

□ 1045

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 99, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

Ms. SUTTON. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 275 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 275

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

SEC. 2. During consideration in the House of House Concurrent Resolution 99 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the

concurrent resolution to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

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

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

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

(Ms. SUTTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SUTTON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 275.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SUTTON. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 275 provides for consideration of H. Con. Res. 99, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008 under a structured rule.

The rule provides for 4 hours of general debate, three to be controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the Budget and one to be controlled by Representative MALONEY of New York and Representative SAXTON of New Jersey.

The rule also makes in order three substitute amendments by Representative SCOTT of Virginia, Representative WOOLSEY and Representative RYAN of Wisconsin.

Madam Speaker, budgets, more than anything else this government produces, are a statement of what matters to us and what does not. They are moral documents. They tell us to what degree we care to look after the old and protect the young. They indicate our responsibilities to commitments both abroad and here at home. They give life to our greatest dreams as a Nation. They are the hope we leave for our children and become the legacy we bestow upon our people.

And they can be examples of great courage, or an absolution of Congress's responsibility to set priorities consistent with strengthening our people and our communities.

Madam Speaker, as it concerns the budget, it has been a long 6 years for this Nation. The budget has been out of balance fiscally, and it has been out of balance with the needs of the American people.

Just 6 years ago, we were looking at a projected \$5.6 trillion surplus. That has collapsed into a \$9 trillion deficit. For every American in this country, there is \$29,000 worth of debt.

And to add insult to injury, most of the debt we have taken on in recent years will be sent to investors in foreign countries.

It goes far beyond having been drunk at the wheel. Our predecessors in the

majority not only crashed the car into a ditch, they accelerated after landing there, allowing mud to cave in on top of it.

That was the fiscal situation Democrats found when we arrived here a few months ago in the majority.

Since President Bush took office in 2001, my home State of Ohio alone has lost over 200,000 manufacturing jobs; and 3 million have been lost nationwide.

Job growth overall has slowed to a significantly slower pace in recent years than under the Clinton administration, at a rate even below the level necessary to keep pace with population growth. Sadly, our families have even less purchasing power today than they did in January of 2001.

And the debt has continued to pile up, with no accountability, no fiscal responsibility, no effort to place priorities in the right places, to curb wasteful spending, to do what needs to be done to make sure that the programs consistent with the values of this Nation, Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid, SCHIP and Community Block Grants continue to be able to survive.

In short, the policies enacted in recent years will have devastating effects on our future competitiveness and standard of living if we continue down the same destructive road.

But it is a new day, and we have a new path to follow, one that says that it is more important to take care of our wounded veterans than it is to take care of oil companies, one that says that kids cannot grow up to thrive and give back to this great Nation if they do not have the health care when they are young, one that says that a measure of a Nation can be taken in small things like heating assistance for the elderly and nutrition programs in local schools and special assistance for those with disabilities.

Indeed, it is in the small print of the Federal budget that we find our worth as a government, which is why I am proud, both as a member of the Budget Committee, and as a Member of Congress, to support this Democratic budget.

It is the first time in a very long time that Congress has before it a budget that is fiscally responsible and in line with the needs of the American people.

□ 1100

This budget makes critical investments in education, health care, our veterans, our communities and our economy while at the same time adhering to PAYGO principles and returning our budget to balance by 2012. The reckless economic policies of the last 6 years have been immensely damaging to our economy's long-term global competitiveness and particularly to our workers.

The Democratic budget will strengthen middle-class families by providing funding for job training programs,

health care, and education, particularly in math and science. These are all essential investments in our workforce that will lay a solid foundation for a growing economy and improve our competitiveness. The Democratic budget rejects the President's draconian cuts to programs that provide health care to the poor, to our children, and our seniors. Nine million of the neediest children in this country and 242,000 in the State of Ohio lack health insurance coverage, and the funding levels in the President's budget put as many as 1 million of these children at risk to fall off the SCHIP program by 2012. In contrast, the Democratic budget provides for a \$50 billion increase to SCHIP, allowing us to reach millions more children than we reach right now, making our children's health care needs a Federal Government priority.

The Democratic budget also rejects the \$300 billion in Medicare and Medicaid cuts proposed by the administration. Access to health care should be a right, not a privilege, in this Nation and it does not serve any of us to roll back the clock on the health care initiatives that have served us so well up until now.

The Democratic budget is also about investing in our communities. It provides for increased funding for Community Development Block Grants, the Social Service Block Grants, and it saves Community Services Block Grants which was zeroed out in the President's budget. I have personally spoken with a number of the community officials in my own district that would have been affected by the proposed cuts in block grant programs and I will tell you that at the local level, these programs are lifelines for our neighborhoods and towns. They address needs in affordable housing, education and nutrition. They promote financial literacy and assist with child care needs and special services to children with disabilities. And in our cities, the CDBG funds help provide affordable housing and services to our most vulnerable populations. In short, we should not be trying to do away with programs that work.

The Democratic budget also makes education a priority, from early childhood to lifelong learning. To that end, our budget provides \$3 billion over the current services level for education, training and social services. These increases are an investment in our future and will be vital to our global competitiveness. We have increased funding for those just beginning their education, like the 38,000 children in Head Start in Ohio, and we have taken steps to make college education more affordable through Pell Grants and a higher education reserve fund. We have included funds to train more math and science teachers.

