
Waxman	Woolsey

NOT VOTING—11

Bono	Greenwood	Tauzin
Boyd	Honda	Waters
Cummings	Jackson-Lee	
DeMint	(TX)	
Filner	Solis	

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

□ 1442

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California changed his vote from "nay" to "yea." So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 144, I was unavoidably detained, and I missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 144, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 144 on final passage on H.R. 4227, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "No."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 144, I was unavoidably detained in a meeting with the Secretary of State. If I had been present, I would have voted "no."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the bill, H.R. 4227, just passed.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON S. CON. RES. 95, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MOORE of Kansas moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 95 be instructed to agree to the pay-as-you-go enforcement provisions within the scope of the conference regarding direct spending increases and tax cuts in the House and Senate. In complying with this instruction, such managers shall be instructed to recede to the

Senate on the provisions contained in section 408 of the Senate concurrent resolution (relating to the pay-as-you-go point of order regarding all legislation increasing the deficit as a result of direct spending increases and tax cuts).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE).

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

Mr. Speaker, we have in this country a \$7.1 trillion national debt. We have a projected deficit by the Office of Management and Budget for this year alone of \$521 billion. The interest on our national debt, \$7.1 trillion, is almost \$1 billion a day. We are in a hole, Mr. Speaker, and we are digging the hole deeper and deeper by our lack of fiscal responsibility.

American families live by three simple rules: Number one, do not spend more money than they make; number two, pay off their debts; and, number three, invest in basics in the future. The basics for an American family are food, shelter, transportation, health care, education, things that we write checks for, bills that we write checks for, every month. And the same basics for our country, our national defense, some sort of Social Security system, some sort of national highway system to transport goods around this country and keep our economy going. And yet the government, our government and our Congress, has not lived by these rules that American families lived by for many years, and to show for that we have a \$7.1 trillion debt.

We need to get back to fiscal responsibility. We have an opportunity to do that. We have done it before and we should do it again. I am not playing partisan politics here. I do not blame President Bush for a slowdown and the recession that happened. I do not blame President Bush certainly for September 11. That was only the maniacs that created that horrible problem and killed 3,000 Americans. But we have got to get back to fiscal responsibilities here, and we are not doing it right now. In fact, the Committee on the Budget, and I see the chairman over here, passed a PAYGO rule requiring only that if we are going to have a new spending proposal, we have to abide by the rule that says it has got to be offset or paid for.

They did not apply the same rule, though, to tax cuts. The Senate, on a bipartisan basis, did apply the rule to tax cuts and to spending proposals, and I think we need to look at doing the same thing here. And this is a motion to instruct conferees to institute that kind of PAYGO procedure here.

□ 1445

If we do that, Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity as a Nation to return to fiscal responsibility.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to this discussion and disputing the central premise, I think, of the motion offered by the gentleman from Kansas, which seems to be that new spending is somehow equivalent to the American people with lowering the tax burden. I want to get into that in a little bit because these two ideas are not equivalent.

They are certainly not equivalent in terms of their impact on the economy. New spending is contrary to maximizing economic growth, while tax cuts reduce it.

Mr. Speaker, before I do that, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget, for his thoughts on this.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I am perplexed. The gentleman who offers the motion to instruct conferees says, gee, it would be nice if we had a rule that tax cuts had to be paid for. Well, that is not what the instruction says. The instruction says they should. It is not a, gee, it would be nice. The gentleman just voted for a tax cut that was not offset, was not paid for. In fact, he joined 109 Democratic colleagues who voted not to pay for tax cuts.

In fact, what is even more interesting is that the same gentleman, and I respect his position, because it is how I voted, so it is hard to complain when somebody joins you on a vote, I do not mean it that way, voted just last week with 101 other colleagues for the marriage penalty relief, without offsetting pay-as-you-go requirements.

So on the one hand, the gentleman is saying we ought to have a rule, we ought to have a rule around here that you pay for things. It is important to do that, because we are in a hole and you ought to stop digging.

I understand. We have heard that rhetoric a lot. Except, he says, do not apply it to me, is what the gentleman is saying. Instruct everybody else for other tax bills, but not the one I just voted for this week, or not the one I voted for last week. Let us have a pay-as-you-go rule, but let us not apply it to us right now because it is kind of politically popular to vote for this.

The difference is that on our side of the aisle we know and we agree with the gentleman that tax cuts often pay for themselves in a way that stimulates the economy, stimulates growth, puts people back to work, generates economic growth and development, and drives revenues into the Treasury to the tune of, this year, what we know already from what CBO says, is about \$200 billion more revenue. Even with tax reduction, even with those tax cuts, \$200 billion is what CBO estimates now. Just yesterday, in *The Washington Post*, it was revealed that that number is only going up, is what we are hearing.

So on the one hand, just 5 minutes ago the gentleman voted for tax relief

without paying for it and now rushes to the floor with a rule that says but from now on and for everybody else, it is fair to, quote-unquote, pay for tax cuts.

I think we should be consistent; and just like in the past, we should consistently say that in this instance we should not tie our hands when it comes to creating jobs, when it comes to making sure that married people are not penalized, when it comes to not raising taxes on families with children, when it comes to AMT relief that people are being hit with now, this alternative minimum tax, that we should provide that kind of relief, and we should do it in a way that does the job now and gets the economy going, as opposed to putting some arbitrary rule on, which I would argue if you vote 5 minutes ago one way, and then come back here and say, well, really I did not mean that, which vote do you not mean? Is it the vote for tax relief, or is it the vote for the rule?

So I would hope that people do not tie our hands when it comes to this, what is called pay-as-you-go. When it comes to taxes, I have said it before and I will say it again, you may think the government pays for taxes. The only people in America who pay for taxes are taxpayers, and they are the people who deserve the relief, and what you are trying to do is cause automatic tax increases for this country by tying hands and by putting arbitrary rules in, and I do not believe that is the right thing to do for this economy. It is finally back on its feet, it is finally creating jobs, and we need to make sure that continues.

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

Mr. Speaker, to respond to the chairman, the gentleman talks fiscal responsibility, but does not vote it. I am following the rules that are in place right now, and I am proposing that this body change the rules and practice fiscal responsibility and not just talk about it. We have got to get back to that.

What the gentleman neglected to mention is we have the highest national debt in our Nation's history. What the gentleman neglected to mention is we have the highest deficit in any one year in our Nation's history. We are mortgaging the future of our children and grandchildren, and it has got to stop.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time and for his bringing this measure before this House for a vote.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the motion offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) which would require the budget conferees to include the pay-as-you-go provisions, budgets enforcement provisions, in the final budget bill.

Ten years ago, our colleagues across the aisle made a contract with Amer-

ica. One of the first principles they promised to instill in this Congress was a requirement that all laws that apply to the rest of the country would also apply equally to the Congress.

Well, the truth is, American families are required by law to pay their bills; yet in Congress we do not require the same thing of our own institution, and that is wrong.

One of the previous speakers said that we are trying to tie the hands of Congress so we can automatically bring about tax increases. That is absolutely not true. All this measure says is, if we pass a bill, we should pay for that bill.

The House budget resolution for 2005 was passed on a straight party line vote; but it was the alternative, with the strongest budget enforcement provisions, the Blue Dog budget, that got the bipartisan support.

Budget enforcement received bipartisan support not only in the House, but in the Senate also. They passed an amendment extending pay-as-you-go rules to both revenue and spending measures with the support of a bipartisan majority. Common ground, bipartisan ground can be found on the issue of budget enforcement.

If we are really going to reduce the deficit, bipartisanship is a must. It does not matter if it is an increase in spending or a reduction in revenue. If it is important enough for this House to pass it as law, by golly, we should pay for it. That is what this motion to instruct says. The motion is to instruct the conferees to agree to the Senate pay-as-you-go provision, which requires the Congress to find a way to pay for new spending or new tax cuts.

Members of the Blue Dog Coalition have been calling for the reinstatement of pay-as-you-go on both revenue and spending since the Budget Enforcement Act expired in 2002. And it is not a partisan concept. From the original pay-as-you-go provision, it was brought about by bipartisanship. It was an agreement between the first President Bush and a Democratic Congress. A Democratic President and Congress extended pay-as-you-go in 1993, and a Democratic President and a Republican Congress extended it again in 1997, along with \$100 billion worth of tax cuts.

Today we can send a clear message from the Congress that we will hold ourselves to the same standards as we hold American families. Vote "yes" on this motion to instruct and reintroduce fiscal responsibility to this House and to the American taxpayers.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to one of the points just made by the gentleman from California. This is pretty close to being a direct quote as I heard him say it, and it was pertaining to this deficit. I think what the gentleman said was it does not matter if it is a decrease in revenue, which is to say a tax cut, or an increase in spending; either way, we have to offset it.

I am here to say that that is just not right. It does matter. It makes a difference. It makes a big difference. I am going to finish my point, because I think it makes a big difference in terms of the economic growth of our economy, and that means the opportunity for Americans, and that means prosperity and ultimately the quality of life of the working people.

Look at the data that we have. After we passed a tax cut package, look at what has happened. We have had a 2-decade high point in terms of GDP growth. The economy grew at 6 percent in the second half of last year; it is growing very strongly this year. This is the best economic growth numbers we have had in 20 years. Housing starts are at a record high. Homeownership, a record high number of Americans own their own home today.

We have financial markets that have made huge gains, which generally have been a good predictor of economic growth. The manufacturing sector, which has undergone a very difficult time, has, by all accounts and all objective data, turned around, is showing growth, is actually hiring.

Speaking of hiring, we have strong new job growth now. We waited a long time, because we know that job growth is always the last part to come in during an economic recovery. But it really looks like the job growth is happening now. Whether you are looking at the household survey or whether you are looking at the payroll survey, the job growth is strong. In March, we had 308,000 new jobs, and on Friday we are going to get a number for April; and it looks like we are going to have another strong month for job growth.

What this means is we are approaching a period now of sustainable economic recovery. When new people are getting to work and being able to generate their own incomes, now the economy starts to be able to grow of its own. This has happened because we lowered the tax burden.

If we go and pass this provision that you guys are advocating, it almost certainly means a big tax increase, and I am very concerned that this would cut off this economic recovery we have under way, and that is the last thing we should be doing.

The problem that we have, we have got a problem here, no question about it. We have a deficit that is too big, there is no question about it. But the problem has come from years of excessive spending. It is not that we do not bring in enough revenue. In fact, as we all probably know, recent numbers suggest that revenue growth is growing and it is accelerating, which is not surprising, given the strong economy we have today, the strength that is developing; but it is spending that has been the problem.

Now when we offered a PAYGO provision that would require that we offset any new spending proposals, you guys all voted against it. You guys said no, no, we do not want to just offset spending.

The point I am trying to make here is that new spending and lowering the tax burden, and in fact maintaining existing tax law, because that is what we are talking about now, these are not equivalent.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOOMEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The point is if it is important enough to pass, it is important enough to pay for. The record deficit and the record debt, \$7 trillion worth of debt, on mark to go up to \$10.4 trillion in the next 5 years, that is the difference between revenue and spending. It is not the difference between spending. If we believe this is important enough to tax, we should pay for whatever it is we pass.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman is not recognizing we have had a growth in revenue, despite lower tax rates. This is what happens when the economy grows strongly. And the most important thing here, it is very important that we get the deficit under control and reduce the debt, but the most important thing is we have a strong economy, and everybody who wants a job is able to get a job and that wages are rising and people are having more and more opportunities.

If we do that, and control spending, which we are trying to do which this budget, which, again, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle did not agree with, but it is a budget which for the first time I am aware of in a very long time, we took the nonsecurity parts of discretionary spending and decided to freeze it.