Finally, the Democratic budget reflects a major shift in priorities by providing for a \$5.4 billion increase in the Veterans Affairs budget which is an 18.1 percent increase over 2007 levels

and the largest increase in history. Recently it has become clear that the needs of our brave men and women who have served our country so honorably have not been met. We have heard heartbreaking stories of wounded veterans who must wait up to 6 months for disability determinations and about VA facilities that are in disrepair. The more than 1 million veterans in Ohio and the more than 24 million nationwide deserve nothing less than our full support. Anything less is simply unacceptable.

A budget reflects the soul of a nation. It can give life to our most honorable pursuits and provide proof of the best of our intentions. It is the Rosetta Stone which those who look upon us from the present and from the future can decipher our worth and our courage.

It is with those thoughts in mind that I am proud to present this budget for consideration by the House.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this rule and to the unprecedented tax increase that the Democrat majority is bringing to the House floor today. The massive and irresponsible tax increase included in this budget would be the largest in American history, weighing in at a shocking \$392.5 billion over the next 5 years. This Democrat budget, which is balanced on the backs of everyday taxpayers, will be used to finance bloated new government spending that my colleague just spoke about that will be well above the rate of inflation through 2012 while ignoring the brewing entitlement crisis. Spending, more spending, and more spending rather than worrying about the brewing entitlement crisis that faces this Nation. Around 77 million baby boomers will be retiring in the near future and will begin collecting Social Security, Medicaid and Medicare. Funding this new spending represents the greatest economic challenge of our era and is a challenge the Democrat budget has chosen to completely ignore while going on a spending spree everywhere else.

If fiscal discipline is what the Democrats promised voters this past fall, then by my count it took all of about 3 months for the Democrat candidates to abandon their campaign trail promises and show their true tax-and-spend stripes here again on the floor today.

This deeply flawed budget would increase taxes on almost 8 million taxpayers in my home State of Texas, costing each of them an average of \$2,755 per year. It would collect these taxes by allowing the 2001 and 2003 tax relief provided by the Republican Congress to expire. In real terms, for every taxpayer, this means reducing the child tax credit for working families so that government can collect \$27 billion more to finance the new spending that the Democrat majority chooses. It means reinstating the marriage pen-

alty and the death tax to collect an additional \$104 billion so that the majority can kick that further down the road rather than reforming and strengthening our Nation's entitlement programs. And it means completely ignoring the alternative minimum tax crisis which is projected to hit 23 million middle-class families if not dealt with quickly.

Madam Speaker, I believe the voters watching this debate on C-SPAN understand what these tax increases mean for our economy and our ability to compete globally, for, you see, I remember just a few short years ago when America was shipping thousands and thousands of jobs overseas and then the tax cuts took place and now we can't find enough workers in America. Madam Speaker, I would suggest to you, that is the way to be globally competitive, when you have plenty of jobs in America. But the voters and those people watching this debate may not realize that for a family of four with \$60,000 in earnings, it would mean a tax increase of some 61 percent. It means that a single parent with two children and \$30,000 in earnings would see a tax increase of 67 percent. And it means that an elderly couple with \$40,000 in income would see their taxes increased by a whopping 156 percent.

Now, one would think that a tax increase of almost \$400 billion impacting every American taxpayer would be enough to finance the Democrats' appetite for big government programs. But hold on. This is just the start. There's more to come. This budget also contains 12 reserve funds, or pet initiative IOUs, which set the stage for more than \$115 billion in future higher spending which will have to be financed by, let me say, you guessed it, the taxpayer. Higher taxes.

For the last 4 years, responsible budgets passed by the Republican Party kept discretionary spending at or below inflation for all non-defense, non-homeland security spending. This budget plan brought forward by the Democrats brings this tradition to a screeching halt by allowing about \$25 billion more in discretionary spending than requested by President Bush or even the spendthrift Senate, which asks for about \$7 billion less than the House.

Thankfully, it is not too late to stop this fiscal train wreck. My friend, the ranking member of the Budget Committee, PAUL RYAN, has proposed an alternative budget that achieves balance by 2012 and ends the raid on Social Security without raising taxes. The Republican alternative maintains our strong economy, reforms and strengthens entitlement programs, and does this while keeping in place the tax relief that has contributed so much to our economy since 2001.

Without meaningful tax relief passed by recent Republican Congresses, our economy would not have seen the massive job growth—with 7.6 million new jobs or roughly 170,000 per month—and

economic growth of 3.5 percent a year that it has experienced over the last 15 quarters.

The Republican budget contains no increase in marginal rates and leaves in place the 10 percent bracket for low-income filers. It includes no reduction in child tax credit, no rollback of the marriage penalty or death tax relief, and no increase in capital gains or dividend tax rates. It provides for an extension of alternative minimum tax relief, the research and development tax credit, and the State and local sales tax deduction that is so important to people all across this country, including the 17 States that it benefits. It ends the raid on Social Security and fully funds the President's request for national defense and the war on terrorism. It also makes important budget reforms, such as a legislative line-item veto; earmark transparency; requiring PAYGO to be offset by spending reductions, not tax increases; discretionary spending caps; requiring a vote on any debt limit increase; and requiring a vote on any bill that seeks to spend or authorize more than \$50 million.

Madam Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to listen very carefully today about what the choices are that are on the floor of the House of Representatives and what they can support and to stand up for fiscal discipline, economic growth and responsible budgeting by opposing this rule and the underlying legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SUTTON. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN), a distinguished member of the Rules and Budget Committees.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I am proud to rise in support of this rule and in support of this budget resolution. It provides our families, seniors and children with economic security, health care, and nutrition.

Madam Speaker, 5.4 million more people live in poverty today than in the year 2000. That is over 35 million total, and 12.4 million are children. One in every eight Americans is hungry. One in eight does not know whether they will be able to put food on the table. Madam Speaker, every single Member of this Congress should be ashamed of these statistics. The United States is the only wealthy industrialized nation in the world that tolerates widespread hunger amongst its people, including its children.

□ 1115

The decision to tolerate hunger in America has serious costs for us as a Nation. We constantly hear that we are a Nation committed to leaving no child behind. But children who are hungry, who live in poverty, cannot keep up. They cannot develop and thrive. They cannot learn or play with energy and enthusiasm.

Hunger stunts the physical, mental and emotional growth of millions of

our children. When these children become adults, they are more likely to have low earnings and low productivity in the workforce. Their poor health means more illness that requires large health care expenditures. Their early mortality robs our economy of their labor and consumption. They are more likely to engage in crime, which results in monetary and personal cost to their victims and to the taxpayers for the cost of our criminal justice system. And, sadly, they are also more likely to be victims, resulting in similar costs.

In other areas, we see the difficulties faced by our seniors, who are dehumanized and demoralized when they have to choose between utilities and food. Many need special diets and adequate nutrition for their medications to work effectively. But, unfortunately, hundreds of thousands lack adequate food. And when we fail to end hunger among our elderly, we choose to add to their immediate and long-term health care costs, even while we hasten their deaths.

These are some of the priorities addressed in the Democratic budget resolution.

This budget resolution recognizes the burden faced by families when they are forced to choose between rent, food, heat and medicine, and provides funding for children's health care and provides funding for programs like LIHEAP, Head Start and low-income housing.

I want to thank Chairman SPRATT for holding a budget hearing on hunger and inviting Boston pediatrician Deborah Frank and South Carolina food banker Denise Holland to testify about the urgent need to address hunger in America. I only wish more of my colleagues attended that hearing.

We heard how food stamp benefits provide a first defense against hunger but are too meager to solve the problem, how food stamp benefits average just \$1 per person per meal, how the minimum monthly benefit is stuck at the decades-old level of \$10, and how the program is missing four in every 10 eligible people.

Madam Speaker, it is unconscionable that the programs proven to attack hunger in America are continually under attack. The Commodity Food Supplemental Program is continually zeroed out by the Bush administration. The Food Stamp Program is constantly derided, with fraud, waste and abuse cited, when, according to the GAO, it is running at the most productive levels in the history of the program.

It is unconscionable, Madam Speaker, that legal immigrants, people here legally with proper documentation, must wait 5 years for the food stamps they may need today, simply because they happen to be newcomers to our Nation. This is simply bad policy, and it needs to be fixed immediately. And it is unconscionable that children in need who receive breakfast and lunches during the school year are denied food

during the summer months simply because school isn't in session.

The next farm bill needs to invest the additional Federal resources to improve these Federal anti-hunger programs. It should improve the food stamp benefit, open eligibility to vulnerable and underserved groups, and adequately fund and fully utilize USDA resources to support emergency food assistance and other commodity assistance programs that serve the needy.

This budget resolution, by providing a \$20 billion reserve fund for the farm bill and by rejecting the President's arbitrary eligibility cuts to food stamps and the elimination of the Commodity Supplemental Food Program, not only makes a strong statement on the need to combat hunger in America, it actually takes concrete steps to do so.

This resolution deserves support for the economic and food security it provides all our people, but, and let me stress, it is only a beginning. Ending hunger is not and should not be a partisan issue. The moral and economic costs affect every community in America. There is not a single community in America that is hunger-free.

So I call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to work together here in the Congress and in our communities to create the sustained and comprehensive investment necessary to end hunger and to make us a stronger Nation. One step in this path is to pass the budget resolution before us.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from San Dimas, California (Mr. DREIER).

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, as I listened to my colleague on the other side of the aisle, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN), speak about the need to expand spending in a wide range of areas, I could not help but think about why it is that I chose to run for Congress and why I know my Republican colleagues stepped up to the plate to run for Congress. We want a defense capability that is second to none, but we also, Madam Speaker, want to do everything that we possibly can to reduce the size and scope of government, encouraging individual initiative and responsibility.

One of the things that troubles me as I listen to the arguments propounded by so many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle is that they talk about a need that is there. We all want to make sure that we address the very important societal needs that are there. We want to put into place entitlement reform in the area of both Medicare and Medicaid. Why? Not only so we can save taxpayer dollars but so that we can ensure that the Medicare and Medicaid programs are more effective and provide needed assistance to those who are out there who truly are in need.