We said we are going to freeze this, because I think that is what you need to do to get this spending under control so we can get this deficit under control. I think we are heading in the right direction if we can have the discipline on the spending side.

We should not be advocating a provision, which the gentleman from Kansas is introducing, which almost guarantees a big tax increase right at the time when our economy seems to be recovering strongly.

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

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time. I have a prepared statement. I am not going to give it.

Perhaps the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and perhaps the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) believe if you say something enough, somebody will believe it.

I refer the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) to page 22 of the administration's budget document on receipts. For 8 years under Clinton, receipts went up. After we passed the 1993

bill, the economy went up and deficits went down. However, for the 12 years of Reagan and Bush, deficits went up, and under this administration, deficits have soared. And I would say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), check out page 22. Receipts have gone down, my friend. Down.

□ 1500

Starting with 2000, \$2.25 trillion; 2001, \$1.9 trillion. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), he is not listening to these figures. I know he wants to know the truth. I know he wants to know the facts. I am trying to give them to him so he will not misstate again. I want him to hear these facts, and then he can respond. This is the administration's book, not mine.

I will give them to the gentleman again. In 2000, \$2.25 trillion; 2001 \$1.9 trillion; 2002, 1.8 trillion; 2003, 1.7 trillion.

So to not tell us and the American public that resources are going up, they are not. This graph reflects what the Republican budget book says.

Now, with respect to spending, I say to my friend, we are spending less on discretionary spending than we spent in 1962 of GDP. But you all talk about that. Why? Because it is easy to talk about that. It is 17 percent of the budget; you do not talk about the other 83 percent.

What the gentleman from Kansas is saying, I say to my colleagues, is do not pass these tax cuts for which there is no money to give anybody. You are taking it from Social Security. You are taking it from Medicare. And, more importantly, I will tell my colleagues who is going to pay for these tax cuts: my children, my grandchildren, and the generations yet to come. That is not only intellectually wrong, it is an immoral fiscal policy.

Mr. Speaker, if the vote on this motion to instruct budget conferees is anything like the first one on March 30, then someone should summon the house physician because there may be some very sore arms on the Republican side of the aisle.

Certainly, we remember that five-minute vote? The Republican leadership held it open for 28 minutes so that it could (quote/unquote) persuade eight Republicans to change their votes from yes to no, and defeat the motion on a tie vote.

As David Broder, the syndicated columnist, pointed out (and I quote):

Clearly, on a free vote of conscience, narrow majorities in both the House and Senate would be prepared to impose this degree of self-discipline [meaning pay-as-you-go budget rules].

The simple fact is, Mr. Speaker, the Office of Management and Budget projects that our Nation will run a record budget deficit of \$521 billion this year. That figure does not include the costs of fighting wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, an estimated \$50 billion to \$75 billion.

The 10-year budget surplus of \$5.6 trillion that George W. Bush inherited when he took office has been turned into a projected deficit of more than \$4 trillion in just 3 short years.

And now, our Republican friends want to drive us even deeper into debt with tax cuts that are not paid for.

Perhaps Mr. NUSSLE, the chairman of the Budget Committee, summed up the Republican philosophy best. In March, he said (and I quote):

We don't believe that you should have to pay for tax cuts.

Well, my Republican friends, you don't. But our children and grandchildren surely will.

That's why the list of those supporting pay-as-you-go rules includes, among others, House Democrats, a bipartisan majority of the Senate, Federal Reserve Chairman Greenspan, the Concord Coalition, the Committee for Economic Development, and the Committee For a Responsible Federal Budget.

Republicans have not always believed that tax cuts are sacrosanct.

In fact, the majority leader himself even said in 1997 of Jack Kemp, a former member of this body (and I quote):

Jack Kemp worships at the altar of tax cuts. Jack has always said that deficits don't matter. We think that deficits do matter.

Mr. Speaker, PAYGO rules will not preclude tax cuts.

They simply recognize that, with a fiscal crisis looming, it is irresponsible—indeed immoral—to force the next generation to pay our bills.

I urge my colleagues to support this motion.

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

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, it is truly amazing when we come to the floor and have this debate over and over and over again. We are fighting a war today, and I believe I would be factually correct to say this is the first war we have fought by reducing the amount of revenue.

I suggest our troops are paying dearly for that, because as we all know, they have not received that which they need in order to protect themselves while they are doing for us what we are unwilling to do for them.

This is a pretty straightforward amendment; and despite the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), despite the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) and all of his rhetoric, nobody is talking about raising taxes. That is just rhetoric that will be used in campaign slogans.

All we are saying is, if we are going to cut taxes and reduce the amount of revenue to pay for the war, we have to provide either cuts in spending, which we do, in spite of the fact, all of what you talk about never happens because spending has gone up, up, and up since Republicans took over this House, and how you can stand on the floor and keep lecturing Democrats on spending, you have no conscience.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STENHOLM. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a budget

that had lower spending and lower deficits even than the one that we passed, the Republican one. I do not know of any Democrat that voted for my alternative budget.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, that is great rhetoric, and I will yield again, but I want to respond to that. The gentleman from Pennsylvania put a budget out. How many votes did the gentleman get for his budget?

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, we got just under half the Republican caucus on it, about 100, maybe 110.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, that is the problem. I can put a budget out too.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, how did the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) vote on it?

Mr. STENHOLM. On your budget, I opposed it, because it increased the deficit.

Mr. TOOMEY. It increased it much less than your budget did. It got us back to a balance much sooner than your budget or any other budget, and you voted "no." You voted "no."

Mr. STENHOLM. You could not pass it.

I take back my time. I take back my time. Yes, it is great. You can come out, but the problem that comes out today is we have to live under the rules of the majority party. And for years I was criticized by the gentleman's side because it was my party that was doing to the economy what you said we were doing. Today, you are in charge; and no matter how many times you say it, you cannot overcome the facts. Republicans have spent more in the Reagan-Bush years, in the Bush years than we did in the Clinton years. You have spent more, period, and that record stands up.