The problem that I have is, as they talk about all of these programs, it undermines, it undermines initiative and responsibility. What we want to do with our budget, Madam Speaker, is everything within our power, as Mr. SESSIONS said so well, to make sure that we keep taxes low.

One of the things that I find to be very troubling is that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle hate most, hate most the taxes that have actually created a surge in revenues to the Federal Treasury.

We all know that the budget that they are going to be bringing forward puts into place the largest tax increase in American history. We always held up the 1993 Clinton tax increase, that not one Republican voted for, as the largest increase in history; and I am proud that when we won our majority in 1994 we brought about major changes that, in fact, repealed large parts of that 1993 tax increase. But, Madam Speaker, that 1993 tax increase, which has been held up as the model, as the largest tax increase in American history, pales in comparison to this \$392.5 billion tax increase that they are advocating in this budget.

Madam Speaker, when I say that they hate most the tax cuts that have created the greatest surge in revenue, I am referring, of course, to capital gains. I have been one who has long advocated a zero capital gains tax rate. One of the things that we found is that reducing the top rate on capital gains has not done what virtually every green eyeshade prognosticator looked at as what happened. They said there would be a loss in revenues to the Federal Treasury.

We found, of course, that there has been a surge in revenues to the Federal Treasury. Why? Because it has encouraged economic growth to the point where the deficit this year is actually \$73 billion lower than it was last year. And that is as we have cut taxes, met the very important funding priorities of homeland security and national security, and we still have been able to actually reduce the Federal deficit. As a percentage of our Gross Domestic Product the deficit today, which everyone decries, Democrats and Republicans alike decry, is in fact lower as a percentage of the GDP than almost ever.

In light of that, Madam Speaker, I think it is very important for us to recognize we have a strong, vibrant, growing economy today.

I was very surprised when the distinguished Chair of the Committee on Rules last night, late last night when we were reporting out this rule, talked about how devastating the economy is.

Madam Speaker, I will tell you it is a devastatingly good economy. Just this morning, we got the report that there has been an increase in durable goods purchases. We have a 4.5 percent unemployment rate: 146 million Americans, more than ever in the history of our country, are working today. That

is not an accident. We have gone through terrorist attacks, corporate scandals, the economic downturn; and, because of the policies that we put into place, we have the strongest, most dynamic, \$13 trillion economy that we have ever seen in the history of the United States of America.

Madam Speaker, I talked to an economist last night who said to me, "You know, I had no idea that they would move this quickly to increase spending and increase taxes." And that is exactly what they are doing, and that is why we need to reject this rule and clearly do everything that we can to reject the tax-and-spend budget that they have propounded and support Mr. RYAN's alternative.

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

Madam Speaker, before I yield to my next speaker, I want to point out that the Democratic budget does not raise a single penny of taxes, period.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from Ohio for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to support this rule and to enthusiastically support this solid and balanced budget resolution. It invests in strategic priorities for the future, while putting the Nation on the path to fiscal stability.

In approaching this debate, I would ask that Members and our constituents keep in mind that we are not starting from scratch. The previous leadership left us with a fiscal disaster that can't be repaired overnight. But this budget gets us on the right track in a responsible and strategic way.

That is governing. Governing is not easy. It requires making hard choices. But making hard choices today is better than Congress abdicating its responsibility to choose altogether. Because the alternative to making hard choices is passing debt on to tomorrow's decisionmakers, leaving our children and grandchildren, like my own Anna and Robby, with a diminished quality of life.

With PAYGO rules, the budget draws a line in the sand. If you want new mandatory spending or tax cuts, find a way to pay for it.

Shifting the burden on to the next generation is no longer an option under this budget. We are not going to eradicate the deficit as quickly as some would like, and we can't spend as much on domestic priorities as some would like. But this budget gives us the type of solid foundation that will allow us to tackle our fiscal challenges, while still investing in the most important priorities.

This budget recognizes that we need to invest in healthcare and education for our children. It recognizes that we must move to a clean energy economy

by driving research and development and by promoting scientific innovation and that we must provide for our veterans, who have served honorably and deserve the best care possible. Finally, this budget recognizes that the Tax Code should be fair for hardworking families.

All of this is accomplished in a fiscally responsible manner, while ensuring the security of our Nation. That is a tremendous achievement, and I thank Chairman SPRATT for his diligence in achieving this excellent legislative product. I urge my colleagues to provide the type of broad and enthusiastic support that it deserves.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the favorite son from Pasco, Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas for yielding.

Madam Speaker, there are two ways to balance a budget, whether it is your family budget or the Federal budget. You can either, one, reduce the amount of money being spent or, two, increase the amount of money coming in.

Madam Speaker, the Democrats have flat-out rejected option number one of spending less and declared their allegiance to option number two of raising taxes; and they have done both with a fervor that our country has never seen before.

The Democrat 5-year budget plan would spend more money each and every year and at a rate faster than the inflation rate. This means that each year the size of the Federal Government will grow bigger and more rapidly than the American economy. To pay for the record levels of spending in their budget, the Democrats plan to raise taxes on the American people more than at any other time in our country's history. That is right, raising spending to record levels and to pay for it with the largest tax increase in American history.

□ 1130

This budget does not extend tax relief from the marriage tax penalty. It doesn't extend the \$1,000 child tax credit that many young families use. It doesn't end the death tax. It doesn't fix the alternative minimum tax for middle-class families. It doesn't protect the lowest tax rate, and would again impose taxes on lower income Americans who right now pay no taxes, thanks to the 2001 tax relief law passed by the Republican Congress.

This tax relief should not be repealed or allowed to expire to pay for more government spending. This tax relief that was passed in 2001 and 2003 should remain permanent for the American people.

Madam Speaker, on important priorities for my State, like the extension of the State and local sales tax deduction from the Federal tax and county payments for rural schools, the Democrat budget falls short. It offers only promises, but no real action. The Republican plan, on the other hand, sets

aside real dollars to extend the State and local sales tax deduction for another year. So I encourage all Members who believe in sales tax fairness to think carefully about this when casting their vote.

On the issue of payment to rural schools in counties with Federal forests, this budget allows an extension, but it takes no real steps to make it happen. As I have said before on this issue, I am disappointed that the Democratic leadership denied the opportunity to attach an extension of this legislation to another bill, a bill that has, in fact, been signed into law.

Madam Speaker, the Republican plan I will be supporting holds the line on spending, sets priorities and allows taxpayers to keep more of their hard-earned money and invest it as they see fit, not how the Federal Government sees fit.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and the budget resolution offered by the Democrat majority and support the substitute offered by Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.

Ms. SUTTON. Madam Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon, a distinguished member of the Budget Committee (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy.

You can hear the drumbeat from our friends on the other side of the aisle about the largest tax increase in American history. Well, the fact is we are today going to be able to talk about the largest tax increase in American history, but it is not contained in the Democratic budget. The largest tax increase in American history is \$1.8 trillion that the President's budget anticipates as a result of the collection of the alternative minimum tax.

It has never been a priority of the Republicans to deal with this looming disaster. Indeed, they squandered 8 years of hard-earned Democratic surpluses, unprecedented surpluses, squandered in a heartbeat in their relentless pursuit to give tax benefits for those who need them least.

There are a few items in there that would have broad bipartisan agreement, the 10 percent bracket, tax credit for families, making some reasonable adjustment in the inheritance tax. But no, they were not interested in dealing with areas of agreement and then solving the alternative minimum tax. Each year, they have kicked the millionaire tax down the road. It has long since morphed into something that is not a millionaire's tax. It is going to be a tax under the President's proposal, and with the Republican priorities, it is going to be a tax on every two-income working family in America with children that have any sort of middle income.

They are going to be paying the alternative minimum tax. And in fact, it is going to cost them more to compute in many cases than the actual tax. They get whacked twice.

In 2001, in 2003, the Republicans refused to deal with this looming challenge and instead gave all sorts of tax breaks to all sorts of people and avoided solving this problem.

In 2004, when we had a \$4 billion problem with our overseas manufacturing tax credit, that morphed into a \$137 billion tax grab bag and ignored the alternative minimum tax. I put forth to the administration in our hearings in both Ways and Means and in Budget to find out where their priority was. Well, their priority is not fixing the alternative minimum tax, just a 1-year patch. They want to extend all of these tax breaks, the good and, frankly, some of the bizarre, for people like Paris Hilton.

Well, Madam Speaker, the Democratic alternative is focusing on what the real problem is. What we are doing in Ways and Means, we have made a commitment. Our number one priority is to solve the alternative minimum tax. Theirs, as is evidenced in their substitute, is going to take all of the potential headroom to make that challenge in solving the problem even more difficult by permanently extending all of those tax increases without any offset.

The Democratic alternative is responsible, it speaks to the needs of working men and women, fiscal stability, and most important, our priorities stopping the looming tax tsunami of the alternative minimum tax, which will, in fact, be the largest tax increase in American history.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, by the way, I encourage the gentleman from Oregon to read the bill. The Democrat budget does not address the alternative minimum tax, as he stated.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Is the gentleman familiar with the provisions in our bill that set up the reserve fund so that it permits the opportunity for the Ways and Means Committee to be able to move forward, hopefully on a bipartisan basis, to be able to establish that within the pay-as-you-go rule?

Mr. SESSIONS. You know, a reserve fund out there in the future does not fix a darn thing.

Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to yield 3 minutes to the chairman of the Suburban Caucus from Highland Park, Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. KIRK. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Madam Speaker, the budget coming before this House does more than approve the largest tax increase in American history. That is what it includes. But what this budget is notable for is what it also does not include.

The leaders of the Republican Tuesday Group and the study committees came together to outline reforms to help the government spend less. And why should we do that? Let's note that in 1961, when President Kennedy took

office, the Federal Government spent just \$98 billion. We didn't hit our first trillion until 1987. We broke the second trillion in 2002, and in 2010, we will go above the \$3 trillion level.

The Federal debt held by the public has climbed to over \$3 trillion in 2006, a 300 percent increase in the last quarter century. This year, interest payments on our debt alone will top over \$200 billion.

Now, last night I offered an amendment cosponsored by Congressmen DENT, PENCE and HENSARLING. We laid out some commonsense reforms that this budget should include, like statutory discretionary spending limits, like the kind approved by President Clinton that helped us spend less; like provisions to slow the growth of entitlement spending by requiring offsets for any new benefits allowed; like enforcement tools that restricted the definition of "emergency spending" that would have helped us not declare a spinach farmer bailout last week as a national security emergency, which we did in the supplemental appropriations bill; like accrual accounting, to show what the taxpayers' long-term obligations are, and to clearly lay out for the American people our financial position.