All we are talking about today is a simple resolution saying, let us put us all under the gun. If you put your budget on the floor under pay-as-you-go, I will have to vote for it, if it is under pay-as-you-go, because I am sincerely for it. I did not vote for the last tax cut because it is with borrowed money on my children and grandchildren. I did not vote for last week's tax cut because it is with borrowed money; and I will not vote for the additional tax cuts with borrowed money on my children and grandchildren's money. But your rhetoric and mine should match. Where is the mismatch?

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

A couple of points I would like to make. One, to follow up on some comments made by the gentleman from Maryland, first of all, history has proven time and time again when we have cut taxes, we have ended up with increasing revenue. The gentleman from Maryland cited the Reagan administration. The fact is, within a decade of the big Reagan tax cuts, revenue collected by the Federal Government, tax revenue had about doubled. The problem

was that expenditures tripled, and this reinforces my point that the problem here is spending. The problem is not that we are undertaxed.

The second point that I want to make, the gentleman from Maryland was referring to declining revenues in the height of the economic slowdown. I do not think anybody disputes that if the economy is in a recession, when the economy is contracting, revenue decreases. That is true. That is what happens when you have, especially a combination of a contracting economy, and then you have the cost of a war, it is not surprising that you have a deficit under those circumstances.

The final point I want to make, to suggest that this provision does not amount to the equivalent of a tax increase I think is just factually wrong. We all know that we have provisions in the current tax law that are expiring very soon; and if we do not allow those to become permanent, then we have a big tax increase coming. And if this provision were to be adopted and become binding on Congress, then it is almost assured that we are going to have a significant tax increase.

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

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I got up to my office, and I heard the comments of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) both said not the perspective you thought revenues were going to increase, but that they had increased. That was not accurate. That was my point, and I think your review of the book indicates that I was accurate.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, if I could just respond to that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Kansas has the time.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE), for yielding me this time.

What we have here is what never has been tried in history. We are waging three wars with three tax cuts that have resulted in \$500 billion of annual deficits and a \$3 trillion increase in the debt.

What has passed here in the year 2001, 2002 and 2003 are record tax cuts for the special interests that have produced record deficits and record national debt. There is an economic program here that basically we followed in the 1990s.

In 1993 we cut taxes and reduced the deficit. In 1997 we cut taxes for middle-class families and balanced the budget while investing in children's health care, the environment, and also in job training and education, higher education access. We threw that book out

that led to record job growth of 22 million jobs, a decrease in poverty, an expansion of the middle class, incomes going up for all people. And now what we have is record deficits and record debt, all because we followed an economic strategy that threw out the book of putting our fiscal house in order, investing in the priorities of tax cuts for middle-class families, and investing in the areas of education and health care.

What do we have to show for it? We have \$500 billion in annual deficit. We have a record deficit while the economy is growing. You all have said if the economy grows, the deficit will disappear. Well, the economy is growing and we have record deficits. Why? Because your economic strategy lacks any logic to it. And that is you cannot follow and have three tax cuts and three wars at the same time and get any other result than the one we are getting today. And to repeat the same mistake and expect a different result is a sign of somebody who is not facing reality.

Today, what we need to do and what this proposal does is it begins to get us on a road of putting our fiscal house back in order and setting the priorities straight that if we want to invest in education, if we want to finance wars overseas, if we want to have tax cuts, we have to make sure that we live within a balanced set of priorities. We cannot leave to other generations and steal from Social Security and steal from Medicare to live today in bacchanalia and happy times. We have to put our fiscal house in order.

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

The point I was making about the increase in revenue, and the gentleman from Maryland was disputing this, I think, my point is if you look at the last 6 months of this year, if you look back from October of 2003 through March of 2004 and you compare the same 6-month period to the year before, you will discover that we brought in more revenue to the Federal Treasury in this most recent 6-month period than we did in the last 6-month period. That is the point that the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) and I have been making.

Revenue coming into the Federal Government is, in fact, growing, and it is at an accelerating pace; and I strongly suspect that the next quarter is going to show an increase over the corresponding quarter from the previous year. That is precisely because of the strong economic growth.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOOMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I understand his analysis of the last 6 months; we have had a good growth in the last 6 months. Not as good, contrary to what the gentleman says, as we had in terms of the Clinton years,

because where we grew 23 million new jobs, we have still lost jobs. The gentleman pointed out we raised 300,000 jobs. As he knows, 100,000 of those were returning workers from the strikes around the country.

But the point I would make is that in 1993 when we adopted the Clinton economic program, Mr. Armev and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), I cannot say the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), but Mr. Kasich was then the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, they said that program was going to destroy America's economy, we would lose jobs, have high deficits and high unemployment and high interest rates. In fact, exactly the opposite happened, and we had the best economy we have had in the history of the country.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, what happened was that immediately after that tax increase in 1993, economic growth was quite slow for some period of time; and then it accelerated, despite the tax increases.

But my point is, and I do not think the gentleman is disputing me now, that over the last 6 months we have had a revenue growth compared to the same 6-month period a year before, and all evidence and all trends suggest that this is going to continue. And what I think it demonstrates is, once again, lowering marginal tax rates and encouraging strong economic growth more than offsets the reduction in revenue that comes from the nominal loss that comes from the rates themselves.

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

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL).

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Kansas for leading this discussion here this afternoon.

A few minutes ago on the floor of this House, I cast a vote against the AMT tax cut. Some would say that that was a foolish vote for me politically, do I not think so. I do not think it was a foolish vote politically, because I believe that the people of the Ninth District in southern Indiana believe that if it is tax cuts versus shoring up Social Security, if it is tax cuts versus paying down the debt, if it is tax cuts versus shoring up Medicare, if it is tax cuts or having foreign countries buy our paper to finance the debt, I think that they will pick fighting the war, shoring up Social Security, shoring up Medicare, making sure that not too many foreigners have our paper. They want to be fiscally responsible like many of the Members on this side of the aisle want to be. And the only way that can happen, I say to my colleagues, is for there to be PAYGO discipline in both spending and tax cuts.