And finally, periodic audits and summaries updating the accounting rules we use so the American people always have the most transparent view of what their government is doing.

Unfortunately, last night the Rules Committee rejected this amendment. We will not even be allowed to vote on these commonsense reforms. Ironic because most of these reforms were taken from the Democratic Blue Dog group that has advocated strong financial controls, but somehow backed this effort to deny this amendment from even a vote.

I urge this House to reject this rule and allow these commonsense reforms to go through. If the past is our guide, even the budget that the Congress will consider today and tomorrow will be waived shortly because when the supplemental appropriations bill comes back from Congress, it will include a provision that says the budget act is entirely waived and \$125 billion, \$23 billion over the President's request, will be passed, waiving the budget that we even approve tomorrow.

Ms. SUTTON. Madam Speaker, before I yield, I would just like to remind the public that those on the other side of the aisle who are here today preaching about fiscal responsibility are the same people who, when they were in charge for 6 years, took a projected \$5.6 trillion surplus and collapsed it into a \$9 trillion deficit.

Madam Speaker, with that, I would yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, the President's fiscal year 2008 budget requests funding for the Iraq war through 2009. The Democratic budget accepts that timeline. It includes \$145.2 billion

for military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan as requested by the President for fiscal year 2008. It requests \$50 billion for fiscal year 2009. That is in addition to the \$510 billion we have already spent on the war and another \$97 billion pending in the supplemental, according to the CRS. The total, if approved, would be over \$800 billion for war, while our schools, our health care and the quality of our environment are in decline. The budget should reflect the mandate Democrats were given in November, yet we are mirroring the President's plan for the war and his budget request to fund the war.

The supplemental calls for withdrawal by August 2008. Why does the budget encourage the war to continue into 2009? If we were serious about trying to stop the war, the budget should not contradict the supplemental language.

This budget does not end the war, it continues it through the end of President Bush's term. The American people want the war to end now, not in 2008, not in 2009, but the people want the war to end now.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, at this time, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HELLER).

Mr. HELLER of Nevada. Thank you, to my colleague from Texas, I appreciate the time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule on the budget. It is unfair, and it unnecessarily limits debate on middle-class tax cuts.

Together with a colleague from Pennsylvania, we offer an amendment to ensure that the child tax credit is included in the budget. But the majority won't allow us to offer that amendment today or even have a debate about it. It is a shame that this amendment in defense of the middle-class families was not allowed. The new majority must still be convinced it is their money and not the taxpayers'.

Thirty-one million taxpayers will see their taxes increase in 2011 when the per-child tax credit is cut in half, and that is just the start. The average tax hike on 975,000 middle-class families and taxpayers in Nevada will be almost \$3,000. We will likely be told that the budget assumes the cost of this tax provision will be addressed, along with seven others, through some vague "smoke and mirrors" policy. My western values told me what happens when you assume. Instead, the Murphy-Heller amendment guaranteed that funds would be there for families instead of wishful thinking.

Madam Speaker, to my colleagues, do the middle-class families make too much money? Is a child born after 2011 somehow less expensive than a child born in 2010? Is the child tax credit a partisan issue? Have those colleagues of mine in the majority like the Blue Dogs lost their way, or have they just been muzzled?

We are going to hear a lot from the majority today about the children, but

apparently that is only when it comes to government spending, not middle-class tax cuts. Their rhetoric on tax rings hollow when Congress is muzzled on such a critical debate. Don't assume. Vote this rule down and for middle-class tax cuts for families.

Ms. SUTTON. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut, a distinguished member of the Budget Committee (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Let's be clear. The 2008 budget resolution, the Democratic proposal leaves the tax cuts in place, it plans for their extension, and it extends the child tax credit and will do that. If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle cared a whit about the child tax credit, they would entertain lowering the eligibility threshold so that families who make less than \$10,500 a year in this Nation could be eligible for the child tax credit. They refuse to do that. So take their words with a grain of salt today, my friends.

As a nation, we face great challenges, challenges in education and in health care, challenges that the Federal Government has the ability, the capacity, the resources and the moral obligation to help us meet.

□ 1145

Our job is to help create real opportunity, to give people the tools that they need to succeed. The budget that we consider today reflects our Nation's values and puts us on the right path to meet our obligations.

I am proud of the work that we have done with this budget because I believe it addresses our most urgent priorities, and for the first time in 6 years we have a budget that makes an investment in children and in families. It puts children first by addressing their health care needs. It rejects the inadequate funding level proposed by the President for the SCHIP, the children's health care program. Our Nation's health care problems have become increasingly desperate. SCHIP is virtually the only success story that we have, covering nearly 1 million more children and working families today than even President Clinton anticipated when he created it.

And Republicans agree. Recently, I received a letter from my Republican Governor from the State of Connecticut saying as much.

This expands coverage to the estimated 6 million children eligible but not currently enrolled in SCHIP.

This budget focuses on education. A quality education is more closely tied to our economic prosperity than ever. It is critical to staying competitive in today's global economy. The President's budget reduces our commitment to education investment for a third year in a row. As we face record school enrollments, the academic requirements under No Child Left Behind and rising college costs, to say nothing of increased competition from China and India, the President's budget takes us in the wrong direction for this country.

Now is the time to invest more in education and not less. The funding allows for an infusion of new resources for No Child Left Behind and IDEA, where the Federal Government has a promise to keep, and it works to make higher education more affordable through a commitment to the Pell Grants.

Madam Speaker, I support this rule. I support this budget. It represents a commitment to fiscal responsibility and a greater investment in our future.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, the Rules Committee does not charge for people to come and attend our meetings, and it seems like a good number of Members probably needed to be there last night.

The gentlewoman from Connecticut would have heard that this big increase that she is talking about in SCHIP is in a reserve fund. It is not paid for. As a matter of fact, it is going to have to find an offset somewhere if they are going to get to it. So it is not reserved in the budget as necessarily to be paid for; it is in a reserve fund.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the budget expert from the Republican Party from the Fifth District of Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank my good friend and the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. It is anti-family, it is anti-tax, it is fiscally irresponsible. And I agree with my colleague from Texas. I can hardly believe some of the things I am hearing on the House floor.

The Democrats, Madam Speaker, obviously want to have it both ways. They claim on the one hand that they have done this incredible job of balancing the Federal budget, and then they claim that they actually preserve tax relief in the budget. But if anybody would bother to read the document, the only way they achieve balance is by taking away all of the tax relief that we have enjoyed in the last several years. They would bring forth the single largest tax increase in American history.

And guess what, Madam Speaker? Twelve years ago, the last time that they were in power, guess what they did? They brought forth the single largest tax increase in American history. Certainly they at least get an A for consistency, but you have to give them an F for fiscal responsibility.

I would point out to the preceding speaker, the gentlewoman from Connecticut, and I have the honor of serving with her on the Budget Committee, had the Democrats felt so strongly about preserving the tax relief, they had ample opportunity in committee to preserve the tax relief for American families, and they chose not to do it.

This is a budget which may be worthy of a Pulitzer Prize in fiction. It is full of Orwellian-speak. It is something that is worthy of the Twilight Zone. It makes no sense. You cannot claim that you are not reducing spending, you are

preserving tax relief, and you are balancing budget all at the same time. You are taking three different sides of the argument. It does not wash.

This Democrat budget is also silent, absolutely stone cold silent on the number one fiscal issue facing our Nation, and that is out-of-control entitlement spending. If we don't reform these entitlement programs, it will lead to a doubling of taxes on the American people, our children, and our grandchildren. The single largest tax increase in history will pale in comparison if we don't act today.

And this is a budget for the next election, it is not a budget for the next generation. You can't have a fiscally responsible budget and remain silent on the number one fiscal challenge facing the Nation today. If you want to save Medicare, if you want to save Social Security, if you want to save Medicaid, you have to reform these programs; and the Democrat budget, again, is stone cold silent.

They speak of their reserve funds, but, Madam Speaker, there is no reserve and there is no funds. Again, this is fiction. This is pure, unadulterated fiction.

What isn't fiction is the largest single tax increase in American history that is going to fall upon American families. It is going to fall upon them hard. Because every time the Democrats increase the Federal budget, they are cutting some family budget. They are taking away from a family's ability to send a child to college. They are taking away from a family's ability to help a parent with long-term health care. They are taking away a family's ability to buy that first home, make a down payment on their first home. Every time you take away, every time you increase the Federal budget, you are taking away from the family budget.

So these two documents stand in stark contrast. The Democrat budget, the single largest tax increase in history. Again, this contrast could not be more stark. The single largest tax increase in American history. And I remind my colleagues on the other side to please, please think about the families that are in your district that actually pay these taxes.

You may think we are having a debate on how much our society is going to spend on health care and housing and education. That is not the debate I think we are having. I think we are having a debate about who is going to do that spending. Is it going to be government bureaucrats, or is it going to be American families?

In my State of Texas, the average Texas family is going to have to pay an additional \$2,700 a year under the Democrat plan to have the single largest tax increase in American history. I asked my constituents, Madam Speaker, what is this going to mean to you? And I heard from several of them.

I heard, for example, from Diana in Mesquite, Texas. She wrote, "Dear

Congressman, I wanted to let you know that I am a single mom that does not receive any type of child support, and an increase of this amount would break me. I would be at the risk of losing my home with this type of increase. I am writing to ask your help to keep this from happening. This would be devastating to middle-income families." That is what Diana in Mesquite wrote.

Brian in Dallas, "This tax increase would affect our ability to pay tuition and books for our daughter to go to college. While she's a junior this year, we are trying to save money for her education. But as the cost of education increases this year, the loss of these funds, this increase in taxes, will have a negative impact on our ability to send her to college."

Again, this largest single tax increase in American history will have devastating impacts on American families. So the two budgets sit in stark contrast. One preserves the tax relief that has helped bring down the deficit, has given us the most tax revenues we have ever had before. We are awash in tax revenues, because people rolled up their sleeves, they went out, they worked, they saved. And that is why we have to vote down this rule.

Ms. SUTTON. Madam Speaker, before I yield, I would just like to respond.