Now, I was at the Joint Economic Committee meeting last week where

Alan Greenspan was at the meeting. I asked him, Mr. Chairman, do you believe that PAYGO rules ought to apply to tax cuts as well as spending? And his answer in his prolonged way that he answers was an unequivocal yes. There needs to be discipline in the Congress of the United States. PAYGO rules have worked in the past, they will work in the future, and it is the fiscally responsible thing to do.

One last thing that I would just like to remind my colleagues of on this side of the aisle. A quote from the majority leader on the Republican side, Dick Armev: "I am sitting here, and I am upset about the deficit. I am upset about spending. There is no way I can pin this on the Democrats. Republicans own the town now." Wise words, indeed.

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

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. It is a shame we cannot have a longer, more substantive debate on this. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) got up and criticized the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) for his inconsistency. He is for middle-class tax cuts, as I am; but he wants to pay for them. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) in 1997 voted for the Balanced Budget Amendment, as I did, which had exactly the same PAYGO as is included in the Moore motion to instruct.

Hear me, I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY). The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) voted for exactly the same PAYGO as did 193 Republicans. Stick with your original convictions.

□ 1515

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

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY).

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE).

It is our duty as lawmakers and the voices of our constituents to demand a budget resolution that is fiscally responsible and meets the needs of our country. This motion a very simple motion would require that any increase in spending and tax cuts must be subjected to a pay-as-you-go rule.

As this country faces record deficits, increased spending on homeland security and the war in Iraq, now is the time for fiscal discipline. The Federal budget deficit is fast approaching \$500 billion and will only continue to grow. Unless we act now, our children and

our grandchildren will be paying for our fiscal irresponsibility.

Remember 1990 when America also struggled with record deficits. Congress faced the same choice that we do today. Ignore the realities of fiscal irresponsibility or confront it head on and resolve the problem. In 1990, the Democratic-controlled Congress made the responsible choice. It included PAYGO legislation as a part of 1990 budget agreement.

PAYGO was extended in 1993 and 1997 and was essential in restoring this country's economic health. The sky-high deficits of the late 1980s and early 1990s turned into substantial budget surpluses by the late 1990s. When this administration took office, there was nearly a \$400 billion surplus and a projected surplus of several trillion dollars.

Despite this success, the administration's irresponsible choice to allow the PAYGO rules to expire in 2002 has contributed to the record deficit we face today. The time to act is now, before our Nation slides further and further into debt. We must include PAYGO rules that apply to both spending and tax cuts in this year's budget resolution.

If I could add something personal. My husband is not only a Republican, he is a Heritage Foundation Republican, a fiscal conservative in our personal life; and he believes that this is outrageous. He is astounded that the Republican-controlled Congress is behaving in this irresponsible fiscal manner. He will not have it and neither will I.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make sure everybody is very clear as we have this discussion that if this proposed provision were to become binding, the net effect is almost certainly a very, very major tax increase. All we are talking about is, what I want to do here is let us make sure we can maintain existing tax law.

What the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) is proposing is that under existing law, unfortunately, taxes are scheduled to go up. If we prevent that by making sure we maintain the existing rate structure, the existing tax law, we would have to come up with these huge offsets, which we certainly are not going to get the votes over there to do that with spending cuts, so we would have to raise taxes somewhere else.

So the net effect is a huge tax increase. What are some of the things that are scheduled to expire, some of the problems that we would have if this were adopted? Well, we would find we would get the marriage penalty coming back in full force. We get the child tax credit that would be diminished dramatically. The increase in the size of the 10 percent bracket, that goes away. Small business expensing which has probably contributed significantly to this economic turn around. That goes away. Small businesses cannot expense

items the way they can under current law.

I think it is a bad idea when we have all the evidence suggesting we are well into a substantial and probably a sustainable economic recovery, why we would suddenly ratchet back up the taxes in the face of that and the fact that this has been a very successful tax policy, very successful in terms of turning this economy around and now in terms of getting people back to work, why we would want to undo all of that with a measure like this makes no sense to me.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman can say black is white until his face is blue, but it does not change the facts. You can talk about tax increases here. We are talking about fiscal responsibility and he is not. In fact, what he is doing and his policies would do is put our Nation deeper and deeper and deeper in debt.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we have the largest debt, \$7.1 trillion in our Nation's history. We have the largest 1-year deficit in our Nation's history, and the policies he is talking about, contrary to what Chairman Greenspan wants, will put our Nation in deeper debt and mortgage the future of our children and grandchildren.

I was at a high school last week and I talked to a group of high school students, government students, about this, and I said, Why should you care about a \$7.1 trillion debt? A girl raised her hand and she said, Because we are going to have to pay for it. And I said you get an A for today, and you should be angry about what folks in Congress are doing to you and your children and grandchildren because you are putting them in a hole they can never dig their way out of.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to go back to this point because this is a very important point. We have created an environment, created a tax environment in which the economy can grow more rapidly and it is growing more rapidly. We have both CBO projections and the House budget resolution both forecast Federal receipts at \$35 billion more this year than last year, despite the fact that we cut taxes last year; and now the monthly Treasury data that is coming in this year shows, and I do not think anybody is disputing this, that, in fact, we probably low-balled that. The revenue was coming in at an even faster clip than the amount by which we thought it would exceed last year.

So the fact is we have got a deficit that is too big. We all acknowledge that. It is getting smaller. The revenue is coming in faster because the economy is growing. And if we get spending under control, we can solve this problem. But the right way to do it is not to raise taxes.

I know the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) does not like the characterization of this. But the fact is we have got provisions in law that will result in a tax increase if we do not do something about it, and what your provision would do would prevent us from solving that problem that results in a tax increase.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman has done is presided over policies that has created the greatest debt in our Nation's history and nothing he says can change that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) did not deliberately attempt to misspeak to this body, but revenues in 2000 were \$2.025 trillion, revenues in 2003 were \$1.782 trillion; projected CBO for this year is the \$1.817 trillion. I understand that you are putting the best spin forward, on this year, it is going up, but look at what it has done under the policies that you continue to advocate.

What we are talking about is what Chairman Alan Greenspan would like to see us do; what the Concord Coalition would like to see us do: Put some fiscal responsibility into all our actions.

The gentleman keeps referring to the Reagan years. I was here. I helped pass the first Reagan tax cut. It did not work as was intended. It built up \$1.8 trillion of debt in 8 years. The Bush 41 built up another \$1.5 trillion of debt. In the 8 years of the Clinton administration debt went up \$1.4 trillion; and it is estimated under the Bush 43, debt will go up \$2.4 trillion. That is what we were suggesting doing something about. It is called fiscal responsibility. It is called living within your means. It is called making tough decisions.

Yes, there are tax cuts that grow the economy, but there are also tax cuts that increase the deficit. Let us make that decision, instead of just coming here and rhetorically talking about things that just are not so. With all due respect, it just is not so from the standpoint of the deficit coming down.

If you talk about spending, I just have to smile and get myself under control, every time I hear a Republican stand up on this floor and talk about spending, and I would yield to the gentleman to answer to a question, who has been in control of this House since 1994?

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, I have been the first one to say that excessive spending is a bipartisan problem.

Mr. STENHOLM. Then if it is a bipartisan problem, that is what we are suggesting today is a bipartisan solution.

Mr. TOOMEY. With a tax increase. That is not a good solution.

Mr. STENHOLM. No, with all due respect, well, if you want to fight the war by shortchanging the troops in order that you can have your rhetorical answers on that, fine.

I will be happy to yield for a simple discourse, but every time you start that rhetoric that has put us into a \$2.4 trillion hole in 4 years.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. First of all, I think the gentleman will acknowledge that Republicans have not short-changed our troops; that we have advocated and passed legislation that would provide the necessary resources; and we had a budget resolution that took the non-security portions of our budget and we froze that. We said, these areas that are not critical to American security should grow at zero.

Now, most if not all Members on the gentleman's side of the aisle, thought that that was somehow unreasonable, because we did not grow spending. So I do not think you can accuse us at this point of not dealing with this problem.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield me some time.

Mr. Speaker, if not, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman. The short-changing of our troops is bipartisan. I am  $\frac{1}{435}$  of this body and anything we have not done, I accept my share of the blame for; but I am not in control. I am not in the majority. And the minority has been totally ignored on most of these issues, but I still have to take my responsibility for that action. And the fact is we have not done a real good job.

On the question of providing for spousal benefits for military retirees, we have a bill that has 300 cosponsors of and we cannot get it on the floor of the House in order to debate.

Mr. TOOMEY. Reclaiming my time, we are getting a little bit far afield from the discussion.

Mr. STENHOLM. We are talking about pay-as-you-go.

Mr. TOOMEY. We are getting a bit far afield.

I think one of the fundamental areas of disagreement that we have is the idea that my colleagues who offered the proposal, equate new spending with new tax relief, including maintaining existing tax law.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOOMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, that is not the intent of this amendment. It is not to get into taxes or spending. It is just to say to this body, we have to make a decision regarding how much more we borrow on our children and grandchildren.

Mr. TOOMEY. Reclaiming my time, but the mechanism by which you choose to make that decision is precisely this, it is to say that we have to treat, even maintaining existing tax law, as though it were equivalent to launching a new spending program because you want to impose the exact same mechanism on both those activities as though they are equivalent. And my point is they are not equivalent.

One, the new spending, leads to lower economic growth, lower productivity, fewer opportunities for American workers; and the other, maintaining this lower tax burden that we managed to pass in recent years, leads to stronger economic growth, more jobs, higher wages, and we are seeing it in the numbers. We are seeing that this economy has turned around. We are seeing the strength of this economy. We are seeing it producing new jobs. And, in fact, as the gentleman has acknowledged in recent months, we are even seeing a growth in revenue to the Federal Government. It is true.

It has not yet reached the level that it was at before the recession and before the war and before September 11. It will get there. It may take a little bit longer but the fact is revenue to the Federal government is growing. It is growing at an accelerating pace. But, frankly, that is not my highest priority in life. My highest priority, and what I think it should be here is, are we creating an environment where we create the maximum opportunity for Americans, the most job opportunities, the greatest chance for new businesses to flourish.

I know that is what the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) would like to see accomplished. I think we differ about how to get there. But I strongly believe that making it essentially impossible to maintain the existing tax law and instead having a higher tax regime does not get us there.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOOMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STENHOLM. Because nothing in PAYGO precludes tax cuts, nothing does.

Mr. TOOMEY. They have to be offset with equal tax increases or spending cuts; is that correct?

Mr. STENHOLM. Right.

Mr. TOOMEY. Do you think that there are the votes anywhere in this Chamber to have spending cuts when the Democrats in this Chamber would not vote for a Republican budget?

Mr. STENHOLM. We did it in 1997. It was Democrats like me that stood up with Republicans and got it done.

Mr. TOOMEY. Reclaiming my time, I would be thrilled if you and your colleagues would vote with us on this budget resolution that freezes non-security spending, that just says let us hold it at last year's level because we really cannot afford more than that. But we never got the votes to do that.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would respond to the gentleman simply by saying that we have, on this side, coined a phrase called the debt tax, not the death tax, D-E-A-T-H, but the debt tax, D-E-B-T. And the debt tax is the interest we pay on our national debt and the debt tax is going up just as the deficits are going up and the debt is going up.

□ 1530

It is the policies of the gentleman across the aisle that are causing this to happen, and it has got to change. People in this country know in their hearts and they know right in their heads that we cannot give like this forever. We are the strongest Nation on the Earth. We are the freest Nation on the Earth, but we cannot be strong and free and broke, and that is the policy advocated by the gentleman from across the aisle.

That is going to happen if we keep going the way we are. Our Nation will end up owing so much money it will be financially unsustainable for our children and grandchildren. I do not want that to happen.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) has 9 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) has 7 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Kansas has the right to close.

Mr. TOOMEY. May I ask a question of the gentleman from Kansas. Does the gentleman have any additional speakers?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I am going to grant some additional time at the appropriate time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

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

I would just make one additional point, and that is the point that has been made for us at our committee by CBO Director Crippin, and I think this is a very important one. When we look at how best to get our deficit under control, he makes the observation that a one-tenth of 1 percent increase in GDP growth accounts for about an additional quarter of a trillion dollars, \$250 billion, in additional Federal revenue over a 10-year period. This is why economic growth is so important.

The real reason it is mostly important is for the benefits that accrue to the American people who produce this growth; but if we want to figure out how do we get our budget house in order here, a strong economy gets us there. One-tenth of 1 percent, going from 4 percent growth to 4.1 percent growth, just that small difference amounts to an extra quarter of a trillion dollars in Federal revenue. If we can maximize economic growth and have some discipline on the spending side, we get this budget back to balance. We are moving in that direction,

and I think that is a direction we should stay in.

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

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago is when this debate began and those of us that believed that we had a little better plan, we lost that battle; and today, we are still fighting the same battle we did 3 years ago. We were told if we instigated the tax cuts that we would balance the budget in 4 years. It did not work out quite that way. We cannot argue with the fact that the budget, that is somewhere out there in never-never land between the House and the Senate, includes an increasing of the debt ceiling, the amount which this country can borrow, to over \$8 trillion.

In the last 2½ years, we have borrowed \$1 trillion. In the next year and a half, we are going to borrow in excess of another \$1.5 trillion. We cannot escape that those are the facts. We all know the reason why.

This amendment today just suggests that this generation ought to be doing some of the paying rather than just blindly following a theory that does not work, the theory that we can balance the budget by cutting the amount of revenue when we are at war.

This is the first war in the history of our country that we have fought by cutting taxes, and the results are predictable. It is amazing. Most main-line economists agree with what we are talking about today, making it tough to raise spending, being very scrupulous on the manner in which we spend our taxpayer dollars, but also take a good, hard look at what we are leaving our children and grandchildren and take a good, hard look at who is buying our debt.

The Japanese will soon own over \$600 billion of our debt. The Chinese are at \$200 billion and going up rapidly; and if that does not bother my colleagues who is the banker of the United States, then continue to say, as some so-called conservatives continue to say, deficits do not matter as long as we are following the great game plan that has been totally rhetorized today by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY); and he does a good job, and I respect the fact he is sincere.

That is something that I can respect on this floor because he puts his money where his mouth is. The problem is there are not 218 Republicans that agree with him, but there are 218 Members of this body that would agree on pay-as-you-go and would get our fiscal house in order as we did in 1990 when Democrats were in control and a few of us voted with Republicans to put some fiscal order, and as we did in 1997 when Republicans could not pass their budget in 1997 without Democratic support, and I was there and I helped because I believed in that compromise legislation that then ultimately gave us the

economic growth and expansion that we saw in the 1990s.

Now, we are arguing a theory today, and I understand there are some that just cannot say, I was wrong, I did not make a mistake, I am perfect, everything we are doing we have just got to keep on plugging and we can send that debt to our children and grandchildren and look at them with a straight face. I have three grandsons, and I cannot do it; and that is why I will continue to say we will reach out the hand to the folks on the other side of the aisle, and we will work together to bring our fiscal house in order; but we cannot do it with the game plan that they are advocating.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

We have had a spirited debate here this afternoon about this, and I would simply close by reminding my colleagues that if we were to pass the provision that is proposed here, it would certainly result in very, very large tax increases in this year, next year, the following years of a very huge magnitude; and I am gravely concerned that the result of that would be to, at a minimum, diminish the growth of our economy and quite possibly even turn us down into an economic downturn, back from whence we came.

We are on the right path. The economy is growing. It is growing strongly. It is actually growing at a nearly record pace. We have job growth that has kicked in in a very impressive way, and that is the most important part of this; and that is really manifesting itself in recent months, likely to continue, likely to generate a self-sustaining momentum for the economy.

This is exactly what we should be trying to work for. It is the tax cut package that helped us get here. We have now seen so much economic growth that, as my colleagues on the other side have acknowledged, even in recent months and recent quarters, revenue collected by the Federal Government is growing. It is accelerating. That means if we stick to the budget resolution that we passed with votes on this side of the aisle alone, where we put a freeze on nonsecurity discretionary spending, if we maintain that spending discipline, while we continue to have the strong economic growth, we will, in fact, see a dramatic reduction in this deficit. That is what we should be working towards, maintaining the tax law, keeping the tax burden as low as we possibly can on the American people, with some spending restraint.

Again, we proposed that we freeze this nonsecurity spending, unfortunately. My colleagues on the other side would not go along with that freeze. That is the kind of discipline that will get our budget in order.

What we need to do is reject this proposal today, vote "no" on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas, and stick to some discipline on the spending side.

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

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

PAYGO, the PAYGO rule that we are proposing here today, does not stop new tax cuts. All it says is that if we are going to have a new tax cut, we have got to cut spending; and if he talks about discipline, he should practice what he preaches. If he talks about discipline, he should practice what he preaches; and if he wants a new tax cut, he should say here is how we are going to pay for it. If my colleague finds a way to do that, then I am all for the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), but he is not doing that. He is just talking and not practicing reality here.

I voted for the President's tax cut 3 years ago. We were in surplus mode at that time, but now we are in deficit mode. Now we are in deficit mode. We are no longer in surplus mode.

Chairman Alan Greenspan of the Federal Reserve Board has testified before the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Financial Services, on which I serve; and he said consistently, if we are not in a fiscally responsible position when this economy takes off, interest rates could climb rather dramatically, and we should not let that happen. It could be devastating for business, for the real estate industry, for consumer borrowing, and for people in this country. Chairman Greenspan has said over and over, we should have budget enforcement rules, PAYGO rules, that apply not only to new spending but to tax cuts.

I understand the gentleman thinks he knows more than Mr. Greenspan, but I do not believe that is true. I do not believe that is true.

We are going to have soon an \$8 trillion national debt at 4 percent. The interest on that national debt will be \$320 billion a year. It is digging us deeper and deeper in this hole. If that interest rate went up to only 5 percent, it would add another \$80 billion, another tax increase; and that is what we are talking about here is the debt tax, the interest on our national debt.

They will put us, the policy advocated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), deeper and deeper in the hole; and the problem is, they do not want to pay for it now. They want to pass the bill to our children and grandchildren; and our children and grandchildren if they are watching television today and they have heard this debate, they should say, enough, we are not going to take that anymore; it is not fair; it is really not American.

We should end this today by saying common sense. If my colleagues want a tax cut, they have a new spending proposal, find a way to pay for it; and if they cannot do that, we will not do it because it is not fiscally responsible. It is not the right thing to do. It is not how American families live, and we are going to start living like American families.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ADERHOLT). All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later today or tomorrow.

#### RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF INCREASING AWARENESS OF AUTISM

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 605) recognizing the importance of increasing awareness of autism, supporting programs for increased research and improved treatment of autism, improving training and support for individuals with autism and those who care for individuals with autism, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

##### H. RES. 605

Whereas the Autism Society of America, Cure Autism Now, the National Alliance for Autism Research, Unlocking Autism, and numerous other organizations commemorate April of each year as "National Autism Awareness Month";

Whereas autism is a developmental disorder that is typically diagnosed during the first three years of life, robbing individuals of their ability to communicate and interact with others;

Whereas autism affects an estimated 1 of every 166 children in the United States;

Whereas autism is four times more likely to be found in boys than in girls and can affect anyone, regardless of race, ethnicity, or other factors;

Whereas the cost of specialized treatment in a developmental center for individuals with autism is approximately \$80,000 per individual per year;

Whereas the cost of special education programs for school-aged children with autism is often more than \$30,000 per child per year;

Whereas the total cost nationally of caring for individuals with autism is estimated at more than \$90,000,000,000 per year; and

Whereas despite the fact that autism is one of the most common developmental disorders, many professionals in the medical and educational fields are still unaware of the best methods to diagnose and treat the disorder: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of "National Autism Awareness Month";

(2) recognizes and commends the parents and relatives of children with autism for their sacrifice and dedication in providing for the special needs of children with autism and for absorbing significant financial costs for specialized education and support services;

(3) supports aggressive research to determine the causes of autism, identify the best methods of early intervention and treatment, expand programs for individuals with autism across their lifespan, and promote understanding of the special needs of individuals with autism;

(4) commends the Department of Health and Human Services for implementing programs to study the epidemiology of autism and related disorders and advancing autism research at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the National Institutes of Health;

(5) stresses the need to begin early intervention services soon after an individual has been diagnosed with autism, noting that early intervention strategies are the primary therapeutic options for individuals with autism and early intervention significantly improves outcomes for individuals with autism and can reduce the level of funding and services needed later in life;

(6) supports the Federal Government's commitment to provide States with part of the costs needed to educate children with disabilities under part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1411 et seq.);

(7) encourages more Americans to pursue the teaching profession and to be trained with the skills necessary to teach, assist, and respond to special needs students, including those students with autism; and

(8) recognizes the importance of worker training programs that meet the needs of developmentally disabled individuals, including those individuals with autism, and notes that people with autism can be, and are, productive members of the workforce if they are given appropriate support, training, and early intervention services.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS).

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 605, a resolution that recognizes the importance of increasing awareness of autism, supporting programs for increased research and im-

proved treatment of autism, and improving training and support for individuals with autism and those who care for individuals with autism.

Autism is a developmental disability that usually appears, unfortunately, in very young children. We all have friends who are experiencing the tragedy, and God knows it is a tragedy, of having a child diagnosed that is autistic. What that does to a family we can only try to imagine. The least that we can do is to encourage more research and awareness and education among all families.

The disease impacts the normal development of the brain that controls social interaction and communication skills. Autism is four times more prevalent in boys and knows no racial, ethnic, or social boundaries.

More than 500,000 people in the United States today have some form of autism, making it the third most common developmental disability. Many people are surprised to learn that autism is more common than Downs Syndrome.

While we are finding better ways to understand and work with autistic individuals, the disease is still greatly misunderstood. The majority of individuals, including health care professionals, are still unaware of how autism affects people and how to effectively work with the individuals with the disease.

However, some progress has been made. A few years ago, most people with autism were eventually placed in institutions. Today, even the most severely autistic disabled can be taught skills to assist their development due to the development of individualized services and programs.

We are all extremely concerned about this disease. This resolution stresses that early diagnosis and treatment are essential to ensuring a better quality of life for individuals with autism. However, early diagnosis and treatment can only occur with increased awareness, and that is much of what we try to do with this resolution; and that is why, Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this good bipartisan legislation.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY) for his leadership on this critical and growing health problem, and I would like to thank my friend from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Health, for his good work on this issue and on many others.

One of the more eye-opening meetings I have had in my 12 years in Congress was with the family of an autistic child. The first time I did that, it was sobering to listen to the mother and father talk about their son's diagnosis of autism, a disease about which the causes are disagreed and generally unknown. It is sobering to learn what