Again, our budget resolution does not contain a single penny of tax increases, period. And I will tell you what does not wash to the distinguished gentleman who just spoke. What doesn't wash is that we are getting this lesson in fiscal responsibility from the party that took a projected \$5.6 trillion surplus and collapsed it into a \$9 trillion deficit.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and the Democratic budget for fiscal year 2008. This measure provides robust funding for our most important programs, while maintaining our firm commitment to fiscal discipline.

Last year, Democrats promised to move the country in a new direction, and that is exactly what this budget does. This budget restores many programs the President proposed to cut, while achieving balance by 2012.

It meets our commitments to defense and homeland security by implementing the 9/11 Commission recommendations and funding port security and first responders. It also recognizes those who have served our country with significant increases for veterans health care.

The resolution meets our domestic priorities by blocking proposed cuts to Medicare and Medicaid, while providing funding to cover millions of children without health insurance, something particularly important to my constituents in Rhode Island.

It boosts funds for education programs such as Pell Grants and promotes investment in programs that helps us move closer to energy independence and improve our environment.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the Democratic budget so that we can meet the needs of all Americans and restore fiscal responsibility through this process.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we have heard the debate today about this budget, about the priorities of the new Democrat majority, about how they have set aside all these 11 reserve funds; and we have seen Member after Member after Member from the new Democrat majority take credit for all these things that are going to be done. And yet, in fact, what they are is reserve funds set aside to find a way to either increase taxes or to find an offset.

We think that this is an irresponsible way to run the government. We think this is an irresponsible budget. We think raising taxes \$395 billion, which is included in that budget; we heard the testimony last night from the chairman of the Budget Committee and the ranking member that the assumptions that are based on the Democrat budget are that the tax cuts will go away, that tax increases will fill their place. We disagree with that. We think that hardworking American families deserve the right and the opportunity to continue their best wishes for their families, for their children's education, and take care of their family needs through the hard-earned money that they earned, to be able to keep that rather than bringing it for more spending that this new Democrat majority has in mind.

Mr. Speaker, I will be asking Members to oppose the previous question so that I may amend the rule to make in order a very thoughtful amendment offered by Mr. BRADY of Texas which was rejected by the Rules Committee last night. The Democrats in the committee voted down on party line.

Mr. BRADY's amendment would amend the budget resolution to add reconciliation instructions to the Committee on Ways and Means to extend the State and local sales tax deduction through 2012.

Currently, the Democrat budget resolution does not contemplate the extension of any meaningful tax relief provided by Republicans in 2001 or 2003. In fact, the Democrat budget resolution is relying on tax increases to reach this balance. As Americans make their household budgets, they should be able to rely on a consistent and fair Tax Code. The Democrat budget resolution will undermine this goal by imposing double taxation and will help eliminate the stability in the Tax Code that Americans deserve.

So even if all the substitutes are defeated, we will still be able to consider and debate this very important amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask unanimous consent to have the text of the amendment and extraneous material printed in the RECORD just prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

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

□ 1200

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

In a document released March 28, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities stated: "Some are claiming that the budget plan adopted last week by the House Budget Committee, which the full House is expected to vote on this week, would constitute 'the largest tax increase in history.' This claim is incorrect. The House plan does not include a tax increase." That is what the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities stated.

Mr. Speaker, last November the American people made it clear they are ready for a government that will be fiscally responsible. This Nation spoke loud and clear when it put a new party in power in Congress, 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 are concerned 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, and it puts forth the single largest increase in veterans spending in our Nation's history, and not a moment too soon.

It funds math and science programs for our kids, and 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.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress to be accountable to American taxpayers once again. It is time for Congress to be accountable to our children's future once again. I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

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

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against or-

dering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

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

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

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

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 275

OFFERED BY REP. SESSIONS OF TEXAS

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendment printed in section 4 shall be in order as though printed as the last amendment in the report of the Committee on Rules if offered by Representative Brady of Texas or a designee. That amendment shall be debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

SEC. 4. The amendment referred to in section 3 is as follows:

Reduce the amounts on page 3, lines 10 through 12, and page 4, lines 1 through 3, by the following amounts:

Fiscal year 2008: \$300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: \$1,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010: \$2,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011: \$2,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012: \$3,800,000,000.

Amend page 4, lines 7 through 12 to read as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: \$300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: \$1,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010: \$2,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011: \$2,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012: \$3,800,000,000.

Insert at the end of Title VI (page 61, line 10), the following section:

SEC. 602. RECONCILIATION FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH AND TAX FAIRNESS.

(a) IN THE HOUSE.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report a reconciliation bill not later than May 8, 2008, that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce revenues by not more than \$10,400,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2012.

(b) PURPOSE.—The reconciliation legislation reported pursuant to subsection (a) shall make the changes in the Internal Revenue Code such that the deduction of State and Local Sales Taxes shall not decrease during the fiscal years covered by this resolution.

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

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

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, 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 question are postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1538, WOUNDED WARRIOR ASSISTANCE ACT OF 2007

Ms. CASTOR. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 274 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 274

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1538) to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve the management of medical care, personnel actions, and quality of life issues for members of the Armed Forces who are receiving medical care in an outpatient status, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour and 20 minutes, with one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed